Synchronous + concurrent + sequential = earlier than + not later than

Gabriel Juhás, Robert Lorenz, Sebastian Mauser

Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Juhás, Gabriel, Robert Lorenz, and Sebastian Mauser. 2006. "Synchronous + concurrent + sequential = earlier than + not later than." In *Sixth International Conference on Application of Concurrency to System Design (ACSD'06), 28-30 June 2006, Turku, Finland*, edited by Kees Goossens and Laure Petrucci, 261–72. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/acsd.2006.31.

Synchronous + Concurrent + Sequential = Earlier than + Not later than

Gabriel Juhás
Faculty of Electrical Engineering
and Information Technology
Slovak University of Technology Bratislava
gabriel.juhas@stuba.sk

Robert Lorenz, Sebastian Mauser
Department of Applied Computer Science
Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
robert.lorenz@ku-eichstaett.de
sebastian.mauser@ku-eichstaett.de

Abstract

In this paper, we show how to obtain causal semantics distinguishing "earlier than" and "not later than" causality between events from algebraic semantics of Petri nets.

Janicki and Koutny introduced so called stratified order structures (so-structures) to describe such causal semantics. To obtain algebraic semantics, we redefine our own algebraic approach generating rewrite terms via partial operations of synchronous composition, concurrent composition and sequential composition. These terms are used to produce so-structures which define causal behavior consistent with the (operational) step semantics. For concrete Petri net classes with causal semantics derived from processes minimal so-structures obtained from rewrite terms coincide with minimal so-structures given by processes. This is demonstrated exemplarily for elementary nets with inhibitor arcs.

1. Introduction

Since the basic developments of Petri nets more and more different *Petri net classes* for various applications have been proposed. Causal semantics of such special Petri net classes are often constructed in a complicated ad-hoc way, defining process nets which generate causal structures (see e.g. [14, 6, 11, 12]). Naturally there are also several approaches to unify the different classes in order to be able to define non-sequential semantics in a systematic way using algebraic descriptions [19, 1, 3, 5, 17, 15, 16] (see [18] for an overview). Most of these approaches are based on the paper [13], where non-sequential runs of nets are described by equivalence classes of rewrite process terms. These process terms are generated from elementary terms (transitions and markings) by concurrent and sequential composition. Unfortunately, none of these works provides a method how to obtain causal semantics from the algebraic semantics.

This paper extends the *unifying approach* of *algebraic Petri nets* as proposed in Part II of [7]. With the approach from [7] *non-sequential semantics* can be derived on an abstract level for Petri nets with restricted occurrence rule (encoded by partiality of concurrent composition). In addition to other works, and in particular to [5], in [7] it is shown how to obtain causal semantics based on "earlier than" causality between events (formally given as labelled partial orders (LPOs)) from process terms. It is shown in [7] for many concrete net classes that the minimal LPOs obtained from process terms coincide with minimal LPOs given by acknowledged classical processes.



Figure 1. An elementary net with inhibitor arcs (p_3, f), (p_6, h) and (p_7, g), a process of the net and the associated run.

As explained in [6], "earlier than" causality expressed by LPOs is not enough to describe causal semantics for some Petri net classes, as for example the a-priori semantics of elementary nets with inhibitor arcs.[1] In Figure 1 this phenomenon is depicted: In the a-priori semantics the testing for absence of tokens (through inhibitor arcs) precedes the execution of a transition. Thus f cannot occur later than e, because after the occurrence of e the place p_3 is marked and consequently the occurrence of f is prohibited by the inhibitor arc (p_3, f). Therefore e and f cannot occur concurrently or sequentially in order $e \rightarrow f$. But they still can

[1] There are also other semantics for elementary nets with inhibitor arcs such as the a-posteriori semantics which are less problem-prone [6].

occur synchronously (because of the occurrence rule "testing before execution") or sequentially in order $f \rightarrow e$ - this is exactly the behavior described by "f not later than e" (see Section 2 for details on the occurrence rule). After the respective firing of f and e we reach the marking $\{p_3, p_4, p_5\}$. Now with the same arguments as above the transitions g and h can even only occur synchronously but not sequentially in any order. The described causal behavior (between events) of the net is illustrated on the right side of Figure 1 ("run"). The drawn through arcs represent a (common) "earlier than"-relation, i.e. the events can only occur in the expressed order but not synchronously or inversely, and dotted arcs depict the "not later than" relation explained above. The net in the middle of Figure 1 shows a process corresponding to the run on the right (details on processes and runs are explained in the next section). Altogether there exist net classes including the by practitioners admired inhibitor nets where synchronous and concurrent behaviour has to be distinguished. In [6] causal semantics based on stratified order structures (so-structures, see Section 2) like the run in Figure 1 consisting of a combination of an "earlier than" and a "not later than" relation between events were proposed to cover such cases.

In order to describe such situations on the algebraic level, in [9] we extended the algebraic Petri nets from [5] by a synchronous composition operation which allows to distinguish between concurrent and synchronous occurrences of events. Therewith a great variety of additional concrete net classes can be covered compared to [7]. Unfortunately, paper [9] does not provide a general method how to construct so-structure based causal semantics from algebraic semantics. Therefore in [9] a correspondence of the algebraic semantics to non-sequential a-priori semantics of elementary nets with inhibitor arcs was proven in a complicated ad hoc way not comparing causal semantics.

As the main result of this paper we fill this gap. Namely, we show how to obtain causal semantics based on so-structures from process terms and derive exemplarily their correspondence to causal semantics produced from processes for elementary nets with inhibitor arcs equipped with the a-priori semantics.

Thereto we generalize our own algebraic approach from [9] generating process terms via partial operations of synchronous composition, concurrent composition and sequential composition (Section 3). These terms are used to produce so called *enabled* so-structures defining causal semantics of algebraic nets (Section 4). These causal semantics are consistent with the step semantics of algebraic nets in the sense that an so-structure is enabled iff every of its step sequentializations is an enabled step sequence. Given a Petri net of a concrete Petri net class, we define the corresponding algebraic net to have the same step semantics (Section 5). Then for concrete Petri net classes with causal semantics derived from processes minimal enabled so-structures obtained from process terms of a corresponding algebraic net coincide with minimal so-structures given by processes. Exemplarily we will show this result in a systematic way (which can obviously be adapted to further net classes) for elementary nets with inhibitor arcs (Section 6)[2], thus generalizing the main result of [9].

Because of lack of space we omitted all proofs in this published version of our paper; these can be found in a detailed technical report [8].

2. Preliminaries

In this section we recall the basic definitions of *stratified order structures*, *elementary nets with inhibitor arcs (equipped with the a-priori semantics)* and *partial algebras*. Given a set X we will denote the set of all subsets of X by 2^X, the set of all multisets over X by $\mathbb{N}^X$, the identity relation over X by id_X, the reflexive, transitive closure of a binary relation R over X by R^* and the composition of two binary relations R, R' over X by $R \circ R'$. Two nodes $a, b \in V$ are called *independent* w.r.t. a binary relation $\rightarrow$ over V if $a \not\rightarrow b$ and $b \not\rightarrow a$. We denote the set of all pairs of nodes independent w.r.t. $\rightarrow$ by $\mathrm{co}_{\rightarrow} \subseteq V \times V$. A *partial order* is a pair $\mathrm{po} = (V, <)$, where V is a finite set of nodes and $<$ is an irreflexive and transitive binary relation on V. If $\mathrm{co}_{<} = id_V$ then $(V, <)$ is called *total*. Given two partial orders $\mathrm{po}_1 = (V, <_1)$ and $\mathrm{po}_2 = (V, <_2)$, we say that po_2 is a *sequentialization* (or *extension*) of po_1 if $<_1 \subseteq <_2$. A *relational structure* (rel-structure) is a triple $\mathcal{S} = (X, \prec, \sqsubset)$, where X is a set (of *events*), and $\prec \subseteq X \times X$ and $\sqsubset \subseteq X \times X$ are binary relations on X. A rel-structure $\mathcal{S}' = (X, \prec', \sqsubset')$ is said to be an *extension* of another rel-structure $\mathcal{S} = (X, \prec, \sqsubset)$, written $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}'$, if $\prec \subseteq \prec'$ and $\sqsubset \subseteq \sqsubset'$.

Definition 1 (Stratified order structure [6]). *A rel-structure $\mathcal{S} = (X, \prec, \sqsubset)$ is called* stratified order structure *(so-structure) if the following conditions are satisfied for all $x, y, z \in X$:*
(C1) $x \not\sqsubset x$
(C2) $x \prec y \Longrightarrow x \sqsubset y$
(C3) $x \sqsubset y \sqsubset z \wedge x \neq z \Longrightarrow x \sqsubset z$
(C4) $x \sqsubset y \prec z \vee x \prec y \sqsubset z \Longrightarrow x \prec z$

In figures $\prec$ is graphically expressed by drawn through arcs and $\sqsubset$ by dotted arcs. According to (C2) a dotted arc is omitted if there is already a drawn through arc. Moreover, we omit arcs which can be deduced by (C3) and (C4). It is shown in [6] that $(X, \prec)$ is a partial order. Therefore so-structures are a generalization of partial orders which turned

[2] This net class has the advantage that it is already extensively analysed in the concept of ad-hoc process definitions.

out to be adequate to model the causal relations between events of complex systems regarding sequential, concurrent and synchronous behavior. In this context $\prec$ represents the ordinary "earlier than" relation (as in partial order based systems) while $\sqsubset$ models a "not later than" relation (examples are depicted in Figure 1 and 2). The $\diamondsuit$-*closure* of a rel-structure $\mathcal{S} = (X, \prec, \sqsubset)$ is given by $\mathcal{S}^{\diamondsuit} = (X, \prec_{S^\diamondsuit}, \sqsubset_{S^\diamondsuit}) = (X, (\prec \cup \sqsubset)^* \circ \prec \circ (\prec \cup \sqsubset)^*, (\prec \cup \sqsubset)^* \setminus id_X)$. A rel-structure $\mathcal{S}$ is called $\diamondsuit$-*acyclic* if $\prec_{S^\diamondsuit}$ is irreflexive. The $\diamondsuit$-*closure* $\mathcal{S}^{\diamondsuit}$ of a rel-structure $\mathcal{S}$ is an so-structure if and only if $\mathcal{S}$ is $\diamondsuit$-acyclic [6] (observe that the notion of the $\diamondsuit$-closure in the context of so-structures corresponds to the concept of the transitive closure in the less general situation of partial orders). Finally, we introduce two subclasses of so-structures which turn out to be associated to (specific subclasses of) process terms of algebraic Petri nets. Let $\mathcal{S} = (X, \prec, \sqsubset)$ be an so-structure, then $\mathcal{S}$ is called *synchronous closed* if $\mathrm{co}_{\prec} = \mathrm{co}_{\sqsubset} \cup (\sqsubset \setminus \prec)$ (e.g. the so-structure in Figure 1 is not synchronous closed) and $\mathcal{S}$ is called *total linear* if $\mathrm{co}_{\prec} = (\sqsubset \setminus \prec) \cup id_X$ (for examples see Figure 2). The set of all total linear extensions (or linearizations) of $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted by $strat_{sos}(\mathcal{S})$. Now we will summarize some results about these two classes of so-structures. The following result proven in [11] shows that every so-structure can be reconstructed from its linearizations (see Figure 2 for an example):

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be an so-structure. Then*

$$\mathcal{S} = (X, \bigcap_{(X,\prec,\sqsubset) \in strat_{sos}(\mathcal{S})} \prec, \bigcap_{(X,\prec,\sqsubset) \in strat_{sos}(\mathcal{S})} \sqsubset)$$



Figure 2. All linearizations of the so-structure from Figure 1 and process terms of the net from Figure 1, to which the respective so-structures above are associated.

Each total linear so-structure is synchronous closed because according to (C2) $\mathrm{co}_{\prec} = (\sqsubset \setminus \prec) \cup id_X$ implies $\mathrm{co}_{\sqsubset} = id_X$. Using the results from [6] about augmenting so-structures one can conclude that every so-structure is extendable to a total linear so-structure. The crucial property of synchronous closed so-structures is the fact that they exactly describe the causal relationships of events given by process terms (see Section 4).

We will often use *labelled so-structures* in the following. These are so-structures $\mathcal{S} = (X, \prec, \sqsubset)$ together with a *set of labels* M and a *labelling function* $l : X \to M$.

Next we present the example net class considered in this paper. An *elementary net* is a net $N = (P, T, F)$, where P is a finite set of places, T is a finite set of transitions and $F \subseteq (P \times T) \cup (T \times P)$ is the flow relation. For $x \in P \cup T$ we abbreviate ${}^\bullet x = \{y \in P \cup T \mid (y, x) \in F\}$ (pre-set of x) and $x^\bullet = \{y \in P \cup T \mid (x, y) \in F\}$ (post-set of x). This notation can be extended to $X \subseteq P$ or $X \subseteq T$ by ${}^\bullet X = \bigcup_{x \in X} {}^\bullet x$ and $X^\bullet = \bigcup_{x \in X} x^\bullet$. Each $m \subseteq P$ is called a *marking*. A transition $t \in T$ is *enabled to occur* in a marking m of N iff ${}^\bullet t \subseteq m \wedge (m \setminus {}^\bullet t) \cap t^\bullet = \emptyset$. In this case, its occurrence leads to the marking $m' = (m \setminus {}^\bullet t) \cup t^\bullet$. Two transitions $t_1, t_2 \in T, t_1 \neq t_2$ are *in conflict* iff $({}^\bullet t_1 \cup t_1^\bullet) \cap ({}^\bullet t_2 \cup t_2^\bullet) \neq \emptyset$.

An *elementary net with inhibitor arcs* is a quadruple $ENI = (P, T, F, C_-)$, where (P, T, F) is an elementary net and $C_- \subseteq P \times T$ is the *negative context relation* satisfying $(F \cup F^{-1}) \cap C_- = \emptyset$. In the example net of Figure 1 the negative context relation is depicted through so called inhibitor arcs with circles as arrowheads. For a transition t, ${}^- t = \{p \in P \mid (p, t) \in C_-\}$ is the *negative context* of t. A transition t is *enabled to occur* in a marking m iff it is enabled to occur in the underlying elementary net (P, T, F) and ${}^- t \cap m = \emptyset$. The occurrence of an enabled transition t leads to the marking $m' = (m \setminus {}^\bullet t) \cup t^\bullet$. Two transitions $t_1, t_2 \in T, t_1 \neq t_2$, are in *synchronous conflict* (in the a-priori semantics) if they are in conflict in the underlying elementary net or if $({}^\bullet t_i) \cap ({}^- t_j) \neq \emptyset$ (for $i, j \in 1, 2, i \neq j$). A set of transitions $s \subseteq T$, called *synchronous step*, is *enabled to occur* in a marking m of N iff every $t \in s$ is enabled to occur in m and no two transitions $t_1, t_2 \in s, t_1 \neq t_2$, are in conflict. In this case, its occurrence leads to the marking $m' = (m \setminus {}^\bullet s) \cup s^\bullet$ and we write $m \xrightarrow{s} m'$ (see the Introduction for an example on the occurrence rule).

Now we introduce the "classical" process semantics for ENI as presented in [6]. Remember that since the absence of a token in a place cannot be directly represented in an occurrence net, every inhibitor arc is replaced by a read arc (depicted with dots as arrowheads) to a complement place. It is shown in [14] that ENI can be transformed via *complementation* into a contact-free elementary net with positive context, i.e. with read arcs, exhibiting the same behavior. The set of complement places [3] will be denoted by P' and the complementation-bijection from P to P' will be denoted by c. The processes of ENI will be defined endowing processes of "ordinary" elementary nets (defined as usual by occurrence nets using complementation, see e.g. [9]) with read arcs (also called activator arcs in [6, 11, 12]).

[3] The concept of complement places can often be simplified (omitting complement places or using existing places as complement places); such principles are applied in graphical representations.

Definition 3 (Activator process)**.** *A labelled activator occurrence net (ao-net) is a five-tuple $AON = (B, E, R, Act, l)$ satisfying: (B, E, R) is an occurrence net, (B, E, R, Act) is an elementary net with positive context, and the relational structure*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}(AON) &= (E, \prec, \sqsubset)\\ &= (E, (R \circ R)|_{E\times E} \cup (R \circ Act), (Act^{-1} \circ R) \setminus id_E)\end{aligned}$$

is $\diamondsuit$-acyclic. An ao-net AON is an activator process *of $ENI = (P, T, F, C_{-})$ w.r.t. m iff:*

- *$ON = (B, E, R, l)$ is a process of the elementary net $N = (P, T, F)$ w.r.t. m, and*
- *$\forall b \in B, \forall e \in E : (b, e) \in Act \iff (c^{-1}(l(b)), l(e)) \in C_{-}$.*

In this case the labelled so-structure $(\mathcal{S}(AON)^{\diamondsuit}, l)$ is called a run of ENI w.r.t. m. Denote by $\mathbf{Run}(ENI, m)$ the set of all runs of ENI w.r.t. m.



Figure 3. The nets in (a) and (b) generate the order $e \prec f$, the net in (c) the order $e \sqsubset f$.

An example of an activator process and an associated run is depicted in Figure 1. The construction rule of $\mathcal{S}(AON)$ is illustrated in Figure 3 (for details see [6, 11, 12]).

The central idea to model restricted occurrence rules as in the case of inhibitor nets on the algebraic level is the utilisation of partial algebras in the context of partial composition rules for process terms. A *partial algebra* is a set called *carrier* together with a set of (partial) operations (with possibly different arity) on the carrier. A partial algebra with one binary operation is a *partial groupoid*, i.e. an ordered tuple $\mathcal{I} = (I, dom_{\dotplus}, \dotplus)$, where I is the *carrier* of $\mathcal{I}$, $dom_{\dotplus} \subseteq I \times I$ is the *domain* of $\dotplus$, and $\dotplus : dom_{\dotplus} \to I$ is the *partial operation* of $\mathcal{I}$. $\mathcal{I}$ is called a *partial closed commutative monoid* if the following conditions are satisfied: If $a \dotplus b$ is defined then also $b \dotplus a$ is defined with $a \dotplus b = b \dotplus a$ (*closed commutativity*), if $(a \dotplus b) \dotplus c$ is defined then also $a \dotplus (b \dotplus c)$ is defined with $(a \dotplus b) \dotplus c = a \dotplus (b \dotplus c)$ (*closed associativity*) and there is a (unique) *neutral element* $i \in I$ such that $a \dotplus i$ is defined for all $a \in I$ with $a \dotplus i = a$ (*existence of a (total) neutral element*). We shortly recall the concept of closed congruences on partial algebras. Given a partial algebra with carrier X, an equivalence relation $\sim$ on X is called *congruence* if for each n-ary operation *op* on X with domain dom_{op}: $a_1 \sim b_1, \ldots, a_n \sim b_n$, $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in dom_{op}$ and $(b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in dom_{op}$ implies $op(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \sim op(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$. A congruence $\sim$ is called *closed* if for each n-ary operation op on X with domain dom_{op}: $a_1 \sim b_1, \ldots, a_n \sim b_n$ and $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in dom_{op}$ implies $(b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in dom_{op}$. Thus, a congruence is an equivalence which preserves all operations of a partial algebra. A closed congruence moreover preserves the domains of operations. Therefore the operations of a partial algebra $\mathcal{X}$ with carrier X can be carried over to the set of equivalence classes of a closed congruence $\sim$. For this, denote $[x]_\sim = \{y \in X \mid x \sim y\}$ and $X/_\sim = \{[x]_\sim \mid x \in X\}$, $dom_{op/_\sim} = \{([a_1]_\sim, \ldots, [a_n]_\sim) \mid (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in dom_{op}\}$ and $op/_\sim([a_1]_\sim, \ldots, [a_n]_\sim) = [op(a_1, \ldots, a_n)]_\sim$ for each n-ary operation $op : dom_{op} \to X$ of $\mathcal{X}$ (this is well defined for closed congruences). This defines a partial algebra $\mathcal{X}/_\sim$ with carrier $X/_\sim$ and operations $op/_\sim$. $\mathcal{X}/_\sim$ is called *factor algebra* of $\mathcal{X}$ w.r.t. $\sim$. A possibility to generate (closed) congruences on partial algebras is through so called *(closed) homomorphisms* [2]. The most important result of [2] for this paper is that there always exists a unique greatest closed congruence on a given partial algebra.

3. Algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets

A *general algebraic Petri net* is a quadruple $\mathcal{A} = (M, T, pre\colon T \to M, post\colon T \to M)$ (similar to [13]), which is a graph with vertices representing *markings* and edges labelled by *transitions*. Formally, the set of markings is given by a (total) commutative monoid $\mathcal{M} = (M, +)$ with neutral element $\underline{0}$. T denotes the set of transitions. The two mappings $pre\colon T \to M, post\colon T \to M$ assign *pre-sets* and *post-sets* to each transition. In order to obtain process term semantics, firstly transitions can be synchronously composed to *synchronous step terms*, and secondly markings and synchronous step terms can be sequentially and concurrently composed to *process terms*. As usual, each process term α has assigned an *initial marking* $pre(\alpha) \in M$ and a *final marking* $post(\alpha) \in M$, written $\alpha : pre(\alpha) \to post(\alpha)$. Two process terms can be *sequentially composed*, if the final marking of the first process term equals the initial marking of the second process term. Moreover, each marking and each transition has assigned an information element used for determining the synchronous composability of transitions and the concurrent composability of process terms. Thus, a set of information elements I is equipped with partial operations $\dot{\|} : dom_{\dot{\|}} \to I$ and $\dot{\oplus} : dom_{\dot{\oplus}} \to I$, $dom_{\dot{\|}}, dom_{\dot{\oplus}} \subseteq I \times I$, for the concurrent and synchronous composition of information elements, resulting in a partial algebra $\mathcal{I} = (I, dom_{\dot{\|}}, \dot{\|}, dom_{\dot{\oplus}}, \dot{\oplus})$. The groupoids $(I, dom_{\dot{\|}}, \dot{\|})$ and $(I, dom_{\dot{\oplus}}, \dot{\oplus})$ are assumed to be partial closed commutative monoids with neutral elements i_0 and j_0. Such $\mathcal{I}$ is called *sc-partial algebra*.

Definition 4 (Algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net)**.** *Let $\mathcal{I} = (I, dom_{\dot{\|}}, \dot{\|}, dom_{\dot{\oplus}}, \dot{\oplus})$ be an sc-partial algebra,*

$\mathcal{A} = (M, T, pre\colon T \to M, post\colon T \to M)$ *be a general algebraic Petri net, and* $inf : M \cup T \to I$ *be a mapping. Then* $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ *is called* algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net.

For the example (Figure 1) of elementary nets with inhibitor arcs the crucial mappings pre, $post$ and inf for a corresponding algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net (see Section 5 for the technical definition of corresponding) will be defined as follows: $pre(t) = {}^\bullet t$, $post(t) = t^\bullet$, $\mathit{inf}(t) = ({}^\bullet t, t^\bullet, {}^- t)$ for $t \in T$ and $\mathit{inf}(m) = (m, m, \emptyset)$ for $m \subseteq P$ (see Section 6 for details), i.e. $\mathcal{M} = (2^P, \cup)$, $T = T$ and $I = 2^P \times 2^P \times 2^P$. The first two components of $i \in I$ represent the write part - pre and $post$ - and the last component stores the read information - the negative context which is not in the write part. Consequently for the example net from Figure 1 we have $inf(e) = (\{p_1\}, \{p_3\}, \emptyset)$, $inf(f) = (\{p_2\}, \{p_4\}, \{p_3\})$, $inf(g) = (\{p_5\}, \{p_6\}, \{p_7\})$, $inf(h) = (\{p_4\}, \{p_7\}, \{p_6\})$. Note that in this example it is now important which information triples can be composed synchronously respectively concurrently and which information triples result from such a composition. Thereto completely coincident with the occurrence rule of elementary nets with inhibitor arcs equipped with the a-priori semantics, two information elements $i_1, i_2 \in I$ can be composed

– concurrently iff the write part of i_1 is disjoint from the write and the read part of i_2 and vice versa,

– synchronously iff the write parts of i_1 and i_2 are disjoint and the pre-component (first component) of i_1 is disjoint from the read part of i_2 and vice versa.

Two transitions can be *synchronously composed*, if their associated information elements can be synchronously composed. Their synchronous composition yields a synchronous step term, which has associated as information element the synchronous composition of their information elements. Accordingly in our example the only pair of transitions that cannot be composed synchronously is f with h. Note that e and f as well as g and h can be composed synchronously with $inf(e \oplus f) = (\{p_1, p_2\}, \{p_3, p_4\}, \emptyset)$ and $inf(g \oplus h) = (\{p_4, p_5\}, \{p_6, p_7\}, \emptyset)$. The illustrated principle of synchronous composition can be iterated. In this way also $e \oplus f \oplus g$ and $e \oplus g \oplus h$ are defined synchronous step terms. Thus, in general the synchronous step terms of an algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net are defined inductively as follows.

Definition 5 (Synchronous step terms)**.** *The* elementary synchronous step terms *of* $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ *are its transitions* $t \in T$. *If* s *and* s' *are synchronous step terms with* $(\mathit{inf}(s), \mathit{inf}(s')) \in dom_{\dot{\oplus}}$, *then their synchronous composition yields the* synchronous step term $s \oplus s'$ *with* initial marking $pre(s \oplus s') = pre(s) + pre(s')$, final marking $post(s \oplus s') = post(s) + post(s')$ *and assigned* information element $\mathit{inf}(s \oplus s') = \mathit{inf}(s) \dot{\oplus} \mathit{inf}(s')$. *Denote by* $Step_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})}$ *the set of all synchronous step terms.*

Each $s \in Step_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})}$ has the form $s = v_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus v_n$ for transitions $v_1, \ldots, v_n \in T$. We define $|s| \in \mathbb{N}^T$ by $|s|(t) = |\{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid t = v_i\}|$. Next we define the process term semantics of algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets through sequential and concurrent composition of markings and synchronous step terms. Each process term will have assigned a set of information elements (information set). For markings and synchronous step terms, the associated information set will contain only the information element assigned by the mapping inf. The sequential composition of two process terms has assigned the union of their respective information sets. The concurrent composition of two process terms has assigned the set of concurrent compositions of the information elements in their respective information sets. Note that the concurrent composition $\|$ is partial, since for concurrent composability the information sets of the two process terms have to be independent[4]. Consequently a possible process term in the example is $((e \oplus f) \,\|\, \{p_5\}); ((g \oplus h) \,\|\, \{p_3\})$ (illustrated in Figure 4). For the technical definitions the sc-partial algebra $\mathcal{I} = (I, dom_{\dot{\|}}, \dot{\|}, dom_{\dot{\oplus}}, \dot{\oplus})$ is lifted to the partial algebra $\mathcal{X} = (2^I, dom_{\{\dot{\|}\}}, \{\dot{\|}\}, 2^I \times 2^I, \cup)$ defined by $dom_{\{\dot{\|}\}} = \{(X, Y) \in 2^I \times 2^I \mid X \times Y \subseteq dom_{\dot{\|}}\}$ and $X \{\dot{\|}\} Y = \{x \,\dot{\|}\, y \mid x \in X \wedge y \in Y\}$. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{X}$ is also a partial closed commutative monoid. Two information sets A and B can *carry the same "information"* in the sense that each information set C is either independent from both A and B or not independent from both A and B. Such sets need not be distinguished and can be technically identified through a closed congruence on 2^I. Therefore we distinguish information sets only up to the greatest closed congruence $\cong \in 2^I \times 2^I$ on $\mathcal{X}$ (for a concrete construction of $\cong$ see Section 6). Based on these preparations process terms of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ which represent all its abstract computations are defined inductively as follows:

Definition 6 (Process terms)**.** *The* elementary process terms *of* $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ *are of the form* $id_a : a \longrightarrow a$ *with* $Inf(id_a) = [\{\mathit{inf}(a)\}]_{\cong}$ *for* $a \in M$ *(mostly we denote* id_a *simply by* a*) and* $s : pre(s) \longrightarrow post(s)$ *with* $Inf(s) = [\{\mathit{inf}(s)\}]_{\cong}$ *for* $s \in Step_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})}$.

If $\alpha : a_1 \longrightarrow a_2$ *and* $\beta : b_1 \longrightarrow b_2$ *are process terms satisfying* $(Inf(\alpha), Inf(\beta)) \in dom_{\{\dot{\|}\}/_{\cong}}$, *their* concurrent composition *yields the process term* $\alpha \,\|\, \beta\colon a_1 + b_1 \longrightarrow a_2 + b_2$ *with* $Inf(\alpha \,\|\, \beta) = Inf(\alpha) \{\dot{\|}\}/_{\cong} Inf(\beta)$.

If $\alpha : a_1 \longrightarrow a_2$ *and* $\beta : b_1 \longrightarrow b_2$ *are process terms satisfying* $a_2 = b_1$, *their* sequential composition *yields the process term* $\alpha; \beta : a_1 \longrightarrow b_2$ *with* $Inf(\alpha; \beta) = Inf(\alpha) \cup/_{\cong} Inf(\beta)$.

The partial algebra of all process terms *with the partial*

[4] Two information sets X and Y are called *independent* if each information element in X is independent from (i.e. concurrently composable with) each information element in Y.

operations of synchronous, concurrent and sequential composition will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}, inf)$.



Figure 4. Deriving exemplary a process term of the net from Figure 1 with associated information elements resp. information sets.

Compared to [9] and [7], the definition of algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets is as general as possible. In order to derive conclusions about process term semantics on the algebraic level similar as in [7] it is necessary to require certain properties for the mapping inf of an algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net $(\mathcal{A}, inf)$, relating the sets $(\mathcal{I}, dom_{\dot{\|}}, \dot{\|})$, $(\mathcal{I}, dom_{\dot{\oplus}}, \dot{\oplus})$ and $\mathcal{M} = (M, +)$. All properties have a simple intuitive interpretation and for all common net classes (with so-structure based semantics) it is easy to show that they are fulfilled. In contrast to [9] where no results are obtained on the abstract level we have to introduce more specific properties for inf. We did not include them into the algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net definition, instead, for each stated result we will explicitly mention which properties are required. These properties are for $x, y, m, m_1, m_2 \in M$ and $s, s_1, s_2 \in Step_{(\mathcal{A}, inf)}$:

(Con1) $(inf(x), inf(y)) \in dom_{\dot{\|}} \Longrightarrow inf(x+y) = inf(x) \,\dot{\|}\, inf(y)$

(Con2) $inf(\underline{0}) = i_0$

(Con3) $\{inf(s)\} \cong \{inf(s), inf(pre(s)), inf(post(s))\}$

(Con4) $(inf(s_1), inf(s_2)) \in dom_{\dot{\oplus}} \Longrightarrow \{inf(s_1 \oplus s_2)\} \cong \{inf(s_1 \oplus s_2), inf(s_1), inf(s_2)\}$

(Con5) $(inf(s_1), inf(s_2)) \in dom_{\dot{\oplus}}$, $(inf(s_1) \,\dot{\oplus}\, inf(s_2), m)$, $(inf(s_1), inf(m_1))$, $(inf(s_2), inf(m_2)) \in dom_{\dot{\|}}$, $pre(s_1) + pre(s_2) + m = pre(s_1) + m_1$, $post(s_1) + m_1 = pre(s_2) + m_2 \Longrightarrow (inf(pre(s_2)+m), inf(s_1))$, $(inf(post(s_1)+m), inf(s_2)) \in dom_{\dot{\|}}$

(Con6) $(inf(s_1), inf(s_2)) \in dom_{\dot{\|}} \Longrightarrow (inf(s_1), inf(s_2)) \in dom_{\dot{\oplus}}$ and $\{inf(s_1) \,\dot{\|}\, inf(s_2)\} \cong \{inf(s_1) \,\dot{\|}\, inf(s_2), inf(s_1) \,\dot{\oplus}\, inf(s_2)\}$

(Det) $(inf(s), inf(x)), (inf(s), inf(y)) \in dom_{\dot{\|}}, pre(s) + x = pre(s) + y \Longrightarrow post(s) + x = post(s) + y$

The first two consistency properties (Con1) and (Con2) are self explanatory. Property (Con3) states that the information (about concurrent composability) attached to a synchronous step s includes information about $pre(s)$ and $post(s)$ and (Con4) tells that it also includes information about sub-steps of s. (Con5) can be interpreted as follows: if two synchronous step terms s_1, s_2 can occur synchronously and sequentially in the order $s_1 \longrightarrow s_2$ in the same initial marking, then the occurrence of s_2 does not depend on the final marking of the occurrence of s_1 and the occurrence of s_1 does not depend on the initial marking of the occurrence of s_2. The next condition (Con6) determines that two synchronous step terms, which can occur concurrently, can also occur synchronously and that the information associated to their concurrent composition includes the information associated to their synchronous composition. For net classes we are interested in, the occurrence of a step s in a marking m is deterministic in the sense that the follower marking m' is unique (Det).

4. Causal semantics of algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets

We define explicit causal semantics of algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets by associating so-structures to process terms.

Definition 7 (So-structures of process terms)**.** *We define inductively* labelled so-structures $go_\alpha = (V, \prec_\alpha, \sqsubset_\alpha, l_\alpha)$ of (or associated to) a process terms α*:* $go_m = (\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ *for* $m \in M$*,* $go_t = (\{v\}, \emptyset, \emptyset, l)$ *with* $l(v) = t$ *for* $t \in T$*, and* $go_{s_1 \oplus s_2} = (V_1 \cup V_2, \emptyset, \sqsubset_1 \cup \sqsubset_2 \cup (V_1 \times V_2) \cup (V_2 \times V_1), l_1 \cup l_2)$*, for synchronous step terms* $s_1, s_2 \in Step_{(\mathcal{A}, inf)}$ *with associated so-structures* $go_1 = (V_1, \emptyset, \sqsubset_1, l_1)$ *and* $go_2 = (V_2, \emptyset, \sqsubset_2, l_2)$*, where the sets of nodes* V_1 *and* V_2 *are assumed to be disjoint (what can be achieved by appropriate renaming of nodes). Finally, given process terms* α_1 *and* α_2 *with associated so-structures* $go_1 = (V_1, \prec_1, \sqsubset_1, l_1)$ *and* $go_2 = (V_2, \prec_2, \sqsubset_2, l_2)$*, define*

- $go_{\alpha_1 \,\|\, \alpha_2} = (V_1 \cup V_2, \prec_1 \cup \prec_2, \sqsubset_1 \cup \sqsubset_2, l_1 \cup l_2)$,
- $go_{\alpha_1 ; \alpha_2} = (V_1 \cup V_2, \prec_1 \cup \prec_2 \cup (V_1 \times V_2), \sqsubset_1 \cup \sqsubset_2 \cup (V_1 \times V_2), l_1 \cup l_2)$,

again assuming disjoint sets of nodes V_1 and V_2.

Since all labelled so-structures associated to a process term α are isomorphic (and arbitrary labelled so-structures isomorphic to go_α are also associated to α) we mostly distinguish labelled so-structures only up to isomorphism. It is easy to verify (by an inductive proof) that a labelled so-structure go_α of a process term α is synchronous closed.

In Figure 2 the principle of so-structures associated to process terms is demonstrated. Note that there cannot exist a process term to which the run from Figure 1 is associated because this so-structure is not synchronous closed. That is why we considered its linearizations (which are always synchronous closed). The fact that in this example it is actually possible to find such process terms for all of these linearizations (see Figure 2) leads to the next essential idea.

We want to deduce so-structure based semantics of algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets from their process term semantics. Easy examples show that single so-structures associated to a process term in general cannot describe each run of a Petri net (e.g. as explained the run from Figure 1 is not associated to a process term; other examples which are also valid for the partial order case include so called N-forms [7]). Consequently the set of so-structures of process terms is not expressive enough in order to directly describe the complete causal semantics of algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets. But we can derive the complete causal behaviour from the set of so-structures of process terms in a similar way as in [7] for the partial order based semantics case. This causal behaviour will be represented by the set of so called *enabled labelled so-structures*. For their definition we denote process terms α of the form $\alpha = (s_1 \,\|\, m_1); \ldots; (s_n \,\|\, m_n)$ $(s_1, \ldots, s_n \in Step_{(\mathcal{A}, inf)},\ m_1, \ldots, m_n \in M)$ as *synchronous step sequence terms*, and the set of all synchronous step sequence terms with initial marking m by $Stepseq_{(\mathcal{A}, inf, m)}$. It is easy to observe that so-structures associated to synchronous step sequence terms are total linear.

Definition 8 (Enabled labelled so-structure)**.** *A labelled so-structure go is* enabled to occur *in a marking m w.r.t. $(\mathcal{A}, inf)$, if every $go' \in strat_{sos}(go)$ is associated to some $\beta \in Stepseq_{(\mathcal{A}, inf, m)}$. Denote by* $\mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, inf, m)$ *the set of labelled so-structures enabled to occur in m w.r.t. $(\mathcal{A}, inf)$.*

In this definition enabled labelled so-structures are introduced using linearizations. Figure 2 gives an example how to check if an so-structure is enabled. It shows that the run from Figure 1 is enabled w.r.t. the marked net in the same figure. We will show in Theorem 10, that so-structures of process terms are always enabled in the initial marking of the process term. Obviously, every extension of an so-structure enabled in m is also enabled in m. A labelled so-structure go enabled in m is said to be *minimal*, if there exists no labelled so-structure $go' \neq go$ enabled in m, where go is an extension of go'. We denote by $\mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, inf, m)$ the set of all such minimal enabled labelled so-structures. For example with this definition one can check (intuitively and technically) that the run from Figure 1 is in $\mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, inf, m)$. In the next definition process terms are identified through an equivalence relation. The basic idea is to identify two enabled so-structures if one is an extension of the other. Carrying over this principle to process terms we will show in Theorem 13 that two process terms are equivalent if their associated so-structures can be identified in the above described sense. In this context the process terms in Figure 2 should all be equivalent. For algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets representing concrete Petri nets equivalent process terms will represent the same commutative process of the Petri net (for details and examples to commutative processes see [7]). In the example all process terms in Figure 2 represent the (commutative) process in Figure 1.

Definition 9 (The congruence $\sim$)**.** *The relation $\sim$ on the set of all process terms of an algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net is the least congruence of the partial algebra of all process terms with the partial operations $\oplus$, $\|$ and ;[5], which includes the relation given by the following axioms for process terms $\alpha, \beta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$ and markings m, n:*
(1) $\alpha \,\|\, \beta \sim \beta \,\|\, \alpha$
(2) $(\alpha \,\|\, \beta) \,\|\, \gamma \sim \alpha \,\|(\beta \,\|\, \gamma)$
(3) $(\alpha; \beta); \gamma \sim \alpha; (\beta; \gamma)$
(4) $\alpha = ((\alpha_1 \,\|\, \alpha_2); (\alpha_3 \,\|\, \alpha_4)) \sim \beta = ((\alpha_1; \alpha_3) \,\|(\alpha_2; \alpha_4))$
(5) $\alpha \oplus \beta \sim \beta \oplus \alpha$
(6) $(\alpha \oplus \beta) \oplus \gamma \sim \alpha \oplus (\beta \oplus \gamma)$
(7) $(\alpha \oplus \beta) \sim (\alpha \,\|\, pre(\beta)); (post(\alpha) \,\|\, \beta)$
(8) $(\alpha; post(\alpha)) \sim \alpha \sim (pre(\alpha); \alpha)$
(9) $id_{(m+n)} \sim id_m \,\|\, id_n$
(10) $pre(\alpha) + m = pre(\alpha) + n,\ post(\alpha) + m = post(\alpha) + n \Longrightarrow (\alpha \,\|\, id_m) \sim (\alpha \,\|\, id_n)$
(11) $(\alpha \,\|\, id_{\underline{0}}) \sim \alpha$
if the terms on both sides of $\sim$ are defined process terms.

E.g. for the first two process terms in Figure 2 we have the following equivalence transformation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&((e \oplus f) \,\|\{p_5\}); ((g \oplus h) \,\|\{p_3\}) &&\overset{(7)}{\sim}\\
&(((f \,\|\{p_1\}); (e \,\|\{p_4\})) \,\|\{p_5\}); ((g \oplus h) \,\|\{p_3\}) &&\overset{(8)}{\sim}\\
&(((f \,\|\{p_1\}); (e \,\|\{p_4\})) \,\|(\{p_5\}; \{p_5\})); ((g \oplus h) \|\{p_3\}) &&\overset{(4)}{\sim}\\
&((f \,\|\{p_1\} \,\|\{p_5\}); (e \,\|\{p_4\} \,\|\{p_5\})); ((g \oplus h) \,\|\{p_3\}) &&\overset{(9)}{\sim}
\end{aligned}
$$

$((f \,\|\{p_1, p_5\}); (e \,\|\{p_4, p_5\})); ((g \oplus h) \,\|\{p_3\})$ (note that all occurring process terms are defined).

Given two $\sim$-equivalent process terms α and β, there holds $pre(\alpha) = pre(\beta)$ and $post(\alpha) = post(\beta)$. The so-structures associated to process terms are changed only through the axioms (4) and (7). Regarding (4) we get that

[5] According to [2] this least congruence exists uniquely.

go_α is an extension of go_β with additional $\prec$-ordering between events of α_1 and α_4 as well as between events of α_2 and α_3. Regarding (7) the associated so-structures are not comparable in a similar way.

In order to simplify the identification of transitions of a process term and nodes (events) of an associated so-structure it would be helpful to assume that the labelling function of an so-structure go_α of α is the id-function. In such a case a transition would occur only once in a process term. To achieve this simplification for a given process term, we will identify copies of transitions of the process term with events of the associated so-structure: For a set V and a surjective labelling function $l : V \to T$ we denote by $(\mathcal{A}_{(V,l)}, \mathit{inf}_{(V,l)})$ the algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net given by $\mathcal{A}_{(V,l)} = (M, V, pre_{(V,l)}, post_{(V,l)})$ and $\mathit{inf}_{(V,l)} : M \cup V \to I$, where $pre_{(V,l)}(v) = pre(l(v))$, $post_{(V,l)}(v) = post(l(v))$, $\mathit{inf}_{(V,l)}|_M = \mathit{inf}|_M$ and $\mathit{inf}_{(V,l)}(v) = \mathit{inf}(l(v))$ for every $v \in V$. $(\mathcal{A}_{(V,l)}, \mathit{inf}_{(V,l)})$ is called *(V, l)-copy net of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$*.

The first important theorem of this paper shows that so-structures of process terms are enabled in the initial marking of the process term.

Theorem 10. *Let α be a process term of an algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ which fulfills (Con1)-(Con3) and (Con6). Then $go_\alpha \in \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$ with $m = pre(\alpha)$. In particular, every $go' \in strat_{sos}(go_\alpha)$ is associated to some $\beta \in Stepseq_{(\mathcal{A},\mathit{inf},m)}$ satisfying $\alpha \sim \beta$.*

An enabled so-structure *go* is uniquely determined by the set of process terms whose associated so-structures extend *go*. As we have already seen in the recurring example the run (an enabled so-structure) from Figure 1 can be reconstructed with the linearizations from Figure 2 which are all associated to certain process terms.

Definition 11. *Let $go = (V, \prec, \sqsubset, l) \in \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$. Then the set Υ_{go}^{can} of all process terms α of $(\mathcal{A}_{(V,l)}, \mathit{inf}_{(V,l)})$ with $pre(\alpha) = m$ whose associated so-structures extend $(V, \prec, \sqsubset, id)$ is called the* canonical set *of go.*

Remark 12. *Let $go = (V, \prec, \sqsubset, l) \in \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$, $\alpha \in \Upsilon_{go}^{can}$ and $go_\alpha = (V, \prec_\alpha, \sqsubset_\alpha, id)$. Then $go = (V, \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Upsilon_{go}^{can}} \prec_\alpha, \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Upsilon_{go}^{can}} \sqsubset_\alpha, l)$ by Proposition 2.*

The next theorem states that process terms with the same initial marking, whose associated so-structures are all extensions of one enabled so-structure, are $\sim$-equivalent.

Theorem 13. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ be an algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net fulfilling (Det) and (Con1)-(Con5) and α and β process terms with initial marking m. If go_α and go_β are extensions of $go \in \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$, then there holds $\alpha \sim \beta$.*

With this theorem we can identify minimal enabled so-structures through their canonical sets (use Remark 12).

Corollary 14. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ be an algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net with the same preconditions as in Theorem 13 and let $go \in \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$. Then $\Upsilon_{go}^{can} \subseteq [\alpha]_\sim$ for some process term α of $(\mathcal{A}_{(V,l)}, \mathit{inf}_{(V,l)})$. If $\Upsilon_{go}^{can} = [\alpha]_\sim$, then $go \in \mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$.*

5 The corresponding algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net

Despite the differences between classes of Petri nets, there are some common features of almost all net classes, such as the notions of *marking* (state), *transition*, and *occurrence rule* (see [4]). Thus, in the next definition we suppose a Petri net be given by a set of markings, a set of transitions and an occurrence rule determining whether a synchronous step (a multi-set) of transitions is enabled to occur in a given marking and if yes determining the follower marking. The occurrence rule of a Petri net with a set of transitions T and a set of markings M can always be described by a transition system. Accordingly, we suppose that a Petri net is given in the form of a transition system $(M, E, \mathbb{N}^T)$ with nodes $m \in M$, labelled arcs $e \in E \subseteq M \times \mathbb{N}^T \times M$ and labels $s \in \mathbb{N}^T$, where s is interpreted as a synchronous step of transitions. The notation $m \xrightarrow{s} m'$ for $(m, s, m') \in E$ means that s can occur in m with follower marking m'. The notation $m_0 \overset{s_1 \ldots s_n}{\longrightarrow} m_n$ means that there exist $m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1} \in M$, such that $m_0 \xrightarrow{s_1} m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1} \xrightarrow{s_n} m_n$.

Definition 15 (Corresponding net)**.** *Let $N = (M, E, \mathbb{N}^T)$ be a Petri net in the form of a transition system. An algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-net $((M, T, pre\colon T \to M, post\colon T \to M), \mathit{inf}) = (\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ is called a* corresponding net to N *if the occurrence rule for synchronous steps is preserved, i.e. if for every pair of markings $m, m' \in M$ and every synchronous step $s \in \mathbb{N}^T$ there holds: $m \xrightarrow{s} m'$ if and only if there exists $\tilde{s} \in Step_{(\mathcal{A},\mathit{inf})}$ with $|\tilde{s}| = s$ and a marking $\tilde{m} \in M$ such that $\alpha = \tilde{s} \parallel \tilde{m}$ is a defined process term fulfilling $pre(\alpha) = m$ and $post(\alpha) = m'$.*

From the definitions we conclude: $m \overset{s_1 \ldots s_n}{\longrightarrow} m' \iff$ there exists $\alpha : m \to m' \in Stepseq_{(\mathcal{A},\mathit{inf},m)}$ of the form $\alpha = \tilde{s_1} \parallel \tilde{m_1}; \ldots; \tilde{s_n} \parallel \tilde{m_n}$, where $\tilde{m_i} \in M$ and $\tilde{s_i} \in Step_{(\mathcal{A},\mathit{inf})}$ with $|\tilde{s_i}| = s_i$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then α is called *corresponding to* $m \overset{s_1 \ldots s_n}{\longrightarrow} m'$. Moreover, an so-structure associated to α is called *associated to* $m \overset{s_1 \ldots s_n}{\longrightarrow} m'$. Altogether this describes the consistency of the algebraic approach to operational step semantics.

The construction of corresponding algebraic $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I})$-nets provides a general framework to derive causal semantics for a wide range of concrete net classes. This is illustrated in Section 6 for the example of elementary nets with inhibitor arcs equipped with the a-priori semantics (the respective ideas were already exemplary developed in the previous sections) using the following general scenario: (1) Give the classical definition of a Petri net class including their synchronous step occurrence rule. (2) Given a net N of the considered class, construct a corresponding algebraic $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{I})$-net $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ through defining $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{I}$, pre, post, inf appropriately and deduce $\mathcal{X}$, $\cong$ and a partial algebra of information isomorphic to $\mathcal{X}/_{\cong}$. (3) Show that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ satisfies the stated properties of the mapping inf (thus ensuring the validity of the theorems of Section 4). (4) Now one can derive algebraic semantics of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ through process terms and thus causal semantics of N through $\mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$.

From the considerations of this section we can conclude that the causal semantics of N derived with this scheme are consistent with the operational semantics of N, because obviously (using Theorem 10): go is associated to $m \xrightarrow{s_1 \ldots s_n} m' \iff go \in \mathit{strat}_{sos}(go')$ for some $go' \in \mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$. Moreover so-structures which are not enabled never fulfill such a property and thus minimal enabled so-structures are the so-structures with the least causalities guaranteeing consistency to the operational occurrence rule. These characteristics ensure that the derived causal semantics are reasonable and should always coincide with process based semantics. In [7] this was already demonstrated for several Petri net classes with partial order based semantics. Moreover if there are no non-sequential semantics based on processes for a given Petri net class, they can be straightforwardly given (following the scenario above) by $\mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$.

6 Elementary nets with inhibitor arcs

In this section we will now apply the techniques developed in the previous sections to the concrete net class of elementary nets with inhibitor arcs equipped with the a-priori semantics. Some of the main ideas, e.g. the definition of a corresponding algebraic $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{I})$-net, were already partially discussed on the basis of the recurring example net in Figure 1. Note that the content of this section is based on the process semantics introduced by Janicki and Koutny (see Section 2). Similar results as in this section have been derived in [9]. But in [9] there was only shown a one to one correspondence between the process term semantics and the process semantics in a complicated lengthy ad-hoc way without regarding causal behaviour. Here we additionally get the complete consistency of the causal behaviour derived from process terms and the causality of activator processes using the general framework from Section 5.

Given an elementary net with inhibitor arcs $ENI = (P, T, F, C_-)$ (see Section 2) we construct a corresponding algebraic $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{I})$-net analogously as in [7] by

- $\mathcal{M} = (2^P, \cup)$, $I = 2^P \times 2^P \times 2^P$, $\mathit{pre}(t) = {}^\bullet t$, $\mathit{post}(t) = t^\bullet$, $\mathit{inf}(t) = ({}^\bullet t, t^\bullet, {}^- t)$ $(t \in T)$ and $\mathit{inf}(m) = (m, m, \emptyset)$ $(m \in M)$.
- $\mathit{dom}_{\dot{\oplus}} = \{((a,b,c),(d,e,f)) \in I \times I \mid (a \cup b) \cap (d \cup e) = a \cap f = d \cap c = \emptyset\}$ with $(a,b,c) \dot{\oplus} (d,e,f) = (a \cup d, b \cup e, (c \cup f) \setminus (b \cup e))$.
- $\mathit{dom}_{\dot{\|}} = \{((a,b,c),(d,e,f)) \in I \times I \mid (a \cup b) \cap (d \cup e) = (a \cup b) \cap f = c \cap (d \cup e) = \emptyset\}$ with $(a,b,c) \dot{\|} (d,e,f) = (a \cup d, b \cup e, c \cup f)$

and define

- $\mathit{supp} : 2^I \to 2^P \times 2^P$, $\mathit{supp}(A) = (s_1(A), s_2(A) \setminus s_1(A))$ where $s_1(A) = \bigcup_{(a,b,c) \in A}(a \cup b)$ and $s_2(A) = \bigcup_{(a,b,c) \in A} c$.
- $\cong \subseteq 2^I \times 2^I$, $A \cong B \iff \mathit{supp}(A) = \mathit{supp}(B)$.

In [7] it was shown that $\cong$ is the greatest closed congruence on $\mathcal{X} = (2^I, \{\dot{\|}\}, \mathit{dom}_{\{\dot{\|}\}}, 2^I \times 2^I, \cup)$. It is a straightforward computation that the algebraic $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{I})$-net defined in this section fulfills all formulated properties of the mapping inf. It is shown in [7]:

Theorem 16. *The algebraic $(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{I})$-net $((2^P, T, \mathit{pre}, \mathit{post}), \mathit{inf})$ with $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{I}, \mathit{pre}, \mathit{post}, \mathit{inf}$ as developed in this section is corresponding to ENI (according to Definition 15).*

To prove the consistency of the algebraic approach to the process based concept we can use an important result about activator processes. Corollary 2 in [11] (considering the more general case of p/t-nets with inhibitor arcs) reads in our terminology:

Theorem 17. $\{go_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathit{Stepseq}_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)}\} = \bigcup_{r \in \mathbf{Run}(ENI, m)} \mathit{strat}_{sos}(r)$.

As a consequence we directly get that $\mathbf{Run}(ENI, m) \subseteq \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$. In order to prove the main result $\mathbf{Run}(ENI, m) = \mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$, we fundamentally need the following lemma.

Lemma 18. *Let $go_1 = (V, \prec_1, \sqsubset_1, id)$ and $go_2 = (V, \prec_2, \sqsubset_2, id)$ be labelled so-structures of $\sim$-equivalent process terms $\alpha : m \to m'$ and $\beta : m \to m'$ of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf})$ and let $go = (V, \prec, \sqsubset, id) \in \mathbf{Run}(ENI, m)$ satisfying that $go \subseteq go_2$, then $go \subseteq go_1$.*

As a corollary we get that for each run $r \in \mathbf{Run}(ENI, m)$ there is α with $\Upsilon_r^{can} = [\alpha]_\sim$. That means $\mathbf{Run}(ENI, m) \subseteq \mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$ (Corollary 14). For the reverse statement observe that for $go \in \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)$ every so-structure $go' \in \mathit{strat}_{sos}(go)$ is associated to $\alpha \in \mathit{Stepseq}_{(\mathcal{A}, \mathit{inf}, m)}$. All these process terms α are $\sim$-equivalent (Theorem 13) and all elements of $strat_{sos}(go)$ are extensions of one run $r \in \mathbf{Run}(ENI, m)$ (Theorem 17, Lemma 18). Using the representation of go from Proposition 2, we get that go itself is an extension of r. This gives altogether

Theorem 19. *Given ENI and $(\mathcal{A}, inf)$ as defined above, there holds $\mathbf{Run}(ENI, m) = \mathbf{MinEnabled}(\mathcal{A}, inf, m)$.*

We deduce that every $\sim$-equivalence class of process terms of the copy net is the canonical set of a unique run (Theorem 10, Remark 12). Consequently there holds the following one-to-one relationship, which is an enhancement of the main result of [9] (proven in another manner).

Theorem 20. *Given ENI and $(\mathcal{A}, inf)$ as defined above, the mapping $\psi : \mathbf{Run}(ENI, m) \to \{[\alpha]_\sim \mid pre(\alpha) = m\}$ defined by $\psi(r) = [\alpha]_\sim$ for some α such that go_α is an extension of r is well-defined and bijective.*

Finally, this especially implies that every $go \in \mathbf{Enabled}(\mathcal{A}, inf, m)$ is an extension of exactly one $r \in \mathbf{Run}(ENI, m)$. This result is connected to the well-known result obtained for elementary nets (without context), which says that each occurrence sequence of an elementary net is a linearization of exactly one run of the net.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we have presented a very flexible and general unifying approach regarding causal semantics. While in other approaches to unifying Petri nets (see e.g. [17, 15, 16, 10]) the occurrence rule is never a parameter and therefore the definitions in [15] and [10] both capture elementary nets but let open more complicated restrictions of enabling conditions in the occurrence rule, such as inhibitor arcs or capacities, in our case we were even able to extend the basic approach from [7] to so-structure based semantics. Thus it would be an interesting and promising project of further research to additionally extend the approach of algebraic Petri nets in order to include new net classes of a different fundamental structure. But we also have more proximate and immediate research in this area. On the one hand we still have to examine some net classes and compare the algebraic semantics to process semantics, as for example elementary nets with read arcs and p/t-nets with inhibitor arcs each equipped with the a-priori semantics,[6] nets with priorities or p/t-nets with weak capacities regarding explicit synchronous semantics. On the other hand it would be interesting to derive behavioral results beyond the causal semantics on the abstract level.

[6] Note that these classes are already discussed regarding the a-posteriori semantics [7].

References

[1] R. Bruni and V. Sassone *Algebraic Models for Contextual Nets*. LNCS 1853, pp. 175–186, 2000.

[2] P. Burmeister. *Lecture Notes on Universal Algebra – Many Sorted Partial Algebras*. TU Darmstadt, 2002.

[3] A. Corradini P. Baldan and U. Montanari. *Contextual petri nets, asymmetric event structures, and processes*. Inf. and Comp. 171(1), pp. 1–49, 2001.

[4] J. Desel and G. Juhás. *What is a Petri Net?* LNCS 2128, pp. 1–25, 2001.

[5] J. Desel, G. Juhás and R. Lorenz. *Petri Nets over Partial Algebra*. LNCS 2128, pp. 126–172, 2001.

[6] R. Janicki and M. Koutny. *Semantics of Inhibitor Nets*. Inf. and Comp. 123, pp. 1–16, 1995.

[7] G. Juhás. *Are these events independent? It depends!*. Habilitation thesis, Catholic University Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, 2005.

[8] G. Juhás, R. Lorenz, S. Mauser. *Synchronous + Concurrent + Sequential = Earlier than + Not later than* (Technical Report). http://www.informatik.ku-eichstaett.de/mitarbeiter/lorenz/veroeff.htm

[9] G. Juhás, R. Lorenz, T. Singliar. *On Synchronicity and Concurrency in Petri Nets*. LNCS 2679, pp. 357–376, 2003.

[10] E. Kindler, M. Weber. *The Dimensions of Petri Nets: The Petri Net Cube*. EATCS Bulletin 66, pp. 155–166, 1998.

[11] H.C.M. Kleijn and M. Koutny. *Process semantics of P/T-Nets with inhibitor arcs*. LNCS 1825, pp. 261–281, 2000.

[12] H.C.M. Kleijn M. and Koutny. *Process semantics of general inhibitor nets*. Inf. and Comp. 190(1), pp. 18–69, 2004.

[13] J. Meseguer and U. Montanari. *Petri nets are monoids*. Inf. and Comp. 88(2), pp. 105–155, 1990.

[14] U. Montanari and F. Rossi. *Contextual nets*. Acta Informatica 32(6), pp. 545–596, 1995.

[15] J. Padberg. *Abstract Petri Nets: Uniform Approach and Rule-Based Refinement*.Ph.D. Thesis, TU Berlin, 1996.

[16] J. Padberg. *Classification of Petri Nets Using Adjoint Functors*. Bulletin of EACTS 66, 1998.

[17] J. Padberg, H. Ehrig. *Parametrized Net Classes: A uniform approach to net classes*. LNCS 2128, pp. 173–229, 2001.

[18] V. Sassone *The Algebraic Structure of Petri Nets*. In: Current Trends in Theoretical Computer Science, World Scientific, 2004.

[19] M.-O. Stehr, J. Meseguer and P. Ölveczky. *Rewriting Logic as a Unifying Framework for Petri Nets*. LNCS 2128, pp. 250–303, 2001.