#### **Reversible Structures**

#### Luca Cardelli Cosimo Laneve

January 19, 2012

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ● ● ●

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ≣ のへで

**Review:** This is a well-formulated and rigorous technical paper, but not likely to be an important paper in the future development of synthetic systems biology.

**Review:** This is a well-formulated and rigorous technical paper, but not likely to be an important paper in the future development of synthetic systems biology.

On the other hand, if the paper is structured differently, it may influence others to think about problems of this nature and develop the field further.

▲ロト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ● ● の Q ()

**Review:** This is a well-formulated and rigorous technical paper, but not likely to be an important paper in the future development of synthetic systems biology.

On the other hand, if the paper is structured differently, it may influence others to think about problems of this nature and develop the field further.

One solutions would be to abandon the Bourbaki style in which the paper is written, and start by motivating the problem in terms of DNA computation and then show how it can be formalized in the framework presented.

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

**Review:** This is a well-formulated and rigorous technical paper, but not likely to be an important paper in the future development of synthetic systems biology.

On the other hand, if the paper is structured differently, it may influence others to think about problems of this nature and develop the field further.

One solutions would be to abandon the Bourbaki style in which the paper is written, and start by motivating the problem in terms of DNA computation and then show how it can be formalized in the framework presented.

There should be a section then summarizing all the results, how to interpret them and why the results do not completely correspond to the real physics, thermodynamics, etc. One technicals section should collect all the theorems and proofs.

# ... following CMSB's reviewer: plan

- (motivations) reversibility in nature: the instance of DNA circuits
- (**our solution**) the algebra of DNA circuits: *reversible structures*
- (the appendix) overview of the theory of reversible structures
  - reversibility/causality in reversible structures
  - causally equivalent computations (permutation equivalence) and the standardization theorem

- コン・4回ン・4回ン・4回ン・4回ン・4日ン

modelling of asynchronous RCCS

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

in computational systems, computations are sequence of *irreversible steps*

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

- in computational systems, computations are sequence of *irreversible steps*
- implementations of these systems in physics or chemistry are usually reversible

- in computational systems, computations are sequence of *irreversible steps*
- implementations of these systems in physics or chemistry are usually reversible
- reversibility means undoing the computation *not in a deterministic way*:

states reached during a backward computation are states that could have been reached during the forward computation by just performing independent actions in a different order

### motivations/reversibility/example



transition system

## motivations/reversibility/example





a computation



a reverted computation of its

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲臣▶ ★臣▶ = 臣 = のへで

## motivations/reversibility/example



transition system







a reverted computation of its

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ



a different computation

motivations/the formalization of reversibility in nature

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

since parts of physics and chemistry are reversible,

what is the theory of reversibility underneath?

motivations/the formalization of reversibility in nature

since parts of physics and chemistry are reversible,

what is the theory of reversibility underneath?

said otherwise:

*taking a reversible system <u>in nature</u>, what properties may we prove?* 

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# motivations/reversibility in DNA

- subsequences of a DNA strand are called domains



domains are independent of each other

- they cannot hybridize from any other domain except their complement

▲ロト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ● ● の Q ()

# motivations/reversibility in DNA

- subsequences of a DNA strand are called domains

| CTTGAGAATCGGATATTTCGGATCGCGATTAAATCAAATG |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Х  | У | Z |

domains are independent of each other

- they cannot hybridize from any other domain except their complement
- there are very few short domains with reversible hybridizations

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# motivations/reversibility in DNA

- subsequences of a DNA strand are called domains

| TTGAGAATCGGA | TATTTCGGATCGC | SATTAAATCAAATG |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Х            | У             | Z              |

domains are independent of each other

- they cannot hybridize from any other domain except their complement
- there are very few short domains with reversible hybridizations



- and long domains with irreversible hybridizations



## motivations/reversibility in DNA/branch migration

#### clever strand designs give reversible behaviours



▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ のQで

.../reversibility in DNA/three-domains structures

- a three-domains transducer



.../reversibility in DNA/three-domains structures

- a three-domains transducer



- its dynamics



.../reversibility in DNA/three-domains structures

- a three-domains transducer







- and causalities



E 990

.../reversibility in DNA/massive concurrency

DNA circuits are massively concurrent:

- solutions consist of populations of species of strands and

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- populations are not singletons

# .../reversibility in DNA/massive concurrency

DNA circuits are *massively concurrent*:

- solutions consist of populations of species of strands and
- populations are not singletons

*it is not possible to desynchronize processes that actually interacted in the past* 



◆□▶ ◆帰▶ ◆ヨ▶ ◆ヨ▶ = ● ののの

## .../reversibility in DNA/massive concurrency

the situation may be even worse due to bad designs



.../reversibility in DNA/issues

reversibility/causality in nature (massive concurrent systems) has not been studied

 theories have been defined for reversible calculi where processes retain unique ids (Danos-Krivine, Phillips-Ulidowski, Lanese-Mezzina-Stefani)

▲ロト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ● ● の Q ()

.../reversibility in DNA/issues

reversibility/causality in nature (massive concurrent systems) has not been studied

 theories have been defined for reversible calculi where processes retain unique ids (Danos-Krivine, Phillips-Ulidowski, Lanese-Mezzina-Stefani)

question addressed by this talk:

what is the distance between current theories of reversible algebras and reversibility in nature?

signals gates



u a

signals : u:ā gates



 $\begin{array}{rl} signals: & u:\overline{a} \\ gates: & g \end{array}$ 

u a

input part.output part + ^

signals : u:ā \_\_\_\_\_a gates : g input part.output part + ^

examples of gates:

 $a \cdot a' \cdot v:\overline{b}$   $u:a \cdot a' \cdot v:\overline{b}$ 

 $u:a \cdot u':a' \cdot v:\overline{b}^{\uparrow}$ 

signals : u:ā \_\_\_\_\_a gates : g input part.output part + ^

*examples of gates:* 





▲ロト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ● ● の Q ()

signals : u:ā \_\_\_\_\_a gates : g input part.output part + ^

examples of gates:





structures : S ::= 0 (null)  $| u:\overline{a}$  (signal) | g (gate) | S | S (parallel) | (new x)S (new)

◆□ → ◆□ → ◆三 → ◆三 → ○へぐ

## .../the algebra of reversible structures/reductions

*input-capture:* 
$$u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C}$$
  
*input-release:*  $A^{\perp} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C}$   
*output-release:*  $A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C}$   
*output-capture:*  $u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C}$
*input-capture*: 
$$u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C}$$
  
*input-release*:  $A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C}$   
*output-release*:  $A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C}$   
*output-capture*:  $u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C}$   
EXAMPLE:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ○ □ ○ ○ ○ ○

 $v:\overline{a} \mid w:\overline{a} \mid \hat{a} \cdot u:\overline{b}$ 

v

$$\begin{array}{rcl} input-capture: & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} & \longrightarrow & A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \overline{C} \\ input-release: & A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \overline{C} & \longrightarrow & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} \\ output-release: & A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} & \longrightarrow & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C} \\ output-capture: & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C} & \longrightarrow & A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \\ example: & & & & & \\ w:\overline{a} \mid w:\overline{a} \mid \hat{a} \cdot u:\overline{b} \end{array}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ● ● ●

*input-capture*: 
$$u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C}$$
  
*input-release*:  $A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C}$   
*output-release*:  $A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C}$   
*output-capture*:  $u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C}$   
EXAMPLE:

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●

 $v:\overline{a} \mid w:\overline{a} \mid \hat{a} \cdot u:\overline{b}$  $\forall v:\overline{a} \mid w:a \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{b}$ 

v

$$\begin{array}{rcl} input-capture: & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} & \longrightarrow & A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \overline{C} \\ input-release: & A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \overline{C} & \longrightarrow & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} \\ output-release: & A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} & \longrightarrow & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C} \\ output-capture: & u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C} & \longrightarrow & A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \\ example: & & & & & \\ w:\overline{a} \mid w:\overline{a} \mid \hat{a} \cdot u:\overline{b} \end{array}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ● ● ●

v

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ● ● ●

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆目▶ ◆目▶ ▲□▶ ◆□◆

*input-capture*: 
$$u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C}$$
  
*input-release*:  $A^{\perp} \cdot u:a \cdot \hat{B} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \hat{a} \cdot B \cdot \overline{C}$   
*output-release*:  $A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C} \longrightarrow u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C}$   
*output-capture*:  $u:\overline{a} \mid A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot u:\overline{a} \cdot \hat{C} \longrightarrow A^{\perp} \cdot \overline{B} \cdot \hat{u}:\overline{a} \cdot \overline{C}$ 

reverse reductions:

input-capture/input-release and output-release/output-capture

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

join input  $(a \mid b \triangleright \overline{c})$ 

input-guarded choice  $(a.\overline{b} + a'.\overline{c})$ 



join input  $(a | b \triangleright \overline{c})$ 

^*a*. *b*. *u*:*c* 

input-guarded choice  $(a.\overline{b} + a'.\overline{c})$ 



join input  $(a | b \triangleright \overline{c})$ 

^*a*. *b*. *u*:*c* 

input-guarded choice  $(a.\overline{b} + a'.\overline{c})$ 

 $(\text{new } v, e)(e. a. u:\overline{b} | e. a'. u':\overline{c} | v:\overline{e})$ 

join input  $(a | b \triangleright \overline{c})$ 

^а. b. u:<del>c</del>

input-guarded choice  $(a.\overline{b} + a'.\overline{c})$ 

 $(\operatorname{new} v, e)(e. a. u:\overline{b} | e. a'. u':\overline{c} | v:\overline{e})$ 

- similarly for mixed-guarded choice

this is the basic scheme for implementing asynchronous RCCS

.../weak coherence and DNA realizability

*a structure is weak coherent whenever ids are uniquely associated to names and co-names* 

- if  $u:\alpha$  and  $u:\alpha'$  occur in the structure then either  $\alpha = \alpha'$  or  $\alpha = \overline{\alpha'}$ 

STATEMENT: (weak coherent) reversible structures may be implemented into three domains DNA strands

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ● ● ●

#### 1. reversibility is reduced to causal (in)dependencies

two reductions are (causally) dependent if they have either the signal or the gate in common

**note**: two reductions may be dependent even if they concern different elements (of the same population)

- コン・4回ン・4回ン・4回ン・4回ン・4日ン

#### 1. reversibility is reduced to causal (in)dependencies

two reductions are (causally) dependent if they have either the signal or the gate in common

**note**: two reductions may be dependent even if they concern different elements (of the same population)

2. STATEMENT: independent reductions can be swapped (*diamond lemma*)

1. reversibility is reduced to causal (in)dependencies

two reductions are (causally) dependent if they have either the signal or the gate in common

**note***: two reductions may be dependent even if they concern different elements (of the same population)* 

- 2. STATEMENT: independent reductions can be swapped (*diamond lemma*)
- 3. define *permutation equivalence*, an equivalence on computations that is insensible

(i) to swapping of consecutive independent reductions(ii) to the removal of consecutive reverse reductions

1. reversibility is reduced to causal (in)dependencies

*two reductions are (causally) dependent if they have either the signal or the gate in common* 

**note**: two reductions may be dependent even if they concern different elements (of the same population)

- 2. STATEMENT: independent reductions can be swapped (*diamond lemma*)
- 3. define *permutation equivalence*, an equivalence on computations that is insensible

(i) to swapping of consecutive independent reductions(ii) to the removal of consecutive reverse reductions

・ロト・西ト・ヨト・ヨト・日・ つくぐ

4. a computation  $\sigma'$  is the reverse of  $\sigma$  if  $\sigma; \sigma' \sim \varepsilon$ 

$$u:\overline{a} \mid \hat{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b}$$

*u* | ^*a*<sub>0</sub>*v* ∠

 $u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid u:a \cdot v:\overline{b}$ 

*u*∘^*v* ∖

 $u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid v:\overline{b}$ 

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

$$u:\overline{a} | \hat{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b}$$
$$u | \hat{a} \cdot v \swarrow \qquad \searrow u \cdot \hat{v}$$
$$u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b}$$
$$u \cdot \hat{v} \searrow$$
$$u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} + v:\overline{b}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ◆□▶

$$u:\overline{a} | \hat{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b}$$

$$u | \hat{a} \cdot v \swarrow \qquad \searrow u \cdot \hat{v}$$

$$u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b} \qquad u:\overline{a} | \hat{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \wedge | v:\overline{b}$$

$$u:a \cdot \hat{v}:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \wedge | v:\overline{b}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ○○ ○○○○

$$u:\overline{a} | ^{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot ^{v}:\overline{b}$$

$$u | ^{a} \circ v \swarrow \qquad \searrow u \circ ^{v}$$

$$u:a \cdot ^{v}:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot ^{v}:\overline{b} \qquad u:\overline{a} | ^{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} ^{*} | v:\overline{b}$$

$$u \circ ^{v} \searrow \qquad \swarrow u | ^{a} \circ v$$

$$u:a \cdot ^{v}:\overline{b} | u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} ^{*} | v:\overline{b}$$

◆□▶ ◆圖▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ ─臣 ─の�?

 $u:\overline{a} \mid u:\overline{a} \mid \hat{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid w:c \cdot u:\overline{a}$ 



 $u:\overline{a} \mid u:\overline{a} \mid \widehat{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid w:c \cdot u:\overline{a} \stackrel{u \mid \widehat{a} \circ v}{\longrightarrow} u:\overline{a} \mid u:a \cdot \widehat{v}:\overline{b} \mid w:c \cdot u:\overline{a}$ 

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ○ □ ○ ○ ○ ○

 $u:\overline{a} \mid u:\overline{a} \mid \widehat{a} \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid w:c \cdot u:\overline{a}^{\wedge} \qquad u:\overline{a} \mid u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid w:c \cdot u:\overline{a}^{\wedge} \qquad u:u:u:\overline{a} \mid u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid w:c \cdot u:\overline{a}^{\wedge} \qquad u:u:u:\overline{a} \mid u:a \cdot v:\overline{b} \mid w:c \cdot u:\overline{a}$ 

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●

cannot be swapped because  $u \mid a_0 v$  and  $u \mid w_0 u$  have terms in common

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

cannot be swapped because  $u \mid a_0 v$  and  $u \mid w_0 u$  have terms in common

RATIONALE: in massive concurrent systems, different occurrences of a same molecule cannot be separated

- we do not catch *multiplicities*
- a similar anomaly is present in Petri nets (*cf.* Degano, Meseguer, Montanari)

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# the appendix/the standardization theorem

STATEMENT: let  $\mu_1$ ;  $\sigma$ ;  $\mu_n$  be a computation of a <u>weak coherent</u> structure such that  $\mu_n$  is the reverse of  $\mu_1$ 

- there is a shorter computation that is permutation equivalent to  $\mu_1$ ;  $\sigma$ ;  $\mu_n$ 

# the appendix/the standardization theorem

STATEMENT: let  $\mu_1$ ;  $\sigma$ ;  $\mu_n$  be a computation of a <u>weak coherent</u> structure such that  $\mu_n$  is the reverse of  $\mu_1$ 

- there is a shorter computation that is permutation equivalent to  $\mu_1$ ;  $\sigma$ ;  $\mu_n$ 

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

the evolution of a gate in a computation without reverse reductions (normal) is unidirectional

# the appendix/coherence

a structure is coherent when it contains exactly one molecule of every species and different species have disjoint ids

EXAMPLES:  $u:\overline{a} \mid a \cdot v:\overline{a}$  and  $v:\overline{a} \mid u:a \cdot v:\overline{a}^{-}$  are coherent  $v:\overline{a} \mid a \cdot v:\overline{a}$  and  $b \cdot v:\overline{a} \mid b \cdot v:\overline{a}$  are not

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

<□> <@> < E> < E> E のQ@

STATEMENT: two coinitial computations of a coherent structure are permutation equivalent if and only if they are cofinal

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

(false in weak-coherent structures)

STATEMENT: two coinitial computations of a coherent structure are permutation equivalent if and only if they are cofinal

(false in weak-coherent structures)

STATEMENT: coherent structures encode in a causally consistent way asynchronous Reversible CCS

STATEMENT: two coinitial computations of a coherent structure are permutation equivalent if and only if they are cofinal

(false in weak-coherent structures)

STATEMENT: coherent structures encode in a causally consistent way asynchronous Reversible CCS

STATEMENT: the reachability problem in coherent structure has a computational complexity of  $O(n^2)$ , where n is the number of gates in the structure

(in weak-coherent structures, reachability is EXPSPACE complete)

### conclusions

research directions:

#### conclusions

research directions:

- coherence is very hard to achieve in nature
  - + biology prompts a thorough study of reversible concurrent calculi where processes have multiplicities and the causal dependencies between copies may be exchanged

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

#### conclusions

research directions:

- coherence is very hard to achieve in nature
  - + biology prompts a thorough study of reversible concurrent calculi where processes have multiplicities and the causal dependencies between copies may be exchanged

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- reversible structures may be extended with irreversible combinators (that may be implemented in DNA)
  - + this makes possible to model standard irreversible operators of programming languages in DNA
## conclusions

research directions:

- coherence is very hard to achieve in nature
  - + biology prompts a thorough study of reversible concurrent calculi where processes have multiplicities and the causal dependencies between copies may be exchanged
- reversible structures may be extended with irreversible combinators (that may be implemented in DNA)
  - + this makes possible to model standard irreversible operators of programming languages in DNA
- studying biological relevant problems in reversible structures may be simpler
  - + we already studied reachability; other issues are absence of molecules/processes, persistence of materials, ···