# A lower bound for web service composition <sup>1</sup>

Anca Muscholl

LaBRI,Bordeaux

LIAFA, 9/2/07

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>FoSSaCS07, with I. Walukiewicz

## **Simulation problem**

### Problem

- Input: DFA  $A_1, \ldots, A_n, B$
- Question: Does  $A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n$  simulate B?

### Simulation relation

For 
$$\mathcal{A} = \langle Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma, \delta_{\mathcal{A}}, q^0_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle, \mathcal{B} = \langle Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma, \delta_{\mathcal{B}}, q^0_{\mathcal{B}} \rangle$$
:  
 $\mathcal{B} \leq \mathcal{A}$  if there exists a relation  $R \subseteq Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}$  s.t.

- $(q^0_{\mathcal{B}},q^0_{\mathcal{A}})\in R$ , and
- for every  $(p,q) \in R$ ,  $a \in \Sigma$ ,  $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$  there exists q' s.t.  $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$  and  $(p',q') \in R$ .

Equivalently: simulation game.

## **Result & motivation**

### Result

EXPTIME lower bound for the simulation problem when the product is fully asynchronous (for constant-size alphabet  $\Sigma$ ).

Moreover, i the alphabets of the  $A_i$  are disjoint, then the problem is in PTIME.

### **Motivation**

- (de Giacomo et al.'03, '05): EXPTIME upper bound (Roman model, a simplified version of Colombo)
  Web service composition: given services A<sub>1</sub>,..., A<sub>n</sub>, is it possible to compose them (find a *delegator*) for obtaining a service B?
- **orchestration problem:** find a communication architecture between peers  $p_1, \ldots, p_n$  with services  $A_1, \ldots, A_n$  such that  $\prod_i A_i$  and B are bisimilar.

### Variants

#### automata/product

- fully asynchronous
- partial synchronization (Schnoebelen/Laroussinie '00)
- communicating (finite-) state machines (Roman model, Vianu)
- Simulation vs. bisimulation
- **(3)** arbitrary many copies of each  $A_i$

#### Rem.

Here: simplest possible setting (no synchronization). Lower bound much easier with synchronization.

# Proof ideas (1)

#### Reduction

Given DTM M, word w, is the computation of M on w infinite?

$$\mathcal{A}_i = \langle S_i, \Sigma_i, s_i^0, \delta_i : S_i \times \Sigma_i \to S_i \rangle, \quad \mathcal{B} = \langle S, \Sigma = \bigcup_i \Sigma_i, s^0, \delta : S \times \Sigma \to S \rangle$$

#### Proof

- first, PSPACE lower bound; second, extension to EXPTIME
- classical idea: A<sub>i</sub> controls the *i*-th tape symbol of a TM, B controls the head moves ("synchronization")
- proof with arbitrary alphabets  $\Sigma_i$ , then reduction to constant size

## Proof ideas (2)



Figure: qa has no outgoing transitions if M has no move



# **Proof ideas (3)**

- From PSPACE to EXPTIME: same with alternation (difficulty: existential moves)
- Constant-size alphabet: replace each transition s → s' by unary encoded transitions

$$s \xrightarrow{a} \langle s, s', k, 0 \rangle \xrightarrow{\#} \langle s, s', k, 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{\#} \cdots \langle s, s', k, k \rangle \xrightarrow{\$} s'$$

Disjoint alphabets Σ<sub>i</sub> in PTIME:
 B is simulated by A<sub>1</sub> ⊗··· ⊗ A<sub>n</sub> iff B is Σ<sub>i</sub>-simulated by A<sub>i</sub>, for each i

## **Open questions**

- Complexity of bisimulation?
- Simulation of FSM by product of arbitrary many copies?