

Actris: Session-Type Based Reasoning in Separation Logic

Jonas Kastberg Hinrichsen, IT University of Copenhagen

Joint work with

Jesper Bengtson, IT University of Copenhagen

Robbert Krebbers, Delft University of Technology

22 January 2020

POPL 2020, New Orleans

The Actor model and message passing

Principled way of writing concurrent programs

- ▶ Isolation of concurrent behaviour
- ▶ Threads as services and clients
- ▶ Used in Erlang, Elixir, Go, Java, Scala, F# and C#

Message passing primitives

`new_chan ()`, `send c v`, `recv c`

Example: `let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {let x = recv c' in send c' (x + 2)};
send c 40; recv c`

Many variants of message passing exist

We consider: asynchronous, order-preserving and reliable

Message passing is not a silver bullet for concurrency

“We studied 15 large, mature, and actively maintained actor programs written in Scala and found that 80% of them mix the actor model with another concurrency model.” [[Tasharofi et al., ECOOP'13](#)]

Problem: No existing solution for dependent high-level actor-based reasoning in combination with existing concurrency models for functional correctness

- ▶ **Dependent:** dependency on previously communicated messages
- ▶ **High-level:** communication of references, channels and higher-order functions

Protocols akin to **session types** for specifications in **concurrent separation logic**

Session types [Honda et al., ESOP'98]

- ▶ Type system for channels
- ▶ Example: $!N.?N.end$
- ▶ Ensures safety and session fidelity

Concurrent separation logic [O'Hearn & Brooks, CONCUR'04]

- ▶ Logic for reasoning about concurrent programs with mutable state
- ▶ Example: $\{l \mapsto v\} l \leftarrow w \{l \mapsto w\}$
- ▶ Ensures functional correctness

Actris: A concurrent separation logic for proving *functional correctness* of programs that combine *message passing* with other programming and concurrency paradigms

- ▶ Introducing *dependent separation protocols*
- ▶ Integration with Iris and its existing concurrency mechanisms
- ▶ Verification of feature-heavy programs including a variant of map-reduce
- ▶ Full mechanization in Coq (<https://gitlab.mpi-sws.org/iris/actris/>)



Features of dependent separation protocols

Specification and proof system for message passing that allows

- ▶ **Resources:** sending references
- ▶ **Higher-order:** sending function closures
- ▶ **Delegation:** sending channels over channels
- ▶ **Dependent:** dependency on previous messages
- ▶ **Recursion:** looping protocols
- ▶ **Branching:** protocols with choice
- ▶ **Manifest sharing:** sharing channel endpoints

Features of dependent separation protocols

Specification and proof system for message passing that allows

- ▶ **Resources**: sending references
- ▶ **Higher-order**: sending function closures
- ▶ **Delegation**: sending channels over channels
- ▶ **Dependent**: dependency on previous messages
- ▶ **Recursion**: looping protocols
- ▶ **Branching**: protocols with choice
- ▶ **Manifest sharing**: sharing channel endpoints

Tour of Actris

Tour of Actris - Goal

Language: ML-like language extended with concurrency, state and message passing

$$e \in \text{Expr} ::= \begin{array}{l} \text{new_chan } () \\ \text{send } c \ v \\ \text{recv } c \end{array} \quad \left| \begin{array}{l} \\ \\ \dots \end{array} \right.$$

Example program:

```
let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {let x = recv c' in send c' (x + 2)};
send c 40; recv c
```

Goal: prove that returned value is 42

Symbols

$$\begin{array}{l|l} st \triangleq !T.st & | \\ ?T.st & | \\ \text{end} & | \dots \end{array}$$

Example

$$!N.?N.\text{end}$$

Duality

$$\begin{array}{l} \overline{!T.st} = ?T.\overline{st} \\ \overline{?T.st} = !T.\overline{st} \\ \overline{\text{end}} = \text{end} \end{array}$$

Rules

$$\text{new_chan } () : st \otimes \overline{st}$$
$$\text{send} : (!T.st \otimes T) \multimap st$$
$$\text{recv} : ?T.st \multimap (T \otimes st)$$

Example program:

```
let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {let x = recv c' in send c' (x + 2)};
send c 40; recv c
```

Session types:

$c : !N.?N.end$ and
 $c' : ?N.!N.end$

Properties obtained:

- ✓ Type safety / session fidelity
- ✗ Functional correctness

Dependent separation protocols - Definitions

	<u>Dependent separation protocols</u>	<u>Session types</u>
Symbols	$prot \triangleq !\vec{x}:\vec{\tau}\langle v\rangle\{P\}.prot \quad $ $\quad ?\vec{x}:\vec{\tau}\langle v\rangle\{P\}.prot \quad $ $\quad end$	$st \triangleq !T.st \quad $ $\quad ?T.st \quad $ $\quad end \quad \dots$
Example	$!(x:\mathbb{N})\langle x\rangle\{True\}.?(y:\mathbb{N})\langle y\rangle\{y = x + 2\}.end$	$!\mathbb{N}.\?\mathbb{N}.end$
Duality	$\overline{!\vec{x}:\vec{\tau}\langle v\rangle\{P\}.prot} = ?\vec{x}:\vec{\tau}\langle v\rangle\{P\}.\overline{prot}$ $\overline{?\vec{x}:\vec{\tau}\langle v\rangle\{P\}.prot} = !\vec{x}:\vec{\tau}\langle v\rangle\{P\}.\overline{prot}$ $\overline{end} = end$	$\overline{!T.st} = ?T.\overline{st}$ $\overline{?T.st} = !T.\overline{st}$ $\overline{end} = end$
Usage	$c \rightsquigarrow prot$	$c : st$

Dependent separation protocols - Rules

Dependent separation protocols

Session types

New

$\{\text{True}\}$
 $\text{new_chan } ()$
 $\{(c, c'). c \mapsto \text{prot} * c' \mapsto \overline{\text{prot}}\}$

$\text{new_chan } () : st \otimes \overline{st}$

Send

$\{c \mapsto !\vec{x} : \vec{\tau} \langle v \rangle \{P\}. \text{prot} * P[\vec{t}/\vec{x}]\}$
 $\text{send } c (v[\vec{t}/\vec{x}])$
 $\{c \mapsto \text{prot}[\vec{t}/\vec{x}]\}$

$\text{send} : (!T.st \otimes T) \multimap st$

Recv

$\{c \mapsto ?\vec{x} : \vec{\tau} \langle v \rangle \{P\}. \text{prot}\}$
 $\text{recv } c$
 $\{w. \exists \vec{y}. (w = v[\vec{y}/\vec{x}]) * P[\vec{y}/\vec{x}] * c \mapsto \text{prot}[\vec{y}/\vec{x}]\}$

$\text{recv} : ?T.st \multimap (T \otimes st)$

Example program:

```
let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {let x = recv c' in send c' (x + 2)};
send c 40; recv c
```

Dependent separation protocols:

$$c \rightsquigarrow !(x:\mathbb{N}) \langle x \rangle \{\text{True}\}. ?(y:\mathbb{N}) \langle y \rangle \{y = x + 2\}. \text{end} \quad \text{and}$$
$$c' \rightsquigarrow ?(x:\mathbb{N}) \langle x \rangle \{\text{True}\}. !(y:\mathbb{N}) \langle y \rangle \{y = x + 2\}. \text{end}$$

Properties obtained:

- ✓ Type safety / session fidelity
- ✓ Functional correctness

Example program:


```
let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {let l = recv c' in l ← !l + 2; send c' ()};
let l = ref 40 in send c l; recv c; !l
```

Dependent separation protocols:

$$c \rightsquigarrow !(l: \text{Loc}) (x: \mathbb{N}) \langle l \rangle \{l \mapsto x\}. ? \langle () \rangle \{l \mapsto x + 2\}. \text{end} \quad \text{and}$$
$$c \rightsquigarrow ? (l: \text{Loc}) (x: \mathbb{N}) \langle l \rangle \{l \mapsto x\}. ! \langle () \rangle \{l \mapsto x + 2\}. \text{end}$$

Example program:

```
let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {let l = recv c' in l ← !l + 2; send c' ()};
let l = ref 40 in send c l; recv c; !l
```



$\{\text{True}\} \text{ref } v \{l. l \mapsto v\}$

Dependent separation protocols:

$c \mapsto !(l: \text{Loc}) (x: \mathbb{N}) \langle l \rangle \{l \mapsto x\}. ? \langle () \rangle \{l \mapsto x + 2\}. \text{end}$ and

$c \mapsto ? (l: \text{Loc}) (x: \mathbb{N}) \langle l \rangle \{l \mapsto x\}. ! \langle () \rangle \{l \mapsto x + 2\}. \text{end}$

Tour of Actris - References

Example program:

```
let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {let l = recv c' in l ← !l + 2; send c' ()};
let l = ref 40 in send c l; recv c; !l
```

$\{\text{True}\} \text{ref } v \{l. l \mapsto v\}$

$\{l \mapsto v\} !l \{w. w = v \wedge l \mapsto v\}$

Dependent separation protocols:

$c \mapsto !(l: \text{Loc}) (x: \mathbb{N}) \langle l \rangle \{l \mapsto x\}. ? \langle () \rangle \{l \mapsto x + 2\}. \text{end}$ and

$c \mapsto ? (l: \text{Loc}) (x: \mathbb{N}) \langle l \rangle \{l \mapsto x\}. ! \langle () \rangle \{l \mapsto x + 2\}. \text{end}$

Soundness and implementation of Actris

Soundness of Actris

If $\{\text{True}\} e \{v. \phi(v)\}$ is provable in Actris then:

- ✓ **Type safety/session fidelity:** e will not crash and not send wrong messages
- ✓ **Functional correctness:** If e terminates with v , the postcondition $\phi(v)$ holds

Obtained by modeling Actris as an embedded domain-specific logic in **Iris**

- ▶ A language-independent higher-order impredicative concurrent separation logic in Coq
- ▶ Exactly what we need

Implementation and model of Actris in Iris

Approach:

- ▶ Implement `new_chan`, `send`, and `recv` as a library using lock-protected buffers
- ▶ Define `prot` using Iris's recursive domain equation solver
- ▶ Define $c \rightsquigarrow \text{prot}$ using Iris's invariant and ghost state machinery
- ▶ Prove Actris's proof rules as lemmas in Iris

Benefits:

- ✓ Actris's soundness result is a corollary of Iris's soundness
- ✓ Can readily reuse Iris's support for interactive proofs in Coq
- ✓ Very small Coq mechanization
(200 lines for channel implementation and proofs, 1000 lines for the definition and proof rules of $c \rightsquigarrow \text{prot}$, 450 lines for Coq tactics specific for message passing)
- ✓ Readily integrates with other concurrency mechanisms in Iris

Integration with other concurrency mechanisms in Iris

Example program:

```
let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {
  let lk = new_lock () in
  fork {acquire lk; send c' 21; release lk};
  acquire lk; send c' 21; release lk
};
recv c + recv c
```

Dependent separation protocols:

$$\text{lock_prot } (n : \mathbb{N}) \triangleq \text{if } n = 0 \text{ then end else } ?\langle 21 \rangle.\text{lock_prot } (n - 1)$$
$$c \mapsto \text{lock_prot } 2 \quad \text{and} \quad c' \mapsto \overline{\text{lock_prot } 2}$$

Proof:

- ▶ Main thread: follows immediately from Actris's rules
- ▶ Forked-off thread: requires reasoning about locks using Iris

Beyond this talk

Features:

- ▶ **Higher-order:** sending function closures
- ▶ **Delegation:** sending channels over channels
- ▶ **Branching:** protocols with choice

Case Studies:

- ▶ Various distributed merge sort variants
- ▶ Distributed load-balancing mapper
- ▶ A variant of map-reduce

Model:

- ▶ Protocols: *prot*
- ▶ Ownership: $c \rightsquigarrow prot$

In the paper!

Ongoing and future work

- ▶ Semantic model of session types via logical relations ([Daniël Louwrik](#))
- ▶ Reasoning about deadlock freedom in separation logic ([Jules Jacobs](#))
- ▶ Multi-party variant of dependent separation protocols (based on [[Honda et al., POPL'08](#)])
- ▶ Communication between distributed systems with logical marshalling
- ▶ Linearity of channels through Iron [[Bizjak et al., POPL'19](#)]
 - ▶ Ensure channels are closed

Example program:

```

let (c, c') = new_chan () in
fork {
  let lk = new_lock () in
  fork { acquire lk; send c' 21; release lk };
  acquire lk; send c' 21; release lk
};
recv c + recv c

```

Dependent separation protocols:

$$\text{lock_prot } (n : \mathbb{N}) \triangleq \text{if } n = 0 \text{ then end else } ? \langle 21 \rangle . \text{lock_prot } (n - 1)$$

$$c \mapsto \text{lock_prot } 2 \quad \text{and} \quad c' \mapsto \overline{\text{lock_prot } 2}$$

Hoare Triple for critical section:

$$\{ \text{is_lock } lk \ (\exists n. c' \mapsto \overline{\text{lock_prot } n} * \{ \bullet n : \text{AUTH}(\mathbb{N}) \}^\gamma) * \{ \circ 1 : \text{AUTH}(\mathbb{N}) \}^\gamma \}$$

$$\text{acquire } lk; \text{send } c' \ 21; \text{release } lk$$

$$\{ \text{True} \}$$

The Model of Actris - Channels

Channels encoded directly on top of HeapLang as a pair of lock-protected buffers

$$(c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2)$$

The rules enqueue and dequeue as one would expect

$$\begin{array}{lll} \{\text{True}\} & \text{new_chan } () & \{(c_1, c_2). (c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\epsilon, \epsilon)\} \\ \{(c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2)\} & \text{send } c_1 \ w & \{(c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1 \cdot [w], \vec{v}_2)\} \\ \{(c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2)\} & \text{send } c_2 \ w & \{(c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2 \cdot [w])\} \\ \{(c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2)\} & \text{recv } c_1 & \{w. (\vec{v}_2 = [w] \cdot \vec{w}) * (c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1, \vec{w})\} \\ \{(c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2)\} & \text{recv } c_2 & \{w. (\vec{v}_1 = [w] \cdot \vec{w}) * (c_1, c_2) \mapsto (\vec{w}, \vec{v}_2)\} \end{array}$$

The Model of Actris - Dependent separation protocols

Defined in Continuation-Passing Style to allow use of quantifiers and have positive position of recursive occurrence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{iProto} &\cong 1 + (\mathbb{B} \times (\text{Val} \rightarrow (\blacktriangleright \text{iProto} \rightarrow \text{iProp}) \rightarrow \text{iProp})) \\ \text{end} &\triangleq \text{inj}_1 () \\ ! \vec{x} : \vec{\tau} \langle v \rangle \{ P \}. \text{prot} &\triangleq \text{inj}_2 (\text{true}, \lambda w (f : \blacktriangleright \text{iProto} \rightarrow \text{iProp}). \exists (\vec{x} : \vec{\tau}). (v = w) * \triangleright P * f(\text{next prot})) \\ ? \vec{x} : \vec{\tau} \langle v \rangle \{ P \}. \text{prot} &\triangleq \text{inj}_2 (\text{false}, \lambda w (f : \blacktriangleright \text{iProto} \rightarrow \text{iProp}). \exists (\vec{x} : \vec{\tau}). (v = w) * \triangleright P * f(\text{next prot})) \end{aligned}$$

Supplied function eventually chosen as an equivalence

$$f \triangleq (\lambda \text{prot}' . \text{prot}' = \text{next prot})$$

The Model of Actris - Endpoint ownership

Protocol ownership “ $c \rightsquigarrow prot$ ” encoded via ghost state and invariants

$$c \rightsquigarrow prot \triangleq \exists \gamma_1 \gamma_2 c_1 c_2. ((c = c_1 * \gamma_1 \mapsto_o prot) \vee (c = c_2 * \gamma_2 \mapsto_o prot)) * \boxed{I \ \gamma_1 \ \gamma_2 \ c_1 \ c_2}$$

Protocol Invariant - One buffer is always empty

$$I \ \gamma_1 \ \gamma_2 \ c_1 \ c_2 \triangleq \exists \vec{v}_1 \ \vec{v}_2 \ prot_1 \ prot_2. (c_1, c_2) \rightsquigarrow (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2) * \\ \gamma_1 \mapsto_{\bullet} prot_1 * \gamma_2 \mapsto_{\bullet} prot_2 * \\ \triangleright \left(\begin{array}{l} (\vec{v}_2 = \epsilon * \text{interp } \vec{v}_1 \ prot_1 \ prot_2) \vee \\ (\vec{v}_1 = \epsilon * \text{interp } \vec{v}_2 \ prot_2 \ prot_1) \end{array} \right)$$

Duality and ownership of resources in transit

$$\text{interp } \epsilon \ prot_1 \ prot_2 \triangleq prot_1 = \overline{prot_2} \\ \text{interp } ([v] \cdot \vec{v}) \ prot_1 \ prot_2 \triangleq \exists \Phi \ prot'_2. (prot_2 = \text{inj}_2(\text{false}, \Phi)) * \\ \Phi \vee (\lambda prot'. prot' = \text{next } prot'_2) * \\ \triangleright \text{interp } \vec{v} \ prot_1 \ prot'_2$$

Distributed merge sort

Program:

```
sort_service cmp c  $\triangleq$   
  let l = recv c in  
  if |l| ≤ 1 then send c () else  
  let l' = split l in  
  let c1 = start (sort_service cmp) in  
  let c2 = start (sort_service cmp) in  
  send c1 l; send c2 l';  
  recv c1; recv c2;  
  merge cmp l l'; send c ()
```

```
start e  $\triangleq$   
  let f = e in  
  let (c, c') = new_chan () in  
  fork {f c'}; c
```

Dependent separation protocol:

```
sort_prot (l : T → Val → iProp) (R : T → T →  $\mathbb{B}$ )  $\triangleq$   
  ?  $\vec{x} \ell \langle \ell \rangle \{ \ell \mapsto_l \vec{x} \}.$   
  !  $\vec{y} \langle () \rangle \{ \ell \mapsto_l \vec{y} * \text{sorted\_of}_R \vec{y} \vec{x} \}.$ end
```

```
{ cmp_spec l R cmp *  
  c ↦ sort_prot l R  
  sort_service cmp c  
  { c ↦ end }
```

```
cmp_spec l R cmp  $\triangleq$   
   $\forall x_1 x_2 v_1 v_2. \{ l x_1 v_1 * l x_2 v_2 \}$   
  cmp v1 v2  
  { r. r = R x1 x2 * l x1 v1 * l x2 v2 }
```

Fine-grained merge sort

Program:

```
sort_servicefg cmp c  $\triangleq$   
  branch c with  
    right  $\Rightarrow$  select c right  
  | left  $\Rightarrow$   
    let x1 = recv c in  
    branch c with  
      right  $\Rightarrow$  select c left;  
              send c x1;  
              select c right  
    | left  $\Rightarrow$   
      let x2 = recv c in  
      let c1 = start sort_servicefg cmp in  
      let c2 = start sort_servicefg cmp in  
      select c1 left; send c1 x1;  
      select c2 left; send c2 x2;  
      splitfg c c1 c2; mergefg cmp c c1 c2  
    end  
  end
```

Dependent separation protocol:

$$\text{sort_prot}_{fg} (I : T \rightarrow \text{Val} \rightarrow \text{iProp}) (R : T \rightarrow T \rightarrow \mathbb{B}) \triangleq$$
$$\text{sort_prot}_{fg}^{\text{head}} \mid R \in$$
$$\text{sort_prot}_{fg}^{\text{head}} \mid R \triangleq$$
$$\mu (\text{rec} : \text{List } T \rightarrow \text{iProto}).$$
$$\lambda \vec{x}. (? x v \langle v \rangle \{ I x v \}. \text{rec } (\vec{x} \cdot [x]))$$
$$\& \text{sort_prot}_{fg}^{\text{tail}} \mid R \vec{x} \in$$
$$\text{sort_prot}_{fg}^{\text{tail}} \mid R \triangleq$$
$$\mu (\text{rec} : \text{List } T \rightarrow \text{List } T \rightarrow \text{iProto}).$$
$$\lambda \vec{x} \vec{y}. (! y v \langle v \rangle \{ (\forall i < |\vec{y}|. R \vec{y}_i y) * I y v \}. \text{rec } \vec{x} (\vec{y} \cdot [y]))$$
$$\{ \text{True} \} \oplus \{ \vec{x} \equiv_p \vec{y} \} \text{ end}$$

Distributed mapper

Program:

```
mapper_worker f_v lk c  $\triangleq$   
  acquire lk; select c left;  
  branch c with  
    right  $\Rightarrow$  release lk  
  | left  $\Rightarrow$  let x := recv c in release lk; (* acquire work *)  
            let y := f_v x in (* map it *)  
            acquire lk; select c right; send c y; release lk; (* send it back *)  
            mapper_worker f_v lk c  
end
```

Dependent separation protocol:

```
mapper_prot I_T I_U (f : T  $\rightarrow$  List U)  $\triangleq$   
   $\mu$  rec.  $\lambda$  (n :  $\mathbb{N}$ ) (X : MultiSet T).  
    if n = 0 then end else  
      (? x v  $\langle$ v $\rangle$ {I_T x v}. rec n (X  $\uplus$  {x})) & rec (n - 1) X  
      {(n=1) $\Rightarrow$ (X= $\emptyset$ )}  $\oplus$  {True}  
      ! x l  $\langle$ l $\rangle$ {x  $\in$  X * l  $\mapsto$  I_U (f x)}. rec n (X \ {x})
```

```
prot_1 {Q_1}  $\oplus$  {Q_2} prot_2  $\triangleq$   
  !(b :  $\mathbb{B}$ )  $\langle$ b $\rangle$ {if b then Q_1 else Q_2}.  
  if b then prot_1 else prot_2
```

```
prot_1 {Q_1} & {Q_2} prot_2  $\triangleq$   
  ?(b :  $\mathbb{B}$ )  $\langle$ b $\rangle$ {if b then Q_1 else Q_2}.  
  if b then prot_1 else prot_2
```

Distributed mapper - Specification

Concurrent Spec of Mapper Worker:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{f_spec } I_T \ I_U \ f \ f_v \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ \emptyset \ * \\ \text{is_lock } lk \ \left(\frac{\exists n \ X. \ \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ X \ *}{c \mapsto \text{mapper_prot } I_T \ I_U \ f \ n \ X} \right) \end{array} \right\}$$

mapper_worker $f_v \ lk \ c$
{True}

$$\text{f_spec } (T \ U : \text{Type}) \ (f_v : \text{Val}) \triangleq \\ \forall x \ v. \ \{I_T \ x \ v\} \ f_v \ v \ \{l. \ l \mapsto_{I_U} \ f \ x\}$$

Ghost Theory:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{True} \Rightarrow & \exists \gamma. \ \text{auth}_\gamma \ 0 \ \emptyset \\ \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ X \Rightarrow & \text{auth}_\gamma \ (1 + n) \ X \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ \emptyset \\ \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ X \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ \emptyset \Rightarrow & \text{auth}_\gamma \ (n - 1) \ X \\ \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ X \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ Y \Rightarrow & \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ (X \uplus Z) \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ (Y \uplus Z) \\ Z \subseteq Y \ * \ \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ X \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ Y \Rightarrow & \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ (X \setminus Z) \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ (Y \setminus Z) \\ \text{auth}_\gamma \ n \ X \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ Y \ * & n > 0 \ * \ Y \subseteq X \\ \text{auth}_\gamma \ 1 \ X \ * \ \text{contrib}_\gamma \ Y \ * & Y = X \end{array}$$