



**HAL**  
open science

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

Nicolas Chappe, Ludovic Henrio, Amaury Maillé, Matthieu Moy, Hadrien Renaud

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Chappe, Ludovic Henrio, Amaury Maillé, Matthieu Moy, Hadrien Renaud. An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice. *The Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming*, 2021, 6 (1), pp.1-41. 10.22152/programming-journal.org/2022/6/3 . hal-03440766

**HAL Id: hal-03440766**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03440766v1>**

Submitted on 22 Nov 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

Nicolas Chappe<sup>a</sup>, Ludovic Henrio<sup>a</sup>, Amaury Maillé<sup>a</sup>, Matthieu Moy<sup>a</sup>, and Hadrien Renaud<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Univ Lyon, EnsL, UCBL, CNRS, Inria, LIP, F-69342, LYON Cedex 07, France

<sup>b</sup> École Polytechnique/Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Palaiseau, France

**Abstract** A future is an entity representing the result of an ongoing computation. A synchronisation with a “get” operation blocks the caller until the computation is over, to return the corresponding value. When a computation in charge of fulfilling a future delegates part of its processing to another task, mainstream languages return nested futures, and several “get” operations are needed to retrieve the computed value (we call such futures “control-flow futures”). Several approaches were proposed to tackle this issues: the “forward” construct, that allows the programmer to make delegation explicit and avoid nested futures, and “data-flow explicit futures” which natively collapse nested futures into plain futures.

This paper supports the claim that data-flow explicit futures form a powerful set of language primitives, on top of which other approaches can be built. We prove the equivalence, in the context of data-flow explicit futures, between the “forward” construct and classical “return” from functions. The proof relies on a branching bisimulation between a program using “forward” and its “return” counterpart. This result allows language designers to consider “forward” as an optimisation directive rather than as a language primitive.

Following the principles of the Godot system, we provide a library implementation of control-flow futures, based on data-flow explicit futures implemented in the compiler. This small library supports the claim that the implementation of classical futures based on data-flow ones is easier than the opposite. Our benchmarks show the viability of the approach from a performance point of view.

ACM CCS 2012

- **Computing methodologies** → *Distributed programming languages*; **Parallel programming languages**;
- **Theory of computation** → Program semantics;

**Keywords** parallelism, programming languages, futures

## The Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming

Submitted September 30, 2020

Published July 15, 2021

doi 10.22152/programming-journal.org/2022/6/3



© Nicolas Chappe, Ludovic Henrio, Amaury Maillé, Matthieu Moy, and Hadrien Renaud  
This work is licensed under a “CC BY 4.0” license.

In *The Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2022, article 3; 41 pages.

### 1 Introduction

A future [4] is an entity representing the result of an ongoing computation. It is used when launching a sub-task in parallel with the current task to later retrieve the result computed by the sub-task. A future is *resolved* when the associated value is computed. Futures have been used for more than 30 years now, and their adoption became wider and reached mainstream object-oriented languages during the last 20 years. Futures are used as a high-level parallelism paradigm in the standard libraries of Java, Scala, JavaScript, C++, or in the Akka and ProActive toolkits. A future is at the same time a container for some data and a way to synchronise processes: programs that use futures wait for the resolution of the future before executing some piece of code.

To classify futures, the classical approach is to distinguish implicit from explicit futures [7, 28], i.e. whether there are dedicated operations to access a future's content (explicit) or not (implicit). We demonstrated [12, 17] that the way synchronisation is performed is a more distinctive feature. In particular futures should be classified depending on whether they are equipped with a data-flow or a control-flow synchronisation. We call the synchronisation “control-flow” when the execution of a given statement releases the synchronisation, and “data-flow” when it is the availability of some data that releases the synchronisation; such a distinction appears when nesting futures (see next paragraph). Control-flow futures are explicit by nature and generally typed using a parametric type of the form  $\text{Fut}[T]$ . Traditionally, data-flow futures have been implicit, but we showed they could be explicit as well. The typing of data-flow explicit futures requires specific typing rules that prevent the construction of nested future types. We call data-flow explicit futures *flows* [12] and denote their type  $\text{Flow}[T]$ . The type system for flows relies on a collapse rule that transforms a type of the form  $\text{Flow}[\text{Flow}[T]]$  into  $\text{Flow}[T]$ .

**Delegation and Future Nesting** The distinction between control-flow and data-flow synchronisation makes a particular sense when the asynchronous task responsible for resolving a future delegates the resolution of this future to another asynchronous task (i.e. terminates its execution with a return *asynchronous-call*) and provides another future as the computed value. With *control-flow futures*, two synchronisations (e.g. `get(get(nested_future))`) are necessary to fetch the result: one waiting for the task that delegates and another for the task that resolves the future. With *data-flow futures*, a single synchronisation (e.g. `get*(nested_future)`) is necessary to wait for the resolution of both tasks. See listing 1.b on page 5 for an example of such a delegation. It is also in case of delegation that the difference between type systems is visible: the type of the result of an asynchronous call itself delegated asynchronously to another entity will be of the form  $\text{Fut}[\text{Fut}[\text{int}]]$ ; with data-flow explicit futures such a type is *collapsed* into  $\text{Flow}[\text{int}]$ .

Encore [9] is a language with control-flow futures but a focus on data-flow like synchronisations. Encore is an active object language extended with a forward construct allowing the programmer to encode delegation without creating nested future types [11]. The direct semantics of forward relies on future chaining but an optimising compilation phase avoids chaining and uses *promises*. Promises are variants of futures

that are explicitly resolved through a set operation while a future is resolved when the associated task terminates.

**Contribution** Compared to the previous works, this article further investigates the use of data-flow explicit futures and illustrates the benefits of this new kind of futures over existing ones. More precisely:

- We present both a formal definition and a concrete implementation of data-flow explicit futures in the Encore language.
- We illustrate the expressiveness and ease of programming brought by data-flow explicit futures both with illustrative examples and by showing that control-flow futures can easily be encoded from data-flow explicit futures; as such we provide the first complete implementation of an encoding of the Godot approach [12].
- The formal aspects of this article are based on DeF, a new core calculus dedicated to the study of data-flow explicit futures. DeF is not meant to be a new programming language, but rather a minimalistic formal language, expressive enough to be representative of existing mainstream languages. Because we target mainstream languages with imperative aspects, we define this calculus with a mutable state and some standard imperative constructs. It also features asynchronous calls that take advantage of data-flow explicit futures. The main improvement over Godot, a lambda-based calculus with data-flow explicit futures [12], is our support for mutable state.
- We formally and experimentally study one of the most promising optimisations enabled by data-flow futures: with data-flow explicit futures, the return and the forward primitives have the same semantics. We prove this equivalence and investigate the benefits we could obtain by exploiting it. Our calculus includes the formalisation of the forward\* primitive with a novel typing rule that is safe even when the function that performs a forward\* is invoked synchronously.

**Organisation of the Paper** Section 2 presents existing future constructs and illustrates the benefits of data-flow explicit futures on an example. Section 3 presents DeF, a core calculus of data-flow explicit futures, its syntax, semantics, and type system. The extension of DeF with a forward\* primitive is called DeF+F, it is also defined in this section. Section 4 proves that the return and the forward\* primitives have the same behaviour by exhibiting a branching bisimulation between programs that use the forward\* primitive and programs that only use return. Section 5 presents our DeF extension to Encore, the encoding of control-flow futures based on data-flow explicit futures, the implementation of the forward\* primitive and concludes with a performance evaluation of the constructs presented in this paper.

### 2 Context and Related Work

#### 2.1 A Brief History of Futures

“Futures” are a programming abstraction that has been introduced by [4]. It has then been used in programming languages like MultiLisp [16]. Futures provide an elegant form of parallelism by enabling the creation of asynchronous tasks that return a result. The synchronisation mechanism provided by futures is closely related with the flow of data in the programs. In MultiLisp, the future construct creates a thread and returns a future that can be manipulated by operations like assignment that do not need a real value, but the program would *automatically block* when performing an operation that requires the future value (e.g. an arithmetic operation). In MultiLisp, futures are implicitly accessed in the sense that there is no specific instruction for accessing a future but there is an explicit statement for creating them. Typed futures appeared with ABCL/f [27] to represent the result of asynchronous method invocations, i.e. invocations performed in parallel with the code that triggered them.

The first work on formalisation of futures was probably realised by Flanagan and Felleissen [13, 14] and was already focused on the difference between explicit and implicit future access. This work studies the futures of MultiLisp, that are explicitly created but implicitly accessed. The authors translate a program with futures into a lower-level program that explicitly retrieves futures, and then optimise the number of necessary future retrievals. In a similar vein,  $\lambda(fut)$  [24] is a concurrent lambda calculus with futures with cells and handles. Futures in  $\lambda(fut)$  are explicitly created, similarly to MultiLisp. Alice ML [23] can be considered as an implementation of  $\lambda(fut)$ .

While the first adoptions of futures were in functional languages, they are nowadays used in imperative and object-oriented programming. For example, futures now exist in many mainstream languages such as C++, Java, Javascript, Scala, ... In particular futures play a central role in actor [2] and active object languages [7], which are based on asynchronous communications between single-threaded entities. They use futures to represent replies to asynchronous messages. Except for ProActive [3], actor and active-object languages use explicit futures [9, 20, 21, 29]. In this context, De Boer et al. [8] designed a compositional proof theory for active objects, that puts a strong emphasis on the modelling of futures.

#### 2.2 Motivational Examples

Listing 1 shows the same simple program in different languages and using different constructs: with control-flow explicit futures in Encore, with data-flow explicit futures in our extension to Encore, and with implicit futures in ProActive. The syntax of these languages is mostly simple object oriented programming except the following: in Encore, ! triggers an asynchronous method invocation that returns a control-flow explicit future; !! is the equivalent operation that creates data-flow futures; Fut[T] (resp. Flow[T]) is the type of a control-flow explicit future (resp. a data-flow explicit future) that will be resolved by a value of type T; get (resp. get\*) waits for the resolution of a control-flow explicit future (resp. a data-flow explicit future) and returns its value.

■ **Listing 1** A simple actor example: control-flow explicit futures, data-flow explicit futures and implicit futures (that are always data-flow).

a) Encore (control-flow explicit futures)

```

1 active class B
2   def bar(t: int): int
3     t * 2
4   end
5
6   def foo(x: int): Fut[int]
7     val t = x + 1
8     val beta = new B()
9     beta!bar(t)
10  end
11
12  -- we need this function as foo cannot take
13     ↪ both fut and int
14  def foo_fut(x: Fut[int]): Fut[int]
15    this.foo(get(x))
16  end
17
18  active class Main
19    def main(): unit
20      val alpha = new B()
21      -- Asynchronous call using !, returns a
22         ↪ future
23      val x: Fut[Fut[int]] = alpha!foo(1)
24      val y: int = get(get(x)) + 1
25      val z: Fut[Fut[int]] = alpha!foo_fut(get(x))
26      println(get(get(z))) -- 10
27    end
28  end

```

b) Encore with DeF (our extension)

```

1 active class B
2   def bar(t: int): int
3     t * 2
4   end
5
6   def foo(x: Flow[int]): Flow[int]
7     val t = get*(x) + 1
8     val beta = new B()
9     beta!!bar(t)
10  end
11 end
12
13 active class Main
14   def main(): unit
15     val alpha = new B()
16     -- Asynchronous call using !!, returns a flow
17     val x: Flow[int] = alpha!!foo(1) -- this lifts 1
18        ↪ from int to Flow[int]
19     var y: int = get*(x) + 1
20     val z: Flow[int] = alpha!!foo(x)
21     println(get*(z)) -- 10
22   end
23 end

```

c) ProActive, implicit futures (Complete code for this example can be found on this gist)

```

1 public class B {
2   // ... define newB, main ...
3
4   public WrappedInt bar(WrappedInt t) {
5     return t.mult(2);
6   }
7
8   public WrappedInt foo(WrappedInt x) throws Exception {
9     WrappedInt t = x.add(1);
10    B beta = newB();
11    return beta.bar(t);
12  }
13
14  public static void realMain() throws Exception {
15    B alpha = newB();
16    WrappedInt x = alpha.foo(new WrappedInt(1)); // Method call on active object ⇒ asynchronous
17        ↪ call, returns an implicit future implementing the WrappedInt interface
18    WrappedInt y = x.add(1); // Forces synchronisation
19    WrappedInt z = alpha.foo(x);
20    System.out.println(z); // Forces synchronisation
21  }
22 }

```

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

In this article and in our implementation we use two different operators `get` and `get*` to distinguish operations on control-flow explicit futures and on data-flow explicit futures. Using polymorphism to offer a single primitive would be possible but we believe it is better to expose the programmer to two different operators that have a different semantics.

The example creates an actor `alpha` that is invoked asynchronously to perform the operation `foo`. The operation is partially delegated to an actor named `beta` as the result of `foo` is an asynchronous call to the method `bar` of `beta`. Notice the nested future type that exists with control-flow explicit futures (listing 1.a line 22) due to the delegated call and the subsequent double `get` operation line 23. With data-flow explicit futures, there are never two nested `Flow` types and never two consecutive invocations of `get*`. We call these futures *data-flow* because `get*` always returns data, never a future, but they are still explicit in the sense that the user needs to call `get*` akin to `get` in control-flow explicit futures. In ProActive, futures are implicit and the synchronisation occurs automatically on line 17 when an operation is triggered on the future. Implicit futures are always data-flow: because the type and the way to access data are transparent to the user, neither nested future types nor double-get operations would make sense for them. Finally, the example illustrates the invocation of a function with a future as parameter. With control-flow explicit futures the fact that a parameter is a future is explicit in a method's signature, but with data-flow explicit futures it is not necessary to declare two methods `foo` as an integer can be passed as parameter where a `Flow[int]` is expected. The synchronisation on line 7 of listing 1.b is resolved immediately if the parameter `x` is in fact an integer (that has been lifted to a `Flow`).

This example shows that the data-flow explicit futures are a good middle point between implicit futures and control-flow explicit futures, where the user keeps control over the synchronisation but delegates the chain handling to the language. The type system with data-flow explicit futures avoids the need for method duplication by automatically lifting native types to `Futures`. We now define more formally the different existing kinds of `Futures`, and position our work accordingly.

### 2.3 The Limitations of Existing Future and Promise Constructs

Two initial works highlighted the differences between explicit and implicit futures. First, it has been shown that adapting a static analysis [15] from explicit to implicit futures is difficult mostly because, with implicit futures, an unbounded number of synchronisation can be triggered by a given statement. Also the proof of correctness of the ProActive backend for ABS revealed the impossibility to simulate exhaustively control-flow synchronisation on implicit futures [19], this was due to the fact that synchronisation on implicit and explicit futures cannot observe the same thing.

Following this, a first active object version of data-flow explicit futures was proposed in a report [17]. Then the Godot system [12] was designed. It includes both data-flow and control-flow explicit futures and illustrates how to encode one into the other. The Godot system highlights three shortcomings of standard explicit futures and offers solutions:

**The Future Type Proliferation Problem** leading to the nesting of future types in case of delegated calls. Line 22 of listing 1.a shows a nesting of future types. Data-flow explicit futures solve this problem.

**The Future Reference Proliferation Problem** referring to the possibly long chain of future references that has to be followed to reach the resolved future with either implicit or explicit futures in case of delegated calls. The use of forward can solve this problem.

**The Fulfilment Observation Problem** referring to the fact that the events observed with data-flow and with control-flow synchronisations are not the same. Indeed control-flow futures are better adapted to observe the flow of computation, e.g. in a scheduler, whereas data-flow futures are better adapted to express a computation and its data dependencies, e.g. in the resolution of a computational problem.

The current limitations of the Godot system are:

- The provided semantics is based on a stateless calculus while most of the languages that use futures are stateful. In particular the semantics does not allow a program to create a cycle of futures. While not desirable in practice, such cycles can happen as a consequence of the fact that the host language allows side effects. Our calculus is stateful and thus more representative of the existing implementations of futures.
- **Incomplete implementation:** the artefact associated with [12] encodes data-flow futures as a library built on top of the control-flow futures of Scala. It cannot handle parametric types that contain futures. Technically, the collapse rule is implemented at the time of creation of Flow to avoid creating a Flow[Flow[T]], but a Flow[Flow[T]] can be created by using a parametric type Foo[T] and instantiating it with T=Flow[T]. In this case the compiler has no way to collapse such types, and the type proliferation problem remains. To the best of our knowledge, no solution to this problem can work in a library-based approach without specific language support.

We perform the reverse encoding (modify the language and compiler to implement data-flow natively, and encode control-flow on top of data-flow) and fully supports parametric types. The encoding of control-flow futures on top of data-flow ones was defined formally in [12], but was not implemented and therefore not studied experimentally.

- The typing rule of [12] for forward\* allows calling synchronously a method that actually runs asynchronously, adding an implicit synchronisation. We believe this implicit synchronisation contradicts the principles of explicit futures, and as such, we provide a safer typing rule for forward\*.

**About Promises** A promise is a future plus a handler that must be invoked to resolve the future. The handler is created at the same time as the future and any process that knows the handler can resolve the future. The advantage is that the resolution of the future is not tied to a given process. Promises do not suffer from the limitations of futures concerning delegation but they are more difficult to program. Indeed it is in general not possible to ensure that a promise is resolved exactly once [1]. Data-flow futures, explicit or implicit, keep the single resolution guarantee of futures while



## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

changing dynamically the thread responsible for fulfilling a future, which is the major advantage of promises compared to futures. Promises are used internally in Encore [11] to implement the forward primitive efficiently while avoiding the risks mentioned above.

**About Non-Blocking Future Access** Another future access method is to register a continuation that will be executed asynchronously upon future resolution. It exists for example in Creol and AmbientTalk [10], where futures can only be accessed asynchronously, i.e. the programmer can only register some piece of code that will be executed when the future is resolved. Creol interrupts the execution of the current thread while waiting for the future. In AmbientTalk, *when-becomes-catch* behaves similarly but also a method invocation on a future generates an asynchronous invocation that will be scheduled when the future is resolved. In Akka, blocking future access is possible (using *Await.result* or *Await.ready*) but asynchronous future accesses should be preferred according to the documentation. Asynchronous reaction on future resolution is called *future chaining* in Encore [9], where it is provided by a `~>` operator (also called *then*). This operator registers code to be executed when the future is resolved; for example, with `fut.then(lambda x ...)` the resolution of `fut` triggers the execution of the lambda-expression on the right.

The advantage of non-blocking future accesses is that they prevent deadlocks. The counterpart is that the absence of synchronisation instruction makes it difficult to reason on the computations that are finished or not at a given program point. Many complete programming languages like Encore, ABS, and Akka feature both blocking and non-blocking future access.

Non-blocking access to data-flow futures makes perfect sense and, while our formalisation focuses on blocking synchronisation on futures, our results can be extended to non-blocking future access. On the practical side, we implemented non-blocking future access for data-flow futures in Encore (called chaining and denoted `~>*`).

### 2.4 Positioning and Discussion

The traditional classification of futures differentiates explicit from implicit futures [7, 28]. What is generally meant by the explicit vs implicit classification is the existence of 1) a specific type construct for futures (e.g., `fut[int]`), and 2) a specific future access primitive (e.g., `get`). In this sense our futures are explicit. However in all mainstream implementations of explicit futures, the type system for futures relies on classical parametric types that enforce a control-flow synchronisation on futures. Data-flow explicit futures are explicit but with a type system and synchronisation semantics that are different from usual explicit futures that use parametric types. Specifically, the type system of data-flow explicit futures *collapses* `Flow[Flow[T]]` into `Flow[T]` and it can *lift* `T` to `Flow[T]`. *Collapsing* enables data-flow synchronisation on futures while *lifting* allows a non-future type to be considered as a future.

One major example of a library with data-flow synchronisation on futures is the ProActive library [3]. GCM components [5], and a content addressable network [25]

are two major projects that use the library. They both rely on delegation to route messages and on data-flow synchronisation for the access to results of invocations.

Data-flow synchronisation is more adapted to the programming of computations manipulating values. Control-flow synchronisation is better adapted to control explicitly the scheduling of tasks. Overall, control-flow explicit futures and data-flow explicit futures should probably coexist in a good programming library [12]. A short summary of the kinds of futures and their typical uses is given in table 1.

■ **Table 1** Summary of kinds of futures

		Benefits	
		Explicit	Implicit
Suitable for		Easier debugging	Concise
Control-flow	task schedulers, ...	C++, Java, Scala, Encore	<i>impossible</i>
Data-flow	computation using data	Godot, our contribution	MultiLisp, ProActive

This article presents our modification to the Encore compiler to add support for data-flow explicit futures in addition to the existing explicit futures. We chose Encore because it is a full-fledged language and its compiler and type-checker are not too big. Moreover, Encore is an actor language where it is simple to create small examples that illustrate the delegation of asynchronous invocations and data-flow explicit futures.

This article also proposes an encoding of control-flow synchronisation based on data-flow explicit futures. This direction is the opposite one compared to the artefact of Godot [12], i.e. a Scala library that provides data-flow explicit futures based on existing control-flow explicit futures. Our encoding implementation is also more complete as it can fully deal with parametric types but its syntax is less nice: we only provide a set of functions and have no way to extend the syntax because our implementation is an Encore library. By implementing control-flow explicit futures as a library in a language that only provides data-flow explicit ones, the compiler has a single future primitive and the programmer can use both kinds of futures. We believe this approach is adapted to most languages that use explicit futures or promises.

Implementation matters are further discussed in section 5.

### 3 Data-Flow Explicit Futures: Principles and Semantics

This section presents two core languages called DeF (for data-flow explicit futures) and DeF+F that extends DeF with a `forward*` operator. DeF features data-flow explicit futures exclusively, functions that can be called synchronously or asynchronously, and a global state that enables imperative programming. We designed DeF as a minimalistic calculus but expressive enough so that our results on data-flow futures would still be relevant on a wide range of more complex calculi.

Our languages are equipped with a type system. Compared to our implementation of data-flow explicit futures in Encore we do not encode objects or actors and con-

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

■ **Table 2** Static syntax of DeF.

$P ::= \overline{T x} \overline{M} \{ \overline{T x s} \}$	program
$M ::= T m(\overline{T x}) \{ \overline{T x s} \}$	function
$s ::= \text{skip} \mid x = z \mid \text{if } v \{s\} \text{ else } \{s\} \mid s ; s \mid \text{return } v$	statements
$z ::= e \mid m(\overline{v}) \mid !m(\overline{v}) \mid \text{get}^* v$	right-hand-side of assignments
$e ::= v \mid v \oplus v$	expressions
$v ::= x \mid \text{integer-and-boolean-values}$	atoms
$B ::= \text{Int} \mid \text{Bool}$	basic type
$T ::= B \mid \text{Flow}[B]$	Type

■ **Table 3** Runtime Syntax of DeF.

$cn ::= a \rangle F$	configuration
$F ::= \overline{f(\overline{q})} \overline{f(w)}$	set of futures in configuration (unresolved / resolved)
$q ::= \{\ell   s\}$	stack frame
$w ::= f \mid b$	runtime values: future identifiers and basic values
$b ::= \text{integer-and-boolean-values}$	values of basic types
$\ell, a ::= [\overline{x} \mapsto \overline{w}]$	local and global store
$s ::= \text{skip} \mid x = z \mid \text{if } v \{s\} \text{ else } \{s\} \mid s ; s \mid \text{return } v$	statements
$v ::= x \mid w$	variable or runtime value
$e ::= v \mid v \oplus v$	expressions with runtime values
$z ::= e \mid m(\overline{v}) \mid !m(\overline{v}) \mid \text{get}^* v$	right hand side of assignments

sequently data-races exist in DeF but not in Encore. We show in section 5.3 how to implement control-flow explicit futures on top of DeF.

### 3.1 Syntax of DeF

We use the following notations in our syntax. A bar over an expression, e.g.  $\overline{q}$  denotes a list. All lists are ordered, except the set of futures in a configuration.  $\emptyset$  is the empty list, and  $q\#\overline{q}$  is the ordered list  $\overline{q}$  with  $q$  prepended to it. As for sets of futures,  $FF'$  simply denotes the union of the sets  $F$  and  $F'$ .  $\oplus$  denotes any usual integer or boolean binary operator. Table 2 shows the static syntax of DeF. A program  $P$  is made of a list of typed global variable declarations, a list of function definitions, and a main function ( $s$  is the body of the main function). Each function  $M$  has a return type, a name, a list of typed arguments, a list of typed local variables, and a statement that is the function body. Asynchronous function calls are supported via the  $!m(\overline{v})$  syntax. If  $B$  is a basic type,  $\text{Flow}[B]$  denotes the type of a data-flow explicit future that is to be resolved by a value of type  $B$ .

Table 3 describes the runtime syntax of DeF. The configuration of a running DeF program contains a global store  $a$ , a set of resolved futures  $f(w)$  and a set of unresolved futures  $f(\overline{q})$  each associated with a running call stack  $\overline{q}$ . Each frame  $q$  of a call stack contains a local store  $\ell$  and a statement to be executed  $s$ . Each store is defined as a mapping from variable names to runtime values where runtime values  $w$  are basic

values  $b$  and future identifiers  $f$ . Note that we also allow expressions and future values to contain future identifiers, this will be useful for evaluating `get*` statements.

To evaluate a program  $P = \overline{T} x \overline{M} \{ \overline{T}' x' s \}$  one must place it in an *initial configuration*. To do this we suppose that all variables have an initialisation value denoted  $\overline{0}$ . The initial configuration for  $P$  is:  $a \succ f_0(\{\ell | s\})$  where  $f_0$  is any future identifier, the global store  $a = [\overline{x} \mapsto \overline{0}]$  maps all global variables to an initialisation value, and  $\ell = [\overline{x}' \mapsto \overline{0}]$  maps all local variables of the main body to an initialisation value.

The sequence  $s$ ;  $s$  is associative and `skip` is neutral as the statement has no effect; thus we can rewrite any statement  $s$  under the form  $s' ; s''$  where  $s'$  is not a sequence (and  $s''$  might be `skip` if  $s$  is a single statement). In the following we suppose that every statement is rewritten under this form (this simplifies the operational semantics).

Configurations are identified modulo reordering of futures (hence  $Ff$  picks any  $f$  in the set, not necessarily the last one) and future identifiers are unique; if  $f(w) \in cn$  and  $f(w') \in cn$ , necessarily  $w = w'$ . Thus a configuration can be considered as a mapping from future identifiers to call stacks or values.

### 3.2 Semantics of DeF

Figure 1 details the small-step operational semantics of DeF that uses three notations:

- Similarly to other languages with binding of methods or functions [20], provided the program that is evaluated defines a function  $T m(\overline{T} x) \{ \overline{T} y s \}$ , the bind operator instantiates a new stack frame with the local environment and the body of the function to be executed:  $\text{bind}(m, \overline{w}) = \{ [\overline{x} \mapsto \overline{w}, \overline{y} \mapsto \overline{0}] | s \}$
- Given two stores  $a$  and  $\ell$ ,  $(a + \ell)$  is the union of the two stores with values taken in  $\ell$  in case of conflict:  $(a + \ell)(x) = \ell(x)$  if  $x \in \text{dom}(\ell)$  and  $(a + \ell)(x) = a(x)$  otherwise.<sup>2</sup>
- Given two stores  $a$  and  $\ell$ ,  $(a + \ell)[x \mapsto w]$  is defined as  $(a, \ell[x \mapsto w])$  if  $x \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ , or  $(a[x \mapsto w], \ell)$  otherwise.

Our semantics features asynchronous calls. `INVK-ASYNC` spawns an asynchronous task by adding an unresolved future to the configuration. From this point, the callee executes the spawned task in parallel with the caller. Once the spawned task is completed, the callee fulfils the future through the rule `RETURN-ASYNC`. The semantic rules for synchronous calls are more standard. `INVK-SYNC` pushes a new stack frame initialised in accordance with the function called and the arguments provided, and `RETURN-SYNC` pops the current stack frame and resumes the execution of the caller with the return value properly propagated.

The `get*` operator retrieves the value of a future  $f$ , defining the synchronisation points of a DeF program. Indeed, rules `GET-FUTURE` and `GET-DATA` are only enabled when getting a future of the form  $f(w)$ , that is, a fulfilled future. Consequently, performing a `get*` on an unresolved future blocks the process trying to access the future. Thus, this introduces a synchronisation when getting an unresolved future.

<sup>1</sup> Defining initial values for each existing type is not detailed here, note that 0 is a valid value for a `Flow[int]`, corresponding to an already resolved future.

<sup>2</sup> We suppose that the program is type-checked and every variable is declared.



A function invocation corresponding to the call to *foo* can be expressed by the following reduction (applying the rule `INVK-ASYNC`):

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{\emptyset \mid x = !foo(1) ; \dots ; y = \text{get}^* x\}) \\ \rightarrow \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{\emptyset \mid x = f ; \dots ; y = \text{get}^* x\}) f(\{[x \mapsto 1] \mid \dots\}) \end{aligned}$$

Later on the resolution of future *f* will be delegated to a *bar* function that returns 4. We reach the following configuration and apply the `RETURN-ASYNC` rule:

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get}^* x\}) f(\{[x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto f'] \mid \text{return } y\}) f'(4) \\ \rightarrow \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get}^* x\}) f(f') f'(4) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the  $y = \text{get}^* x$  statement can be reduced, fetching the future value in three steps (2 `GET-FUTURE` and one `GET-DATA`)

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get}^* x\}) f(f') f'(4) &\rightarrow \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get}^* f'\}) f(f') f'(4) \\ \rightarrow \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get}^* 4\}) f(f') f'(4) &\rightarrow \emptyset \rangle f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = 4\}) f(f') f'(4) \end{aligned}$$

### 3.3 Syntax and Semantics of DeF+F

We now extend the language with a `forward*` statement. `forward*` takes a `Flow` as parameter and can be used instead of `return` to terminate the execution of a function. `forward*` *f* delegates the computation performed by the current task to the task that is computing *f* but only if `forward*` *f* is in the body of a function called asynchronously. If the function is called synchronously, `forward*` behaves like `return`. We present the consequences of this addition on syntax and semantics. The static syntax of DeF+F is the same as DeF plus a `forward*` statement:

$$s ::= \text{skip} \mid x = z \mid \text{if } v \{s\} \text{ else } \{s\} \mid s ; s \mid \text{return } v \mid \text{forward}^* v$$

The runtime configurations of DeF+F have one more kind of future: chained futures.

$$F ::= \overline{f(\bar{q})} \overline{f(w)} \overline{f(\text{chain } f')}$$

Figure 2 defines the four semantic rules associated with `forward*`. `FORWARD-SYNC` is similar to `RETURN-SYNC` and allows using `forward*` with the same semantics as `return` in synchronous calls context, `FORWARD-DATA` is similar to `RETURN-ASYNC` but limited to the trivial case of a `forward*` of a non-future value.

The rule `FORWARD-ASYNC` complements them by handling the forwarding of future values in an asynchronous context. Where `RETURN-ASYNC` would have inserted an  $f(f')$  into the context, `FORWARD-ASYNC` inserts a  $f(\text{chain } f')$  instead. Then, an application of `CHAIN-UPDATE` will replace the chained future with a resolved future.

Concretely, if there is a sequence of futures  $f_0(\text{chain } f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(\text{chain } f_n) f_n(w)$  in the configuration *cn*, `CHAIN-UPDATE` will replace  $f_{n-1}(\text{chain } f_n)$  with  $f_{n-1}(w)$ , then  $f_{n-2}(\text{chain } f_{n-1})$  with  $f_{n-2}(w)$ , and so on. The *n*-th `CHAIN-UPDATE` will update  $f_0$  to  $f_0(w)$ . At this point, assuming *w* is not a future, a `get`<sub>*f*</sub> statement will only need a single `GET-FUTURE` to reach a `GET-DATA` transition.

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{FORWARD-ASYNC} \\
\frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket_{a+\ell} = f'}{a \succ F f(\{\ell \mid \text{forward* } v ; s\}) \rightarrow a \succ F f(\text{chain } f')} \\
\\
\text{FORWARD-DATA} \\
\frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket_{a+\ell} = b}{a \succ F f(\{\ell \mid \text{forward* } v ; s\}) \rightarrow a \succ F f(b)} \\
\\
\text{FORWARD-SYNC} \\
\frac{\llbracket v \rrbracket_{a+\ell} = w}{a \succ F f(\{\ell \mid \text{forward* } v ; s\} \# q \# \bar{q}) \rightarrow a \succ F f(\{\ell \mid \text{return } w ; s\} \# q \# \bar{q})} \\
\\
\text{CHAIN-UPDATE} \\
\frac{}{a \succ F f(\text{chain } f') f'(w) \rightarrow a \succ F f(w) f'(w)}
\end{array}$$

■ **Figure 2** Additional rules for the semantics of DeF+F.

The `forward*` construct proposes similar behaviour to `return` in DeF, but with operations occurring in a different order: in the case of `forward*`ed futures, future values are propagated as soon as possible, from the inner future to the outer one, and the resolution is performed only once per future, no matter how many delegated invocations there are. If `return` is used instead, several successive future retrieval operations occur until the inner future is reached.

**Example** We show here how a configuration evolves differently when `forward*` is used instead of `return`. For that purpose, as in section 3.2 we consider a configuration resulting from the execution of the Encore program in listing 1.b, slightly modified so that `foo` uses a `forward*` to return its result.

When the execution reaches line 9, if we are in a similar state as the example in the previous section we can apply the `FORWARD-ASYNC` rule:

$$\begin{aligned}
\emptyset \succ f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get* } x\}) f(\{[x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto f'] \mid \text{forward* } y\}) f'(4) \\
\rightarrow \emptyset \succ f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get* } x\}) f(\text{chain } f') f'(4)
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $f'$  is a resolved future, `CHAIN-UPDATE` can be applied immediately:

$$\begin{aligned}
\emptyset \succ f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get* } x\}) f(\text{chain } f') f'(4) \\
\rightarrow \emptyset \succ f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get* } x\}) f(4) f'(4)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the `y = get* x` statement can be reduced, fetching the future value with only one `GET-FUTURE` and one `GET-DATA`.

$$\begin{aligned}
\emptyset \succ f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get* } x\}) f(4) f'(4) &\rightarrow \emptyset \succ f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = \text{get* } 4\}) f(4) f'(4) \\
&\rightarrow \emptyset \succ f_0(\{[x \mapsto f] \mid y = 4\}) f(4) f'(4)
\end{aligned}$$

Somehow, the `CHAIN-UPDATE` transition replaces one of the `GET-FUTURE` applications of the example in section 3.2. Section 4 will show that despite this difference, `return` and `forward*` have in fact equivalent semantics in DeF+F.

### 3.4 The Type Systems of DeF and DeF+F

Figure 3 gives a type system for DeF, and figure 4 introduces an additional typing rule for DeF+F. There are four kinds of type judgements:  $\Gamma \vdash z : T$  types any expression  $z$ ;

Type judgements for expressions:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-VAR)} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash x : \Gamma(x)
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-SUBTYPE)} \\
 \Gamma \vdash z : B \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash z : \text{Flow}[B]
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-EXPRESSION)} \\
 \Gamma \vdash v : T \quad \Gamma \vdash v' : T' \quad \oplus : T \times T' \rightarrow T'' \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash v \oplus v' : T''
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-INVK-ASYNC)} \\
 \Gamma(\mathfrak{m}) = \bar{T} \rightarrow T' \quad \Gamma \vdash \bar{v} : \bar{T} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash !\mathfrak{m}(\bar{v}) : \downarrow \text{Flow}[T']
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-GET)} \\
 \Gamma \vdash v : \text{Flow}[B] \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash \text{get}^* v : B
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-INVK-SYNC)} \\
 \Gamma(\mathfrak{m}') = \bar{T} \rightarrow T' \quad \Gamma \vdash \bar{v} : \bar{T} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash \mathfrak{m}'(\bar{v}) : T'
 \end{array}$$

Type judgements for statements:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-ASSIGN)} \\
 \Gamma(x) = T \quad \Gamma \vdash e : T \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} x = e
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-SEQ)} \\
 \Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} s \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} s' \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} s ; s'
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-RETURN)} \\
 \Gamma \vdash e : T' \quad \Gamma(\mathfrak{m}) = \bar{T} \rightarrow T' \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} \text{return } e
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-SKIP)} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} \text{skip}
 \end{array}$$

Type judgements for programs and functions:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-METHOD)} \\
 \Gamma' = \Gamma[\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{T}][\bar{x}' \mapsto \bar{T}'] \quad \Gamma' \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} s \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash T'' \mathfrak{m}(\bar{T} \bar{x})\{\bar{T}' \bar{x}' s\}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-PROGRAM)} \\
 \Gamma = [\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{T}] \quad \Gamma[\bar{x}' \mapsto \bar{T}'] \vdash s \quad \forall M \in \bar{M}. \Gamma \vdash M \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash \bar{T} \bar{x} \bar{M} \{\bar{T}' \bar{x}' s\}
 \end{array}$$

■ **Figure 3** Type system; each operator  $\oplus$  has a predefined signature, the rule for if is omitted.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{(T-FORWARD)} \\
 \Gamma \vdash e : \text{Flow}[T'] \quad \Gamma(\mathfrak{m}) = \bar{T} \rightarrow \text{Flow}[T'] \\
 \hline
 \Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} \text{forward}^* e
 \end{array}$$

■ **Figure 4** Type system addition for DeF+F.

$\Gamma \vdash_{\mathfrak{m}} s$  types a statement  $s$  that belongs to the function  $\mathfrak{m}$ ;  $\Gamma \vdash T'' \mathfrak{m}(\bar{T} \bar{x})\{\bar{T}' \bar{x}' s\}$  checks that a function definition is well-typed; and  $\Gamma \vdash \bar{T} \bar{x} \bar{M} \{\bar{T}' \bar{x}' s\}$  checks the correct typing of a program. Due to the fact that a flow already encodes an arbitrary number of asynchronous delegations of a computation, flows of flows are forbidden at the type system levels. The notation  $\downarrow$  represents the collapsing of a flow type:  $\downarrow \text{Flow}[\text{Flow}[T]]$  reduces to  $\downarrow \text{Flow}[T]$ . The interested reader should refer to [R2] for a complete specification of collapse in a type system that supports parametric types. In our simplified context, the description can be summarised by the following rules:

$$\downarrow \text{Flow}[\text{Flow}[T]] = \downarrow \text{Flow}[T] \qquad \downarrow \text{Flow}[T] = \text{Flow}[\downarrow T] \text{ if } T \neq \text{Flow}[T'] \qquad \downarrow B = B$$

In figure 3, rule T-SUBTYPE allows any basic type to be considered as a flow type. T-INVK-ASYNC states that the type resulting of an asynchronous function invocation is flow containing the type returned by the function; the collapse operator prevents nested flow types. Symmetrically, T-GET states that the result of the synchronisation on a flow is necessarily a basic type. Indeed as flows on flows do not exist and basic types can be lifted to flow types, a  $\text{get}^*$  operation can always be typed and always returns a basic type. Other type-checking rules are standard.



## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

Concerning the rule T-FORWARD shown in figure 4, it types the forward\* statement. It checks that the function's return type is  $\text{Flow}[T']$  and that the returned type is compatible with this signature. This ensures that a synchronous call to a function that performs a forward\* must consider the result of type  $\text{Flow}[T]$ . Our solution contrasts with what was adopted in Encore, where synchronously calling a function that contains a forward performs an implicit synchronisation on the future returned by the function; see Appendix B for more details. Because of the subtyping rule,  $e$  could be of basic type  $B$  but  $T'$  cannot be of the form  $\text{Flow}[T'']$ .

**Properties of the Type System** The type system is not particularly original compared to the one of the Godot system [12] except the rule T-FORWARD that elegantly solves the typing of synchronous calls with forward, as explained above. It shares the classical properties: *progress* and *preservation* (reduction doesn't break typing). Both properties are expressed on  $\text{DeF}+\text{F}$ , and also valid on  $\text{DeF}$  which is a subset of  $\text{DeF}+\text{F}$ .

For stating and proving preservation one needs to extend the type system in order to type configurations. The extension raises no particular difficulty: each thread is type-checked separately, we check that the type of values in the store fits with the type of the declared variables, and that for each future  $f$  of type  $\text{Flow}[T]$ ,  $T$  is the type of the value stored in the future  $f$  (or computed by the thread that computes  $f$ ), and a  $\text{get } f$  operation returns a value of type  $T$ . To type a runtime configuration, we need an extended typing environment of the form:

$$\Omega ::= \Gamma \quad \overline{f \mapsto \Gamma, m} \quad \overline{f \mapsto T}$$

The first  $\Gamma$  is the type of the global store, then for each not yet resolved future, the future identifier is mapped to a stack of  $\Gamma, m$  where each  $\Gamma$  is the typing environment that types the function body and  $m$  is the function name that provides the returned type, and the type of the future for the last  $m$  of the stack; finally we have a second mapping for resolved futures that maps each future identifier to the type of the future value. The initial configuration of a well-typed program is well-typed. Then we can state the preservation theorem:

**Theorem 1** (Preservation). *A well-typed configuration remains well-typed during reduction.*

$$\Omega \vdash a \rangle F \quad \wedge \quad a \rangle F \rightarrow a' \rangle F' \implies \exists \Omega'. \Omega' \vdash a' \rangle F'$$

$\Omega$  and  $\Omega'$  are additionally constrained: the global  $\Gamma$  is the same in  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega'$ , and each future defined in  $\Omega$  is also defined in  $\Omega'$  with the same type.

Like Encore and most of the languages with futures, our language has imperative features. Thus, contrarily to the Godot system, it is possible to create cycles of processes where each process references the future that is to be resolved by the next process in the cycle. In imperative languages with futures, and therefore in  $\text{DeF}$  and  $\text{DeF}+\text{F}$ , it is possible to have deadlocks in such situations. We only ensure progress in the absence of such deadlocks. This restriction of the progress property is in fact an advantage of our model: it shows that  $\text{DeF}$  and  $\text{DeF}+\text{F}$  model faithfully the deadlocks that exist in mainstream languages with futures.

We introduce the *Unresolved* predicate that checks whether a future is unresolved. It is defined by:  $Unresolved(f, F) = \nexists w. f(w) \in F$ . We use it to state a progress property:

**Theorem 2** (Progress). *In a runtime configuration, each element that is an unresolved future can progress except if it tries to perform a get on an unresolved future.*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega \vdash a \triangleright f(\bar{q}) F \implies & (\exists a' F'. a \triangleright f(\bar{q}) F \rightarrow a' \triangleright F' \wedge f(\bar{q}) \notin F') \\ & \vee (\exists v, \ell, y, s, \bar{q}'. \bar{q} = \{\ell \mid y = \text{get} * v ; s\} \# \bar{q}' \wedge Unresolved(\llbracket v \rrbracket_{a+\ell}, F)) \end{aligned}$$

This theorem ensures that any chosen task can progress unless it is trying to access an unresolved future. Consequently, a configuration that cannot progress only consists of tasks blocked on a future access, which implies that there is a cycle of futures. More generally, any chosen task is able to terminate except if it depends (indirectly) on itself or on a task that contains a non-terminating computation (e.g. an infinite recursive call).

#### 4 Forward: A Safe Optimisation in DeF

The previous section showed the different runtime semantics for return in DeF/DeF+F and forward\* in DeF+F. This section proves that despite this difference, they can be used interchangeably in DeF+F, by showing formally that the use of forward\* instead of return does not alter the semantics of a DeF+F program. This positions the choice between return and forward\* in DeF+F as an optimisation matter rather than a semantics matter.

To prove this, we provide a simple translation from a DeF+F program to a DeF program that replaces forward\* by return statements. We then show using a branching bisimulation that the translation does not modify the behaviour of the program.

**Note on Bisimulations.** Bisimulations allow to compare the semantics of asynchronous programs [22]. Given a relation  $\mathcal{R}$ , two transition systems are said to be strongly bisimilar if for two states related by  $\mathcal{R}$ , a series of transitions on either side can be associated to the same series of transitions on the other side, with each pair of intermediate states linked by  $\mathcal{R}$ . Most of the time a strong bisimulation is too strict to compare programs and one needs to consider that some of the transitions do not need to be simulated. A weak bisimulation relaxes the definition of strong bisimulation by allowing a subset of transitions to take place at any time even without an equivalent in the other transition system. These transitions are called non-observable, or  $\tau$ -transitions, and are useful to encode updates of internal state.

This relaxation has a cost: two weakly similar programs might have some different properties, e.g. concerning the presence of deadlocks. Branching bisimulation is a compromise between strong and weak bisimulation that guarantees more properties but allows the presence of non-observable transitions. With a branching bisimulation a program that performs a  $\tau$ -transition must remain in relation with the same states, guaranteeing that  $\tau$ -transitions have almost no effect on the program state. A divergence-branching simulation is another compromise that further requires an

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{R}\text{-ID-STORE}}{a \mathcal{R} a} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}\text{-ID-RESOLVED}}{cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}\text{-FORWARD-ASYNC}}{cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}\text{-FORWARD-ELIM}}{cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}\text{-CHAIN-UPDATE}}{cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}\text{-GET-FUTURE-F}}{cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}\text{-GET-FUTURE-D}}{cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D}
\end{array}$$

■ **Figure 5** Relation between DeF+F configurations and DeF configurations.

infinite sequence of  $\tau$ -transitions on either side to correspond to an infinite sequence of  $\tau$ -transitions on the other side.

Below, we prove a branching bisimulation. Our semantics are too different to ensure divergence-branching simulation because of the different synchronisation strategies between return and forward\*: getting the value of a future that is in a cycle will block on the DeF+F side, but enter an infinite sequence of  $\tau$ -transitions on the DeF side.

### 4.1 Translation from DeF+F to DeF and Program Equivalence

A DeF+F program can be translated into a plain DeF program using the semantics-preserving transformation  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$  defined as follows:

$$\llbracket \text{forward* } v \rrbracket_{fwdElim} \triangleq \text{return } v$$

Terms other than forward\* are unchanged. To prove that  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$  actually preserves the semantics of a DeF+F program, we define in figure 5 a relation  $\mathcal{R}$ . It associates a DeF+F configuration  $cn_F$  and a DeF configuration  $cn_D$  that represents a similar state of execution. We prove that two configurations related by  $\mathcal{R}$  are bisimilar. More precisely, the equivalence we prove is a branching bisimulation that does not observe the update of intermediate futures in a sequence of chained futures (i.e. considers GET-FUTURE and CHAIN-UPDATE as  $\tau$ -transitions) as the precise resolution status of a future is internal state that does not matter for the observable state of a program.

The trivial rules  $\mathcal{R}\text{-ID-STORE}$  and  $\mathcal{R}\text{-ID-RESOLVED}$  state that two identical configurations are similar.  $\mathcal{R}\text{-FORWARD-ELIM}$  deals with syntactic equality modulo forward\* elimination, simply replacing forward\* by return.

These rules are not sufficient, as CHAIN-UPDATES can happen at any time on the DeF+F side, making the executions of a DeF+F program and its DeF counterpart slightly diverge. We still want these configurations to be related by  $\mathcal{R}$ , which will in fact be needed by the first item of theorem 3, as CHAIN-UPDATE is a  $\tau$ -transition.

$\mathcal{R}\text{-FORWARD-ASYNC}$  and  $\mathcal{R}\text{-CHAIN-UPDATE}$  deal with the fact that some futures are chained and others are not. The rule  $\mathcal{R}\text{-FORWARD-ASYNC}$  states that chaining a future to another one, as the semantic rule FORWARD-ASYNC does, is semantically

equivalent to fulfilling it with this same future, as RETURN-ASYNC does. Rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -CHAIN-UPDATE can be used to undo the future chaining operation.

As the resolution of futures is done in a different order, and possibly at a different time, when forward\* is used instead of return, the rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -CHAIN-UPDATE and both  $\mathcal{R}$ -GET-FUTURE rules are needed to associate configurations in which some futures are at different stages of resolution. This different ordering only occurs upon resolution of the get\* statement, and is handled by the two GET-FUTURE rules.

This different ordering of future resolution also implies that there isn't a one-to-one mapping between CHAIN-UPDATE transitions in a DeF+F execution and GET-FUTURE transitions in the context of that same program after forward\* elimination. All these facts are formalised by theorem 3.

## 4.2 Branching Bisimulation between DeF+F and DeF

**Theorem 3** (Correctness of the translation from DeF+F to DeF).  *$\mathcal{R}$  is a branching bisimulation between the operational semantics of the DeF+F program  $P$  and the operational semantics of the DeF program  $\llbracket P \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ .*

Let  $R$  range over observable transitions. If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  then:

$$\begin{aligned} cn_F \xrightarrow{\tau^*} cn'_F &\implies cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn_D & cn_D \xrightarrow{\tau^*} cn'_D &\implies cn_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D \\ cn_F \xrightarrow{R} cn'_F &\implies \exists cn'_D. cn_D \xrightarrow{\tau^*} R cn'_D \wedge cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D \\ cn_D \xrightarrow{R} cn'_D &\implies \exists cn'_F. cn_F \xrightarrow{\tau^*} R cn'_F \wedge cn'_D \mathcal{R} cn'_D \end{aligned}$$

The transitions GET-FUTURE and CHAIN-UPDATE are non-observable, both of them are labelled  $\tau$ . The observable transitions FORWARD-ASYNC and FORWARD-DATA are labelled RETURN-ASYNC, and FORWARD-SYNC is labelled RETURN-SYNC. All the other transitions are labelled with their original rule name.

As the use of forward\* does not change when futures are created but only how they are resolved, if  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  then the identifiers of the futures of  $cn_F$  are exactly those of  $cn_D$ , e.g. we have  $f \in cn_F \iff f \in cn_D$ . However, the value of  $f$  in  $cn_F$  and the value of  $f$  in  $cn_D$  may differ. In the following, we will denote that some futures  $f \in cn_F$  and  $f' \in cn_D$  actually share the same identifier by  $f = f'$  or  $f \equiv f'$ .

First, we introduce the notion of sequence of futures, and define a few lemmas on properties implied by  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$ . This will help to prove that  $\mathcal{R}$  is a branching bisimulation.

**Definition 1** (Sequence of futures). *In a DeF or DeF+F configuration  $cn$ ,  $(f_0 \dots f_n)$  such that  $\forall i, f_i(f_{i+1}) \in cn \vee f_i(\text{chain } f_{i+1}) \in cn$  is called a sequence of futures.*

Given a future resolved or chained to another one in a DeF+F configuration, lemmas 1 and 2 state the possible forms of the corresponding future in an associated DeF configuration. Conversely, given a future resolved to another one in a DeF configuration, lemma 3 states the possible forms of the corresponding future in the associated DeF+F configuration. Lemma 5 generalises lemmas 1 and 2: given a sequence of futures in a DeF+F configuration, it states the possible forms of the corresponding sequence in DeF, while lemma 6 generalises lemma 3 in a similar manner. As for lemma 4, it formalizes

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

that the local store and statements of a task are not altered by  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ , apart from `get*` statements that can express a different stage of future resolution.

**Lemma 1** (Matching a chained future). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f(\text{chain } f') \in cn_F$ , then  $f(f') \in cn_D$ .*

The case of a future resolved on the DeF+F side is more complicated, as such a future can not only come from a return statement, but also from a `CHAIN-UPDATE`. The following lemma illustrates that the chain construct can flatten chains of futures.

**Lemma 2** (Resolved future in DeF+F). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f(w) \in cn_F$ , then there exists  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) \in cn_D$  such that  $f_0 \equiv f$ ,  $f_n(w) \in cn_D$ , and  $\forall i, f_i(w) \in cn_F$ .*

The previous two lemmas dealt with futures resolved on the DeF+F side, the next one deals with futures resolved on the DeF side.

**Lemma 3** (Resolved future in DeF). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f(w) \in cn_D$ , then:*

- *Either  $w$  is a future and  $f(\text{chain } w) \in cn_F$ .*
- *Or there exists  $w'$  such that  $f(w') \in cn_F$  and there exists  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) \in cn_D$  such that  $f \equiv f_0$ ,  $f_n(w') \in cn_D$ , and  $\forall i, f_i(w') \in cn_F$ .*

Given a resolved or chained future in a DeF or DeF+F configuration, the previous lemmas gave the form of the corresponding future on the other side. The next lemma deals with the last case: futures not yet resolved, that still have a task attached to them. As the  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$  transformation is fairly simple, the local store and most statements will be identical on both sides, but `get*` statements may differ. Indeed, following a sequence of futures by the rule `GET-FUTURE` being non-observable,  $\mathcal{R}$  has to relate `get*` statements at different stages of update. In this case, walking back the chain of `GET-FUTURE` leads to the same initial future.

**Lemma 4** (Matching tasks). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$ , then  $\exists s. f(\{l \mid s\} \# \bar{q}) \in cn_F$  if and only if  $\exists s'. f(\{l \mid s'\} \# \llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}) \in cn_D$ . In this case:*

- *Either  $s' = \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ .*
- *Or  $s$  is of the form  $y = \text{get}^* w; s_1$ , and  $s'$  of the form  $y = \text{get}^* w'; \llbracket s_1 \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ , with*

$$\exists w_0 \dots w_n \in cn_F. \exists w'_0 \dots w'_m \in cn_D \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall i < n \ w_i(w_{i+1}) \in cn_F \\ \forall i < m \ w'_i(w'_{i+1}) \in cn_D \\ w_0 \equiv w'_0 \\ w_n = w \\ w'_m = w' \end{array} \right.$$

The two last lemmas are generalisations of the three first ones. They answer the question: given a sequence of futures, on the DeF side or on the DeF+F side, what can we say about the other side? Lemma 5 is about the DeF to DeF+F case, while lemma 6 handles the other direction.

**Lemma 5** (Sequence of futures: DeF to DeF+F).

If  $cn_F \not\mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) f_n(w) \in cn_D$  with  $\nexists f \in cn_D, w = f$ , then there exists  $k_0 \leq \dots \leq k_l$  such that for all  $i < l$  either  $f_{k_i}(f_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F$  or  $f_{k_i}(\text{chain } f_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F$  with  $k_0 = 0$  and  $k_l = n$ .

**Lemma 6** (Sequence of futures: DeF+F to DeF).

If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) f_n(w) \in cn_F$ , then there exists  $f'_0(f'_1) \dots f'_{l-1}(f'_l) \in cn_D$  such that  $f'_0 = f_0$  and  $f'_l(w) \in cn_D$ .

The proof of theorem 3 is done by induction and a classical case analysis on the reduction rule applied, proving that the bisimulation relation is maintained. Details of the proofs are provided in appendix A. The most interesting cases are the GET-DATA rules, where a future is about to be resolved on one side, but there may still be multiple  $\tau$ -transitions needed to get to the resolution on the other side.

In this section we have shown that, with data-flow explicit futures, the behaviour of the forward\* primitive is the same as the behaviour of a standard return. This highlights the fact that forward provides a form of data-flow synchronisation for control-flow explicit futures. More interestingly this shows that if necessary any return statement that returns a data-flow future could be compiled similarly to a forward\* statement, which should in general improve performances. In the next section, we will first present our implementation, in Encore of DeF and how DeF can be used to encode classical futures. We will also evaluate the performance of different future constructs and different ways to use them. Our objective is both to evaluate the effectiveness of data-flow future synchronisation and the opportunities for automatic optimisation of future flows.

## 5 DeF in Practice

This section has four purposes:

1. Describe an implementation of data-flow explicit futures in the Encore language. This is considered as a basis for the implementation of DeF in another language.
2. Explain the choice we made in the implementation of forward\* in our extension to the Encore language.<sup>3</sup>
3. Describe our implementation of explicit futures based on data-flow explicit futures, following the approach proposed in [12]. This is crucial in order to provide to the programmer the choice between control-flow and data-flow synchronisation (cf. fulfilment observation problem above).
4. Evaluate the performance of different implementation and synchronisation strategies for futures on programs that express various communication patterns.

<sup>3</sup> <https://gitlab.inria.fr/lhenrio/encorewithdatafuts>, visited on 2021-05-23.

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

### 5.1 Implementation of Flow

To implement data-flow synchronisation for explicit futures in a language, three steps are necessary: 1) adapt the type system, 2) deal with the creation of data-flow explicit futures at runtime, and 3) provide manipulation primitives for data-flow futures.

#### 5.1.1 Typing

There are two aspects related to the typing of  $\text{Flow}[T]$  that require special care: the subtyping rule ( $T\text{-SUBTYPE}$ ) and the collapsing rules (operator  $\downarrow$  in  $T\text{-INVK-ASYNC}$ ). The subtyping occurs when the programmer tries to substitute a value of type  $T$  ( $T \neq \text{Flow}$ ) where a value of type  $\text{Flow}[T]$  is expected: such a substitution is correct. As for the collapsing rules, when the typechecker encounters the type  $\text{Flow}[T]$ , it must collapse it as per the collapsing rules established in [12], and summarised in 3.4. This ensures that nested flow types do not appear and that lifting of non flow values into flows is possible.

#### 5.1.2 Creation of Flow

In DeF flows are created when a value of type  $T$  is substituted to a value of type  $\text{Flow}[T]$  (*lifting*) and when a function is called in an asynchronous way using the  $!!$  operator in DeF. In our extension to Encore, additionally to lifting and the  $!!$  operator, we provide an  $\text{async}^*$  operator that allows asynchronously executing arbitrary code. Asynchronous invocation of methods and asynchronous execution of arbitrary code do not need special care compared to control-flow explicit futures: one should create an instance of  $\text{Flow}$  and set it to be resolved with the result of the asynchronous execution. Lifting requires to create an instance of  $\text{Flow}$  and immediately resolve it with the lifted value (no process creation nor context-switching is needed). Lifting the value into a  $\text{Flow}$  allows programmers to write functions that may return results of asynchronous invocations as well as values lifted to an instance of  $\text{Flow}$ , unified under a single type.

#### 5.1.3 Flow Synchronisation with $\text{get}^*$

In figure 2, rules  $\text{GET-FUTURE}$  and  $\text{GET-DATA}$  are used to recursively traverse a chain of flows until a value is reached.  $\text{GET-DATA}$  is only applicable on non-flow values. An implementation typically calls  $\text{get}^*$  recursively ( $\text{GET-FUTURE}$ ) until a non-flow value is found and returns this value ( $\text{GET-DATA}$ ), but deciding whether to perform a recursive call requires that the information of whether a value is a flow be available at runtime. In the absence of parametric types, the information is even available statically as part of typing, making the implementation straightforward. In the presence of parametric types, in a compilation scheme using type erasure, the compiler cannot know statically whether a parametric type  $P[T]$  is instantiated with  $T$  being a flow or a non-flow type. The decision to make a recursive call or not then requires introspection facilities built into the runtime. In languages where no such introspection features are available, implementing flows requires compiler designers to add runtime information to flows to determine whether an instance is resolved with another flow or with a value. In Encore, the Pony runtime [26] adds introspection facilities that we use to check whether a  $\text{Flow}$  is resolved with a flow or with a non-flow value.

## 5.2 Implementation of `forward*` in Encore

The `forward` primitive is easy to type and understand when it is in the body of a function that is run asynchronously. However, defining a good semantics and type system in the context of Encore where methods can be called either synchronously or asynchronously needs more attention. For example `•` symbol was used in [11] “to prevent the use of `forward` in contexts where the expected task type is not clear”. In our case, similar difficulties arise with the conjunction of synchronous invocation and `forward*` statement.

The rule in figure 4 provides an elegant and safe solution to this problem. However, the existing implementation of `forward` in the Encore language is more permissive. Our theoretical results of section 4 are based on the rule of figure 4 because it is the safest solution but our implementation is a bit more permissive concerning the typing of functions that perform a `forward*`: the return type of such functions does not need to be `Flow[T]`. This changes nothing when the function is called asynchronously. Instead, this choice entails an additional synchronisation (`get*`) performed before the `forward` statement when a function that performs a `forward*` is called synchronously. This changes a bit the semantics and thus our result on equivalence between `return` and `forward` is only valid *in the Encore implementation* if the method is called asynchronously. However as asynchronous invocations are identified syntactically, it would be easy to use `forward*` only in the asynchronously called functions. These aspects are further discussed in appendix B.

Because the more permissive semantics introduces an implicit synchronisation on an explicit future, in a freshly designed language we would advise to use data-flow futures with the typing of `forward*` taken from figure 4. In our implementation we chose a more permissive and less safe version to be consistent with the Encore ecosystem.

## 5.3 Encoding `Fut[]` from `Flow[]`

In this section, we build control-flow explicit futures on top of DeF, to assert its backward compatibility with existing systems. We show that a language implementing only `Flow[]` can build `Fut[]` as a library. In Encore, a library has no possibility to extend the syntax or introspect the rest of the code, we are thus limited to simple encodings. In practice, we provide an implementation of `Fut[]` that relies on our `Flow[]` construct of Encore and on our implementation of `get*`, `~>*` (the natural extension to data-flow explicit futures of the `~>` operator for future chaining), and `async*`.

**Definition** Godot [12] suggests a construction for such control-flow explicit futures:

$$\text{Fut}[\tau] ::= \square \text{Flow}[\tau]$$

$\square$  is called the “box” operator. It encapsulates its argument in a structure of a different type, whose only available operation is `unbox`, where `unbox( $\square x$ ) = x`. Intuitively, the  $\square$  operator stops type collapsing:  $\downarrow \text{Flow}[\text{Flow}[T]]$  reduces to  $\downarrow \text{Flow}[T]$ , but  $\downarrow \text{Flow}[\square \text{Flow}[T]]$  is not collapsed (it reduces to `Flow[ $\square \text{Flow}[T]$ ]`).

The corresponding operations follow:

$$\text{get } e ::= \text{get}^*(\text{unbox } e) \quad \text{then}(e, f) ::= \square \text{then}^*(\text{unbox } e, f)$$



## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

**Implementation** We define the class `Future[t]` and the `get_`<sup>4</sup> function as shown in listing 2.

■ **Listing 2** `Future[t]` and `get_` based on `Flow` and `get*`

```
1 read class Future[t]
2   val content: Flow[t]
3   def init(x: Flow[t]): unit
4     this.content = x
5   end
6 end
7
8 fun get_(y: Future[t]): t
9   return get*(y.content)
10 end
```

A restriction of our approach is that, in an Encore library, we cannot overload existing operators or functions. As such, we provide functions with the right behaviour, but not the desired name: `get_`, `call_`, `await_`, or `async_`. For the call operator (!) the problem is slightly more complex as functions are not sufficient and the syntax should be extended. In the current state, programmers should use `call_(this!!foo(...))` when they mean `this!foo(...)`. A similar adaptation is needed for `forward`. This restriction is only a matter of syntactic sugar.

**Summary** With this implementation of control-flow explicit futures on top of data-flow explicit futures, we showed that control-flow explicit futures can be provided as an extension of DeF, and as a simple library. It is interesting to note that Godot provides an implementation in Scala of data-flow synchronisation on top of control-flow explicit futures (the opposite of what we did here), but that implementation does not fully support parametric types and its extension to parametric types would be challenging. Consequently, we believe that implementing DeF directly in the compiler is more flexible, and thus we advise, in the design of future programming languages with explicit futures, to first implement a data-flow synchronisation, and then extend it with control-flow explicit futures.

### 5.4 Benchmarks

In this section, we provide a performance analysis of different implementations of futures<sup>5</sup>: the builtin control-flow explicit futures `Fut` of Encore, the data-flow explicit futures DeF that we introduced earlier, denoted as `Flow`, and the control-flow explicit futures that were built in the previous subsection, denoted as `Fut on Flow`. We analyse several programs, using chains of futures of different length, or different memory management patterns. Our focus is to analyse the performance of futures, not the efficiency of the parallelisation in Encore or the number of actors that can be created in the Encore system. This is why we do not compare ourselves with other frameworks and

<sup>4</sup> Underscore appended to avoid name collision with the `get` reserved keyword.

<sup>5</sup> All the code for those benchmarks is available at: <https://gitlab.inria.fr/datafut/fut-on-flow>, visited on 2021-05-23.

our programs are mostly sequential or with little parallelism. Reducing parallelism allow us to avoid the complex interactions that exist between additional objects, concurrent garbage collection, memory contention: we only analyse the direct impact of different forms of futures.

All the benchmark results provided here are done on the same Dell XPS 13 9370, with a 8-core Intel Core i7-8550U and 16GiB of memory, running Ubuntu 20.04 and clang v10.0. Encore at version ea5736869d2ac34cfbeee2be4a2988c819a215af is run using the release configuration and the -O3 flag.

#### 5.4.1 Test Programs

We evaluate performance on four examples, the first using non-nested futures, the next two stressing the implementation with long chains of futures, and the last one being closer to real-world workloads.

**Word Counter example.** The Encore compiler is shipped with tests, one is a word counter, from which we adapted this example. The WordCounter test dispatches asynchronous hash table insertions to 32 actors. We re-implemented the standard library module Big.HashTable.Supervisorh with Flow, with Fut on flow and with sequential execution (referred to as fun). There is no need here to use any forward, because there is no chain of futures. The original example used an optimisation that removed the use of futures: send one-way messages when the caller does not need the result. As this does not use futures, we disabled it in the Fut example, but still displayed its performance as OneWay.

**Recursive calls on a single actor: Ackermann.** We implemented the Ackermann function with recursive calls on a single actor. This program performs successive asynchronous invocations on the same entity (no parallelism, long delegation chains). In this benchmark, the chains of futures are of various lengths, because each call makes two recursive call, one which is forwarded and one for which it waits. Because we only have one actor, this wait cannot be a synchronisation, otherwise it would block the execution. We use here a cooperative yield (await) on the future before calling get. This problem does not arise with forward.

**Recursive calls on many actors without actor creation: recursive list summation.** We compute the sum of the numbers from 1 to  $n$  by creating a linked list of actors with those numbers and then traversing the list with successive asynchronous tail recursive invocations. The measured time does not take into account list creation. There is here one long chain of futures of length  $n$ . When forward is used, as one future is delegated along the chain of futures, this sum is done in constant space.

**K-Means** This benchmark runs a fixed number of iterations of the k-means clustering algorithm. Every compute intensive step is delegated to a large number of actors, then synchronised. This does not use forward since there are no chained futures. However, the benchmark is interesting because it allows us to compare the performance of Encore's native control-flow explicit futures and our re-implementation of it on top of data-flow explicit ones, on a realistic workload.

#### 5.4.2 Results and Discussion

The performance of each of the four benchmarks are shown in tables 4, 5, 6, and 7.

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

- **Table 4** Running time of WordCounter (100 runs). The OneWay line corresponds to the version futures are optimised out by the compiler.

Future used	Average running time (ms)	Std deviation	
OneWay	103.4 ms	4.6 ms	4.4%
Fut	185.5 ms	6.5 ms	3.5%
Flow	184.6 ms	6.7 ms	3.6%
Fut on Flow	190.4 ms	7.6 ms	4.0%
fun	119.3 ms	2.4 ms	2.0%

- **Table 5** Running time of the Ackermann benchmark (arguments: 3, 4 – 100 iterations)

Future used	Average running time	Std deviation	
Fut with forward	27.86 ms	1.2 ms	4.3%
Fut on Flow with forward	28.10 ms	1.0 ms	3.5%
Flow with forward*	31.49 ms	0.7 ms	2.2%
Flow	39.13 ms	1.0 ms	2.4%
Fut	44.63 ms	0.7 ms	1.7%
Fut on Flow	46.71 ms	0.8 ms	1.6%

- **Table 6** Average running time of the recursive list summation (10000 actors, 100 iterations)

Future used	Average running time	Std deviation	
Fut with forward	16.03 ms	1.0 ms	6.4%
Fut on Flow with forward	16.30 ms	1.0 ms	6.3%
Flow with forward*	16.14 ms	0.9 ms	5.8%
Flow	26.02 ms	1.3 ms	5.1%
Fut	46.87 ms	3.9 ms	8.4%
Fut on Flow	47.64 ms	3.8 ms	8.0%

- **Table 7** Running time of 10 k-means steps (100 clusters, 10000 observations, 100 iterations)

Future used	Average running time	Std deviation	
Flow	468.8 ms	114.7 ms	24.5%
Fut on Flow	494.9 ms	125.8 ms	25.4%
Fut	500.7 ms	66.8 ms	13.3%

The ackermann example has lower standard deviation than the other benchmarks, this might be caused by smaller future chains than the list summation example, or the absence of parallelism, unlike the WordCounter example.

The OneWay version of the WordCounter example is unsurprisingly far faster than the others. It allows evaluating the overhead of the future synchronisation over a plain one-way message. The sequential version is the slowest, showing that other versions do exploit parallelism even with a fine granularity of synchronisation.

The Ackermann and recursive list summation examples show the performance benefit of using `forward` or `forward*` over the plain `Fut` or `Flow` equivalent when there are delegated computations.

On all examples, `Fut` and `Fut` on `Flow` perform similarly, showing that a library-based implementation of `Fut` based on data-flow explicit futures reaches performance similar to a dedicated implementation within the compiler. We can notice a small overhead that can be explained by the additional “box” objects introduced by `Fut` on `Flow`.

Both Ackerman and the recursive list summation show the performance benefit of using `Flow` over `Fut`, since less synchronisation is needed (for Ackermann, using `Flow` allowed us to directly return a `Flow` without the need for a costly `await`). This difference disappears when using `forward` on both versions since no synchronisation is needed whatever the type of future.

The k-means benchmark models real-world workloads and has a larger standard deviation than the others. However the observed performances still show that adding data-flow explicit futures does not affect significantly the performance of futures.

In the `Fut` version of the benchmarks, `forward` explicitly changes the semantics to relax synchronisation. As shown in section 4, in the `Flow` version, it becomes an optimisation that does not change semantics. A clever compiler could have compiled the `Flow` version to `Flow` with `forward*` with the same semantics, and these benchmarks show that this is an interesting optimisation. An implementation with `DeF` and implicit optimisation of `return` into `forward*` (for long chains) would ally both the performance improvements of `forward` and the improved type handling of `DeF`.

## 6 Conclusion

We presented both theoretical and practical results showing that data-flow explicit futures form a relevant programming abstraction for parallel programming. Other constructs such as classical control-flow explicit futures can be implemented on top of them, and they allow optimisations that used to require ad-hoc keywords.

Our `forward*` construct has a safe static semantics that constrains functions performing a `forward*` to return a `Flow` type. As a consequence, even if the function is called synchronously, the semantics stays the same as `return`. On the contrary, the original Encore language has a specific semantics for synchronously called functions: they are forbidden in the formalisation but in practice, they are implemented with an additional synchronisation that may lead to deadlocks.

One of the advantages of data-flow synchronisation is the possibility to optimise the order of transmission of futures to the processes that use it, this had been partially studied in a distributed setting in [18] but the current article opens new opportunities, allowing the compiler and the runtime to explore compromises between pulling the results with recursive `get*`, pushing it based on `forward*`, or using the optimised compilation into promises provided by Encore [11].

**About Failures** Dealing with failures in concurrent and distributed systems is difficult. While futures can be safely integrated inside recovery protocols [6], it is more difficult

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

to deal asynchronously with failures or timeouts inside the application code because the point of usage of a future can be far from the point of invocation of the computation and thus traditional exception handling mechanisms are often not adapted. Like for asynchronous reaction to fulfilment (section 2.3), mechanisms similar to what exists for control-flow futures can be adapted for handling exceptions or failures with futures. In the current state of our study it does not seem that data-flow synchronisation helps with the difficulty of handling failures in an asynchronous manner. However, the data-flow synchronisation offers a different point of reaction to failure, closer to the use of the computation result, which can help the programmer handle the failure from a computational point of view.

## References

- [1] Erika Ábrahám, Immo Grabe, Andreas Grüner, and Martin Steffen. “Behavioral interface description of an object-oriented language with futures and promises”. In: *The Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming* 78.7 (2009). The 19th Nordic Workshop on Programming Theory (NWPT 2007), pages 491–518. ISSN: 1567-8326. DOI: 10.1016/j.jlap.2009.01.001. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1567832609000022>.
- [2] Gul Agha. *Actors: a model of concurrent computation in distributed systems*. MIT Press, 1986. ISBN: 0-262-01092-5.
- [3] Laurent Baduel, Françoise Baude, Denis Caromel, Arnaud Contes, Fabrice Huet, Matthieu Morel, and Romain Quilici. “Programming, Composing, Deploying for the Grid”. In: *Grid Computing: Software Environments and Tools*. Edited by José C. Cunha and Omer F. Rana. London: Springer London, 2006, pages 205–229. ISBN: 978-1-84628-339-0. DOI: 10.1007/1-84628-339-6\_9.
- [4] Henry G. Baker Jr. and Carl Hewitt. “The Incremental Garbage Collection of Processes”. In: *Proc. Symp. on Artificial Intelligence and Programming Languages*. New York, NY, USA: ACM Press, 1977, pages 55–59. DOI: 10.1145/872734.806932.
- [5] Françoise Baude, Denis Caromel, Cédric Dalmaso, Marco Danelutto, Vladimir Getov, Ludovic Henrio, and Christian Pérez. “GCM: a grid extension to Fractal for autonomous distributed components”. In: *Annals of Telecommunications* 64.1-2 (2009), pages 5–24. DOI: 10.1007/s12243-008-0068-8.
- [6] Françoise Baude, Denis Caromel, Christian Delbé, and Ludovic Henrio. “Promised Messages: Recovering from Inconsistent Global States”. In: *ACM SIGOPS conference Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming (PPoPP). Poster*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2007. ISBN: 9781595936028. DOI: 10.1145/1229428.1229463.
- [7] Frank De Boer, Vlad Serbanescu, Reiner Hähnle, Ludovic Henrio, Justine Rochas, Crystal Chang Din, Einar Broch Johnsen, Marjan Sirjani, Ehsan Khamespanah, Kiko Fernandez-Reyes, and Albert Mingkun Yang. “A Survey of Active Object

- Languages”. In: *ACM Comput. Surv.* 50.5 (Oct. 2017), 76:1–76:39. ISSN: 0360-0300. DOI: 10.1145/3122848.
- [8] Frank S. de Boer, Dave Clarke, and Einar Broch Johnsen. “A complete guide to the future”. In: *Proc. 16th European Symposium on Programming (ESOP’07)*. Volume 4421. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2007, pages 316–330. ISBN: 978-3-540-71314-2. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-71316-6\_22.
- [9] Stephan Brandauer, Elias Castegren, Dave Clarke, Kiko Fernandez-Reyes, Einar Broch Johnsen, Ka I. Pun, S. Lizeth Tapia Tarifa, Tobias Wrigstad, and Albert Mingkun Yang. “Parallel Objects for Multicores: A Glimpse at the Parallel Language Encore”. English. In: *Formal Methods for Multicore Programming*. Edited by Marco Bernardo and Einar Broch Johnsen. Volume 9104. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2015, pages 1–56. ISBN: 978-3-319-18940-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-18941-3\_1.
- [10] Jessie Dedecker, Tom Van Cutsem, Stijn Mostinckx, Theo D’Hondt, and Wolfgang De Meuter. “Ambient-Oriented Programming in Ambienttalk”. In: *Proceedings of the 20th European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming. ECOOP’06*. Nantes, France: Springer-Verlag, 2006, pages 230–254. ISBN: 978-3-540-35726-1. DOI: 10.1007/11785477\_16.
- [11] Kiko Fernandez-Reyes, Dave Clarke, Elias Castegren, and Huu-Phuc Vo. “Forward to a Promising Future”. In: *Coordination Models and Languages*. Edited by Giovanna Di Marzo Serugendo and Michele Loreti. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018, pages 162–180. ISBN: 978-3-319-92408-3. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-92408-3\_7.
- [12] Kiko Fernandez-Reyes, Dave Clarke, Ludovic Henrio, Einar Broch Johnsen, and Tobias Wrigstad. “Godot: All the Benefits of Implicit and Explicit Futures”. In: *33rd European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP 2019)*. Edited by Alastair F. Donaldson. Volume 134. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs). Distinguished artefact. Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2019, 2:1–2:28. ISBN: 978-3-95977-111-5. DOI: 10.4230/LIPIcs.ECOOP.2019.2. URL: <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2019/10794>.
- [13] Cormac Flanagan and Matthias Felleisen. “The Semantics of Future and an Application”. In: *Journal of Functional Programming* 9.1 (Jan. 1999), pages 1–31. ISSN: 0956-7968. DOI: 10.1017/S0956796899003329.
- [14] Cormac Flanagan and Matthias Felleisen. “The Semantics of Future and Its Use in Program Optimizations”. In: *Conference Record of POPL’95: 22nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, San Francisco, California, USA, January 23-25, 1995*. Edited by Ron K. Cytron and Peter Lee. ACM Press, 1995, pages 209–220. DOI: 10.1145/199448.199484.
- [15] Elena Giachino, Ludovic Henrio, Cosimo Laneve, and Vincenzo Mastandrea. “Actors may synchronize, safely!” In: *PPDP 2016 18th International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom,

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

- Sept. 2016. ISBN: 9781450341486. DOI: 10.1145/2967973.2968599. URL: <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01345315>.
- [16] Robert H. Halstead, Jr. “MULTILISP: A language for concurrent symbolic computation”. In: *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 7.4 (1985), pages 501–538. ISSN: 0164-0925. DOI: 10.1145/4472.4478.
- [17] Ludovic Henrio. *Data-flow Explicit Futures*. Research Report. I3S, Université Côte d’Azur, Apr. 2018. URL: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01758734>.
- [18] Ludovic Henrio, Muhammad Uzair Khan, Nadia Ranaldo, and Eugenio Zimeo. “First Class Futures: Specification and implementation of Update Strategies”. In: *Selected Papers Coregrid Workshop On Grids, Clouds and P2P Computing*. Edited by Mario R. Guarracino, Frédéric Vivien, Jesper Larsson Träff, Mario Cannataro, Marco Danelutto, Anders Hast, Francesca Perla, Andreas Knüpfer, Beniamino Di Martino, and Michael Alexander. Volume 6586. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, Aug. 2010, pages 295–303. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-21878-1\_37.
- [19] Ludovic Henrio and Justine Rochas. “Multiactive objects and their applications”. In: *Logical Methods in Computer Science* Volume 13, Issue 4 (Nov. 2017). DOI: 10.23638/LMCS-13(4:12)2017. URL: <http://lmcs.episciences.org/4079>.
- [20] Einar Broch Johnsen, Reiner Hähnle, Jan Schäfer, Rudolf Schlatte, and Martin Steffen. “ABS: A Core Language for Abstract Behavioral Specification”. In: *Proc. 9th Intl. Symp. on Formal Methods for Components and Objects (FMCO)*. Edited by Bernhard Aichernig, Frank S. de Boer, and Marcello M. Bonsangue. Volume 6957. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2011, pages 142–164. ISBN: 978-3-642-25271-6. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-25271-6\_8.
- [21] Einar Broch Johnsen and Olaf Owe. “An Asynchronous Communication Model for Distributed Concurrent Objects”. In: *Software and System Modeling* 6.1 (Mar. 2007), pages 35–58. DOI: 10.1007/s10270-006-0011-2.
- [22] Frédéric Lang, Radu Mateescu, and Franco Mazzanti. “Compositional Verification of Concurrent Systems by Combining Bisimulations”. In: *FM 2019 - 23rd International Conference on Formal Methods*. Volume 11800. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Porto, Portugal: Springer Verlag, Oct. 2019, pages 196–213. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-30942-8\_13. URL: <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-02295459>.
- [23] Joachim Niehren, David Sabel, Manfred Schmidt-Schauß, and Jan Schwinghammer. “Observational Semantics for a Concurrent Lambda Calculus with Reference Cells and Futures”. In: *23rd Conference on Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics*. ENTCS. New Orleans, Apr. 2007. DOI: 10.1016/j.entcs.2007.02.041.
- [24] Joachim Niehren, Jan Schwinghammer, and Gert Smolka. “A Concurrent Lambda Calculus with Futures”. In: *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 364.3 (Nov. 2006), pages 338–356. ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: 10.1016/j.tcs.2006.08.016.
- [25] Laurent Pellegrino, Françoise Baude, and Iyad Alshabani. “Towards a Scalable Cloud-based RDF Storage Offering a Pub/Sub Query Service”. In: *CLOUD COMPUTING 2012*. ISBN: 978-1-61208-216-5. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-40053-7\_4.

- [26] Pony Developers, editor. *Pony, an open-source, object-oriented, actor-model, capabilities-secure, high-performance programming language*. 2021. URL: <https://www.ponylang.io> (visited on 2021-05-01).
- [27] Kenjiro Taura, Satoshi Matsuoka, and Akinori Yonezawa. “ABCL/f: A Future-Based Polymorphic Typed Concurrent Object-Oriented Language - Its Design and Implementation”. In: *Proceedings of the DIMACS workshop on Specification of Parallel Algorithms*. American Mathematical Society, 1994, pages 275–292. DOI: 10.1090/dimacs/018.
- [28] *Futures and promises*. 2021. URL: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/index.php?title=Futures\\_and\\_promises&oldid=1024620691](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/index.php?title=Futures_and_promises&oldid=1024620691) (visited on 2021-05-23).
- [29] Derek Wyatt. *Akka Concurrency*. Artima, 2013. ISBN: 978-0-9815316-6-3.



## A Proofs

This section gathers the lemmas used to prove the bisimulation theorem, their proof, and the proof of the theorem itself.

### A.1 Proofs of Lemmas

**Lemma 1** (Matching a chained future). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f(\text{chain } f') \in cn_F$ , then  $f(f') \in cn_D$ .*

*Proof.* This property can be proved by induction on  $\mathcal{R}$ : the only relevant rules are  $\mathcal{R}$ -ID-RESOLVED and  $\mathcal{R}$ -FORWARD-ASYNC, both trivial. Note that by construction there is no chain on the right hand side of  $\mathcal{R}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2** (Resolved future in DeF+F). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f(w) \in cn_F$ , then there exists  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) \in cn_D$  such that  $f_0 \equiv f$ ,  $f_n(w) \in cn_D$ , and  $\forall i, f_i(w) \in cn_F$ .*

*Proof.* Induction on  $\mathcal{R}$ . Apart from the trivial case of  $\mathcal{R}$ -ID-RESOLVED, the only rule that adds a  $f(w)$  to the forward configuration is  $\mathcal{R}$ -CHAIN-UPDATE.

Assume the property holds between  $cn_F = cn'_F f(\text{chain } f') f'(w)$  and  $cn_D$ . We now consider  $cn'_F f(w) f'(w) \mathcal{R} cn_D$ .

From lemma 1 applied in  $cn_F$ ,  $f(f') \in cn_D$ . And from the induction hypothesis, there exists  $f'_0(f'_1) \dots f'_{n-1}(f'_n) \in cn_D$  such that  $f' \equiv f'_0$ ,  $f'_n(w) \in cn_D$  and  $\forall i, f'_i(w) \in cn_F$ .

The sequence  $(f_k)$  with  $f_0 = f$ , and  $f_i = f'_{i-1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ , is such that  $f_0 = f$ ,  $f_n(w) \in cn_D$ , and  $\forall i, f_i(w) \in cn_F$ . Thus the induction hypothesis still holds for  $cn'_F f(w) f'(w) \mathcal{R} cn_D$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3** (Resolved future in DeF). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f(w) \in cn_D$ , then:*

- *Either  $w$  is a future and  $f(\text{chain } w) \in cn_F$ .*
- *Or there exists  $w'$  such that  $f(w') \in cn_F$  and there exists  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) \in cn_D$  such that  $f \equiv f_0$ ,  $f_n(w') \in cn_D$ , and  $\forall i, f_i(w') \in cn_F$ .*

*Proof.* By definition of  $\mathcal{R}$  and case analysis on the possible configurations, there exists  $w'$  such that either  $f(\text{chain } w') \in cn_F$  or  $f(w') \in cn_F$ . Then we conclude using lemmas 1 and 2.  $\square$

**Lemma 4** (Matching tasks). *If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$ , then  $\exists s. f(\{l \mid s\} \# \bar{q}) \in cn_F$  if and only if  $\exists s'. f(\{l \mid s'\} \# \llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}) \in cn_D$ . In this case:*

- *Either  $s' = \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ .*
- *Or  $s$  is of the form  $y = \text{get}^* w; s_1$ , and  $s'$  of the form  $y = \text{get}^* w'; \llbracket s_1 \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ , with*

$$\exists w_0 \dots w_n \in cn_F. \exists w'_0 \dots w'_m \in cn_D \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall i < n \ w_i(w_{i+1}) \in cn_F \\ \forall i < m \ w'_i(w'_{i+1}) \in cn_D \\ w_0 \equiv w'_0 \\ w_n = w \\ w'_m = w' \end{array} \right.$$

*Proof.* An induction on  $\mathcal{R}$  proves this property. Essentially, the rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -GET-FUTURE-F adds one more  $w_i$ , the rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -GET-FUTURE-D adds one more  $w'_i$ , and the other cases are trivial.

We detail the case of  $\mathcal{R}$ -GET-FUTURE-D. Suppose the lemma holds for  $cn_F f''(\{\ell \mid s\} \# \bar{q}) \mathcal{R} cn_D f(f') f''(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* f; s'\} \# \llbracket \bar{q} \rrbracket_{fwdElim})$ , and consider  $cn_F f''(\{\ell \mid s\} \# \bar{q}) \mathcal{R} cn_D f(f') f''(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* f'; s'\} \# \llbracket \bar{q} \rrbracket_{fwdElim})$ .

Two cases appear from the induction hypothesis.

- If  $(y = \text{get}^* f; s') = \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ , then  $s$  is of the form  $y = \text{get}^* f; s_1$  with  $s_1$  such that  $s' = \llbracket s_1 \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ . In this case our new pair of configurations will verify the second case of the lemma with the sequence  $(w_i)$  reduced to  $(f)$  and  $(w'_i) = (f, f')$ .
- Otherwise,  $s$  is of the form  $y = \text{get}^* w; s_1$ , and there exist  $w_0 \dots w_n$  and  $w'_0 \dots w'_m$  such that

$$\begin{cases} \forall i < n \ w_i(w_{i+1}) \in cn_F f''(\{\ell \mid s\} \# \bar{q}) \\ \forall i < m \ w'_i(w'_{i+1}) \in cn_D f(f') f''(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* f; s'\} \# \llbracket \bar{q} \rrbracket_{fwdElim}) \\ w_0 \equiv w'_0 \\ w_n = w \\ w'_m = f \end{cases}$$

The sequences  $w_0 \dots w_n$  and  $w'_0 \dots w'_m$  satisfy the lemma for

$$cn_F f''(\{\ell \mid s\} \# \bar{q}) \mathcal{R} cn_D f(f') f''(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* f'; s'\} \# \llbracket \bar{q} \rrbracket_{fwdElim}) \quad \square$$

**Lemma 5** (Sequence of futures: DeF to DeF+F).

If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) f_n(w) \in cn_D$  with  $\nexists f \in cn_D. w = f$ , then there exists  $k_0 \leq \dots \leq k_l$  such that for all  $i < l$  either  $f_{k_i}(f_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F$  or  $f_{k_i}(\text{chain } f_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F$  with  $k_0 = 0$  and  $k_l = n$ .

*Proof.* We build a strictly increasing sequence of indices  $(k_i)$  bounded by  $n$ .

Suppose we have  $k_0 \leq \dots \leq k_j$  such that  $\forall i < j$  either  $f_{k_i}(f_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F$  or  $f_{k_i}(\text{chain } f_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F$ , and  $k_0 = 0$ ,  $k_j < n$ . Two cases arise from lemma 3 applied to  $f_{k_j}$ :

- Either  $f_{k_j}(\text{chain } f_{k_{j+1}}) \in cn_F$ , in which case we can take  $k_{j+1} = k_j + 1$ .
- Or there exists  $w'$  such that  $f_{k_j}(w') \in cn_F$  and  $f'_0(f'_1) \dots f'_{m-1}(f'_m) \in cn_D$  such that  $f'_0 = f_{k_j}$  and  $f'_m(w') \in cn_D$ . It is clear that  $f'_i = f_{k_j+i}$ . As  $\nexists f. w = f$ , this implies that  $k_j + m \leq n$ , thus we can take  $k_{j+1} = k_j + m \geq k_j$ .

The resulting integer sequence is strictly increasing and bounded by  $n$ , which proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 6** (Sequence of futures: DeF+F to DeF).

If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  and  $f_0(f_1) \dots f_{n-1}(f_n) f_n(w) \in cn_F$ , then there exists  $f'_0(f'_1) \dots f'_{l-1}(f'_l) \in cn_D$  such that  $f'_0 = f_0$  and  $f'_l(w) \in cn_D$ .

*Proof.* For each  $i$  ( $0 \leq i < n$ ), lemma 2 proves that there exists a sequence of futures from  $f_i$  to  $f_{i+1}$ . We choose the sequence  $(f')$  as the concatenation of these sequences.  $\square$

## A.2 Main Bisimulation Theorem

**Theorem 1** (Correctness of the translation from DeF+F to DeF).  $\mathcal{R}$  is a branching bisimulation between the operational semantics of the DeF+F program  $P$  and the operational semantics of the DeF program  $\llbracket P \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ .

Let  $R$  range over observable transitions. If  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  then:

$$\begin{aligned} cn_F \xrightarrow{\tau^*} cn'_F &\implies cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn_D & cn_D \xrightarrow{\tau^*} cn'_D &\implies cn_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D \\ cn_F \xrightarrow{R} cn'_F &\implies \exists cn'_D. cn_D \xrightarrow{\tau^*} R cn'_D \wedge cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D \\ cn_D \xrightarrow{R} cn'_D &\implies \exists cn'_F. cn_F \xrightarrow{\tau^*} R cn'_F \wedge cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D \end{aligned}$$

The transitions *GET-FUTURE* and *CHAIN-UPDATE* are non-observable, both of them are labelled  $\tau$ . The observable transitions *FORWARD-ASYNC* and *FORWARD-DATA* are labelled *RETURN-ASYNC*, and *FORWARD-SYNC* is labelled *RETURN-SYNC*. All the other transitions are labelled with their original rule name.

*Proof of theorem 3.* From the form of the theorem, we have to prove one implication per rule of the operational semantics of DeF + F, and one implication per rule of the operational semantics of DeF. We start with the only  $\tau$ -rule of DeF: *GET-FUTURE*.

**Case of  $R = \text{GET-FUTURE}$ .** We suppose  $cn_D \xrightarrow{\text{GET-FUTURE}} cn'_D$  and  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$ . We have to prove  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D$ . The definition of *GET-FUTURE* implies that  $f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* w; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim} \# \llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}\}) \in cn_D$ ,  $w(w') \in cn_D$ , and  $f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* w'; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim} \# \llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}\}) \in cn'_D$ . The rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -*GET-FUTURE-D* of  $\mathcal{R}$  immediately gives  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D$ .

We now suppose  $cn_D \xrightarrow{R} cn'_D$  and  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$ , with  $R$  an observable rule of DeF, and we aim to prove that there exists a  $cn'_F$  such that  $cn_F \xrightarrow{\tau^*} R cn'_F$  and  $cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D$ . We will detail the simple case of *SKIP*, then move on to the two interesting non-trivial cases: *RETURN-ASYNC* and *GET-DATA*.

**Case of  $R = \text{SKIP}$ .** The form of the rule *SKIP* implies that  $cn_D = cn''_D f(\{\ell \mid \text{skip}; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim} \# \llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}\})$  and  $cn'_D = cn''_D f(\{\ell \mid \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim} \# \llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}\})$ .

From lemma 4,  $cn_F = cn''_F f(\{\ell \mid \text{skip}; s \# \bar{q}\})$ . Take  $cn_F \xrightarrow{\text{SKIP}} f(\{\ell \mid s \# \bar{q}\}) cn''_F$ , and  $cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D$  remains to be proven.

This can be done by induction on  $\mathcal{R}$ . Indeed we can build a proof tree for  $cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D$  with the same shape as the one of  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$ , the only difference being that the application of the rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -*FORWARDELIM* that introduces  $f(\{\ell \mid \text{skip}; s \# \bar{q}\})$  is replaced by an application of the same rule but for  $f(\{\ell \mid s \# \bar{q}\})$  instead.

**Case of  $R = \text{RETURN-ASYNC}$ .**  $a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid \text{return } v\}) \xrightarrow{\text{RETURN-ASYNC}} a \triangleright F f(w)$ . If  $cn_F$  is of the form  $cn''_F f(\{\ell \mid \text{return } v\})$ , then we can take  $cn_F \xrightarrow{\text{RETURN-ASYNC}} cn''_F f(w)$ . Otherwise,  $cn_F$  is of the form  $cn''_F f(\{\ell \mid \text{forward}^* v\})$ , in which case we can take  $cn_F \xrightarrow{\text{FORWARD-ASYNC}} cn''_F f(\text{chain } v)$  and the rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -*FORWARD-ASYNC* gives  $cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D$ .

**Case of  $R = \text{GET-DATA}$ .** We suppose  $cn_D \xrightarrow{\text{GET-DATA}} cn'_D$ . This implies that  $cn_D$  contains a term of the form  $f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get} * w' ; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim}\} \# \overline{\llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}})$ , and  $cn'_D$  contains a term of the form  $f(\{\ell \mid y = w' ; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{fwdElim}\} \# \overline{\llbracket q \rrbracket_{fwdElim}})$  such that  $\nexists f \in cn_D. w' = f$ .

From lemma 4,  $f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get} * w ; s\} \# \bar{q}) \in cn_F$  and

$$\exists w_0 \dots w_n \in cn_F. \exists w'_0 \dots w'_m \in cn_D \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall i < n \ w_i(w_{i+1}) \in cn_F \\ \forall i < m \ w'_i(w'_{i+1}) \in cn_D \\ w_0 \equiv w'_0 \\ w_n = w \\ w'_m = w' \end{array} \right.$$

Then, lemma 5 applied to  $(w'_0, \dots, w'_m)$  gives us  $k_0 \leq \dots \leq k_l$  such that

$$\forall i < l \ \text{either } w'_{k_i}(w'_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F \text{ or } w'_{k_i}(\text{chain } w'_{k_{i+1}}) \in cn_F$$

with  $k_0 = 0$  and  $k_l = m$ .

$(w'_{k_0} \dots w'_{k_l})$  and  $(w_0 \dots w_n)$  are both sequences of futures in  $cn_F$ , and they start from the same future  $w_0$ . Since a future can be defined only once in a configuration, these sequences coincide. As by definition the sequence  $(w'_{k_0} \dots w'_{k_l})$  cannot be further extended at its right, necessarily  $n \leq l$ . This results in:  $(w'_{k_0} \dots w'_{k_n}) = (w_0 \dots w_n)$ . Also,  $w = w_n = w'_{k_n}$ .

This means that  $a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get} * w ; s\} \# \bar{q}) \xrightarrow{\tau^{l-n}} a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get} * w' ; s\} \# \bar{q})$ , with the  $\tau$ -transitions a series of **GET-FUTURE** and **CHAIN-UPDATE**. This proves that  $a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get} * w ; s\} \# \bar{q}) \xrightarrow{\tau^{l-n} \text{GET-DATA}} a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = w' ; s\} \# \bar{q})$ , which concludes this case.

We now consider the simulation of a transition on the DeF+F side. We first consider the  $\tau$  case: suppose  $cn_F \xrightarrow{\tau} cn'_F$  and  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$ . This side has two  $\tau$ -transitions.

**Case of  $R = \text{CHAIN-UPDATE}$ .**  $a \triangleright F f(\text{chain } f') f'(w) \xrightarrow{\text{CHAIN-UPDATE}} a \triangleright F f(w) f'(w)$ . The rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -CHAIN-UPDATE allows to conclude immediately.

**Case of  $R = \text{GET-FUTURE}$ .** Similar to the case of **GET-FUTURE** on the DeF side, but with  $\mathcal{R}$ -GET-FUTURE-F instead of  $\mathcal{R}$ -GET-FUTURE-D.

We now suppose  $cn_F \xrightarrow{R} cn'_F$  and  $cn_F \mathcal{R} cn_D$  with  $R$  an observable rule of DeF+F, and we aim to prove that there exists a  $cn'_D$  such that  $cn_D \xrightarrow{\tau^* R} cn'_D$  and  $cn'_F \mathcal{R} cn'_D$ . Once again, most cases are trivial. We thus only detail the non-trivial cases: **FORWARD-ASYNC** and **GET-DATA**.

**Case of  $R = \text{FORWARD-ASYNC}$ .** We have  $\llbracket v \rrbracket_{a+l} = f'$  and  $a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid \text{forward} * v ; s'\}) \xrightarrow{\text{FORWARD-ASYNC}} a \triangleright F f(\text{chain } f')$ . From lemma 4,  $f(\{\ell \mid \text{return } v ; s\}) \in cn_D$  with  $(\text{forward} * v ; s') = \llbracket \text{return } v ; s \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ . This allows to apply **RETURN-ASYNC** on the DeF side:

$$a f(\{\ell \mid \text{return } v ; s\}) \rightarrow a f(f')$$

Then the rule  $\mathcal{R}$ -FORWARD-ASYNC allows to conclude.

## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

**Case of  $R = \text{GET-DATA}$ .** We suppose  $cn_F \xrightarrow{\text{GET-DATA}} cn'_F$ . This implies that  $cn_F$  contains a term of the form  $f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* w ; s\} \# \bar{q})$ , and  $cn'_F$  contains a term of the form  $f(\{\ell \mid y = w ; s\} \# \bar{q})$ .

From lemma 4,  $f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* w' ; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}\} \# \overline{\llbracket q \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}}) \in cn_D$  and

$$\exists w_0 \dots w_n \in cn_F. \exists w'_0 \dots w'_m \in cn_D \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall i < n \ w_i(w_{i+1}) \in cn_F \\ \forall i < m \ w'_i(w'_{i+1}) \in cn_D \\ w_0 \equiv w'_0 \\ w_n = w \\ w'_m = w' \end{array} \right.$$

Then, lemma 6 gives us  $f''_0(f''_1) \dots f''_{l-1}(f''_l) \in cn_D$  such that  $f''_0 = w_0$  and  $f''_l(w) \in cn_D$ .

From their definition, it is clear that  $(f''_0 \dots f''_{m-1}) = (w'_0 \dots w'_{m-1})$ , and  $m \leq l$ . Also,  $w' = w'_m = f''_m$ .

This means that

$$a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* w' ; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}\} \# \overline{\llbracket q \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}}) \xrightarrow{\tau^{l-m}} a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* w ; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}\} \# \overline{\llbracket q \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}})$$

with the  $\tau$ -transitions a series of **GET-FUTURE**. This proves that

$$a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = \text{get}^* w' ; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}\} \# \overline{\llbracket q \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}}) \xrightarrow{\tau^{l-m} \text{GET-DATA}} a \triangleright F f(\{\ell \mid y = w ; \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}\} \# \overline{\llbracket q \rrbracket_{\text{fwdElim}}})$$

which concludes this case.  $\square$

## B Typing and Implementing forward\*

In this subsection, we present how an implementation of `forward*` can be typed. As a mean of comparison, we will consider the `forward` construct in the Encore programming language, which is similar to ours.

The formal typing rule **T-FORWARD** given in figure 4 imposes that a function containing `forward* x` must be typed as  $t_1..t_n \rightarrow \text{Flow}[t]$ .

If we look at the Encore language, a function containing `forward x`, with  $x :: \text{Fut}[t]$ , is typed  $t_1..t_n \rightarrow t$ . Calling the function asynchronously actually returns a `Fut[]`. This is in effect an alternate way to type `forward`. To add the notion of `Flow[]` from **DeF+F** to the Encore language, one should consider a `forward*` operator, akin to the existing `forward*` but operating on `Flow[]`.

There are now two possible ways to type `forward*`, the **DeF+F** way called *strict* mode in the paper, and the *flexible* mode actually used for the implementation of `forward*` in the Encore compiler. We will now discuss those two typing solutions.

## B.1 Flexible vs Strict Typing of Future

**The Strict Way** The first possibility is what we have introduced previously in DeF+F (figure 4). Coding a method with strict typing would look like:

```
1 def work(arg: s): Flow[t]
2   forward*(worker!compute(arg))
3 end
```

Notice the presence of Flow in the type of the result of the method. If the return type was int, the user could trigger an implicit synchronisation on a synchronous call to the function, for example by `this.work(arg)`. Returning a future forces the user to trigger explicitly synchronisations, without being burdensome for the user as only one data-flow synchronisation is needed.

Typing `forward*` in Encore this way doesn't require more typing or semantic rules than what we have already established.

**The Flexible Way** This way is used in the Encore compiler to type its own `forward` construct. In Encore, `forward` works on a `Fut[t]`. The return type of a function using Encore's `forward` is then `t`, as seen in the following code:

```
1 def work(arg: s): t
2   forward worker!compute(arg)
3 end
```

Notice the absence of `Fut[]` in the function return type. If `work` is called asynchronously there no problem, but if `work` is called synchronously, this may hide the fact that the result of `work` is still an asynchronous computation. In the type system of DeF+F, this would correspond to the rule:

$$\frac{\text{T-CEF-FORWARD} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : \text{Flow}[T'] \quad \Gamma(m) = \bar{T} \rightarrow T'}{\Gamma \vdash_m \text{forward}^* e}$$

Then the problem is to give a semantics to the use of `forward*` inside a synchronous call. In principle, a function that performs a `forward*` is made to be invoked asynchronously but it is always possible to invoke it synchronously. Figure 6 describes the semantic rule that should replace the `FORWARD-SYNC` rule of DeF+F (figure 2) in the flexible solution. Consider a synchronous invocation to a function that finishes with a `forward*`. As the invoker of the function cannot know that the result should be `Flow[T]`, it is necessary to synchronise the returned value before returning it (with the typing of figure 2 the invoker is aware that the result is a `Flow[T]`) and ensure the returned value is not a Flow anymore.

$$\frac{\text{CEF-FORWARD-SYNC} \quad \llbracket v \rrbracket_{a+\ell} = w \quad y \text{ fresh variable}}{a \triangleright F f(\{\ell' \mid \text{forward}^* v ; s\} \# q \# \bar{q}) \rightarrow a \triangleright F f(\{\ell' \mid y = \text{get}^* w ; \text{return } y ; s\} \# q \# \bar{q})}$$

■ **Figure 6** Semantic rule of a synchronous `forward*`.

### B.2 Benefits and Drawbacks

**Synchronous Calls** The main argument against flexible typing is that it induces an implicit `get` synchronisation when a method using `forward*` is called in a synchronous way, as shown in the semantic rule in figure 6. This drawback only applies to methods, as `forward` cannot be used inside functions. Consider the following example that uses `forward` with the flexible typing of Encore.

```
1 active class A
2   def print_job_result(arg: s): t
3     val result = this.work(arg)
4     println("Result: {}", result)
5     return result
6   end
7   def work(arg: s): t
8     forward worker!compute(arg)
9   end
10 end
```

Here a call to `print_job_result` will implicitly block the actor on line `val result = this.work(arg)`. This behaviour is similar to the way implicit futures work: method `work`, written with futures in mind since it uses `forward*`, can be called transparently like a method of a non-active class.

With the strict typing, the user will have to write an explicit `get` to resolve the result of the synchronous call. This is expected from a language with explicit futures.

An example of misleading behaviour induced by the flexible typing is illustrated in listing 3, while listing 4 shows how strict typing can make such behavior avoidable. In listing 3, `bar` uses `forward` hence it is naturally called asynchronously. However, Encore allows the programmer to use the synchronous call syntax `this.bar()` as a shortcut for `get(this!bar())`, which triggers a deadlock since the instance of `Foo` is still processing the message that triggered the invocation of `foo`. In order for the message `bar` to be processed, `foo` needs to finish, and `foo` can only finish once the `bar` message is processed. While the shortcut may make the code more concise and allow synchronous-like syntax, it also makes the `get` synchronisation implicit, which is misleading when using explicit futures. On the other hand, in listing 4, because the typing of `forward*` is strict, `bar` explicitly returns a `Flow`, and the synchronous call syntax induces an effectively synchronous call that returns a `Flow` on which the caller needs to explicitly call `get` to get the actual value. The potential deadlock is explicit in this version, and can be avoided by adding an `await*` statement that waits until the future is resolved, allowing `baz` to execute in the meantime. Thanks to the collapse rule, calling a method returning a `Flow` asynchronously doesn't create any nested flow (unlike what would happen with a method returning `Fut`), hence returning a `Flow` explicitly isn't a problem.

■ **Listing 3** Forward with futures in classic Encore

```

1 active class Foo
2   def foo(): int
3     this.bar() -- Types in classic Encore, but
                  ↳ deadlocks
4   end
5
6   def bar(): int
7     forward(this!baz())
8   end
9
10  def baz(): int
11    42
12  end
13 end
14
15 active class Main
16   def main(): unit
17     var f = new Foo()
18     print(get*(f!foo()))
19   end
20 end

```

■ **Listing 4** Forward with flows in extended Encore

```

1 active class Foo
2   def foo(): int
3     var x = this.bar()
4     -- get*(x) -- Deadlock as there is
                  ↳ already a message being
                  ↳ processed
5     await*(x) -- Wait until forward* is
                  ↳ completed
6     get*(x) -- Now it doesn't deadlock
7   end
8
9   def bar(): Flow[int]
10    forward*(this!!baz())
11  end
12
13  def baz(): int
14    42
15  end
16 end
17
18 active class Main
19   def main(): unit
20     var f = new Foo()
21     print(get*(f!foo()))
22   end
23 end

```

**Backward Compatibility** The main advantage for using flexible typing is that code can seamlessly be translated from control-flow explicit futures `Fut[]` to data-flow explicit futures `Flow[]`. Let us consider the following example with control-flow explicit futures:

```

1 active class LinkedListNode
2   val state: int
3   val next: Maybe[Node]
4   -- ...
5   def sum(acc: int = 0): int
6     match this.next with
7       case Just(next) => forward(next!sum(this.state + acc))
8       case _ => this.state + acc
9     end
10  end
11 end

```

To port this code to DeF+F, one can just change the asynchronous operators: `forward` into `forward*` and `!` (asynchronous call returning a `Fut[]`) into `!!` (asynchronous call returning a `Flow[]`). This operation is very easy and does not require any major change in the code. In particular, the type system of Encore with DeF includes the previously control-flow explicit futures type system.

On the other hand, if we use strict typing, porting this code to Encore with DeF can be burdensome, as the return types of functions may change. This would require



## An Optimised Flow for Futures: From Theory to Practice

programmers to manually change the signature of all functions using `forward` and then track calls to these functions to change the code.

### B.3 Decision

We chose to implement the flexible version into our Encore extension, to provide backward compatibility between the DeF and the original Encore compiler. That being said, it is recommended to type the methods using `forward*` in a strict way, as to emphasise their asynchronous nature, and prevent synchronous calls to asynchronous methods. In the context of a fresh language developed with data-flow explicit futures, we would advise to use the strict rule.

The bisimulation proven in our paper still holds in this setting as long as `forward*` is only used in asynchronously called functions. The additional flexibility introduced with our implementation does not allow us to have the equivalence between `forward* v` and `return v` (translation  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{fwdElim}$ ) in synchronous calls. Indeed the additional synchronisation introduced by the semantics of `forward` might block a program that would otherwise terminate, for example. Note that potentially problematic cases (synchronous calls to asynchronous methods) can easily be forbidden statically, hence this is not a limitation of our choice.

### About the authors

**Nicolas Chappe** Nicolas Chappe is an internship student from Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon. email: nicolas.chappe@ens-lyon.fr.

**Ludovic Henrio** Ludovic Henrio is a researcher in the Cash team at LIP laboratory in Lyon. email: ludovic.henrio@cns.fr.

**Amaury Maillé** Amaury Maillé is a PhD student in the Cash team at LIP laboratory in Lyon. email: amaury.maille@ens-lyon.fr.

**Matthieu Moy** Matthieu Moy is assistant professor in the Cash team at LIP laboratory in Lyon. email: matthieu.moy@univ-lyon1.fr.

**Hadrien Renaud** Hadrien Renaud is an internship student from Ecole Polytechnique. email: hadrien.renaud@polytechnique.edu.