

I am classifying repairs according to problem between:

- messages on the same sequential branch;
- messages on the same sequential branch in a parallel execution with other branches;
- · messages between;

Despite the automaton of this example is a bit mazy, we are interested only in the final part. Considering the initial BPMN specification, if we execute *msg5* after all the others, we can't guarantee that *msg5* will be executed before *quit*, because all the involved peers are independent. The repair is correct, adding the possibility to execute *msg5* after *quit*.

Anyway this is a just theoretical repair, since I am modifying just one of all the possible parallel interleaving: I can't replicate this repair on the initial specification. So the practical solutions should one of these:

## 1. Enfold the parallelism

Transform the parallel in a sequence of nested choices. This replicates the exact system's automaton and the exact repair. However I lose the specification readability and maintenance. I would discard this option.

## 2. Put msg5 after the parallel execution

I could put *msg5* before *quit*, but after the parallelism fragment. This restricts some good actions, and doesn't repair the choreography. Extra repair actions are needed between *msg5* and *msg2*, *msg4*. However, the extra repair needed, should be fine.

## 3. Put msg5 before the parallel execution

I could put *msg5* at the beginning. Since the sender of *msg5* is the same of the others branches (otherwise I should have already repaired that), it MAY repair the choreography without extra actions. However, it is not a general solution. It's only the case when there is just one message exchange in the branch.

## 4. Force the *restrict* repair

