

# Symmetric Transfer and Sender Composition

---

Document Number: P2583R0  
Date: 2026-02-22  
Audience: LEWG  
Reply-to: Mungo Gill [mungo.gill@me.com](mailto:mungo.gill@me.com)  
Vinnie Falco [vinnie.falco@gmail.com](mailto:vinnie.falco@gmail.com)

## Table of Contents

---

Abstract

Revision History

R0: March 2026 (pre-Croydon mailing)

1. Disclosure

2. Symmetric Transfer in C++20

3. Production Libraries

4. `std::execution` 's Coroutine Bridges

4.1 Coroutine Completing as Sender

4.2 Sender Co-Awaited by Coroutine

5. Why Sender Algorithms Cannot Provide a Handle

5.1 The Composition Layer

5.2 The Protocol

6. `std::execution::task` and `affine_on`

7. The Proposed Fix and Its Limits

7.1 The Cost

8. Failure To Launch

8.1 Two Entry Points

8.2 `spawn` Does Not Compile

8.3 `on` Is a Sender Algorithm

8.4 Implementation Experience

9. The Symmetric Transfer Gap

10. Conclusion

Acknowledgements

References

WG21 Papers

Libraries

Other

## Abstract

---

C++20 provides symmetric transfer (P0913R1<sup>[1]</sup>) - a mechanism where `await_suspend` returns a `coroutine_handle<>` and the compiler resumes the designated coroutine as a tail call. Coroutine chains execute in constant stack space. `std::execution` (P2300R10<sup>[5]</sup>) composes asynchronous operations through sender algorithms. These algorithms create receivers that are structs, not coroutines. No `coroutine_handle<>` exists at any intermediate point in a sender pipeline. When a coroutine `co_await`s a sender that completes synchronously, the stack grows by one frame per completion. P3552R3<sup>[2]</sup>'s `std::execution::task` inherits this property. The sender model's zero-allocation composition property and symmetric transfer's constant-stack property cannot both be satisfied. One requires structs. The other requires coroutines. This paper describes the mechanism, provides implementation experience, and documents the tradeoff.

---

## Revision History

---

R0: March 2026 (pre-Croydon mailing)

- Initial version.
- 

## 1. Disclosure

---

The authors developed P4003R0<sup>[3]</sup> ("Coroutines for I/O") and P4007R0<sup>[4]</sup> ("Senders and Coroutines"). Coroutines solve specific problems. We do not claim they are the answer to all problems. The limitation documented here exists independently of any alternative design.

P4007R0<sup>[4]</sup> documents three costs at the boundary where the sender model meets coroutines: error reporting, error returns, and frame allocator propagation. Each is an interface mismatch. This paper documents a cost inside the composition mechanism. Sender algorithms are structs. The completion protocol is void-returning. These are not boundary properties. They are what sender algorithms are.

---

## 2. Symmetric Transfer in C++20

---

Prior to P0913R1<sup>[1]</sup>, coroutines could only return control to their caller or resumer. Gor Nishanov described the problem:

*“Recursive generators, zero-overhead futures and other facilities require efficient coroutine to coroutine control transfer. Involving a queue and a scheduler makes coroutine to coroutine control transfer inefficient. Coroutines need direct and efficient way of expressing the desired behavior.”*

The solution was a third form of `await_suspend`. C++20 provides three:

```
void await_suspend(coroutine_handle<>);           // unconditional suspend
bool await_suspend(coroutine_handle<>);           // conditional suspend
coroutine_handle<> await_suspend(coroutine_handle<>); // symmetric transfer
```

The third form returns a `coroutine_handle<>`. The compiler resumes the designated coroutine as if by a tail call. The note in `[expr.await]`<sup>[15]</sup> states:

*“Any number of coroutines can be successively resumed in this fashion, eventually returning control flow to the current coroutine caller or resumer.”*

The stack does not grow. One coroutine suspends and another resumes in constant stack space. This is the mechanism C++20 provides to prevent stack overflow in coroutine chains.

Lewis Baker, author of `cppcoro`<sup>[9]</sup> and co-author of P2300R10<sup>[5]</sup>, implemented symmetric transfer in `cppcoro` and documented the motivation in the source:

*“We can eliminate the use of the `std::atomic` once we have access to `coroutine_handle`-returning `await_suspend()` on both MSVC and Clang as this will provide ability to suspend the awaiting coroutine and resume another coroutine with a **guaranteed tail-call to resume()**.”*

The canonical implementation is cppcoro's `final_awaitable` :

```
struct final_awaitable
{
    bool await_ready() const noexcept { return false; }

    template<typename PROMISE>
    std::coroutine_handle<> await_suspend(
        std::coroutine_handle<PROMISE> coro) noexcept
    {
        return coro.promise().m_continuation;
    }

    void await_resume() noexcept {}
};
```

When the coroutine reaches `final_suspend` , `await_suspend` returns the continuation's handle. The compiler performs a tail call to the continuation. No stack frame is added.

### 3. Production Libraries

Every major C++ coroutine library the authors surveyed uses symmetric transfer in its task type. The following table shows the `await_suspend` return type in each library's `final_suspend` awaiter:

Library	<code>await_suspend</code> Return	Mechanism
cppcoro	<code>coroutine_handle&lt;&gt;</code>	Returns <code>m_continuation</code>
folly::coro	<code>coroutine_handle&lt;&gt;</code>	Returns <code>continuation_.getHandle()</code>
Boost.Cobalt	<code>coroutine_handle&lt;&gt;</code>	Returns <code>awaited_from</code> or <code>noop_coroutine()</code>
libcoro	<code>coroutine_handle&lt;&gt;</code>	Returns <code>m_continuation</code> or <code>noop_coroutine()</code>

Library	<code>await_suspend</code> Return	Mechanism
<code>Boost.Capy</code>	<code>coroutine_handle&lt;&gt;</code>	Returns <code>p_-&gt;continuation()</code>
<code>asyncpp</code>	<code>void</code>	Event-based notification

Five of six libraries converge on the same mechanism: `await_suspend` returns a `coroutine_handle<>`. This is independent replication. The libraries were developed by different authors, for different platforms, with different design goals. They arrived at symmetric transfer independently because it is the only guaranteed zero-overhead mechanism C++20 provides for preventing stack overflow in coroutine chains.

## 4. `std::execution` 's Coroutine Bridges

`P2300R10`<sup>[5]</sup> provides two bridges between coroutines and the sender model. Neither uses symmetric transfer.

### 4.1 Coroutine Completing as Sender

When an awaitable is used where a sender is expected, `P2300R10` bridges it via `connect-awaitable`. The completion uses `suspend-complete`:

```
template<class Fun, class... Ts>
auto suspend-complete(Fun fun, Ts&&... as) noexcept {
    auto fn = [&, fun]() noexcept { fun(std::forward<Ts>(as)...); };

    struct awaiter {
        decltype(fn) fn;

        static constexpr bool await_ready() noexcept { return false; }
        void await_suspend(coroutine_handle<>) noexcept { fn(); }
        [[noreturn]] void await_resume() noexcept { unreachable(); }
    };
    return awaiter{fn};
}
```

`await_suspend` returns `void`. The coroutine is unconditionally suspended. The completion function `fn()` - which calls `set_value`, `set_error`, or `set_stopped` on the receiver - runs as a nested function call on the current stack. This is not symmetric transfer.

## 4.2 Sender Co-Awaited by Coroutine

When a coroutine `co_await` s a sender, P2300R10 bridges it via `sender-awaitable` :

```
class sender-awaitable {  
    // ...  
    connect_result_t<Sndr, awaitable-receiver> state;  
  
public:  
    static constexpr bool await_ready() noexcept { return false; }  
    void await_suspend(coroutine_handle<Promise>) noexcept { start(state); }  
    value-type await_resume();  
};
```

`await_suspend` returns `void` . The sender is started. When the sender completes, the `awaitable-receiver` resumes the coroutine:

```
// awaitable-receiver::set_value (exception handling elided)  
rcvr.result_ptr->template emplace<1>(vs...);  
rcvr.continuation.resume();
```

The `.resume()` call is a function call within whatever context `set_value` is invoked from. If the sender completes synchronously inside `start` , the call chain is:

```
await_suspend -> start(state) -> ... -> set_value -> continuation.resume()
```

The stack grows with each synchronous completion. Symmetric transfer would return the continuation handle from `await_suspend` , allowing the compiler to arrange a tail call. The sender model calls `.resume()` as a function call inside `set_value` .

Both bridges use `void await_suspend` . Neither can perform symmetric transfer.

## 5. Why Sender Algorithms Cannot Provide a Handle

Symmetric transfer requires `await_suspend` to return a `coroutine_handle<>` . The question is where that handle would come from. The answer has two parts.

## 5.1 The Composition Layer

Sender algorithms ( `then` , `let_value` , `when_all` ) compose operations by wrapping one receiver in another. The wrapping receiver is a struct. It has `set_value` , `set_error` , and `set_stopped` member functions that invoke the wrapped callable and forward to the next receiver. It is not a coroutine. It has no `coroutine_handle<>` .

A sender pipeline with three algorithms produces a chain: coroutine -> struct -> struct -> struct -> coroutine. The structs are sender algorithm receivers. No `coroutine_handle<>` exists at any intermediate point. There is nothing to symmetric-transfer to.

Making each sender algorithm a coroutine would produce a handle at every intermediate point. It would also produce a heap-allocated frame at every intermediate point. The sender model's zero-allocation composition property and symmetric transfer's constant-stack property cannot both be satisfied. One requires structs. The other requires coroutines.

## 5.2 The Protocol

Even when a receiver IS backed by a coroutine - as `awaitable-receiver` is, holding a `coroutine_handle<Promise> continuation` member - the completion protocol does not help. `set_value` is void-returning:

```
// awaitable-receiver::set_value (exception handling elided)
rcvr.result_ptr->template emplace<1>(vs...);
rcvr.continuation.resume();
```

The handle exists inside the receiver. The protocol calls `.resume()` on it as a function call. It does not return the handle to the caller. The caller of `set_value` - which is the sender algorithm's receiver, which is a struct - cannot receive a `coroutine_handle<>` back from a void-returning function.

Four facts:

1. Sender algorithms create receivers that are structs, not coroutines. These structs have no `coroutine_handle<>` .
2. Even coroutine-backed receivers complete through void-returning `set_value` .
3. The handle exists inside the receiver but the protocol provides no way to return it.
4. `await_suspend` cannot return what neither the composition layer nor the protocol provides.

Could the protocol be changed? If `set_value` returned `coroutine_handle<>` , every non-coroutine receiver - every `then` , `let_value` , and `when_all` implementation - would need to produce one. Returning `noop_coroutine()` transfers control to a no-op. The continuation remains suspended.

## 6. `std::execution::task` and `affine_on`

P3552R3<sup>[2]</sup>'s `task` wraps every `co_await` ed sender in `affine_on` for scheduler affinity. The `await_transform` is defined in `[task.promise] p10`<sup>[15]</sup>:

```
as_awaitable(affine_on(std::forward<Sender>(sndr), SCHED(*this)), *this)
```

Even when one `task` `co_await` s another `task`, the inner task is wrapped in `affine_on`, producing a different sender type. Dietmar Kühl, a co-author of P3552R3, documented this in P3796R1<sup>[6]</sup> (“Coroutine Task Issues”), Section 3.2.3:

*“The specification doesn’t mention any use of symmetric transfer. Further, the `task` gets adapted by `affine_on` in `await_transform` (`[task.promise] p10`) which produces a different sender than `task` which needs special treatment to use symmetric transfer.”*

Jonathan Müller demonstrated the consequence in P3801R0<sup>[7]</sup> (“Concerns about the design of `std::execution::task`”), Section 3.1:

```
ex::task<void> f(int i);

ex::task<void> g(int total) {
    for (auto i = 0; i < total; ++i) {
        co_await f(i);
    }
}
```

*“Depending on the value of `total` and the scheduler used to execute `g` on, this can lead to a stack overflow. Concretely, if the `ex::inline_scheduler` is used, each call to `f` will execute eagerly, but, because `ex::task` does not support symmetric transfer, each schedule back-and-forth will add additional stack frames.”*

Müller added:

*“Having iterative code that is actually recursive is a potential security vulnerability.”*



## 7. The Proposed Fix and Its Limits

Kühl suggested a fix direction in P3796R1<sup>[6]</sup>, Section 3.2.3:

*“To address the different scheduling problems (schedule on `start`, schedule on completion, and symmetric transfer) it may be reasonable to mandate that `task` customises `affine_on` and that the result of this customisation also customises `as_awaitable`.”*

This would allow a `task` `co_await` ing another `task` to bypass the sender machinery and use a direct awaiter with symmetric transfer. The fix addresses one case: task-to-task.

It does not address the general case. Müller stated this directly in P3801R0<sup>[7]</sup>, Section 3.1:

*“A potential fix is adding symmetric transfer to `ex::task` with an `operator co_await` overload. However, while this would solve the example above, it would not solve the general problem of stack overflow when awaiting other senders. A thorough fix is non-trivial and requires support for guaranteed tail calls.”*

Three cases remain after the proposed fix:

1. A `task` `co_await` ing a sender that is not a `task` - no symmetric transfer. The sender completes through the receiver, which calls `.resume()` as a function call.
2. A `task` `co_await` ing a `task` whose body `co_await` s a synchronously completing sender (e.g. `co_await just()`) - the inner task's `co_await` goes through the `sender-awaitable` bridge, which uses `void await_suspend`. Stack frames accumulate inside the inner task.
3. Any sender chain where coroutines are composed through sender algorithms (`then`, `let_value`, `when_all`) - each sender algorithm is not a coroutine. It is a struct with `set_value` member functions. There is no coroutine handle to transfer to.

Kühl acknowledged the general case requires a different mitigation:

*“There is a general issue that stack size needs to be bounded when operations complete synchronously. The general idea is to use a trampoline scheduler which bounds stack size and reschedules when the stack size or the recursion depth becomes too big.”*

A trampoline scheduler is a runtime mitigation. It detects excessive stack depth and reschedules. This is the runtime overhead in the completion path that P0913R1<sup>[1]</sup> was specifically adopted to eliminate.

Müller identifies a language-level alternative: guaranteed tail calls. If C++ adopted such a feature, `set_value` could transfer control without growing the stack, potentially closing the gap without changing the receiver abstraction. No such feature exists in C++.

## 7.1 The Cost

A coroutine that `co_await`s  $N$  synchronously-completing senders in a loop accumulates  $O(N)$  stack frames. With symmetric transfer, the same loop executes in  $O(1)$  stack space. The difference is the composition mechanism.

The stack growth is not specific to `inline_scheduler`. Any sender that completes synchronously grows the stack: `just()`, `then()` on a ready value, a cached result, an in-memory lookup.

Two mitigations exist. Both have costs:

Mitigation	Mechanism	Cost
Real scheduler	Every <code>co_await</code> round-trips through the scheduler queue	Latency per iteration, even when the work completes immediately
Trampoline	Detect stack depth at runtime, reschedule when threshold is reached	Runtime check on every completion, plus occasional rescheduling latency

Neither mitigation is zero-cost. Symmetric transfer is zero-cost. The difference is the price of composing coroutines through sender algorithms rather than through the awaitable protocol.

Symmetric transfer does not prevent all stack overflow. Infinite recursion exhausts any finite stack regardless. What symmetric transfer prevents is the specific case where a finite coroutine chain overflows due to accumulated frames from non-tail calls. Sender composition creates exactly this case.

---

## 8. Failure To Launch

Section 7 showed that the proposed task-to-task fix does not reach the general case of `co_await`ing arbitrary senders. This section shows that the gap extends further: no launch mechanism in P3552R3<sup>[2]</sup> avoids the sender composition layer.

### 8.1 Two Entry Points

P3552R3<sup>[2]</sup> provides two ways to start a `task` from non-coroutine code:

- `sync_wait(task)` <sup>[15]</sup> - blocks the calling thread until the task completes.
- `spawn(task, token)` <sup>[8]</sup> (“`async_scope`”) - launches the task into a `counting_scope` .

The paper’s only complete example uses `sync_wait` :

```
int main() {
    return std::get<0>(*ex::sync_wait([]->ex::task<int> {
        std::cout << "Hello, world!\n";
        co_return co_await ex::just(0);
    }()));
}
```

## 8.2 `spawn` Does Not Compile

`task` is scheduler-affine by default. The scheduler is obtained from the receiver’s environment when `start` is called. P3552R3<sup>[2]</sup>, Section 4.5:

*“An example where no scheduler is available is when starting a task on a `counting_scope` . The scope doesn’t know about any schedulers and, thus, the receiver used by `counting_scope` when `connecting` to a sender doesn’t support the `get_scheduler` query, i.e., this example doesn’t work:”*

```
ex::spawn([]->ex::task<void> { co_await ex::just(); }(), token);
```

The paper acknowledges this is not a corner case:

*“Using `spawn()` with coroutines doing the actual work is expected to be quite common.”*

The working pattern wraps the task in `on` :

```
ex::spawn(ex::on(sch, my_task()), scope.get_token());
```

### 8.3 `on` Is a Sender Algorithm

`on(sch, sndr)` <sup>[15]</sup> is a sender algorithm. Its receiver is a struct with void-returning `set_value`. This is the composition layer Section 5 proved cannot support symmetric transfer. The task's completion traverses the `on` algorithm's receiver before reaching the scope's receiver. No `coroutine_handle<>` exists at any point in this path.

`sync_wait` goes through the same bridge. Section 4.2 showed that `sender-awaitable` uses `void await_suspend`. The `run_loop` scheduler inside `sync_wait` resumes the coroutine through `.resume()` as a function call.

Both entry points route through sender algorithms. Both use void-returning completions. Neither can perform symmetric transfer.

### 8.4 Implementation Experience

A coroutine-native launcher avoids the sender pipeline entirely. `Boost.Capy` <sup>[13]</sup> starts a task directly on an executor:

```
corosio::io_context ioc;
run_async(ioc.get_executor())(do_session());
ioc.run();
```

The launcher creates a trampoline coroutine that owns the task. The task chain uses symmetric transfer throughout. No sender algorithm participates. The gap documented in Sections 5 through 7 does not arise because the composition layer is the awaitable protocol, not the sender protocol.

This is not an argument for one design over another. It is evidence that the symmetric transfer gap is specific to the sender launch path, not inherent to launching coroutines.

Every path into `std::execution::task` enters the sender composition layer. No path out preserves symmetric transfer.

---

## 9. The Symmetric Transfer Gap

The prior papers document the symptom. Kühl's `P3796R1` <sup>[6]</sup> states that the specification does not mention symmetric transfer and suggests a partial fix through domain customization of `affine_on`. Müller's `P3801R0` <sup>[7]</sup> confirms the partial fix does not reach the general case and identifies guaranteed tail calls as a language-level

direction. Neither paper claims the gap is architectural. Both frame it as a missing feature - absent, difficult to add, but not structurally precluded.

This paper makes a stronger claim. The analysis in Section 5 identifies two structural causes. Sender algorithms create receivers that are structs, not coroutines - no `coroutine_handle<>` exists at the composition layer. Even coroutine-backed receivers complete through void-returning `set_value` - the protocol does not return the handle. The gap is not a missing feature. It is a consequence of the design choices that define the sender model.

The distinction matters. If symmetric transfer is merely missing, it can be added. If it is architectural, it can only be closed by removing the property it trades against - non-coroutine composition through sender algorithms - or by a language feature that does not exist. The committee should know which characterization is correct.

Symmetric transfer requires `await_suspend` to return a `coroutine_handle<>`. Sender algorithms create receivers that are structs. These structs are not coroutines and have no handle. Even when the final receiver is coroutine-backed, `set_value` is void-returning and does not propagate the handle to the caller.

Sender composition	Symmetric transfer
Sender algorithms compose through non-coroutine structs	<code>await_suspend</code> must return a <code>coroutine_handle&lt;&gt;</code>
Completion is a void-returning call to <code>set_value</code>	Completion is a tail jump to the continuation
Zero-allocation pipelines, compile-time work graphs	Constant-stack coroutine chains

Symmetric transfer requires a handle. The sender model provides a function call. No bridge exists between the two.

This is a tradeoff, not a defect. P2300R10<sup>[5]</sup> was designed for GPU dispatch and heterogeneous computing - domains where symmetric transfer provides no benefit. The cost appears only when the same model is applied to coroutine composition, where symmetric transfer is the primary stack-overflow prevention mechanism that C++20 provides.

## 10. Conclusion

P0913R1<sup>[1]</sup> was adopted into C++20 to solve a specific problem: stack overflow in coroutine chains. The solution is `coroutine_handle<>`-returning `await_suspend`. Every major coroutine library adopted it.

The sender model's architectural choice - composing operations through non-coroutine sender algorithms - structurally prevents this mechanism from operating. P3552R3<sup>[2]</sup>'s `std::execution::task` inherits this limitation. The proposed task-to-task fix does not reach the general case. No launch mechanism avoids the

sender composition layer. The trampoline scheduler mitigation reintroduces the runtime cost that symmetric transfer was designed to eliminate.

The gap is architectural. It cannot be closed without removing the property - non-coroutine composition - that enables zero-allocation sender pipelines. Three directions could be explored: domain customization that short-circuits the receiver abstraction for known coroutine types, a language feature for guaranteed tail calls, or coroutine task types that use the awaitable protocol directly for coroutine-to-coroutine composition and reserve the sender model for the boundaries where it is needed.

Users and WG21 should be aware of this cost when evaluating coroutine integration with `std::execution`.

---

## Acknowledgements

---

This document is written in Markdown and depends on the extensions in `pandoc` and `mermaid`, and we would like to thank the authors of those extensions and associated libraries.

The authors would like to thank Gor Nishanov for the design of symmetric transfer, Lewis Baker for demonstrating it in `cppcoro`, and Dietmar Kühl and Jonathan Müller for documenting the limitation in `P3796R1` and `P3801R0`.

---

## References

---

### WG21 Papers

1. `P0913R1` - "Add symmetric coroutine control transfer" (Gor Nishanov, 2018). <https://wg21.link/p0913r1>
2. `P3552R3` - "Add a Coroutine Task Type" (Dietmar Kühl, Maikel Nadolski, 2025). <https://wg21.link/p3552r3>
3. `P4003R0` - "Coroutines for I/O" (Vinnie Falco, Steve Gerbino, Mungo Gill, 2026). <https://wg21.link/p4003r0>
4. `P4007R0` - "Senders and Coroutines" (Vinnie Falco, Mungo Gill, 2026). <https://wg21.link/p4007r0>
5. `P2300R10` - "`std::execution`" (Michał Dominiak, Georgy Evtushenko, Lewis Baker, Lucian Radu Teodorescu, Lee Howes, Kirk Shoop, Michael Garland, Eric Niebler, Bryce Adelstein Lelbach, 2024). <https://wg21.link/p2300r10>
6. `P3796R1` - "Coroutine Task Issues" (Dietmar Kühl, 2025). <https://wg21.link/p3796r1>
7. `P3801R0` - "Concerns about the design of `std::execution::task`" (Jonathan Müller, 2025). <https://wg21.link/p3801r0>

8. **P3149R11** - “`async_scope`” (Ian Petersen, Jessica Wong, Kirk Shoop, et al., 2025).  
<https://wg21.link/p3149r11>

## Libraries

9. **cppcoro** - A library of C++ coroutine abstractions (Lewis Baker). <https://github.com/lewissbaker/cppcoro>
10. **folly::coro** - Facebook’s coroutine library. <https://github.com/facebook/folly/tree/main/folly/coro>
11. **Boost.Cobalt** - Coroutine task types for Boost (Klemens Morgenstern). <https://github.com/boostorg/cobalt>
12. **libcoro** - C++20 coroutine library (Josh Baldwin). <https://github.com/jbaldwin/libcoro>
13. **Boost.Capy** - Coroutines for I/O (Vinnie Falco). <https://github.com/cppalliance/capy>
14. **asyncpp** - Async coroutine library (Péter Kardos). <https://github.com/petiaccja/asyncpp>

## Other

15. **C++ Working Draft** - (Richard Smith, ed.). <https://eel.is/c++draft/>