Proposed corrections to graphical notation for successions, messages, (succession) flows

Hans Peter de Koning, for Graphical Specification WG
Inconsistencies in graphical notation for successions, messages and flows in general / action flow / sequence / interconnection views

Some examples:
- 7.13.1 different labels, arrowheads
- 7.16.1 succession indistinguishable from message
- 8.2.3.9 GBNF for message, succession in sequence view
- 8.2.3.16 GBNF for succession in action flow view
Overarching need is clear and unambiguous human-interpretable notation – consistent within and across views

Resolution should ensure:

- Distinguishable notation for succession, message, flow, succession flow
- Smooth transition from SysML v1
  - E.g., succession with dashed line similar to control flow
- Same notation in action flow and sequence views
- Consistent notation for message or flow on connection (or interface) in interconnection view
Proposed Resolution (basics by example)
Proposed Resolution

Legend (4 basic flow types)

1) «succession» with optional keyword
2) «message» with optional keyword, optional name, optional «of» payload
3) «flow» with optional keyword, optional name, optional «of» payload
4) «succession flow» with optional keyword, optional name, optional «of» payload

message, flow or succession flow on a connection
Practical Example