



UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

Department of Computer  
Science and Technology

May 22, 2025

# **Efficient coinductives through state-machine corecursors**

**William Sørensen**

Gonville & Caius College

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
Computer Science Tripos, Part III

# Declaration

I, William Sørensen of Gonville & Caius College, being a candidate for the course, hereby declare that this report and the work described in it are my own work, unaided except as may be specified below, and that the report does not contain material that has already been used to any substantial extent for a comparable purpose. **Signed:**

**Date:** May 22, 2025

# Abstract

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magnam aliquam quaerat voluptatem. Ut enim aequaleam animo, cum corpore dolemus, fieri tamen permagna accessio potest, si aliquod aeternum et infinitum impendere malum nobis opinemur. Quod idem licet transferre in voluptatem, ut postea variari voluptas distinguere possit, augeri amplificarique non possit.

# Acknowledgements

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magnam aliquam quaerat voluptatem. Ut enim aequaleam animo, cum corpore dolemus, fieri tamen permagna accessio potest, si aliquod aeternum et infinitum impendere malum nobis opinemur. Quod idem licet transferre in voluptatem, ut postea variari voluptas distinguere possit, augeri amplificarique non possit.

# Contents

1	Introduction .....	6
1.1	Dependent type theory .....	6
1.2	Polynomial functors .....	6
1.2.1	Lean formalization .....	6
2	Preparation .....	7
3	Implementation .....	8
3.1	The ABI Type .....	8
3.2	Stream implementation .....	8
3.3	Expanding the progressive approximation theory .....	8
3.3.1	Universe lifting of polynomial functors. ....	8
3.3.2	Generalizing the corecursor .....	9
3.4	State machine encoding .....	9
3.5	Proving the equivlence .....	9
3.6	Cofix implementation .....	9
4	Evaluation .....	10
4.1	Performance between SME and PA .....	10
5	Conclusions .....	11
6	Appendicies .....	12

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Dependent type theory

### 1.2 Polynomial functors

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua quaerat voluptatem. Ut enim aequae doleamus animo, cum corpore dolemus, fieri tamen permagna accessio potest, si aliquod aeternum et infinitum impendere malum nobis opinemur. Quod idem licet transferre in voluptatem, ut postea variari voluptas distinguere possit, augeri amplificarique non possit. At etiam Athenis, ut e patre audiebam facete et urbane Stoicos irridente, statua est in quo a nobis philosophia defensa et collaudata est, cum id, quod maxime placeat, facere possimus, omnis voluptas assumenda est, omnis dolor repellendus. Temporibus autem quibusdam et.

#### 1.2.1 Lean formalization

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua quaerat voluptatem. Ut enim aequae doleamus animo, cum corpore dolemus, fieri tamen permagna accessio potest, si aliquod aeternum et infinitum impendere malum nobis opinemur. Quod idem licet transferre in voluptatem, ut postea variari voluptas distinguere possit, augeri amplificarique non possit. At etiam Athenis, ut e patre audiebam facete et urbane Stoicos irridente, statua est in quo a nobis philosophia defensa et collaudata est, cum id, quod maxime placeat, facere possimus, omnis voluptas assumenda est, omnis dolor repellendus. Temporibus autem quibusdam et.

# Chapter 2

## Preparation

# Chapter 3

## Implementation

### 3.1 The ABI Type

### 3.2 Stream implementation

### 3.3 Expanding the progressive approximation theory

During the pheasability assesment I noticed that, in the current formalised theory of polynomials, the statement wouldn't even type-check. This stemmed from a problem with the corecursive principle for the M type in the old implementation.  $\text{corec} : \{\alpha : \text{TypeVec}.\{\mathcal{U}\}n\} \rightarrow \{\beta : \text{Type } \mathcal{U}\} \rightarrow (g : \beta \rightarrow P(\alpha :: \beta)) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow M\alpha^1$ . The problem here is that both  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  have to both reside in  $\mathcal{U}$ . Solving this is done through the next two sections.

#### 3.3.1 Universe lifting of polynomial functors.

The main problem caused here comes from the fact that lean isnt cummulative. This means it is impossible to express a universe hetrogouns typevector. In other words  $\alpha :: \beta$  is only typable if  $\alpha : \text{TypeVec}.\{\mathcal{U}\}n$  and  $\beta : \text{Type } \mathcal{U}$ . The natural way of solving this is using the supremum in universe levels you get from  $\text{ULift} : \text{Type } \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \text{Type } (\max \mathcal{UV})$ . This means we can have  $\beta : \text{Type } \mathcal{U}$  and  $\alpha : \text{Type } \mathcal{V}$ , then ulift both of them to a common universe  $\text{ULift } \alpha :: \text{ULift } \beta : \text{TypeVec}.\{\max \mathcal{UV}\}(n + 1)^2$ .

Noticable the next hurdle we encounter is that PFunctors are restricted to a universe level. Recall the definition from Section 1.2.1. Observe how for a  $\text{MvPfunctor}.\{\mathcal{U}\}n$ , we require that both the head and child reside in  $\mathcal{U}$ . This will also cause problems, as looking back at the definition of the corecursor, we will require  $P$  to be able to accept  $\text{ULift } \alpha :: \text{ULift } \beta$ . If we do not add the ability to lift  $P$ , the unifier will force  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}$ , thereby invalidating all the work we did in the previous section. Luckily lifting a PFunctor is relatively easy. We define it as

---

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/leanprover-community/mathlib4/blob/7a60b315c7441b56020c4948c4be7b54c222247b/Mathlib/Data/PFunctor/Multivariate/M.lean#L152-L154>

<sup>2</sup>Note we overload ULift as a notation to refer to lifting TypeVecs as well



$\text{ULift } P \triangleq \langle \text{ULift } P.1, \lambda x \mapsto \text{ULift } (P.2x) \rangle$ . This works and now we can move on to our goal<sup>3</sup>.

### 3.3.2 Generalizing the corecursor

Now with all the work in the previous section, by generalizing `corec`<sup>4</sup>, we can define `corecU` :  $\{\alpha : \text{TypeVec}.\{\mathcal{U}\}n\} \rightarrow \{\beta : \text{Type } \mathcal{V}\} \rightarrow (g : \beta \rightarrow \text{ULift } P(\text{ULift } \alpha :: \text{ULift } \beta)) \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow M.\{\mathcal{U}\}\alpha$ . Notably we are able to fit the object into  $\mathcal{U}$  (as opposed to in the SME).

The expected diagram using `corecU` and `dest` commutes.

### 3.4 State machine encoding

Noting the definition of `corecU`, one might wonder if you could define `M` from first principles for this. The problem one encounters is one of universes. As seen in the definition above, if one were to define a type whose constructor is directly the `corecU` definition, it would hold a  $\beta : \text{Type } \mathcal{V}$ . This then forces the object to reside in  $\text{Type max } \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{V} + 1)$ . This is a problem as one loses most closure results as you will be lifting more and more. The main benefit from this is the performance aspect though. This will be seen in Section 4.1. We will henceforth refer to the datatype `SME.PreM`.

### 3.5 Proving the equivalence

### 3.6 Cofix implementation

---

<sup>3</sup>TODO: Speak with JV / W to see if this might be done in the `lit`, `Ex` : Locally presentable and accessible categories `Adameck` `roshiki`

<sup>4</sup>Done in PR NUMBER

# Chapter 4

## Evaluation

### 4.1 Performance between SME and PA

# Chapter 5

## Conclusions

# Chapter 6

## Appendicies