Trace Types for Sound Programmable Inference in Probabilistic Languages – Supplementary Material

ALEXANDER K. LEW, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MARCO F. CUSUMANO-TOWNER, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
BENJAMIN SHERMAN, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MICHAEL CARBIN, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
VIKASH K. MANSINGHKA, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A IMPLEMENTATIONS OF CONTROL FLOW CONSTRUCTS.

Because our control flow constructs introduce only a single label into a program's trace, their disintegrations are trivial (either their entire traces are observed, or nothing is observed). But here, we describe the constructions of their samplers and densities.

A.1 Branching.

We first present the implementation of our stochastic branching construct, withProbability₁.

withProbability₁ $p \mu$ else ν

```
traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.do {
       u \leftarrow \text{sample}
 3
       if u < p then \mathcal{M}.do {
       t \leftarrow \mu.traced.sampler
 4
         return \{l = inl t\}
       } else M.do {
 6
        t \leftarrow v.traced.sampler
 7
         return \{l = inr t\}
 8
 9
       }
10
      traced.density(t) = \mathbf{match} t.l \mathbf{with}
        inl s \rightarrow p * \mu.traced.density(s)
13
        inr s \rightarrow (1 - p) * v.traced.density(s)
14
16
      returnValue(t) = \mathbf{match} \ t.l \ \mathbf{with}
        inl s \rightarrow \mu.returnValue(s)
17
        inr s \rightarrow v.returnValue(s)
18
```

A.2 Looping.

Next, we implement each of our three looping constructs.

$for_l i inRandomRange d p(i)$

```
traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.\mathbf{do} {
 1
 2
       n \leftarrow d
       snd (fold<sub>N</sub> n (n, return {l = Nil}) (\lambda (i, \mu_i). (i - 1, \mathcal{M}.do {
 3
 4
         subtrace \leftarrow p(i).traced.sampler
 5
 6
         return \{l = \mathbf{Cons} \ subtrace \ t_i.l\}
 7
       }))
     }
 8
      traced.density(t) = d.density(\mathbf{length}\ t.l) * \prod_{i \in \{1,...,\mathbf{length}\ t.l\}} p(i).traced.density(\mathbf{nth}\ t.l\ i)
      returnValue(t) = indexedMap(\lambda(i, t_i). p(i).returnValue(t_i)) t.l
12
                                          while<sub>l</sub> (s := s_0; min(p(s), p_{max})) \mu(s)
     traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.do {
 1
       n \leftarrow \mathbf{geometric} \, p_{max}
       (\_, res) ← fold<sub>N</sub> n (return ((false, s_0), Nil)) (\lambda soFar. \mathcal{M}.do {
 3
 4
         ((stopped, s), t_i) \leftarrow soFar
         u \leftarrow \text{sample}
 5
         let stopped' = stopped or u < \frac{p(s)}{p_{max}}
 6
 7
         if stopped' then return ((stopped', s), t_i) else \mathcal{M}.do {
           subtrace \leftarrow \mu(s).traced.sampler
 8
           return ((false, \mu(s). returnValue(subtrace)), Cons subtrace t_i)
 9
10
         }
11
       return \{l = (reverse \ res)\}
12
13
15
      traced.density(t) = let
         (\rho, s) = fold t.l(1, s_0)(\lambda((\rho, s), t).(\rho * \mu(s).traced.density(t), \mu(s).returnValue(t)))
16
       in \rho * \min(p(s), p_{max})
17
      returnValue(t) = fold t.l s_0(\lambda(s, t).\mu(s).returnValue(t))
                                                    forEach<sub>1</sub> x in v \mu(x)
     traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.do {
       v_t \leftarrow \mathbf{mapM} (\lambda x. \mu(x). traced. sampler) v
 3
       return \{l = v_t\}
 4 }
     traced.density(t) = \prod_{(x,t_x) \in \mathbf{zipv} \ v \ t.l} \mu(x).traced.density(t_x)
```

```
8 returnValue(t) = \mathbf{mapv} (\lambda(x, t_x).\mu(x).returnValue(t_x)) (\mathbf{zipv} \ \upsilon \ t.l)
```

B PROOF NOTES: CORRECTNESS OF DENSITIES AND DISINTEGRATIONS (THEOREM 1)

Correctness of \mathcal{P} .return. First, note that for \mathcal{P} .return x, we have $[traced.sampler] = [return <math>\{\}] = \mathcal{B}[[\{\}]] = [M.do\{t \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[[\{\}]]; score\ 1; return\ t\}]]$, so $\lambda t.1$ is a valid (and clearly strictly positive) density. Because its trace type is empty, it has only the trivial empty trace disintegration.

Correctness of $sample_l d$. Let $d : \mathcal{D} \tau$. We can use the definition of density to rewrite d. sampler in the implementation of traced. sampler, to obtain

```
[\![\mathcal{M}.\mathbf{do}\{x \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\tau]\!]; \mathbf{score}\ d.density(x); \mathbf{return}\ \{l = x\}\}]\!].
```

By noting that $\mathcal{B}[\![\tau]\!]$ is equal to $\mathcal{M}.\mathbf{do}\{t \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\{l:\tau\}]\!]; \mathbf{return}\, t.l\}\}$, then repeatedly applying the monad laws, we can further rewrite traced.sampler as

```
\llbracket \mathcal{M}.\mathbf{do}\{t \leftarrow \mathcal{B}\llbracket\{l : \tau\}\rrbracket; \mathbf{score}\ d.density(t.l); \mathbf{return}\ t\} \rrbracket,
```

thus justifying the density $\lambda t.d.density(t.l)$. The strict positivity of this density follows from that of d.density. This equation, combined with the fact that $\{\} + t = t$, also justifies the formula for $observe_{\{l\}} t$.

Correctness of \mathcal{P} .do. First, note that if we can show them to be correct, both density formulas (for the trace distribution and for the disintegrations) are strictly positive by induction, because pointwise multiplication preserves strict positivity, and these densities are both products of other strictly positive densities.

We now show that *traced.density* is a density for *traced.sampler*. We begin by recalling the implementation for the sampler:

```
traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.\mathbf{do} \{
t_{\tau} \leftarrow \mu.traced.sampler
\mathbf{let} \ x = \mu.returnValue(t_{\tau})
t_{\sigma} \leftarrow (v \ x).traced.sampler
\mathbf{return} \ t_{\tau} + t_{\sigma}
\}
```

We use the definition of density to rewrite the sampling lines, and also get rid of **let** expression, performing the substitution for x:

```
\begin{split} &traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.\mathbf{do} \, \{ \\ &t_{\tau} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\tau]\!] \\ &\mathbf{score} \, \mu.traced.density(t_{\tau}) \\ &t_{\sigma} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\sigma]\!] \\ &\mathbf{score} \, (v \, (\mu.returnValue(t_{\tau}))).traced.density(t_{\sigma}) \\ &\mathbf{return} \, t_{\tau} \, + \, t_{\sigma} \\ \} \end{split}
```

By the commutativity of the measure monad, we can swap the second line of the body with the third. We can also consolidate the two stock measures into one joint stock measure, and rewrite references to t_{τ} and t_{σ} accordingly:

```
traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.\mathbf{do} {
  t \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\tau + \sigma]\!]
  score \mu. traced. density(restrict_{\tau}t)
  score (\nu (\mu.returnValue(restrict_{\tau}t))).traced.density(restrict_{\sigma}t)
  return t
}
   Adjacent score statements can be combined via multiplication:
traced.sampler = \mathcal{M}.do {
  t \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\tau + \sigma]\!]
  score\ \mu.traced.density(restrict_{\tau}t)*(v\ (\mu.returnValue(restrict_{\tau}t))).traced.density(restrict_{\sigma}t)
  return t
}
   And we can invoke the definition of density to conclude.
   Next, we show that observe_K(t). sampler is a valid trace disintegration. Our goal is to show that
the following expression is equal to traced.sampler:
M.do {
  t \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![ \prod_{k \in K} \tau_k ]\!]
  let (t_{\tau}, t_{\sigma}) = (\mathbf{restrict}_{\tau \cap K}(t), \mathbf{restrict}_{\sigma \cap K}(t))
  s_{\tau} \leftarrow (\mu.observe_{K \cap \tau}(t_{\tau})).sampler
  let x = \mu.returnValue(s_{\tau} + t_{\tau})
  s_{\sigma} \leftarrow ((v \ x).observe_{K \cap \sigma}(t_{\sigma})).sampler
  return t + (s_\tau + s_\sigma)
   We begin by rewriting the first two lines as assigning t_{\tau} and t_{\sigma} separately:
M.do {
  t_{\tau} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\prod_{k \in K \cap \tau} \tau_k]\!]
  t_{\sigma} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\prod_{k \in K \cap \sigma} \tau_{k}]\!]
  s_{\tau} \leftarrow (\mu.observe_{K \cap \tau}(t_{\tau})).sampler
  let x = \mu.returnValue(s_{\tau} + t_{\tau})
  s_{\sigma} \leftarrow ((v \ x).observe_{K \cap \sigma}(t_{\sigma})).sampler
  return (t_{\tau} + t_{\sigma}) + (s_{\tau} + s_{\sigma})
}
   We now use commutativity (of the monad, and on the last line, of +) to move the t and s variables
next to each other:
M.do {
  t_{\tau} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\prod_{k \in K \cap \tau} \tau_k]\!]
  s_{\tau} \leftarrow (\mu.observe_{K \cap \tau}(t_{\tau})).sampler
  t_{\sigma} \leftarrow \mathcal{B}[\![\prod_{k \in K \cap \sigma} \tau_{k}]\!]
  s_{\sigma} \leftarrow ((v (\mu.returnValue(s_{\tau} + t_{\tau}))).observe_{K \cap \sigma}(t_{\sigma})).sampler
  return (t_\tau + s_\tau) + (t_\sigma + s_\sigma)
}
```

Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 4, No. POPL, Article 19. Publication date: January 2020.

By induction (using the fact that μ and ν have valid trace disintegrations), we can rewrite lines 1 and 2, then lines 3 and 4, to get exactly the expression for *traced.sampler*, as required:

```
\mathcal{M}.do {
t_{\tau} \leftarrow \mu.traced.sampler
t_{\sigma} \leftarrow (v (\mu.returnValue(t_{\tau}))).traced.sampler
return (t_{\tau} + t_{\sigma})
} = traced.sampler
```

The proof that the density for the disintegration is correct follows the same pattern as the proof that the prior density (for *traced.sampler*) is correct: we expand each of the *sampler* calls using the definition of density, then reorganize to bring the two resulting **score** statements next to one another, resulting in the multiplication that appears in the disintegration's density.