

MASTER THESIS

---

**FORMALIZED CORRECTNESS PROOFS OF AUTOMATIC DIFFERENTIATION IN  
Coq**

---

*Student:*  
Curtis Chin Jen Sem

*Supervisors:*  
Mathijs Vákár  
Wouter Swierstra

**Department of Information and Computing Science**

*Last updated: July 7, 2020*

### **Abstract**

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Aenean quis dapibus lorem. Praesent volutpat feugiat erat. Quisque quis hendrerit lectus, et malesuada nisi. Quisque id elementum lectus. Phasellus sit amet ante ornare, hendrerit orci non, consectetur erat. Phasellus pulvinar orci urna. Donec fringilla fringilla ornare. Sed ut tempus arcu, eget ornare ligula.

Ut varius pretium pellentesque. Nam sit amet sapien lobortis nisl faucibus tempor. Curabitur non enim venenatis, euismod elit convallis, auctor sapien. Praesent eget urna sed justo luctus malesuada. In scelerisque metus nibh, ullamcorper efficitur eros fermentum non. Phasellus accumsan congue diam, non fringilla lorem fringilla sit amet. Ut molestie feugiat sagittis. Integer in lobortis justo, et euismod augue. Suspendisse nec euismod lectus, at condimentum magna. Pellentesque eu elementum dui.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Automatic differentiation . . . . .	5
2.2	Denotational semantics . . . . .	6
2.3	Coq . . . . .	7
2.3.1	Language representation . . . . .	8
2.3.2	Dependently-typed programming in Coq . . . . .	9
2.4	Logical relations . . . . .	11
2.5	Related work . . . . .	12
<b>3</b>	<b>Formalizing Forward-Mode AD</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	Simply Typed Lambda Calculus . . . . .	12
3.2	Adding Sums and Primitive Recursion . . . . .	18
3.3	Arrays . . . . .	21
<b>4</b>	<b>Optimization</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Program Transformations . . . . .	24
<b>5</b>	<b>Towards Formalizing Reverse-Mode AD</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1	Formalizing Continuation-Based AD . . . . .	26
5.2	Combinator-Based Source Code Transformation . . . . .	29
<b>6</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>29</b>
6.1	Future Work . . . . .	29
6.2	Conclusion . . . . .	29
<b>A</b>	<b>Language Definitions</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Forward-Mode Macro</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Denotations</b>	<b>29</b>

## 1 Introduction

AI and machine learning research has sparked a lot of new interest in recent times. It has been used in fields such as computer vision, natural language processing, and as opponents in various games such as chess and Go. In machine learning and more specifically neural network research, researchers set up functions between input and output data and through an algorithm called back propagation, try to optimize the network such that it learns how to solve the problem implied by the data. Back propagation makes heavy use of automatic differentiation, but programming in an environment which allows for automatic differentiation can be limited.

Frameworks such as Tangent<sup>1</sup> or autograd<sup>2</sup> make use of source code transformations and operator overloading, which can restrict which high-level optimizations one is able to apply to generated code. Support for higher-order derivatives is also limited.

Programming language research has a rich history with many well-known both high- and low-level optimization techniques such as partial evaluation and deforestation. If instead of a framework, we were to have a programming language that is able to facilitate automatic differentiation, we would be able to apply many of these techniques. Through the use of higher-order functions and type systems, we would also get additional benefits such as code-reusability and correctness.

In this thesis, we will aim to formalize an extendable correctness proof of an implementation of automatic differentiation on a simply-typed lambda calculus in the *Coq* proof assistant, opening up further possibilities for formally proving the correctness of more complex language features in the future. Our formalization is based on a recent proof by Huot, Staton, and Vákár [31]. They proved, using a denotational model of diffeological spaces, that their forward-mode emulating macro is correct when applied to a simply-typed lambda calculus with products, co-products and inductive types.

With this thesis we make the following core contributions:

- Formalize the proofs of both the forward-mode and continuation-based automatic differentiation algorithms specified by Huot, Staton, and Vákár [31] in *Coq*.
- Prove the semantic correctness of various useful compile-time optimizations techniques in the context of generating performant code for automatic differentiation.
- Extend the proofs with the array types and compile-time optimization rules by Shaikhha, et. al.[24].

Chapter 2 includes a background section explaining many of the topics and techniques used in this thesis. The formalization of forward-mode automatic differentiation is given in Chapter 3, starting from a base simply-typed lambda calculus extended with product types and incrementally adding new types and language constructs. Chapters 4 and 5 give formalizations of optimization avenues using respectively program transformations and continuation-based reverse-mode automatic differentiation.

<sup>1</sup> <https://github.com/google/tangent>

<sup>2</sup> <https://github.com/HIPS/autograd>

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Automatic differentiation

Automatic differentiation (AD) has a long and rich history, where its driving motivation is to efficiently calculate the derivatives of functions in a manner that is both correct and fast[19]. There are several different methods of implementing AD algorithms, such as source-code transformations or operator overloading. These algorithms usually transform any program which implements some function to one that calculates its derivative.

There are two main variants of AD, namely forward-mode and reverse-mode AD. In forward-mode AD, every term in the function trace is annotated with the corresponding derivative of that term. These are also known as the respectively the primal and tangent traces. So calculating the partial derivatives of sub-terms is structure preserving with respect to the normal calculation of terms.

This approach to forward-mode AD can be explained by dual numbers as these are, mathematically seen, what we are calculating with[19]. Dual numbers are numbers of the form of

$$x + x'\epsilon$$

where  $x, x' \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\epsilon$  is a nilpotent number, such that  $\epsilon^2 = 0$  and  $\epsilon \neq 0$ . Notably, both primal and tangent values are tracked in this representation, namely the tangent value is present in the coefficients of  $\epsilon$ . As an example, we can see that this is true for both addition and multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned}(x + x'\epsilon) + (y + y'\epsilon) &= (x + y) + (x' + y')\epsilon \\ (x + x'\epsilon)(y + y'\epsilon) &= (xy) + (xy' + yx')\epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Using the following scheme for function application:


$$f(x + x'\epsilon) = f(x) + f'(x)x'\epsilon$$

We can also see that it follows the chain rule for function composition.

$$\begin{aligned}f(g(x + x'\epsilon)) &= f(g(x) + g'(x)x'\epsilon) \\ &= f(g(x)) + f'(g(x))g'(x)x'\epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Using this, we can essentially calculate the derivative of any derivable function by interpreting the non-dual number input  $x$  as its dual number counterpart of  $x + 0\epsilon$ .

To give a more elaborate example of how this works in forward-mode AD, take the function  $f(x, y) = x^2 + (x - y)$  as an example. The dependencies between the terms and operations of the function is visible in the computational graph in Figure 1. The corresponding traces are filled in Table 1 for the input values  $x = 2, y = 1$ . We can calculate the partial derivative  $\frac{\delta f}{\delta x}$  at this point by setting  $x' = 1$  and  $y' = 0$ . In this paper we will prove the correctness of a simple forward-mode automatic differentiation algorithm with respect to the semantics of a simply-typed lambda calculus.

Figure 1: Computational graph of  $f(x, y) = x^2 + (x - y)$ 

Primal trace			Tangent trace		
$v_{-1}$	$= x$	$= 2$	$v'_{-1}$	$= x'$	$= 1$
$v_0$	$= y$	$= 1$	$v'_0$	$= y'$	$= 0$
$v_1$	$= v_{-1}^2$	$= 4$	$v'_1$	$= 2 * v_{-1}$	$= 4$
$v_2$	$= v_{-1} - v_0$	$= 1$	$v'_2$	$= v'_{-1} - v'_0$	$= 1$
$v_3$	$= v_1 + v_2$	$= 5$	$v'_3$	$= v'_1 + v'_2$	$= 5$
$f$	$= v_3$	$= 5$	$f'$	$= v'_3$	$= 5$

Table 1: Primal and tangent traces of  $f(x, y) = x^2 + (x - y)$ 

Reverse-mode automatic differentiation takes a different approach. It works backwards from the output by annotating each intermediate variable  $v_i$  with an adjoint  $v'_i = \frac{\delta y_i}{\delta v_i}$ . To do this, two passes are necessary. Like the forward-mode variant, a primal trace is needed to determine the intermediate variables and their dependencies. The second pass calculates the derivatives by working backwards from the output using the adjoints, also called the adjoint trace.

The optimal choice between automatic differentiation variant is heavily dependent on the specific function being differentiated. Preference is given for forward-mode AD when the number of output variables exceeds the number of input variables, as it has to be rerun for each partial derivative of the function. On the other hand, as reverse-mode AD works backwards, the reverse-pass needs to be redone for each output variable. In machine learning research, reverse-mode AD is generally preferred as the objective functions generally contain a small number of output variables.

## 2.2 Denotational semantics

The notion of denotational semantics tries to find underlying mathematical models able to underpin the concepts known in programming languages. The most well-known example is the solution given by Dana Scott and Christopher Strachey[1] for lambda calculi, also called domain theory. To be able to formalize non-termination and partiality, they thought to use concepts such as partial orderings and least fixed points[28]. In this model, programs are regularly interpreted as partial functions, and recursive computations as taking the fixpoint of such functions. Non-termination, on the other hand, is formalized as a value  $\perp$ .

that is lower in the ordering relation than any other element.

Automatic differentiation introduces a challenge in constructing a denotational semantics as the notion of differentiability needs to be included. If the language under consideration were to be restricted to real-typed terms, cartesian spaces would have been sufficient as any well-typed term  $x_1 : \mathbb{R}, \dots, x_n : \mathbb{R} \vdash t : \mathbb{R}$  could be interpreted as the corresponding smooth function  $\llbracket t \rrbracket : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ . Note that we use  $\mathbb{R}$  as the syntactic type for real numbers, while  $\mathcal{R}$  is its denotational counterpart. This, however, does not work when function types are added as their denotational equivalent, function spaces, are not supported by Cartesian spaces[31]. In the original pen and paper proof of automatic differentiation this thesis is based on by Huot, Staton and Vákár[31], the mathematical models used were diffeological spaces.

For the purpose of this thesis, however, we were able to avoid using diffeological spaces by directly encoding the property of differentiability in the logical relation itself. We were also able to avoid domain theoretical models such as  $\omega$ -cpo's by excluding language constructs such as recursion and iteration where non-termination and partiality come into play. As a part of its type system, *Coq* contains a set-theoretical model available under the sort *Set*, which is satisfactory as the denotational semantics for our language.

Because we use the real numbers as the ground type in our language, we also needed an encoding of the real numbers in *Coq*. The library for real numbers in *Coq* has improved in recent times from one based on a completely axiomatic definition to one involving Cauchy sequences<sup>3</sup>. For the purposes of this thesis, however, we also needed differentiability as the denotational result of applying the macro operation. Instead of attempting to encode this by hand, we opted for the more comprehensive library *Coquelicot*[20], which contains many useful definitions for differentiating functions.

### 2.3 Coq

*Coq* is a proof assistant based on the calculus of constructions type theory created by Thierry Coquand and Gérard Huet[2]. In the past 30 years since it has been released, research has contributed to extending the proof assistant with additional features such as inductive and co-inductive data types[3], dependent pattern matching[15] and advanced modular constructions for organizing large mathematical proofs[14][18].

The core of this type theory is based on constructive logic and so many of the laws known in classical logic are not provable. An example includes the law of the excluded middle,  $\forall A, A \vee \neg A$ . In most cases they can, however, be safely added to *Coq* without making its logic inconsistent. Many of these axioms are readily available in the standard library. Due to its usefulness in proving propositions over functions, we will make use of the functional extensionality axiom in *Coq*, which states that functions are equal if they are extensionally equivalent,  $(\forall x, f\ x = g\ x) \rightarrow f = g$ .

<sup>3</sup> <https://coq.inria.fr/library/Coq.Reals.ConstructiveCauchyReals.html>

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{elem\ n\ \Gamma = \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{var } n : \tau} \text{TVAR} \qquad \frac{(\sigma, \Gamma) \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash t : \sigma \rightarrow \tau} \text{TABS} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash t_1\ t_2 : \tau} \text{TAPP}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2: Type-inference rules for a simply-typed lambda calculus using De-Bruijn indices

### 2.3.1 Language representation

When defining a simply-typed lambda calculus, there are two main possibilities[27]. The arguably simpler variant, known as an extrinsic representation, is traditionally the one introduced to new students learning *Coq*. In the extrinsic representation, the terms themselves are untyped and typing judgments are defined separately as relations between the types and terms. A basic example of working with this is given by Pierce, et. al.[21]. This, however, required many additional lemmas and machinery to be proved to be able to work with both substitutions and contexts as these are defined separate from the terms. As an example, the preservation property which states that reduction does not change the type of a term, needs to be proven explicitly. The other approach, also called an intrinsic representation, makes use of just a single well-typed definition. Ill-typed terms are made impossible by the type checker. This representation, while beneficial in the proof load, however complicates much of the normal machinery involved in programming language theory. One example is how one would define operations such as substitutions or weakening.

But even when choosing an intrinsic representation, the problem of variable binding persists. Much meta-theoretical research has been done on possible approaches to this problem each with their own advantages and disadvantages. The POPLmark challenge gives a comprehensive overview of each of the possibilities in various proof assistants[9]. One example of such an approach is the nominal representation where every variable is named. Code snippet 1 gives an example of how one would define a simply-typed lambda calculus in such a representation. While this does follow the standard format used in regular mathematics, problems such as alpha-conversion and capture-avoidance appears.

The approach used in the rest of this thesis is an extension of the De-Bruijn representation which numbers variables relative to the binding lambda term. In this representation the variables are referred to as well-typed De-Bruijn indices. A significant benefit of this representation is that the problems of capture avoidance and alpha equivalence are avoided. As an alternative, instead of using numbers to represent the distance, indices within the typing context can be used to ensure that a variable is always well-typed and well-scoped. While the idea of using type indexed terms has been both described and used by many authors[6][8][10], the specific formulation used in this thesis using separate substitution and renaming operations was fleshed out in *Coq* by Nick Benton, et. al.[16], and was also



```

Inductive ty : Type :=
  | unit : ty
  |  $\Rightarrow$  : ty  $\rightarrow$  ty  $\rightarrow$  ty.

Inductive tm : Type :=
  | var : string  $\rightarrow$  tm
  | abs : string  $\rightarrow$  ty  $\rightarrow$  tm  $\rightarrow$  tm
  | app : tm  $\rightarrow$  tm  $\rightarrow$  tm.

```

Code snippet 1: Simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus using an nominal extrinsic representation.

used as one of the examples in the second POPLmark challenge which deals with logical relations[22]. While this does avoid the problems present in the nominal representation, it unfortunately does have some problems of its own. Variable substitutions have to be defined using two separate renaming and substitution operations. Renaming is formulated as extending the typing context of variables, while substitution actually swaps the variables for terms. Due to using indices from the context as variables, some lifting boilerplate is required to manipulate contexts.

```

Inductive  $\tau \in \Gamma$  : Type :=
  | Top :  $\forall \Gamma \tau, \tau \in (\tau :: \Gamma)$ 
  | Pop :  $\forall \Gamma \tau \sigma, \tau \in \Gamma \rightarrow \tau \in (\sigma :: \Gamma)$ .

Inductive tm  $\Gamma \tau$  : Type :=
  | var :  $\forall \Gamma \tau, \tau \in \Gamma \rightarrow \text{tm } \Gamma \tau$ 
  | abs :  $\forall \Gamma \tau \sigma, \text{tm } (\sigma :: \Gamma) \tau \rightarrow \text{tm } \Gamma (\sigma \Rightarrow \tau)$ 
  | app :  $\forall \Gamma \tau \sigma, \text{tm } \Gamma (\sigma \Rightarrow \tau) \rightarrow \text{tm } \Gamma \sigma \rightarrow \text{tm } \Gamma \tau$ .

```

Code snippet 2: Basis of a simply-typed  $\lambda$ -calculus using the strongly typed intrinsic formulation.

### 2.3.2 Dependently-typed programming in Coq

In *Coq*, one can normally write function definitions using either case-analysis as is done in other functional languages, or using *Coq*'s tactics language. Using the standard case-analysis functionality can cause the code to be complicated and verbose, even more so when proof terms are present in the function signature. This has been caused by the previously poor support in *Coq* for dependent pattern matching. Using the `return` keyword, one is able to vary the result type of a match expression. But due to requirement *Coq* used to

```

Inductive ilist : Type → nat → Type :=
| nil : ∀ A, ilist A 0
| cons : ∀ A n, A → ilist A n → ilist A (S n)

```

```

Definition hd' {A} n (ls : ilist A n) :=
  match ls in (ilist A n) return
    (match n with
      | 0 => unit
      | S _ => A end) with
  | nil => tt
  | cons h _ => h
end.

```

```

Definition hd {A} n (ls : ilist A (S n)) : A := hd' n ls.

```

Code snippet 3: Definition of a length indexed list and hd using the return keyword, adapted from Certified Programming with Dependent Types[17].

have that case expressions be syntactically total, this could be very difficult to work with. One other possibility would be to write the function as a relation between its input and output. This also has its limitations as you then lose computability as *Coq* treats these definitions opaquely. In this case the standard `simpl` tactic which invokes *Coq*'s reduction mechanism is not able to reduce instances of the term. This often requires the user to write many more proofs to be able to work with the definitions.

As an example, we will work through defining a length indexed list and a corresponding head function limited to lists of length at least one in Snippet 3. Using the *Coq* keyword `return`, it is possible to let the return type of a match expressions depend on the result of one of the type arguments. This makes it possible to define an auxiliary function which, while total on the length of the list, has an incorrect return type. It namely returns the type `unit` if the input list had the length zero. We can then use this auxiliary function in the actual head function by specifying that the list has length at least one. It should be noted that more recent versions of *Coq* do not require that case expressions be syntactically total, so specifying that the input list has a length of at least zero is enough to eliminate the requirement for the zero-case.

Mathieu Sozeau introduces an extension to *Coq* via a new keyword `Program` which allows the use of case-analysis in more complex definitions[32][12]. To be more specific, it allows definitions to be specified separately from their accompanying proofs, possibly filling them in automatically if possible. While this does improve on the previous situation, using the definitions in proofs can often be unwieldy due to the amount of boilerplate introduced. This makes debugging error messages even harder than it already is in a proof

```

Equations hd {A n} (ls : ilist A n) (pf : n <> 0) : A :=
hd nil pf with pf eq_refl := {};
hd (cons h n) _ := h.

```

Code snippet 4: Definition of `hd` using `Equations`

assistant. This approach was used by Benton in his formulation of strongly typed terms.

Sozeau further improves on this introducing a method for user-friendlier dependently-typed pattern matching in *Coq* in the form of the `Equations` library[15][26]. This introduces *Agda*-like dependent pattern matching with `with`-clauses. It does this by using a notion called coverings, where a covering is a set of equations such that the pattern matchings of the type signature are exhaustive. There are two main ways to integrate this in a dependently typed environment, externally where it is integrated as high-level constructs in the pattern matching core as *Agda* does it, or internally by using the existing type theory and finding witnesses of the covering to prove the definition correct, which is the approach used by Sozeau. Due to the intrinsic typeful representation this paper uses, much of this was invaluable when defining the substitution operators as the regular type checker in *Coq* often had difficulty unifying dependently typed terms in certain cases.

## 2.4 Logical relations

Logical relations arguments are a proof technique often employed when proving programming language properties of statically typed languages[25]. There are two main ways they are used, namely as unary and binary relations. Unary logical relations, also known as logical predicates, are predicates over single terms and are typically used to prove language characteristics such as type safety or strong normalization. Binary logical relations on the other hand are used to prove program equivalences, usually in the context of denotational semantics as we will do. There have been many variations on the versatile technique from syntactic step-indexed relations which have been used to reason about recursive types and general references[11], to open relations which enable working with terms of non-ground type[29][31]. Logical relations in essence are relations between terms defined by induction on their types. A logical relations proof consists of 2 main steps. The first states the terms for which the property is expected to hold are in the relation, while the second states that the property of interest follows from the relation. The second step is easier to prove as it usually follows from the definition of the relation. The first on the other hand, will often require proving a generalized variant, called the fundamental property of the logical relation. In most cases this requires that the relation is correct with respect to applying substitutions.

A well-known logical relations proof is the proof of strong normalization of well-typed terms, which states that all terms eventually terminate. An example of a logical relation used in such a proof using the intrinsic strongly-typed formulation is given in Snippet 5.

```

Equations SN {Γ} τ (t : tm Γ τ): Prop :=
  SN unit t := halts t;
  SN (τ ⇒ σ) t := halts t ∧
    (∀ (s : tm Γ τ), SN τ s → SN σ (app Γ σ τ t s));

```

Code snippet 5: Example of a logical predicate used in a strong normalization proof in the strongly-typed intrinsic representation

Noteworthy is the case for function types, where one needs to prove that applying a function preserves the strong normalization property. If one were to attempt the proof of strong normalization without using logical relations, the proof would get stuck in the cases dealing with function types. More specifically when applying a function term to an argument term which terminates, the induction hypothesis is not strong enough to prove that substituting the argument into the body of the abstraction results in a terminating term.

## 2.5 Related work

While there are proofs of forward-mode AD algorithms[31][29] and many more implementations[24][23], there have been relative few attempts at formalized proofs in proof assistant. In 2002, M. Mayero did a formalized proof of an AD framework in *Fortran* in *Coq*[7]. Their minimal language example included assignments and sequences, and excluded all forms of non-sequential control flow.

## 3 Formalizing Forward-Mode AD

We will explain our formalization of the forward-mode automatic differentiation macro in the following sections. The formal proof will start from a base simply-typed lambda calculus extended with product types and incrementally add both sum and array types. Also included in the final language are natural number types with a primitive recursion principle. Many of the theorems and lemmas introduced in section 3.1 do not change, as they are independent of the specific types and terms included in the language.

### 3.1 Simply Typed Lambda Calculus

As mentioned in the background section 2.3.1, we will make use of De-Brujin indices in an intrinsic representation to formulate our language. We include both addition and multiplication as example operations on the real numbers, but the proofs are easily extensible to other primitive operations. Our base language consists of the classic simply-typed lambda calculus with product types and real numbers.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{elem\ n\ \Gamma = \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{var } n : \tau} \text{TVAR} \qquad \frac{(\sigma, \Gamma) \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{abs } t : \sigma \rightarrow \tau} \text{TABS} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t1 : \sigma \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash t2 : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{app } t1\ t2 : \tau} \text{TAPP} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t1 : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash t2 : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{tuple } t1\ t2 : \tau \times \sigma} \text{TTUPLE} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau \times \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{first } t : \tau} \text{TFST} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau \times \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{second } t : \sigma} \text{TSND} \\
\\
\frac{r \in \mathcal{R}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{rval } r : \mathbb{R}} \text{TRVAL} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash r1 : \mathbb{R} \quad \Gamma \vdash r2 : \mathbb{R}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{add } r1\ r2 : \mathbb{R}} \text{TADD} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash r1 : \mathbb{R} \quad \Gamma \vdash r2 : \mathbb{R}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{mul } r1\ r2 : \mathbb{R}} \text{TMULL}
\end{array}$$

Figure 3: Type-inference rules for the base simply-typed lambda calculus

Both the language constructs and the typing rules for this language are common for a simply-typed lambda calculus, as shown in figure 3. As expected, we include variables, applications, and abstractions in the language using, respectively, the `var`, `app`, and `abs` terms. We work with projection products, whose elimination rules are encoded in the `first` and `second` terms. The `tuple` term is used to represent the introduction rule. For real numbers, `rval` is used to introduce real numbered constants and `add` and `mul` will be used to respectively encode addition and multiplication.

These can be translated into *Coq* definitions in a reasonably straightforward manner, with each case keeping track of both how the typing context and types change. In the `var` case, we need some way to determine what type the variable is referencing. Like many others previously [16][4], instead of using indices into the list accompanied by a proof that the index does not exceed the length of the list, we make use of an inductively defined type evidence to type our variables as shown in code snippet 2. The cases for `app` and `abs` are as expected, where variables in the body of abstractions can reference their respective arguments.

Note that in the original proof by Huot, Staton, and Vákár [31], they made use of n-ary products accompanied by pattern matching expressions. We opted to implement binary projection products, as these are conceptually simpler while still retaining much of the same functionality expected of product types.

```

Inductive tm (Γ : Ctx) : ty → Type :=
...
(* Binary projection products *)
| tuple : forall τ σ,
  tm Γ τ →
  tm Γ σ →
  tm Γ (τ × σ)
| first : forall τ σ, tm Γ (τ × σ) → tm Γ τ
| second : forall τ σ, tm Γ (τ × σ) → tm Γ σ
(* Operations on reals *)
| rval : forall r, tm Γ R
| add : tm Γ R → tm Γ R → tm Γ R
| mul : tm Γ R → tm Γ R → tm Γ R

```

We use the same inductively defined macro on types and terms used by many previous authors to implement the forward-mode automatic differentiation macro[31][29][24]. The forward-mode macro,  $\vec{D}$ , keeps track of both primal and tangent traces using tuples as respectively its first and second elements. In most cases, the macro simply preserves the structure of the language. The cases for real numbers such as addition and multiplication are the exception. Here, the element encoding the tangent trace needs to contain the proper syntactic translation of the derivative of the operation.

Due to the intrinsic nature of our language representation, the macro also needs to be applied to both the types and typing context to ensure that the terms remain well-typed. In other words, for any well-typed term  $\Gamma \vdash t : \tau$ , applying the forward-mode macro results in a well-typed term in the macro-expanded context,  $\vec{D}(\Gamma) \vdash \vec{D}(t) : \vec{D}(\tau)$ .

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\vec{D}(R) = R \times R & \vec{D}(\text{rval } n) = \text{tuple } (\text{rval } n) (\text{rval } 0) \\
\vec{D}(\tau \times \sigma) = \vec{D}(\tau) \times \vec{D}(\sigma) & \vec{D}(\text{add } n \ m) = \text{tuple } (\text{add } n \ m) (\text{add } n' \ m') \\
\vec{D}(\tau \Rightarrow \sigma) = \vec{D}(\tau) \Rightarrow \vec{D}(\sigma) & \vec{D}(\text{mul } n \ m) = \text{tuple } (\text{mul } n \ m) \\
& \quad (\text{add } (\text{mul } n' \ m) (\text{mul } m' \ n)))
\end{array}$$

Figure 4: Macro on base simply-typed lambda calculus

Applying the macro to a term gives the syntactic counterparts of both their primal and tangent denotations as a tuple. These terms can be accessed with projections to implement the various derivative implementations of the operations on real terms included in the language. Note that applying the macro to the case for variables does nothing as the macro is also applied to the typing context, so variables implicitly already reference macro-applied terms.

As we restrict our language to total constructions and excluding concepts such as

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\llbracket R \rrbracket = \mathcal{R} & \llbracket \text{var } v \rrbracket = \lambda x. \text{lookup } \llbracket v \rrbracket x \\
\llbracket \tau \times \sigma \rrbracket = \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \star \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket & \llbracket \text{app } t_1 t_2 \rrbracket = \lambda x. (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket(x))(\llbracket t_2 \rrbracket(x)) \\
\llbracket \tau \Rightarrow \sigma \rrbracket = \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket & \llbracket \text{abs } t \rrbracket = \lambda x y. \llbracket t \rrbracket(y :: x) \\
\llbracket \text{Top} \rrbracket = \text{hd} & \llbracket \text{add } t_1 t_2 \rrbracket = \lambda x. \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket(x) + \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket(x) \\
\llbracket \text{Pop } v \rrbracket = \llbracket v \rrbracket \circ \text{tl} & \llbracket \text{mul } t_1 t_2 \rrbracket = \lambda x. \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket(x) * \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket(x) \\
& \llbracket \text{tuple } t_1 t_2 \rrbracket = \lambda x. (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket(x), \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket(x)) \\
& \llbracket \text{first } t \rrbracket = \lambda x. \text{let } (x, y) = \llbracket t \rrbracket(x) \text{ in } x \\
& \llbracket \text{second } t \rrbracket = \lambda x. \text{let } (x, y) = \llbracket t \rrbracket(x) \text{ in } y
\end{array}$$

Figure 5: Denotations of the base simply-typed lambda calculus

general recursion and iteration, it suffices to give our language a set-theoretic denotational semantics. In this case the types  $R, \Rightarrow, \times$  directly correspond to their *Coq* equivalent, respectively  $\mathcal{R}, \rightarrow, \star$ . Well-typed terms of type  $\tau$ , given typing context  $\Gamma$ , will denote to functions  $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$ .

Denotating the terms in our language now corresponds to finding the appropriate inhabitants in the denotated types. As typing contexts,  $\Gamma$ , are represented by lists of types. The appropriate way to denote these would be to map the denotation function over the list. The resulting heterogeneous list contains the denotations of each type in the list in the correct order. The specific implementation of heterogeneous lists used in the proof corresponds to the one given by Adam Chlipala[17]. In this implementation, heterogeneous lists consist of an underlying list of some type  $A$  and an accompanying function  $A \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , which in our use case are, respectively, the typing context and the denotation function.

When giving the constructs in our language their proper denotations, most of the cases are straightforward. Notable is the case for variables, where we made use of the inductively defined type evidence to type our terms. Remember that to type variables in our term language, we have to also give the exact position of the type we are referencing in the typing context. Similarly as denotations, we are able to transform this positional information to generate a specialized lookup function, which given a valid typing context, gives a term denotation with the correct type. Essentially, we do a lookup into the heterogeneous list of denotations corresponding to the typing context.

```

Equations denote_v  $\Gamma$   $\tau$  ( $v$ :  $\tau \in \Gamma$ ) :  $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$  :=
denote_v (Top  $\Gamma$   $\tau$ ) := hd;
denote_v (Pop  $\Gamma$   $\tau$   $\sigma$   $v$ ) := denote_v  $v$   $\circ$  tl.

```

**Example 1** (Square). *abs (mul (var Top) (var Top)) denotes to the square function  $\lambda x. x * x$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the definition of our denotation functions.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \text{abs } (\text{mul } (\text{var Top}) (\text{var Top})) \rrbracket [] \\
& \equiv \lambda x. \llbracket \text{mul } (\text{var Top}) (\text{var Top}) \rrbracket [x] \\
& \equiv \lambda x. \llbracket \text{var Top} \rrbracket [x] * \llbracket \text{var Top} \rrbracket [x] \\
& \equiv \lambda x. x * x \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Using the denotation rules in Figure 5, syntactically well-typed terms in our language of the form  $x_1 : R, \dots, x_n : R \vdash t : R$  can be interpreted as their corresponding smooth functions  $f : \mathcal{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ . Intuitively, the free variables in the syntactic term  $t$  correspond to the parameters of the denotation function  $f$ .

Although Barthe, et. al.[29] gave a syntactic proof of correctness of the macro, our formal proof follows the more denotational style of proof given by Huot, Staton and Vákár[31]. Likewise, our proof of correctness will follow a similar logical relations argument. While both approaches have their merits, the proof using the denotational semantics requires less technical bookkeeping of open and closed terms.

Informally, the correctness statement of the forward-mode macro will consist of the assertion that the denotation of any macro-applied term of type  $x_1 : R, \dots, x_n : R \vdash t : R$  will result in a pair of both the denotation of the original term and the derivative of that denotation. Note that while both the free variables and result type of the term  $t$  are restricted to type  $R$ ,  $t$  itself can contain subterms of higher-order types.

The logical relation will ensure that both the smoothness property and the derivatives are preserved over higher-order types. We define the logical relation as a type-indexed relation between denotations of both terms and their macro-applied variants, so for any type  $\tau$ ,  $S_\tau$  is the relation between functions  $R \rightarrow \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$  and  $R \rightarrow \llbracket \vec{D}(\tau) \rrbracket$ .

When  $\tau = R$ , the denotation of the macro-applied term should give both the original denotation and its derivative. With function types, as long as the relation is valid for the argument, applying these argument functions to the tracked denotations should preserve the relation. Some care has to be taken in the case for products. Notably, the denotations of the subterms,  $R \rightarrow \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$  and  $R \rightarrow \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$ , should be existentially quantified as these are dependent on the original denotation  $R \rightarrow \llbracket \tau \times \sigma \rrbracket$ .

**Definition 1.** (Logical relation) Denotation functions  $f$  and their corresponding derivatives  $g$  are inductively defined on the structure of our types such that they follow the relation

$$S_\tau(f, g) = \begin{cases} \text{smooth } f \wedge g = \lambda x. (f(x), \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x)) & : \tau = R \\ \exists f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2, & : \tau = \sigma \times \rho \\ \quad S_\sigma(f_1, f_2), S_\rho(g_1, g_2). \\ \quad f = \lambda x. (f_1(x), g_1(x)) \wedge \\ \quad g = \lambda x. (f_2(x), g_2(x)) \\ \forall f_1, f_2. & : \tau = \sigma \rightarrow \rho \\ \quad S_\sigma(f_1, f_2) \Rightarrow \\ \quad S_\rho(\lambda x. f(x)(f_1(x)), \lambda x. f(x)(f_2(x))) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$



The next step involves proving that syntactically well-typed terms are semantically correct. In other words, the relation needs to be proven valid for any term  $x_1 : R, \dots, x_n : R \vdash t : \tau$  and argument function  $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$  such that  $S_\tau(\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f, \llbracket \vec{D}(t) \rrbracket \circ \vec{D}_n \circ f)$ . To properly instantiate the arguments to the denotation of the macro-applied term, an auxiliary function is needed that pairs each constant with their derivative 0. So it transforms the argument function  $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \llbracket R^n \rrbracket$  into one that supplies both the original input value and its accompanying derivative. The full type signature of this auxiliary function is  $\vec{D}_n : (\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \llbracket R^n \rrbracket) \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \llbracket \vec{D}(R)^n \rrbracket$ . Note that  $\tau^n$  is used as syntactic sugar for repeat  $\tau$   $n$  and is simply a typing context consisting of the type  $\tau$  repeated  $n$  times.

$$\vec{D}_n(f, x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & : n = 0 \\ ((hd \circ f)(x), \frac{\partial(hd \circ f)}{\partial x}(x)) :: \vec{D}_{n'}(tl \circ f, x) & : n = n' + 1 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Proving this statement directly by induction on the typing derivation, however, does not work. As expected in a logical relations proof, the indicative issue lies in both the case for applications and abstractions. To make this work, the correctness statement needs to be generalized to arbitrary contexts and implicitly, substitutions. If this were a syntactic proof, one would need to show that the relation is preserved when applying substitutions consisting of arbitrary terms, possibly containing higher-order constructs. In this style of proof, however, the same concept needs to be formulated in a denotational manner.

The key in formulating these denotationally lies in the argument function  $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$ . Previously the function was used to indicate the open variables or function arguments. Generalized to  $\Gamma = x_1 : \tau_1, \dots, x_n : \tau_n$ , this function can be interpreted as supplying for each open variable  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  a corresponding denotated term with type  $\llbracket \tau_1 \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket \tau_n \rrbracket$ . So the argument function now becomes the pair of functions  $s : R \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$  and  $s_D : R \rightarrow \llbracket \vec{D}(\Gamma) \rrbracket$ , which intuitively speaking, form the denotational counterparts of syntactic substitutions. Notably, for the functions  $s$  and  $s_D$  to be valid with respect to the logical relation, they are required to be built from the denotations of terms such that these denotations also follow the logical relation. We phrase this requirement as a definition.

**Definition 2.** (*Instantiation*) *Instantiation functions  $s : R \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$  and  $s_D : R \rightarrow \llbracket \vec{D}(\Gamma) \rrbracket$  are inductively defined such that they follow*

$$inst_\Gamma(f, g) = \begin{cases} f = (\lambda x. [\ ]) \wedge g = (\lambda x. [\ ]) & : \Gamma = [\ ] \\ \forall f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2. & : \Gamma = (\tau :: \Gamma') \\ \quad inst_{\Gamma'}(f_1, g_1) \wedge S_\tau(f_2, g_2) & \\ \quad \rightarrow f = (\lambda x. f_2(x) :: f_1(x)) \wedge & \\ \quad g = (\lambda x. g_2(x) :: g_1(x)) & \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Using this notion of instantiations we can now formulate our fundamental lemma. Informally, this states that given correct instantiation functions any well-typed term is semantically correct with respect to the logical relation.

**Lemma 1** (Substitution). *For any well-typed term  $\Gamma \vdash t : \tau$ , and instantiation functions  $s : R \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$  and  $s_D : R \rightarrow \llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\Gamma) \rrbracket$  such that they follow  $inst_\Gamma(s, s_D)$ , we have that  $S_\tau(\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ s, \llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket \circ s_D)$ .*

*Proof.* This is proven by induction on the typing derivation of the well-typed term  $t$ . The majority of cases follow from the induction hypothesis. The case for `var` follows from  $inst$  which ensures that any term referenced is semantically well-typed with respect to the relation. Proving the cases used to encode the operators on reals such as `add` and `mul` involve proving both smoothness and giving the witness of the derivative.  $\square$

We can derive the fundamental property of the base logical relation directly from the substitution lemma. This involves proving the prerequisite  $inst$  we used previously. Note that the correctness of both the macro and the fundamental property is dependent on the requirement that the denotations supplied by the argument function are smooth.

**Corollary 1** (Fundamental property). *For any term  $x_1 : R, \dots, x_n : R \vdash t : R$ ,  $\llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket$  gives the dual number representation of  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ , such that for any argument function  $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$ , we have that  $S_\tau(\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f, \llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket \circ \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n \circ f)$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the substitution lemma. We lastly need to prove  $inst_{(\text{repeat } R \ n)}$ . This is proven by induction on  $n$ . If  $n = 0$ , the goal is trivial due to the argument function  $f$  being extensionally equal to `const []`, which directly corresponds to  $inst_{[]}$ . The induction step is proven by both the induction hypothesis and the assumption that the denotations of the arguments supplied are smooth.  $\square$

**Theorem 1** (Macro correctness). *For any term  $x_1 : R, \dots, x_n : R \vdash t : R$ ,  $\llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket$  gives the dual number representation of  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ , such that for any argument function  $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$ , we have that  $\llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket \circ \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n \circ f = \lambda x. (\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f, \partial(\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f) / \partial x)$ .*

*Proof.* This is proven by showing that the goal follows from the logical relation which itself is implied by the fundamental property.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket \circ \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n \circ f &= \lambda x. (\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f, \partial(\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f) / \partial x) \\ &\vdash (\text{By definition of } S_R \text{ with } f := \llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f \text{ and } g := \llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket \circ \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n \circ f) \\ &S_R(\llbracket t \rrbracket \circ f, \llbracket \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \rrbracket \circ \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n \circ f) \\ &\vdash (\text{Fundamental property (1)}) \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

### 3.2 Adding Sums and Primitive Recursion

Now that correctness has been verified for the base simply-typed lambda calculus, the next goal will be to add in both sum and integer types. In the interest of testing the flexibility

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau <+> \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash t_1 : \tau \Rightarrow \rho \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : \sigma \Rightarrow \rho}{\Gamma \vdash \text{case } e \ t_1 \ t_2 : \rho} \text{TCASE} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } t : \tau <+> \sigma} \text{TIINL} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } t : \tau <+> \sigma} \text{TIINR} \\
\\
\frac{n \in \mathbb{N}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{nval } n : \mathbb{N}} \text{TNVAL} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mathbb{N}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{nsucc } t : \mathbb{N}} \text{TNSucc} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : \tau \Rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash n : \mathbb{N} \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{nrec } f \ n \ t : \tau} \text{TPRIM}
\end{array}$$

Figure 6: Type-inference rules for language constructs for sum types and primitive recursion

of both the representation and the proof technique, natural number types and primitive recursion were also added. The inference rules for the new language constructs added for sum and number types are given in figure 6.

```

Inductive tm (Γ : Ctx) : ty → Type :=
...
(* Sums *)
| case : forall τ σ ρ,
  tm Γ (τ <+> σ) →
  tm Γ (τ ⇒ ρ) →
  tm Γ (σ ⇒ ρ) →
  tm Γ ρ
| inl : forall τ σ,
  tm Γ τ → tm Γ (τ <+> σ)
| inr : forall τ σ,
  tm Γ σ → tm Γ (τ <+> σ)

```

Binary sum types are included in the language using `inl` and `inr` as introducing terms. The `case` term encodes case-analysis given a function term for each possibility. Primitive recursion is implemented using simple integers, where a endomorphic function is recursively applied a bounded number of times to a start value. For convenience, an additional successor function is added in the form of the `nsucc` term.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \tau <+> \sigma \rrbracket &= \llbracket \tau \rrbracket + \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \mathbf{N} \rrbracket &= \mathcal{N} \\
\llbracket \text{case } e \ t_1 \ t_2 \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \begin{cases} (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket(x))(t) & : \llbracket e \rrbracket(x) = \text{inl}(t) \\ (\llbracket t_2 \rrbracket(x))(t) & : \llbracket e \rrbracket(x) = \text{inr}(t) \end{cases} \\
\llbracket \text{inl } t \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \text{inl}(\llbracket t \rrbracket(x)) \\
\llbracket \text{inr } t \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \text{inr}(\llbracket t \rrbracket(x)) \\
\llbracket \text{nval } n \rrbracket &= n \\
\llbracket \text{nsucc } t \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \llbracket t \rrbracket(x) + 1 \\
\llbracket \text{nrec } f \ i \ t \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \text{fold}(\llbracket f \rrbracket(x), \llbracket i \rrbracket(x), \llbracket t \rrbracket(x)) \\
\text{fold}(f, i, t) &= \begin{cases} t & : i = 0 \\ f(\text{fold}(f, i', t)) & : i = i' + 1 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 7: Denotations of the sum and integer terms

```

Inductive tm (Γ : Ctx) : ty → Type :=
...
(* Primitive recursion *)
| nval : forall n, tm Γ N
| nsucc : tm Γ N → tm Γ N
| nrec : forall τ,
  tm Γ (τ ⇒ τ) → tm Γ N → tm Γ τ → tm Γ τ

```

In terms of denotations, case expressions will follow the same lines as app as they both involve applying a function to an argument. Note that the sum term first needs to be destructed to be able to determine which function branch to apply. Both `inl` and `inr` will map to their *Coq* counterparts. For `nrec`, the number of applications should be dependent on the input integer.

Both sums and integer terms are structure preserving with respect to the forward-mode macro. Note that we only take the derivative of values of type `R`, so when integers are encountered, these are largely ignored. More specifically, we do not keep track of derivatives at natural number types as the tangent space is 0-dimensional.

For a similar reason, the logical relation at integer types only needs to establish that the denotations of integer terms tracked by the logical relation, which will be of type  $\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ , are constant. For sum terms, the functions tracked are either the left or right tag of the

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{N}) &= \mathbb{N} \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau <+> \sigma) &= \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) <+> \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{inl } t) &= \text{inl } \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{inr } t) &= \text{inr } \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{case } e \ t_1 \ t_2) &= \text{case } \vec{\mathcal{D}}(e) \ \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t_1) \ \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t_2) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{nval } n) &= \text{nval } n \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{nsucc } nm) &= \text{nsucc } \vec{\mathcal{D}}(n) \ \vec{\mathcal{D}}(m) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{nrec } f \ i \ t) &= \text{nrec } \vec{\mathcal{D}}(f) \ \vec{\mathcal{D}}(i) \ \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 8: Macro on the sum and integer terms

sum. This is neatly defined using a logical disjunction.

$$S_\tau(f, g) = \begin{cases} f = g \wedge \exists n. f = \text{const}(n) & : \tau = \mathbb{N} \\ (\exists f_1, f_2, \\ \quad S_\sigma(f_1, f_2) \wedge f = \text{inl} \circ f_1 \wedge g = \text{inl} \circ g_1) \\ \vee \\ (\exists f_1, f_2, \\ \quad S_\rho(f_1, f_2) \wedge f = \text{inr} \circ f_1 \wedge g = \text{inr} \circ g_1) \end{cases} : \tau = \sigma <+> \rho \quad (4)$$

The only lemma or theorem that requires extension to deal with these new terms is the substitution lemma, as the validity of every other statement is independent of the additional types added to our language. With terms of integer type, the proof for the substitution lemma is trivial using the definition of our denotation functions. The `nrec` case for primitive recursion is only slightly more difficult as case-analysis on the denotation of the iteration term is required, where the 0 and  $n + 1$  case are proven using the induction hypotheses derived from respectively the initial and function terms. As expected with the case term for sums, the denotation of the term under scrutiny needs to be destructured to properly apply the two disjunct induction hypotheses to their respective cases.

### 3.3 Arrays

Automatic differentiation is rarely done on mono-valued real numbers, due to the massive computational power available on GPUs in the form of array operations. So the next extension worth considering in our language are the array types. To be more specific, we will be considering the array types and terms presented by Shaikhha, et. al.[24].

This final iteration of our simply-typed lambda calculus differs from the  $\tilde{F}$  language given by Shaikhha, et. al. only superficially. We can define both their `ifold` and `let`

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : \text{Fin } n \rightarrow \text{tm} \Gamma \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{build } n f : \text{Array } n \tau} \text{TBUILD} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \text{Array } n \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash i : \text{Fin } n}{\Gamma \vdash \text{get } i t : \tau} \text{TGET}
\end{array}$$

Figure 9: Type-inference rules for array construction and indexing

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{Array } n R) &= \text{Array } n \vec{\mathcal{D}}(R) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{build } n f) &= \text{build } n (\vec{\mathcal{D}} \circ f) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}(\text{get } i t) &= \text{get } i \vec{\mathcal{D}}(t)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 10: Macro on array construction and indexing terms

constructs as syntactic sugar:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{let } e \text{ } t &\equiv \text{app } (\text{abs } t) e \\
\text{ifold } f \text{ } n \text{ } d &\equiv \text{nrec } (\text{app } (\text{abs } (\text{app } f \text{ } (\text{nsucc } (\text{var Top})))) (\text{nval } 0)) n \text{ } d
\end{aligned}$$

Note that due to our nameless representation, `let` terms lose much of their original usefulness in writing programs. Nonetheless, we included it to help formulate some of the program optimizations used in the final system. We also omit much of their cardinality and indexing constructions due to our shallow embedding of arrays. The well-typed nature of our representation allows us to avoid much of the hairy details associated with bounds checking both indexing and array creation. To accomplish this, we use the `Fin` inductive datatype which is indexed by an upper-bound and represents for some  $n$ , the range  $[1..n]$ .

Both the macro and denotation functions deviate slightly from how the previous terms were defined. When looking at the macro, while it previously sufficed to recursively call the macro on subterms, this is not possible as the subterm of interest is now a function. This can be solved by substituting the function by a composition of itself combined with the forward-mode macro, essentially applying the macro to every possible result of the function.

Similarly for denotations, the denotation function, instantiated to the correct type, has to be passed along to an auxiliary function that builds up a vector of denotation terms. Appropriately, array types will denote to vectors indexed by length. There is some additional boilerplate necessary to circumvent the structurally recursive requirement imposed by the *Coq* type checker. Note that in the definition of *vect*, the *Fin* and *nat* types are treated interchangeably, where `Fin  $n$`  is treated as the type level integer corresponding

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{Array } n \ \tau \rrbracket &= \text{vector}(n, \llbracket \tau \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \text{build } n \ f \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \text{vect}(n, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket \circ f, x) \\
\llbracket \text{get } i \ t \rrbracket &= \lambda x. \llbracket t \rrbracket(x) ! i \\
\text{vect}(i, f, x) &= \begin{cases} [] & : i = 0 \\ f(i, x) :: \text{vect}(i', \lambda j. f(j+1), x) & : i = i' + 1 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 11: Denotations of the array construction and indexing terms

to a  $n : \mathcal{N}$ . So every  $n : \mathcal{N}$  is transformed to 1 in the corresponding  $\text{Fin } n$ , and any  $i : \text{Fin } n$  is transformed to  $n$ .

The logical relation for array types needs to exhibit the same behavior with respect to both construction and indexing in how it preserves the relation on subterms. This is accomplished by first and foremost, quantifying over the indices possible for the vector denotation. Next, each subdenotation needs to both preserve the relation and be extensionally equal to the appropriate projection of the term.

$$S_\tau(f, g) = \begin{cases} \forall i. \exists f_1, g_1. & : \tau = \text{Array } n \ \sigma \\ S_\sigma(f_1, g_1) \wedge & \\ f_1 = \lambda x. f(x) ! i \wedge & \\ f_1 = \lambda x. g(x) ! i & \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

As was the case for sum types, only the proof of the substitution lemma needs to be extended. The proof for the array terms proceeds as follows. For `build`, we first do induction on  $n$ , the length of the array. The base case is trivial, as  $\text{Fin } 0$  contains 0 inhabitants. For the induction step, we first do case-analysis on the indices,  $i$ , where the  $(+1)$  case follows from the induction hypothesis. For  $i = 1$  it suffices to give the proper inhabitants using the induction hypothesis derived from the function used for construction.

## 4 Optimization

Shaikhha, et. al. have presented a small system which has proven to be very performant[24]. They empirically showed that forward-mode AD can approach the performance of reverse-mode AD, even if the forward-mode algorithm has to be executed  $n$  times to calculate the  $n$  partial derivatives of a function. In Section 3.3 we already formalized one of the critical components of their system, namely their usage of array types. Next, we will prove that the various program transformation rules they use to drastically reduce the number of calculations needed, are sound.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{add } t_1 \ t_2 \rightsquigarrow \text{add } t_2 \ t_1 & t \Downarrow t' \rightarrow t \rightsquigarrow t' \\
\text{add } 0 \ t \rightsquigarrow t & \text{(b) Reuse rewriting rules from operational semantics} \\
\text{add } t \ (-t) \rightsquigarrow 0 & \\
\text{mul } t_1 \ t_2 \rightsquigarrow \text{mul } t_2 \ t_1 & \\
\text{add } (\text{mul } t \ t_1) \ (\text{mul } t \ t_2) & t \rightsquigarrow t' \rightarrow \text{abs } t \rightsquigarrow \text{abs } t' \\
\rightsquigarrow \text{mul } t \ (\text{add } t_1 \ t_2) & \text{(c) Partial evaluation on functions} \\
\text{mul } 0 \ t \rightsquigarrow 0 & \\
\text{mul } 1 \ t \rightsquigarrow t & \text{get } i \ (\text{build } n \ f) \rightsquigarrow f \ i \\
& \text{(d) Loop fusion} \\
\text{ifold } (\text{abs } (\text{abs } (\text{tuple} & \\
\text{(app (app } f \ (\text{var } (\text{Pop } \text{Top})))) \ (\text{first } (\text{var } \text{Top})))) & \\
\text{(app (app } f \ (\text{var } (\text{Pop } \text{Top})))) \ (\text{second } (\text{var } \text{Top})))))) \ i \ (\text{tuple } z_1 \ z_2) & \\
\rightsquigarrow \text{tuple } (\text{ifold } f \ i \ z_1) \ (\text{ifold } f \ i \ z_2) & \\
& \text{(e) Loop fission}
\end{array}$$

Figure 12: Included rewrite rules for the simply-typed lambda calculus extended with sum, product, number and array types

#### 4.1 Program Transformations

The transformation rules consist of several algebraic identities, along with compile time optimization techniques such as partial evaluation and deforestation or loop fusion.

As a small deviation from the rules given by Shaikhha, et. al.[24], we explicitly included some simplification rules in the style of a natural semantics. Figures 12 and 13 show, respectively, the rewrite rules we included in our language and the inference rules we used for our simplification rules.

Before we can prove soundness of our rewrite rules, we have to prove soundness of our natural semantics. We reuse the denotational semantics from Section 3 we used to prove the forward-mode algorithm correct.

**Lemma 2** (Soundness of natural semantics). *For any well-typed terms  $t, t'$  such that  $t \Downarrow t'$  holds, we have  $\llbracket t \rrbracket = \llbracket t' \rrbracket$ .*

*Proof.* This is proven by induction on the evaluation relation  $\Downarrow$ . All of the cases follow from the induction hypotheses after simplification.  $\square$



$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{t_1 \Downarrow \text{abs } t'_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow t'_2}{\text{app } t_1 \ t_2 \Downarrow \text{substitute } t'_2 \ t'_1} \text{EVA\_APP\_ABS} \quad \frac{t \Downarrow \text{nval } n}{\text{nsucc } t \Downarrow \text{nval } (n+1)} \text{EVS\_SUCC} \\
\\
\frac{t_1 \Downarrow t'_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow \text{nval } 0 \quad t_3 \Downarrow t'_3}{\text{nrec } t_1 \ t_2 \ t_3 \Downarrow t_3} \text{EVN\_REC0} \\
\\
\frac{t_1 \Downarrow t'_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow \text{nval } (n+1) \quad t_3 \Downarrow t'_3}{\text{nrec } t_1 \ t_2 \ t_3 \Downarrow \text{app } t'_1 \ (\text{nrec } t'_1 \ (\text{nval } n) \ t'_3)} \text{EVN\_RECS} \\
\\
\frac{t_1 \Downarrow \text{rval } r_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow \text{rval } r_2}{\text{add } t_1 \ t_2 \Downarrow \text{rval } r_1 + r_2} \text{EVA\_ADD} \quad \frac{t_1 \Downarrow \text{rval } r_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow \text{rval } r_2}{\text{mul } t_1 \ t_2 \Downarrow \text{rval } r_1 * r_2} \text{EVM\_MULT} \\
\\
\frac{t_1 \Downarrow t'_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow t'_2}{\text{tuple } t_1 \ t_2 \Downarrow \text{tuple } t'_1 \ t'_2} \text{EVT\_TUPLE} \\
\\
\frac{t \Downarrow \text{tuple } t_1 \ t_2}{\text{first } t \Downarrow t_1} \text{EVF\_ST} \quad \frac{t \Downarrow \text{tuple } t_1 \ t_2}{\text{second } t \Downarrow t_2} \text{EVS\_ND} \\
\\
\frac{t \Downarrow t'}{\text{inl } t \Downarrow \text{inl } t'} \text{EVI\_NL} \quad \frac{t \Downarrow t'}{\text{inr } t \Downarrow \text{inr } t'} \text{EVI\_NR} \\
\\
\frac{t \Downarrow \text{inl } t' \quad t_1 \Downarrow t'_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow t'_2}{\text{case } t \ t_1 \ t_2 \Downarrow \text{app } t'_1 \ t'} \text{EVC\_CASE\_INL} \\
\\
\frac{t \Downarrow \text{inr } t' \quad t_1 \Downarrow t'_1 \quad t_2 \Downarrow t'_2}{\text{case } t \ t_1 \ t_2 \Downarrow \text{app } t'_2 \ t'} \text{EVC\_CASE\_INR}
\end{array}$$

Figure 13: Inference rules for the evaluation relation

**Theorem 2** (Soundness of program transformations). *For any well-typed terms  $t, t'$  such that  $t \rightsquigarrow t'$  holds, we have  $\llbracket t \rrbracket = \llbracket t' \rrbracket$ .*

*Proof.* This is proven by induction on the rewriting relation  $\Downarrow$ . Most of the cases follow from the induction hypothesis. The rewrite rule where we incorporated the evaluation relation is proven by Lemma 2. The rewrite rules associated with algebraic identities are proven by exactly those identities after simplifying using the denotational semantics.

For the loop fusion rule, we first do induction on the index,  $i$ . For  $i = 0$ , we use case-analysis on  $n$  along with simple rewriting to prove the goal. The induction step is proven by the induction hypothesis. Similarly for the loop fission rule, we have to do induction on the denotation of the term used to encode the number of iterations. The base case is trivial and the induction step is proven by the induction hypothesis.  $\square$

## 5 Towards Formalizing Reverse-Mode AD

There have been attempts at reverse-mode algorithms that operate on simply-typed lambda calculi **ShiftResetBackpropagator**[30][13], but these often make use of unconventional semantics such as mutable state or delimited continuations.

Huot, Staton and Vákár showed the versatility of their denotational semantics on a continuation-based automatic differentiation algorithm, whose origin can be traced back to the implementation given by Karczmarszuk[5]. While this algorithm does calculate gradients, it is not true a reverse-mode AD algorithm, as their resulting computation graphs differ[13]. Nonetheless, it is useful to prove correctness of this algorithm in terms of what we have already established, to show the versatility of our proofs and, by extension, the simple set-theoretic denotational semantics. This is done in Section 5.1. A novel reverse-mode algorithm posed by Vákár along with an attempt at a formal proof in *Coq*, is discussed in Section 5.2.

### 5.1 Formalizing Continuation-Based AD

The guiding principle in this algorithm is to build up the reverse pass as a continuation using a macro on the program. Like the forward-mode macro  $\vec{D}$ , the continuation-based macro  $\vec{D}^c$  is structure preserving and works with tuples at ground type  $R$ . But unlike the forward-mode macro, which uses these tuples to represent dual-numbers, the continuation-based macro pairs the primal values with a continuation calculating all of the perturbation values. Notably, because the macro calculates the perturbation values with respect to each of the input variables, the macro is also indexed by the number of input variables.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(R) = R \times (R \Rightarrow \text{Array } n \, R) & \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\text{rval } r) = \text{tuple } (\text{rval } r) \, (\text{rval } 0) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\tau \times \sigma) = \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) \times \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) & \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\text{add } r_1 \, r_2) = \text{tuple } (\text{add } r_1 \, r_2) \, (\text{add } r'_1 \, r'_2) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\tau <+> \sigma) = \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) <+> \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) & \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\text{mul } r_1 \, r_2) = \text{tuple } (\text{mul } r_1 \, r_2) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\tau \Rightarrow \sigma) = \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) \Rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) & \quad (\text{add } (\text{mul } r'_1 \, r_2) \, (\text{mul } r'_2 \, r_1))) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\text{Array } m \, \tau) = \text{Array } m \, \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\tau) &
\end{array}$$

Figure 14: Continuation-based macro on the simply-typed lambda calculus extended with array types

As we will phrase correctness in terms of the forward-mode macro, the forward-mode macro used in Section 3.1 has to be slightly altered to calculate the partial derivatives with respect to all of the input variables. This change is slight, and merely swaps what was previously the tangent value for a vector of the tangent values corresponding to the input variables. The operations of reals are then swapped out for their vector element-wise counterparts. The modified forward-mode macro is shown in Figure 15.

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(R) &= R \times \text{Array } n \ R \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(\tau \times \sigma) &= \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) \times \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(\tau <+> \sigma) &= \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) <+> \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(\tau \Rightarrow \sigma) &= \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) \Rightarrow \vec{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(\text{Array } m \ \tau) &= \text{Array } m \ \vec{\mathcal{D}}_n^c(\tau)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(\text{rval } r) &= \text{tuple } (\text{rval } r) (\text{build } n \ (\text{fun } \_ \Rightarrow 0)) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(\text{add } r_1 \ r_2) &= \text{tuple } (\text{add } r_1 \ r_2) (\text{vector\_add } r'_1 \ r'_2) \\
\vec{\mathcal{D}}_n(\text{mul } r_1 \ r_2) &= \text{tuple } (\text{mul } r_1 \ r_2) \\
&\quad (\text{vector\_add } (\text{vector\_scale } r_2 \ r'_1) (\text{vector\_scale } r_1 \ r'_2))
\end{aligned}$$

(a) Forward-mode macro calculating all partial derivatives

**Definition** `vector_map`  $\Gamma \ \tau \ \sigma \ n \ (a : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ \tau))$   
 $(f : \text{tm } \Gamma \ \tau \rightarrow \text{tm } \Gamma \ \sigma) : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ \sigma) :=$   
`build n (fun i => f (get i a)).`

**Definition** `vector_map2`  $\Gamma \ \tau \ \sigma \ \rho \ n$   
 $(a1 : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ \tau)) \ (a2 : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ \sigma))$   
 $(f : \text{tm } \Gamma \ \tau \rightarrow \text{tm } \Gamma \ \sigma \rightarrow \text{tm } \Gamma \ \rho) : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ \rho) :=$   
`build n (fun i => f (get i a1) (get i a2)).`

**Definition** `vector_add`  $\Gamma \ n$   
 $(a1 \ a2 : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ R)) : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ R) := \text{vector\_map2 } a1 \ a2 \ \text{add}.$

**Definition** `vector_scale`  $\Gamma \ n \ (s : \text{tm } \Gamma \ R)$   
 $(a : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ R)) : \text{tm } \Gamma \ (\text{Array } n \ R) := \text{vector\_map } a \ (\text{mul } s).$

(b) Helper functions on array types

Figure 15: Continuation-based macro on the simply-typed lambda calculus extended with array types

As we work with the same denotational semantics as in our proof in Section 3.1, the usage of an argument supplying function  $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^n$  makes a reappearance. Unlike last time, however, the arguments have to be massaged to fit both the forward and the reverse-mode macro.

## 5.2 Combinator-Based Source Code Transformation

## 6 Discussion

### 6.1 Future Work

### 6.2 Conclusion

## A Language Definitions

## B Forward-Mode Macro

## C Denotations

## References

- [1] D. Scott, “Outline of a mathematical theory of computation”, *Kiberneticheskij Sbornik. Novaya Seriya*, vol. 14, Jan. 1977 (cit. on p. 6).
- [2] T. Coquand and G. Huet, “The calculus of constructions”, *Information and Computation*, vol. 76, no. 2-3, pp. 95–120, Feb. 1988. DOI: 10.1016/0890-5401(88)90005-3. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(88\)90005-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(88)90005-3) (cit. on p. 7).
- [3] T. Coquand and C. Paulin, “Inductively defined types”, in *COLOG-88*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1990, pp. 50–66. DOI: 10.1007/3-540-52335-9\_47. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-52335-9\\_47](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-52335-9_47) (cit. on p. 7).
- [4] T. Coquand and P. Dybjer, “Inductive definitions and type theory an introduction (preliminary version)”, in *Foundation of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, P. S. Thiagarajan, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1994, pp. 60–76, ISBN: 978-3-540-49054-8 (cit. on p. 13).
- [5] J. Karczmarczuk, “Functional differentiation of computer programs”, in *Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation*, 1998, pp. 195–203 (cit. on p. 26).
- [6] T. Altenkirch and B. Reus, “Monadic presentations of lambda terms using generalized inductive types”, in *Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop and 8th Annual Conference of the EACSL on Computer Science Logic*, ser. CSL ’99, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1999, pp. 453–468, ISBN: 3540665366 (cit. on p. 8).
- [7] M. Mayero, “Using theorem proving for numerical analysis correctness proof of an automatic differentiation algorithm”, in *Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics*, V. A. Carreño, C. A. Muñoz, and S. Tahar, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 246–262, ISBN: 978-3-540-45685-8 (cit. on p. 12).
- [8] C. McBride and J. McKinna, “The view from the left”, *J. Funct. Program.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 69–111, Jan. 2004, ISSN: 0956-7968. DOI: 10.1017/S0956796803004829. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796803004829> (cit. on p. 8).

- [9] B. E. Aydemir, A. Bohannon, M. Fairbairn, J. N. Foster, B. C. Pierce, P. Sewell, D. Vytiniotis, G. Washburn, S. Weirich, and S. Zdancewic, “Mechanized metatheory for the masses: The PoplMark challenge”, in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 50–65. doi: 10.1007/11541868\_4. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/11541868\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/11541868_4) (cit. on p. 8).
- [10] R. Adams, “Formalized metatheory with terms represented by an indexed family of types”, in *Types for Proofs and Programs*, J.-C. Filliâtre, C. Paulin-Mohring, and B. Werner, Eds., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 1–16, ISBN: 978-3-540-31429-5 (cit. on p. 8).
- [11] A. Ahmed, “Step-indexed syntactic logical relations for recursive and quantified types”, in *Programming Languages and Systems*, P. Sestoft, Ed., Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 69–83, ISBN: 978-3-540-33096-7 (cit. on p. 11).
- [12] M. Sozeau, “Program-ing finger trees in coq”, *SIGPLAN Not.*, vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 13–24, Oct. 2007, ISSN: 0362-1340. doi: 10.1145/1291220.1291156. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1291220.1291156> (cit. on p. 10).
- [13] B. Pearlmutter and J. Siskind, “Reverse-mode ad in a functional framework: Lambda the ultimate backpropagator”, *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, vol. 30, Jan. 2008 (cit. on p. 26).
- [14] M. Sozeau and N. Oury, “First-class type classes”, in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 278–293. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-71067-7\_23. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71067-7\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71067-7_23) (cit. on p. 7).
- [15] M. Sozeau, “Equations: A dependent pattern-matching compiler”, in *Interactive Theorem Proving*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 419–434. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-14052-5\_29. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14052-5\\_29](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14052-5_29) (cit. on pp. 7, 11).
- [16] N. Benton, C.-K. Hur, A. J. Kennedy, and C. McBride, “Strongly typed term representations in coq”, *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 141–159, Mar. 2011. doi: 10.1007/s10817-011-9219-0. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10817-011-9219-0> (cit. on pp. 8, 13).
- [17] A. Chlipala, *Certified Programming with Dependent Types: A Pragmatic Introduction to the Coq Proof Assistant*. The MIT Press, 2013, ISBN: 0262026651 (cit. on pp. 10, 15).
- [18] A. Mahboubi and E. Tassi, “Canonical structures for the working Coq user”, in *Interactive Theorem Proving*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 19–34. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-39634-2\_5. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39634-2\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39634-2_5) (cit. on p. 7).
- [19] A. G. Baydin, B. A. Pearlmutter, A. Radul, and J. M. Siskind, “Automatic differentiation in machine learning: A survey”, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 18, 153:1–153:43, 2015 (cit. on p. 5).

- [20] S. Boldo, C. Lelay, and G. Melquiond, “Coquelicot: A user-friendly library of real analysis for coq”, *Mathematics in Computer Science*, vol. 9, pp. 41–62, 2015 (cit. on p. 7).
- [21] B. C. Pierce, A. A. de Amorim, C. Casinghino, M. Gaboardi, M. Greenberg, C. Hrițcu, V. Sjöberg, A. Tolmach, and B. Yorgey, *Programming Language Foundations*, ser. Software Foundations series, volume 2. Electronic textbook, May 2018, ch. Stlc (cit. on p. 8).
- [22] A. Abel, G. Allais, A. Hameer, B. Pientka, A. Momigliano, S. Schäfer, and K. Stark, “Poplmark reloaded: Mechanizing proofs by logical relations”, *Journal of Functional Programming*, vol. 29, e19, 2019. DOI: 10.1017/S0956796819000170 (cit. on p. 9).
- [23] C. C. Margossian, “A review of automatic differentiation and its efficient implementation”, *ArXiv*, vol. abs/1811.05031, 2019 (cit. on p. 12).
- [24] A. Shaikhha, A. Fitzgibbon, D. Vytiniotis, and S. Jones, “Efficient differentiable programming in a functional array-processing language”, *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 3, pp. 1–30, Jul. 2019. DOI: 10.1145/3341701 (cit. on pp. 4, 12, 14, 21, 23, 24).
- [25] L. Skorstengaard, *An introduction to logical relations*, 2019. arXiv: 1907.11133 [cs.PL] (cit. on p. 11).
- [26] M. Sozeau and C. Mangin, “Equations reloaded: High-level dependently-typed functional programming and proving in coq”, *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 3, no. ICFP, pp. 1–29, Jul. 2019. DOI: 10.1145/3341690. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341690> (cit. on p. 11).
- [27] P. Wadler and W. Kokke, *Programming Language Foundations in Agda*. 2019, Available at <http://plfa.inf.ed.ac.uk/> (cit. on p. 8).
- [28] A. Aaby, “Introduction to programming languages”, *Syntax Imperative Programming Concurrent Programming Object-Oriented Programming Evaluation*, vol. 3, Apr. 2020 (cit. on p. 6).
- [29] G. Barthe, R. Crubillé, U. D. Lago, and F. Gavazzo, *On the versatility of open logical relations: Continuity, automatic differentiation, and a containment theorem*, 2020. arXiv: 2002.08489 [cs.PL] (cit. on pp. 11, 12, 14, 16).
- [30] A. Brunel, D. Mazza, and M. Pagani, “Backpropagation in the simply typed lambda-calculus with linear negation”, *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 4, pp. 1–27, 2020 (cit. on p. 26).
- [31] M. Huot, S. Staton, and M. Vákár, *Correctness of automatic differentiation via diffeologies and categorical gluing*, 2020. arXiv: 2001.02209 [cs.PL] (cit. on pp. 4, 7, 11–14, 16).
- [32] M. Sozeau, “Subset coercions in coq”, in *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 237–252. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-74464-1\_16. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74464-1\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74464-1_16) (cit. on p. 10).