Mechanising Recursion Schemes with Magic-Free Coq Extraction

David Castro-Perez, Marco Paviotti, and Michael Vollmer

d.castro-perez@kent.ac.uk

02-05-2024

University of Kent

Background

Hylomorphisms

Fold over Lists

One way to guarantee **recursive functions** are **well-defined** is via **Recursion Schemes**.

```
foldr :: (a -> b -> b) -> b -> [a] -> b
foldr g b [] = b
foldr g b (x : xs) = g x (foldr g b xs)
```

There are many different kinds of Recursion Schemes (e.g. Folds, Paramorphisms, Unfolds, Apomorphisms, . . .)

Folds as Initial Algebras

```haskell
data Fix f = In { inOp :: f (Fix f) }

fold :: Functor f =>
          (f x -> x) ->
          Fix f ->
          x
fold a = a . fmap (fold a) . inOp
```

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\texttt{f (Fix f)} \arrow[r, dotted] \arrow[d, "\texttt{In}"] & \texttt{f x} \arrow[d, "\texttt{a}"] \\
\texttt{Fix f} \arrow[r, dotted] & \texttt{x}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Folds as Initial Algebras

Least Fixed-Point

`Fix f` $\cong$ `f (Fix f)`

```haskell
data Fix f = In { inOp :: f (Fix f) }

fold :: Functor f =>
          (f x -> x) ->
          Fix f ->
          x
fold a = a . fmap (fold a) . inOp
```

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\texttt{f (Fix f)} \arrow[r, dotted] \arrow[d, "\texttt{In}"] & \texttt{f x} \arrow[d, "\texttt{a}"] \\
\texttt{Fix f} \arrow[r, dotted] & \texttt{x}
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Folds as Initial Algebras

```haskell
data Fix f = In { inOp :: f (Fix f) }

fold :: Functor f =>
            (f x -> x) ->
            Fix f ->
            x
fold a = a . fmap (fold a) . inOp
```

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathtt{f\ (Fix\ f)} \arrow[r, dotted] \arrow[d, "\mathtt{In}"] & \mathtt{f\ x} \arrow[d, "\mathtt{a}"] \\
\mathtt{Fix\ f} \arrow[r, dotted] & \mathtt{x}
\end{tikzcd}$$

f-algebra

Hylomorphisms: Divide-and-conquer Computations

```haskell
hylo :: Functor f =>
          (f b -> b) ->
          (a -> f a) ->
          a -> b
hylo a c = a . fmap (hylo a c) . c
```

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathtt{f\ a} \arrow[r, dotted] & \mathtt{f\ b} \arrow[d, "\mathtt{a}"] \\
\mathtt{a} \arrow[u, "\mathtt{c}"] \arrow[r, dotted] & \mathtt{b}
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Hylomorphisms: Divide-and-conquer Computations

```haskell
hylo :: Functor f =>
          (f b -> b) ->
          (a -> f a) ->
          a -> b
hylo a c = a . fmap (hylo a c) . c
```

$$\begin{tikzcd} f\ a \arrow[r, dotted] & f\ b \arrow[d, "a"] \\ a \arrow[u, "c"] \arrow[r, dotted] & b \end{tikzcd}$$

f-algebra
(“divide”)

Hylomorphisms: Divide-and-conquer Computations

```haskell
hylo :: Functor f =>
          (f b -> b) ->
          (a -> f a) ->
          a -> b
hylo a c = a . fmap (hylo a c) . c
```

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathtt{f\ a} \arrow[r, dotted] & \mathtt{f\ b} \arrow[d, "\mathtt{a}"] \\
\mathtt{a} \arrow[u, "\mathtt{c}"] \arrow[r, dotted] & \mathtt{b}
\end{tikzcd}
$$

f-coalgebra
(“conquer”)

Folds as Hylomorphisms

f-coalgebra

```haskell
data Fix f = In { inOp :: f (Fix f) }

fold :: Functor f =>
        (f x -> x) ->
        Fix f ->
        x
fold a = a . fmap (fold a) . inOp
```

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\texttt{f (Fix f)} \arrow[r, dotted] & \texttt{f x} \arrow[d, "\texttt{a}"] \\
\texttt{Fix f} \arrow[u, "\texttt{inOp}"] \arrow[r, dotted] & \texttt{x}
\end{tikzcd}
$$

f-algebra

Adjoint Folds

Given an adjunction:

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{D} \arrow[r, bend left, "\mathsf{R}"] \arrow[r, phantom, "\perp"] & \mathcal{C} \arrow[l, bend left, "\mathsf{L}"]
\end{tikzcd}
$$

- There is a correspondence of arrows $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor : \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(L\,A, B) \cong \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, R\,B) : \lceil\cdot\rceil$.
- An initial algebra on the right corresponds to an universal property on the left ($\mu F \cong F\mu F$):
$$\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(L\,\mu F, B) \cong \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mu F, R\,B)$$

Conjugate Hylomorphisms

Every recursion scheme is a conjugate hylomorphism

recursion scheme	*adjunction*	*conjugates*	*para-hylo equation*	*algebra*
(hylo-shift law)	$\mathsf{Id} \dashv \mathsf{Id}$	$\alpha \dashv \alpha$	$x = a \cdot (id \vartriangle \mathsf{D}\, x \cdot \alpha\, C \cdot c) \;:\; A \leftarrow C$	$a : C \times \mathsf{D}\, A \rightarrow A$
mutual recursion	$\Delta \dashv (\times)$	ccf	$x_1 = a_1 \cdot (id \vartriangle \mathsf{D}\,(x_1 \vartriangle x_2) \cdot c) \;:\; A_1 \leftarrow C$ $x_2 = a_2 \cdot (id \vartriangle \mathsf{D}\,(x_1 \vartriangle x_2) \cdot c) \;:\; A_2 \leftarrow C$	$a_1 : C \times \mathsf{D}\,(A_1 \times A_2) \rightarrow A_1$ $a_2 : C \times \mathsf{D}\,(A_1 \times A_2) \rightarrow A_2$
accumulator	$- \times P \dashv (-)^P$	ccf	$x = a \cdot (outl \vartriangle ((\mathsf{D}\,(\Lambda\, x) \cdot c) \times P)) \;:\; A \leftarrow C \times P$	$a : C \times \mathsf{D}\,(A^P) \times P \rightarrow A$
course-of-values (§5.6)	$\mathsf{U}_{\mathsf{D}} \dashv \mathsf{Cofree}_{\mathsf{D}}$	ccf	$x = a \cdot (id \vartriangle \mathsf{D}\,(\mathsf{D}_\infty\, x \cdot [\![c]\!]) \cdot c) \;:\; A \leftarrow C$	$a : C \times \mathsf{D}\,(\mathsf{D}_\infty\, A) \rightarrow A$
finite memo-table (§5.6)	$\mathsf{U}_* \dashv \mathsf{Cofree}_*$	ccf	$x = a \cdot (id \vartriangle \mathsf{D}\,(\mathsf{D}_*\, x \cdot [\![c]\!]_*) \cdot c) \;:\; A \leftarrow C$	$a : C \times \mathsf{D}\,(\mathsf{D}_*\, A) \rightarrow A$

Table 1. Different types of para-hylos building on the canonical control functor (ccf); the coalgebra is $c : C \rightarrow \mathsf{D}\, C$ in each case.

R. Hinze, N. Wu, J. Gibbons: **Conjugate Hylomorphisms - Or: The Mother of All Structured Recursion Schemes**. POPL 2015.

Why Mechanising Hylomorphisms in Coq?

- Structured Recursion Schemes have been used in Haskell to structure functional programs, but they do not ensure termination/productivity
- On the other hand, Coq does not capture all recursive definitions
- The benefits of formalising hylos in Coq is two fold:
  - Giving the Coq programmer a library where for most recursion schemes they do not have to prove termination properties
  - Extracting code into ML/Haskell to provide termination guarantees even in languages with non-termination

Goals

1. Avoiding axioms: functional extensionality, heterogeneous equality, ...
2. Extracting "clean" code: close to what a programmer would have written directly in OCaml.
3. Fixed-points of functors, non-termination, etc.

Goals

1. Avoiding axioms: functional extensionality, heterogeneous equality, ...
2. Extracting "clean" code: close to what a programmer would have written directly in OCaml.
3. Fixed-points of functors, non-termination, etc.

Solutions (the remainder of this talk):

1. Machinery for building setoids, use of decidable predicates, . . .

Goals

1. Avoiding axioms: functional extensionality, heterogeneous equality, ...
2. Extracting "clean" code: close to what a programmer would have written directly in OCaml.
3. Fixed-points of functors, non-termination, etc.

Solutions (the remainder of this talk):

1. Machinery for building setoids, use of decidable predicates, . . .
2. Avoiding type families and indexed types.

Goals

1. Avoiding axioms: functional extensionality, heterogeneous equality, ...
2. Extracting “clean” code: close to what a programmer would have written directly in OCaml.
3. Fixed-points of functors, non-termination, etc.

Solutions (the remainder of this talk):

1. Machinery for building setoids, use of decidable predicates, ...
2. Avoiding type families and indexed types.
3. **Containers** & **recursive coalgebras**

Roadmap

Part I: Extractable Containers in Coq
Part II: Recursive Coalgebras & Coq Hylomorphisms
Part III: Code Extraction & Examples

Part I

Extractable Containers in Coq

Part II

Recursive Coalgebras & Coq Hylomorphisms

Part III

Code Extraction & Examples

Wrap-up