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# Stop thinking about bottoms when writing programs ... 
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## Partiality is an effect

- $A_{\perp}$ - partial computations over $A$.
- Computational monad
- $\eta: A \rightarrow A_{\perp}$ - embed values into partial computations.
- $\perp$ : $A_{\perp}$ - non-terminating computation.
- $A \neq A+1$ !
- Given $f:\left(A \rightarrow B_{\perp}\right) \rightarrow\left(A \rightarrow B_{\perp}\right)$ compute fix $(f): A \rightarrow B_{\perp}$ satisfying fix $(f)=f(f i x(f))$.
- We need that $f$ is continuous.


## Capretta's solution

- Defining the Delay monad coinductively:

$$
\text { Delay : Set } \rightarrow \text { Set }
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \eta: A \rightarrow \operatorname{Delay}(A) \\
& \text { later }: \infty \operatorname{Delay}(A) \rightarrow \operatorname{Delay}(A)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Divergent computation:

$$
\perp=\operatorname{later}(\perp)
$$

- Want to identify computations that differ in a finite number of later.


## Paper <br> Venanzio Capretta <br> General Recursion via Coinductive Types <br> Logical Methods in Computer Science, 2005

## Weak bisimilarity

- Inductively define

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \downarrow: A_{\perp} \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text { Prop } \\
& \eta(a) \downarrow a \\
& p \downarrow a \rightarrow \operatorname{later}(p) \downarrow a
\end{aligned}
$$

- Equivalence relation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \approx: \operatorname{Delay}(A) \rightarrow \operatorname{Delay}(A) \rightarrow \text { Prop } \\
& p \approx q:=\Pi_{a: A}(p \downarrow a \leftrightarrow q \downarrow a)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Quotient types

- Capretta used setoids $=$ a type + an equivalence relation.
- In 2005 we (A.,Capretta,Uustalu) suggested to use quotient types

$$
A_{\perp}: \equiv \operatorname{Delay}(A) / \approx
$$

- We never published a paper about this ...


## Desired properties

- $(-)_{\perp}$ should be a monad.

$$
\gg=: A_{\perp} \rightarrow\left(A \rightarrow B_{\perp}\right) \rightarrow B_{\perp}
$$

- $A_{\perp}$ should be a $\omega$-CPO.

$$
\bigsqcup: \Pi_{f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A_{\perp}}\left(\Pi_{n: \mathbb{N}} f(n) \sqsubseteq f(n+1)\right) \rightarrow A_{\perp}
$$

## TYPES 2015

## Paper based on TYPES talk

James Chapman, Tarmo Uustalu and Niccolò Quotienting the Delay Monad by Weak Bisimilarity Theoretical Aspects of Computing - ICTAC 2015

- Using countable axiom of choice $\mathrm{AC}_{\omega}$ :

$$
\left(\Pi x: \mathbb{N} \cdot \exists y: B \cdot R(x, y) \rightarrow\left(\exists f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow B \cdot \Pi_{x: \mathbb{N}} R(x, f(x))\right)\right.
$$

they show that $(-)_{\perp}$ is a monad.

- $\exists x: A . \Phi(x): \equiv\|\Sigma x: A . \Phi(x)\|$
- $\mathrm{AC}_{\omega}$ is not provable in Type Theory.
- But it can be constructively justified. (unlike general AC)


## Dejavue?

- Similar problem with the Cauchy Reals.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S:=\Sigma f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} . \Pi \epsilon: \mathbb{Q} . \epsilon>0 \rightarrow \exists n: \mathbb{N} .|f(n+1)-f(n)|<\epsilon \\
& (f,-) \sim(g,-): \equiv \Pi \epsilon: \mathbb{Q} \cdot \epsilon>0 \rightarrow \exists n . n \in \mathbb{N} .|f(n)-g(n)|<\epsilon \\
& \mathbb{R}: \equiv S / \sim
\end{aligned}
$$

- Cannot prove in Type Theory that $\mathbb{R}$ is Cauchy complete. Every convergent sequence of reals has a limit.
- Unless we assume countable choice.


## Homotopy Type Theory

Unimalent Foundations of Mathematics


## HITs to the rescue

- Using (set-truncated) higher inductive types we can avoid $A C_{\omega}$.
- We define $\mathbb{R}$ as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \eta: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
& \text { Every convergent sequence in } \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}
\end{aligned}
$$

- We define
- the elements,
- the order relation,
- and equality
at the same time.
- We call this a

Quotient Inductive Type since it isn't higher dimensional in the sense of HoTT.

## Defining $A_{\perp}$ as a QIT

$A_{\perp}:$ Set
$\sqsubseteq: A_{\perp} \rightarrow A_{\perp} \rightarrow$ Prop
$\perp: A_{\perp}$
$\eta: A \rightarrow A_{\perp}$
$\bigsqcup: \Pi_{f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A_{\perp}}\left(\Pi_{n: \mathbb{N}} f(n) \sqsubseteq f(n+1)\right) \rightarrow A_{\perp}$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\overline{d \sqsubseteq d} \quad \overline{\perp \sqsubseteq d} \quad \frac{\bigsqcup(f, p) \sqsubseteq d}{\Pi_{n: \mathbb{N}} f(n) \sqsubseteq d} & \frac{\Pi_{n: \mathbb{N} f(n) \sqsubseteq d}}{\bigsqcup(f, p) \sqsubseteq d} \\
& \frac{d \sqsubseteq d^{\prime} \quad d^{\prime} \sqsubseteq d}{d=d^{\prime}} &
\end{array}
$$

## Results

- $(-)_{\perp}$ is a monad. formalized in Agda
- $A_{\perp}$ is non-trivial.
$\perp \neq \eta(a)$
- $A_{\perp}$ is an $\omega-\mathrm{CPO}$ trivial Indeed we define $A_{\perp}$ as the free $\omega$-CPO over $A$.
- Assuming $A C_{\omega}$ the definition is equivalent to the previous one.
- Case study:

Danielsson has ported the Agda code related to his paper Operational Semantics using the Partiality Monad to the new definition.

