

# Bialgebraic Reasoning on Higher-Order Program Equivalence

Sergey Goncharov\*

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg  
Germany  
sergey.goncharov@fau.de

Stefan Milius†

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg  
Germany  
stefan.milius@fau.de

Stelios Tsampas‡

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg  
Germany  
stelios.tsampas@fau.de

Henning Urbat§

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg  
Germany  
henning.urbat@fau.de

## ABSTRACT

Logical relations constitute a key method for reasoning about contextual equivalence of programs in higher-order languages. They are usually developed on a per-case basis, with a new theory required for each variation of the language or of the desired notion of equivalence. In the present paper we introduce a general construction of (step-indexed) logical relations at the level of *Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics*, a highly parametric categorical framework for modeling the operational semantics of higher-order languages. Our main result states that for languages whose weak operational model forms a lax bialgebra, the logical relation is automatically sound for contextual equivalence. Our abstract theory is shown to instantiate to combinatory logics and  $\lambda$ -calculi with recursive types, and to different flavours of contextual equivalence.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Reasoning about program equivalence is one of the primary goals of the theory of programming languages, and it is known to be particularly challenging in the presence of higher-order features. The definite operational notion of program equivalence for higher-order languages is given by *contextual equivalence* [62]: two programs  $p$  and  $q$  are contextually equivalent if, whichever context  $C[\cdot]$  they are executed in, they co-terminate:

$$p \simeq q \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall C. (C[p] \text{ terminates} \Leftrightarrow C[q] \text{ terminates}).$$

Informally, a context  $C[\cdot]$  runs tests on its input ‘ $\cdot$ ’, and  $p \simeq q$  means that no such test leads to observations distinguishing  $p$  from  $q$ .

While the definition of contextual equivalence is simple and natural, proving  $p \simeq q$  directly can be very difficult due to the quantification over all possible contexts. Therefore, a substantial strain of research has been devoted to developing sound (and ideally complete) proof techniques for contextual equivalence. The most widely used approach are *logical relations*. Originally introduced in the context of denotational semantics [61, 64, 65, 69, 76, 79, 81, 82],

logical relations have evolved into a robust and ubiquitous operational technique [11, 27, 51, 68, 72, 74]. Besides reasoning about contextual equivalence [6, 7, 17, 26, 28, 29, 51, 71, 73, 75, 83], they have been applied to proofs of strong normalization [9], safety properties [36, 37], and formally verified compilation [12, 50, 63, 66], in a variety of settings such as as effectful [53], probabilistic [5, 18, 89], and differential programming [25, 56, 57].

A logical relation is, roughly, a type-indexed relation on program terms that respects their operational behaviour, with the distinctive requirement that related terms of function type should send related inputs to related outputs. In practice, logical relations are introduced in a largely empirical fashion. Every higher-order language comes with its own tailor-made construction of a logical relation (or several of those), involving careful design choices to match the features and idiosyncrasies of the language, and accompanied with a sequence of technical lemmas establishing its compatibility and soundness properties. The required proofs are typically not inherently difficult but notoriously long, tedious, and error-prone. Moreover, every variation of the underlying language (e.g. its syntax, its type system, its computational effects) or of the targeted form of contextual equivalence (e.g. restricting the admissible contexts or observations) requires a careful adaptation of definitions and proof details. As a result, logical relations tend to scale rather poorly with the size and complexity of the language.

The contribution of the present paper is a generic, *language-independent*, theory of logical relations that aims to address these issues. It is developed at the level of generality of *Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics*, a.k.a. *higher-order abstract GSOS*, a categorical framework for the operational semantics of higher-order languages recently introduced by Goncharov et al. [38] that builds on the seminal work of Turi and Plotkin [85]. In higher-order abstract GSOS, the (small-step) operational semantics of a language is modeled abstractly as a *higher-order GSOS law*, a dinatural transformation that distributes the *syntax* of a language (given by an endofunctor  $\Sigma$  on a category  $\mathbb{C}$ ) over its *behaviour* (given by a mixed variance bifunctor  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ). Every higher-order GSOS law comes equipped with a canonical operational model, which forms a (*higher-order*) *bialgebra*

$$\Sigma(\mu\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mu\Sigma \xrightarrow{\gamma} B(\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma) \quad (1)$$

on the object  $\mu\Sigma$  of program terms. Intuitively, the coalgebra  $\gamma$  is the transition system that runs programs according to the operational rules encoded by the underlying higher-order GSOS law.

\*Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – project number 527481841

†Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – project number 517924115

‡Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – project number 419850228 and 527481841

§Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – project number 470467389

At this level of abstraction, we show that every higher-order GSOS law induces a family of *generic* logical relations on  $\mu\Sigma$  (Construction 4.23). They are constructed as *step-indexed logical relations* [11], a general and robust kind of logical relations that is suitable for languages with recursive types. In addition, we introduce a notion of *contextual preorder*  $\leq^O$  on  $\mu\Sigma$  that is parametric in a preorder  $O$  of admissible *observations*  $O$  on program contexts. We regard this notion and its properties established in Section 4.2 to be of independent interest, as to our knowledge it provides the first treatment of contextual preorders as an abstract categorical notion.

Our main result (Theorem 4.30 and its corollaries) states that for languages modeled in higher-order abstract GSOS, the soundness of generic logical relations often comes for free. We may state this result informally as follows.

**Generic Soundness Theorem.** If the small-step operational rules of a language remain sound for weak transitions, and a generic logical relation is adequate for  $O$ , then it is sound for  $\leq^O$ .

In technical terms, the condition on weak transitions amounts to requiring that the weak operational model associated to (1) forms a *lax bialgebra*. This condition isolates the language-specific core of soundness proofs for logical relations, and it is usually easily verified by inspecting the operational rules of the language. Hence, our generic soundness theorem can significantly reduce the proof burden associated with soundness results for logical relations.

Thanks to their highly parametric nature, our categorical results instantiate to a wide variety of different settings and languages. In our presentation we focus on the functional language **FPC** [33, 43] (a  $\lambda$ -calculus with recursive types), and a corresponding combinatory logic called  $\mu$ **TCL**. Let us note that the previous work on higher-order abstract GSOS has only considered untyped [38, 86] and simply typed languages [39]. The insight that complex type systems featuring recursive types can be implemented in the abstract framework is thus a novel contribution in itself.

*Related work.* The majority of the literature dedicated to the abstract study of logical relations has so far focused on denotational [42, 45, 46, 54] rather than operational logical relations. In recent work [23, 24], Dagnino and Gavazzo introduce a categorical notion of operational logical relations that is largely orthogonal to ours, in particular regarding the parametrization of the framework: In *op. cit.*, the authors work with a fixed *fine-grain call-by-value* language [59] parametrized by a signature of generic effects, while the notion of logical relation is kept variable and in fact is parametrized over a fibration; in contrast, we adhere to conventional logical relations and parametrize over the syntax and semantics of the language. Unlike our present paper, Dagnino and Gavazzo have not incorporated step-indexing and recursive types.

Goncharov et al. [39] devise a generic construction of unary, non-step-indexed logical predicates in the framework of higher-order abstract GSOS, and provide induction up-to techniques for reasoning on them, with *strong normalization* predicates as a key application. First-order lax bialgebras are initially proposed by Bonchi et al. [20] to capture coalgebraic weak bisimilarity and are subsequently generalized to higher-order lax bialgebras by Urbat et al. [86], where the authors gave an abstract proof of congruence of applicative (bi)similarity [2] in higher-order abstract GSOS,

using a categorical generalization of Howe’s method [48, 49]. The relation between the present paper and the work of Urbat et al. is elaborated on in Remark 4.35.

While the standard version of step-indexing involves only natural numbers, it turns out that indexing by arbitrary ordinals emerges as a matter of course in our abstract formulation; this relates our notion to the recent generalizations [5, 80].

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

### 2.1 Category Theory

We assume familiarity with basic category theory [60], e.g. functors, natural transformations, (co)limits, and monads. Here, we briefly review some terminology and notation.

*Notation.* For objects  $X_1, X_2$  of a category  $\mathbb{C}$ , we denote their product by  $X_1 \times X_2$  and the pairing of morphisms  $f_i: X \rightarrow X_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , by  $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle: X \rightarrow X_1 \times X_2$ . We write  $X_1 + X_2$  for the coproduct,  $\text{inl}: X_1 \rightarrow X_1 + X_2$  and  $\text{inr}: X_2 \rightarrow X_1 + X_2$  for its injections,  $[g_1, g_2]: X_1 + X_2 \rightarrow X$  for the copairing of morphisms  $g_i: X_i \rightarrow X$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\nabla = [\text{id}_X, \text{id}_X]: X + X \rightarrow X$  for the codiagonal. The *coslice category*  $X/\mathbb{C}$ , where  $X \in \mathbb{C}$ , has as objects all pairs  $(Y, p_Y)$  consisting of an object  $Y \in \mathbb{C}$  and a morphism  $p_Y: X \rightarrow Y$ , and a morphism from  $(Y, p_Y)$  to  $(Z, p_Z)$  is a morphism  $f: Y \rightarrow Z$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  such that  $p_Z = f \cdot p_Y$ . The *slice category*  $\mathbb{C}/X$  is defined dually.

*Algebras.* Let  $F$  be an endofunctor on a category  $\mathbb{C}$ . An  $F$ -*algebra* is a pair  $(A, a)$  consisting of an object  $A$  (the *carrier* of the algebra) and a morphism  $a: FA \rightarrow A$  (its *structure*). A *morphism* from  $(A, a)$  to an  $F$ -algebra  $(B, b)$  is a morphism  $h: A \rightarrow B$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  such that  $h \cdot a = b \cdot Fh$ . Algebras for  $F$  and their morphisms form a category, whose initial object, if it exists, is called an *initial algebra*; we denote its carrier by  $\mu F$  and its structure by  $\iota: F(\mu F) \rightarrow \mu F$ . A *free  $F$ -algebra* on an object  $X$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  is an  $F$ -algebra  $(F^*X, \iota_X)$  together with a morphism  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow F^*X$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  such that for every algebra  $(A, a)$  and every morphism  $h: X \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathbb{C}$ , there exists a unique  $F$ -algebra morphism  $h^*: (F^*X, \iota_X) \rightarrow (A, a)$  such that  $h = h^* \cdot \eta_X$ ; the morphism  $h^*$  is called the *free extension* of  $h$ . If free algebras exist on every object, their formation gives rise to a monad  $F^*: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , the *free monad* generated by  $F$ . For every  $F$ -algebra  $(A, a)$  we can derive an Eilenberg-Moore algebra  $\widehat{a}: F^*A \rightarrow A$  whose structure is the free extension of  $\text{id}_A: A \rightarrow A$ .

The most familiar example of functor algebras are algebras for a signature. Given a set  $S$  of *sorts*, an  $S$ -*sorted algebraic signature* consists of a set  $\Sigma$  of *operation symbols* and a map  $\text{ar}: \Sigma \rightarrow S^* \times S$  associating to every  $f \in \Sigma$  its *arity*. We write  $f: s_1 \times \dots \times s_n \rightarrow s$  if  $\text{ar}(f) = (s_1, \dots, s_n, s)$ , and  $f: s$  if  $n = 0$  (in which case  $f$  is called a *constant*). Every signature  $\Sigma$  induces an endofunctor on the category  $\mathbf{Set}^S$  of  $S$ -sorted sets and  $S$ -sorted functions, denoted by the same letter  $\Sigma$ , defined by  $(\Sigma X)_s = \coprod_{f: s_1 \dots s_n \rightarrow s} \prod_{i=1}^n X_{s_i}$  for  $X \in \mathbf{Set}^S$  and  $s \in S$ . (Endofunctors of this form are called *polynomial endofunctors*.) An algebra for the functor  $\Sigma$  is precisely an algebra for the signature  $\Sigma$ , viz. an  $S$ -sorted set  $A = (A_s)_{s \in S}$  equipped with an operation  $f^A: \prod_{i=1}^n A_{s_i} \rightarrow A_s$  for every  $f: s_1 \times \dots \times s_n \rightarrow s$  in  $\Sigma$ . Morphisms of  $\Sigma$ -algebras are  $S$ -sorted maps respecting the algebraic structure. Given an  $S$ -sorted set  $X$  of variables, the free algebra  $\Sigma^*X$  is the  $\Sigma$ -algebra of  $\Sigma$ -terms with variables from  $X$ ; more precisely,  $(\Sigma^*X)_s$  is inductively defined by  $X_s \subseteq (\Sigma^*X)_s$  and

$f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in (\Sigma^* X)_s$  for all  $f: s_1 \times \dots \times s_n \rightarrow s$  and  $t_i \in (\Sigma^* X)_{s_i}$ . The free algebra on the empty set is the initial algebra  $\mu\Sigma$ ; it is formed by all *closed terms* of the signature. We write  $t: s$  for  $t \in (\mu\Sigma)_s$ . For every  $\Sigma$ -algebra  $(A, a)$ , the induced Eilenberg-Moore algebra  $\widehat{a}: \Sigma^* A \rightarrow A$  is given by the map that evaluates terms in  $A$ .

An (*S-sorted*) *relation*  $R$  on  $X \in \mathbf{Set}^S$ , denoted  $R \subseteq X \times X$ , is a family of relations  $(R_s \subseteq X_s \times X_s)_{s \in S}$ . We write  $x R_s y$  or  $R_s(x, y)$  for  $(x, y) \in R_s$ , and sometimes omit the subscript  $s$ . Moreover we let  $\mathbf{Rel}_X$  denote the complete lattice of relations on  $X$ , ordered by inclusion in every sort. Its top element is the full relation  $\top = X \times X$ , and meets are given by sortwise intersection.

A *congruence* on a  $\Sigma$ -algebra  $A$  is an  $S$ -sorted relation  $R \subseteq A \times A$  compatible with all operations of  $A$ : for each  $f: s_1 \times \dots \times s_n \rightarrow s$  and elements  $x_i, y_i \in A_{s_i}$  such that  $R_{s_i}(x_i, y_i)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), one has  $R_s(f^A(x_1, \dots, x_n), f^A(y_1, \dots, y_n))$ . Unlike other authors we do not require congruences to be equivalence relations. However, every congruence on the initial algebra  $\mu\Sigma$  is reflexive in every sort.

*Coalgebras.* Dual to the notion of algebra, a *coalgebra* for an endofunctor  $F$  is a pair  $(C, c)$  consisting of an object  $C$  (the *state space*) and a morphism  $c: C \rightarrow FC$  (its *structure*). Coalgebras are abstractions of state-based systems [78]. For instance, a coalgebra  $c: C \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(L \times C)$  for the set functor  $\mathcal{P}(L \times -)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the power set functor and  $L$  is a fixed set of labels, is precisely a labelled transition system.

## 2.2 Higher-Order Abstract GSOS

We review the fundamentals of *higher-order abstract GSOS* [38], a categorical framework for the operational semantics of higher-order languages. It is parametric in the following data:

- (1) a category  $\mathbb{C}$  with finite products and coproducts;
- (2) an object  $V \in \mathbb{C}$  of *variables*;
- (3) two functors  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  and  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , where  $\Sigma = V + \Sigma'$  for some functor  $\Sigma': \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , and free  $\Sigma$ -algebras exist on all  $X \in \mathbb{C}$ .

The functors  $\Sigma$  and  $B$  model the *syntax* and the *behaviour* of a higher-order language. The mixed variance of  $B$  reflects the requirement that programs can occur both contravariantly (as inputs) and covariantly (as outputs) of programs. The initial algebra  $\mu\Sigma$  is the object of program terms in the language; since  $\Sigma = V + \Sigma'$ , variables are terms. An object  $(X, p_X)$  of the coslice category  $V/\mathbb{C}$  (a *V-pointed object* for short) is thought of as an abstract set  $X$  of programs with an embedding  $p_X: V \rightarrow X$  of the variables. For variable-free languages such as  $\mu\text{TCL}$  introduced in Section 3, we put  $V = 0$  (the initial object). In the setting of higher-order abstract GSOS, the operational semantics of a language is specified by a dinatural transformation that distributes syntax over behaviours:

**Definition 2.1** (Higher-Order GSOS Law). A (*V-pointed*) *higher-order GSOS law* of  $\Sigma$  over  $B$  is given by a family of morphisms

$$\varrho_{(X, p_X), Y}: \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y)) \rightarrow B(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y)) \quad (2)$$

dinatural in  $(X, p_X) \in V/\mathbb{C}$  and natural in  $Y \in \mathbb{C}$ .

**Notation 2.2.** (1) We usually write  $\varrho_{X, Y}$  for  $\varrho_{(X, p_X), Y}$ , as the point  $p_X: V \rightarrow X$  will always be clear from the context.

- (2) For every  $\Sigma$ -algebra  $(A, a)$ , we regard  $A$  as a  $V$ -pointed object with point  $p_A = (V \xrightarrow{\text{inl}}, V + \Sigma^* A = \Sigma A \xrightarrow{a} A)$ .

A higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho$  is thought of as an encoding of the small-step operational rules of a higher-order language: given an operation  $f$  from  $\Sigma$  and the one-step behaviours of its operands, the law  $\varrho$  specifies the one-step behaviour of a program  $f(-, \dots, -)$ , i.e. the  $\Sigma$ -terms it transitions into. The *operational model* of  $\varrho$  is a transition system on  $\mu\Sigma$  that runs programs according to the rules:

**Definition 2.3** (Operational Model). The *operational model* of a higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho$  in (2) is the  $B(\mu\Sigma, -)$ -coalgebra

$$\gamma: \mu\Sigma \rightarrow B(\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma)$$

obtained via primitive recursion [52, Prop. 2.4.7] as the unique morphism making the diagram in Figure 1 commute. Here we regard the initial algebra  $\mu\Sigma$  as  $V$ -pointed as in Notation 2.2, and  $\widehat{\iota}: \Sigma^*(\mu\Sigma) \rightarrow \mu\Sigma$  is the  $\Sigma^*$ -algebra induced by  $\iota: \Sigma(\mu\Sigma) \rightarrow \mu\Sigma$ .

This makes  $(\mu\Sigma, \iota, \gamma)$  an (initial)  $\varrho$ -*bialgebra*; see Section 4.4 for a more detailed discussion of bialgebras.

## 3 COMBINATORY LOGIC

In this section we introduce a combinatory logic [47] with (iso-)recursive types, called  $\mu\text{TCL}$ , that will serve as a running example for the abstract theory of logical relations developed in our paper. It forms a (computationally complete) fragment of the well-known functional language **FPC** [33, 43] but does not involve variables; this allows us to circumvent the technical overhead associated with binding and substitution. The fully fledged **FPC** language is discussed in Section 5.

### 3.1 The $\mu\text{TCL}$ Language

The type expressions of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  are given by the grammar

$$\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau, \dots ::= \alpha \mid \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2 \mid \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2 \mid \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \mid \mu\alpha. \tau, \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha$  ranges over a fixed countably infinite set of type variables. Free and bound type variables and  $\alpha$ -equivalence are defined in the usual way. We denote by  $\text{Ty}$  the set of closed type expressions modulo  $\alpha$ -equivalence, and refer to them simply as *types*. The type constructors  $\boxplus, \boxtimes, \rightarrow$  represent binary sums, binary products and function spaces internal to the language, and are denoted non-standardly for distinction with the set constructors  $+, \times, \rightarrow$ . Using the recursion operator we define the empty type ( $\text{void} = \mu\alpha. \alpha$ ), the unit type ( $\text{unit} = \text{void} \rightarrow \text{void}$ ), and the types of booleans ( $\text{bool} = \text{unit} \boxplus \text{unit}$ ) and natural numbers ( $\text{nat} = \mu\alpha. \text{unit} \boxplus \alpha$ ). We write  $\tau_1[\tau_2/\alpha]$  for the capture-avoiding substitution of  $\tau_2$  for  $\alpha$ . The constructor  $\rightarrow$  binds most weakly and is right-associative, which means that  $\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3$  is parsed as  $\tau_1 \rightarrow (\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3)$ .

The syntax of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  is specified by the Ty-sorted signature  $\Sigma$  given by the following operation symbols, with  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3$  ranging over  $\text{Ty}$ , and  $\tau$  over types with at most one free variable  $\alpha$ :

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3} &: (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3) \rightarrow (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) \rightarrow \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_3 \\ S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3} &: (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3) \rightarrow ((\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) \rightarrow \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_3) \\ S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3} &: (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3) \times (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) \rightarrow (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_3) \\ K_{\tau_1, \tau_2} &: \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_1 \quad K'_{\tau_1, \tau_2} : \tau_1 \rightarrow (\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_1) \\ I_{\tau_1} &: \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Sigma(\mu\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\quad l \quad} \mu\Sigma \\
\downarrow \Sigma(\text{id}, \gamma) \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \gamma \\
\Sigma(\mu\Sigma \times B(\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma)) \xrightarrow{\varrho_{\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma}} B(\mu\Sigma, \Sigma^*(\mu\Sigma + \mu\Sigma)) \xrightarrow{B(\text{id}, \Sigma^* \nabla)} B(\mu\Sigma, \Sigma^*(\mu\Sigma)) \xrightarrow{B(\text{id}, i)} B(\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma)
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: Operational model of a higher-order GSOS law

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} : (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) \times \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 & \text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} : \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_1 \\
\text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2 & \text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} : \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_2 \\
\text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} : \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2 & \text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} : \tau_1 \times \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2 \\
\\
\text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3} : (\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2) \times (\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_3) \times (\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3) \rightarrow \tau_3 & \\
\text{fold}_{\tau} : \tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha] \rightarrow \mu\alpha. \tau & \\
\text{unfold}_{\tau} : \mu\alpha. \tau \rightarrow \tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha] &
\end{array}$$

We let  $\text{Tr} = \mu\Sigma$  denote the initial algebra for  $\Sigma$ , carried by the Ty-sorted set of closed  $\Sigma$ -terms. Type indices at polymorphic operations are often omitted for the sake of readability. The operation  $\text{app}$  represents function application, and we write  $st$  for  $\text{app}(s, t)$ . The familiar combinators  $I, K, S$  represent the  $\lambda$ -terms  $\lambda x. x, \lambda x. \lambda y. x$  and  $\lambda x. \lambda y. \lambda z. (xz)(yz)$ . Apart from those, we use auxiliary operations  $S', S'', K'$ ; these are needed to provide a small-step semantics, which is instrumental for our coalgebraic approach.

We equip  $\mu\text{TCL}$  with a call-by-name operational semantics whose transition rules are given in Figure 2; here  $e, s, t, t'$  range over appropriately typed terms in  $\text{Tr}$ . There are three kinds of transitions:

- $t \rightarrow s$ , indicating that  $t$  one-step  $\beta$ -reduces to  $s$ ,
- $t \xrightarrow{e} s$  where  $e \in \text{Tr}$ , indicating that  $t$  applied to  $e$  yields  $s$ ,
- $t \xrightarrow{l} s$  where  $l \in \{\boxtimes_1, \boxtimes_2, \boxplus_1, \boxplus_2, \mu\}$ , which all identify  $t$  as a value and provide information about its structure; for example, a transition  $t \xrightarrow{\boxplus_1} s$  means that  $t = \text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s)$ , and  $t \xrightarrow{\boxplus_2} s$  means that  $t = \text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s, e)$  for some  $e$ .

These transitions are deterministic: every term  $t$  either reduces to a unique term  $s$ , i.e.  $t \rightarrow s$ , or exhibits a unique labelled transition  $t \xrightarrow{e} t_e$  for each appropriately typed term  $e$ , or exhibits a unique transition  $t \xrightarrow{l} s$  where  $l \in \{\boxtimes_1, \boxtimes_2, \boxplus_1, \boxplus_2, \mu\}$ .

The semantics of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  prominently features labelled transitions and forms a “higher-order LTS”, i.e. a labelled transition system on terms whose labels may also be terms. This style of semantics draws inspiration from the work of Abramsky [2] and Gordon [40] on the  $\lambda$ -calculus. The incorporation of the auxiliary operators  $S', S''$  and  $K'$  does not alter the functional behavior of programs, except for possibly adding more unlabelled transitions. For example, the conventional rule  $Stse \rightarrow (te)(se)$  for the  $S$ -combinator [47] is rendered as the sequence of transitions

$$Stse \rightarrow S'(t)se \rightarrow S''(t, s)e \rightarrow (te)(se).$$

To model  $\mu\text{TCL}$  in higher-order abstract GSOS, we take the base category  $\mathbb{C} = \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$  of Ty-sorted sets, the polynomial functor  $\Sigma : \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}} \rightarrow \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$  corresponding to the signature of  $\mu\text{TCL}$ , and

the behaviour bifunctor  $B : (\text{Set}^{\text{Ty}})^{\text{op}} \times \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}} \rightarrow \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$  given by

$$B_{\tau}(X, Y) = Y_{\tau} + D_{\tau}(X, Y),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}}, & D_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_1} + Y_{\tau_2}, \\
D_{\mu\alpha. \tau}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha]}, & D_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

(We denote the components of a functor  $F : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$  by  $F_{\tau} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  for  $\tau \in \text{Ty}$ .) In  $Y_{\tau} + D_{\tau}(X, Y)$ ,  $Y_{\tau}$  models  $\beta$ -reduction and  $D_{\tau}(X, Y)$  the information carried by values. The deterministic transition rules of (2) induce a coalgebra  $\gamma : \text{Tr} \rightarrow B(\text{Tr}, \text{Tr})$  given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{\tau}(t) &= t' && \text{if } t \rightarrow t', \text{ for } t, t' : \tau, \\
\gamma_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(t) &= \lambda e. te && \text{if } t \xrightarrow{e} t_e \text{ for } t : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2, e : \tau_1, \\
\gamma_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(t) &= t' && \text{if } t \xrightarrow{\boxplus_i} t' \text{ for } t : \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2, t' : \tau_i, \\
\gamma_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(t) &= (t_1, t_2) && \text{if } t \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_i} t_i, t \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_j} t_j, \text{ for } t_i : \tau_i, \\
\gamma_{\mu\alpha. \tau}(t) &= t' && \text{if } t \xrightarrow{\mu} t' \text{ for } t : \mu\alpha. \tau, t' : \tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha].
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

We omit explicit coproduct injections for better readability, e.g. the term  $t'$  in the last clause lies in the second summand of the coproduct  $B_{\mu\alpha. \tau}(\text{Tr}, \text{Tr}) = \text{Tr}_{\mu\alpha. \tau} + \text{Tr}_{\tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha]}$ . The coalgebra  $\gamma : \text{Tr} \rightarrow B(\text{Tr}, \text{Tr})$  is the canonical operational model of a (0-pointed) higher-order GSOS law of the syntax functor  $\Sigma$  over the behaviour bifunctor  $B$ , i.e. a family of Ty-sorted maps

$$\varrho_{X, Y} : \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y)) \rightarrow B(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y)) \tag{6}$$

dinatural in  $X \in \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$  and natural in  $Y \in \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$ . The components of  $\varrho$  are given by case distinction over the operations of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  and simply encode the rules of Figure 2 as functions. We list a few selected clauses below, again omitting coproduct injections; see the appendix for a complete definition.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varrho_{X, Y}(S_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}) &= \lambda e. S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(e), \\
\varrho_{X, Y}(S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, f)) &= \lambda e. S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, e), \\
\varrho_{X, Y}(S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}((t, f), (s, g))) &= \lambda e. \text{app}_{\tau_2, \tau_3}(\text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3}(t, e), \\
&\qquad \qquad \qquad \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s, e)), \\
\varrho_{X, Y}(\text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, f)) &= t, \\
\varrho_{X, Y}(\text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}((t, f), (s, g))) &= \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}}, \\ \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f, s) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

### 3.2 Logical Relations for $\mu\text{TCL}$

A natural operational notion of program equivalence is given by *contextual* or *observational equivalence*, a relation that identifies programs if they behave the same in all program contexts. It comes in two different flavours: *Morris-style* contextual equivalence [62], and a more abstract, relational approach by Gordon [41] and Lassen [58] (see also [73]). For the purposes of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  we pick the former; we elaborate on the connections in Section 4.2.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{S_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3} \xrightarrow{e} S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(e)} \quad \frac{}{S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t) \xrightarrow{e} S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, e)} \quad \frac{}{S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, s) \xrightarrow{e} (te)(se)} \quad \frac{}{K_{\tau_1, \tau_2} \xrightarrow{e} K'_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(e)} \\
 \\
 \frac{}{K'_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t) \xrightarrow{e} t} \quad \frac{}{I_\tau \xrightarrow{e} e} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{ts \rightarrow t's} \quad \frac{t \xrightarrow{s} t'}{ts \rightarrow t's} \quad \frac{}{\text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t) \xrightarrow{\boxplus_1} t} \quad \frac{}{\text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t) \xrightarrow{\boxplus_2} t} \\
 \\
 \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, s, r) \rightarrow \text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t', s, r)} \quad \frac{t \xrightarrow{\boxplus_1} t'}{\text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, s, r) \rightarrow st'} \quad \frac{t \xrightarrow{\boxplus_2} t'}{\text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, s, r) \rightarrow rt'} \\
 \\
 \frac{}{\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, s) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_1} t} \quad \frac{}{\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, s) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_2} s} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t) \rightarrow \text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t')} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t) \rightarrow \text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t')} \\
 \\
 \frac{t \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_1} t'}{\text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t) \rightarrow t'} \quad \frac{t \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_2} t'}{\text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t) \rightarrow t'} \quad \frac{}{\text{fold}_\tau(t) \xrightarrow{\mu} t} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{unfold}_\tau(t) \rightarrow \text{unfold}_\tau(t')} \quad \frac{t \xrightarrow{\mu} t'}{\text{unfold}_\tau(t) \rightarrow t'}
 \end{array}$$

 Figure 2: Call-by-name operational semantics of  $\mu\text{TCL}$ .

**Notation 3.1.** (1) A *program context*  $C: \tau_1 \rightsquigarrow \tau_2$  is a  $\Sigma$ -term of output type  $\tau_2$  with a hole of type  $\tau_1$ , i.e. if  $\mathbb{1}_{\tau_1}$  denotes the Ty-sorted set with a single element ‘.’ in sort  $\tau_1$  and empty otherwise,  $C$  is a term in  $(\Sigma^* \mathbb{1}_{\tau_1})_{\tau_2}$  with at most one occurrence of the variable ‘.’. We let  $C[t]$  denote the result of substituting  $t \in \text{Tr}_{\tau_1}$  for the hole.

(2) We use the following notations for *weak transitions*:

- $\Rightarrow$  for the reflexive, transitive hull of the reduction relation  $\rightarrow$ ;
- $t \stackrel{l}{\Rightarrow} s$  if  $t \Rightarrow t' \xrightarrow{l} s$  for some  $t'$  and  $l \in \text{Tr} \cup \{\boxtimes_1, \boxtimes_2, \boxplus_1, \boxplus_2, \mu\}$ ;
- $t \Downarrow$  if  $t$  terminates, i.e.  $t \stackrel{l}{\Rightarrow} s$  for some  $l$  and  $s$ .

The *contextual preorder*  $\lesssim$  and *contextual equivalence*  $\simeq$  are the Ty-sorted relations on  $\text{Tr}$  given by

$$t \lesssim_\tau s \quad \text{if} \quad \forall \tau' \forall C: \tau \rightsquigarrow \tau'. C[t] \Downarrow \implies C[s] \Downarrow, \quad (7)$$

$$t \simeq_\tau s \quad \text{if} \quad \forall \tau' \forall C: \tau \rightsquigarrow \tau'. C[t] \Downarrow \iff C[s] \Downarrow. \quad (8)$$

Since direct reasoning on  $\lesssim$  and  $\simeq$  is difficult, we introduce a (*step-indexed*) *logical relation* for  $\mu\text{TCL}$ , which will give rise to a sound proof method for the contextual preorder (Corollary 3.6):

**Definition 3.2.** The *step-indexed logical relation*  $\mathcal{L}$  for  $\mu\text{TCL}$  is the family of relations  $(\mathcal{L}^\alpha \subseteq \text{Tr} \times \text{Tr})_{\alpha \leq \omega}$  defined inductively by

$$\mathcal{L}^0 = \top,$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{n+1} = \mathcal{L}^n \cap \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{L}^n) \cap \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L}^n, \mathcal{L}^n), \quad \mathcal{L}^\omega = \bigcap_{n < \omega} \mathcal{L}^n,$$

where  $\mathcal{E}: \text{Rel}_{\text{Tr}} \rightarrow \text{Rel}_{\text{Tr}}$  and  $\mathcal{V}: (\text{Rel}_{\text{Tr}})^{\text{op}} \times \text{Rel}_{\text{Tr}} \rightarrow \text{Rel}_{\text{Tr}}$  are the monotone maps given as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_\tau(R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t \rightarrow t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow s' \wedge R_\tau(t', s')\}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(Q, R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t \xrightarrow{\boxplus_1} t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \xrightarrow{\boxplus_1} s' \wedge R_{\tau_1}(t', s'),$$

$$\text{if } t \xrightarrow{\boxplus_2} t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \xrightarrow{\boxplus_2} s' \wedge R_{\tau_2}(t', s')\}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(Q, R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_1} t_1 \wedge t \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_2} t_2 \text{ then}$$

$$\exists s_1, s_2. s \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_1} s_1 \wedge s \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_2} s_2 \wedge R_{\tau_1}(t_1, s_1) \wedge R_{\tau_2}(t_2, s_2)\}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(Q, R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{for all } e_1, e_2: \tau_1, Q_{\tau_1}(e_1, e_2),$$

$$\text{if } t \xrightarrow{e_1} t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \xrightarrow{e_2} s' \wedge R_{\tau_2}(t', s')\}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mu\alpha.\tau}(Q, R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t \xrightarrow{\mu} t' \text{ then}$$

$$\exists s'. s \xrightarrow{\mu} s' \wedge R_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}(t', s')\}$$

**Remark 3.3.** (1) While details can vary greatly in the construction of logical relations in the literature, their common key feature is that related terms of function type send related inputs to related outputs. In our case, this is reflected by the definition of  $\mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}$ .

(2) One may think of extending  $(\mathcal{L}^\alpha)_{\alpha \leq \omega}$  beyond  $\omega$  by putting

$$\mathcal{L}^{\omega+1} = \mathcal{L}^\omega \cap \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{L}^\omega) \cap \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{L}^\omega, \mathcal{L}^\omega)$$

etc. It is, however, easy to verify that  $\mathcal{L}^{\omega+1} = \mathcal{L}^\omega$ . In contrast, in effectful (e.g. non-deterministic or probabilistic) settings, a transfinite extension may be required [5, 80]. Our generic logical relations introduced in Section 4 thus use indexing by arbitrary ordinals.

(3) In simply typed languages, such as the fragment of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  without recursive types (and with an explicit unit type), it is possible to construct an alternative logical relation  $\overline{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \text{Tr} \times \text{Tr}$  more directly via structural induction over types. For instance, assuming that  $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tau_1}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tau_2}$  have already been defined,  $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}$  is given by all  $(t, s) \in \text{Tr}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \times \text{Tr}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}$  such that

$$\text{if } t \xrightarrow{e_1} t' \wedge \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tau_1}(e_1, e_2) \text{ then } \exists s'. s \xrightarrow{e_2} s' \wedge \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{\tau_2}(t', s').$$

This approach does not extend to untyped languages, or languages with unrestricted recursive types like  $\mu\text{TCL}$ , which motivates step-indexing. From a more abstract perspective emphasized by Goncharov et al. [39], the above inductive definition of  $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$  is possible because behaviour functors  $B$  for simply typed languages are contractive w.r.t. a suitable ultrametric [16] on the subobject lattices of  $\mathbb{C} = \text{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$ . This fails in presence of recursive types.

The key property of  $\mathcal{L}$  is its compatibility with all operations of  $\text{Tr}$ , the initial algebra of closed  $\mu\text{TCL}$ -terms:

**Theorem 3.4.** For all  $\alpha \leq \omega$  the relation  $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$  is a congruence on  $\text{Tr}$ .

**PROOF SKETCH.** We show that each  $\mathcal{L}^n$  ( $n < \omega$ ) is a congruence; this implies that  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$  is a congruence, since congruences are closed under intersection. The proof is by induction on  $n$ . The base

case  $n = 0$  is trivial, since  $\mathcal{L}^0 = \top$ . For the inductive step  $n \rightarrow n+1$ , suppose that  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a congruence. To show that  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}$  is a congruence, we need to prove that for each  $\Sigma$ -operation  $f: \tau_1 \times \dots \times \tau_k \rightarrow \tau$  and all terms  $t_i, s_i: \tau_i$  such that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_i}^{n+1}(t_i, s_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , we have  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^{n+1}(f(t_1, \dots, t_k), f(s_1, \dots, s_k))$ . This is equivalent to

- (1)  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^n(f(t_1, \dots, t_k), f(s_1, \dots, s_k))$ .
- (2)  $(f(t_1, \dots, t_k), f(s_1, \dots, s_k)) \in \mathcal{E}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^n)$ ;
- (3)  $(f(t_1, \dots, t_k), f(s_1, \dots, s_k)) \in \mathcal{V}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ .

Statement (1) holds because  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^n$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a congruence. Statements (2) and (3) require a long case distinction over the 15 operation symbols  $f$  of  $\Sigma$ . Let us illustrate the case of application. We need to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$  implies (2)  $(t_1 t_2, s_1 s_2) \in \mathcal{E}_{\tau_2}(\mathcal{L}^n)$  and (3)  $(t_1 t_2, s_1 s_2) \in \mathcal{V}_{\tau_2}(\mathcal{L}^n, \mathcal{L}^n)$ . Note that (3) holds vacuously as applications do not admit labelled transitions. For (2), suppose that  $t_1 t_2 \rightarrow t$ . By the semantics of application (Figure 2) such a transition may occur for two possible reasons:

- **Case 1:**  $t_1 \rightarrow t'_1$  and  $t = t'_1 t_2$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ , there exists  $s'_1$  such that  $s_1 \Rightarrow s'_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$ . Since  $s_1 s_2 \Rightarrow s'_1 s_2$ , it suffices to show  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2}^n(t'_1 t_2, s'_1 s_2)$ . This holds because  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$  (hence  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(t_2, s_2)$ ) and  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a congruence.
- **Case 2:**  $t_1 \xrightarrow{t_2} t$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$  (hence  $\mathcal{L}^n(t_2, s_2)$ ), there exists  $s$  such that  $s_1 \xrightarrow{s_2} s$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n(t, s)$ . Moreover  $s_1 s_2 \Rightarrow s$ , which proves the claim.  $\diamond$

A complete proof can be found in the appendix. An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.4 is the so-called *Fundamental Property* of  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$ , namely that all terms are related to themselves:

**Corollary 3.5.** *The relation  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$  is reflexive.*

Indeed, all congruences on an initial (term) algebra are reflexive (Section 2.1). As another important corollary of Theorem 3.4, we conclude that  $\mathcal{L}$  is sound for the contextual preorder:

**Corollary 3.6.** *For all  $\tau \in \text{Ty}$  and terms  $t, s \in \text{Tr}_\tau$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau^\omega(t, s) \implies t \lesssim_\tau s. \quad (9)$$

**PROOF.** (1) Note first that  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$  is *adequate* w.r.t. termination, i.e.  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^\omega(t, s)$  implies that if  $t \Downarrow$  then  $s \Downarrow$ . To see this, let  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^\omega(t, s)$  and suppose that  $t \Downarrow$ , say  $t$  terminates in  $n$  steps in the term  $t'$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^{n+1}(t, s)$ , there exists  $s'$  such that  $s \Rightarrow s'$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^1(t', s')$ . Since  $t'$  has a labelled transition, we get  $s' \Downarrow$  by definition of  $\mathcal{L}^1$ , hence  $s \Downarrow$ . (2) To prove (9), suppose that  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^\omega(t, s)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$  is a congruence, it follows that  $\mathcal{L}_\tau^\omega(C[t], C[s])$  for every context  $C: \tau \rightsquigarrow \tau'$ . Hence, if  $C[t] \Downarrow$  then  $C[s] \Downarrow$  by adequacy, which proves  $t \lesssim_\tau s$ .  $\diamond$

**Remark 3.7.** In order to prove  $t \lesssim s$ , it thus suffices to prove  $\mathcal{L}^\omega(t, s)$ , or equivalently  $\mathcal{L}^n(t, s)$  for all  $n < \omega$ . A useful observation for such proofs is that  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is backwards closed under silent transitions: if  $t \Rightarrow t'$  and  $s \Rightarrow s'$ , then  $\mathcal{L}^n(t', s')$  implies  $\mathcal{L}^n(t, s)$ .

**Example 3.8.** We put Corollary 3.6 to the test by proving

$$f \lesssim S(KI)f \quad \text{for all } f: \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2. \quad (10)$$

The term  $S(KI)f$  behaves like the  $\lambda$ -term  $\lambda x. fx$ , as

$$(S(KI)f)t \Rightarrow (KI t)(ft) \Rightarrow I(ft) \rightarrow ft,$$

so (10) is an analogue of one half of the  $\eta$ -law of the  $\lambda$ -calculus. It suffices to prove by induction that  $\mathcal{L}^n(f, S(KI)f)$  for all  $n < \omega$ . We prove a slightly stronger statement, namely  $\mathcal{L}^n(t, S(KI)f)$  whenever  $f \Rightarrow t$ . The base case  $n = 0$  is trivial, as  $\mathcal{L}^0 = \top$ . For the inductive step  $n \rightarrow n+1$ , we consider two cases:

(1)  $t \rightarrow t'$ . Then  $S(KI)f \Rightarrow S(KI)f$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^n(t', S(KI)f)$  by the inductive hypothesis as  $f \Rightarrow t'$ , hence  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(t, S(KI)f)$ .

(2)  $t \xrightarrow{e} t'$ . Then  $S(KI)f \xrightarrow{e'} (KI e')(f e') \Rightarrow f e' \Rightarrow t e' \rightarrow t''$  for every  $e'$ , where  $t \xrightarrow{e'} t''$ . To prove  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(t, S(KI)f)$  we need to show that if  $\mathcal{L}^n(e, e')$  then  $\mathcal{L}^n(t', (KI e')(f e'))$ . By Remark 3.7 it suffices to show  $\mathcal{L}^n(t', t'')$ ; this holds as  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(t, t)$  by reflexivity.

The other direction  $S(KI)f \lesssim f$  of the  $\eta$ -law generally fails because  $S(KI)f$  always terminates, while  $f$  may diverge. However, we shall see below that it does hold when restricting to contexts of ground type like the type of booleans. Specifically, we define the *ground contextual preorder* and *ground contextual equivalence* by

$$t \lesssim_\tau^{\text{bool}} s \quad \text{if} \quad \forall C: \tau \rightsquigarrow \text{bool}. C[t] \Downarrow \implies C[s] \Downarrow, \quad (11)$$

$$t \simeq_\tau^{\text{bool}} s \quad \text{if} \quad \forall C: \tau \rightsquigarrow \text{bool}. C[t] \Downarrow \iff C[s] \Downarrow. \quad (12)$$

The ground contextual preorder is (subtly) coarser than the contextual preorder, see e.g. [70, §5]. To get a sufficiently expressive logical relation for  $\lesssim^{\text{bool}}$ , we extend the weak transition relation  $\xRightarrow{l}$ :

**Notation 3.9.** For  $t, s \in \text{Tr}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}$  and  $e \in \text{Tr}_{\tau_1}$  put

$$t \xRightarrow{e} s \iff \exists t'. (t \Rightarrow t') \wedge (t' \xrightarrow{e} s \vee s = t' e).$$

For terms which are not of function type, put  $t \xRightarrow{l} s$  iff  $t \xRightarrow{l} s$ .

**Definition 3.10.** The step-indexed logical relation  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\mu\text{TCL}$  is constructed like  $\mathcal{L}$ , except that all occurrences of weak labelled transitions  $\xRightarrow{l}$  in the definitions of  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are replaced by  $\xRightarrow{l}$ .

Again we obtain compatibility with the language operations:

**Theorem 3.11.** *For all  $\alpha \leq \omega$  the relation  $\mathcal{M}^\alpha$  is a congruence on  $\text{Tr}$ .*

The proof works similarly to that of Theorem 3.4, modulo handling the extra transitions in cases such as application. The relation  $\mathcal{M}$  is sound for the ground contextual preorder:

**Corollary 3.12.** *For all  $\tau \in \text{Ty}$  and terms  $t, s \in \text{Tr}_\tau$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{M}_\tau^\omega(t, s) \implies t \lesssim_\tau^{\text{bool}} s.$$

**PROOF.** Unlike  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$ , the relation  $\mathcal{M}^\omega$  is not adequate to observe termination at all types. It is, however, adequate at  $\text{bool}$ :

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{bool}}^\omega(t, s) \implies (t \Downarrow \implies s \Downarrow).$$

The remaining argument is like in the proof of Corollary 3.6.  $\diamond$

The extra permissiveness of  $\xRightarrow{l}$  allows potentially diverging terms  $t: \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2$  to be tested and compared against terminating terms, in a manner similar to [40, §4]. In particular, it helps us to establish the other direction of the  $\eta$ -law:

**Example 3.13.** We prove the full  $\eta$ -law w.r.t. ground equivalence:

$$f \simeq^{\text{bool}} S(KI)f \quad \text{for all } f: \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2. \quad (13)$$

We already know  $f \lesssim S(KI)f$  from [Example 3.8](#), which implies  $f \lesssim^{\text{bool}} S(KI)f$  because  $\lesssim^{\text{bool}}$  is coarser than  $\lesssim$ . For the reverse direction  $S(KI)f \lesssim^{\text{bool}} f$ , it suffices to show  $\mathcal{M}^{n+1}(S(KI)f, f)$  for all  $n < \omega$ . We have

$$S(KI)f \Rightarrow S''(KI, f) \xrightarrow{e} (K I e)(f e) \Rightarrow f e.$$

Note that analogous to [Remark 3.7](#), the relations  $\mathcal{M}^{(-)}$  are backwards closed under silent transitions. Hence it is enough to prove  $\mathcal{M}^{n+1}(S''(KI, f), f)$ . Thus let  $\mathcal{M}^n(e, e')$ . Then  $f \xRightarrow{e'} f e'$ , and it remains to prove  $\mathcal{M}^n((K I e)(f e), f e')$ . For this it suffices to prove  $\mathcal{M}^n(f e, f e')$ , again using backwards closure, and this holds because  $\mathcal{M}^n(f, f)$  by reflexivity,  $\mathcal{M}^n(e, e')$ , and  $\mathcal{M}^n$  is a congruence.

At this point it is worth mentioning some of the difficulties arising from working with logical relations, which the developments for  $\mu\text{TCL}$  help identify and which our theory aims to address.

First, the principal technical challenge associated with any logical relation is establishing its congruence property. The argument typically follows the structure of the proof of [Theorem 3.4](#): one proceeds via an ultimately straightforward, yet tedious, structural induction over the syntax of the language, requiring meticulous case distinctions along the various operations and their operational rules. In the literature, the individual cases are often organized into separate *compatibility lemmas*. The length and complexity of the corresponding proofs makes them error-prone and arguably hard to trust without formalization in a proof assistant.

Second, another layer of reasoning is required for proving soundness w.r.t. contextual equivalence, as in [Corollaries 3.6 and 3.12](#).

Lastly, logical relations are tailor-made for the language under consideration and for the desired notion of contextual equivalence. Every small variation of the setting requires the construction of a separate logical relation, along with new and largely repetitive proofs of the congruence and soundness properties, as illustrated above when passing from  $\mathcal{L}$  to  $\mathcal{M}$ .

In the remainder we will demonstrate how our categorical approach to operational semantics can help mitigate these issues: for all languages modeled in higher-order abstract GSOS, a *generic* construction of step-indexed logical relations is available, associated with *generic* congruence and soundness theorems.

## 4 LOGICAL RELATIONS, ABSTRACTLY

We present our main technical contribution, a theory of contextual preorders and (step-indexed) logical relations in the framework of higher-order abstract GSOS. To ensure a convenient calculus of relations, we work under the following global assumptions:

**Assumptions 4.1.** We hereafter fix  $\mathbb{C}$  to be a category such that: (1)  $\mathbb{C}$  is complete, (2)  $\mathbb{C}$  has finite coproducts, (3)  $\mathbb{C}$  is well-powered, (4) monomorphisms are stable under finite coproducts, and (5) strong epimorphisms are stable under pullbacks.

**Remark 4.2.** (1) Recall that an epimorphism  $e$  is *strong* if for every commutative square  $g \cdot e = m \cdot f$  with  $m$  monic, there exists  $d$  such that  $f = d \cdot e$  and  $g = m \cdot d$ . Condition (5) means that for every pullback square  $e \cdot \bar{f} = f \cdot \bar{e}$ , if  $e$  is strongly epic, then so is  $\bar{e}$ .

(2) Since  $\mathbb{C}$  is complete and well-powered, every morphism  $f$  admits a (strong epi, mono)-factorization  $f = m \cdot e$  [[21, Prop. 4.4.3](#)]. The subobject represented by  $m$  is called the *image* of  $f$ . All our results can be extended to arbitrary proper factorization systems [[3](#)].

**Example 4.3.** Categories satisfying our assumptions include the category **Set** of sets and functions, the category  $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{D}}$  of (covariant) presheaves on a small category  $\mathbb{D}$  and natural transformations, and the categories of posets and monotone maps, nominal sets and equivariant maps, and metric spaces and non-expansive maps.

### 4.1 Relations in Categories

We review some basic terminology concerning relations in abstract categories. A *relation* on  $X \in \mathbb{C}$  is a subobject  $\langle l_R, r_R \rangle: R \rightarrow X \times X$ ; the projections  $l_R$  and  $r_R$  are usually left implicit. A *morphism* from a relation  $R \rightarrow X \times X$  to another relation  $S \rightarrow Y \times Y$  is given by a morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  such that there exists a (necessarily unique) morphism  $R \rightarrow S$  rendering the square below commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \dashrightarrow & S \\ \langle l_R, r_R \rangle \downarrow & & \downarrow \langle l_S, r_S \rangle \\ X \times X & \xrightarrow{f \times f} & Y \times Y \end{array}$$

We write  $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$  for the category of relations in  $\mathbb{C}$  and their morphisms. Finite products and coproducts in  $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$  are formed like in  $\mathbb{C}$ ; for coproducts this is due to [Assumption 4.1\(4\)](#). For  $X \in \mathbb{C}$  we denote by  $\mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$  the *fiber* at  $X$ , viz. the non-full subcategory consisting of all relations  $R \rightarrow X \times X$  and morphisms on the identity  $\text{id}_X: X \rightarrow X$ . Each fiber  $\mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C})$  is a poset; we write  $R \leq S$  for its partial order. As  $\mathbb{C}$  is complete and well-powered,  $\mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C})$  is in fact a complete lattice. We denote the top and bottom element by  $\top$  and  $\perp$ , respectively, meets (which are given by pullbacks) by  $\wedge$  and joins by  $\vee$ . For relations on (sorted) sets, joins and meets are (sortwise) union and intersection.

Given  $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  and a relation  $R \rightarrow X \times X$ , we write  $(f \times g)_*[R] \rightarrow Y \times Y$  for the *direct image* of  $R$  under  $f \times g$ , i.e. the image of the morphism  $R \xrightarrow{\langle l_R, r_R \rangle} X \times X \xrightarrow{f \times g} Y \times Y$ , and we write  $f_*$  for  $(f \times f)_*$ . Similarly, given  $S \rightarrow Y \times Y$  we let  $(f \times g)^*[S] \rightarrow X \times X$  denote the *preimage* of  $S$  under  $f \times g$ , i.e. the pullback of  $\langle l_S, r_S \rangle$  along  $f \times g$ , and we put  $f^*$  for  $(f \times f)^*$ . Note that  $(f \times g)_*$  is a left adjoint of  $(f \times g)^*$ : one has  $(f \times g)_*[R] \leq S$  iff  $R \leq (f \times g)^*[S]$ .

We denote the *identity relation*  $\langle \text{id}, \text{id} \rangle: X \rightarrow X \times X$  by  $\Delta_X$ , or just  $\Delta$ . The *composite* of two relations  $R, S \rightarrow X \times X$  is the relation  $R \cdot S \rightarrow X \times X$  given by the image of the morphism

$$\langle l_R \cdot \bar{l}_{R,S}, r_S \cdot \bar{r}_{R,S} \rangle: R \cdot S \rightarrow X \times X,$$

where  $\bar{l}_{R,S}$  and  $\bar{r}_{R,S}$  form the pullback of  $r_R$  and  $l_S$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \bar{l}_{R,S} & R \cdot S & \bar{r}_{R,S} \\ & & \swarrow & \vee & \searrow \\ l_R & \swarrow & R & & S & \searrow & r_S \\ & \swarrow & & X & \swarrow & & \searrow \\ & & & X & & & X \end{array}$$

Composition defines a monotone map  $\mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C})$ . A relation  $R$  is *reflexive* if  $\Delta \leq R$ , *transitive* if  $R \cdot R \leq R$ , and a *preorder* if it is both reflexive and transitive.

*Preordered objects.* Our abstract congruence results involve objects whose generalized elements are suitably preordered. We recall the required terminology from Urbat et al. [86].

**Definition 4.4.** A *preordered object* in  $\mathbb{C}$  is a pair  $(X, \leq)$  of an object  $X \in \mathbb{C}$  and a family  $\leq = (\leq_Y)_{Y \in \mathbb{C}}$ , where  $\leq_Y$  is a preorder on the hom-set  $\mathbb{C}(Y, X)$  satisfying

$$f \leq_Y g \implies f \cdot h \leq_Z g \cdot h \quad \text{for all } h: Z \rightarrow Y.$$

We drop the subscript from  $\leq_Y$  when it is obvious from the context.

**Example 4.5.** Every preordered set  $(X, \leq)$  can be viewed as a preordered object in  $\mathbf{Set}$  by taking the pointwise preorder on  $\mathbf{Set}(Y, X)$ :

$$f \leq g \iff \forall y \in Y. f(y) \leq g(y).$$

Note that there exist preordered objects in  $\mathbf{Set}$  where the order on  $\mathbf{Set}(Y, X)$  is not pointwise determined by that on  $\mathbf{Set}(1, X)$ ; hence preordered objects are more general than preordered sets.

**Definition 4.6.** Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a preordered object. A relation  $R \rhd X \times X$  is *up-closed* if for every span  $X \xleftarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} X$  and every morphism  $S \rightarrow R$  such that the left-hand triangle in the first diagram below commutes, and the right-hand triangle commutes laxly as indicated, then there exists a morphism  $S \rightarrow R$  such that the second diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & S & \\ f \swarrow & & \searrow g \\ X & \xleftarrow{l_R} R & \xrightarrow{r_R} X \end{array} \implies \begin{array}{ccc} & S & \\ f \swarrow & \dashrightarrow & \searrow g \\ X & \xleftarrow{l_R} R & \xrightarrow{r_R} X \end{array}$$

Urbat et al. [86] have called up-closed relations *good for simulations*, as they admit a typical property of simulation relations.

**Example 4.7.** Given a preordered set  $(X, \leq)$ , regarded as a preordered object in  $\mathbf{Set}$  as in Example 4.5, a relation  $R \subseteq X \times X$  is up-closed iff  $R; \leq \subseteq R$ . For instance:

(1) Every relation  $R \subseteq X \times X$  induces a relation  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}R \subseteq \mathcal{P}X \times \mathcal{P}X$  on the power set known as the (left-to-right) Egli-Milner relation:

$$\vec{\mathcal{P}}(A, B) \iff \forall a \in A. \exists b \in B. R(a, b).$$

This relation is up-closed w.r.t.  $\subseteq$ .

(2) In contrast, the *two-sided Egli-Milner relation* given by

$$\overline{\mathcal{P}}R(A, B) \iff \forall a \in A. \exists b \in B. R(a, b) \wedge \forall b \in B. \exists a \in A. R(a, b)$$

is not up-closed.

## 4.2 Congruences and Contextual Preorders

As highlighted in Section 3.2, logical relations are employed as a sound proof method for contextual preorders. In the following we introduce the abstract contextual preorder that will feature in our generic soundness result. It is based on the categorical notion of congruence for functor algebras, which is most conveniently presented in terms of relation liftings of the underlying functor.

A *relation lifting* of an endofunctor  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a functor  $\overline{\Sigma}: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$  making the square below commute; here

$|-|$  denotes the forgetful functor sending  $R \rhd X \times X$  to  $X$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C}) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\Sigma}} & \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C}) \\ \downarrow |-| & & \downarrow |-| \\ \mathbb{C} & \xrightarrow{\Sigma} & \mathbb{C} \end{array}$$

Every endofunctor  $\Sigma$  has a *canonical relation lifting*  $\overline{\Sigma}$ , which takes a relation  $R \rhd X \times X$  to the relation  $\overline{\Sigma}R \rhd \Sigma X \times \Sigma X$  given by the image of the morphism  $\langle \Sigma l_R, \Sigma r_R \rangle: \Sigma R \rightarrow \Sigma X \times \Sigma X$ .

**Example 4.8.** (1) For a polynomial functor  $\Sigma$  on  $\mathbf{Set}^S$ , the canonical lifting  $\overline{\Sigma}$  sends  $R \subseteq X \times X$  to the relation  $\overline{\Sigma}R \subseteq \Sigma X \times \Sigma X$  relating  $u, v \in (\Sigma X)_s$  iff  $u = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $v = f(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  for some  $f: s_1 \times \dots \times s_n \rightarrow s$  in  $\Sigma$ , and  $R_{s_i}(x_i, y_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

(2) The canonical lifting  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$  of the power set functor  $\mathcal{P}: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  takes a relation  $R \rhd X \times X$  to the two-sided Egli-Milner relation  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}R \subseteq \mathcal{P}X \times \mathcal{P}X$  (Example 4.7(2)). Taking the left-to-right Egli-Milner relation yields a non-canonical lifting, denoted by  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ .

(3) For every set  $S$  of sorts, the pointwise power set functor

$$\mathcal{P}_*: \mathbf{Set}^S \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^S, \quad \mathcal{P}_*X = (\mathcal{P}X_s)_{s \in S},$$

has a relation lifting  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_*$  taking  $R \subseteq X \times X$  to  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_*R = (\vec{\mathcal{P}}R_s)_{s \in S}$ .

In our applications, syntax endofunctors  $\Sigma$  will always be equipped with their canonical relation lifting. This ensures that free  $\Sigma$ -algebras emerge as liftings of free  $\Sigma$ -algebras:

**Proposition 4.9** [86, Prop. V.4]. *Let  $\overline{\Sigma}$  and  $\overline{\Sigma}^*$  be the canonical liftings of  $\Sigma$  and  $\Sigma^*$ . If  $\Sigma$  preserves strong epimorphisms, then  $\overline{\Sigma}^* = \overline{\Sigma}$ .*

Using canonical liftings, the notion of congruence from universal algebra extends to functor algebras [52]:

**Definition 4.10.** For an endofunctor  $\Sigma$  with canonical lifting  $\overline{\Sigma}$ , a *congruence* on a  $\Sigma$ -algebra  $(A, a)$  is a relation  $R \rhd A \times A$  such that

$$a_*[\overline{\Sigma}R] \leq R.$$

**Example 4.11.** For a polynomial functor  $\Sigma$  on  $\mathbf{Set}^S$ , a relation  $R \subseteq A \times A$  is a congruence as per Definition 4.10 iff it is a congruence in the usual sense, i.e. compatible with all  $\Sigma$ -operations.

We will mainly consider congruences on the initial algebra  $\mu\Sigma$ , which admit a useful property; see e.g. [52, Ex. 3.3.2]:

**Proposition 4.12.** *Every congruence on  $\mu\Sigma$  is reflexive.*

We are prepared to set up our abstract notion of contextual preorder, which is parametric in a choice of admissible observations.

**Definition 4.13.** Let  $O \rhd \mu\Sigma \times \mu\Sigma$  be a preorder.

(1) A relation  $R \rhd \mu\Sigma \times \mu\Sigma$  is *O-adequate* if  $R \leq O$ .

(2) If a greatest  $O$ -adequate congruence on  $\mu\Sigma$  exists, then it is said to be the *contextual preorder w.r.t. O* and denoted by

$$\lesssim^O \rhd \mu\Sigma \times \mu\Sigma.$$

This terminology is justified by the following result:

**Proposition 4.14.** *If  $\Sigma$  preserves strong epimorphisms and the relation  $\lesssim^O$  exists, then it is a preorder.*



**Example 4.15.** (1) For every  $S$ -sorted signature  $\Sigma$  and preorder  $O \subseteq \mu\Sigma \times \mu\Sigma$ , the contextual preorder  $\lesssim^O$  exists; it is given by

$$t \lesssim_{\tau}^O s \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall \tau'. \forall C: \tau \rightsquigarrow \tau'. O_{\tau'}(C[t], C[s]) \quad (14)$$

in sort  $\tau$ . To see this, we take (14) as the definition of  $\lesssim^O$  and prove it to be the greatest  $O$ -adequate congruence. Indeed, every  $O$ -adequate congruence  $R$  is contained in  $\lesssim^O$ : if  $R_{\tau}(t, s)$  and  $C: \tau \rightsquigarrow \tau'$  we have  $R_{\tau'}(C[t], C[s])$  because  $R$  is a congruence, hence  $O_{\tau'}(C[t], C[s])$  because  $R$  is  $O$ -adequate, which proves  $t \lesssim_{\tau}^O s$ . Conversely, it is not difficult to verify that the relation  $\lesssim^O$  defined by (14) is itself an  $O$ -adequate congruence. Hence it is the greatest such relation.

(2) Taking  $O_{\tau} = \{(t, s) \mid t \Downarrow \Rightarrow s \Downarrow\}$  for all  $\tau$ , the relation  $\lesssim^O$  coincides with the contextual preorder of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  given by (7).

(3) Similarly, for  $O_{\text{bool}} = \{(t, s) \mid t \Downarrow \Rightarrow s \Downarrow\}$  and  $O_{\tau} = \tau_{\neq}$  if  $\tau \neq \text{bool}$ , we recover the ground contextual preorder given by (11).

In general the existence of a greatest  $O$ -adequate congruence  $\lesssim^O$  is not obvious because a join of congruences need not be a congruence. However, we show next that it always exists for well-behaved categories and syntax functors:

**Remark 4.16.** (1) A category  $\mathbb{C}$  is *infinitary extensive* [22] if it has small coproducts and for every set-indexed family of objects  $(X_i)_{i \in I}$  the functor  $E: \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{C}/X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{C}/\coprod_{i \in I} X_i$  sending  $(p_i: Y_i \rightarrow X_i)_{i \in I}$  to  $\coprod_{i \in I} p_i: \coprod_{i \in I} Y_i \rightarrow \coprod_{i \in I} X_i$  is an equivalence of categories. Extensivity hence ensures that coproducts behave like disjoint unions.

(2) A diagram  $D: I \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is *directed* if  $I$  is a directed poset, that is,  $I$  is non-empty and any two elements  $i, j \in I$  have an upper bound  $k \geq i, j$ . A *directed colimit* is a colimit of a directed diagram.

(3) The category  $\mathbb{C}$  has *smooth monomorphisms* [4] if for every object the join of a directed family of subobjects is given by the colimit of the corresponding directed diagram in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

**Theorem 4.17** (Existence of  $\lesssim^O$ ). *Suppose that  $\mathbb{C}$  is infinitary extensive and has smooth monomorphisms, and that  $\Sigma$  preserves strong epimorphisms, monomorphisms, and directed colimits. Then for every preorder  $O \rightsquigarrow \mu\Sigma \times \mu\Sigma$  the contextual preorder  $\lesssim^O \rightsquigarrow \mu\Sigma \times \mu\Sigma$  exists.*

All categories of Example 4.3 satisfy the assumptions on  $\mathbb{C}$ , and all polynomial functors on  $\text{Set}^S$  satisfy those on  $\Sigma$ . The proof is a categorical generalization of an argument by Pitts [73, Thm. 7.5.3] for a fragment of the ML language. It rests on the lemma below; here  $R^*$  denotes the least preorder containing a given relation  $R$ .

**Lemma 4.18.** *In the setting of Theorem 4.17, if  $\mathcal{R}$  is a set of reflexive congruences on a  $\Sigma$ -algebra  $(A, a)$ , then  $(\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^*$  is a congruence.*

**PROOF OF THEOREM 4.17.** Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be the set of all  $O$ -adequate congruences on  $\mu\Sigma$ . Then  $\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R$  exists as  $\text{Rel}_A(\mathbb{C})$  is a complete lattice,  $S = (\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^*$  is a congruence by Proposition 4.12 and Lemma 4.18, and  $S$  is  $O$ -adequate because  $S = (\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^* \leq O^* = O$ , using that each  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  is adequate and  $O$  is a preorder. Hence  $S \in \mathcal{R}$ , so  $S$  is the greatest  $O$ -adequate congruence.  $\diamond$

### 4.3 Logical Relations via Liftings

Next we develop our abstract categorical notion of (step-indexed) logical relation, with the goal of exposing a sound proof method for the contextual preorders  $\lesssim^O$  introduced above. Just like congruences rely on relation liftings of syntax endofunctors, logical relations are based on relation liftings of behaviour bifunctors.

A *relation lifting* of a mixed variance bifunctor  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a functor  $\bar{B}: \text{Rel}(\mathbb{C})^{\text{op}} \times \text{Rel}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$  such that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Rel}(\mathbb{C})^{\text{op}} \times \text{Rel}(\mathbb{C}) & \xrightarrow{\bar{B}} & \text{Rel}(\mathbb{C}) \\ \downarrow | \cdot |^{\text{op}} \times | \cdot | & & \downarrow | \cdot | \\ \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} & \xrightarrow{B} & \mathbb{C} \end{array}$$

commutes. Similar to the case of endofunctors, every bifunctor  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  has a *canonical relation lifting*  $\bar{B}$ ; it takes two relations  $R \rightsquigarrow X \times X$  and  $S \rightsquigarrow Y \times Y$  to the relation  $\bar{B}(R, S) \rightsquigarrow B(X, Y) \times B(X, Y)$  given by the image of the morphism  $u_{R, S}$  in the pullback below. This is an equivalent, albeit simplified, version of a construction due to Urbat et al. [86, Sec. C.2].

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_{R, S} & \xrightarrow{v_{R, S}} & B(R, S) \\ \swarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \langle B(\text{id}, \text{id}_S), B(\text{id}, r_S) \rangle \\ \bar{B}(R, S) & \xleftarrow{u_{R, S}} & B(\text{Id}, \text{id}) \times B(r_R, \text{id}) \\ \searrow & & \downarrow \\ & & B(X, Y) \times B(X, Y) \longrightarrow B(R, Y) \times B(R, Y) \end{array}$$

**Example 4.19.** For the behaviour bifunctor  $B$  on  $\text{Set}^{\text{T}_Y}$  given by (4), the canonical lifting  $\bar{B}$  sends a pair of relations  $R \subseteq X \times X$  and  $S \subseteq Y \times Y$  to the relation  $\bar{B}(R, S)$  on  $B(X, Y)$  defined as follows:

(1)  $\bar{B}(R, S)_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \subseteq (Y_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} + Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}})^2$  contains all  $(u, v)$  such that either  $u, v \in Y_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}$  and  $S_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(u, v)$ , or  $u, v \in Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}}$  and for all  $x, x' \in X_{\tau_1}$ , if  $R_{\tau_1}(x, x')$  then  $S_{\tau_2}(u(x), v(x'))$ .

(2)  $\bar{B}(R, S)_{\mu\alpha.\tau} \subseteq (Y_{\mu\alpha.\tau} + Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]})^2$  contains all such  $(u, v)$  that either  $u, v \in Y_{\mu\alpha.\tau}$  and  $S_{\mu\alpha.\tau}(u, v)$ , or  $u, v \in Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}$  and  $S_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}(u, v)$ .

(3)  $\bar{B}(R, S)_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2} \subseteq (Y_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2} + Y_{\tau_1} + Y_{\tau_2})^2$  contains all  $(u, v)$  such that either  $u, v \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}$  and  $S_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(u, v)$ , or  $u, v \in Y_{\tau_1}$  and  $S_{\tau_1}(u, v)$ , or  $u, v \in Y_{\tau_2}$  and  $S_{\tau_2}(u, v)$ .

(4)  $\bar{B}(R, S)_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} \subseteq (Y_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} + Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2})^2$  contains all  $(u, v)$  such that either  $u, v \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}$  and  $S_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(u, v)$ , or  $u = (u_1, u_2), v = (v_1, v_2) \in Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2}$  and  $S_{\tau_i}(u_i, v_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ .

Note how these clauses match the definition of the logical relation  $\mathcal{L}$  in Definition 3.2. In particular, clause (1) captures the requirement that for functions, related inputs should lead to related outputs.

Using relation liftings of bifunctors we can introduce bisimulations and logical relations for higher-order coalgebras. Both notions are parametric in a pair of coalgebras  $c, \tilde{c}: X \rightarrow B(X, X)$ , with  $c$  thought of as the operational model of some higher-order GSOS law and  $\tilde{c}$  as some form of weak transition system associated to  $c$  (see Example 4.22 below for illustration).

**Definition 4.20** (Bisimulation, Logical Relation). Let  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with a relation lifting  $\bar{B}$ , and let  $c, \tilde{c}: X \rightarrow B(X, X)$  be coalgebras.

(1) A *bisimulation* for  $(c, \bar{c})$  is a relation  $R \multimap X \times X$  such that

$$R \leq (c \times \bar{c})^* [\bar{B}(\Delta, R)].$$

(2) A *logical relation* for  $(c, \bar{c})$  is a relation  $R \multimap X \times X$  such that

$$R \leq (c \times \bar{c})^* [\bar{B}(R, R)].$$

(3) A *step-indexed logical relation* for  $(c, \bar{c})$  is an ordinal-indexed family of relations  $(R^\alpha \multimap X \times X)_\alpha$  that forms a decreasing chain (i.e.  $R^\alpha \leq R^\beta$  for all  $\beta < \alpha$ ) and satisfies

$$R^{\alpha+1} \leq (c \times \bar{c})^* [\bar{B}(R^\alpha, R^\alpha)] \quad \text{for all } \alpha.$$

Informally, a (step-indexed) logical relation requires that, on term-labeled transitions, related input terms should lead to related output terms, while a bisimulation only considers identical inputs.

**Remark 4.21.** The above concepts are related as follows:

- (1) For  $c = \bar{c}$  a bisimulation corresponds to the familiar notion of (Hermida-Jacobs) bisimulation [44] for the endofunctor  $B(X, -)$  and its relation lifting  $\bar{B}(\Delta, -)$ . If  $\bar{c}$  is some weakening of  $c$ , one obtains an abstract notion of *applicative bisimulation* [86].
- (2) Every reflexive logical relation is a bisimulation.
- (3) Every logical relation  $R$  can be regarded as a step-indexed logical relation by putting  $R^\alpha = R$  for all  $\alpha$ .
- (4) Conversely, every step-indexed logical relation  $(R^\alpha)_\alpha$  induces a logical relation: since  $\mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C})$  is a small complete lattice, the decreasing chain  $(R^\alpha)_\alpha$  eventually stabilizes, i.e. there exists a (least) ordinal  $\nu$  such that  $R^{\nu+1} = R^\nu$ . An upper bound to  $\nu$  is given by the cardinality of  $\mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C})$ . Then  $R^\nu$  is a logical relation because

$$R^\nu = R^{\nu+1} \leq (c \times \bar{c})^* [\bar{B}(R^\nu, R^\nu)].$$

**Example 4.22.** Let  $\gamma: \text{Tr} \rightarrow B(\text{Tr}, \text{Tr})$  be the operational model of  $\mu\text{TCL}$  given by (5). By postcomposing with the map  $b \mapsto \{b\}$  we regard  $\gamma$  as a nondeterministic transition system  $\gamma: \text{Tr} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_*B(\text{Tr}, \text{Tr})$ , and we denote by  $\tilde{\gamma}: \text{Tr} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_*B(\text{Tr}, \text{Tr})$  its corresponding *weak transition system*, given for each  $\tau \in \text{Ty}$  and  $t \in \text{Tr}_\tau$  by

$$\tilde{\gamma}_\tau(t) = \{t\} \cup \bigcup_{t \Rightarrow s} \gamma_\tau(s).$$

The bifunctor  $\mathcal{P}_* \cdot B$  has a relation lifting  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_* \cdot \bar{B}$  where  $\bar{B}$  is the canonical lifting of  $B$  (Example 4.19) and  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_*$  is the left-to-right Egli-Milner lifting of  $\mathcal{P}_*$  (Example 4.8(3)). The relations  $(\mathcal{L}^\alpha)_\alpha$  given by Definition 3.2 for  $\alpha \leq \omega$  and by  $\mathcal{L}^\alpha = \mathcal{L}^\omega$  for  $\alpha > \omega$  form a step-indexed logical relation for  $(\gamma, \tilde{\gamma})$  w.r.t. the lifting  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_* \cdot \bar{B}$ .

#### 4.4 Constructing Step-Indexed Logical Relations

In the following we present a general construction of a step-indexed logical relation that applies to arbitrary higher-order coalgebras, in particular to operational models of higher-order GSOS laws.

**Construction 4.23 (Step-Indexed Henceforth).** Let  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with a relation lifting  $\bar{B}$ , and let  $c, \bar{c}: X \rightarrow B(X, X)$  be coalgebras. For every  $R \multimap X \times X$  we define the step-indexed logical relation  $(\square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \alpha} R \multimap X \times X)_\alpha$  by transfinite induction:

$$\square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, 0} R = R,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \alpha+1} R &= \square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \alpha} R \wedge (c \times \bar{c})^* [\bar{B}(\square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \alpha} R, \square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \alpha} R)], \\ \square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \alpha} R &= \bigwedge_{\beta < \alpha} \square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \beta} R \quad \text{for limit ordinals } \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

We usually write  $\square^\alpha R$  for  $\square^{\bar{B}, c, \bar{c}, \alpha} R$ , and we let  $\nu$  denote the least ordinal such that  $\square^{\nu+1} R = \square^\nu R$  (Remark 4.21(4)).

The construction of  $\square^\alpha R$  thus takes, at every non-zero ordinal  $\alpha$ , the greatest relation satisfying the conditions of Definition 4.20(3).

**Example 4.24.** Taking  $B, \bar{B}, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}$  as in Example 4.22 and  $R = \top$  (the total relation on  $\text{Tr}$ ), we see that  $(\square^{\bar{B}, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \alpha} \top)_\alpha$  coincides with the step-indexed logical relation  $(\mathcal{L}^\alpha)_\alpha$  for  $\mu\text{TCL}$  given by Definition 3.2. Note that  $(\square^\alpha \top)_\alpha$  stabilizes after  $\omega$  steps (Remark 3.3(2)).

We will now apply Construction 4.23 to the operational model of a higher-order GSOS law. Let us fix the required setup:

**Assumptions 4.25.** In the remainder we assume that we are given:

- (1) an endofunctor  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that preserves strong epimorphisms and admits free algebras  $\Sigma^* X$ , with its canonical lifting  $\bar{\Sigma}$ ;
- (2) a bifunctor  $B: \mathbb{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with a relation lifting  $\bar{B}$ ;
- (3) for each  $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}$  a preorder  $\leq$  on  $B(X, Y)$  such that each relation  $\bar{B}(R, S)$  is up-closed w.r.t.  $\leq$  (Definition 4.6);
- (4) a  $V$ -pointed higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho$  of  $\Sigma$  over  $B$  that lifts to a  $\Delta_V$ -pointed higher-order GSOS law  $\bar{\varrho}$  of  $\bar{\Sigma}$  over  $\bar{B}$ .

**Remark 4.26.** (1) We stress that the relation lifting  $\bar{B}$  of  $B$  need not be canonical, while we always choose the canonical lifting of  $\Sigma$ .

(2) The requirement that  $\Sigma$  preserves strong epimorphism ensures that the free monad  $\Sigma^*$  lifts (Proposition 4.9) and is rather innocent: it holds, e.g., for all set functors, all left adjoints (including binding functors on presheaf categories figuring in Section 5), for coproducts of such functors, and for products in categories where strong epimorphisms are stable under products. This covers a wide range of syntax functors for higher-order languages, which typically combine polynomial and binding constructions.

(3) Condition (4) states that  $|\bar{\varrho}_{R,S}| = \varrho_{X,Y}$  for all relations  $R \multimap X \times X$  and  $S \multimap Y \times Y$ , where  $|-|: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is the forgetful functor. Note that  $|\bar{\varrho}_{R,S}|$  has the type (6) by Proposition 4.9. Note also that a lifting  $\bar{\varrho}$  is necessarily unique because  $|-|$  is faithful. If  $\bar{B}$  is the canonical lifting of  $B$ , a corresponding higher-order GSOS law always has a relation lifting [87, Constr. D.5]. Generally, the existence of  $\bar{\varrho}$  can be understood as a monotonicity condition on the rules represented by  $\varrho$ . For instance, for functors  $B$  modelling nondeterministic behaviours and whose relation lifting involves the left-to-right Egli-Milner lifting  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ , it entails the absence of rules with negative premises [35].

**Example 4.27.** For  $\mu\text{TCL}$  we instantiate the above data to

- (1) the signature functor  $\Sigma: \mathbf{Set}^{\text{Ty}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$  of  $\mu\text{TCL}$ ;
- (2) the behaviour  $\mathcal{P}_* \cdot B$  and its lifting  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_* \cdot \bar{B}$  as in Example 4.22;
- (3) the order  $\subseteq$  on  $\mathcal{P}_*B(X, Y)$  given by pointwise inclusion;

(4) the (0-pointed) higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho'$  of  $\Sigma$  over  $\mathcal{P}_* \cdot B$  whose component at  $X, Y \in \mathbf{Set}^{\text{Ty}}$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma(X \times \mathcal{P}_* B(X, Y)) & \xrightarrow{\Sigma \text{st}_{X, B(X, Y)}} & \Sigma \mathcal{P}_*(X \times B(X, Y)) \\ & \swarrow \delta_{X \times B(X, Y)} & \nearrow \\ \mathcal{P}_* \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y)) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}_* \varrho_{X, Y}} & \mathcal{P}_* B(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y)) \end{array} \quad (15)$$

Here  $\varrho$  is the higher-order GSOS law for  $\mu\text{TCL}$  given by (6), the natural transformation  $\text{st}$  is the (pointwise) canonical strength

$$\text{st}_{X, Y}: X \times \mathcal{P}_* Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_*(X \times Y), \quad (\text{st}_{X, Y})_\tau(x, A) = \{(x, a) \mid a \in A\},$$

and the natural transformation  $\delta: \Sigma \mathcal{P}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_* \Sigma$  is given by

$$f(U_1, \dots, U_n) \mapsto \{f(u_1, \dots, u_n) \mid u_1 \in U_1, \dots, u_n \in U_n\}.$$

Hence,  $\varrho'$  is essentially the law  $\varrho$  regarded as a law for the non-deterministic behaviour functor  $\mathcal{P}_* \cdot B$ . Accordingly, the operational model of  $\varrho'$  is simply the composite

$$\mu\Sigma \xrightarrow{\gamma} B(\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma) \mapsto \mathcal{P}_* B(\mu\Sigma, \mu\Sigma),$$

of the operational model  $\gamma$  of  $\varrho$  given by (5) with the map  $b \mapsto \{b\}$ .

Let us verify that  $\varrho'$  has a relation lifting (Assumption 4.25(4)). Since  $\bar{B}$  is the canonical lifting, the law  $\varrho$  lifts (Remark 4.26(3)), so we only need to show that  $\text{st}$  and  $\delta$  lift. This means that for all  $R \mapsto X \times X$  and  $S \mapsto Y \times Y$  the maps

$$\text{st}_{X, Y}: R \times \bar{\mathcal{P}}_* S \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{P}}_*(R \times S) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_X: \bar{\Sigma} \bar{\mathcal{P}}_* R \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{P}}_* \bar{\Sigma} R$$

are  $\text{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$ -morphisms, which easily follows from the definitions.

The key ingredient to our general congruence result for logical relations is a higher-order version of *lax bialgebras* [20]:

**Definition 4.28** [38, 86]. A *lax  $\varrho$ -bialgebra*  $(X, a, c)$  is given by an object  $X \in \mathbb{C}$  and morphisms  $a: \Sigma X \rightarrow X$  and  $c: X \rightarrow B(X, X)$  such that the diagram below commutes laxly:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Sigma X & \xrightarrow{a} & X & \xrightarrow{c} & B(X, X) \\ \Sigma(\text{id}, c) \downarrow & & \text{id} & & \uparrow B(\text{id}, \hat{a}) \\ \Sigma(X \times B(X, X)) & \xrightarrow{\varrho_{X, X}} & B(X, \Sigma^*(X + X)) & \xrightarrow{B(\text{id}, \Sigma^* \nabla)} & B(X, \Sigma^* X) \end{array}$$

If the diagram commutes strictly, then  $(X, a, c)$  is a  $\varrho$ -bialgebra.

Informally, in a lax bialgebra the operational rules corresponding to the law  $\varrho$  are sound (every  $c$ -transition required by some rule exists), and in a bialgebra they are also complete (no other  $c$ -transitions exists). The operational model  $(\mu\Sigma, \iota, \gamma)$  of  $\varrho$  (Figure 1) is a  $\varrho$ -bialgebra, and if  $\tilde{\gamma}$  is some weakening of  $\gamma$ , laxness of  $(\mu\Sigma, \iota, \tilde{\gamma})$  means that the rules given by  $\varrho$  are sound for weak transitions.

**Example 4.29.** The weak operation model  $\tilde{\gamma}$  for  $\mu\text{TCL}$  (Example 4.22) forms a lax  $\varrho'$ -algebra, with  $\varrho'$  given by (15). Indeed, all the rules of Figure 2 remain sound when strong transitions are replaced by weak ones<sup>1</sup>. For illustration, consider the two rules for application and their respective weak versions:

$$\frac{t \rightarrow t'}{ts \rightarrow t's} \quad \frac{t \xrightarrow{s} t'}{ts \rightarrow t'} \quad \frac{t \Rightarrow t'}{ts \Rightarrow t's} \quad \frac{t \xrightarrow{s} t'}{ts \Rightarrow t'}$$

<sup>1</sup>This alludes to the rules being *cool* in the sense of the cool congruence formats of Bloom [19] and van Glabbeek [88].

The third rule is sound because it emerges via repeated application of the first one. The fourth rule is sound as it follows from the second and third rule. Similarly for the other rules of Figure 2.

The soundness condition modeled by lax bialgebras give rise to a natural criterion for the logical relation  $\square^V R$  to be a congruence:

**Theorem 4.30.** Let  $(X, a, c)$  be a  $\varrho$ -bialgebra, and let  $(X, a, \tilde{c})$  be a lax  $\varrho$ -bialgebra. For every congruence  $R \mapsto X \times X$  on  $(X, a)$  and every ordinal  $\alpha$ , the relation  $\square^\alpha R = \square^{\bar{B}, c, \tilde{c}, \alpha} R$  is a congruence on  $(X, a)$ .

**PROOF.** We proceed by transfinite induction. The base case is immediate since  $\square^0 R = R$  is a congruence by assumption. The limit step follows because meets of congruences are congruences. For the successor step  $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha+1$ , suppose that  $\square^\alpha R$  is a congruence. We are to prove that  $\square^{\alpha+1} R$  is congruence, i.e.  $a_*[\bar{\Sigma}(\square^{\alpha+1} R)] \leq \square^{\alpha+1} R$ . By definition of  $\square^{\alpha+1} R$ , this is equivalent to showing

$$a_*[\bar{\Sigma}(\square^{\alpha+1} R)] \leq \square^\alpha R, \quad (16)$$

$$a_*[\bar{\Sigma}(\square^{\alpha+1} R)] \leq (c \times \tilde{c})^*[\bar{B}(\square^\alpha R, \square^\alpha R)]. \quad (17)$$

The inequality (16) holds because  $\square^{\alpha+1} R \leq \square^\alpha R$  and  $\square^\alpha R$  is a congruence by induction. To prove (17), we first observe that there exists a  $\mathbb{C}$ -morphism  $\bar{\Sigma}(\square^{\alpha+1} R) \rightarrow \bar{B}(\square^\alpha R, \square^\alpha R)$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \bar{\Sigma}(\square^{\alpha+1} R) & \\ c \cdot a \cdot l \swarrow & \downarrow & \tilde{c} \cdot a \cdot r \searrow \\ B(X, X) & \xleftarrow{l} \bar{B}(\square^\alpha R, \square^\alpha R) \xrightarrow{r} & B(X, X) \end{array} \quad (18)$$

commutes laxly, where  $l$  and  $r$  are the projections of the respective relations (omitting subscripts). This follows from the diagram in Figure 3; all its cells commute (laxly) as indicated. Here  $p$  is the pairing of the  $\text{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$ -morphisms witnessing that  $\square^{\alpha+1} R \leq \square^\alpha R$  and  $\square^{\alpha+1} R \leq (c \times \tilde{c})^*[\bar{B}(\square^\alpha R, \square^\alpha R)]$ , and  $@: \bar{\Sigma} R \rightarrow R$  is the  $\bar{\Sigma}$ -algebra structure witnessing that  $R$  is a congruence on  $(X, a)$ . (We write  $f_1: S \rightarrow T$  for the  $\mathbb{C}$ -morphism witnessing that  $f: Y \rightarrow Z$  is  $\text{Rel}(\mathbb{C})$ -morphism from  $S \mapsto Y \times Y$  to  $T \mapsto Z \times Z$ .) Since  $\bar{B}(\square^\alpha R, \square^\alpha R)$  is up-closed (Assumption 4.25(3)), it follows from (18) that there exists a morphism  $\bar{\Sigma}(\square^{\alpha+1} R) \rightarrow \bar{B}(\square^\alpha R, \square^\alpha R)$  such that the diagram below commutes strictly:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \bar{\Sigma}(\square^{\alpha+1} R) & \\ c \cdot a \cdot l \swarrow & \downarrow & \tilde{c} \cdot a \cdot r \searrow \\ B(X, X) & \xleftarrow{l} \bar{B}(\square^\alpha R, \square^\alpha R) \xrightarrow{r} & B(X, X) \end{array}$$

This commutative diagram is equivalent to (17).  $\diamond$

The main interest of Theorem 4.30 is the case where  $R = \top$  and  $(X, a, c)$  is the operational model of the higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho$ . This leads us to the main result of our paper, a congruence result for our generic step-index logical relation  $(\square^\alpha \top)_\alpha$ . We stress that our results rely on the Assumptions 4.1 and 4.25.

**Corollary 4.31** (Congruence). Let  $(\mu\Sigma, \iota, \gamma)$  be the operational model of  $\varrho$ , and let  $(\mu\Sigma, \iota, \tilde{\gamma})$  be a lax  $\varrho$ -bialgebra. Then for every ordinal  $\alpha$  the relation  $\square^\alpha \top = \square^{\bar{B}, \gamma, \tilde{\gamma}, \alpha} \top$  is a congruence on  $\mu\Sigma$ .

Since every congruence on  $\mu\Sigma$  is reflexive (Proposition 4.12), we immediately conclude:




Figure 3: Diagram for the proof of Theorem 4.30

**Corollary 4.32** (Fundamental Property). *In the setting of Corollary 4.31, the logical relation  $\square^{\vee\top}$  is reflexive.*

Finally, we deduce a simple criterion for the logical relation  $\square^{\vee\top}$  to yield a sound proof method for a contextual preorder:

**Corollary 4.33** (Soundness). *Let  $O \rightsquigarrow \mu\Sigma \times \mu\Sigma$  be a preorder such that the contextual preorder  $\leq^O$  exists. In the setting of Corollary 4.31, if the logical relation  $\square^{\vee\top}$  is  $O$ -adequate, it is contained in  $\leq^O$ .*

Recall from Proposition 4.14 that  $\leq^O$  always exists under natural assumptions on the category  $\mathbb{C}$  and the syntax functor  $\Sigma$ .

**Example 4.34.** Choose the data for  $\mu\text{TCL}$  as in Example 4.27.

- (1) By taking  $O_\tau = \{(t, s) \mid t \Downarrow \Rightarrow s \Downarrow\}$  as in Example 4.15(2), we recover the results of Theorem 3.4 and Corollary 3.6: the relation  $\square^{\vee\top} = \mathcal{L}^\omega$  is a congruence, and sound for the contextual preorder.
- (2) To capture the ground contextual preorder, we extend the weak transition system  $\tilde{\gamma}$  of Example 4.22 as follows: put

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(t) = \tilde{\gamma}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(t) \cup \bigcup_{t \Downarrow s} \{\lambda e : \tau_1. (s e)\}$$

at function types and  $\tilde{\gamma}_\tau = \tilde{\gamma}_\tau$  at all other types. This amounts to extending the weak transition relation  $\stackrel{l}{\Rightarrow}$  to  $\stackrel{l}{\Rightarrow}$  as required in Definition 3.10. Observe that  $(\mu\Sigma, \iota, \tilde{\gamma})$  is still a lax bialgebra, i.e. the rules remain sound w.r.t. the extended weak transition relation. The step-indexed logical relation  $(\square^{\alpha\top})_\alpha = (\square^{\tilde{B}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\gamma}, \vee\top})_\alpha$  coincides with  $(\mathcal{M}^\alpha)_\alpha$  given in Definition 3.10. Taking  $O_{\text{bool}} = \{(t, s) \mid t \Downarrow \Rightarrow s \Downarrow\}$  and  $O_\tau = \mu\Sigma_\tau \times \mu\Sigma_\tau$  for  $\tau \neq \text{bool}$  as in Example 4.15(2), we recover the results of Theorem 3.11 and Corollary 3.12: the relation  $\mathcal{M}^\omega$  is a congruence, and sound for the ground contextual preorder.

The key insight to draw from the above results is that the lax bialgebra condition forms the language-specific core of compatibility and soundness of logical relations, while their boiler-plate part comes for free thanks to the categorical setup. Checking the lax bialgebra condition itself for a given language usually boils down to a straightforward analysis of its rules, as in Example 4.29.

**Remark 4.35.** We highlight some noteworthy connections with the recent work of Urbat et al. [86], which lifts another operational method – namely Howe’s method [48, 49] – to the level of higher-order abstract GSOS. Briefly, Howe’s method is used to show that applicative (bi)similarity is a congruence, while logical relations are a form of relation between programs that is essentially designed with the congruence property in mind. There are

certain similarities between the two methods, which our present work makes explicit:

- (1) Logical relations and Howe’s method are regarded as independent techniques in the literature, each with its own use cases. Our present results demonstrate that logical relations for recursive types can be modeled in the same categorical framework as applicative simulations for untyped languages. Even more remarkably, the respective congruence results (Corollary 4.31 and [86, Thm. VIII.6]) boil down to the same abstract (lax-bialgebra) condition. This exposes a formal and explicit connection between the two most widely used higher-order operational techniques.
- (2) Our present technical setup is slightly simpler compared to [86]:
  - (a) Extensivity is not needed for the congruence result (just for constructing the contextual preorder).
  - (b) Weakenings are arbitrary coalgebras, while in [86] they are restricted. For instance, the coalgebra  $\tilde{\gamma}$  of Example 4.34(2) is not a weakening in the sense of [86].
  - (c) The congruence proof proceeds directly via structural induction and does not involve Howe’s closure.

These simplifications bear a relevant insight on their own: they reflect, on a categorical level, the common wisdom that congruence proofs for logical relations are (and in fact should be) less complex than for applicative simulations.

## 5 BINDING AND NONDETERMINISM

We conclude with a case study of our general framework, namely the functional language **FPC**, which is a typed  $\lambda$ -calculus with recursive types. We consider a nondeterministic variant of the standard **FPC** [33, 43] to emphasize that higher-order abstract GSOS can handle effectful settings. The overall treatment is similar to that of untyped [38, 86] and simply typed [39]  $\lambda$ -calculi in earlier work; hence we focus on the core ideas and omit technical details.

The types of **FPC** are the same as those of  $\mu\text{TCL}$ , defined earlier (3). The language **FPC** lacks combinators but instead includes variables,  $\lambda$ -abstractions, sums, products conditionals and a non-deterministic choice operator. We skip the term formation rules of **FPC**, as they are standard; the (call-by-name, open evaluation) operational semantics is presented in Figure 4.

To implement **FPC** in higher-order abstract GSOS, we build on the categorical approach to abstract syntax and variable binding using presheaves [30, 34]. Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be the category of finite cardinals

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{t s \rightarrow t' s} \quad \frac{}{(\text{lam } x: \tau. t) s \rightarrow t[x/s]} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{unfold}(t) \rightarrow \text{unfold}(t')} \quad \frac{}{\text{unfold}(\text{fold}(t)) \rightarrow t} \\
 \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{fst}(t) \rightarrow \text{fst}(t')} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{snd}(t) \rightarrow \text{snd}(t')} \quad \frac{}{\text{fst}(\text{pair}(t, s)) \rightarrow t} \quad \frac{}{\text{snd}(\text{pair}(t, s)) \rightarrow s} \\
 \frac{}{t \oplus s \rightarrow t} \quad \frac{}{t \oplus s \rightarrow s} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{case}(t, s, r) \rightarrow \text{case}(t', s, r)} \quad \frac{}{\text{case}(\text{inl}(t), s, r) \rightarrow s t} \quad \frac{}{\text{case}(\text{inr}(t), s, r) \rightarrow r t}
 \end{array}$$

Figure 4: Call-by-name operational semantics of FPC. Metavariables  $r, s, t, t'$  range over possibly open terms.

and functions, and regard the set  $\text{Ty}$  of types as a discrete category. An object  $\Gamma: n \rightarrow \text{Ty}$  of the slice category  $\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  is a *typed variable context* associating to each variable  $x \in n$  a type; we put  $|\Gamma| = n$ . The fundamental operation of *context extension*  $(- + \tilde{\tau}): \mathbb{F}/\text{Ty} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  extends a context with a new variable  $x: \tau$ .

The base category for modeling FPC, and typed languages in general, is the presheaf category  $\mathbb{C} = (\text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}}$ . Informally, a presheaf  $X \in (\text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}}$  associates to each type  $\tau$  and context  $\Gamma$  a set  $X_\tau(\Gamma)$  of terms of type  $\tau$  in context  $\Gamma$ . For example, the presheaf  $V$  of *variables* is given by  $V_\tau(\Gamma) = \{x \in |\Gamma| \mid \Gamma(x) = \tau\}$ , and FPC-terms form a presheaf  $\Lambda$  given by  $\Lambda_\tau(\Gamma) = \{t \mid t \text{ is an FPC-term and } \Gamma \vdash t: \tau\}$ , with terms taken modulo  $\alpha$ -equivalence. The presheaf  $\Lambda$  carries the initial algebra for the endofunctor  $\Sigma$  on  $(\text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}}$  corresponding to the *binding signature* [34] of FPC:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Sigma_\tau X &= V_\tau + X_\tau \times X_\tau + \Sigma_\tau^1 X + \Sigma_\tau^2 X + \Sigma_\tau^3 X + \Sigma_\tau^4 X, \\
 \Sigma_\tau^1 X &= \coprod_{\tau' \in \text{Ty}} (X_{\tau' \rightarrow \tau} \times X_{\tau'}) + X_{\tau \boxtimes \tau} + X_{\tau \boxtimes \tau'}, \\
 \Sigma_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}^2 X &= X_{\tau_1} + X_{\tau_2}, \quad \Sigma_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}^2 X = X_{\tau_1} \times X_{\tau_2}, \\
 \Sigma_{\mu\alpha. \tau}^2 X &= X_{\tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha]}, \quad \Sigma_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^2 X = X_{\tau_2} \cdot (- + \tilde{\tau}_1), \\
 \Sigma_\tau^3 X &= \coprod_{\tau_1 \in \text{Ty}} \coprod_{\tau_2 \in \text{Ty}} X_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} \times X_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau} \times X_{\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau}, \\
 \Sigma_\tau^4 X &= \coprod_{\sigma: \tau = \sigma[\mu\alpha. \sigma/\alpha]} X_{\mu\alpha. \sigma}.
 \end{aligned}$$

In the definition of  $\Sigma^4$ ,  $\sigma$  ranges over types with one free variable. The bifunctor  $B$  for FPC (compare with (4)) is given by

$$B(X, Y) = \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y)),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}}, & D_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_1} + Y_{\tau_2}, \\
 D_{\mu\alpha. \tau}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha]}, & D_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\mathcal{P}_*$  is the pointwise power set functor  $X \mapsto \mathcal{P} \cdot X$ , we write  $Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}}$  for the exponential in  $\text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}}$ , and  $\langle\langle -, - \rangle\rangle$  is given by

$$\langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle_\tau(\Gamma) = \text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}}\left(\prod_{x \in |\Gamma|} X_{\Gamma(x)}, Y_\tau\right).$$

The bifunctor  $\langle\langle -, - \rangle\rangle$  models *substitution*. For example, there is a morphism  $\gamma_0: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle$  mapping terms of FPC to their substitution structure: given  $t \in \Lambda_\tau(\Gamma)$ , the natural transformation  $(\gamma_0)_\tau(t): \prod_{x \in |\Gamma|} \Lambda_{\Gamma(x)} \rightarrow \Lambda_\tau$  is given at component  $\Delta \in \mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  by

$$\vec{u} \in \prod_{x \in |\Gamma|} \Lambda_{\Gamma(x)}(\Delta) \mapsto t[\vec{u}] \in \Lambda_\tau(\Delta),$$

i.e. the simultaneous substitution of  $\vec{u}$  for the variables of  $t$ .

There is a  $V$ -pointed higher-order order GSOS law  $\rho$  of  $\Sigma$  over  $B$  modelling FPC (Appendix C) which, as in the case of  $\mu\text{TCL}$ , encodes the operational rules of FPC into maps, taking into account how the individual constructors affect the substitution structure of terms. The canonical operational model of  $\rho$  is the coalgebra

$$\langle\gamma_0, \gamma\rangle: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(\Lambda, \Lambda))$$

where  $\gamma_0$  is as described above, and  $\gamma$  is the transition system that models  $\beta$ -reduction according to the operational semantics and identifies values similarly to  $\mu\text{TCL}$  in Section 3.1. For instance,

$$\gamma_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(\Gamma)(\text{pair}(t, s)) = \{(t, s)\}, \text{ else } \gamma_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(\Gamma)(t) = \{t' \mid t \rightarrow t'\}.$$

Here,  $\gamma$  identifies  $\text{pair}(t, s)$  as a value with projections  $t$  and  $s$ . Replacing  $\rightarrow$  by its reflexive transitive hull  $\Rightarrow$  we obtain the *weak operational model*  $\langle\gamma_0, \tilde{\gamma}\rangle: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(\Lambda, \Lambda))$ . Similar to the  $\mu\text{TCL}$  case, we choose the relation lifting  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_* \cdot \bar{B}$  of  $\mathcal{P}_* \cdot B$  where  $\vec{\mathcal{P}}_*$  is the left-to-right Egli-Milner lifting and  $\bar{B}$  is the canonical lifting. The generic logical relation  $(\mathcal{L}^\alpha)_\alpha = (\square^\alpha)_\alpha$  w.r.t.  $(\gamma, \tilde{\gamma})$  is then given by  $\mathcal{L}^0 = \top$ ,  $\mathcal{L}^\alpha = \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{L}^\beta$  at limit ordinals  $\alpha$ , and

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau^{\alpha+1} = \mathcal{L}_\tau^\alpha \cap \mathcal{S}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^\alpha, \mathcal{L}^\alpha) \cap \mathcal{E}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^\alpha) \cap \mathcal{V}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^\alpha, \mathcal{L}^\alpha)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V}$  are the maps on  $\text{Rel}_\Lambda$  given by

$$\mathcal{S}_\tau(\Gamma)(Q, R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{for all } \Delta \text{ and } Q_{\Gamma(x)}(\Delta)(u_x, v_x) (x \in |\Gamma|), \text{ one has } R_\tau(\Delta)(t[\vec{u}], s[\vec{v}])\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_\tau(\Gamma)(R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t \rightarrow t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow s' \wedge R_\tau(\Gamma)(t', s')\},$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(\Gamma)(Q, R) = \{(t, s) \mid \text{for all } Q_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)(e, e'),$$

$$\text{if } t = \lambda x. t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow \lambda x. s' \wedge R_{\tau_2}(\Gamma)(t'[e/x], s'[e'/x])\},$$

and similarly for the other types.

**Remark 5.1.** Note that substitution closure is directly built into the definition of  $\mathcal{L}$ . In the literature, logical relations are commonly constructed in two steps, namely by first defining them on closed terms, and then extending to open terms via (closed) substitutions.

By instantiating our results of Section 4 to FPC, we obtain:

**Corollary 5.2.** *The logical relation  $\mathcal{L}$  for FPC is a congruence, and sound for the contextual preorder w.r.t. the termination predicate.*

Again, this amounts to observing that the operational rules of FPC remain sound for weak transitions, which is easily verified.

## 6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have developed a language-independent theory of step-indexed logical relations and contextual equivalence based on higher-order abstract GSOS. We have shown that logical relations

arise naturally via a generic construction and that soundness for contextual equivalence is contingent of a simple condition on the operational semantics. We expect that our theory will lead to a higher level of automation of proofs via logical relations and that its scaling nature contributes towards efficient reasoning on real-world languages.

Let us identify several directions for future work that will further enrich our theory. Currently, we have investigated logical relations in higher-order abstract GSOS for call-by-name languages, and define them in terms of their small-step ( $\rightarrow$ ) and weak ( $\Rightarrow$ ) semantics. In the future, we will look to explore call-by-value logical relations, and make use of *big-step* semantics ( $\Downarrow$ ). For the latter, the challenge would be to find a suitable analogue of our lax-bialgebra condition.

Another direction is to leverage our abstract coalgebraic theory to effectful, probabilistic and differential settings, and also to generalize to *Kripke* logical relations [29, 50, 51, 64]. Another compelling prospect is to apply our theory to *cross-language logical relations* [12, 26, 50, 66, 67], specifically to reason about (secure) compilers. Such an effort would likely involve the development of notions of *morphisms of higher-order GSOS laws*, analogously to the first-order case [90], a notion that has been used as criterion of secure compilation in the past [1, 84].

In the present paper, we have focused on logical relations that are sound for contextual equivalence; investigating completeness at similar generality is a sensible (and likely challenging) next step.

Finally, ever since their conception, logical relations have been used for *parametricity* [8, 10, 13, 55, 77]. We will aim to leverage our theory to study and reason about parametricity at the level of generality of higher-order abstract GSOS.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author would like to thank Paul Blain Levy for helpful discussions on the reasoning about program equivalence.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Carmine Abate, Matteo Busi, and Stelios Tsampas. 2021. Fully Abstract and Robust Compilation: And How to Reconcile the Two, Abstractly. In *19th Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems, APLAS'21 (LNCS, Vol. 13008)*, Hakjoo Oh (Ed.). Springer, 83–101. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89051-3\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89051-3_6)
- [2] S. Abramsky. 1990. The lazy  $\lambda$ -calculus. In *Research topics in Functional Programming*. Addison Wesley, 65–117.
- [3] Jiří Adámek, Horst Herrlich, and George E. Strecker. 1990. *Abstract and Concrete Categories*. John Wiley and Sons. Free online version: <http://www.tac.mta.ca/tac/reprints/articles/17/tr17abs.html>.
- [4] Jiří Adámek, Stefan Milius, and Lawrence S. Moss. 2021. Initial Algebras Without Iteration. In *9th Conference on Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science (CALCO 2021) (Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Vol. 211)*, Fabio Gadducci and Alexandra Silva (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 5:1–5:20.
- [5] Alejandro Aguirre and Lars Birkedal. 2023. Step-Indexed Logical Relations for Countable Nondeterminism and Probabilistic Choice. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 7, POPL (2023), 33–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571195>
- [6] Amal Ahmed. 2006. Step-Indexed Syntactic Logical Relations for Recursive and Quantified Types. In *15th European Symposium on Programming (ESOP 2006) (LNCS, Vol. 3924)*. Springer, 69–83. [https://doi.org/10.1007/11693024\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/11693024_6)
- [7] Amal Ahmed, Derek Dreyer, and Andreas Rossberg. 2009. State-dependent representation independence. In *36th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, (POPL 2009)*, Zhong Shao and Benjamin C. Pierce (Eds.). ACM, 340–353. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1480881.1480925>
- [8] Amal Ahmed, Dustin Jamner, Jeremy G. Siek, and Philip Wadler. 2017. Theorems for free for free: parametricity, with and without types. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 1, ICFP (2017), 39:1–39:28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3110283>
- [9] Thorsten Altenkirch and Ambrus Kaposi. 2016. Normalisation by Evaluation for Dependent Types. In *1st International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD 2016) (LIPIcs, Vol. 52)*. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 6:1–6:16. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSCD.2016.6>
- [10] Abhishek Anand and Greg Morrisett. 2017. Revisiting Parametricity: Inductives and Uniformity of Propositions. *CoRR abs/1705.01163* (2017). arXiv:1705.01163 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.01163>
- [11] Andrew W. Appel and David A. McAllester. 2001. An indexed model of recursive types for foundational proof-carrying code. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 23, 5 (2001), 657–683. <https://doi.org/10.1145/504709.504712>
- [12] Nick Benton and Chung-Kil Hur. 2009. Biorthogonality, Step-Indexing and Compiler Correctness. In *14th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP 2009) (Edinburgh, Scotland)*. ACM, 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1596550.1596567>
- [13] Jean-Philippe Bernardy, Patrik Jansson, and Ross Paterson. 2012. Proofs for free - Parametricity for dependent types. *J. Funct. Program.* 22, 2 (2012), 107–152. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796812000056>
- [14] Lars Birkedal, Ales Bizjak, and Jan Schwinghammer. 2013. Step-Indexed Relational Reasoning for Countable Nondeterminism. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 9, 4 (2013). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9\(4:4\)2013](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9(4:4)2013)
- [15] Lars Birkedal, Filip Sieczkowski, and Jacob Thamsborg. 2012. A Concurrent Logical Relation. In *26th International Workshop/21st Annual Conference of the EACSL (CSL 2012) (LIPIcs, Vol. 16)*, Patrick Cégielski and Arnaud Durand (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2012.107>
- [16] Lars Birkedal, Kristian Støvring, and Jacob Thamsborg. 2010. The Category-Theoretic Solution of Recursive Metric-Space Equations. *Theoretical Computer Science* 411, 47 (2010), 4102–4122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2010.07.010>
- [17] Ales Bizjak and Lars Birkedal. 2015. Step-Indexed Logical Relations for Probability. In *18th International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FoSSaCS 2015)*, Vol. 9034. Springer, 279–294. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0_18)
- [18] Aleš Bizjak and Lars Birkedal. 2015. Step-Indexed Logical Relations for Probability. In *18th International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FoSSaCS 2015) (LNCS, Vol. 9034)*, Andrew Pitts (Ed.). Springer, 279–294. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0_18)
- [19] Bard Bloom. 1995. Structural Operational Semantics for Weak Bisimulations. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 146, 1&2 (1995), 25–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(94\)00152-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(94)00152-9)
- [20] Filippo Bonchi, Daniela Petrisan, Damien Pous, and Jurriaan Rot. 2015. Lax Bialgebras and Up-To Techniques for Weak Bisimulations. In *26th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2015, Madrid, Spain, September 1-4, 2015 (LIPIcs, Vol. 42)*, Luca Aceto and David de Frutos-Escrig (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 240–253. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2015.240>
- [21] Francis Borceux. 1994. *Handbook of Categorical Algebra: Volume 1: Basic Category Theory*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, Vol. 1. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511525858>
- [22] Aurelio Carboni, Stephen Lack, and R. F. C. Walters. 1993. Introduction to Extensive and Distributive Categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 84, 2 (Feb. 1993), 145–158. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049\(93\)90035-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049(93)90035-R)
- [23] Francesco Dagnino and Francesco Gavazzo. 2022. A Fibrational Tale of Operational Logical Relations. In *7th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD 2022) (LIPIcs, Vol. 228)*. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 3:1–3:21. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSCD.2022.3>
- [24] Francesco Dagnino and Francesco Gavazzo. 2023. A Fibrational Tale of Operational Logical Relations: Pure, Effectful and Differential. *CoRR* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.03271> arXiv:2303.03271 [cs]
- [25] Ugo Dal Lago and Francesco Gavazzo. 2021. Differential Logical Relations, Part II: Increments and Derivatives. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 895, C (2021), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2021.09.027>
- [26] Dominique Devriese, Marco Patrignani, and Frank Piessens. 2016. Fully-abstract compilation by approximate back-translation. In *43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2016*. 164–177. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2837614.2837618>
- [27] Derek Dreyer, Amal Ahmed, and Lars Birkedal. 2009. Logical Step-Indexed Logical Relations. In *24th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2009)*. IEEE Computer Society, 71–80. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2009.34>
- [28] Derek Dreyer, Amal Ahmed, and Lars Birkedal. 2011. Logical Step-Indexed Logical Relations. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 7, 2 (2011). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-7\(2:16\)2011](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-7(2:16)2011)
- [29] Derek Dreyer, Georg Neis, and Lars Birkedal. 2012. The impact of higher-order state and control effects on local relational reasoning. *J. Funct. Program.* 22, 4-5 (2012), 477–528. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095679681200024X>
- [30] Marcelo Fiore. 2022. Semantic analysis of normalisation by evaluation for typed lambda calculus. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* 32, 8 (2022), 1028–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129522000263>
- [31] Marcelo P. Fiore. 2008. Second-Order and Dependently-Sorted Abstract Syntax. In *23rd Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2008)*. IEEE Computer Society, 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2008.38>
- [32] Marcelo P. Fiore and Chung-Kil Hur. 2010. Second-Order Equational Logic (Extended Abstract). In *24th International Workshop on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2010) (LNCS, Vol. 6247)*. Springer, 320–335. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15205-4\\_26](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15205-4_26)
- [33] Marcelo P. Fiore and Gordon D. Plotkin. 1994. An Axiomatization of Computationally Adequate Domain Theoretic Models of FPC. In *9th Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '94)*. IEEE Computer Society, 92–102. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1994.316083>
- [34] Marcelo P. Fiore, Gordon D. Plotkin, and Daniele Turi. 1999. Abstract Syntax and Variable Binding. In *14th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 1999)*. IEEE Computer Society, 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1999.782615>
- [35] Marcelo P. Fiore and Sam Staton. 2010. Positive structural operational semantics and monotone distributive law. In *CMCS'10 Short Contributions: 10th International Workshop on Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science*.
- [36] Aina Linn Georges, Armaël Guéneau, Thomas Van Strydonck, Amin Timany, Alix Trieu, Dominique Devriese, and Lars Birkedal. 2023. Cerise: Program Verification on a Capability Machine in the Presence of Untrusted Code. *J. ACM* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3623510>
- [37] Paolo G. Giarrusso, Léo Stefanescu, Amin Timany, Lars Birkedal, and Robert Krebbers. 2020. Scala Step-by-Step: Soundness for DOT with Step-Indexed Logical Relations in Iris. In *25th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP 2020) (Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 4)*. ACM, Article 114, 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3408996>
- [38] Sergey Goncharov, Stefan Milius, Lutz Schröder, Stelios Tsampas, and Henning Urbat. 2023. Towards a Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics. In *50th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2023) (Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 7)*. ACM, Article 22, 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571215>
- [39] Sergey Goncharov, Alessio Santamaria, Lutz Schröder, Stelios Tsampas, and Henning Urbat. 2024. Logical Predicates in Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics. (2024).
- [40] Andrew D. Gordon. 1999. Bisimilarity as a Theory of Functional Programming. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 228, 1-2 (1999), 5–47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(98\)00353-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(98)00353-3)
- [41] A. D. Gordon. 1999. *Operational Equivalences for Untyped and Polymorphic Object Calculi*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 9–54.
- [42] Jean Goubault-Larrecq, Slawomir Lasota, and David Nowak. 2008. Logical relations for monadic types. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* 18, 6 (2008), 1169–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129508007172>
- [43] C.A. Gunter. 1992. *Semantics of Programming Languages: Structures and Techniques*. London.
- [44] Claudio Hermida and Bart Jacobs. 1998. Structural Induction and Coinduction in a Fibrational Setting. *Information and Computation* 145, 2 (1998), 107–152. <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1998.2725>

- [45] Claudio Hermida, Uday S. Reddy, and Edmund P. Robinson. 2014. Logical Relations and Parametricity - A Reynolds Programme for Category Theory and Programming Languages. *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 303 (2014), 149–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2014.02.008>
- [46] Claudio Alberto Hermida. 1993. *Fibrations, logical predicates and indeterminates*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Edinburgh. <https://era.ed.ac.uk/handle/1842/14057>
- [47] J. Roger Hindley and Jonathan P. Seldin. 2008. *Lambda-Calculus and Combinators: An Introduction* (2 ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809835>
- [48] Douglas J. Howe. 1989. Equality In Lazy Computation Systems. In *4th Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 1989)*. IEEE Computer Society, 198–203. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1989.39174>
- [49] Douglas J. Howe. 1996. Proving Congruence of Bisimulation in Functional Programming Languages. *Inf. Comput.* 124, 2 (1996), 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1996.0008>
- [50] Chung-Kil Hur and Derek Dreyer. 2011. A Kripke logical relation between ML and Assembly. In *38th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, (POPL 2011)*, Thomas Ball and Mooly Sagiv (Eds.). ACM, 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1926385.1926402>
- [51] Chung-Kil Hur, Derek Dreyer, Georg Neis, and Viktor Vafeiadis. 2012. The marriage of bisimulations and Kripke logical relations. In *39th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2012) USA, January 22-28, 2012*, John Field and Michael Hicks (Eds.). ACM, 59–72. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2103656.2103666>
- [52] Bart Jacobs. 2016. *Introduction to Coalgebra: Towards Mathematics of States and Observation*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 59. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316823187>
- [53] Patricia Johann, Alex Simpson, and Janis Voigtländer. 2010. A Generic Operational Metatheory for Algebraic Effects. In *25th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2010)*. IEEE Computer Society, 209–218. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2010.29>
- [54] Shin-ya Katsumata. 2005. *A generalisation of pre-logical predicates and its applications*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Edinburgh. <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/850>
- [55] Chantal Keller and Marc Lasson. 2012. Parametricity in an Impredicative Sort. In *Computer Science Logic - 26th International Workshop/21st Annual Conference of the EACSL, (CSL 2012) (LIPLcs, Vol. 16)*, Patrick Cégielski and Arnaud Durand (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 381–395.
- [56] Ugo Dal Lago and Francesco Gavazzo. 2022. Effectful program distancing. In *49th Annual ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2022) (Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 6)*. 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498680>
- [57] Ugo Dal Lago, Francesco Gavazzo, and Akira Yoshimizu. 2019. Differential Logical Relations, Part I: The Simply-Typed Case. In *46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2019) (LIPLcs, Vol. 132)*. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 111:1–111:14. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPLcs.ICALP.2019.111>
- [58] Søren B. Lassen. 1998. *Relational Reasoning about Functions and Nondeterminism*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Aarhus University. <https://www.brics.dk/DS/98/2/BRICS-DS-98-2.pdf>
- [59] Paul Levy, John Power, and Hayo Thielecke. 2003. Modelling environments in call-by-value programming languages. *Inf. Comput.* 185, 2 (2003), 182–210.
- [60] S. Mac Lane. 1978. *Categories for the Working Mathematician* (2 ed.). Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5. Springer. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4757-4721-8>
- [61] Robin Milner. 1978. A theory of type polymorphism in programming. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 17, 3 (1978), 348–375. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(78\)90014-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(78)90014-4)
- [62] James H. Morris. 1968. *Lambda-Calculus Models of Programming Languages*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [63] Max S. New, William J. Bowman, and Amal Ahmed. 2016. Fully abstract compilation via universal embedding. In *21st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP 2016)*. ACM, 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2951913.2951941>
- [64] Peter W. O’Hearn and Jon G. Riecke. 1995. Kripke Logical Relations and PCF. *Inf. Comput.* 120, 1 (1995), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1995.1103>
- [65] C-H Luke Ong. 1988. *The Lazy Lambda Calculus: An Investigation into the Foundations of Functional Programming*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Imperial College London. <http://hdl.handle.net/10044/1/47211>
- [66] Marco Patrignani, Eric Mark Martin, and Dominique Devriese. 2021. On the Semantic Expressiveness of Recursive Types. In *48th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2021) (Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 5)*. ACM, Article 21, 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434302>
- [67] James T. Perconti and Amal Ahmed. 2014. Verifying an Open Compiler Using Multi-language Semantics. In *Programming Languages and Systems - 23rd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2014, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2014 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 8410)*. Springer, 128–148. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-54833-8\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-54833-8_8)
- [68] Andrew M. Pitts. 1996. Reasoning about Local Variables with Operationally-Based Logical Relations. In *11th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 1996)*. IEEE Computer Society, 152–163. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1996.561314>
- [69] Andrew M. Pitts. 1996. Relational Properties of Domains. *Information and Computation* 127, 2 (1996), 66–90. <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1996.0052>
- [70] Andrew M Pitts. 1997. Operationally-based theories of program equivalence. *Semantics and Logics of Computation* 14 (1997), 241.
- [71] Andrew M. Pitts. 1998. Existential Types: Logical Relations and Operational Equivalence (*Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1443*). Springer, 309–326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0055063>
- [72] Andrew M. Pitts. 2000. Parametric Polymorphism and Operational Equivalence. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 10, 3 (2000), 321–359. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129500003066>
- [73] Andrew M. Pitts. 2004. Typed operational reasoning. In *Advanced Topics in Types and Programming Languages*, Benjamin C. Pierce (Ed.). The MIT Press, Chapter 7.
- [74] Andrew M. Pitts and Ian D. B. Stark. 1993. Observable Properties of Higher Order Functions That Dynamically Create Local Names, or: What’s New?. In *8th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 1993) (LNCS, Vol. 711)*. Springer, 122–141. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57182-5\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57182-5_8)
- [75] Andrew M Pitts and Ian D. B. Stark. 1998. Operational Reasoning for Functions with Local State. In *Higher Order Operational Techniques in Semantics*, Andrew D. Gordon and Andrew M. Pitts (Eds.). Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 227–274.
- [76] G. D. Plotkin. 1973. *Lambda-Definability and Logical Relations*. Technical Report. University of Edinburgh.
- [77] John C. Reynolds. 1983. Types, Abstraction and Parametric Polymorphism. In *Information Processing 83, Proceedings of the IFIP 9th World Computer Congress*, R. E. A. Mason (Ed.). North-Holland/IFIP, 513–523.
- [78] Jan J. M. M. Rutten. 2000. Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 249, 1 (2000), 3–80. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(00\)00056-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(00)00056-6)
- [79] K. Sieber. 1992. Reasoning about sequential functions via logical relations. In *Applications of Categories in Computer Science: Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society Symposium, Durham 1991 (London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series)*, M. P. Fourman, P. T. Johnstone, and A. M. Editors Pitts (Eds.). Cambridge University Press, 258–269. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511525902.015>
- [80] Simon Spies, Neel Krishnaswami, and Derek Dreyer. 2021. Transfinite step-indexing for termination. 5, POPL, Article 13 (jan 2021), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3434294>
- [81] R. Statman. 1985. Logical relations and the typed lambda-calculus. *Information and Control* 65, 2 (1985), 85–97. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(85\)80001-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(85)80001-2)
- [82] William W. Tait. 1967. Intensional Interpretations of Functionals of Finite Type I. *J. Symb. Log.* 32, 2 (1967), 198–212. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2271658>
- [83] Amin Timany, Léo Stefanesco, Morten Krogh-Jespersen, and Lars Birkedal. 2017. A Logical Relation for Monadic Encapsulation of State: Proving Contextual Equivalences in the Presence of RunST. In *44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2017) (Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 2)*. ACM, Article 64, 28 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158152>
- [84] Stelios Tsampas, Andreas Nuyts, Dominique Devriese, and Frank Piessens. 2020. A Categorical Approach to Secure Compilation. In *15th IFIP WG 1.3 International Workshop on Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science, CMCS’20 (LNCS, Vol. 12094)*, Daniela Petrisan and Jurriaan Rot (Eds.). Springer, 155–179. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57201-3\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57201-3_9)
- [85] Daniele Turi and Gordon D. Plotkin. 1997. Towards a Mathematical Operational Semantics. In *12th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 1997)*, 280–291. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1997.614955>
- [86] Henning Urbat, Stelios Tsampas, Sergey Goncharov, Stefan Milius, and Lutz Schröder. 2023. Weak Similarity in Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics. In *38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2023)*. IEEE Computer Society Press. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175706>
- [87] Henning Urbat, Stelios Tsampas, Sergey Goncharov, Stefan Milius, and Lutz Schröder. 2023. Weak Similarity in Higher-Order Mathematical Operational Semantics. [arXiv:2302.08200](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.08200) [cs.PL]
- [88] Rob J. van Glabbeek. 2011. On cool congruence formats for weak bisimulations. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 412, 28 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2011.02.036>
- [89] Mitchell Wand, Ryan Culpepper, Theophilos Giannakopoulos, and Andrew Cobb. 2018. Contextual Equivalence for a Probabilistic Language with Continuous Random Variables and Recursion. In *23rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP 2018) (Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 2)*. ACM, Article 87, 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236782>
- [90] Hiroshi Watanabe. 2002. Well-behaved Translations between Structural Operational Semantics. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 65, 1 (2002), 337–357. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661\(04\)80372-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661(04)80372-4)



## APPENDIX: OMITTED PROOFS AND DETAILS

This appendix provides all omitted proofs and additional details on our examples, ordered by section.

### A DETAILS FOR SECTION 3

#### Full Definition of the Higher-Order GSOS Law $\rho$ for $\mu\text{CTL}$ (Section 3.1)

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \rho_{X,Y} : \quad \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y)) \rightarrow B(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y)) \\
 \rho_{X,Y}(tr) = \text{case } tr \text{ of} \\
 \begin{array}{ll}
 S_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3} & \mapsto \lambda e. S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(e) \\
 S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, f) & \mapsto \lambda e. S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(t, e) \\
 S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}((t, f), (s, g)) & \mapsto \lambda e. \text{app}_{\tau_2, \tau_3}(\text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3}(t, e), \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s, e)) \\
 K_{\tau_1, \tau_2} & \mapsto \lambda e. K'_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(e) \\
 K'_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, f) & \mapsto \lambda e. t \\
 I_\tau & \mapsto \lambda e. e \\
 \text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, f) & \mapsto t \in X_{\tau_1} \\
 \text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, f) & \mapsto t \in X_{\tau_2} \\
 \\
 \text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}((t, f), (s, g), (r, h)) & \mapsto \begin{cases} \text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(f, s, r) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2} \\ \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_3}(s, t') & \text{if } f = \text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t') \\ \text{app}_{\tau_2, \tau_3}(r, t') & \text{if } f = \text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t') \end{cases} \\
 \\
 \text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, f) & \mapsto \begin{cases} \text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} \\ l(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2} \end{cases} \\
 \\
 \text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, f) & \mapsto \begin{cases} \text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} \\ r(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2} \end{cases} \\
 \\
 \text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}((t, f), (s, g)) & \mapsto (t, s) \\
 \\
 \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}((t, f), (s, g)) & \mapsto \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}} \\ \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f, s) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \end{cases} \\
 \\
 \text{fold}_\tau(t, f) & \mapsto t \in Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]} \\
 \\
 \text{unfold}_\tau(t, f) & \mapsto \begin{cases} \text{unfold}_\tau(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\mu\alpha.\tau} \\ f & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]} \end{cases}
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

#### Proof of Theorem 3.4

We show by induction on  $n$  that  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a congruence for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $n = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{L}^0 = \top$  and thus the base case is immediate. For the induction step, we assume that  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a congruence. By the definition of  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}$ , for each operation  $f \in \Sigma$  of arity  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n$  and pairs  $t_i, s_i : \tau_i$  such that  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_{\tau_1}(t_1, s_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_{\tau_n}(t_n, s_n)$ , we have to show the following:

- (i)  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau_f}(f(t_1, \dots, t_n), f(s_1, \dots, s_n))$ .
- (ii) If  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rightarrow t$ , then  $\exists s. f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \Rightarrow s$  with  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau_f}(t, s)$ .
- (iii) We have four subcases based on the type of  $\tau_f$ .
  - (a) *Subcase*  $\tau_f = \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2$ . We have that if  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \xrightarrow{\boxplus_1} t$  then  $\exists s. f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{\boxplus_1} s$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau_f}(t, s)$ . If  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \xrightarrow{\boxplus_2} t$  then  $\exists s. f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{\boxplus_2} s$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau_f}(t, s)$ .
  - (b) *Subcase*  $\tau_f = \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2$ . If  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_1} t_1$  and  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_2} t_2$  then  $\exists s_1, s_2. f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_1} s_1$  and  $f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{\boxtimes_2} s_2$ ; moreover,  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau_1}(t_1, s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau_2}(t_2, s_2)$ .
  - (c) *Subcase*  $\tau_f = \mu\alpha.\tau$ . If  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \xrightarrow{\mu} t$  then  $\exists s. f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{\mu} s$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}(t, s)$ .
  - (d) *Subcase*  $\tau_f = \tau \rightarrow \tau'$ . For all terms  $e_1, e_2 : \tau$  with  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau}(e_1, e_2)$ , if  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \xrightarrow{e_1} t$ , then  $\exists s. f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \xrightarrow{e_2} s$  and  $\mathcal{L}^n_{\tau'}(t, s)$ .

We begin with (i). Let  $f \in \Sigma$  be an operation. By the definition of  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}^{n+1} \leq \mathcal{L}^n$  and thus

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1) \wedge \dots \implies \mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(t_1, s_1) \wedge \dots$$

By the induction hypothesis we may conclude

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(f(t_1, \dots, t_n), f(s_1, \dots, s_n)),$$

finishing the case of (i). For (ii) and (iii) we proceed by case distinction on the operation  $f \in \Sigma$ .

- (1) *Case*  $\text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ . We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t, s)$ .
  - (ii) This clause is void, as  $\text{inl}$  does not reduce.
  - (iii) We have  $\text{inl}(t) \xrightarrow{\text{inl}} t$ ,  $\text{inl}(s) \xrightarrow{\text{inl}} s$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t, s)$ , thus  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(t, s)$ .
- (2) *Case*  $\text{inr}$ . Similar to  $\text{inl}$ .
- (3) *Case of*  $\text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}$  *expression*. We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_3}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3}^{n+1}(t_3, s_3)$ .
  - (ii) First,  $t_1 \rightarrow t'_1$  and  $\text{case}(t_1, t_2, t_3) \rightarrow \text{case}(t'_1, t_2, t_3)$ . Thus, by  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ ,  $\exists s'_1. s_1 \Rightarrow s'_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$ . Thus, by the semantics we can conclude that  $\text{case}(s_1, s_2, s_3) \Rightarrow \text{case}(s'_1, s_2, s_3)$ . It now suffices to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_3}^n(\text{case}(t'_1, t_2, t_3), \text{case}(s'_1, s_2, s_3))$ , which follows from the inductive hypothesis, namely that  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a  $\Sigma$ -congruence.  
 Second,  $t_1 \xrightarrow{\text{inl}} t'_1$  leading to  $\text{case}(t_1, t_2, t_3) \rightarrow t_2 t'_1$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ ,  $\exists s'_1. s_1 \xrightarrow{\text{inl}} s'_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$ . The term  $\text{case}(s_1, s_2, s_3)$  will gradually evaluate  $s_1$  until it becomes a value, to which point it will choose the “left” path. In other words,  $\text{case}(s_1, s_2, s_3) \Rightarrow s_2 s'_1$ . Furthermore, the inductive hypothesis yields  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_3}^n(t'_1 t_2, s'_1 s_2)$ . The final subclause for  $t_1 \xrightarrow{\text{inl}} t'_1$  is done analogously.
  - (iii) This clause is void.
- (4) *Case*  $\text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ . We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ .
  - (ii) First,  $t_1 \rightarrow t'_1 \implies \text{fst}(t_1) \rightarrow \text{fst}(t'_1)$ . Hence, by our assumption  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ ,  $\exists s'_1. s_1 \Rightarrow s'_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$ . This yields  $\text{fst}(s_1) \Rightarrow \text{fst}(s'_1)$ ; furthermore,  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}^n(\text{fst}(t'_1), \text{fst}(s'_1))$  by the inductive hypothesis.
  - (iii) This clause is void.
- (5) *Case*  $\text{snd}$ . This is done similarly to  $\text{fst}$ .
- (6) *Case*  $\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ . We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$ .
  - (ii) This clause is void.
  - (iii) We see that  $\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t_1, t_2) \xrightarrow{\text{pair}} t_1$  and  $\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t_1, t_2) \xrightarrow{\text{pair}} t_2$ . Conversely,  $\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s_1, s_2) \xrightarrow{\text{pair}} s_1$  and  $\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t_1, t_2) \xrightarrow{\text{pair}} s_2$ , and our assumptions allow us to conclude this clause.
- (7) *Case of application*. We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$ .
  - (ii) By the semantics in [Definition 3.2](#),  $t_1 t_2 \rightarrow t$  in two ways. First,  $t_1 \rightarrow t'_1$  and  $t = t'_1 t_2$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ , there exists  $s'_1$  such that  $s_1 \Rightarrow s'_1$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$ . Hence, the semantics dictate  $s_1 s_2 \Rightarrow s'_1 s_2$ . It now suffices to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2}^n(t'_1 t_2, s'_1 s_2)$ , which follows from the inductive hypothesis, namely that  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a  $\Sigma$ -congruence. Second,  $t_1 t_2 \rightarrow t$  by  $t_1 \xrightarrow{t_2} t$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ , we can conclude that  $s_1 \xrightarrow{s_2} s$ . In addition, by virtue of  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$  (thus  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(t_2, s_2)$ ),  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2}^n(t, s)$ , finishing the clause.
  - (iii) This clause is void, as application expressions do not perform labelled transitions.
- (8) *Case*  $I$ .
  - (ii) This clause is void.
  - (iii) Given  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2}^n(e_1, e_2)$ , and since  $I \xrightarrow{e} e$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2}^n(e_1, e_2)$  which is a tautology.
- (9) *Case*  $K_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ .
  - (ii) This clause is void.
  - (iii) Given  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(e_1, e_2)$ , and since  $K \xrightarrow{e} K'(e)$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_1}^n(K'(e_1), K'(e_2))$ . The latter holds by the induction hypothesis.
- (10) *Case*  $K'_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ . We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ .
  - (ii) This clause is void.
  - (iii) Given  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_2}^n(e_1, e_2)$  and the rule  $K'(t) \xrightarrow{e} t$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(t_1, s_1)$ , which holds by the assumption  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ .
- (11) *Case*  $S_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}$ .
  - (ii) This clause is void.
  - (iii) Given  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3}^n(e_1, e_2)$ , and since  $S \xrightarrow{e} S'(e)$ , it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{(\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2) \rightarrow \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_3}^n(S'(e_1), S'(e_2))$ . The latter holds by the induction hypothesis.
- (12) *Case*  $S'_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}$ . We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ .
  - (ii) This clause is void.
  - (iii) Given  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^n(e_1, e_2)$  and since  $S'(t) \xrightarrow{e} S''(t, e)$ , it suffices to show  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_3}^n(S''(t_1, e_1), S''(t_2, e_2))$ , which holds by the induction hypothesis.

(13) *Case  $S''_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}$ .* Assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^{n+1}(t_2, s_2)$ .

(ii) This clause is void.

(iii) Given  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1}^n(e_1, e_2)$  and the rule  $S'(t, s) \xrightarrow{e} (t e) (s e)$ , it suffices to show  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_3}^n((t_1 e_1) (s_1 e_1), (t_2 e_2) (s_2 e_2))$ , which holds by the induction hypothesis.

(14) *Case  $\text{fold}_\tau$ .* We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ .

(ii) This clause is void.

(iii) As  $\text{fold}(t) \xrightarrow{\mu} t$ , it suffices to show  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}^n(t_1, s_1)$ , which holds by the assumption.

(15) *Case  $\text{unfold}_\tau$ .* We assume  $\mathcal{L}_{\mu\alpha.\tau}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ .

(ii) First, we have  $t_1 \rightarrow t'_1$ , and thus  $\text{unfold}(t_1) \rightarrow \text{unfold}(t'_1)$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_{\mu\alpha.\tau}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ ,  $\exists s'_1. s_1 \Rightarrow s'_1 \wedge \mathcal{L}_{\mu\alpha.\tau}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$ . Hence, we conclude that  $\text{unfold}(s_1) \Rightarrow \text{unfold}(s'_1)$ . It suffices to show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}^n(\text{unfold}(t'_1), \text{unfold}(s'_1))$ , which holds by the induction hypothesis.

Second, we have  $t_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} t'_1$ , and thus  $\text{unfold}(t_1) \rightarrow t'_1$ . By  $\mathcal{L}_{\mu\alpha.\tau}^{n+1}(t_1, s_1)$ ,  $\exists s'_1. s_1 \xrightarrow{\mu} s'_1 \wedge \mathcal{L}_{\mu\alpha.\tau}^n(t'_1, s'_1)$ . Hence, we conclude that  $\text{unfold}(s_1) \Rightarrow s'_1$  and we are done.

(iii) This clause is void.

We have just proved that  $\mathcal{L}^n$  is a congruence for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$  as an intersection and the fact that congruences are closed under arbitrary intersections, we conclude that  $\mathcal{L}^\omega$  is a congruence.


## B DETAILS FOR SECTION 4

### Relations in Categories

We collect a few auxiliary results about relations in categories that we shall need in subsequent proofs. Throughout this section we work under the global [Assumptions 4.1](#) on the category  $\mathbb{C}$ .

**Notation B.1.** Recall that given relations  $R, S \twoheadrightarrow X \times X$  the composite relation  $R \cdot S \twoheadrightarrow X \times X$  is constructed in two steps:

(1) Form the pullback of  $r_R$  and  $l_S$ :



(2) The relation  $R \cdot S$  is given by the (strong epi, mono)-factorization

$$R; S \xrightarrow{e_{R,S}} R \cdot S \xrightarrow{\langle l_R, r_{R,S} \rangle} X \times X$$

**Lemma B.2.** *If  $\mathbb{C}$  is infinitary extensive, composition of relations distributes over joins: For every relation  $S \twoheadrightarrow X \times X$  and every non-empty family  $\mathcal{R}$  of relations over  $X$ ,*

$$\left( \bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R \right) \cdot S = \bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R \cdot S \quad \text{and} \quad S \cdot \left( \bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R \right) = \bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} S \cdot R.$$

**PROOF.** See [87, Lem. A.5] for the case of binary joins, under the assumption of finitary extensivity (more generally, local distributivity). The proof for infinite joins is completely analogous.  $\diamond$

Recall that a relation  $R$  is *reflexive* if  $\Delta \leq R$ , and *transitive* if  $R \cdot R \leq R$ . Since intersections of reflexive (transitive) relations are again reflexive (transitive), there exists for every relation  $R \twoheadrightarrow X \times X$  a least reflexive and transitive relation  $R^* \twoheadrightarrow X \times X$  such that  $R \leq R^*$ .

**Lemma B.3.** *Suppose that  $\mathbb{C}$  is infinitary extensive.*

(1) *For every relation  $R \twoheadrightarrow X \times X$ , we have  $R^* = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} R^n$ , where  $R^0 = \Delta$  and  $R^n = R \cdot \dots \cdot R$  ( $n$  factors) for  $n \geq 1$ .*

(2) *For every non-empty family  $\mathcal{R}$  of relations over  $X \in \mathbb{C}$ , we have  $(\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^* = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} R_1 \cdot \dots \cdot R_n$ .*

**PROOF.** (1) The relation  $S = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} R^n$  contains  $R$  because  $R = R^1 \leq S$ , it is reflexive because  $\Delta = R^0 \leq S$ , and transitive because

$$SS = \left( \bigvee_{m \geq 0} R^m \right) \left( \bigvee_{n \geq 0} R^n \right) = \bigvee_{m, n \geq 0} R^{m+n} = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} R^n = S;$$

the first step uses [Lemma B.2](#). Therefore  $R^* \leq S$ . Conversely, we have  $R^n \leq R^*$  for every  $n \geq 0$ . Indeed, for  $n = 0$  this follows from  $R$  being reflexive, for  $n = 1$  use that  $R \leq R^*$ , and for  $n \geq 2$  use that  $R^*$  is transitive. Hence  $S \leq R^*$ .

(2) We compute

$$(\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^* = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} (\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^n = \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} R_1 \cdots R_n$$

where the first step uses part (1) and the second one follows from Lemma B.2.  $\diamond$

**Lemma B.4.** Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

- (1) The map  $f_*: \mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Rel}_Y(\mathbb{C})$  preserves joins.
- (2) For all relations  $R, S \rhd X \times X$  one has  $f_*[R \cdot S] \leq f_*[R] \cdot f_*[S]$ .

PROOF. Item (1) holds because  $f_*$  is a left adjoint (with right adjoint  $f^*$ ). For item (2), see [87, Lem. A.7].  $\diamond$

**Notation B.5.** Recall that the canonical relation lifting  $\bar{\Sigma}$  of an endofunctor  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  maps a relation  $R \rhd X \times X$  to the relation  $\bar{\Sigma} \subseteq \Sigma X \times \Sigma X$  obtained via the (strong epi, mono)-factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \langle \Sigma l_R, \Sigma r_R \rangle & \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ \Sigma R & \xrightarrow{e_{\Sigma R}} \bar{\Sigma} R & \xrightarrow{\langle l_{\Sigma R}, r_{\Sigma R} \rangle} \Sigma X \times \Sigma X \end{array} \quad (19)$$

**Lemma B.6.** Given an endofunctor  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  preserving strong epimorphisms and relations  $R, S \rhd X \times X$ , one has  $\bar{\Sigma}(R \cdot S) \leq \bar{\Sigma}R \cdot \bar{\Sigma}S$ .

PROOF. Consider the pullbacks used in the definition of  $R \cdot S$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}R \cdot \bar{\Sigma}S$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R; S & \\ \bar{l}_{R,S} \swarrow & & \searrow \bar{r}_{R,S} \\ R & & S \\ \downarrow l_R \quad \downarrow r_R & & \downarrow l_S \quad \downarrow r_S \\ X & & X \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \bar{\Sigma}R; \bar{\Sigma}S & \\ \bar{l}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \swarrow & & \searrow \bar{r}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \\ \bar{\Sigma}R & & \bar{\Sigma}S \\ \downarrow l_{\Sigma R} \quad \downarrow r_{\Sigma R} & & \downarrow l_{\Sigma S} \quad \downarrow r_{\Sigma S} \\ \Sigma X & & \Sigma X \end{array} \quad (20)$$

Now consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \Sigma R & \xleftarrow{\Sigma \bar{l}_{R,S}} & \Sigma(R; S) & \xrightarrow{\Sigma \bar{r}_{R,S}} & \Sigma S \\ \left. \begin{array}{c} \downarrow e_{\Sigma R} \\ \downarrow r_{\Sigma R} \end{array} \right\} \Sigma r_R & \downarrow e_{\Sigma R} & \downarrow \Sigma \bar{l}_{R,S} & \downarrow f & \downarrow e_{\Sigma S} & \downarrow e_{\Sigma S} \\ & \bar{\Sigma} R & \xleftarrow{\bar{l}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S}} & \bar{\Sigma}R; \bar{\Sigma}S & \xrightarrow{\bar{r}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S}} & \bar{\Sigma}S \\ \left. \begin{array}{c} \downarrow l_{\Sigma R} \\ \downarrow r_{\Sigma R} \end{array} \right\} \Sigma r_R & \downarrow l_{\Sigma R} & \downarrow \bar{l}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} & \downarrow f & \downarrow l_{\Sigma S} & \downarrow r_{\Sigma S} \\ & \Sigma X & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \Sigma X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Sigma X \end{array} \left. \begin{array}{c} \downarrow e_{\Sigma S} \\ \downarrow r_{\Sigma S} \end{array} \right\} \Sigma l_S \quad (21)$$

Its outside is the commutative square in (20) on the left under the functor  $\Sigma$ . The left-hand part is the right-hand component of (19); similarly, the right-hand part is the left-hand component of (19) instantiated for  $S$  in lieu of  $R$ . Thus, by the universal property of the pullback in (20) on the right, there exists a unique  $f: \Sigma(R; S) \rightarrow \bar{\Sigma}R; \bar{\Sigma}S$  such that the upper two squares commute.

Then the outside of the following diagram commutes, as we explain below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Sigma(R; S) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \Sigma(R; S) & \xrightarrow{f} & \bar{\Sigma}R; \bar{\Sigma}S \\ \downarrow \Sigma e_{R,S} & \searrow \langle e_{\Sigma R} \cdot \Sigma \bar{l}_{R,S}, e_{\Sigma S} \cdot \Sigma \bar{r}_{R,S} \rangle & \downarrow & \searrow \langle \bar{l}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S}, \bar{r}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \rangle & \downarrow e_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \\ \Sigma(R \cdot S) & \xrightarrow{\langle \Sigma(l_R \cdot \bar{l}_{R,S}), \Sigma(r_S \cdot \bar{r}_{R,S}) \rangle} & \bar{\Sigma}R \times \bar{\Sigma}S & \xrightarrow{\langle \bar{l}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S}, \bar{r}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \rangle} & \bar{\Sigma}R \cdot \bar{\Sigma}S \\ \downarrow e_{\Sigma(R \cdot S)} & \searrow \langle \Sigma l_{R,S}, \Sigma r_{R,S} \rangle & \downarrow l_{\Sigma R} \times r_{\Sigma S} & \searrow \langle \bar{l}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S}, \bar{r}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \rangle & \downarrow e_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \\ \bar{\Sigma}(R \cdot S) & \xrightarrow{\langle \bar{l}_{\Sigma(R \cdot S)}, \bar{r}_{\Sigma(R \cdot S)} \rangle} & \Sigma X \times \Sigma X & \xrightarrow{\langle \bar{l}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S}, \bar{r}_{\Sigma R, \Sigma S} \rangle} & \bar{\Sigma}R \cdot \bar{\Sigma}S \end{array}$$

The lower left-hand triangle commutes by (19), and the one above it by the definition of  $R \cdot S \rhd X \times X$  as the image of the pair in the span given in (20) on the left. For the triangle above that (the upper left-hand one overall) consider the product components separately: the left-hand one is  $\Sigma \bar{l}_{R,S}$  precomposed with the left-hand component of (19); for the right-hand component one has, similarly,  $\Sigma \bar{r}_{R,S}$  precomposed with the right-hand component of (19) instantiated for  $S$  in lieu of  $R$ . The upper right-hand triangle commutes by using the two top squares

in (21), and the one below it is obvious. Finally, the lower right-hand triangle commutes by the definition of  $\overline{\Sigma}R \cdot \overline{\Sigma}S \mapsto \Sigma X \times \Sigma X$  as the image of the outside span in (20) on the right.

Now note that  $\Sigma e_{R,S}$  at the left-hand edge above is a strong epimorphism because  $\Sigma$  preserves strong epimorphisms by assumption. Hence we obtain a diagonal fill-in witnessing that  $\overline{\Sigma}(R \cdot S) \leq \overline{\Sigma}R \cdot \overline{\Sigma}S$ , as shown in the diagram below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Sigma(R; S) & \xrightarrow{f} & \overline{\Sigma}R; \overline{\Sigma}S \\
 \Sigma e_{R,S} \downarrow & & \downarrow \epsilon_{\overline{\Sigma}R, \overline{\Sigma}S} \\
 \Sigma(R \cdot S) & & \overline{\Sigma}R \cdot \overline{\Sigma}S \\
 \epsilon_{\overline{\Sigma}(R \cdot S)} \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \langle \downarrow_{\overline{\Sigma}R, \overline{\Sigma}S}, \uparrow_{\overline{\Sigma}R, \overline{\Sigma}S} \rangle \\
 \overline{\Sigma}(R \cdot S) & \xrightarrow{\langle \downarrow_{\overline{\Sigma}(R \cdot S)}, \uparrow_{\overline{\Sigma}(R \cdot S)} \rangle} & \Sigma X \times \Sigma X
 \end{array}$$

◇

**Lemma B.7.** *Suppose that  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  preserves strong epimorphisms. Then for every  $\Sigma$ -algebra  $(A, a)$  the diagonal  $\Delta \mapsto A \times A$  is a congruence, and the composite  $R \cdot S$  of congruences is a congruence.*

PROOF. The diagonal is a congruence because

$$a_* \overline{\Sigma} \Delta = a_* \Delta \leq \Delta.$$

Given congruences  $R, S \mapsto A \times A$ , the composite  $R \cdot S$  is a congruence since

$$a_* \overline{\Sigma}(R \cdot S) \leq a_*(\overline{\Sigma}R \cdot \overline{\Sigma}S) \leq (a_* \overline{\Sigma}R) \cdot (a_* \overline{\Sigma}S) \leq R \cdot S,$$

where the first step uses Lemma B.6 and the second step uses Lemma B.4.(2). ◇

**Lemma B.8.** *Suppose that  $\mathbb{C}$  is infinitary extensive and has smooth monomorphisms, and that  $\Sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  preserves monomorphisms and directed colimits. Then for every  $X \in \mathbb{C}$  the map  $\overline{\Sigma}: \mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Rel}_{\Sigma X}(\mathbb{C})$  preserves directed joins.*

PROOF. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a directed set of relations on  $X$ . By smoothness, its join  $\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R$  in  $\mathbf{Rel}_X(\mathbb{C})$  coincides with the colimit of the corresponding diagram in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Since  $\Sigma$  preserves that colimit, it follows that  $\overline{\Sigma}(\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R) = \bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \overline{\Sigma}R$ , as required. ◇

### Proof of Proposition 4.14

This is a consequence of the following observations:

- (1)  $\Delta$  is an  $O$ -adequate relation, and composites of  $O$ -adequate relations are  $O$ -adequate, since  $O$  is a preorder whence transitive.
- (2)  $\Delta$  is a congruence, and composites of congruences are congruences (Lemma B.7).

Since  $\leq^O$  is the greatest  $O$ -adequate relation, it follows from (1) and (2) that both  $\Delta$  and  $\leq^O \cdot \leq^O$  are contained in  $\leq^O$ , hence  $\leq^O$  is a preorder.

### Proof of Lemma 4.18

We need to prove  $a_* \overline{\Sigma}(\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^* \leq (\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^*$ , which follows from the computation

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_* \overline{\Sigma}(\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R^*) &= a_* \overline{\Sigma}(\bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} R_1 \cdots R_n) && \text{Lemma B.3(2)} \\
 &= a_*(\bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} \overline{\Sigma}(R_1 \cdots R_n)) && \text{see below} \\
 &= \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} a_*(\overline{\Sigma}(R_1 \cdots R_n)) && \text{Lemma B.4(1)} \\
 &\leq \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} a_*(\overline{\Sigma}R_1 \cdots \overline{\Sigma}R_n) && \text{Lemma B.6} \\
 &\leq \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} (a_* \overline{\Sigma}R_1) \cdots (a_* \overline{\Sigma}R_n) && \text{Lemma B.4(2)} \\
 &\leq \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} R_1 \cdots R_n && R \in \mathcal{R} \text{ congruence} \\
 &= (\bigvee_{R \in \mathcal{R}} R)^* && \text{Lemma B.3(2)}
 \end{aligned}$$

In the second step, we use that the join  $\bigvee_{n \geq 0} \bigvee_{R_1, \dots, R_n \in \mathcal{R}} R_1 \cdots R_n$  is directed: given  $R_1, \dots, R_n, R'_1, \dots, R'_m \in \mathcal{R}$ , the relations  $R_1 \cdots R_n$  and  $R'_1 \cdots R'_m$  have the upper bound  $R_1 \cdots R_n \cdot R'_1 \cdots R'_m$  because all relations in  $\mathcal{R}$  are reflexive. Hence, by Lemma B.8, the functor  $\overline{\Sigma}$  preserves the join.

## C DETAILS FOR SECTION 5

We provide a more detailed account on how to apply the higher-order abstract GSOS framework to (nondeterministic) **FPC**, which is a typed, call-by-name  $\lambda$ -calculus with sums, products, conditionals, recursive types and choice. The type expressions are given by the grammar

$$\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau, \dots ::= \alpha \mid \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2 \mid \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2 \mid \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \mid \mu\alpha. \tau,$$

where  $\alpha$  ranges over a fixed countably infinite set of type variables. We write  $\text{Ty}$  the set of closed type expressions modulo  $\alpha$ -equivalence. The terms of **FPC** are constructed under the following typing rules:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash s : \tau_1}{\Gamma \vdash t s : \tau_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x : \tau_1 \vdash t : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{lam } x : \tau_1. t : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha]}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fold}(t) : \mu\alpha. \tau} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mu\alpha. \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{unfold}(t) : \tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha]} \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash s : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{pair}(t, s) : \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fst}(t) : \tau_1} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{snd}(t) : \tau_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash s : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash t \oplus s : \tau} \\ \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl}(t) : \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr}(t) : \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash s : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_3 \quad \Gamma \vdash r : \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_3}{\Gamma \vdash \text{case}(t, s, r) : \tau_3} \end{array}$$

The operational semantics work in the expected way:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{t s \rightarrow t' s} \quad \frac{}{(\text{lam } x : \tau. t) s \rightarrow t[x/s]} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{unfold}(t) \rightarrow \text{unfold}(t')} \quad \frac{}{\text{unfold}(\text{fold}(t)) \rightarrow t} \\ \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{fst}(t) \rightarrow \text{fst}(t')} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{snd}(t) \rightarrow \text{snd}(t')} \quad \frac{}{\text{fst}(\text{pair}(t, s)) \rightarrow t} \quad \frac{}{\text{snd}(\text{pair}(t, s)) \rightarrow s} \\ \frac{}{t \oplus s \rightarrow t} \quad \frac{}{t \oplus s \rightarrow s} \quad \frac{t \rightarrow t'}{\text{case}(t, s, r) \rightarrow \text{case}(t', s, r)} \quad \frac{}{\text{case}(\text{inl}(t), s, r) \rightarrow s t} \quad \frac{}{\text{case}(\text{inr}(t), s, r) \rightarrow r t} \end{array}$$

*Categorical modelling.* Implementing **FPC** in the style of higher-order abstract GSOS follows ideas from earlier work [38, 39, 86], this time applied to a typed setting with recursive types. Let  $\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  be the slice category of the category of finite cardinals  $\mathbb{F}$  over  $\text{Ty}$ . The objects of  $\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  are typed cartesian contexts, i.e. vectors of types  $\Gamma : n \rightarrow \text{Ty}$ ; morphisms are type-respecting renamings:

$$\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}(\Gamma : n \rightarrow \text{Ty}, \Delta : m \rightarrow \text{Ty}) = \{r : n \rightarrow m \mid \Delta(r(n)) = \Gamma(n)\}$$

We write  $|\Gamma|$  for the domain of a context  $\Gamma$ . Each type  $\tau \in \text{Ty}$  induces the single-variable context  $\check{\tau} : 1 \rightarrow \text{Ty}$ ; coproducts in  $\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  are formed by copairing:

$$(\Gamma_1 : |\Gamma_1| \rightarrow \text{Ty}) + (\Gamma_2 : |\Gamma_2| \rightarrow \text{Ty}) = [\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2] : |\Gamma_1| + |\Gamma_2| \rightarrow \text{Ty}.$$

The fundamental operation of *context extension*  $(- + \check{\tau}) : \mathbb{F}/\text{Ty} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  extends a variable context with a new variable  $x : \tau$ , i.e.  $\Gamma \xrightarrow{(- + \check{\tau})} \Gamma, x : \tau$  in a type-theoretic notation.

Our higher-order GSOS law for **FPC** lives in the category  $(\text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}}$  of type-indexed covariant presheaves over  $\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$ . Its objects are families of sets indexed by contexts  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  and types  $\tau \in \text{Ty}$  that respect context renamings. Two fundamental examples of objects in  $(\text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}}$  are the presheaf of *variables*  $V$ ,

$$V_\tau(\Gamma) = \{x \in |\Gamma| \mid \Gamma(x) = \tau\} \quad \text{and} \quad V_\tau(\Gamma)(r) = r,$$

and the family  $\Lambda$  of well-typed,  $\alpha$ -equivalent terms in **FPC**, with

$$t \in \Lambda_\tau(\Gamma) \iff \Gamma \vdash t : \tau.$$

The syntax functor  $\Sigma$  of our higher-order GSOS law is the endofunctor corresponding to the  $\text{Ty}$ -sorted *binding signature* of **FPC**:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_\tau X &= V_\tau + X_\tau \times X_\tau + \Sigma_\tau^1 X + \Sigma_\tau^2 X + \Sigma_\tau^3 X + \Sigma_\tau^4 X, \\ \Sigma_\tau^1 X &= \coprod_{\tau' \in \text{Ty}} (X_{\tau' \rightarrow \tau} \times X_{\tau'}) + X_{\tau' \boxtimes \tau} + X_{\tau \boxtimes \tau'}, \\ \Sigma_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}^2 X &= X_{\tau_1} + X_{\tau_2}, \quad \Sigma_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}^2 X = X_{\tau_1} \times X_{\tau_2}, \\ \Sigma_{\mu\alpha. \tau}^2 X &= X_{\tau[\mu\alpha. \tau/\alpha]}, \quad \Sigma_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}^2 X = X_{\tau_2} \cdot (- + \check{\tau}_1), \\ \Sigma_\tau^3 X &= \coprod_{\tau_1 \in \text{Ty}} \coprod_{\tau_2 \in \text{Ty}} X_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2} \times X_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau} \times X_{\tau_2 \rightarrow \tau}, \\ \Sigma_\tau^4 X &= \coprod_{\sigma : \tau = \sigma[\mu\alpha. \sigma/\alpha]} X_{\mu\alpha. \sigma}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The family  $\Lambda$  of  $\alpha$ -equivalent **FPC**-terms is isomorphic to the initial algebra  $\mu\Sigma$  of  $\Sigma$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_*$  be the pointwise powerset functor  $\mathcal{P}_*(X) = \mathcal{P} \cdot X$ . The behaviour bifunctor  $B$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} B(X, Y) &= \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y)), \\ D_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}}, & D_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_1} + Y_{\tau_2}, \\ D_{\mu\alpha.\tau}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}, & D_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(X, Y) &= Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}}$  is the exponential in  $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}}$  and the bifunctor  $\langle\langle -, - \rangle\rangle$  is

$$\langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle_{\tau}(\Gamma) = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}}\left(\prod_{x \in |\Gamma|} X_{\Gamma(x)}, Y_{\tau}\right).$$

The bifunctor  $\langle\langle -, - \rangle\rangle$  models *simultaneous substitution*. For example, there is a morphism  $\gamma_0: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle$  mapping terms of **FPC** to their substitution structure: given  $t \in \Lambda_{\tau}(\Gamma)$ , the natural transformation  $(\gamma_0)_{\tau}(t): \prod_{x \in |\Gamma|} \Lambda_{\Gamma(x)} \rightarrow \Lambda_{\tau}$  is given at component  $\Delta \in \mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}$  by

$$\vec{u} \in \prod_{x \in |\Gamma|} \Lambda_{\Gamma(x)}(\Delta) \mapsto t[\vec{u}] \in \Lambda_{\tau}(\Delta),$$

i.e. the simultaneous substitution of  $\vec{u}$  for the variables of  $t$ .

*Higher-order GSOS law.* The  $V$ -pointed pointed higher-order GSOS law

$$\varrho_v: V \rightarrow X, Y: \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y)) \rightarrow B(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y)) \quad (24)$$

for **FPC** is the pairing of the two components

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_v^1: V \rightarrow X, Y: \Sigma(X \times \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y))) &\rightarrow \langle\langle X, \Sigma^*(X + Y) \rangle\rangle \\ \varrho_v^2: V \rightarrow X, Y: \Sigma(X \times \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y))) &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}_*(\Sigma^*(X + Y) + D(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y))). \end{aligned}$$

Component  $\varrho^1$  is produced by the canonical  $V$ -pointed strength [32, p. 6] (see also [31]) of endofunctor  $\Sigma: (\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}} \rightarrow (\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}}$ , and makes use of the adjunction  $- \otimes Y \dashv \langle\langle Y, - \rangle\rangle$ , where  $- \otimes -$  is the so-called *substitution tensor*, given by

$$(X \otimes_{\tau} Y)(\Gamma) = \int^{\Delta \in \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}}} X_{\tau}(\Delta) \times \prod_{i \in |\Delta|} Y_{\Delta(i)}(\Gamma).$$

The unit of the tensor is the presheaf of variables  $V$ . A  $V$ -pointed strength for an endofunctor  $F$  is given by a family of maps

$$\text{str}_{X,v}^F: V \rightarrow Y: FX \otimes Y \rightarrow F(X \otimes Y),$$

natural in  $X$  and  $Y/V$ . Let  $\text{str}_{X,v}: V \rightarrow Y: \Sigma X \otimes Y \rightarrow \Sigma(X \otimes Y)$  be the canonical  $V$ -pointed strength of  $\Sigma$ . The component  $\varrho^1$  is given in terms of  $\text{str}$  as the adjoint transpose of the morphism

$$\Sigma(X \times \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y))) \otimes X \xrightarrow{\Sigma(r_2) \otimes \text{id}} \Sigma(\langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle) \otimes X \xrightarrow{\text{str}_{\langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle, X}} \Sigma(\langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \otimes X) \xrightarrow{\Sigma(\text{eval}_{X,Y})} \Sigma X \xrightarrow{\theta \cdot \Sigma \text{inl}} \Sigma^*(X + Y),$$

where  $\theta_X: \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma^*$  is the embedding of  $\Sigma$  to its free monad. Note that that applying strength  $\text{str}_{\langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle, X}$  is correct, as  $X$  is  $V$ -pointed. Our setup ensures that in the canonical operational model

$$\langle\langle \gamma_0, \gamma \rangle\rangle: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(\Lambda, \Lambda)),$$

map  $\gamma_0$  yields the substitution structure of terms in  $\Lambda$  (see e.g. [38, Prop. 5.9]). Family  $\varrho^2$  is responsible for the computational behaviour of terms and is given below. We keep the injection maps  $\text{inl}$ ,  $\text{inr}$  on the codomain implicit, and annotate terms by types to improve readability.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\varrho_{v: V \rightarrow X, Y}^2: \Sigma(X \times \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y))) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_*(\Sigma^*(X + Y) + D(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y))) \\
\varrho_{v: V \rightarrow X, Y}^2(tr) = \text{case } tr \text{ of} \\
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{var } x : \tau & \mapsto \emptyset \\
\text{lam}_{\tau_1, \tau_2} x: \tau_1. (t, (v \in \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle_{\tau_2}(\Gamma + \check{\tau}_1)), N) & \mapsto \{\lambda(e \in X_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)).v(x_1, \dots, x_{\Gamma(n)}, e)\} \\
t \oplus_{\tau} s & \mapsto \{t, s\} \\
\text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, v, N) & \mapsto \{t\} \\
\text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, v, N) & \mapsto \{t\} \\
\text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}((t, v, N), (s, u, U), (r, w, W)) & \mapsto \left( t_f = \begin{cases} \text{case}_{\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3}(f, s, r) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2} \\ \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_3}(s, t') & \text{if } f = \text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t') \\ \text{app}_{\tau_2, \tau_3}(r, t') & \text{if } f = \text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t') \end{cases} \right)_{f \in N} \\
\text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, v, N) & \mapsto \left( \begin{cases} \text{fst}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} \\ l(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2} \end{cases} \right)_{f \in N} \\
\text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t, v, N) & \mapsto \left( \begin{cases} \text{snd}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2} \\ r_2(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1} \times Y_{\tau_2} \end{cases} \right)_{f \in N} \\
\text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}((t, v, N), (s, u, U)) & \mapsto \{(t, s)\} \\
\text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}((t, v, N), (s, u, U)) & \mapsto \left( t_f = \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}} \\ \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f, s) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \end{cases} \right)_{f \in N} \\
\text{fold}_{\tau}(t, v, N) & \mapsto \{t \in X_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}\} \\
\text{unfold}_{\tau}(t, v, N) & \mapsto \left( t_f = \begin{cases} \text{unfold}_{\tau}(f) & \text{if } f \in Y_{\mu\alpha.\tau} \\ f & \text{if } f \in Y_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]} \end{cases} \right)_{f \in N}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

The operational semantics of **FPC** involves rules such as

$$\frac{}{\text{unfold}(\text{fold}(t)) \rightarrow t}, \quad \frac{}{\text{case}(\text{inl}(t), s, r) \rightarrow st} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{}{\text{case}(\text{inr}(t), s, r) \rightarrow rt}$$

which, strictly speaking, are not GSOS: the rules seemingly “pattern match” the shape of subterms to decide the next transition. In such instances, the respective subterms (e.g.  $\text{fold}(t)$ ,  $\text{inl}(t)$  and  $\text{inr}(t)$ ) are understood as *values*. The way such rules are modelled is by identifying these terms as values in the behaviour functor, by adding the respective constructor. For example, with  $B(X, Y) = \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y))$  and  $D_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(X, Y) = Y_{\tau_1} + Y_{\tau_2}$ , we identify the injections  $\text{inl}$  and  $\text{inr}$  as value constructors. In addition, the behaviour of  $\lambda$ -abstractions is that of a function on terms of the suitable type.

*Operational model.* The higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho$  for **FPC** induces the operational model

$$\langle\gamma_0, \gamma\rangle: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(\Lambda, \Lambda)).$$

The component  $\gamma_0$  is the substitution map described earlier, and the component  $\gamma$  models the call-by-name semantics of **FPC**. For every  $\Gamma \vdash t: \tau$ , we have that  $\gamma_{\tau}(\Gamma)(t)$  is the smallest subset of  $B(\Lambda, \Lambda)_{\tau}(\Gamma)$  satisfying the following:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\gamma_{\tau}(\Gamma)(t) \ni t' & \text{if } t \rightarrow t', \text{ for } \Gamma \vdash t': \tau, \\
\gamma_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(\Gamma)(t) \ni \lambda e. s[e/x] & \text{if } t = \text{lam } x: \tau_1. s, \text{ for } \Gamma, \tau_1 \vdash s: \tau_2, \\
\gamma_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(\Gamma)(t) \ni t' & \text{if } t = \text{inl}(t'), \\
\gamma_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(\Gamma)(t) \ni t' & \text{if } t = \text{inr}(t'), \\
\gamma_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(\Gamma)(t) \ni (t_1, s_1) & \text{if } t = \text{pair}(t_1, s_1), \\
\gamma_{\mu\alpha.\tau}(\Gamma)(t) \ni t' & \text{if } t = \text{fold}(t')
\end{array}$$

The weak operational model associated to **FPC** is  $\langle\gamma_0, \bar{\gamma}\rangle: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(\Lambda, \Lambda))$ , where  $\bar{\gamma}$  models  $\Rightarrow$ . Alternatively, we could consider a transition system in the style of  $\Rightarrow$  from [Notation 3.9](#) to later obtain a slightly more expressive logical relation.

*A free logical relation for FPC.* Having set-up our higher-order GSOS law, we move on to the logical relation. First we have to specify our relation lifting  $\bar{B}$  on the behaviour functor  $B$  ([23](#)). We let

$$\bar{B}(Q, R) = \overline{\langle\langle Q, R \rangle\rangle} \times \overline{\mathcal{P}_*(R + D(Q, R))}, \tag{25}$$



where  $Q, R \mapsto \overline{\langle\langle Q, R \rangle\rangle}$  is the canonical lifting for the bifunctor  $\langle\langle -, - \rangle\rangle$ ,  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_*$  is the left-to-right Egli-Milner relation lifting and  $\overline{D}$  the canonical relation lifting of  $D$ . Applying [Construction 4.23](#) on the two coalgebras

$$\langle\gamma_0, \gamma\rangle, \langle\gamma_0, \bar{\gamma}\rangle: \Lambda \rightarrow \langle\langle \Lambda, \Lambda \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(\Lambda, \Lambda))$$

yields the following step-indexed logical relation. Note that in this nondeterministic setting [Construction 4.23](#) does not terminate at  $\omega$  steps.

**Definition C.1.** The logical relation  $\mathcal{L}$  for **FPC** is the family of relations  $(\mathcal{L}^\alpha \multimap \Lambda \times \Lambda)_{\alpha \leq 2^\omega}$  defined inductively by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\tau^0(\Gamma) &= \top_\tau(\Gamma) = \{(t, s) \mid \Gamma \vdash t, s: \tau\} \\ \mathcal{L}_\tau^{\alpha+1} &= \mathcal{L}_\tau^\alpha \cap \mathcal{S}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^\alpha, \mathcal{L}^\alpha) \cap \mathcal{E}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^\alpha) \cap \mathcal{V}_\tau(\mathcal{L}^\alpha, \mathcal{L}^\alpha) \\ \mathcal{L}_\tau^\alpha(\Gamma) &= \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{L}_\tau^\beta(\Gamma) \quad \text{for limit ordinals } \alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V}$  are the maps on  $\mathbf{Rel}_\Lambda$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_\tau(\Gamma)(Q, R) &= \{(t, s) \mid \text{for all } \Delta \text{ and } Q_{\Gamma(x)}(\Delta)(u_x, v_x) (x \in |\Gamma|), \text{ one has } R_\tau(\Delta)(t[\bar{u}], s[\bar{v}])\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_\tau(\Gamma)(Q, R) &= \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t \rightarrow t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow s' \wedge R_\tau(\Gamma)(t', s')\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \boxplus \tau_2}(\Gamma)(Q, R) &= \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t = \text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t') \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow \text{inl}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s') \wedge R_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)(t', s')\} \cup \\ &\quad \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t = \text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t') \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow \text{inr}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s') \wedge R_{\tau_2}(\Gamma)(t', s')\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \boxtimes \tau_2}(\Gamma)(Q, R) &= \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t = \text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t_1, t_2) \text{ then } \exists s_1, s_2. s \Rightarrow \text{pair}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(s_1, s_2) \wedge R_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)(t_1, s_1) \wedge R_{\tau_2}(\Gamma)(t_2, s_2)\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_{\mu\alpha.\tau}(\Gamma)(Q, R) &= \{(t, s) \mid \text{if } t = \text{fold}_\tau(t') \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow \text{fold}_\tau(s') \wedge R_{\tau[\mu\alpha.\tau/\alpha]}(\Gamma)(t', s')\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(\Gamma)(Q, R) &= \{(t, s) \mid \text{for all } Q_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)(e, e'), \text{ if } t = \lambda x.t' \text{ then } \exists s'. s \Rightarrow \lambda x.s' \wedge R_{\tau_2}(\Gamma)(t'[e/x], s'[e'/x])\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that termination after  $2^\omega$  steps is guaranteed since  $|\mathbf{Rel}_\Lambda| \leq 2^\omega$ .

**Remark C.2.** Applying [Construction 4.23](#) in **FPC** produces logical relations that are closed under arbitrary substitutions by definition, whereas logical relations in the literature are often defined on closed terms, then extended to open terms in a subsequent step. The two constructions can be shown to be equivalent (see e.g. [87, E.10] for a similar argument).

To prove congruence and reflexivity of  $\mathcal{L}^{2^\omega}$ , we first instantiate the data to [Assumptions 4.25](#), in a manner that is largely similar to [Example 4.27](#). In detail, we pick

- (1) the signature functor  $\Sigma$  (22),
- (2) the behaviour functor  $B(X, Y) = \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle \times \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y))$  (23) and its lifting  $\overline{B}$  (25),
- (3) the higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho = \langle\varrho^1, \varrho^2\rangle$  (24).

Let us check that the higher-order GSOS law  $\varrho$  lifts to a  $\Delta_V$ -pointed higher-order GSOS law

$$\overline{\varrho}_V: \Delta_V \rightarrow Q, R: \overline{\Sigma}(Q \times \overline{B}(Q, R)) \rightarrow \overline{B}(X, \overline{\Sigma}^*(Q + R)).$$

It suffices to show that the following diagram commutes for each  $Q \in \Delta_V / \mathbf{Rel}((\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\mathbb{T}y})^{\mathbb{T}y})$  and  $R \in \mathbf{Rel}((\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\mathbb{T}y})^{\mathbb{T}y})$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\Sigma}(Q \times \overline{B}(Q, R)) & \dashrightarrow & \overline{B}(Q, \overline{\Sigma}^*(Q + R)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y))^2 & \xrightarrow{\varrho \times \varrho} & B(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y))^2 \end{array}$$

The above diagram decomposes into the following two diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\Sigma}(Q \times \overline{B}(R, Q)) & \dashrightarrow & \overline{\langle\langle Q, \overline{\Sigma}^*(Q + R) \rangle\rangle} & \overline{\Sigma}(Q \times \overline{B}(Q, R)) & \dashrightarrow & \overline{\mathcal{P}}_*(\overline{\Sigma}^*(Q + R) + \overline{D}(R, \overline{\Sigma}^*(Q + R))) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y))^2 & \xrightarrow{\varrho^1 \times \varrho^1} & \langle\langle X, \Sigma^*(X + Y) \rangle\rangle^2 & \Sigma(X \times B(X, Y))^2 & \xrightarrow{\varrho^2 \times \varrho^2} & \mathcal{P}_*(\Sigma^*(X + Y) + D(X, \Sigma^*(X + Y)))^2 \end{array} \quad (26)$$

The left diagram commutes by definition of  $\varrho^1$ , as it stems from the  $V$ -pointed strength  $\text{str}$  of  $\Sigma$ , which admits a canonical relation lifting. It remains to consider commutativity of the diagram on the right. The left-to-right Egli-Milner relation lifting  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_*$  works as follows: Given a relation  $R \subseteq X \times X$  then

$$(V, U) \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}_{*\tau}(R)(\Gamma) \iff \forall t \in V \subseteq X_\tau(\Gamma). \exists s \in U \subseteq X_\tau(\Gamma) \quad \text{with} \quad R_\tau(\Gamma)(t, s).$$

With the above in mind, we interpret commutativity of the right diagram in (26) as a kind of monotonicity condition on the operational rules of **FPC**, applying on each  $f \in \Sigma$ . In particular:

- (1) Case of variables. Let  $x: \tau \in V_\tau(\Gamma)$ . The condition says that for all  $f_1 \in \varrho^2(x) = \emptyset$ , there exists  $f_2 \in \varrho^2(x) = \emptyset$  such that  $\overline{\Sigma}^*(Q + R) + \overline{D}(Q, \overline{\Sigma}^*(Q + R))_\tau(\Gamma)(f_1, f_2)$ . This is trivially true.
- (2) Case  $\text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ . Assume terms  $t_1, t_2 \in X_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(\Gamma)$  and  $s_1, s_2 \in X_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)$ , with  $Q_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2}(\Gamma)(t_1, t_2)$  and  $Q_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)(s_1, s_2)$ , and behaviours  $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{P}_*(Y + D(X, Y))$ , such that for each  $f_1 \in V_1$  there exists  $f_2 \in V_2$  with  $(R + \overline{D}(Q, R))_\tau(\Gamma)(f_1, f_2)$ . For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , the operational rules maps each term  $\text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(t_i, s_i) = t_i s_i$  to the set

$$Z_i = \left( t_{f_i} = \begin{cases} f_i(s_i) & \text{if } f_i \in Y_{\tau_2}^{X_{\tau_1}} \\ \text{app}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}(f_i, s_i) & \text{if } f_i \in Y_{\tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2} \end{cases} \right)_{f_i \in V_i}$$

The lifting condition asserts that for each  $t_{f_1} \in Z_1$  there exists a related  $t_{f_2} \in Z_2$ , which is true. Intuitively, the condition holds because for each derivation of  $t_1 s_1$ , there is always a derivation for  $t_2 s_2$  where the conclusions are related. For instance:

$$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow f_1}{t_1 s_1 \rightarrow f_1 s_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{t_2 \rightarrow f_2}{t_2 s_2 \rightarrow f_2 s_2} \quad \text{with} \quad \overline{\Sigma}^*(R + Q)_{\tau_2}(\Gamma)(f_1 s_1, f_2 s_2).$$

- (3) Case  $\text{lam}_{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ . Assume terms  $t_1, t_2 \in X_{\tau_2}(\Gamma + \check{\tau}_1)$  with  $Q_{\tau_2}(\Gamma + \check{\tau}_1)(t_1, t_2)$  and substitution structures  $v_1, v_2 \in \langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle_{\tau_2}(\Gamma)$  such that, given substitutions  $u_1, u_2$  whose components are pointwise in  $Q$ , then  $R_{\tau_2}(\Delta)(v_1[u_1], v_2[u_2])$ . The condition says that for all  $e_1, e_2 \in X_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)$  with  $Q_{\tau_1}(\Gamma)(e_1, e_2)$ ,  $R_{\tau_2}(\Gamma)(v_1[x_1, \dots, x_{|\Gamma|}, e_1], v_2[x_1, \dots, x_{|\Gamma|}, e_2])$ , which is true because  $v_1, v_2$  and  $e_1, e_2$  are appropriately related and  $Q$  is pointed, hence contains the variables  $x_i$ .

The rest of the operations work similarly to either the case of applications and  $\lambda$ -abstractions.

**Theorem C.3.** *Relation  $\mathcal{L}^{2^\omega}$  is a (reflexive) congruence.*

PROOF. All rules of **FPC** are sound for the weak transition system  $\Rightarrow$ , hence  $(\varrho, \iota, \langle \gamma_0, \bar{\gamma} \rangle)$  forms a lax  $\varrho$ -bialgebra. As such, applying [Corollary 4.31](#) and [Corollary 4.32](#) gives the desired result.  $\diamond$

Following other examples in the literature of nondeterministic higher-order languages (see for instance [5, 14, 15]), one suitable choice of observable relation  $O \mapsto \Lambda \times \Lambda$  for the contextual preorder is *may-termination*. To model may-termination, we define  $O$  as  $O_\tau(\Gamma)\{\Gamma \vdash (s, t): s \Downarrow \Rightarrow t \Downarrow\}$ . The category  $(\text{Set}^{\mathbb{F}/\text{Ty}})^{\text{Ty}}$  and the signature endofunctor  $\Sigma$  of (22) satisfy the assumptions of [Theorem 4.17](#), thus the contextual preorder  $\lesssim^O$  exists. It can given in more explicit term using contexts, completely analogous to (7).

**Corollary C.4.** *The logical relation  $\mathcal{L}$  is sound for the contextual preorder.*

PROOF. The logical relation  $\mathcal{L}$  is easily seen to an  $O$ -adequate congruence. Thus, by [Corollary 4.33](#), it is contained in  $\lesssim^O$ .  $\diamond$

The *ground contextual preorder*, which restricts contexts to the bool type, is handled analogously, cf. [Example 4.34](#).