

Algorithmically expressive, always-terminating model for reversible computation

Matteo Palazzo¹[0009–0008–8455–8242] and Luca Roversi¹[0000–0002–1871–6109]

Università degli Studi di Torino, Dipartimento di Informatica, Italy
{matteo.palazzo,luca.roversi}@unito.it

Abstract. Concerning classical computational models able to express all the Primitive Recursive Functions (PRF), there are interesting results regarding limits on their algorithmic expressiveness or, equivalently, efficiency, namely the ability to express algorithms with minimal computational cost. By introducing the reversible programming model For_{est} , at our knowledge, we provide a first study of analogous properties, adapted to the context of reversible computational models that can represent all the functions in PRF. Firstly, we show that For_{est} extends Matos’ linear reversible computational model M-SRL, the very extension being a guaranteed terminating iteration that can be halted by means of logical predicates. The consequence is that For_{est} is PRF-complete, because M-SRL is. Secondly, we show that For_{est} is strictly algorithmically more expressive than M-SRL: it can encode a reversible algorithm for the minimum between two integers in optimal time, while M-SRL cannot.

Keywords: Reversible computation · Loop-language · Primitive Recursive Functions · Algorithmic expressiveness

1 Introduction

In relation to classical computational models results were proven regarding their algorithmic expressiveness, or efficiency, understood as the ability to express algorithms with minimal computational cost.

Colson and others [Col96; CF98] studied the efficiency of Primitive Recursive Functions (PRF), proving their *ultimate obstinacy property*. It means that many algorithms cannot be efficiently implemented by any term of PRF. Among them there are the algorithms to find the *minimum* between two values, which the literature see as a *least standard benchmark* to argue about the efficiency of a given computational model.

Matos [Mat15] proves an analogous of *ultimate obstinacy property* for Meyer/Ritchie’s LOOP [MR67], imperative computational model that characterizes PRF. LOOP is PRF-correct and complete, representing all and only elements in PRF. Roughly, LOOP is “obstinate” because its iterations cannot be interrupted as soon as necessary. They must unfold to their end, no matter the state they must produce as a result becomes available in the course of the unfolding. Matos shows how to tame LOOP “obstinacy” by extending LOOP with conditional breaks and decrements, making the formalism non structured, however.

Motivations. If the expressiveness of a computational model is valuable in the classical setting, we think it holds even greater value if the goal is to define interesting and terminating algorithms for compression/decompression, or encryption/decryption in a reversible computational setting.

```

0 // m,n ≥ 0, x=m, y=n, i=0, min=0, found=0
  min += x;
2 from ((i=0) or 0) to ((i=x) or (found=1)) {
    if (i=y) {
4         min -= x;
           min += y;
6         found += 1
    } else {skip}
8 }
// min=min(m,n)

```

Listing 1.1: Term `minPos` in For_{est} computing the function minimum in \mathbb{N}

Contributions. Matos’ *linear reversible* computational model M-SRL [Mat03] is the natural counterpart of LOOP in a reversible setting. M-SRL is PRF-complete [MPR20], and PRF-correct essentially because every instance of its iterative construct ‘for $r \{P\}$ ’ unfolds as many times as the initial value of r .

Inspiring to [Mat15], we argue about why M-SRL cannot encode at least the algorithm determining the minimum between two integer numbers.

To overcome M-SRL limitation, we introduce the computational model For_{est} , which we show it is: (i) always-terminating; (ii) reversible; (iii) able to simulate every M-SRL program, namely every PRF function; (iv) strictly more algorithmically expressive than M-SRL.

Point (iv) here above means that we can write *at least* Listing 1.1 in For_{est} which *always computes* the *minimum* between two naturals m, n *efficiently*, namely in a number of steps of order equal to the least between m , and n . In fact, we will see that For_{est} can compute the minimum for *every pair of integers*.

All achievements are possible because the iterative construct of For_{est} is:

$$\text{from } (i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \text{ to } (i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} , \quad (1)$$

where i is a variable and e_u, e_v are two expressions with values in \mathbb{Z} , while e_{in} and e_{out} are boolean expressions with values in $\{0, 1\}$. Our construct generalizes ‘for $r \{P\}$ ’ in M-SRL (Section 4 will recall M-SRL) by restricting Janus [Lut86] iteration, which let Janus be (reversible) Turing-complete. Construct (1) assures that For_{est} iterations simultaneously enjoy the two following features: (i) they can be halted by means of predicates, providing more control over the computation flow; (ii) For_{est} is compatible with *structured programming*, possibly easing formal reasoning on it [Dij22].

Iteration in For_{est} , intuitively. We conclude this introduction by illustrating how (1) restricts the iteration in Janus. The body P of (1) cannot alter the

variable i which drives the iteration. Entering the iteration is under the control of a logical disjunction with form $i=e_u$ or e_{in} . Analogously, exiting the iteration is under the control of a logical disjunction with form $i=e_v$ or e_{out} .

Assuming that e_u evaluates to u , and e_v to v such that $u \leq v$, an iteration starts looping if i belongs to the interval $[u, v]$ with the proviso that, in case i is strictly greater than u , then e_{in} must be true. Under the initial assumption, every iteration increments i by one unit. So, the iteration keeps going until $i=e_v$ or e_{out} holds true, namely until i reaches the upper bound v , or the exit condition e_{out} becomes true. Figure 1 visually summarizes how i moves inside the interval $[u, v]$,




Fig. 1: The iteration of For_{est} begins/halts depending on e_u, e_v, e_{in} , and e_{out} .

highlighting that the difference $v - u$ sets the maximum amount of iterations.

On the other side, if $u > v$ when the iteration starts, i must belong to the interval $[v, u]$, and the loop develops a computation which is the inverse of the one we have just described. The flow-charts in Figure 4, which we specialized from [YAG16], will fully describe the computational flow of (1).

Structure of the work. Section 2 introduces syntax and operational semantics of For_{est} . Section 3 firstly shows that the operational semantics always terminates when interpreting a term P in For_{est} , even though this does not mean that P always produces a meaningful state. Secondly, it shows that the function in Section 2, which defines P^- for any P in For_{est} , actually yields the reverse of P . Section 4 translates M-SRL into For_{est} , proving that the latter is complete with respect to the first one. Section 5 shows that For_{est} is algorithmically more expressive than M-SRL. Section 6 concludes, pointing to future and related work.

2 The computational model For_{est}

Concerning the algorithmic expressiveness, For_{est} is defined by means of a syntax and of an operational semantics, designed to fall in between M-SRL and Janus.

Syntax. After some preliminaries (Definition 1) the structure of every term P is given by simultaneously defining *domain* and *writable domain* of P to assure that For_{est} contains the inverse of P itself (Definition 2).

Definition 1 (Arithmetical and boolean expressions).

1. Let V be a set of variable names x, y, \dots . Let \mathcal{Z} denote the set of arithmetical expressions. Representation of numbers in \mathbb{Z} , and elements of V belong to \mathcal{Z} . Moreover, if $e, e' \in \mathcal{Z}$, then their sum and subtraction is in \mathcal{Z} . Finally, the domain $\text{Dom}(e)$ of $e \in \mathcal{Z}$ is the set of variables of V occurring in e .
2. Let \mathcal{B} denote the set of boolean expressions. Truth values $\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}$, and the equivalence test $e=e'$ are in \mathcal{B} , for every $e, e' \in \mathcal{Z}$. Moreover, \mathcal{B} contains disjunctions, conjunctions and negations (operator ‘!’) of elements already in \mathcal{B} . Finally, $\text{Dom}(e)$ is the domain of $e \in \mathcal{B}$ with all the variables of V in e .

For example, $(-1)+(x-3)-y \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\text{Dom}((-1)+(x-3)-y) = \{x, y\}$ while $(3=y) \text{ or } !(1=x+y) \in \mathcal{B}$, and $\text{Dom}((3=y) \text{ or } !(1=x+y)) = \{x, y\}$.

Definition 2 (Set \mathcal{F} of well-formed terms). The elements of \mathcal{F} are ranged over by $P, Q \dots$, and are defined together with their domain $\text{Dom}(P) \subseteq V$ and writable domain $\text{WDom}(P) \subseteq \text{Dom}(P)$ as follows:

1. $\text{skip} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\text{Dom}(\text{skip}) = \text{WDom}(\text{skip}) = \emptyset$;
2. let $x \in V$, and $e \in \mathcal{Z}$ s.t. $x \notin \text{Dom}(e)$. The assignments $x+=e, x-=e \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\text{Dom}(x+=e) = \text{Dom}(x-=e) = \text{Dom}(e) \cup \{x\}$, and $\text{WDom}(x+=e) = \text{WDom}(x-=e) = \{x\}$;
3. let $P, Q \in \mathcal{F}$. The series composition $P;Q \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\text{Dom}(P;Q) = \text{Dom}(P) \cup \text{Dom}(Q)$, and $\text{WDom}(P;Q) = \text{WDom}(P) \cup \text{WDom}(Q)$;
4. let $e \in \mathcal{B}$ and $P, Q \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\text{Dom}(e) \cap (\text{WDom}(P) \cup \text{WDom}(Q)) = \emptyset$. The selection $\text{if}(e)\{P\}\text{else}\{Q\} \in \mathcal{F}$ with guard e , domain $\text{Dom}(e) \cup \text{Dom}(P) \cup \text{Dom}(Q)$, and writable domain $\text{WDom}(P) \cup \text{WDom}(Q)$;
5. let $i \in V$, $e_u, e_v \in \mathcal{Z}$, and $e_{in}, e_{out} \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $P \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $(\{i\} \cup \text{Dom}(e_u) \cup \text{Dom}(e_v)) \cap \text{WDom}(P) = \emptyset$. The iteration:

$$\text{from } (i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \text{ to } (i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} \quad (2)$$

belongs to \mathcal{F} with domain $\text{Dom}(e_{in}) \cup \text{Dom}(e_{out}) \cup \text{Dom}(e_u) \cup \text{Dom}(e_v) \cup \text{Dom}(P) \cup \{i\}$ and writable domain $\text{WDom}(P) \cup \{i\}$. We will typically refer to (2) as “from-to term” and to i as iteration or leading variable.

Listing 1.1 gives an example of a term in \mathcal{F} . Lines 4–7 have domain x, y, min , found and writable domain min, found . Neither min , nor found occurs in the domain of $(i=y)$, $(i=0)$, and $(i=x)$ at lines 3 and 2, respectively. This is true in general. For any $P \in \mathcal{F}$, the notion “writable domain” implies that P cannot write into variables that belong to the domain of the guard of any selection, or to the leading variable or variables in domains of the bounds e_u, e_v of any iteration having P as a sub-term.

Definition 3 (Inverse of a term). The inverse P^- of $P \in \mathcal{F}$ is defined inductively. The inverse of skip is skip . The inverse of $x+=e$, and $x-=e$, are $x-=e$, and $x+=e$, respectively. Let $P, Q \in \mathcal{F}$. The inverse of $P;Q$ is $Q^-;P^-$, while $\text{if}(e)\{P^-\}\text{else}\{Q^-\}$ is the inverse of $\text{if}(e)\{P\}\text{then}\{Q\}$. Finally:

$$\left(\text{from}(i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \text{ to}(i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} \right)^- = \text{from}(i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out}) \text{ to}(i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in})\{P\} . \quad (3)$$

It should be obvious that the image of the here above function is \mathcal{F} . Moreover, the rightmost P in (3) is *not* a typo. We choose the form of (3) between two alternatives offered by generalizing Matos' M-SRL iteration to **from-to**. Our choice is to encode the inversion by exchanging lower limit e_u , and upper limit e_v whose values set the range for i , and to design an operational semantics able to let **from**($i=e_v$ or e_{out})**to**($i=e_u$ or e_{in}){ P } be the inverse of **from**($i=e_u$ or e_{in})**to**($i=e_v$ or e_{out}){ P }. An alternative would be to include a further iterative construct, name it **morf**($i=e_v$ or e_{out})**ot**($i=e_u$ or e_{in}){ P } for example, such that:

$$\left(\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{from}(i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \\ \mathbf{to}(i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} \end{array} \right)^{-} = \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{morf}(i=e_u \text{ or } e_{out}) \\ \mathbf{ot}(i=e_v \text{ or } e_{in})\{P^{-}\} \end{array} , \quad (4)$$

which would be a choice more coherent than (3) as compared to how Matos actually inverts iteration in M-SRL [Mat15]. We opted for syntactic compactness. Our choice would correspond to define M-SRL with an iteration **for** r { Q } whose inverse is **for** $-r$ { Q }, such that, if $r < 0$, then Q^{-} is iterated $|r|$ times.

Operational semantics. A state (Definition 4) sets the values of variables, allowing us to evaluate expressions (Definition 5, and Figure 2). Figure 3 introduces the rules to interpret terms that belong to a syntax which extends \mathcal{F} given in Definition 2. *This is necessary to formalize the behavior of a reversible computational model by means of a classical one.*

Definition 4 (States). A state is a total map $\sigma : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. We write $\sigma[x_1 \mapsto v_1 \dots x_n \mapsto v_n]$ to denote a state such that $\sigma[x_1 \mapsto v_1 \dots x_n \mapsto v_n](y) = v_i$, if $y = x_i$, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$; otherwise $\sigma[x_1 \mapsto v_1 \dots x_n \mapsto v_n](y) = \sigma(y)$. The set Σ , ranged over by $\sigma, \sigma' \dots \tau, \tau' \dots$, contains all the possible states.

$\sigma, 0 \Downarrow 0$	$\sigma, 1 \Downarrow 1$	$\sigma, e=e' \Downarrow \begin{cases} 1 & (\sigma, e \Downarrow n) \wedge (\sigma, e' \Downarrow n) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	
	$\sigma, !e \Downarrow 1 - m$	$(\sigma, e \Downarrow m)$	(5)
	$\sigma, e \text{ and } e' \Downarrow m \cdot n$	$(\sigma, e \Downarrow m) \wedge (\sigma, e' \Downarrow n)$	(6)
	$\sigma, e \text{ or } e' \Downarrow m + n - m \cdot n$	$(\sigma, e \Downarrow m) \wedge (\sigma, e' \Downarrow n)$	(7)

Fig. 2: Interpretation of boolean expressions.

Definition 5 (Evaluating arithmetic and boolean expressions). Let $e \in \mathcal{Z} \cup \mathcal{B}$. We write $\sigma, e \Downarrow n$ meaning that e evaluates to n in the state σ . If $e \in \mathcal{Z}$, the relation \Downarrow can be defined obviously on the structure of e . Concerning boolean expressions, the meaning of $\sigma, e \Downarrow n$ is as in Figure 2.

Remark 1. Clauses (5), (6), and (7) interpret boolean expressions by quadratic polynomials, yielding $\{0,1\}$ iff σ assigns values $\{0,1\}$ to every variable of $!e$, e and e' , e or e' . \square

Definition 6 (Extension \mathcal{F}_{ext} of \mathcal{F}). Let \mathcal{F}_{ext} be \mathcal{F} with boolean expressions \mathcal{B} that also contain ' $e_u \leq e_v$ ' and ' $e_u > e_v$ ', with $e_u, e_v \in \mathcal{B}$, and extended to contain new terms:

$$\text{assert}(e) \quad \text{loop until}(e \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} .$$

For example, $\text{if}(u \leq v)\{\text{assert}(x < 1);\text{skip}\}\text{else}\{\text{loop until}(z > 2)\{\text{skip}\}\}$ belongs to \mathcal{F}_{ext} .

$\frac{\sigma, x \Downarrow n \quad \sigma, e \Downarrow m}{\sigma \ x += e \ \sigma [x \mapsto n + m]} \text{INC}$	$\frac{\sigma, x \Downarrow n \quad \sigma, e \Downarrow m}{\sigma \ x -= e \ \sigma [x \mapsto n - m]} \text{DEC}$	
$\frac{\sigma, b \Downarrow 1 \quad \sigma \ P \ \sigma'}{\sigma \ \text{if}(b)\{P\}\text{else}\{Q\} \ \sigma'} \text{IFTRUE}$	$\frac{\sigma, b \Downarrow 0 \quad \sigma \ Q \ \sigma'}{\sigma \ \text{if}(b)\{P\}\text{else}\{Q\} \ \sigma'} \text{IFFALSE}$	
$\frac{}{\sigma \ \text{skip} \ \sigma} \text{SKIP}$	$\frac{\sigma \ P \ \sigma' \quad \sigma' \ Q \ \sigma''}{\sigma \ P; Q \ \sigma''} \text{SEQ}$	
$\frac{\sigma \ \text{if}(e_u \leq e_v)\{\text{assert}(e_u \leq i \text{ and } i \leq e_v);\text{assert}(i = e_u \text{ or } e_{in}); \text{loop until}(i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P; i += 1; \text{assert}(!e_{in})\}\} \text{else}\{\text{assert}(e_v \leq i \text{ and } i \leq e_u);\text{assert}(i = e_u \text{ or } e_{in}); \text{loop until}(i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{i -= 1; P^-; \text{assert}(!e_{in})\}\} \ \tau}{\sigma \ \text{from}(i = e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \text{ to } (i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} \ \tau} \text{FROMTO}$		
$\frac{\sigma, e \Downarrow 1}{\sigma \ \text{assert}(e) \ \sigma} \text{ASSERT1}$	$\frac{\sigma, e \Downarrow 0}{\sigma \ \text{assert}(e) \ \perp} \text{ASSERT0}$	$\frac{}{\perp \ P \ \perp} \text{PROP}$
$\frac{\sigma, (i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out}) \Downarrow 1 \quad \sigma \ \text{skip} \ \tau}{\sigma \ \text{loop until}(i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} \ \tau} \text{LOOPBASE}$		
$\frac{\sigma, (i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out}) \Downarrow 0 \quad \sigma \ P; \text{loop until}(i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} \ \tau}{\sigma \ \text{loop until}(i = e_u \text{ or } e_{out})\{P\} \ \tau} \text{LOOPREC}$		

Fig. 3: Operational Semantics on \mathcal{F}_{ext} .

Definition 7 (Operational semantics of \mathcal{F}_{ext}). Figure 3 introduces the rules to interpret terms of \mathcal{F}_{ext} . The rules derive three kinds of judgments: $\sigma \ P \ \tau$, $\sigma \ P \ \perp$, and $\perp \ P \ \perp$, for σ, τ in Σ , where \perp , which is not in Σ , denotes the result of a failing interpretation.

Interpreting P means to fix a state σ and to build a derivation tree with rules in Figure 3 whose conclusion can be either a successful $\sigma \ P \ \tau$, for some $\tau \in \Sigma$, or a failing $\sigma \ P \ \perp$, the latter generated if one judgment between $\mu \ \text{assert}(e) \ \perp$ or $\perp \ Q \ \perp$ shows up while building the tree, for some μ, e , and Q .

Rules INC, DEC, IFFALSE, IFTRUE, and SKIP interpret terms in \mathcal{F}_{ext} as expected. SEQ decomposes the evaluation of a sequence $P;Q$, to produce σ' required by Q the application of SEQ proceeds deterministically from left to right. FROMTO




Fig. 4: Flow-chart of the premise of rule FROMTO in Figure 3.

interprets the eponymous term of \mathcal{F}_{ext} . Being σ an initial state, the premise of FROMTO triggers either IFTRUE or IFFALSE to interpret *exactly* one between the sequences:

$$\begin{aligned} & \textcircled{0} \text{assert}(e_u \leq i \text{ and } i \leq e_v); \textcircled{1} \text{assert}(i = e_u \text{ or } e_{in}); \\ & \text{loop until}(i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out}) \{ P; \textcircled{2} i += 1; \textcircled{3} \text{assert}(!e_{in}) \} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \textcircled{0} \text{assert}(e_v \leq i \text{ and } i \leq e_u); \textcircled{1} \text{assert}(i = e_u \text{ or } e_{in}); \\ & \text{loop until}(i = e_v \text{ or } e_{out}) \{ i -= 1; \textcircled{2} P^-; \textcircled{3} \text{assert}(!e_{in}) \} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

by means of LOOPREC, LOOPBASE, ASSERT1, and ASSERT0. Numbers ①, ②, ③ ... in (8) trace how (8) corresponds to the flow-chart in Figure 4a, which is interpreted if $\sigma, e_u \leq e_v \Downarrow 1$, i.e. if the argument of the selection in the premise of FROMTO, holds true. Initially, the interpretation of (8) can yield \perp in two cases because of the first two **assert**. The first **assert** fails if $\sigma, e_u \leq i$ and $i \leq e_v \Downarrow 0$, i.e. the value of i is not in $[u, v]$, assuming that e_u, e_v evaluate to u, v , respectively. Being the first **assert** successful, the second one fails if $\sigma, i = e_u$ or $e_{in} \Downarrow 0$, i.e. the value of i is greater than u but the value of e_{in} forbids to enter the loop, namely it holds false. Otherwise, the construct **loop-until** starts and may keep unfolding until neither i reaches v , nor e_{out} decrees to exit, namely it holds true.

Rules LOOPREC, and LOOPBASE govern the unfolding, generating:

$$P; \textcircled{2}i+=1; \textcircled{3}\text{assert}(!e_{in}); P; \textcircled{2}i+=1; \textcircled{3}\text{assert}(!e_{in}); \dots \quad (10)$$

which may be (abnormally) stopped, yielding \perp , as soon as P sets $!e_{in}$ to false. If this happens, \perp is propagated by means of PROP, leading to the failure of the whole interpretation. If the argument $e_u \leq e_v$ of the selection in the premise of FROMTO holds false in the initial state σ , then (9) must be interpreted, according the flow-chart in Figure 4b, whose behavior is analogous to the one in Figure 4a.

Definition 8 (The computational model For_{est}). For_{est} has \mathcal{F} in Definition 2 as its syntax, and operational semantics as in Definition 7. By $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$ we mean $P \in \mathcal{F}$.

Remark 2 (For_{est} syntax and operational semantics).

1. Definition 8 says that a term in For_{est} cannot be written using the syntax in \mathcal{F}_{ext} : the terms of \mathcal{F}_{ext} are *invisible* to a “programmer”.
2. The terms of For_{est} are designed to be *interpreted* deterministically. Given any $P \in \mathcal{F}$, two cases exist. On one side, P can be interpreted from \perp : in this case only PROP applies, which keeps generating \perp . Otherwise, P is interpreted in $\sigma \in \Sigma$, where a single rule at a time applies, whose premises interpreted from left to right produce states in the expected order.
3. Theorem 2 will formally show that the function in Definition 3 generates the inverse of any $P \in \mathcal{F}$, according to the operational semantics.
A simple example should help to follow how the inversion of an iteration works. Let $P = \text{from}(i=-4 \text{ or } \emptyset) \text{ to } (i=1 \text{ or } \emptyset) \{j+=1\}$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$ s.t. $\sigma(i) = -4$ and $\sigma(j) = 2$. Since $-4 \leq 1$, the interpretation of P proceed forward, iterating $j+=1$ until $i=1$, making $|1 - (-4)| = 5$ iterations. The resulting state is therefore $\sigma' = \sigma[i \mapsto 1, j \mapsto 7]$. Now, let us interpret the inverse P^- , which is $\text{from}(i=1 \text{ or } \emptyset) \text{ to } (i=-4 \text{ or } \emptyset) \{j+=1\}$, starting from σ' . Since $1 > -4$ we proceed backward, iterating $j--=1$ until $i=-4$, making $|-4 - 1| = 5$ iterations yielding the starting state σ .
4. The rule FROMTO is defined according to the idea of *explaining the meaning* of from-to by means of the terms that already belong to \mathcal{F} . Indeed, up to **assert**, the unfolding of a loop relies on terms of M-SRL. A full internalization would require two further steps. In analogy to [MPR20], the first one would be to express **if**(e) $\{P\}$ **else** $\{Q\}$ through M-SRL. Secondly, it would be necessary to eliminate every **assert**, possibly by leveraging partial evaluation techniques [NG24] or tools for static analysis [RGK23; MR24] developed for reversible computations. The consequence of such steps, would be to consider M-SRL as the core of \mathcal{F} , like R-CORE is for R-WHILE [GY17]. \square

3 For_{est} is terminating and reversible

The goal of this section is twofold. Firstly, it shows that, for every reasonable initial state, every $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$ terminates either by failing or by yielding a state

(Theorem 1). Then, it establishes that P^- (Definition 3) truly represents the inverse of P , recovering the initial state from which P may have been interpreted.

The proofs of our goals will tacitly rely on the following fact, implied by the definition of the operational semantics:

Fact 1 Every non failing interpretation of $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$ from a state σ produces a final state τ , that preserves the read-only variables. Formally:

$$\forall P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}, \sigma, \tau \in \Sigma. \sigma P \tau \rightarrow (\forall x \notin (V \setminus \text{WDom}(P)). \tau(x) = \sigma(x)) . \quad \square$$

Theorem 1 (Termination). *Let $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$, and $\sigma \in \Sigma$. The interpretation of P starting from σ , either terminates in some $\tau \in \Sigma$ or fails. Formally:*

$$\forall P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}, \forall \sigma \in \Sigma. (\exists \tau \in \Sigma. \sigma P \tau) \vee (\sigma P \perp) .$$

The proof is by induction on the structure of P . A case worth commenting is when P is $\text{from}(i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \text{ to}(i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out}) \{Q\}$. Let σ be an initial state. Let us assume that, initially, $\sigma, e_u \leq e_v \Downarrow 1$. The assertions at ①, and ② in Figure 4a must be checked. If $\sigma, e_u \leq i$ and $i \leq e_v \Downarrow 0$, namely i is not in the interval delimited by e_u, e_v , or $\sigma, e_{in} \Downarrow 0$ does not hold, then the iteration aborts, namely terminates, yielding \perp . Otherwise, the iteration starts, its termination depending on: (a) Q cannot write variable into e_u, e_v nor i ; (b) by induction Q terminates; (c) every iteration at ③ in Figure 4a increments i . Therefore, i will at some point reach the upper bound determined by e_v , unless meanwhile, e_{out} becomes true or $!e_{in}$ false, allowing the loop to terminate even earlier. Furthermore the loop can also terminate earlier when Q aborts or if the assertion at ③ fails.

Let us now assume $\sigma, e_v \leq e_u \Downarrow 1$. Initially, i must be into the interval determined by e_v, e_u . Termination works as above, but in point (c). Every iteration at ② in Figure 4b decrements i which will reach the lower bound set by e_v unless, meanwhile, e_{out} becomes true or $!e_{in}$ false. \square

Remark 3 (The interpretation may fail). We stress that Theorem 1 only assures that the interpretation of a term P terminates, but says nothing about its *success* or *failure*. This is due to assertions. They are placed in strategic points to block the interpretation whenever a state that it produces does not assure that the interpreted term is reversible.

Theorem 2 (Reversibility). *Let $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$, and $\sigma \in \Sigma$ an initial state. Then, P generates a state τ , namely $\sigma P \tau$ if and only if P^- generates σ , starting from τ . Formally: $\forall P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}, \forall \sigma, \tau \in \Sigma. \sigma P \tau \iff \tau P^- \sigma$.*

Remark 4. Theorem 2 says that P^- can recover the starting state σ exactly when the final state that P generates from σ is not \perp . \square

Clearly, one can simply say that For_{est} is reversible because it can be seen as a restriction of **Janus**. In any case, we briefly comment on how to prove Theorem 2. The proof splits into an ‘only if’ and an ‘if’ case, each proceeding by structural induction on the derivation with $\sigma P \tau$, or $\tau P^- \sigma$ as its conclusion, respectively.

The main intuition follows. Let $P \equiv \text{from}(i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \text{ to } (i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out})\{Q\}$, and let $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Let us focus on the case $\sigma, e_u \leq e_v \Downarrow 1$, the other $\sigma, e_u \leq e_v \Downarrow 0$ being analogous. Rules FORMAIN, IFTRUE and the repetition of LOOPREC and LOOPBASE unfold the `from-to` into a repetition of assertions, P and the increment of i . Since, if $\sigma P \tau$, we know how to prove:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma \text{ assert}(u \leq i \text{ and } i \leq v) ; \text{ assert}(i = u \text{ or } e_{in}) ; \\ & \quad [\text{ assert}(! (i = v \text{ or } e_{out})) ; P ; i += 1 ; \text{ assert}(! (i = u \text{ or } e_{in}))]^m ; \\ & \quad \text{ assert}(i = v \text{ or } e_{out}) ; \text{ assert}(u \leq i \text{ and } i \leq v) \tau , \end{aligned}$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the resulting code can be inverted. Once inverted, it can be wrapped into `from($i=e_v$ or e_{out}) to ($i=e_u$ or e_{in}) $\{Q\}$ which is the inverse of P .`

Concerning the selection, reversibility follows from the fact that its branches cannot alter the value of the guard.

4 For_{est} is PRF-complete because M-SRL is

Firstly, we briefly recall Matos' M-SRL from [Mat03]. Secondly, we provide Definition 9, a function translating M-SRL to For_{est}. Theorem 3 relies on it to prove that For_{est} is complete w.r.t. M-SRL.

Matos' M-SRL stands for *Simple Reversible Language* [Mat15]. M-SRL programs read from, and write registers $r, r1, \dots$, ranged over by r . Registers contain values in \mathbb{Z} . Increment INC r , and decrement DEC r of a register r are the two basic programs of M-SRL, one inverse to the other, namely INC r is (DEC r)⁻, and vice versa. If P, Q are M-SRL programs with P^-, Q^- their inverses, then *series composition* $P; Q$, and *iteration for r* $\{P\}$ are in M-SRL, their inverses being $Q^-; P^-$, and $\text{for } r \{P^-\}$. If the value in r is positive, an iteration is equivalent to $P; \dots; P$ with as many P as the value in r , register which cannot be written by P . If the value in r is negative, an iteration is equivalent to $P^-; \dots; P^-$ with as many P^- as the *inverse* of the value in r . By definition, M-SRL has no `if-then-else`. Using M-SRL terms [MPR20] encodes one in it.

Remark 5. Notions like “domain/co-domain”, “state”, etc. defined for For_{est} obviously adapt to M-SRL. For example, $\sigma P \tau$ stands for “M-SRL program P with a domain compatible with state σ , produces a state τ .” Moreover, variables in For_{est} are registers in M-SRL. \square

Translation. The following notation eases the translation from M-SRL to For_{est}.

Notation 1 [Leading variables] If $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$, the set $l(P)$ of *leading* variables in P contains all the variables *leading* the unfolding of every `from-to` in P . Let

$l(Q), l(Q')$ be given for any $Q, Q' \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$. Let $i \in V, e_u, e_v \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $e_{in}, e_{out} \in \mathcal{B}$. Then, $l(P)$ is empty for every $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$ but the following two terms:

$$l(Q; Q') = l(Q) \cup l(Q') \quad (11)$$

$$l(\text{from}(i=e_u \text{ or } e_{in}) \text{ to}(i=e_v \text{ or } e_{out}) \{Q\}) = \{i\} \cup l(Q) . \quad (12)$$

Identifying the *leading* variables avoids name clashes when an iteration of M-SRL is mapped to a For_{est} from-to.

Definition 9 (Translating M-SRL to For_{est}). Let $P, Q, Q' \in \text{M-SRL}$ and $r \in V$. The map $\llbracket _ \rrbracket$ maps terms of M-SRL to terms in For_{est} as follows:

$$\llbracket \text{INC } r \rrbracket = r+=1 \quad \llbracket \text{DEC } r \rrbracket = r-=1 \quad \llbracket Q; Q' \rrbracket = \llbracket Q \rrbracket; \llbracket Q' \rrbracket$$

$$\llbracket \text{for } r \{P\} \rrbracket = \text{from}(i=0 \text{ or } \emptyset) \text{ to}(i=r \text{ or } \emptyset) \{ \llbracket P \rrbracket \}; i-=r ,$$

where $i \in V$ is a fresh variable not in $\{r\} \cup \text{Dom}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) \cup \text{Dom}(P)$, and $\text{Dom}(Q; Q') \cap l(\llbracket Q \rrbracket) = \text{Dom}(Q; Q') \cap l(\llbracket Q' \rrbracket) = \text{Dom}(\text{for } r \{P\}) \cap l(\llbracket P \rrbracket) = \emptyset$.

An example: $\llbracket \text{for } r \{ \text{INC } j \} \rrbracket = \text{from}(i=0 \text{ or } \emptyset) \text{ to}(i=r \text{ or } \emptyset) \{ j+=1 \}; i-=r$.

Completeness. It is natural to require that $\llbracket P \rrbracket \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$ *simulates* any given $P \in \text{M-SRL}$, which means that For_{est} is complete w.r.t. M-SRL.

Notation 2 Let $\sigma, \hat{\sigma}$ be states in Σ , let P be a term in M-SRL or For_{est} .

1. We say “ σ and $\hat{\sigma}$ are equivalent w.r.t. P ”, written $\sigma \simeq_P \hat{\sigma}$, when $\sigma(r) = \hat{\sigma}(r)$, for every $r \in \text{Dom}(P)$, namely, if the two states have identical values on the variables of P .
2. We say “ σ is P -clean”, written $c(\sigma, P)$, when $\sigma(x) = 0$, for every $x \in l(P)$, namely when the state assigns 0 to every leading variable of P .
3. We say “ $\hat{\sigma}$ simulates σ w.r.t. P ”, written $\sigma \sqsubset_P \hat{\sigma}$, if σ and $\hat{\sigma}$ are equivalent w.r.t. P and σ is $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ -clean. \square

Theorem 3 (For_{est} is complete w.r.t. M-SRL). Let $P \in \text{M-SRL}$, let $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma$ s.t. $\sigma P \tau$. For any $\hat{\sigma}$ s.t. $\sigma \sqsubset_P \hat{\sigma}$, we can derive $\hat{\sigma} \llbracket P \rrbracket \hat{\tau}$ for some $\hat{\tau}$ s.t. $\tau \sqsubset_P \hat{\tau}$.

As for the proof, it is by induction on the structure of P , remarking that Definition 9 assures $\text{Dom}(\llbracket P \rrbracket) = \text{Dom}(P) \cup l(\llbracket P \rrbracket)$ with $\text{Dom}(P) \cap l(\llbracket P \rrbracket) = \emptyset$, for every M-SRL program P .

We intuitively illustrate the case when P is $\text{for } r \{Q\}$, for some r and Q . By definition, $\llbracket \text{for } r \{Q\} \rrbracket$ yields $\text{from}(i=0 \text{ or } \emptyset) \text{ to}(i=r \text{ or } \emptyset) \{ \llbracket Q \rrbracket \}; i-=r$, where $i \notin \{r\} \cup \text{Dom}(\llbracket Q \rrbracket)$ and $l(\llbracket Q \rrbracket) \cap \text{Dom}(P) = \emptyset$. Let $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma$ such that $\sigma(r) = v \geq 0$ and $\sigma P \tau$. The case with $v < 0$, is analogous. In order to return τ , P executes Q as many times as v , which we denote by $\sigma [Q]^v \tau$. Moreover, let $\hat{\sigma} \in \Sigma$ s.t. $\sigma \sqsubset_P \hat{\sigma}$, hence $\hat{\sigma}(i) = 0$, and let $\hat{\tau} \in \Sigma$ s.t. $\hat{\sigma} \llbracket P \rrbracket \hat{\tau}$. In order to produce $\hat{\tau}$, it can be shown that the rules in Figure 3 imply “ $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ executes ‘ $\llbracket Q \rrbracket; i+=1$ ’ v times, followed by $i-=r$ ”, which we shorten as $\hat{\sigma} \llbracket \llbracket Q \rrbracket; i+=1 \rrbracket^v; i-=r \hat{\tau}$.

Now we are able to show that $\hat{\tau}$ *simulates* τ w.r.t. P , namely $\tau \sqsubset_P \hat{\tau}$.

1. To ease the proof of the main statement, we can show what follows.
By induction on m , for every $\mu, \nu, \hat{\mu}$ s.t. $\mu \sqsubset_Q \hat{\mu}$, we can prove:

$$\mu [Q]^m \nu \implies \hat{\mu} [[Q]; i+=1]^m \hat{\nu}$$

where: (i) $\nu \sqsubset_Q \hat{\nu}$; (ii) $\hat{\nu}(i) = \hat{\mu}(i) + m$; and (iii) $\hat{\nu}(r) = \hat{\mu}(r)$, for some $\hat{\nu}$. Specifically, knowing that, by definition, $i \notin \text{Dom}(\llbracket Q \rrbracket)$ we have that: (i) holds by applying the main statement, by induction, on Q ; (ii) holds because i is incremented at every iteration; (iii) holds because, by definition of M-SRL and the translating function, $r \notin \text{WDom}(Q) \cup \text{WDom}(\llbracket Q \rrbracket)$.

2. Back to the main statement, we recall that, by assumption, $\sigma [Q]^v \tau$, and $\sigma \sqsubset_P \hat{\sigma}$ implies $\sigma \sqsubset_Q \hat{\sigma}$. So, the result in the previous point implies that:

$$\hat{\sigma} [[Q]; i+=1]^v \hat{\tau}'$$

where (i) $\tau \sqsubset_Q \hat{\tau}'$; (ii) $\hat{\tau}'(i) = \hat{\sigma}(i) + m = 0 + m = m$; and (iii) $\hat{\tau}'(r) = \hat{\sigma}(r) = m$, for some $\hat{\tau}'$.

3. The conclusion $\tau \sqsubset_P \hat{\tau}'$, follows by observing that it must be $\hat{\tau}(i) = 0$, because $\hat{\tau}$ results from executing $i=-r$ starting from $\hat{\tau}'$.

Corollary 1 (**For_{est} is PRF-complete**). *Let $f \in \text{PRF}$. There exists $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$ that computes f .*

As for the proof, [MPR20] implies that M-SRL is complete w.r.t. the class of *Reversible Primitive Permutations* which in turn is PRF-complete [PPR20; MR22; MR24]. By transitivity, Theorem 3 implies that For_{est} is PRF-complete.

Remark 6. Since Corollary 1 shows that For_{est} is PRF-complete, and Theorem 1 implies that For_{est} is not Turing-complete, because it cannot develop infinite loops, we strongly believe that For_{est} is *weakly PRF-sound*, according to:

Definition 10 (**For_{est} is weakly PRF-sound**). *For every $P \in \text{For}_{\text{est}}$, and $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma$, if $\sigma P \tau$, namely P does not fail, then a primitive recursive $\hat{P} \in \text{PRF}$ exists that computes the same function as P .*

We think that a proof of this would work in analogy to the one that LOOP is PRF-sound [MR67]. We leave it to future work. \square

5 For_{est} is algorithmically more expressive than M-SRL

So far we know that For_{est} is M-SRL-complete, but we can also show:

Theorem 4. *For_{est} is strictly algorithmically more expressive than M-SRL.*

We can prove it in three steps: (i) we introduce a For_{est} term determining the *sign* of an integer in time $O(1)$; (ii) we introduce another For_{est} term computing the *minimum* between two integers m, n in $O(\min(|m|, |n|))$; (iii) we argue about the non existence of a M-SRL program that can do same.

Computing the sign in For_{est} . We determine the sign of $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ in $O(1)$ steps, which is optimal, as follows.

Definition 11 (Sign). Let `sign` be the name for:

$$\text{from } (i=0 \text{ or } 0) \text{ to } (i=x \text{ or } !(s=0)) \{s+=1\}$$

where x is the variable we want the sign of, and i, s the variables eventually containing the sign.

Starting from $\sigma \in \Sigma$ s.t. $\sigma(i) = 0$ and $\sigma(s) = 0$, we can see that $\sigma \text{ sign } \sigma[i \mapsto v, s \mapsto v]$, where:

$$v = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sigma(x) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma(x) = 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } \sigma(x) < 0 \end{cases} .$$

The key point of `sign` is to fully exploit the interpretation given by the rule FROMTO which interprets $\{s+=1\}$, skip it, or interprets its inverse, according to the value in x , which can be greater, equal, or greater than 0, respectively.

Fact 2 Both time and space complexities of `sign` are in $O(1)$. □

The behavior of `sign` can be traced back to how [MPR20] encodes the sign function inside M-SRL. However, M-SRL iterations cannot be preemptively interrupted once the sign has been discovered, while For_{est} ones can. Due to this, the sign algorithm in [MPR20] has quadratic time and exponential space complexity. Thus, `sign` in Definition 11 is a first example of how “*escaping from loops*” extends For_{est} algorithmic expressiveness as compared to M-SRL, possibly reducing drastically time complexity.

```

0 // m, n ∈ ℤ⁻, x=m, y=n, i=0, min=0, found=0
1 min += y;
2 from ((i=0) or 0) to ((i=-x) or (found=1)) {
3   if (i=-y) { // |y| < |x| -> x < y
4     min -= y;
5     min += x;
6     found += 1
7   } else {skip}
8 }
```

Listing 1.2: Minimum between two negative values

Computing the minimum in For_{est} . We detail out the main ideas to write a For_{est} term `minGen` that computes the minimum between any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ in time $O(\min |m|, |n|)$.

Let x, y be two variables holding m and n , respectively. Let `min, i, found` be output and auxiliary variables, initially set to 0. The term `minGen` must start with two instances of `sign` to determine the sign of x , and y . Once the sign is known, `minGen` can distinguish among four scenarios:

1. Both x , and y are positive. In this case `minGen` must behave as `minPos` in Listing 1.1, which works as follows. It assumes that m in x is the minimum, setting `min` to it. Then, `i` counts from 0 to x . If `i` reaches y before getting to x , it means that y is the least value. So, `minGen` sets `min` to y , stopping the iteration by setting `found` to 1. Otherwise, `min` stays at x .
2. Only one between x , and y is positive. Then, `minGen` must set `min` to the variable containing the negative number, and this is trivial.
3. Both x , and y are negative. Then, `minGen` must behave as `minNeg` in Listing 1.2, analogous to `minPos`, but working on the absolute values of x , and y .

Since, by construction, `sign` costs $O(1)$, and every case is in $O(\min(|m|, |n|))$, the whole `minGen` costs $O(\min(|m|, |n|))$. Therefore, we can state:

Proposition 1. *There exists a term in For_{est} computing the minimum between $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ in time $O(\min(|m|, |n|))$.*

M-SRL has no optimal minimum algorithm. We devise this proof following Matos. He proves an analogous of *ultimate obstinacy property* for LOOP languages [Mat15]. Intuitively, we recall that for a computational model being *ultimately obstinate* means that some functions cannot be computed by its programs in optimal time because such functions are *non trivial*, namely they *cannot* have form $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_i + c$ [CF98].

Clearly, the *minimum* between m, n is non trivial, thus every program in M-SRL implementing it must be subject to two structural constraints. They must contain two registers, say `rm`, `rn` storing m, n respectively. Moreover, they must have form $P_1 ; \text{for } r \{P_2\} ; P_3$ where r has to be one between `rm` and `rn`.

Let us assume that r is `rm`, the alternative choice being equivalent. For our purposes *the structure* of P_2 and P_3 is irrelevant, while the structure of P_1 is. P_1 can be empty, an explicit sequence of increments/decrements with fixed length, or even contain iterations, none of them led by `rm` or `rn`. Therefore, once we start interpreting `for rm {P2}`, due to P_1 structure, `rm` contains $m + c$, for some constant $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, implying that the time complexity of `for rm {P2}` is at least $O(m)$. Clearly, if r were `rn`, the time complexity would be $O(n)$. This implies:

Proposition 2. *No M-SRL program exists that computes the minimum between $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ in time $O(\min(|m|, |n|))$.*

So, both Propositions 1, and 2 imply Theorem 4.

6 Conclusions and future work

We addressed the problem of algorithmic expressiveness in a reversible setting. Our artifact is For_{est} , a reversible computational model where iterations always terminate, but can be interrupted preemptively. For_{est} is a meeting point between the two established and reversible computational models M-SRL and Janus. For_{est} is M-SRL and PRF-complete, but strictly more algorithmically expressive. It

allows us to write an algorithm that computes the minimum between two integers m and n in $O(\min(m, n))$, which cannot be encoded in M-SRL. The reason is that we can stop For_{est} iterations as soon as the expected result is available, while M-SRL iterations always unfold to the end.

Future work. Even though For_{est} terms always terminate, this can be due to failing assertions. Clearly, assertions seems to be necessary for loops to have general exit condition. However, failing computations cannot be reversed. We aim to remove assertions to produce a computational model with same algorithmic expressiveness as For_{est} , whose programs always terminate successfully. A possible strategy to follow is at least [RGK23], where authors rely on SMT solvers to statically remove unnecessary assertions.

A further step we plan is to compare our work with the one of [ABV11], which, in fact, inspired us. The authors of [ABV11] introduce $\text{Loop}_{\text{exit}}$. It is an *unstructured* conservative extension of LOOP models. The extension consists of introducing a statement `exit` which can break loops by jumping to end of a program. The main result in [ABV11] is that $\text{Loop}_{\text{exit}}$ is as algorithmically expressive as APRA, a PRF-sound and complete computational model obtained by restricting Gurevich *Abstract State Machines* [Gur93]. In fact, in relation to the algorithmic expressiveness, we think that the most valuable goal would be to introduce a reversible version of APRA subsuming For_{est} .

References

- [ABV11] P. Andary, P. Bruno, and P. Valarcher. “A Representation Theorem for Primitive Recursive Algorithms”. In: *Fundam. Inform.* 107 (Jan. 2011), pp. 313–330.
- [Col96] L. Colson. “A unary representation result for systemT”. In: *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 16 (1996), pp. 385–403.
- [CF98] L. Colson and D. Fredholm. “System T, Call-by-Value and the Minimum Problem”. In: *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 206 (1998), pp. 301–315.
- [Dij22] E. W. Dijkstra. “Go To Statement Considered Harmful”. In: *Edsger Wybe Dijkstra: His Life, Work, and Legacy*. Ed. by K. R. Apt and T. Hoare. Vol. 45. ACM Books. ACM / Morgan & Claypool, 2022, pp. 315–318.
- [GY17] R. Glück and T. Yokoyama. “A Minimalist’s Reversible While Language”. In: *IEICE Trans. Inf. Syst.* 100-D.5 (2017), pp. 1026–1034.
- [Gur93] Y. Gurevich. “Evolving algebras 1993: Lipari guide”. In: *Specification and validation methods*. Ed. by E. Börger. Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 9–36.
- [Lut86] C. Lutz. “Janus: a time-reversible language”. Letter to R. Landauer. 1986.
- [MR22] G. Maletto and L. Roversi. “Certifying Algorithms and Relevant Properties of Reversible Primitive Permutations with Lean”. In: *RC*. Vol. 13354. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2022, pp. 111–127.

- [MR24] G. Maletto and L. Roversi. “Certifying expressive power and algorithms of reversible primitive permutations with Lean”. In: *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* 136 (Jan. 1, 2024), p. 100923.
- [Mat03] A. B. Matos. “Linear programs in a simple reversible language”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 290.3 (2003), pp. 2063–2074.
- [Mat15] A. B. Matos. “The efficiency of primitive recursive functions: A programmer’s view”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 594 (2015), pp. 65–81.
- [MPR20] A. B. Matos, L. Paolini, and L. Roversi. “On the Expressivity of Total Reversible Programming Languages”. In: *Reversible Computation 2020*. Vol. 12227. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2020, pp. 128–143.
- [MR67] A. R. Meyer and D. M. Ritchie. “The Complexity of Loop Programs”. In: *Proceedings of the 1967 22nd National Conference*. ACM ’67. Washington, D.C., USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1967, pp. 465–469.
- [NG24] L. Normann and R. Glück. “Partial Evaluation of Reversible Flowchart Programs”. In: *PEPM*. ACM, 2024, pp. 119–133.
- [PPR20] L. Paolini, M. Piccolo, and L. Roversi. “A class of Recursive Permutations which is Primitive Recursive complete”. In: *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 813 (2020), pp. 218–233.
- [RGK23] J. W. Reholt, R. Glück, and M. Kruse. “Towards a Dereversibilizer: Fewer Asserts, Statically”. In: *RC*. Vol. 13960. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2023, pp. 106–114.
- [YAG16] T. Yokoyama, H. B. Axelsen, and R. Glück. “Fundamentals of reversible flowchart languages”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 611 (2016), pp. 87–115.