

Graphical Quadratic Algebra

DARIO STEIN, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

FABIO ZANASI, University College London, United Kingdom

ROBIN PIEDELEU, University College London, United Kingdom

RICHARD SAMUELSON, University of Florida, USA

We introduce Graphical Quadratic Algebra (GQA), a string diagrammatic calculus extending the language of Graphical Affine Algebra with a new generator characterised by invariance under rotation matrices. We show that GQA is a sound and complete axiomatisation for three different models: quadratic relations, which are a compositional formalism for least-squares problems, Gaussian stochastic processes, and Gaussian stochastic processes extended with non-determinisms. The equational theory of GQA sheds light on the connections between these perspectives, giving an algebraic interpretation to the interplay of stochastic behaviour, relational behaviour, non-determinism, and conditioning. As applications, we discuss various case studies, including linear regression, probabilistic programming, and electrical circuits with realistic (noisy) components.

CCS Concepts: • **Do Not Use This Code** → **Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper**; *Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper*; Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper; Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: String Diagrams, Category Theory, Gaussian Probability, Least-squares Optimisation, Quadratic Programming

ACM Reference Format:

Dario Stein, Fabio Zanasi, Robin Piedeleu, and Richard Samuelson. 2018. Graphical Quadratic Algebra. 1, 1 (July 2018), 37 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Acknowledgments

XXX

1 Introduction

Gaussian probability and least-squares optimisation are two sides of the same coin. *Gaussian probability* studies multivariate normal probability distributions $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. These Gaussian distributions are an expressive family, appearing ubiquitously in natural sciences, statistics and machine learning. Importantly, they are self-conjugate, meaning conditional distributions of Gaussians are again Gaussian.

An *ordinary least-squares* problem is a quadratic optimisation problem whose objective function $S(x) = \|Ax - y\|^2$ is a Euclidean distance. A famous application of this is *linear regression*, one of the most widely used regression techniques.

Authors' Contact Information: Dario Stein, dario@stein@ru.nl, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands; Fabio Zanasi, f.zanasi@ucl.ac.uk, University College London, United Kingdom; Robin Piedeleu, r.piedeleu@ucl.ac.uk, University College London, United Kingdom; Richard Samuelson, rsamuelson@ufl.edu, University of Florida, USA.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM XXXX-XXXX/2018/7-ART

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

The log-density of a Gaussian distribution is a quadratic function. Conversely, finding conditional distributions of a Gaussian model amounts to a least-squares problem. We will explore this connection systematically, showing that Gaussians distributions and quadratic optimisation problems have the same *compositional structure*.

In recent years, a research field of *compositional* approaches both to probability theory and to linear algebra has emerged in theoretical computer science, bringing to the study of these objects methodologies borrowed from programming language semantics, universal algebra, and logic. In particular, stochastic processes are being investigated through the lenses of Markov categories [18], which provide an axiomatic framework to reason uniformly about a wide range of probabilistic phenomena. Similarly, linear systems in various fields, including control theory [2, 11], electrical circuits [1, 4, 6], concurrency [5], and quantum theory [8, 13–15], have been investigated uniformly within the axiomatic framework of Graphical Linear Algebra [10] and related theories. A common trait in all these threads is the use of *string diagrams* [21] as a graphical syntax for processes. String diagrams are manipulated via equational theories just as regular syntax, but have the advantage of clearly displaying the exchange of resources between components – which may be particularly subtle when analysing phenomena such as Bayesian inference, quantum entanglement, or concurrency.

Aims and Contributions. String diagrammatic calculi focussing either on linear systems or stochastic processes have been thoroughly studied. However, models featuring both kinds of behaviour have been so far overlooked. Our aim is to develop the string diagrammatic paradigm in such direction, focussing on the case of Gaussian probability/least-square optimisation. This will allow us to introduce a novel, compositional understanding of least-square problems and their solutions, which at the same time sheds light on the connection with Gaussian stochastic processes. Our contributions may be summarised as follows:

(1) The first task is understanding *composition* of least-square problems, so to organise them into a category. For this purpose we identify the notion of *quadratic relation*, and show how it relates both to least-square optimisation and Gaussian probability. The appeal of quadratic relations is fourfold. First, they characterise the solutions of constrained least-square problems (see Proposition 2.3 below). Second, they can be understood as morphisms of a category because they are composable, via constrained minimisation (Proposition 2.4 below). Third, quadratic relations directly extends linear [10] and affine relations [6], thus linking our approach with the theory of Graphical Linear Algebra. Fourth, understanding least-square problems as relations is coherent with Willems’ behavioural approach in control theory [27?], which argues that systems should be studied as relations rather than functions. We will show that quadratic relations form a symmetric monoidal category **QuadRel**, in which we embed the category **Gauss** of Gaussian stochastic maps and the category **GaussEx** of Gaussian stochastic maps with a non-deterministic component, thus highlighting the connection between least-squares problems and Gaussian probability. The study of **Gauss** and **GaussEx** that we conduct is of independent interest: **Gauss**-morphisms represent Gaussian stochastic processes, as studied eg. in [18]; **GaussEx** is a mathematical framework for systems subject to both probabilistic and nondeterministic constraints, such as noisy circuit resistors and uninformative priors [24]. Note **GaussEx**-morphisms are studied by Willems as open stochastic systems in the context of control theory [27].

(2) We introduce *Graphical Quadratic Algebra* (GQA), a family of sound and complete axiomatic calculi presenting the categories **QuadRel**, **Gauss**, and **GaussEx**. Continuing the programme of Graphical Linear Algebra, our calculi are based on the formalism of string diagrams. The axiomatic theory of GQA is elegant and purely motivated by the symmetries under orthogonal transformations

(evoking the Herschel-Maxwell theorem). These subsume the treatment of conditional probability for Gaussians.

(3) The completeness proof relating GQA to **QuadRel** is of independent interest. A fundamental piece is showing that any least-square problem, represented as an input-less string diagram of GQA, can be turned into a string diagram of the fragment **GaussEx**, representing a Gaussian stochastic process. By analogy with Graphical Linear Algebra, where subspaces can be turned into signal flow graphs [9], we may regard this as a *realisability* procedure: in a sense, it gives an ‘operational’ understanding of an optimisation problem as a stochastic system. The procedure further enlightens the interplay between the least-squares and the Gaussian perspective.

(4) As mentioned, there are transformations relating Gaussian probability, least-square problems, and affine spaces. However making them functorial is technically challenging, as studied in [25]. Thanks to our axiomatic presentations, it suffices to define these mappings on generators to obtain functoriality as a simple corollary.

(5) We showcase our approach via different case studies. First, we show how to perform linear regression with ordinary least squares in a diagrammatic, compositional way.

(6) Second, we use GQA to reason about the semantics of probabilistic programs, discussing its relevance to a conjecture of [26] about contextual equivalence.

(7) Third, we show how to model and reason equationally about noisy electrical circuits, relating our approach to Willems’ framework of open stochastic systems in control theory [27].

We conclude this introduction by discussing more in depth our methodology in approaching the core notions of this work: quadratic relations and graphical quadratic algebra.

Quadratic Relations. A quadratic real function $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a way of expressing multivariate polynomials of maximum degree 2, such as squared euclidean distance $\|x\|^2$, or $(x_1 - 1)x_2$. A certain class of these functions, which are also nonnegative and partial, are precisely those arising in constrained least squares optimisation [12]. Now, in order to reason compositionally about least-square problems, we want to organise these functions as morphisms of a category **QuadRel**: the fundamental question is how they compose. Our insight is that they should compose in a relational way, whence the name *quadratic relations* for nonnegative partial quadratic functions when seen as morphisms of **QuadRel**. Given $F: \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ (of type $m \rightarrow n$ in **QuadRel**) and $G: \mathbb{R}^{n+p} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ (of type $n \rightarrow p$ in **QuadRel**), we define their composite as


$$(F; G)(x, z) = \inf_y \{F(x, y) + G(y, z)\}$$

which mirrors how one would form the composite of relations R_1 and R_2 , as $\{(x, z) \mid \exists y. (x, y) \in R_1 \wedge (y, z) \in R_2\}$. Note that we allow them to take ∞ as value. There is more than one reason leading to this approach. First, it reflects how convex optimisation is usually performed, via summation followed by minimisation. Second, it emphasises a key property of this class of functions, namely being closed under constrained minimisation. Third, it leads to a concise and abstract definition of **QuadRel**, as a category of relations weighted over a quantale. Finally, it draws a more direct comparison with linear and affine relations (both special cases of quadratic relations), which carries over the diagrammatic calculi presenting these objects.

The Gaussian Perspective. Similarly to quadratic relations, we may organise Gaussian stochastic maps into a category **Gauss**. There is an immediate link with **QuadRel**, namely that the negative logdensity of a Gaussian distribution is a partial quadratic function, giving an assignment **Gauss** \rightarrow **QuadRel**. We will see that this assignment is a functorial embedding. This is somewhat surprising, because Gaussian distributions and quadratic relations compose rather differently: One composes via Lebesgue integration, while the other one composes by minimization.

As our axiomatisation will make evident, **Gauss** is not a very expressive fragment of **QuadRel**, missing in particular the relational (as opposed to functional) behaviour expressible by **QuadRel**-morphisms. However, there is an extension of **Gauss** that partially recovers these behaviours: in the category **GaussEx** of *extended Gaussian stochastic maps* we can reason about stochastic processes with a non-deterministic component. These maps, studied categorically in [24], are adapted to express various interesting phenomena, including Willems' open stochastic systems [27] and uninformative priors in Bayesian inference. Our work encompasses **GaussEx**, studying its axiomatic theory in relation to **Gauss** and **QuadRel**.

String Diagrammatic Calculi. The theory of *Graphical Quadratic Algebra* (GQA) is designed in a modular fashion. We divide the generators of the string diagrams of GQA in fragments, depending on the behaviours they will model in **QuadRel**.



The first row expresses basic linear algebraic operations such as copying ($\bullet \cup$), discarding ($\cap \bullet$), addition (\cup), conditioning on the value zero (\circ), scaling (\boxed{k}), and translating by one ($\bar{\quad}$). With the equational theory of Hopf bimonoids, string diagrams built with these generators are known to axiomatise the category of affine linear maps [6]. If we add \bullet and \circ , with behaviour symmetric to \cup and \cap , and extra equations (most notably including two Frobenius monoid structures), we obtain *Graphical Affine Algebra* (GAA), an axiomatisation of affine linear relations, i.e. affine subspaces that compose relationally [6].

In this work we show that, in order to axiomatise **QuadRel**, **Gauss**, and **GaussEx** in a similar fashion, it suffices to add a single extra generator \leftarrow , which represents the quadratic function $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2$ under the quadratic interpretation, and the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ in the Gaussian interpretation. Its purpose is best illustrated with an example.

Example 1.1. Consider the string diagram $\leftarrow \cup \leftarrow$, built up from two instances of \leftarrow and addition. Its semantics in quadratic relations will be given by the constrained minimisation problem

$$\left\| \left\langle \leftarrow \cup \leftarrow \right\rangle \right\| = f : y \mapsto \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2}x_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}x_2^2 : x_1 + x_2 = y \right\}$$


The minimum is attained for $x_1 = x_2 = y/2$, so we have an explicit solution $f(y) = \frac{1}{4}y^2$. This means that, in **QuadRel**

$$\left\| \left\langle \leftarrow \cup \leftarrow \right\rangle \right\| = \left\| \left\langle \leftarrow \boxed{\sqrt{2}} \right\rangle \right\| \quad (1)$$


We will also give semantics to these string diagrams in **Gauss** and **GaussEx**. In the Gaussian setting, (1) means if $X_1, X_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are independent variables, then $Y = X_1 + X_2$ has distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 2)$.

Which axiomatic theory allows us to derive equations like (1)? It turns out that the equations governing this new generator are remarkably simple. The key scheme, (RI), states the almost tautological fact that the function $f(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2)$ is rotation invariant. The other two axioms,


(D) and (Z), govern the interaction of \leftarrow with discarding and conditioning.



For example, to derive (1), note that $\cos(\pi/4) = \sin(\pi/2 - \pi/4) = \sin(\pi/4) = 1/\sqrt{2}$. We can then use (RI) with $\varphi = \pi/4$ and simplify the resulting string diagram using the equations of GAA, obtaining



We finally eliminate the scalar $\leftarrow \bullet$ by (D). Using the same rotation matrix, we can derive that



In **GaussEx**, this expresses that if $X, Y \sim N(0, 1)$ are two Gaussians which we condition to be equal, the posterior distribution has variance $\frac{1}{2}$.

Generalising the above, we will show the following theorems.


- Generators $\leftarrow \circ$, $\leftarrow \bullet$, \circ , \square , \square , \square , \square , \leftarrow , together with a fragment of Graphical Affine Algebra, (RI), and (D), axiomatise **Gauss**.
- Generators $\leftarrow \circ$, $\leftarrow \bullet$, \circ , \square , \square , \square , \leftarrow , \bullet , \leftarrow , together with a fragment of GAA, (RI), and (D), axiomatise **GaussEx**.
- Generators $\leftarrow \circ$, $\leftarrow \bullet$, \circ , \square , \square , \square , \leftarrow , \bullet , \leftarrow , together with all the equations of GAA, (RI), (D), and (Z), axiomatise **QuadRel**.

These characterisations are interesting at different levels. Concretely, they pave the way for a different methodology, based on equational diagrammatic reasoning, of studying phenomena which may be modelled by quadratic relations or (extended) Gaussian distributions, such as linear regression, open stochastic systems, and the semantics of probabilistic programs: we discuss all these examples in Section 5 below. As an anticipation, the following program expresses inferring an underlying value from a noisy measurement. It is written in a probabilistic programming language which can express Gaussian distributions and features a conditioning operator ($:=$), properly introduced in Section 5.3 below.

```

let value = 50 + 10 * normal() in
let measurement = value + 5 * normal() in
measurement ::= 40;
return value
    
```

Such programs systematically correspond to string diagrams, as we will explain. In our example case, we obtain the string diagram



The axioms of **QuadRel** suffice to reduce such a diagram to its posterior distribution, mirroring the execution of the program.

At a more abstract level, our axiomatisations give us a deeper understanding of how least-square optimisation problems connect to Gaussian probability theory, and what is their comparative expressive power. The axiomatic theory of **Gauss** is a fragment of the one of **QuadRel**, missing the ability of modelling properly relational behaviours using Frobenius monoids. Even more interestingly, adding non-deterministic behaviours to **Gauss** leads to **GaussEx**, which is still a fragment of **QuadRel**, where relational behaviour only appears in a controlled way. Crucially, both **Gauss** and **GaussEx** miss the generator \multimap , which we may regard as conditioning of Gaussians. Within this perspective, we may view quadratic relations as generalised forms of Gaussian distributions, which combine probability, non-determinism, and conditioning.

2 Gaussians and Quadratic Relations

In this section, we recall terminology and notation for the mathematical notions that will be the subject of our diagrammatic calculi.

2.1 Gaussian Probability

Gaussian probability is a powerful self-contained fragment of probability theory. We recall what is strictly necessary to our work, referring to e.g. [3] for further background. A random variable X is called *normally distributed* or *Gaussian* with mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and variance σ^2 for $\sigma \in [0, \infty)$, if it has density function

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

with respect to the Lebesgue measure. This is typically written $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, meaning the distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, also called Gaussian distribution, is the law of X . The *standard normal distribution* $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ is particularly significant, as it generates any other normal distribution, in the following sense. A random vector \mathbf{X} is *multivariate normal* if its distribution arises as $\mathbf{X} = A \cdot (Z_1, \dots, Z_k) + \mu$, where $Z_1, \dots, Z_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are independent variables. In other words, multivariable normal distributions arise as the pushforwards of standard normal distributions under affine maps. The distribution of \mathbf{X} is fully characterised by its mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and its covariance matrix $\Sigma = AA^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$. Conversely, every positive semidefinite matrix Σ is the covariance matrix of a unique Gaussian distribution, which we write $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. It is supported on the affine subspace $\mu + \text{im}(\Sigma)$.

Extended Gaussians. An *extended Gaussian distribution* is a Gaussian distribution on a quotient space \mathbb{R}^n/D ; the vector subspace D is called a *nondeterministic fibre*. This concept, introduced in [25], intends to model the idea of a distribution carrying both a probabilistic and a nondeterministic component. We can write it in additive notation $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) + D$, where we think of the subspace D as an idealised uniform distribution. A notion akin to extended Gaussian distributions appears in

Willems' approach to control theory, under the name of open stochastic system [27]. This link will be formally pursued in Section 5.2 below.

2.2 Quadratic Functions

A *quadratic function* $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function that can be written as a multivariate polynomial of maximum degree 2. Examples of quadratic functions are the squared euclidean distance $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2$, $(x_1 - 1)x_2$, $x_1^2 - x_2$ and so on. By collecting coefficients, we can give every quadratic function the following standard form

$$f(x) = \langle x, \Sigma x \rangle + \langle b, x \rangle + c \quad (2)$$

where $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric matrix, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ a scalar, and $\langle -, - \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product on \mathbb{R}^n .

Recall that a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *convex* if its epigraph $\{(x, y) : y \geq f(x)\}$ is a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . We define an *elementary convex quadratic function* to be of the diagonal form $h(x) = \lambda_1 x_1^2 + \dots + \lambda_n x_n^2$ with $\lambda_i \geq 0$. For quadratic functions, being bounded below is a fairly restrictive condition. Such functions must automatically be convex.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *A quadratic function in form (2) is*

- (1) *convex if and only if Σ is positive semidefinite*
- (2) *bounded below if and only if it is convex and $b \in \text{im}(\Sigma)$*
- (3) *bounded below if and only if it can be written as $f(x) = h(A(x - a)) + c$, where A is an invertible matrix, and h an elementary convex quadratic function.*

The fact that every quadratic function can be transformed to an elementary one is known as *Sylvester's law of inertia*. In fact, the diagonal elements λ_i can be chosen to lie in $\{0, 1\}$, that is h is of the form $f(x_1, x_2) = \|x_1\|^2$.

We will work with *partial* quadratic functions, which take values in the extended real numbers $[-\infty, \infty]$. Here we use ∞ to indicate failure/partiality. In analogy to Iverson brackets, we define for a formula ϕ

$$\{\!\! \{ \phi \} \!\!\} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \phi \text{ holds} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

The indicator function of a set A is given by $1_A(x) = \{\!\! \{ x \in A \} \!\!\}$.

Definition 2.2 ([22, p.109]). A *partial quadratic function* $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ is the sum of a quadratic function and the indicator function of an affine subspace $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e. of the form

$$f(x) = \langle x, \Sigma x \rangle + \langle b, x \rangle + c + \{\!\! \{ x \in M \} \!\!\}$$

An *elementary convex partial quadratic function* is one in diagonal form $h(x) = \sum_i \lambda_i x_i^2$ where we now allow $\lambda_i \in [0, +\infty]$. This h is now partial, and its domain is the vector subspace

$$M = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lambda_i = +\infty \Rightarrow x_i = 0\}$$

Again, insisting that such a function is nonnegative gives rise to the following characterisation, whose proof is in Appendix B.

PROPOSITION 2.3. *The following are equivalent for a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$*

- (1) *f is a nonnegative partial quadratic function*
- (2) *f can be written in the form $f(x) = h(A(x - a)) + c$ where A is an invertible matrix, $c \geq 0$ and h an elementary convex partial quadratic function*
- (3) *f can be written as $f(x) = \inf \{\|y\|^2 : (x, y) \in M\}$ where $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is an affine relation*

Item 2 is an analogue of Sylvester's law of inertia for partial quadratic functions; here, the values $\{0, 1, \infty\}$ are allowed on the diagonal. Nonnegative partial convex functions are precisely the class of functions that arise in constrained least squares optimisation [12]. A key property is that they are closed under constrained infimisation, and the minima of such a function are attained on an affine subspace (proof in Appendix B):

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Nonnegative partial quadratic functions are closed under constrained minimization. If $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is an affine relation, and g is a nonnegative partial quadratic function then so is $f(x) = \inf \{g(y) \mid (x, y) \in M\}$.*

Example 2.5. Log-density of a Gaussian distribution yields a function of the above class. First, a Gaussian distribution $\phi = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ is called nondegenerate if its covariance matrix Σ is invertible. The probability density function of a nondegenerate Gaussian distribution ϕ is the function

$$p_\phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^k |\Sigma|}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle x - \mu, \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu) \rangle}.$$

where k is the dimension of x and $|\Sigma|$ is the determinant of Σ . The negative logarithm of this function, called the negative log-density of ϕ , is equal to $-\log p_\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x - \mu, \Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu) \rangle + C$ for some $C \in \mathbb{R}$. When C is left unspecified, we call the latter function *unnormalised*. If ϕ is degenerate, then it is not absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, and hence lacks a probability density function. Nonetheless, we define the unnormalized negative log-density of ϕ to be $\ell(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x - \mu, \Sigma^-(x - \mu) \rangle + \{|x - \mu \in \text{im}\Sigma|\}$, where Σ^- is any generalised inverse of Σ . The function ℓ is a nonnegative partial quadratic function, finite on the support of ϕ and infinite elsewhere.

2.3 Categorical Structures

It will be convenient to formulate our characterisation results in the abstract language of props (**product** and **permutation** categories). Recall that a prop is just a symmetric strict monoidal category with objects the natural numbers, and the monoidal product on objects defined by addition. A prop morphism is an identity-on-objects symmetric strict monoidal functor.

Our mathematical objects of interest can be organised into props. First, we record for later use the well-studied examples of linear maps, linear relations [2, 7], and affine relations [6].

Definition 2.6.

- The prop **Vect** of linear maps has morphism $m \rightarrow n$ the linear functions $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Sequential composition and monoidal product are defined respectively as $(f; g)(x) := g(f(x))$ and $(f_1 \oplus f_2)(x, y) := (f_1(x), f_2(y))$.
- The prop **LinRel** of linear relations has morphisms $m \rightarrow n$ the linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^{m+n} . Composition and product are:

$$(R; S) := \{(x, z) \mid \exists y. (x, y) \in R, (y, z) \in S\}$$

$$R_1 \oplus R_2 := \{((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) \mid (x_1, y_1) \in R_1, (x_2, y_2) \in R_2\}$$

- The prop **AffRel** of affine relations is defined as **LinRel** except the morphisms are affine rather than linear subspaces.

As mentioned in the introduction, in order to compose nonnegative partial quadratic functions, we regard them as special kinds of relations, called quadratic relations. Similarly to affine and linear, we can organise quadratic relations into a prop.

Definition 2.7. The prop **QuadRel** of quadratic relations has:

- morphisms $m \rightarrow n$ are nonnegative partial quadratic functions $F : \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ over the euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{m+n} .
- identities are indicator functions $\text{id}_n(x, y) = \{x = y\}$
- composition is minimisation over the middle variable. Given $F : m \rightarrow n$ and $G : n \rightarrow p$,

$$(F; G)(x, z) = \inf_y \{F(x, y) + G(y, z)\} \quad (4)$$

- the monoidal product is addition. Given $F_i : m_i \rightarrow n_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, then $F_1 \oplus F_2 : m_1 + m_2 \rightarrow n_1 + n_2$ is defined by

$$(F_1 \oplus F_2)((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = F_1(x_1, y_1) + F_2(x_2, y_2)$$

Composition (4) is well-defined because quadratic relations are non-negative (Proposition 2.4). Furthermore, quadratic relations always attain their infima.

Remark 2.8. The relational perspective on partial quadratic functions is not just an analogy: the notion defining **QuadRel** is an instance of the concept of *weighted relation* [20]. The extended reals form a commutative quantale $Q = ([0, \infty], \geq, +)$ in which 0 represents truth and ∞ falsity. Note that Q is isomorphic to $([0, 1], \leq, \cdot)$ under the isomorphism $x \mapsto e^{-x}$. As common for categories of (weighted) relations, **QuadRel** is a hypergraph category [17].

There are clear embeddings $\mathbf{Vect} \rightarrow \mathbf{LinRel}$ and $\mathbf{LinRel} \rightarrow \mathbf{AffRel}$. The relationship between **AffRel** and **QuadRel** is a bit more elaborate. Every affine space $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ corresponds to a partial quadratic convex ‘indicator’ function $f(x) = \{x \in A\}$. The map taking affine relations to their indicator functions yields a prop morphism $\mathbf{AffRel} \rightarrow \mathbf{QuadRel}$. Conversely, every partial quadratic convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ corresponds to an affine space $\{x \mid f(x) < \infty\}$, called its effective domain. Also this map yields a prop morphism, of type $\mathbf{QuadRel} \rightarrow \mathbf{AffRel}$.

Gaussian probability. Stochastic maps in Gaussian probability can be organised as props as follows.

Definition 2.9 ([18, § 6]). The prop **Gauss** has morphisms $m \rightarrow n$ the tuples (A, b, Σ) with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ positive semidefinite. Such a tuple represents a linear function with Gaussian noise, informally $f(x) = Ax + \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma)$. Composition and monoidal product reflect the transformation rules for Gaussian distributions

$$(A, b, \Sigma); (C, d, \Xi) = (CA, Cb + d, C\Sigma C^T + \Xi)$$

$$(A_1, b_1, \Sigma_1) \oplus (A_2, b_2, \Sigma_2) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

Similarly, there is a prop **GaussEx** of linear maps with *extended* Gaussian noise (see Section 2.1). As discussed in [24], nondeterminism makes the definition subtler, requiring the use of cospans.

Definition 2.10 ([24]). The prop **GaussEx** has morphisms $m \rightarrow n$ pairs $(m \xrightarrow{A} k \xleftarrow{P} n, \varphi)$, where $m \xrightarrow{A} k \xleftarrow{P} n$ is a cospan in **Vect**, P is surjective, and φ is a morphism of type $0 \rightarrow k$ in **Gauss**, i.e. a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ on \mathbb{R}^k . In additive notation, we may represent such a morphism as $f(x) = Ax + \mathcal{N}(\mu', \Sigma') + D$, where the kernel subspace $D := \ker(P)$ is the nondeterministic fibre, and $\mu' := Q\mu$, $\Sigma' := Q\Sigma Q^T$ for some right-inverse Q of P . Note $f(x)$ selects one element $z \in D$ of the fibre, which we can interpret as the non-deterministic choice of f .

The monoidal product of $(m \xrightarrow{A} k \xleftarrow{P} n, \varphi)$ and $(m' \xrightarrow{A'} k' \xleftarrow{P'} n', \varphi')$ is defined as $(m + m' \xrightarrow{A \oplus A'} k + k' \xleftarrow{P \oplus P'} n + n', \varphi \oplus \varphi')$, using the monoidal product in **Vect** on the cospan legs and the one in **Gauss**

on the distributions. The sequential composition of $(m_1 \xrightarrow{A_1} k_1 \xleftarrow{P_1} n, \varphi_1)$ and $(n \xrightarrow{A_2} k_2 \xleftarrow{P_2} n_2, \varphi_2)$ is defined as $(m_1 \xrightarrow{A_1;L} k \xleftarrow{P_2;R} n_2, \varphi)$, where $k_1 \xrightarrow{L} k \xleftarrow{R} k_2$ is the pushout of $k_1 \xleftarrow{P_1} n \xrightarrow{A_1} k_2$ in \mathbf{Vect} , in \mathbf{Vect} and φ is the convolution in \mathbf{Gauss} of distributions $\varphi_1; L: 0 \rightarrow k$ and $\varphi_2; R: 0 \rightarrow k$.¹

One may phrase $\mathbf{GaussEx}$ more abstractly as a category of ‘decorated’ cospans [16], see [24] for details. Also, both \mathbf{Gauss} and $\mathbf{GaussEx}$ are Markov categories [18].

Note there is an embedding $\mathbf{Gauss} \rightarrow \mathbf{GaussEx}$ where (A, b, Σ) is sent to the cospan $(m \xrightarrow{A} n \xleftarrow{Id} n, \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma))$ whose right leg is the identity, i.e. the nondeterministic fibre vanishes. Also there is an embedding $\mathbf{GaussEx} \rightarrow \mathbf{QuadRel}$ mapping the cospan $(m \xrightarrow{A} k \xleftarrow{P} n, \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma))$ to the negative log-likelihood function

$$f(x, y) = \langle Py - Ax - b, \Sigma^+(Py - Ax - b) \rangle + \{ \{ Py - Ax - b \in \text{im}(\Sigma) \} \}.$$

with Σ^+ the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of Σ . This embedding is discussed in [25]. Proving functoriality is highly non-trivial. One of the benefits of our approach is making it a simple corollary: we come back to this point in Section 4.3.

3 Graphical Quadratic Algebra


String Diagrammatic Calculi. The main contribution of our work is to give a *sound and complete axiomatisation* for the categories $\mathbf{QuadRel}$ and $\mathbf{GaussEx}$. We shall formulate such results in terms of symmetric monoidal algebraic structures: this allows us to rely on existing axiomatisation results for the ‘simpler’ theories \mathbf{LinRel} and \mathbf{AffRel} . First, recall that a *symmetric monoidal theory* (SMT) is a pair (Σ, E) , where Σ is a signature of generators $o: m \rightarrow n$ with an arity m and coarity n , and E is a set of equations between Σ -terms. A Σ -term c of type $m \rightarrow n$ will be represented graphically as a *string diagram* [21] with m dangling wires on the left and n on the right, or simply $\overset{m}{\square} \overset{n}{\square}$ or even \square when the type is irrelevant to the context. Formally, Σ -terms are freely obtained by sequential and parallel composition of the generators in Σ together with the identity $\text{---}: 1 \rightarrow 1$, the symmetry $\text{---}: 2 \rightarrow 2$, and the ‘empty’ diagram $\square: 0 \rightarrow 0$. Sequential composition of Σ -terms $\overset{m}{\square} \overset{a}{\square} \overset{a}{\square} \overset{n}{\square}$ and $\overset{a}{\square} \overset{a}{\square} \overset{n}{\square}$ is depicted as $\overset{m}{\square} \overset{a}{\square} \overset{a}{\square} \overset{n}{\square}$, of type $m \rightarrow n$. Parallel composition of Σ -terms $\overset{m_1}{\square} \overset{c_1}{\square} \overset{n_1}{\square}$ and $\overset{m_2}{\square} \overset{c_2}{\square} \overset{n_2}{\square}$ is depicted as $\overset{m_1}{\square} \overset{c_1}{\square} \overset{n_1}{\square}$ and $\overset{m_2}{\square} \overset{c_2}{\square} \overset{n_2}{\square}$, of type $m_1 + m_2 \rightarrow n_1 + n_2$. String diagrams are just Σ -terms quotiented by the laws of symmetric monoidal categories.

Given an SMT (Σ, E) , the prop $\text{FreeP}_{(\Sigma, E)}$ freely generated by (Σ, E) has morphisms $m \rightarrow n$ the string diagrams of type $m \rightarrow n$ quotiented by E , with sequential and parallel composition defined as on the corresponding Σ -terms. We will typically regard such a freely generated prop as a *string diagrammatic calculus*, with the string diagrams being its (graphical) *syntax*. The props considered in Section 2.3 are regarded as *semantic models* for diagrammatic calculi. When there is an isomorphism of props $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ between $\text{FreeP}_{(\Sigma, E)}$ and another prop \mathbf{C} , we say that \mathbf{C} is *presented* (or axiomatised) by (Σ, E) . Because prop morphisms are identity-on-objects, to prove such result it suffices to prove that $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is full and faithful. In more ‘logical’ terms, we can phrase these requirements as follows:

- (1) *soundness.* If $s = t$ in $\text{FreeP}_{(\Sigma, E)}$, then $\llbracket s \rrbracket = \llbracket t \rrbracket$, that is, \mathbf{C} interprets all generators and equations of (Σ, E) correctly.
- (2) *completeness.* If $\llbracket s \rrbracket = \llbracket t \rrbracket$ in \mathbf{C} , then $s = t$ in $\text{FreeP}_{(\Sigma, E)}$.
- (3) *definability.* For every $f: m \rightarrow n$ in \mathbf{C} , there exists a string diagram $s: m \rightarrow n$ with $\llbracket s \rrbracket = f$.

¹As usual, for composition by pushout to be well-defined, strictly speaking morphisms of this category are equivalence classes of isomorphic cospans.

Introducing Graphical Quadratic Algebra. We now introduce the symmetric monoidal theory of Graphical Quadratic Algebra (GQA), which we will use to axiomatise **QuadRel** and **GaussEx**. The generators of GQA are the following:




where k ranges over \mathbb{R} . The division into fragments hints at the mathematical objects these generators will model. As a preliminary intuition, $\text{---}\cup\text{---}$ *duplicates*, $\text{---}\cap\text{---}$ *discards*, and $\text{---}\circ\text{---}$ *sums* values, whereas $\text{---}\ominus\text{---}$ produces value 0, $\text{---}\vdash\text{---}$ produces value 1, and $\text{---}\boxed{k}\text{---}$ multiplies by k a given value. Generators $\text{---}\circ\text{---}$ and $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$ behave symmetrically to $\text{---}\ominus\text{---}$ and $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$ respectively. These eight generators already appeared in the context of *Graphical Affine Algebra*, a calculus axiomatising **AffRel** [6]. The novelty of our calculus lies in the *quadratic generator* $\text{---}\leftarrow\text{---}$, which variously stands for

- (1) the quadratic function $x \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x^2$
- (2) the standard Gaussian (normal) probability distribution

depending on the perspective we take on its behaviour. Thanks to $\text{---}\leftarrow\text{---}$, we will be able to extend the reach of the calculus from affine relations to arbitrary quadratic relations.

As derived operations, we may define symmetric counterparts for all the generators. Intuitively, their behaviour is the same, but reversed—this will be reflected by their interpretation being the opposite (quadratic) relation.



The equations of GQA are displayed in Figure 1. The linear fragment states that $\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, $\text{---}\ominus\text{---}$ form a commutative monoid and $\text{---}\cap\text{---}$, $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$ form a commutative comonoid, distributing over each other according to the laws of bimonoids. Furthermore, scalars distribute over the bimonoid, and there are laws expressing the field structure on \mathbb{R} . The relational fragment describes a black and a white special Frobenius algebra, the equivalence between the black and the white compact closed structure arising from the Frobenius algebras (cap), and the fact that in a relational model scalars have inverses (r -inv, r -coinv). Note at this stage we may also prove that $\text{---}\circ\text{---}$, $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$ form a commutative comonoid and $\text{---}\cup\text{---}$, $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$ form a commutative monoid. The affine fragment describes the behaviour of $\text{---}\vdash\text{---}$. Finally, the quadratic fragment describes the behaviour of $\text{---}\leftarrow\text{---}$.

The relational linear fragment sometimes goes under the name of Graphical Linear Algebra, and Graphical Affine Algebra if the affine fragment is also added. These theories have been used to axiomatise the linear algebraic models considered in Section 2.3. We recap those results below,

referring to [6, 28] for details. By including the quadratic fragment in the picture, we will provide analogous theorems for **QuadRel**, **Gauss**, and **GaussEx**.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Consider generators (5) and equations in Fig. 1.*

- *The linear fragment presents Vect.*
- *The relational linear fragment presents LinRel.*
- *The relational linear affine fragment presents AffRel.*

Importantly, Proposition 3.1 implies that, whenever we reason in the aforementioned fragments, any equivalence of matrices or subspaces represented by our string diagrams are provable in the corresponding equational theory. This will allow us to use freely known facts of linear algebra (eg. those recalled in Appendix A) in diagrammatic reasoning whenever needed.

Quadratic Interpretation. We now introduce the interpretation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ of string diagrams of **QuadRel** as quadratic relations. To each generator c , say of type $m \rightarrow n$, we assign a morphism $\llbracket c \rrbracket$ of **QuadRel** of the same type, that means, a nonnegative partial quadratic function of type $\mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. In defining such functions, we use the notation $\{ \phi \}$ introduced in (3), and write $()$ for the unique element of the space \mathbb{R}^0 .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \text{---} \circlearrowleft \rrbracket &:= \left(x, \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \mapsto \{ x = x_1 = x_2 \} \\
 \llbracket \text{---} \bullet \rrbracket &:= (x, ()) \mapsto 0 \\
 \llbracket \text{---} \circlearrowright \rrbracket &:= \left(\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}, y \right) \mapsto \{ y = x_1 + x_2 \} \\
 \llbracket \text{---} \circ \rrbracket &:= ((), x) \mapsto \{ x = 0 \} \\
 \llbracket \text{---} \boxed{k} \text{---} \rrbracket &:= (x, y) \mapsto \{ y = k \cdot x \} \\
 \llbracket \text{---} \circ \rrbracket &:= (x, ()) \mapsto \{ x = 0 \} \\
 \llbracket \bullet \text{---} \rrbracket &:= ((), x) \mapsto 0 \\
 \llbracket \text{---} \vdash \rrbracket &:= ((), x) \mapsto \{ x = 1 \} \\
 \llbracket \text{---} \leftarrow \rrbracket &:= ((), x) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}x^2
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us write **GQA** for the prop freely generated by the theory **GQA**. By freeness of **GQA**, assigning a quadratic relation to each **GQA**-generator as above suffices² to define a prop morphism of type **GQA** \rightarrow **QuadRel**, for which we use the same notation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$. The functor interprets sequential and parallel composition of string diagrams of **GQA** as the corresponding operations in **QuadRel**. In fact, in Section 4 we will show that the equational theory of Figure 1 makes $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ an isomorphism.

The semantics of the generators adheres to the intuition provided below (5) and, with the exception of the new generator \leftarrow , conservatively extends the interpretation of these generators in **AffRel** given in [6].

²This holds provided that $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ is sound, namely $c = d$ in **GQA** implies $\llbracket c \rrbracket = \llbracket d \rrbracket$. This can be readily verified on the axioms of Figure 1, see Appendix E. For a comprehensive explanation of the universal property of freely generated props, which is used both here and in Section 4.3, see [1].

Gaussian Interpretation. The **QuadRel**-semantics models the interpretation of \leftarrow as a quadratic function. As discussed, quadratic relations are linked to Gaussian probability, which leads us to consider an alternative interpretation of \leftarrow , as the standard Gaussian probability distribution. This forms the basis to represent generic linear functions with Gaussian noise as string diagrams, as follows. We define an interpretation of the generators of the linear affine quadratic fragment of (5) as morphisms of **Gauss**. We use the notation $f(x) = Ax + \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma)$ for such a morphism of type $m \rightarrow n$, with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ the linear component, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ defining the stochastic component (cf. Definition 2.9). Also, we write $[\]$ for the unique 0×0 matrix.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \text{---} \bullet \rangle &:= (k) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} k \\ k \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \\
\langle \text{---} \bullet \rangle &:= (k) \mapsto () + \mathcal{N}(\cdot, [\]) \\
\langle \text{---} \circ \rangle &:= \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ k_2 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto (k_1 + k_2) + \mathcal{N}(0, 0) \\
\langle \text{---} \circ \rangle &:= () \mapsto (0) + \mathcal{N}(0, 0) \\
\langle \text{---} \boxed{k} \rangle &:= (k') \mapsto (k \cdot k') + \mathcal{N}(0, 0) \\
\langle \text{---} | \rangle &:= () \mapsto (1) + \mathcal{N}(1, 0) \\
\langle \leftarrow \rangle &:= () \mapsto (0) + \mathcal{N}(0, 1)
\end{aligned}$$

Let us write GLA_{AQ} for the prop freely generated by the generators and equations of linear affine quadratic fragment of GQA (Figure 1), minus the axioms (false) and (Z). As for the quadratic interpretation, we may extend $\langle \cdot \rangle$ to a prop morphism $\text{GLA}_{AQ} \rightarrow \mathbf{Gauss}$, for which we use the same notation. In the next section we will show that $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is an isomorphism, meaning the linear affine quadratic fragment presents **Gauss**.

Via the embedding $\mathbf{Gauss} \rightarrow \mathbf{GaussEx}$ (Section 2.3), we may regard $\langle \cdot \rangle$ as an interpretation of GLA_{AQ} in terms of extended Gaussian stochastic maps. The question is what it takes to turn this interpretation into a presentation, i.e. to make the functor $\langle \cdot \rangle$ an isomorphism. As cospans in **Vect** may be regarded as linear relations in **LinRel**, one may be tempted to follow a similar path to the one leading from **Vect** to **AffRel**, and throw in the presentation the relational fragment of GQA. However, this does not work: both **Gauss** and **GaussEx** are Markov categories [18], meaning every morphism is discardable. From a string diagrammatic viewpoint, this means that, if we included the generator $\text{---} \circ$ in the presentation of **GaussEx**, it should be discardable too, i.e. we should have the axiom $\text{---} \circ = \text{---} \bullet$. Together with axiom $(\bullet \circ \text{---})$, this would trivialise the theory.

As we shall see in the next Section, it turns out that just part of the relational fragment is needed to present **GaussEx**. With respect to the theory generating GLA_{AQ} , we add just the generator $\bullet \text{---}$, and the equations of Figure 2 below: we call GLA_{ANQ} the prop freely generated by such augmented theory. We can thus now write the interpretation of the generators of GLA_{ANQ} in **GaussEx**, as follows.




Fig. 2. Non-deterministic fragment

$$\langle\langle -\boxed{g}- : m \rightarrow n \rangle\rangle := \left(m \xrightarrow{A} n \xleftarrow{Id} n, \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma) \right)$$

for any \mathbf{GLA}_{AQ} -generator $-\boxed{g}-$
with $\langle -\boxed{g}- \rangle = x \mapsto Ax + \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma)$.


$$\langle\langle \bullet - \rangle\rangle := \left(0 \xrightarrow{Id} 0 \xleftarrow{!} 1, \mathcal{N}((\cdot), [\cdot]) \right)$$

where $!$ is the linear map $(k) \mapsto (\cdot)$. This interpretation extends to a prop morphism $\mathbf{GLA}_{ANQ} \rightarrow \mathbf{GaussEx}$, which we also write $\langle\langle \cdot \rangle\rangle$. We will prove in the next section that this yields an isomorphism of props, meaning the linear affine non-deterministic quadratic fragment of GQA (minus axioms (false) and (Z)) presents **GaussEx**.

It is worth spending some more words on the newly introduced fragment of Figure (2). First, the name is due to the fact that the addition of this fragment allows us to generalise a presentation of Gaussian maps to extended Gaussian maps, where the extension is given by a non-deterministic component as illustrated in [24] and recalled in Section 2.1. Algebraically, the non-deterministic fragment is entirely derivable from the linear relational fragment of GQA, see [28]. It is weaker than the relational fragment because we miss $-\circ-$ among the generators, but also $\curvearrowright-\bullet$ is not definable anymore (while we can still define $-\circ\curvearrowleft$). Semantically, we may regard string diagrams of the linear non-deterministic fragment as linear relations, but they will all be *total*, that means, if $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ is one such relation, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $(x, y) \in R$.

Another interesting observation is that the non-deterministic fragment characterises the behaviour of $\bullet-$ analogously to how the quadratic fragment captures the behaviour of $\leftarrow-$: $\leftarrow-$ is invariant under rotation matrices, whereas $\bullet-$ is invariant under invertible matrices.

Linear Algebra in GQA. In preparation for the completeness results of the next section, we introduce notation to represent matrices as subspaces as string diagrams of GQA. First, to unburden notation, let us use thick wires as shorthand for an arbitrary number of ingoing/outgoing wires in a string diagrams, as in $-\boxed{c}- := {}^m\boxed{c}^v$. We use a similar convention to represent multiple instances of the same generator, e.g.:



An $n \times m$ matrix A may be represented by a string diagram $\underline{A} : m \rightarrow n$, with the property that $\llbracket -\underline{A}- \rrbracket$ is the function $(v_1, v_2) \mapsto \{ \{ Av_1 = v_2 \} \}$. This representation is the same as in GLA [10]: the m wires on the left of \underline{A} stand for the columns of A , the n wires on the right stand for the rows, and the left j th wire is connected to the i th wire on the right through a scalar $-\boxed{d}-$ if the coefficient

A_{ij} is k . Via the axioms of the linear fragment, this is disconnected when $k = 0$, and becomes a ‘plain’ wire when $k = 1$. For instance,

$$\text{if } A = \begin{pmatrix} k_1 & 0 & 0 \\ k_2 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{then } \boxed{A} := \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \bullet \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} \quad (6)$$

Similarly, a subspace $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ may be represented by the string diagram $\bullet \boxed{A}$, where A is such that $\text{im}(A) = S$. We have that $\llbracket \bullet \boxed{A} \rrbracket$ is $x \mapsto \{x \in S\}$. We will also write this as \boxed{S} . Well-definedness of this encoding is justified by Proposition C.4.

4 Completeness Results

In this section we establish presentations of **Gauss**, **GaussEx** and **QuadRel** by means of fragments of GQA. As discussed in Section 3, for each characterisation we need to prove soundness, completeness, and definability. Soundness is a routine check on the axioms (see Appendix E). Thus we focus on definability and completeness.

4.1 Presentation of Gauss and GaussEx

We will show that the fragment GLA_{AQ} , as introduced in Section 3, presents **Gauss**. Completeness follows from a normal form argument, which builds on the following lemmas.

PROPOSITION 4.1 (ORTHOGONAL INVARIANCE). *The generator \leftarrow is invariant under $O(n)$, i.e. for all orthogonal matrices $R \in O(n)$ we can derive in GLA_{AQ} that $\leftarrow \boxed{R} = \leftarrow$.*

PROOF. A *Givens rotation* is a rotation matrix which acts as a rotation along two coordinate axes, and the identity otherwise. From (RI), it follows immediately that \leftarrow is invariant under Givens rotations. Now we use the fact (proved below) that every orthogonal matrix R can be written as a product $R = Q_1 \cdots Q_n \cdot D$ where the Q_i are Givens rotations and D is a diagonal matrix with entries ± 1 . From this, the proposition follows by repeated application of invariance under Givens rotations and flip invariance (Proposition C.1).

It remains to prove the claimed decomposition of R , which we establish as follows: The usual algorithm for QR-decomposition gives $R = QU$, where Q is a product of Givens rotations and U is upper triangular. Then $U = Q^T R$ is orthogonal (normal) in addition to being upper triangular, hence must be diagonal, with entries ± 1 . All of these linear algebraic transformations can be performed diagrammatically in GLA_{AQ} . \square

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_1}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_2}$ be two matrices satisfying $AA^T = BB^T$. Then we can derive*

$$\leftarrow \boxed{A} = \leftarrow \boxed{B} \quad (7)$$


PROOF. Without loss of generality we can assume that $m_1 = m_2 = m$: This is because if, say, $m_1 > m_2$, we can extend B with further zero columns to $\tilde{B} = (B \ 0)$ and this still satisfies the assumptions $AA^T = \tilde{B}\tilde{B}^T$ and

$$\leftarrow \boxed{\tilde{B}} = \leftarrow \boxed{B} \stackrel{(D)}{=} \leftarrow \boxed{B} = \leftarrow \boxed{A}$$

By Proposition A.2 (Appendix A), $A = BR$ for some $R \in O(m)$, hence (7) follows from Proposition 4.1. \square

We can now derive an encoding of Gaussian distributions in GLA_{AQ} .

Definition 4.3. Let $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ be a Gaussian distribution on \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\Sigma = LL^T$ be any Cholesky decomposition of Σ . Then we define



By Proposition 4.2, this encoding is provably independent of the choice of A .

THEOREM 4.4. *Gauss* is presented by the fragment GLA_{AQ} .


PROOF. For definability, let $f \in \text{Gauss}(m, n)$ be given by $f(x) = Ax + \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, then f is definable by the string diagram



For completeness, we may transform any string diagram of GLA_{AQ} into the form (8), see Appendix F, Proposition F.1. This is a normal form, because we can read off the values of (A, μ, Σ) from the interpretation in **Gauss**. Thus, $\langle (A, \mu, \Sigma) \rangle = \langle (A', \mu', \Sigma') \rangle$ implies $(A, \mu, \Sigma) = (A', \mu', \Sigma')$, yielding completeness. \square

THEOREM 4.5. *GaussEx* is presented by the fragment GLA_{ANQ} .

PROOF. First we show definability. Let $f = (m \xrightarrow{A} k \xleftarrow{P} n, \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma))$ be a morphism of **GaussEx**, informally representing the map $f(x) = Ax + \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) + D$ where $D = \ker(P)$. Then f is definable by the term



For completeness, we note that the form (9) is not quite a normal for **GaussEx** semantics, but it becomes one if we insist on the further conditions that

$$\mu \in D^\perp, \text{im}(A) \subseteq D^\perp, \text{im}(\Sigma) \subseteq D^\perp$$

where $D^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the orthogonal complement of D . As detailed in Proposition F.2 (Appendix F), we can transform every string diagram of GLA_{ANQ} into that specific normal form. The values of D, A, μ, Σ are then uniquely determined from the interpretation $\langle \langle - \rangle \rangle$ in **GaussEx**. \square

4.2 Presentation of QuadRel

Finally, we show that the full theory **GQA** presents **QuadRel**. First, recall that in a hypergraph category, questions about morphisms can be reduced to questions about states (morphisms $0 \rightarrow n$), as follows: For a morphism $f : m \rightarrow n$, its ‘name’ $[f] : 0 \rightarrow m \oplus n$ is defined as



The assignment $f \mapsto [f]$ is bijective – every morphism can be recovered from its name by composing with the appropriate cap.

The crucial stepping-stone in the completeness proof is an elimination procedure which, given a state in **GQA**, iteratively removes all occurrences of conditioning ($- \circ$), thus turning the state into a string diagrams in the fragment GLA_{ANQ} . This procedure has independent interest, because states in GLA_{ANQ} can be interpreted extended Gaussian distributions. The elimination procedure can

therefore be understood as symbolically conditioning extended Gaussian distributions to obtain an explicit posterior, or as solving a least-squares problem via QR decomposition.

THEOREM 4.6. *Let $M : 0 \rightarrow n$ be a string diagram in **GQA**. Then there exists a string diagram M' in \mathbf{GLA}_{ANQ} , and a scalar $\alpha : 0 \rightarrow 0$, such that $M = M' \oplus \alpha$ is derivable in **GQA**. The scalar is of the form $\boxed{c} \rightarrow$ with $c \in [0, \infty)$, or $\infty = \vdash \circ$.*

PROOF. In Appendix F.2. □


THEOREM 4.7. *The prop **QuadRel** is presented by **GQA**.*

PROOF. For definability, note that by taking names (10), it suffices to show that all states $f : 0 \rightarrow n$ (i.e. nonnegative partial quadratic functions) are definable. By Proposition 2.3, these can be brought via an affine coordinate change into the elementary form $h(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_1\|^2 + \{\mathbf{x}_3 = 0\}$, which is definable as the state



For completeness, it suffices to show that for all states $M_1, M_2 : 0 \rightarrow n$ of **GQA**, if $\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket$ in **QuadRel**, then $M_1 = M_2$ is derivable. The steps of the proof are as follows.

- (1) Using the elimination procedure of Theorem 4.6, we transform each M_i (for $i = 1, 2$) into the form



where M'_i lies in \mathbf{GLA}_{ANQ} .

- (2) To each M'_i , we apply the normalisation procedure for states in \mathbf{GLA}_{ANQ} (Proposition F.2). Those are normal forms for **GaussEx** semantics by Theorem 4.5.
- (3) In order to show that these are normal forms for **QuadRel**, too, we use that passing from **GaussEx** semantics to **QuadRel** semantics is injective (Proposition F.10). This is an embedding/conservativity result which we will spell out in more detail in Section 4.3

□

4.3 Functorial Transformations and Conservativity

A powerful consequence of our presentations for the props **Gauss**, **GaussEx**, **AffRel**, and **QuadRel** is the ease with which we can subsequently define functors between them. This way, our presentations serve as a proof principle, where functoriality is guaranteed by construction.


For example, we can define a functor $\mathbf{Gauss} \rightarrow \mathbf{GaussEx}$ simply by mapping the generators of \mathbf{GLA}_{AQ} to the same generators in \mathbf{GLA}_{ANQ} . Via the isomorphisms $\mathbf{Gauss} \cong \mathbf{GLA}_{AQ}$ and $\mathbf{GaussEx} \cong \mathbf{GLA}_{ANQ}$, the induced functor can be seen to take Gaussian maps $f(x) = Ax + \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ to extended Gaussian maps $(m \xrightarrow{A} n \xleftarrow{Id} n, \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma))$.

Similarly, we can define a functor $\mathbf{GaussEx} \rightarrow \mathbf{QuadRel}$ by including the generators of \mathbf{GLA}_{ANQ} into **GQA**. As worked out in Appendix F.2, the induced functor J takes the **GaussEx** morphism $(m \xrightarrow{A} k \xleftarrow{P} n, \mathcal{N}(b, \Sigma))$ to the unnormalised, negative log-likelihood function


$$\ell(y \mid x) = \langle Py - Ax - b, \Sigma^+(Py - Ax - b) \rangle + \{|Py - Ax - b \in \text{im}(\Sigma)\},$$

This is one way of making precise the logical connection between the world of (extended) Gaussians and of convex optimization problems. Functoriality of logpdf was proved in [25] by explicit means. Here, we obtain it for free from our use of presentations. Seeing that the induced functors are faithful, we may derive the conservativity of the various fragments of **GQA** over each other.


Then, we have:




Using the singular value decomposition above, we can now write




From (11) and the fact that C is invertible and U, V are orthogonal, we get:




Note that we rely here on a well-known fact of graphical linear algebra: swapping the input and output wires of an invertible matrix using the black cups and caps gives its inverse [10, Lemma 5.8]. We can now split U^T into two block matrices as $(U_1 | U_2)$, so that:




Since σI and U^T commute and U is orthogonal, we can apply rotation invariance to remove U^T followed by the normalisation scheme (NORM) (cf. Section 5.3 below):



Since \leftarrow and any matrix (here, σI and U_1) are discardable, we can continue as follows:




where we use rotational invariance and the fact that U^T and σI commute once again. We can now conclude using additivity of matrices and the SVD of the Moore-Penrose inverse we gave above:



The last diagram gives us what we wanted, namely that, assuming the linear model in (13), x is distributed according to a Gaussian with mean A^+b . Interestingly this also shows that the optimal x can be extracted as the mean of the resulting normal distribution. Moreover, we recover a less well-known fact from the same diagram: that the covariance matrix of the OLS estimate is

$$A^+(\sigma I)^2(A^+)^T = (A^T A)^{-1} A^T \sigma^2 A (A^T A)^{-1} = \sigma^2 (A^T A)^{-1}$$

In conclusion, we were able to recover the usual OLS estimator using some simple linear algebra and the axioms of GQA. Note that we could compute the posterior of a Bayesian linear regression model with a Gaussian prior with mean μ and covariance matrix $Q Q^T$ (below left) in a similar way, by finding the covariance $S S^T$ and mean m in the diagram on the right below:



Conversely, ordinary linear regression can be seen as Bayesian linear regression with an uninformative prior \bullet over the parameter space. This prior is not a probability distribution, but is a meaningful quadratic relation which GQA allows us to manipulate rigorously.

5.2 Stochastic Systems à la Willems


The mathematical analysis of stochastic processes also plays an important role in control theory. Whereas traditional approaches study the evolution of stochastic systems as Borel σ -algebras, Willems' behavioural approach argues that a formalism akin to our quadratic relations models more effectively the interaction of a system with its environment [27]. One of Willems' motivating example is drawn from electrical circuit theory: an Ohmic resistor with thermal noise, drawn as

σ r
. Thermal noise, also called Johnson-Nyquist noise, expresses the fact that a resistor may produce current even when no voltage is applied. Its stochastic representation is as a gaussian ϵ_V with zero mean and standard deviation σ . Now, we can model the noisy resistor as a string diagram of our calculus, as follows.


(14)


The interpretation is compositional, and dictated by how we represent the behaviour of circuit components as quadratic relations, following Kirchoff's laws. It is a conservative extension of the interpretation of (non-noisy) electrical circuits as string diagrams for graphical affine algebra [6], where we use the extra generator \leftarrow to model thermal noise. Just as the one in [6], also this interpretation can be expressed as a functor – see Appendix G for the details.

In Willems' example, the noisy resistor has an alternative representation, as an Ohmic resistor in parallel with a random current source. We display it below, along with its representation in GQA.


(15)

Willems argues that the two circuits are equivalent: (14) expresses the relation $V = rI + \epsilon_V$ between voltage V , resistance r , current I , and noise ϵ_V , whereas (15) expresses $I = V/r + \epsilon_I$, with ϵ_I the gaussian with zero mean and standard deviation σ/r . We can prove this fact with an equational

derivation in GQA, as follows.




5.3 Probabilistic Programming

We recall a simple probabilistic programming language (PPL) for Gaussian probability which features conditioning as a first-class construct [26]. The core language resembles first-order OCaml with a construct `normal()` to sample from a standard Gaussian, and conditioning denoted as $(::=)$. Types τ are generated from a basic type R denoting *real* or *random variable*, pair types and unit type I . That is, $\tau ::= R \mid I \mid \tau * \tau$. Terms of the language are

$$\begin{aligned}
 e ::= & x \mid e + e \mid \alpha \cdot e \mid \underline{\beta} \mid (e, e) \mid () \\
 & \mid \text{let } x = e \text{ in } e \mid \pi_i e \mid \text{normal}() \mid e ::= e
 \end{aligned}$$

where α, β range over real numbers and $i \in \{1, 2\}$. The expression $e_1 ::= e_2$ means that e_1 and e_2 shall be conditioned to be exactly equal. Typing judgements are reported in Appendix I. Following the semantics of the CD-calculus [23, 25] we translate terms into string diagrams of GQA as follows.



An example of a PPL program and the corresponding GQA-diagram is the one in the introduction. In [23, 25], the authors give a free construction called **Cond(Gauss)** which is a fully abstract denotational semantics for PPL. However, the **Cond**-construction still involves some quantification over arbitrary contexts, and it is unclear how to decide in general when two morphisms are equal. As noticed there, **Cond(Gauss)** is *not* a hypergraph category, and therefore questions about open programs cannot be reduced to questions about states by taking their name (10).

Using the interpretation in **QuadRel**, we can address this shortcoming. Consider a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. The program $\text{normal}() ::= \underline{c}$ allocates a Gaussian variable and immediately conditions it to be equal to c . Because the allocation is not observable, this program is contextually equivalent to the empty program which does nothing. Note however that they are not equal in **QuadRel** alone: the corresponding denotation in **QuadRel**, $\llbracket \underline{c} \rrbracket = \frac{1}{2}c^2$, gives a different constant depending on the value of c . This scalar is known as *model evidence* or *normalisation factor* in probability theory, and it is discarded during normalisation in the operational semantics of [23]. This suggests that, in order to model this correctly, the following additional equation should hold under the GQA-interpretation of PPL:

$$\llbracket \underline{c} \rrbracket = \square \quad (\text{NORM})$$

Note that (NORM) implies (Z) for $c = 0$. What is the semantic meaning of (NORM)? For quadratic relations $F, G : m \rightarrow n$, write $F \approx G$ when there exists a scalar $c \in \mathbb{R}$ with $F(x, y) = G(x, y) + c$. This is a congruence relation for all prop operations, and we write $\mathbf{QuadRel}/\approx$ for the quotient prop. It is not hard to see that this quotient amounts to assuming (NORM), meaning that the prop $\mathbf{QuadRel}/\approx$ is presented by $\mathbf{GQA} + (\text{NORM})$.

This framework may be compared with the operational semantics of [23] in interesting ways. First, the elimination procedure of Theorem 4.6 mirrors the operational semantics by reducing conditioning statements whenever they occur. The normal form of Proposition F.10 for states yields a decision procedure for contextual equivalence of arbitrary terms: given two terms, take the corresponding string diagrams in **GQA**, take their name, then normalise. This may contribute to solve an outstanding problem posed in [26] where only an incomplete algebraic characterisation of contextual equivalence was given. We leave a complete account of $\mathbf{GQA} + (\text{NORM})$ as a fully abstract model of PPL for future work. As yet another direction, the existence of the unit $\bullet-$ in the semantics also suggests a possible extension of the language which includes improper priors, i.e. a term **UNIFORM** with $\llbracket \text{UNIFORM} \rrbracket = \bullet-$.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

We gave a compositional account of least-squares optimisation via a category **QuadRel** of quadratic relations. **QuadRel** is expressive enough to faithfully contain affine relations, Gaussian probability, and the combination of the two, namely the category **GaussEx**. We introduced a diagrammatic calculus **GQA** which completely axiomatises **QuadRel**, and identified fragments which present **Gauss** and **GaussEx**. The axioms of **GQA** for the generator \leftarrow are elegant and purely stated in terms of symmetry considerations, namely invariance under (2×2) rotations. This is evocative of the Herschel-Maxwell theorem, which states that the Gaussian distribution is uniquely characterised by its rotation invariance (e.g. [19]). Note that the nondeterministic generator \bullet is similarly axiomatised by invariance under translations and scaling. Using the various presentations, it becomes easy to study functors between these categories. Once we define how the generators are mapped, functoriality comes ‘for free’ from the universal property of the presentation.

We showcased our framework in case studies from linear regression, electrical circuit theory, and probabilistic programming. Our investigation in these areas has been only cursory, and much more is possible, as discussed for instance at the end of Section 5.3. From an algebraic viewpoint, an interesting question to explore is to what extent the symmetries present in Graphical Linear Algebra translate to Graphical Quadratic Algebra. For instance, one such symmetry maps each generator of GLA to its ‘color-swapped’ version, i.e. $\leftarrow \mapsto \rightarrow$, $\circ \mapsto \bullet$ and so on. Semantically, this maps a linear relation to a kind of orthogonal complement. We conjecture that this symmetry extends to **GQA**, and that it should send \leftarrow to itself (thus the gray colour). The semantics of this functor should correspond to convex conjugation (Legendre transformation). Indeed, in convex analysis terminology, every quadratic relation is a so-called convex bifunction [22], which have been studied in categorical terms in [25].

References

- [1] John C. Baez, Brandon Coya, and Franciscus Rebro. 2018. Props in Network Theory. arXiv:1707.08321 [math.CT]
- [2] John C. Baez and Jason Erbele. 2015. Categories in Control. *Theory Appl. Categ.* 30 (2015), 836–881. arXiv:1405.6881 [math.CT]
- [3] Patrick Billingsley. 1995. *Probability and Measure* (third ed.). Wiley.
- [4] Guillaume Boisseau and Pawel Sobocinski. 2021. String Diagrammatic Electrical Circuit Theory. In *ACT (EPTCS)*, Vol. 372. 178–191.
- [5] Filippo Bonchi, Joshua Holland, Robin Piedeleu, Pawel Sobocinski, and Fabio Zanasi. 2019. Diagrammatic algebra: from linear to concurrent systems. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3, POPL (2019), 25:1–25:28.
- [6] Filippo Bonchi, Robin Piedeleu, Pawel Sobocinski, and Fabio Zanasi. 2019. Graphical Affine Algebra. In *Proc. LICS 2019*.
- [7] Filippo Bonchi, Pawel Sobociński, and Fabio Zanasi. 2014. A categorical semantics of signal flow graphs. In *CONCUR 2014—Concurrency Theory: 25th International Conference, CONCUR 2014, Rome, Italy, September 2-5, 2014. Proceedings 25*. Springer, 435–450.
- [8] Filippo Bonchi, Pawel Sobocinski, and Fabio Zanasi. 2014. Interacting Bialgebras Are Frobenius. In *FoSSaCS (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 8412. Springer, 351–365.
- [9] Filippo Bonchi, Pawel Sobocinski, and Fabio Zanasi. 2017. The Calculus of Signal Flow Diagrams I: Linear relations on streams. *Inf. Comput.* 252 (2017), 2–29.
- [10] Filippo Bonchi, Pawel Sobociński, and Fabio Zanasi. 2017. Interacting Hopf algebras. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 221, 1 (2017), 144–184.
- [11] Filippo Bonchi, Pawel Sobocinski, and Fabio Zanasi. 2021. A Survey of Compositional Signal Flow Theory. In *IFIP’s Exciting First 60+ Years*. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, Vol. 600. Springer, 29–56.
- [12] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. 2004. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Bob Coecke and Ross Duncan. 2008. Interacting Quantum Observables. In *ICALP (2) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 5126. Springer, 298–310.
- [14] Bob Coecke and Aleks Kissinger. 2018. Picturing Quantum Processes - A First Course on Quantum Theory and Diagrammatic Reasoning. In *Diagrams (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 10871. Springer, 28–31.
- [15] Ross Duncan and Kevin Dunne. 2016. Interacting Frobenius Algebras are Hopf. In *LICS*. ACM, 535–544.

- [16] Brendan Fong. 2015. Decorated Cospans. arXiv:1502.00872 [math.CT]
- [17] Brendan Fong and David I Spivak. 2019. Hypergraph Categories. arXiv:1806.08304 [math.CT]
- [18] Tobias Fritz. 2020. A synthetic approach to Markov kernels, conditional independence and theorems on sufficient statistics. *Advances in Mathematics* 370 (08 2020), 107239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2020.107239>
- [19] Balázs Gyenis. 2017. Maxwell and the normal distribution: A colored story of probability, independence, and tendency toward equilibrium. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* 57 (2017), 53–65.
- [20] F. William Lawvere. 1973. Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories. *Rendiconti Del Seminario Matematico E Fisico Di Milano* 43, 1 (1973), 135–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02924844>
- [21] Robin Piedeleu and Fabio Zanasi. 2023. An Introduction to String Diagrams for Computer Scientists. CoRR abs/2305.08768 (2023).
- [22] R Tyrrell Rockafellar. 1997. *Convex Analysis*. Vol. 11. Princeton University Press.
- [23] Dario Stein. 2021. Structural foundations for probabilistic programming languages. *University of Oxford* (2021).
- [24] Dario Stein and Richard Samuelson. 2023. A Category for Unifying Gaussian Probability and Nondeterminism. In *10th Conference on Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science (CALCO 2023)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [25] Dario Stein and Richard Samuelson. 2023. Towards a Compositional Framework for Convex Analysis (with Applications to Probability Theory). arXiv:2312.02291 [math.CT]
- [26] Dario Stein and Sam Staton. 2021. Compositional semantics for probabilistic programs with exact conditioning. In *2021 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. IEEE, 1–13.
- [27] Jan C. Willems. 2013. Open Stochastic Systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 58, 2 (2013), 406–421. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2012.2210836>
- [28] Fabio Zanasi. 2015. *Interacting Hopf Algebras- the Theory of Linear Systems. (Interacting Hopf Algebras - la théorie des systèmes linéaires)*. Ph.D. Dissertation. École normale supérieure de Lyon, France.

A Notions of Linear Algebra

We call a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ *orthogonal* if $AA^T = A^T A = I$. If furthermore $\det(A) = 1$, then A is a rotation matrix. Orthogonal matrices are obtained from rotations and reflections. The classic matrix groups are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GL}(n) &= \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \text{ invertible} \} \\ \text{O}(n) &= \{A \in \text{GL}(n) \text{ orthogonal} \} \end{aligned}$$

We recall the following two well-known characterisations. Because the relational linear affine fragment presents **AffRel** (Proposition 3.1), we may use them freely while doing diagrammatic reasoning in **GQA**.

PROPOSITION A.1 (COLUMN EQUIVALENCE). *For two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, the following are equivalent*

- (1) $\text{im}(A) = \text{im}(B)$
- (2) *there exists an invertible matrix S with $AS = BS$.*

PROPOSITION A.2 (ORTHOGONAL COLUMN EQUIVALENCE). *For two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, the following are equivalent*

- (1) $AA^T = BB^T$
- (2) *there exists an orthogonal matrix R with $AR = BR$.*

Two subspaces $S, D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are called *complementary* if $S + D = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $S \cap D = 0$. Every vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ decomposes uniquely as $x = x_S + x_D$ with $x_S \in S, x_D \in D$. We obtain the corresponding projections P_S, P_D . A canonical choice of complementary subspace is the orthogonal complement $S = D^\perp$.

B Partial Quadratic Functions

We give the remaining proofs about partial quadratic functions from Section 2.2.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.3. (1) \Rightarrow (2) using an affine coordinate change, we can assume that the domain of f is the subspace $M = \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}$. The restricted function $\tilde{f}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = f(x_1, \dots, x_m, 0, \dots, 0)$ is a total nonnegative quadratic function so we can apply the characterisation Proposition 2.1 to \tilde{f} to obtain the desired form

$$f(x) = h(A((x_1, \dots, x_m) - a)) + \infty \cdot x_{m+1} + \dots + \infty \cdot x_n + c$$

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Under the affine coordinate change $y = A(x - a)$, it suffices to consider $f(y) = h(y) + c$ where h is an elementary quadratic function of the form $h(y_1, y_2, y_3) = \|y_1\|^2 + \{y_3 = 0\}$. In this case, we can define the affine relation

$$M = \{((y_1, y_2, y_3), (y_1, \sqrt{c})) \mid y_3 = 0\}$$

and have $f(x) = \inf \{ \|z\|^2 : (x, z) \in M \}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) If $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is an affine relation, then there exists a vector subspace $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and an affine map $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow D^\perp$ such that

$$M_x = \begin{cases} g(x) + D, & x \in \pi_X M \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $M_X = \{y : (x, y) \in M\}$. Thus we have

$$\inf \{ \|y\|^2 : y \in M_x \} = \|g(x)\|^2 + \{x \in \pi_X M\}$$

which is evidently a nonnegative partial quadratic function. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.4. Let $g : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ be a nonnegative partial quadratic function and $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ an affine relation. Using the representation of Proposition 2.3 and an affine coordinate change, it suffices to consider the case where g is an elementary function, i.e. a constrained minimization problem of the form

$$f(x) = \inf \{ \|y_1\|^2 + \{y_3 = 0\} : (x, (y_1, y_2, y_3)) \in M \}$$

We define the affine relation $M' = \{(x, y_1) : (x, (y_1, y_2, 0)) \in M\}$ and conclude that $f(x) = \inf \{ \|y\|^2 : (x, y) \in M' \}$ which is a partial quadratic function by Proposition 2.3. \square

C Derived laws of GQA

Here we record various derivations that are used throughout the paper. Let us write GLA_{AN} for the linear affine non-deterministic fragment of GQA, i.e. GLA_{ANQ} without \leftarrow . For Appendix D will be useful to show that certain properties already hold in this sub-theory of GQA.

PROPOSITION C.1. \leftarrow is flip invariant, i.e.

$$\leftarrow \boxed{-1} = \leftarrow$$

PROOF. By discardability and rotation invariance for $\varphi = \pi$,

$$\leftarrow = \leftarrow \bullet = \leftarrow \boxed{-1} = \leftarrow \boxed{-1} \bullet = \leftarrow \boxed{-1}$$

\square

The initialisation principle states that if $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and we condition X to be equal to a constant c , the posterior distribution is precisely c up to a scalar.

PROPOSITION C.2 (INITIALISATION PRINCIPLE). The following schema is derivable for all $c \in [0, \infty)$.

$$\boxed{c} \bullet \leftarrow = \boxed{c} \bullet \bullet \leftarrow \boxed{c} \quad (\text{INI})$$

If (NORM) holds, this simplifies further to

$$\boxed{c} \bullet \leftarrow = \boxed{c} \leftarrow$$

PROOF. This is given by the derivation

$$\boxed{c} \bullet \leftarrow = \boxed{c} \bullet \leftarrow \bullet \leftarrow \boxed{c} = \boxed{c} \bullet \leftarrow \bullet \leftarrow \boxed{c}$$

where in the first step we use the black Frobenius algebra structure, and in the second step we use axioms (1-dup) and (dup) to cancel $\leftarrow \bullet$. \square

PROPOSITION C.3 (INVARIANCE). \bullet is invariant under $\text{GL}(n)$, i.e. for all invertible matrices $S \in \text{GL}(n)$ we have in GLA_{AN}

$$\bullet \boxed{S} = \bullet \quad (\text{GLI})$$

PROOF. The Gaussian elimination algorithm, which we may mimic by equational reasoning in GLA_{AN} , demonstrates that every invertible matrix can be built up from three kinds of elementary transformations

- (1) scaling $x \mapsto \alpha x$, with $\alpha \neq 0$

- (2) swapping $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$
- (3) the shear mapping $(x, y) \mapsto (x, kx + y)$

The generator $\bullet \dashv$ is invariant under swapping by the laws of symmetric monoidal categories (Appendix H), and under scaling by (SI). It remains to show that it is invariant under the shear mapping:

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \\ \bullet \dashv \end{array} \stackrel{\text{TI}}{=} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \\ \bullet \dashv \end{array} \stackrel{\text{SI}}{=} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \\ \bullet \dashv \end{array}$$

□

PROPOSITION C.4. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_1}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_2}$ be two matrices satisfying $\text{im}(A) = \text{im}(B)$. Then we can derive in GLA_{AN}

$$\bullet \dashv \underline{A} = \bullet \dashv \underline{B}$$

PROOF. Like in the proof of Proposition 4.2, this follows by combining column equivalence (Proposition A.1) and the fact that $\bullet \dashv$ is invariant under invertible matrices (Proposition C.3). □

PROPOSITION C.5. If S, D are complementary subspaces, then we can prove in GLA_{AN} that

$$\begin{array}{c} \underline{D} \\ \bullet \dashv \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \underline{D} \\ \bullet \dashv \\ \underline{P_S} \end{array}$$

where P_S, P_D are the projection operators onto the subspaces.

PROOF. Using the fact that $P_S + P_D = I$, we can derive in GLA_{AN} .

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_S} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_S} \end{array} \\ \stackrel{(*)}{=} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_S} \end{array} \stackrel{\text{TI}}{=} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_S} \end{array} \\ = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \dashv \underline{P_D} \\ \bullet \dashv \underline{P_S} \end{array}$$

In the step (*) we use the fact that matrices are linear (commute with \dashv), which is provable inside GLA_{AN} . □


D Completeness for total affine relations

It is instructive and useful for later use to note that the linear affine non-deterministic fragment, written GLA_{AN} , yields a characterisation for total affine relations. To phrase this, write TAffRel for the sub-prop of AffRel consisting of *total* affine relations $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$, i.e. those satisfying $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^m \exists y \in \mathbb{R}^n, (x, y) \in R$.

PROPOSITION D.1. The prop TAffRel is presented by GLA_{AN} .

PROOF. It is easy to check that all the string diagrams obtained by generators in this fragment yield total affine relations. Also, the axioms of GLA_{AN} are sound because they are a subset of the axioms of Graphical Affine Algebra, which is sound for affine relations [6]. For definability, we

note that every total affine relation $R \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ can be written as the sum of an affine-linear function $f(x) = Ax + b$ and a subspace $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e. it is definable by the string diagram



where the subspace D has been encoded according to Proposition C.4. Using Proposition C.5, we may project the matrix A and the vector b to lie in the orthogonal complement D^\perp . This form is a normal form, i.e. the values of A, b, D can be recovered uniquely from their denotation in **TAffRel**. This suffices to show completeness: given string diagrams $c, d: m \rightarrow n$ of this fragments such that $\llbracket c \rrbracket = \llbracket d \rrbracket$, they may be put in the same normal form by equational reasoning in the fragment, i.e. $c = d$. \square

E Soundness Proofs

PROPOSITION E.1. *The interpretation of GLA_{AQ} in **Gauss** is sound.*

PROOF. The equations in the fragment corresponding to GAA are evident because **AffVect** embeds in **Gauss**. It remains to show the validity of (RI) and (D). Let $R \in O(2)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \leftarrow \boxed{R} \rightarrow \rangle &= \mathcal{N}(0, RR^T) = \mathcal{N}(0, I) = \langle \leftarrow \rightarrow \rangle \\ \langle \leftarrow \bullet \rangle &= \mathcal{N}(0, 1); ! = \langle \boxed{} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

\square

PROPOSITION E.2. *The interpretation of GLA_{ANQ} in **GaussEx** is sound.*

PROOF. Both **Gauss** and **TAffRel** (introduced in Appendix D) embed in **GaussEx**, and any axiom of GLA_{ANQ} is also an axiom of the theories presenting **Gauss** and **TAffRel** according to Propositions D.1 and E.1. So there are no additional axioms to check. \square

PROPOSITION E.3. *The interpretation of **GQA** in **QuadRel** is sound.*


PROOF. **AffRel** embeds in **QuadRel** via indicator functions of affine relations. Thus all the axioms of Graphical Affine Algebra (the linear affine relational fragment of **GQA**) are verified. It remains to verify the three axioms involving the quadratic generator, namely (RI), (D) and (Z).

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \leftarrow \boxed{R} \rightarrow \rrbracket (y) &= \inf_x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 + \{y = Rx\} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|R^{-1}y\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|y\|^2 \\ &= \llbracket \leftarrow \rightarrow \rrbracket (y) \\ \llbracket \leftarrow \bullet \rrbracket &= \inf_x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} x^2 + 0 \right\} = 0 = \llbracket \boxed{} \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \leftarrow \circ \rrbracket &= \inf_x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} x^2 + \{x = 0\} \right\} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0^2 = \llbracket \boxed{} \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

\square


F Normalisation Procedures and Completeness

PROPOSITION F.1. Let $M : m \rightarrow n$ be any string diagram in GLA_{AQ} . Then M can be brought into the form




with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ positive semidefinite.

PROOF. We collect all uses of the generators \leftarrow , \vdash on the left; the remaining term lies in the linear fragment of GLA_{AQ} and thus corresponds to a linear combination (sum), as follows:




□

PROPOSITION F.2. Let $M : m \rightarrow n$ be any string diagram in GLA_{ANQ} . Then M can be brought into the form



where $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector subspace, and $\mu \in D^\perp$, $\text{im}(\Sigma) \subseteq D^\perp$, $\text{im}(A) \subseteq D^\perp$.

PROOF. Collecting all occurrences of the generators \bullet , \leftarrow , \vdash on the left, we can arrange M as a linear combination




Using Proposition C.4, we normalise the non-deterministic part $D = \text{im}(S)$. We then use Proposition C.5 to project the other summands to D^\perp , and subsequently normalize the Gaussian part as in Proposition F.1. □

F.1 Scalars

In this section we study properties of scalars, using the following shorthand notation:




PROPOSITION F.3. For $a, b, c \in [0, \infty)$, we have



whenever $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$.


PROOF. The first equation follows from flip invariance of \leftarrow (Proposition C.1). For the second equation, we can find a rotation matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ which sends the vector (a, b) to $(c, 0)$. Then by

(RI) and (Z)



□

PROPOSITION F.4. *The equation*




is derivable in GQA if and only if $a^2 = b^2$.

PROOF. If $a^2 = b^2$, then $a = \pm b$, and the equation can be derived from flip invariance of \leftarrow (Proposition C.1). In QuadRel, their denotations are given by $\frac{1}{2}a^2, \frac{1}{2}b^2$ respectively. □

F.2 Elimination Procedure for Conditioning


Let $M : 0 \rightarrow n$ be a state in GQA. We give an inductive procedure to remove occurrences of the conditioning effect $\rightarrow\circ$, except possibly in the scalar ∞ .

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.6. We proceed by induction over the number K of generators $\rightarrow\circ$ appearing in M . First, using equational reasoning in GQA we may arrange all occurrences of the generators $\bullet\leftarrow, \leftarrow\leftarrow, \leftarrow\mid$ to the left and $\rightarrow\circ$ on the right, as in the first equality below. The remaining diagram is necessarily in the linear fragment and represents some matrix A as in the second diagram. We can then separate A into blocks, obtaining a diagram for its first row A_1 , and one for the remaining rows A' as on the rhs of the second equality below. Finally, we can break down A_1 further into row vectors α, β , and γ , for each of the columns corresponding to the three incoming wires, as on the rhs of the third equality below:




where N' is the diagram in the dotted box above, which contains $K - 1$ occurrences of $\rightarrow\circ$.

We now distinguish two cases. If in α there is a coefficient $\alpha_i \neq 0$, we eliminate $\rightarrow\circ$ using the rewrite step



Note that this step at the same time eliminates one occurrence of the generator $\bullet\leftarrow$. In the remaining case, all α_i s are equal to 0, then by equational reasoning in GQA we can discard α and the wire going into it. We can simplify the string diagram further, first by repeatedly applying axiom (1-dup)

to \vdash , then by including the remaining occurrences of \bullet in N' , which yields N . This brings to a string diagram in the shape



with $c \in \mathbb{R}$. We can now find an orthogonal matrix $R \in O(n)$ with $\beta R = (b, \dots, 0)$ where $b = \|\beta\|$:

where we have used the fact that matrices distribute over \vdash (i.e., can be copied). Now, since $\beta R = (b, 0, \dots, 0)$ there are two further cases to consider.

- If $b > 0$, we can simplify the rightmost diagram of (17) further, with the matrix $\beta R = (b, 0, \dots, 0)$ reducing to the string diagram in the dotted box in the first step below (cf. (6)). Then, using (INI) as defined in Proposition C.2, we get:

where the last dotted frame identifies the diagram M' that we wanted to prove the statement of the theorem.

- If $b = 0$, the rightmost string diagram of (17) instead simplifies as

where the scalar is either 0 or ∞ depending on whether $c = 0$.

Then the scalars are normalised separately according to the procedure of Appendix F.1. □

We now give further lemmas needed for the proof of completeness of GQA.

First, recall that a *generalized inverse* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is a matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ such that $AGA = A$; that is, for all $y \in \text{im}(A)$ we have that Gy is a preimage of y . Every matrix has a generalized inverse, but it is generally not unique as there are two degrees of freedom: What shall

G do outside of the image $\text{im}(A)$, and which preimage of y should it pick? The *Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse* A^+ is a particularly well-known generalized inverse which answers both questions by projecting orthogonally.

The Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse gives an explicit solution to least-squares problem:

$$\inf \{ \|x\|^2 : Ax = y \}$$

is attained at $x = A^+y$ when $y \in \text{im}(A)$.

PROPOSITION F.5. *Let $f : m \rightarrow n$ be a quadratic relation and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then*

$$\left[\left[\begin{array}{c} \underline{c} \\ \hline f \end{array} \right] \right] (x, y) = f(x, y - c)$$

PROOF. We compute

$$\inf_{y_1, y_2} \{ f(x, y_1) + \{ y_2 = c \} + \{ y = y_1 + y_2 \} \} = f(x, y - c)$$

□

PROPOSITION F.6. *Let S, D be complementary subspaces, and let $f : 0 \rightarrow n$ be such that $f(x) = \infty$ when $x \notin S$. Then*

$$\left[\left[\begin{array}{c} \underline{D} \\ \hline f \end{array} \right] \right] (x) = f(x_S)$$

PROOF. When taking the infimum

$$\inf_{x_1, x_2} \{ f(x_1) + \{ x_2 \in D \} + \{ x_1 + x_2 = x \} \}$$

the conditions $x_1 \in S, x_2 \in D$ force $x_1 = x_S, x_2 = x_D$ by uniqueness of the decomposition. □

PROPOSITION F.7. *In **QuadRel**, we have the following interpretations for each constant $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and affine subspace $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$*

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\underline{c} \right] (x) &= \{ x = c \} \\ \left[\underline{A} \right] (x, y) &= \{ y = Ax \} \\ \left[\underline{W} \right] (x) &= \{ x \in W \} \end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION F.8. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, then*

$$\left[\left[\left[\underline{A} \right] \right] \right] (y) = \frac{1}{2} \|A^+y\|^2 + \{ y \in \text{im}(A) \}$$

where A^+ is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of A . This expression is furthermore equal to

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle y, \Omega y \rangle + \{ y \in \text{im}(A) \}$$

where Ω is any generalized inverse of AA^T .

PROOF. The denotation corresponds to the least-squares problem

$$\inf_x \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 + \{ y = Ax \} \right\} = \inf \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 : y = Ax \right\}$$

which is solved using the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. We have

$$\langle A^+y, A^+y \rangle = \langle y, (A^+)^T A^+y \rangle = \langle y, \Omega y \rangle$$

□

PROPOSITION F.9. In **QuadRel**, we have

$$\left\| \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma) \right\| (x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle (x - \mu), \Omega(x - \mu) \rangle + \{ (x - \mu) \in \text{im}(\Sigma) \}$$

where Ω is any generalized inverse of Σ .

PROPOSITION F.10. Consider two states in **GQA** with subspaces $D_1, D_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mu_1 \in D_1^\perp, \mu_2 \in D_2^\perp$, $\text{im}(\Sigma_1) \subseteq D_1^\perp, \text{im}(\Sigma_2) \subseteq D_2^\perp$ such that


$$\left\| \begin{array}{c} D_1 \\ \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1) \end{array} \right\| = \left\| \begin{array}{c} D_2 \\ \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \Sigma_2) \end{array} \right\| \tag{18}$$

Then $D_1 = D_2, \mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2$.


PROOF. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be the quadratic relation denoted by (18). Then we can read off the space $D_1 = D_2$ as the largest subspace along which f is constant (Proposition F.6). Restricting f along the complement D^\perp , we obtain the denotation of the Gaussian distribution in Proposition F.9, from which μ and Σ can be determined. \square

G Functorial Semantics of Noisy Electrical Circuits

We give formally the interpretation of noisy electrical circuits as string diagrams of our calculus. First, the prop ECirc_N of noisy electrical circuits is defined as the one freely generated by a signature and equations as follows. The signature features generators



where the parameter k ranges over the non-negative reals. Note voltage and current sources are duplicated because the second set, with indented red boundaries, represent their ‘noisy’ counterpart (in a way made precise by the semantics given below). Morphisms $m \rightarrow n$ of ECirc_N represent open noisy linear electrical circuits with m open terminals on the left and n open terminals on the right. The following are the equations of ECirc_N :



The equations, apart from the last, are those of special Frobenius monoids. The final equation reflects the fact that resistors are bidirectional.

The semantics of an open circuit of type $m \rightarrow n$, displayed in Figure 3, is a partial quadratic function $\mathbb{R}^{2m+2n} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, with the behaviour of the individual elements given by Kirchoff’s laws. We use $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ to range over voltages and $i \in \mathbb{R}$ to range over currents.

The semantics given in Figure 3 is a conservative extension of the one given for electrical circuits (without noise) in [6]. For the new semantics to be defined, we need to move from the prop of affine

H Laws of Symmetric Monoidal Categories




Fig. 4. Laws of Symmetric Monoidal Categories

I Typing Judgements for PPL

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{\Gamma, x : \tau, \Gamma' \vdash x : \tau} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash () : I} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash (s, t) : \sigma * \tau} \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : R \quad \Gamma \vdash t : R}{\Gamma \vdash s + t : R} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : R}{\Gamma \vdash \alpha \cdot t : R} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \beta : R} \\
 \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{normal}() : R} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : R \quad \Gamma \vdash t : R}{\Gamma \vdash (s ::= t) : I} \\
 \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : \sigma \quad \Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash t : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = s \text{ in } t : \tau} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau_1 * \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_i e : \tau_i}
 \end{array}$$