





# Correspondence between Composite Theories and Distributive Laws

Aloïs Rosset<sup>1</sup> , Maaïke Zwart<sup>2</sup> ,  
Helle Hvid Hansen<sup>3</sup> , and Jörg Endrullis<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands  
`{a.rosset, j.endrullis}@vu.nl`

<sup>2</sup> IT University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark  
`maaike.annebeth@gmail.com`

<sup>3</sup> University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands  
`h.h.hansen@rug.nl`

**Abstract.** Composite theories are the algebraic equivalent of distributive laws. In this paper, we delve into the details of this correspondence and concretely show how to construct a composite theory from a distributive law and vice versa. Using term rewriting methods, we also describe when a minimal set of equations axiomatises the composite theory.

**Keywords:** monad · distributive law · algebraic theory · composite theory · term rewriting

## 1 Introduction

Monads are categorical structures [4, 23] with many applications in (co)algebraic approaches to program semantics, notably to model effects such as nondeterminism, probabilities and exceptions [27, 30, 6, 21]. Monads that occur in the specification of programs and are used in reasoning about programs are often finitary and Set-based, and hence can be presented as algebraic theories [7, 24, 1].

The algebraic view on monads has been especially useful when studying monad compositions [8, 17, 28, 29, 38]. Composing monads is a way to combine multiple computational effects, and is usually done categorically via a distributive law [5, 25]. However, the required distributive laws do not always exist, and the use of algebraic theories was instrumental in proving so-called no-go theorems, which tell us when two finitary monads cannot be composed via a distributive law [38].

Central to these results is the correspondence between composites of algebraic theories, and distributive laws between the corresponding monads. Briefly stated, a composite of two algebraic theories  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  is a theory  $\mathbb{U}$  that contains all the function symbols and equations of  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  as well as a set of distribution axioms that specify how equality of mixed terms can be reduced to equality in  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ . Composite theories were originally studied by Cheng [8] on the abstract level of Lawvere theories. Piróg & Staton [29] formulated them in the more concrete setting of algebraic theories.

While Piróg & Staton state the correspondence between composite theories and distributive laws, they do not provide a proof, referring instead to Cheng. In her thesis, Zwart [37] gives a constructive version of this correspondence for the category  $\mathbf{Set}$ , but she does not prove directly that the algebraic theory she constructs from a distributive law is indeed a composite theory.

Furthermore, the theory Zwart constructs is given via a set  $E_\lambda$  that contains all possible equations with interaction between the theories  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ . While this axiomatisation does the job, it is neither elegant nor practical to work with. Composite theories can often be described in terms of a few simple distribution axioms. A classic example is the theory of rings, which is a composite of the theories of monoids and Abelian groups via the two ‘times over plus’ distribution axioms. A systematic approach to identify such a minimal set of distribution axioms for a composite theory would be far more practical than the set  $E_\lambda$ .

In this paper, we present a full and self-contained proof of the correspondence between composite theories  $\mathbb{U}$  (of  $\mathbb{T}$  after  $\mathbb{S}$ ) and distributive laws  $\lambda: ST \rightarrow TS$ , where  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  are algebraic theories and  $S, T$  are their corresponding finitary  $\mathbf{Set}$ -monads. Section 4 shows how to get a distributive law from a composite theory, and Section 5 shows how to construct a composite theory from a distributive law. The proof of the latter uses term rewriting techniques. In particular, we introduce *functorial rewriting systems* in order to reason about strings of functors, and to obtain a separation of  $\mathbb{U}$ -terms.

In addition, in Section 6 we give criteria that ensure that a certain minimal set of distribution axioms  $E' \subseteq E_\lambda$  suffices to axiomatise  $\mathbb{U}$ . The natural candidate for  $E'$  consists of equations in which the left-hand side is made of exactly one  $\mathbb{S}$ -operation symbol, which is applied to arguments built from up to one  $\mathbb{T}$ -operation symbol. We prove that if a term rewriting system corresponding to  $E'$  is terminating, then  $E_\mathbb{S} \cup E_\mathbb{T} \cup E'$  axiomatises  $\mathbb{U}$ . To illustrate that this criterion is not trivially satisfied, we give an example in which  $E'$  does not terminate and indeed does not axiomatise  $\mathbb{U}$ . Finally, we show that we have termination if the right-hand sides of the equations in  $E'$  are of a certain form, and apply our results to establish presentations of some composite monads/theories.

## 2 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with basic notions of category theory [3, 23, 31]. This section recalls basic definitions and results concerning monads, algebraic theories, and term rewriting systems, and fixes notation for the concepts we use in this paper.

### 2.1 Monads

**Definition 1.** A monad  $(M, \eta, \mu)$  on a category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a triple consisting of an endofunctor  $M: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , and two natural transformations, the **unit**  $\eta: \text{id} \Rightarrow M$  and the **multiplication**  $\mu: M^2 \Rightarrow M$  that make (1) and (2) commute. For convenience, we often refer to a monad  $(M, \eta, \mu)$  by its functor part  $M$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M & \xrightarrow{M\eta} & M^2 & \xleftarrow{\eta^M} & M \\
 & \searrow & \downarrow \mu & \swarrow & \\
 & & M & & 
 \end{array} \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M^3 & \xrightarrow{\mu^M} & M^2 \\
 M\mu \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\
 M^2 & \xrightarrow{\mu} & M
 \end{array} \quad (2)$$

*Example 2.* Here are some examples of **Set**-monads, where we always mean the finitary versions. For more details on these monads, see e.g. [16, §1.2.1].

- The *list* and *non-empty list* monads  $L$  and  $L^+$ , with  $\eta_X^L(x) = \eta^{L^+}(x) = [x]$ , and  $\mu^L = \mu^{L^+}$  being concatenation.
- The *multiset* monad  $\mathcal{M}$ , with  $\eta^{\mathcal{M}}(x) = \{x\}$  and  $\mu^{\mathcal{M}}$  taking the union, adding multiplicities. Taking multiplicities in  $\mathbb{Z}$  gives the *Abelian group* monad  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- The *distribution* monad  $\mathcal{D}$ , with  $\eta^{\mathcal{D}}(x) = 1x$  and a weighted average of  $\mu^{\mathcal{D}}$ .
- The *reader* monad  $R_A(X) = X^A$ , where  $A$  is a finite set, with  $\eta^R$  the constant function and  $\mu^R$  reading the same element twice.

**Definition 3.** Given two monads  $(M, \eta^M, \mu^M)$  and  $(T, \eta^T, \mu^T)$  on a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , a **monad morphism** from  $M$  to  $T$  is a natural transformation  $\theta : M \Rightarrow T$  that makes (3) and (4) commute, where  $\theta\theta := \theta_T \cdot M\theta = T\theta \cdot \theta_M$ . If each component of  $\theta$  is an isomorphism, we say that the two monads are **isomorphic**.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \eta^M & M \\
 \text{id} & \nearrow & \downarrow \theta \\
 & \eta^T & T
 \end{array} \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M^2 & \xrightarrow{\theta\theta} & T^2 \\
 \mu^M \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu^T \\
 M & \xrightarrow{\theta} & T
 \end{array} \quad (4)$$

**Definition 4.** Let  $(M, \eta, \mu)$  be a monad on category  $\mathbf{C}$ . An (Eilenberg-Moore)  $M$ -**algebra** is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -morphism  $\alpha : MX \rightarrow X$  for some  $X \in \mathbf{C}$ , denoted  $(X, \alpha)$  for short, such that (5) and (6) commute. An  $M$ -algebra **homomorphism**  $f : (X, \alpha) \rightarrow (Y, \beta)$  between two  $M$ -algebras is a function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that (7) commutes. The category of  $M$ -algebras and  $M$ -algebra homomorphisms is denoted  $\mathbf{EM}(M)$  and called the **Eilenberg-Moore category** of  $M$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & MX \\
 & \searrow & \downarrow \alpha \\
 & & X
 \end{array} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M^2X & \xrightarrow{\mu_X} & MX \\
 M\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\
 MX & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X
 \end{array} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 MX & \xrightarrow{Mf} & MY \\
 \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\
 X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y
 \end{array} \quad (7)$$

**Definition 5.** Let  $S, T$  be monads. A **distributive law**  $\lambda : ST \Rightarrow TS$  between monads is a natural transformation satisfying (8)-(11). A **weak distributive law**  $\lambda : ST \Rightarrow TS$  is a natural transformation satisfying (9)-(11).

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & T & \\
 \eta^{ST} \swarrow & & \searrow T\eta^S \\
 ST & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & TS
 \end{array} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & S & \\
 S\eta^T \swarrow & & \searrow \eta^{TS} \\
 ST & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & TS
 \end{array} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 SST & \xrightarrow{S\lambda} & STS & \xrightarrow{\lambda S} & TSS \\
 \downarrow \mu^{ST} & & & & \downarrow T\mu^S \\
 ST & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & TS & & 
 \end{array} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 STT & \xrightarrow{\lambda T} & TST & \xrightarrow{T\lambda} & TTS \\
 \downarrow S\mu^T & & & & \downarrow \mu^T S \\
 ST & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & TS & & 
 \end{array} \quad (11)$$

A distributive law  $\lambda : ST \rightarrow TS$  induces a monad structure on the functor  $TS$  as follows [5, §1]:

$$\left( TS, \eta^{TS} := (\text{id} \xrightarrow{\eta^T \eta^S} TS), \mu^{TS} := (TSTS \xrightarrow{T\lambda S} TTSS \xrightarrow{\mu^T \mu^S} TS) \right) \quad (12)$$

The algebras for this composite monad are algebras that are simultaneously  $S$ -algebras and  $T$ -algebras. This is visible through the isomorphism  $\mathbf{EM}(TS) \cong \mathbf{Alg}(\lambda)$  [5, §2], where the category  $\mathbf{Alg}(\lambda)$  of  $\lambda$ -algebras is defined as follows:

**Definition 6.** *Given monads  $S, T$  and distributive law  $\lambda : ST \rightarrow TS$ , then the objects of the category  $\mathbf{Alg}(\lambda)$  are triples  $(X, \sigma, \tau)$ , such that  $(X, \sigma)$  is an  $S$ -algebra and  $(X, \tau)$  is a  $T$ -algebra, and the diagram on the right commutes. The morphisms of  $\mathbf{Alg}(\lambda)$  are  $\mathbf{C}$ -morphisms that are both  $S$ - and  $T$ -algebra homomorphisms.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} STX & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & TSX \\ S\tau \downarrow & & \downarrow T\sigma \\ SX & & TX \\ & \searrow \sigma & \swarrow \tau \\ & X & \end{array}$$

## 2.2 Algebraic Theories

**Definition 7.** *An algebraic theory is a pair  $(\Sigma, E)$  consisting of an algebraic signature  $\Sigma$  and set of equations  $E$  over  $\Sigma$  defined as follows.*

- An **algebraic signature**  $\Sigma$  is a set of operation symbols. Each  $\text{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma$  has an arity  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- The set  $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma, X)$ , also denoted  $\Sigma^*X$ , of  $\Sigma$ -**terms** over a set  $X$  is defined inductively: elements in  $X$  are terms, and given terms  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  and  $\text{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma$ , then  $\text{op}(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is a term.
- An **equation** over a signature  $\Sigma$  is a pair  $(s, t)$  of  $\Sigma$ -terms.

For the rest of this paper, we fix a set  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots\}$  of variables. The subset of  $\mathcal{V}$  appearing in a term  $t$  is denoted as  $\text{var}(t)$ .

**Definition 8.** *The category  $\mathbf{Alg}(\Sigma, E)$  consists of  $(\Sigma, E)$ -algebras and homomorphisms between them.*

- A  $\Sigma$ -**algebra** is a pair  $(X, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket)$  consisting of a set  $X$  and a collection of interpretations: for each  $\text{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma$ , we have  $\llbracket \text{op} \rrbracket : X^n \rightarrow X$ . Any function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  extends to a unique homomorphism,  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_f : \mathcal{T}(\Sigma, X) \rightarrow Y$ , as given by equations (13) and (14) below. When  $f = \text{id}_X$ , we omit the subscript. Functions of the form  $v : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow Y$  are called **variable assignments**.

$$\llbracket x \rrbracket_f := f(x), \text{ and} \quad (13)$$

$$\llbracket \text{op}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \rrbracket_f := \llbracket \text{op} \rrbracket(\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket_f, \dots, \llbracket t_n \rrbracket_f). \quad (14)$$

- A  $(\Sigma, E)$ -**algebra**  $(X, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket)$  is a  $\Sigma$ -algebra whose  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  satisfies all equations in  $E$ , i.e., for each  $(s, t) \in E$  and all variable assignments  $v$ ,  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_v = \llbracket t \rrbracket_v$ .
- A  $(\Sigma, E)$ -algebra **homomorphism**  $f : (X, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket) \rightarrow (X', \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket')$  is a function  $f : X \rightarrow X'$  such that  $f \llbracket \text{op} \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{op} \rrbracket' f^n$ , for all  $\text{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma$ .

Given an algebraic theory  $\mathbb{T} = (\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, E_{\mathbb{T}})$  and  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ -terms  $s$  and  $t$ , we write  $s =_{\mathbb{T}} t$  to denote that the equality  $s = t$  is derivable from the axioms  $E_{\mathbb{T}}$  in equational logic. The inference rules of equational logic are in Table 1 (appendix).

**Definition 9.** We have a free-forgetful adjunction  $F: \mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{\overline{\quad}} \mathbf{Alg}(\Sigma, E) : U$  described as follows:

- The **free  $\mathbb{T}$ -algebra** on a set  $X$  is the  $(\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, E_{\mathbb{T}})$ -algebra  $(\mathcal{T}(\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, X) / \equiv_{\mathbb{T}}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^X)$  with carrier  $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, X)$  modulo  $\equiv_{\mathbb{T}}$ . The equivalence class of a term  $t$  is denoted  $\overline{t}$ . The interpretation of  $\mathbf{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma$  is  $\llbracket \mathbf{op} \rrbracket^X(\overline{t_1}, \dots, \overline{t_n}) := \overline{\mathbf{op}(t_1, \dots, t_n)}$ .
- The **free functor**  $F: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Alg}(\Sigma, E)$  sends  $X$  to its free  $(\Sigma, E)$ -algebra.

Composing the adjoint functors gives a monad  $(T := UF, \eta, \mu)$ , called the **free algebra monad** [23, VI.1]. The unit is  $\eta: x \mapsto \overline{x}$  and the multiplication is  $\mu: t[\overline{v_i}/v_i] \mapsto \overline{t[v_i/v_i]}$ . The free algebra monad is defined on functions  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  as follows, for  $x \in X$  and  $\mathbf{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Tf(\overline{x}) &= \overline{f(x)} \\ Tf(\overline{\mathbf{op}(t_1, \dots, t_n)}) &= \mu(\overline{\mathbf{op}(Tf(\overline{t_1}), \dots, Tf(\overline{t_n}))}) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

**Notation 10.** The following standard (shorthand) notation will be used throughout the paper. Given terms  $t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $s_1, \dots, s_n$ , we denote by  $t[s_1, \dots, s_n]$  or by  $t[s_i]$  the term  $t[h]$  where  $h(x_i) = s_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . In particular, we will write  $t[s_x]$  instead of  $t[s_x/x]$ , where  $x$  ranges over all variables in  $t$ . Moreover, given a family of terms  $(t_x[s_x, y/y])_{x \in X}$ , we will simply write each term  $t_x[s_y]$ . Indeed, we can assume each  $t_x$  has distinct variables by choosing the (say  $m$ ) variables of  $t_{x_1}$  to be  $y_1, \dots, y_m$ , the variables of  $t_{x_2}$  to start at  $y_{m+1}$ , and so on.

**Definition 11** ([32, Def. 5, Lem. 8]). An algebraic theory  $(\Sigma, E)$  is an **algebraic presentation** of a Set-monad  $(M, \eta^M, \mu^M)$  if we have an isomorphism of monads  $(T, \eta^T, \mu^T) \cong (M, \eta^M, \mu^M)$ , where  $T$  is the free algebra monad of  $(\Sigma, E)$ . An equivalent formulation is that both categories of algebras are concretely isomorphic<sup>4</sup>:  $\mathbf{EM}(M) \cong_{\text{conc}} \mathbf{Alg}(\Sigma, E)$ . The former isomorphism relates the monads on a syntactic level, whereas the latter relates them semantically.

Note that a monad can have multiple presentations.

*Example 12.* Here are algebraic presentations of the monads from Example 2.

- The *list* monad  $L$  is presented by the theory of *monoids*.
- The *non-empty list* monad  $L^+$  is presented by the theory of *semigroups*.
- The *multiset* monad  $\mathcal{M}$  is presented by the theory of *commutative monoids*.
- The *Abelian group* monad  $\mathcal{A}$  is presented by the theory of *Abelian groups*.
- The *distribution* monad  $\mathcal{D}$  is presented by the theory of *convex algebras* [19].
- The *reader* monad  $R_A$  is presented by the theory of *local states* [30] consisting of a single  $|A|$ -ary operation symbol, satisfying idempotence (e.g.  $a * a = a$ ) and diagonal equations (e.g.  $(a * b) * (c * d) = (a * d)$ ).

<sup>4</sup> “concrete” means that both functors of this isomorphism commute with the forgetful functors  $\mathbf{EM}(M) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  and  $\mathbf{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ . In other words it sends an  $M$ -algebra  $(X, x: MX \rightarrow X)$  to a  $(\Sigma, E)$ -algebra with same carrier  $(X, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket)$  and vice-versa.

### 2.3 Term Rewriting Systems

We only briefly explain the basic concepts and results of term rewriting systems (TRS) that we need in our proofs. For more background, we recommend the book “Term Rewriting Systems” by Terese [34].


**Definition 13.** Given a signature  $\Sigma$ , a **rewrite rule**  $(l \rightarrow r)$  is a pair of  $\Sigma$ -terms  $(l, r)$  such that  $l$  is not a variable, and all variables in the right occur also in the left:  $\text{var}(l) \supseteq \text{var}(r)$ . A **term rewriting system**  $\mathcal{R} = (\Sigma, R)$  consists of a signature  $\Sigma$  and a set of rewrite rules  $R$ . The rewrite relation  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$  is the smallest relation on  $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma, X)$  that contains  $R$  and is closed under substitution and under context<sup>5</sup>. We simply write  $\rightarrow$  when  $\mathcal{R}$  is clear from the context. The transitive and reflexive closure of  $\rightarrow$  is written as  $\twoheadrightarrow$ . When all operation symbols in  $\Sigma$  have arity 1, then  $\mathcal{R} = (\Sigma, R)$  is called a **string rewriting system**.

*Example 14.* Let  $\Sigma := \{0^{(0)}, s^{(1)}, +^{(2)}\}$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \{x + 0 \rightarrow x, x + s(y) \rightarrow s(x + y)\}$ . A rewrite sequence is for instance

$$s(s(0)) + s(0) \rightarrow s(s(s(0)) + 0) \rightarrow s(s(s(0))).$$

**Definition 15.** Let  $\mathcal{R} := (\Sigma, R)$  be a TRS.

- $\mathcal{R}$  is **terminating (SN)** if every rewriting sequence is finite  $t_0 \rightarrow t_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow t_n \not\rightarrow$ .
- $\mathcal{R}$  is **locally confluent (WCR)** if for all terms  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  with  $t_2 \leftarrow t_1 \rightarrow t_3$ , there exists a term  $t_4$  with  $t_2 \twoheadrightarrow t_4 \leftarrow t_3$ .
- $\mathcal{R}$  is **confluent (CR)** if for all terms  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  with  $t_2 \leftarrow t_1 \twoheadrightarrow t_3$ , there exists a term  $t_4$  with  $t_2 \twoheadrightarrow t_4 \leftarrow t_3$ .



A well-known result says that in the presence of termination, local confluence is enough to entail confluence.

**Lemma 16 (Newman’s Lemma).** If a TRS is terminating (SN) and locally confluent (WCR), then it is also confluent (CR).

Two common techniques to prove termination are the *polynomial interpretation* over  $\mathbb{N}$  [34, §6.2.2] and the *multiset path order* [33] methods. The idea of polynomial interpretation over  $\mathbb{N}$  is to choose a  $\Sigma$ -algebra  $(\mathbb{N}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket)$  where every interpretation  $\llbracket \text{op} \rrbracket$  is a monotone polynomial on  $\mathbb{N}$ . If each rule  $(l, r)$  of a system is strictly decreasing,  $\llbracket l \rrbracket > \llbracket r \rrbracket$ , then termination follows by well-foundedness of  $\mathbb{N}$ .

*Example 17.* The TRS in Example 14 is terminating. To see this, take as polynomial interpretation for example  $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket = 1$ ,  $\llbracket s(x) \rrbracket = x + 1$ , and  $\llbracket x + y \rrbracket = x + 2y + 1$ . These polynomials are monotone and every rule is strictly decreasing:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x + 0 \rrbracket &= x + 1 > x = \llbracket x \rrbracket, \\ \llbracket x + s(y) \rrbracket &= x + 2y + 3 > x + 2y + 2 = \llbracket s(x + y) \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>5</sup> For the definition of context, see [34, §2.1.1]

The multiset path order method uses a decreasing sequence of multisets to show termination. We explain this briefly in the appendix.

A common technique for proving local confluence is to prove convergence of *critical pairs* [34, §2.7]. Informally, a critical pair is formed when two rewrite rules can be applied to the same term while overlapping on a function symbol, creating two different outcomes. A critical pair *converges* if the two resulting terms can be rewritten to a common term.

**Lemma 18 (Critical pair lemma).** *A TRS is locally confluent (WCR) if and only if all its critical pairs converge.*

### 3 Composite Theories

We introduce the concept of *composite theories*. Our definition is slightly different from, but equivalent to, the original definition by Piróg & Staton [29, Def. 3] and equivalent formulations in Zwart’s thesis [37, Def. 3.2, Prop. 3.4].

**Definition 19.** *Let  $\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}$  be algebraic theories. Suppose  $\mathbb{U}$  contains  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ , meaning  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}, \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}} \subseteq \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}}$  and  $E_{\mathbb{S}}, E_{\mathbb{T}} \subseteq E_{\mathbb{U}}$ .*

- A  $\mathbb{U}$ -term is **separated** if it is of the form  $t[s_x/x]$ , where  $t$  is a  $\mathbb{T}$ -term and  $\{s_x \mid x \in \text{var}(t)\}$  is a family of  $\mathbb{S}$ -terms.
- Two separated terms  $t[s_x]$  and  $t'[s'_y]$  are **equal modulo**  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  if their *TSV*-equivalence classes are equal in *TSV*:  $\overline{t[s_x]}_{\mathbb{S}} = \overline{t'[s'_y]}_{\mathbb{T}}$ .
- $\mathbb{U}$  is a **composite theory** of  $\mathbb{T}$  after  $\mathbb{S}$  if every  $\mathbb{U}$ -term  $u$  is equal to a separated term  $u =_{\mathbb{U}} t[s_x/x]$ , that we call a **separation** of  $u$ , and for any two separated terms  $v, v'$ , if  $v =_{\mathbb{U}} v'$  then  $v$  and  $v'$  must be equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .

**Proposition 20.** *For any two separated terms  $t[s_x/x]$  and  $t'[s_y/y]$  in a composite theory, the following are equivalent:*

1.  $t[s_x/x]$  and  $t'[s'_y/y]$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  in the sense of Definition 19.
2.  $t[s_x/x]$  and  $t'[s'_y/y]$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  in the sense of [37, Def. 3.2]. ■<sup>6</sup>

*Example 21.* Two  $\mathbb{S}$ -terms  $s$  and  $s'$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  if and only if  $s =_{\mathbb{S}} s'$ , and similarly for  $\mathbb{T}$ -terms.

*Example 22.* The prime example of a composite theory is the theory of rings  $\mathbb{U} := \text{Ring}$ . It contains the theories  $\mathbb{S} := \text{Mon}$  of monoids and  $\mathbb{T} := \text{AbGrp}$  of Abelian groups. We recall their signatures to fix notation:  $\Sigma_{\text{Mon}} := \{\cdot^{(2)}, 1^{(0)}\}$  and  $\Sigma_{\text{AbGrp}} := \{0^{(0)}, +^{(2)}, -^{(1)}\}$ . We sometimes omit the “multiplication” symbol  $\cdot$  for simplicity. The signature of rings is given by  $\Sigma_{\text{Ring}} := \Sigma_{\text{Mon}} \uplus \Sigma_{\text{AbGrp}}$ , and the equations are given by the equations of monoids, Abelian groups, and two distributivity axioms:

$$E_{\text{Ring}} := E_{\text{Mon}} \cup E_{\text{AbGrp}} \cup \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x(y+z) = (xy) + (xz), \\ (y+z)x = (yx) + (zx) \end{array} \right\}.$$

<sup>6</sup> The symbol ■ denotes that the proof is in the Appendix.

A separated term  $t[s_x/x]$  in  $\text{Ring}$  is an Abelian group term  $t$ , with monoid terms  $\{s_x\}$  substituted for its variables. We give some examples of non-separated terms, of possible separations for them, and of equality modulo  $(\text{Mon}, \text{AbGrp})$  between the separations. The term  $x(y+z)$  is non-separated. Possible separations are e.g.  $xy+xz$  and  $(xy+xz)+0$ . Both are equal modulo  $(\text{Mon}, \text{AbGrp})$ , as their monoid parts are identical and their Abelian group parts  $t = (x_1 + x_2) + 0$  and  $t' = x_1 + x_2$  are equal in the theory of Abelian groups.

The term  $x \cdot 0$  is also non-separated. It is equal in  $\text{Ring}$  to the separated terms  $0$  and  $(1 \cdot x) + (-(x \cdot 1))$ . To see that these separations are equal modulo  $(\text{Mon}, \text{AbGrp})$ , notice that  $1 \cdot x =_{\text{Mon}} x \cdot 1$ , and that the terms  $0$  and  $x_1 + (-x_2)$  are equal in Abelian groups when  $x_1 = x_2$ . Hence:  $\overline{0}^{\text{AbGrp}} = \overline{(1 \cdot x)^{\text{Mon}} + (-(x \cdot 1)^{\text{Mon}})}^{\text{AbGrp}}$ .

We now show that distributive laws between monads correspond one-to-one to composite theories.

## 4 From Composite Theory to Distributive Law

We first show how to construct a distributive law from a given composite theory.

**Theorem 23.** [37, Theorem 3.8] *Let  $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}$  be algebraic theories with free algebra monads  $S, T$  respectively. Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be a composite theory of  $\mathbb{T}$  after  $\mathbb{S}$ , with free algebra monad  $U$ . Then the following defines a distributive law  $\lambda : ST \Rightarrow TS$  such that  $\mathbb{U}$  is an algebraic presentation of the resulting monad  $TS$ , where  $t'[s'_x]$  is a separation of  $s[t_x]$ :*

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{V}} : ST\mathcal{V} \rightarrow TS\mathcal{V} : \overline{s[t_x/x]}^{\mathbb{S}} \mapsto \overline{t'[s'_x/x]}^{\mathbb{T}}$$

*Proof.* Instead of directly checking the axioms for a distributive law, we prove an equivalent characterisation given by Beck [5, p.122]. That is, we claim that there exist a natural transformation  $\mu^{TS} : TSTS \Rightarrow TS$  such that:

- (i)  $(TS, \eta^{TS} := \eta^T \eta^S, \mu^{TS})$  is a monad.
- (ii) The natural transformations  $\eta^T S$  and  $T \eta^S$  are monad morphisms.
- (iii) The middle unitary law holds:  $\mu^{TS} \cdot T \eta^S \eta^T S = Id_{TS}$ .

It follows then that the monad  $(TS, \eta^T \eta^S, \mu^{TS})$  does indeed come from a distributive law, which is given by:  $\lambda = \mu^{TS} \cdot \eta^T S T \eta^S$ . A simple but tedious calculation shows that indeed  $\lambda(\overline{s[t_x/x]}^{\mathbb{S}}) = \overline{t'[s'_x/x]}^{\mathbb{T}}$ . The details of this calculation are in the appendix.

To define  $\mu^{TS}$ , we use the fact that the functors  $U$  and  $TS$  are isomorphic. Indeed, since  $\mathbb{U}$  is a composite theory, every  $\mathbb{U}$ -term  $u$  has a separation  $u =_{\mathbb{U}} t[s_x/x]$ . Hence  $\phi : U \Rightarrow TS$  and  $\psi : TS \Rightarrow U$  given below are inverse natural transformations. Using  $\phi, \psi$ , and the multiplication  $\mu^U$ , we can then define  $\mu^{TS}$ .

$$\phi(u) := \overline{t[s_x/x]}^{\mathbb{T}} \tag{16}$$

$$\psi(\overline{t[s_x/x]}^{\mathbb{T}}) := \overline{t[s_x/x]}^{\mathbb{U}} \tag{17}$$

$$\mu^{TS} := (TSTS \xrightarrow{\psi\psi} UU \xrightarrow{\mu^U} U \xrightarrow{\phi} TS). \tag{18}$$

The proofs of (i)-(iii) are in the appendix.  $\square$



## 5 From Distributive Law to Composite Theory

We now show how to construct a composite theory from a given distributive law.

**Theorem 24.** *Let  $S, T$  be two monads algebraically presented by two algebraic theories  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ , respectively. Let  $\lambda : ST \Rightarrow TS$  be a distributive law. We define a set  $E_\lambda$  of equations and a theory  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  as follows [37, Definition 3.8].*

$$\begin{aligned} E_\lambda &:= \left\{ (s[t_x/x], t[s_y/y]) \mid \lambda_{\mathcal{V}}(\overline{s[t_x/x]^\mathbb{S}}) = \overline{t[s_y/y]^\mathbb{T}} \right\}. \\ \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda} &:= \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}} \uplus \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, \\ E_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda} &:= E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Then,  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  is a composite theory of  $\mathbb{T}$  after  $\mathbb{S}$ .

To prove Theorem 24, we observe that every  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -term  $u$  can be assigned a regular expression  $\mathbf{type}(u)$  of the form  $(S \cup T)^*\mathcal{V}$  expressing how  $u$  nests  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  operation symbols. We give an example below in Example 27. We obtain a  $TS$ -separated term by first mapping  $u$  to the equivalence class  $\bar{u}$  in  $\mathbf{type}(u)$ , now viewed as a set. We then apply  $\lambda, \mu^S$  and  $\mu^T$  to  $\bar{u}$  until we reach an equivalence class  $\xi \in TS\mathcal{V}$ . The axioms of the three natural transformations ensure that  $\xi$  does not depend on the order in which they were applied. Finally, by the axiom of choice we can choose a representative of  $\xi$  which serves as a separation of  $u$ .

The termination of the procedure of applying  $\lambda, \mu^S$  and  $\mu^T$  and the uniqueness of  $\xi$  are intuitively clear, yet showing it formally is not trivial. In the following definitions we formalise the separation procedure that we described here. We then give a proof of termination using rewriting techniques. We denote string concatenation with “::”.

**Definition 25.** *We define a function  $\mathbf{type} : \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}^* \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{S, T\}^* \mathcal{V}$  recursively:*

- For  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ , then  $\mathbf{type}(v) := \mathcal{V}$ .
- For  $s[u_1, \dots, u_n]$ , where  $s \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}, \mathcal{V})$ , and  $u_1, \dots, u_n \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}^* \mathcal{V}$  such that their root is not an  $\mathbb{S}$ -symbol, let  $w$  be longest word in the set  $\{\mathbf{type}(u_1), \dots, \mathbf{type}(u_n)\}$ , then  $\mathbf{type}(s[u_1, \dots, u_n]) := S :: w$ .
- The  $t[u_1, \dots, u_n]$  case, where  $u_1, \dots, u_n$  do not start with a  $\mathbb{T}$ -symbol, is dual.

**Definition 26.** *We recursively define a dependent partial function*

$$\mathbf{inject} : \prod_{(u,w) \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}^* \mathcal{V} \times \{S, T\}^* \mathcal{V}} \dashrightarrow w.$$

- For  $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{inject}(v, \mathcal{V}) := v$ , and

$$\mathbf{inject}(v, S :: w') := \overline{\mathbf{inject}(v, w')^\mathbb{S}} \quad \mathbf{inject}(v, T :: w') := \overline{\mathbf{inject}(v, w')^\mathbb{T}}$$

- For  $s[u_1, \dots, u_n]$  where  $s \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}^* \mathcal{V}$ , and  $u_1, \dots, u_n \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}^* \mathcal{V}$  being either variables or having root symbols in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ ,

$$\mathbf{inject}(s[u_1, \dots, u_n], S :: w') := \overline{s[\mathbf{inject}(u_1, w'), \dots, \mathbf{inject}(u_n, w')]^\mathbb{S}}.$$


- The  $t[u_1, \dots, u_n]$  case, where  $u_1, \dots, u_n$  do not start with a  $\mathbb{T}$ -symbol, is dual.

*Example 27.* Take the operations  $s^{(2)}, s'^{(1)} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}$ , and  $t^{(1)} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ .

For  $u := s(s(x, t(x)), t(s'(s(x, x))))$ , we have

$$w := \text{type}(u) = STSV.$$

$$\zeta := \text{inject}(u, w) = s(s(\overline{x}^{\mathbb{T}}, \overline{t(x)}^{\mathbb{T}}), \overline{t(s'(s(x, x)))}^{\mathbb{S}}).$$



Before we formalise the remainder of the separation procedure, we interpret functors and natural transformations as a term rewriting system.

**Definition 28.** Let  $\Sigma := \{F_i \mid i \in I\}$  be a finite set of functors, and  $\mathcal{R} := \{\alpha_j : L_j \rightarrow R_j \mid L_j, R_j \in \Sigma^*, j \in J\}$  be a finite set of natural transformations. We call  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$  a **functorial rewriting system**.

The name “functorial rewriting system” is motivated by seeing each natural transformation  $\alpha : L \rightarrow R$  as a rewrite rule on strings of functors in  $\Sigma^*$  as follows. For any strings of functors  $A, B \in \Sigma^*$ , we can make the rewrite step

$$ALB \xrightarrow{A\alpha B} ARB, \quad (19)$$

where  $A$  is seen as a left-context and  $B$  as a right-context. Note that for a functorial rewriting system  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$  the only valid rewrite steps are those resulting from natural transformations in  $\mathcal{R}$ . If the functors in  $\Sigma$  satisfy identities like  $FG = H$  that are not represented by some  $\beta \in \mathcal{R}$ , then we do not allow rewrite steps that use this identity.

We use the following functorial rewriting system for our separation procedure.

**Definition 29.** We define a functorial rewriting system  $\mathcal{R}^{sep} = (\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ , where  $\Sigma := \{S, T\}$  and  $\mathcal{R} := \{① \lambda : ST \rightarrow TS, ② \mu^S : SS \rightarrow S, ③ \mu^T : TT \rightarrow T\}$ .

The functors and natural transformations in a functorial rewriting system carry categorical structure in the form of commuting diagrams. We use this information to define a variation of (local) confluence.

**Definition 30.** A functorial rewriting system is (read  $\circlearrowleft$  as “commuting”)

- $\text{WCR}\circlearrowleft$  if for all  $T_0 \xleftarrow{\alpha} \cdot \xrightarrow{\beta} T_1$  there exists  $T_0 \xrightarrow{\gamma} \cdot \xleftarrow{\delta} T_1$  s.t.  $\gamma\alpha = \delta\beta$ .
- $\text{CR}\circlearrowleft$  if for all  $T_0 \xleftarrow{\alpha} \cdot \xrightarrow{\beta} T_1$  there exists  $T_0 \xrightarrow{\gamma} \cdot \xleftarrow{\delta} T_1$  s.t.  $\gamma\alpha = \delta\beta$ .

*Remark 31.* When writing  $T_0 \rightarrow \cdot \leftarrow T_1$ , the common descendent must be the exact same word in  $\Sigma^*$ . No equality property between functors is allowed.

There are equivalents to Newman’s Lemma (Lemma 16) and the Critical Pair Lemma (Lemma 18). The proofs are in the appendix.

**Lemma 32 (Functorial Newman’s lemma).** *If a functorial rewriting system is terminating (SN) and  $\text{WCR}\circlearrowleft$ , then it is  $\text{CR}\circlearrowleft$ .* ■

**Lemma 33 (Functorial critical pair lemma).** *A functorial rewriting system is  $\text{WCR}\circlearrowleft$  if and only if all critical pairs converge with a commuting diagram. ■*


The functorial rewriting system  $\mathcal{R}^{sep}$  of Definition 29 has nice properties.

**Lemma 34.**  $\mathcal{R}^{sep}$  is terminating (SN) and confluent-commuting ( $\text{CR}\circlearrowleft$ ).

*Proof.* We show termination (SN) of  $\mathcal{R}^{sep}$  using polynomial interpretation over  $\mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\llbracket S \rrbracket(x) := 2x + 1$  and  $\llbracket T \rrbracket(x) := x + 1$ , which are indeed monotone in  $x$ . The three rewrite rules are strictly decreasing with respect to that order:

$$\begin{aligned}\llbracket ST \rrbracket(x) &= 2x + 3 > 2x + 2 = \llbracket TS \rrbracket(x), \\ \llbracket SS \rrbracket(x) &= 4x + 3 > 2x + 1 = \llbracket S \rrbracket(x), \\ \llbracket TT \rrbracket(x) &= x + 2 > x + 1 = \llbracket T \rrbracket(x).\end{aligned}$$

We now want to prove that  $\mathcal{R}^{sep}$  is  $\text{CR}\circlearrowleft$ . Since we have termination (SN) it suffices to prove  $\text{WCR}\circlearrowleft$  by Lemma 32. We use Lemma 33 and notice that there are only 4 critical pairs, and all converge with a commuting diagram:



We now have the required tools to formalise the separation procedure and show that every term in  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  can be separated.


**Lemma 35.** *There is a function  $\text{sep}: \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}^*$  that maps a  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -term  $u$  to a  $TS$ -separated term  $\text{sep}(u)$  that is  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -equal to  $u$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be an arbitrary  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -term, and let  $w \in (S \cup T)^*$  be such that  $\text{type}(u) = w\mathcal{V}$ . Furthermore, let  $\zeta := \text{inject}(u, \text{type}(u)) \in \text{type}(u)$ . Since  $\mathcal{R}^{sep}$  is terminating (SN), the string  $w$  has a normal form  $w'$  which must be  $TS$ ,  $T$ , or  $S$ , as any other type will contain a reducible expression (redex).

Let  $\alpha$  be a  $\mathcal{R}^{sep}$ -rewrite sequence  $w \rightarrow w'$ . Recall that  $\alpha$  is a natural transformation composed of  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu^S$  and  $\mu^T$ . Let  $\xi := \alpha_{\mathcal{V}}(\zeta)$ . Since  $\xi$  is an equivalence class in  $TS\mathcal{V}$ ,  $T\mathcal{V}$  or  $S\mathcal{V}$ , all of its representatives must be separated. By the axiom of choice we have functions  $\rho_{TS\mathcal{V}}: TS\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Sigma_T^* \Sigma_S^* \mathcal{V}$ ,  $\rho_{S\mathcal{V}}: S\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Sigma_S^* \mathcal{V}$ , and

$\rho_{T\mathcal{V}}: T\mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Sigma_T^* \mathcal{V}$ , that choose a representative. We define  $\text{sep}(u)$  to be  $\rho_{w'\mathcal{V}}(\xi)$ , that is,  $\text{sep}(u) := \rho_{w'\mathcal{V}}(\alpha_{\mathcal{V}}(\text{inject}(u, \text{type}(u))))$ .

To see that  $\text{sep}(u)$  is well defined, let  $w''$  be another normal form and  $\beta$  be a rewrite sequence  $w \rightarrow w''$ . By  $\text{CR}\circ$ , we necessarily have  $w' = w''$ , and also  $\alpha = \beta$ .



We claim that  $u =_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda} \text{sep}(u)$ . Indeed, in every application of  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu^S$  or  $\mu^T$ , any  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -term acting as representative of the input is  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -equal to any term representing the output. For applications of  $\lambda$ , this is by definition of  $E_\lambda$ . The multiplication  $\mu_{\mathbb{S}}$  maps an input  $\overline{s[s'_x]}$  to  $\overline{s[s'_x]}$ . Obviously  $s[s'_x] =_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda} s[s'_x]$ . The congruence rule of equational logic then equates terms resulting from other choices of representatives for  $\overline{s'_x}$ , while the substitution rule equates terms resulting from other choices of representatives for  $\overline{s}$ . The same goes for  $\mu_{\mathbb{T}}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 36.* In general, we need the Axiom of Choice to obtain  $\text{sep}$ . However, if all terms in  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  have unique normal forms, then  $\text{sep}$  is constructive. Instead of choosing a representative, we would choose the unique normal form obtained by normalising in both  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ .

**Lemma 37.** *For all  $\mathbb{S}$ -terms  $s$ ,  $\text{sep}(s) =_{\mathbb{S}} s$ , for all  $\mathbb{T}$ -terms  $t$ ,  $\text{sep}(t) =_{\mathbb{T}} t$ , and for any separated term  $t[s_x/x]$ ,  $\text{sep}(t[s_x/x])$  is equal to  $t[s_x/x]$  modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .*

*Proof.* For an  $\mathbb{S}$ -term  $s$ , we have  $\text{type}(s) = S\mathcal{V}$  and  $\text{inject}(s, S\mathcal{V}) = \overline{s}$ . Since  $S\mathcal{V}$  is already a normal form in  $\mathcal{R}^{sep}$ , by definition  $\text{sep}(s) = \rho_{S\mathcal{V}}(\overline{s})$  is just the choice function choosing a representative of  $\overline{s}$ . We therefore have  $\text{sep}(s) =_{\mathbb{S}} s$ . The arguments for  $\mathbb{T}$ -terms and for separated terms  $t[s_x/x]$  are similar.  $\square$

We now apply Lemma 35 to show that any two separated terms that are equal in  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ , are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .

**Lemma 38.** *Any two separated terms equal in  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose two separated terms  $t_0[s_x/x]$  and  $t'_0[s'_y/y]$  are equal in  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ . Let  $\mathfrak{T}$  be a  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -derivation tree of this equality  $t_0[s_x/x] =_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda} t'_0[s'_y/y]$  in equational logic. By an induction on the structure of  $\mathfrak{T}$ , we prove that for each equation  $u = u'$  in  $\mathfrak{T}$ ,  $\text{sep}(u)$  and  $\text{sep}(u')$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ . By Lemma 37 and transitivity of equality modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ , we then conclude that  $t_0[s_x/x]$  and  $t'_0[s'_y/y]$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .

The base cases are the Axiom and Reflexivity rules. The induction steps are the Symmetry, Transitivity, Congruence, and Substitution rules. We show only the cases of Congruence and Substitution here, as these are the only interesting cases. The full proof is in the appendix.

– Congruence: Given  $\text{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}$ , consider  $\frac{u_1 = u'_1 \quad \dots \quad u_n = u'_n}{\text{op}(u_1, \dots, u_n) = \text{op}(u'_1, \dots, u'_n)}$

Let  $t_i[s_i] := \text{sep}(u_i)$  and  $t'_i[s'_i] := \text{sep}(u'_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . The IH is that  $\overline{t_i[s_i]}^{\mathbb{T}} = \overline{t'_i[s'_i]}^{\mathbb{T}}$ . We distinguish when  $\text{op}$  is a  $\mathbb{T}$ -symbol or an  $\mathbb{S}$ -symbol.

- If  $\text{op} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ , then  $\overline{\text{op}(t_1[s_1], \dots, t_n[s_n])}^{\mathbb{T}} = \overline{\text{op}(t'_1[s'_1], \dots, t'_n[s'_n])}^{\mathbb{T}}$ , by congruence in  $\mathbb{T}$ . By  $\text{CR}_{\odot}$ , applying  $\mu^T S$  on both sides results in the  $TS$ -equivalence classes of  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u_1, \dots, u_n))$  and  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u'_1, \dots, u'_n))$ , which must be equal. Thus  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u_1, \dots, u_n))$  and  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u'_1, \dots, u'_n))$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .
- If  $\text{op} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}$ , then  $\overline{\text{op}(t_1[s_1], \dots, t_n[s_n])}^{\mathbb{S}} = \overline{\text{op}(t'_1[s'_1], \dots, t'_n[s'_n])}^{\mathbb{S}}$ , by congruence in  $\mathbb{S}$ . By  $\text{CR}_{\odot}$ , applying  $T\mu^S \cdot \lambda$  on both sides results in the  $TS$ -equivalence classes of  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u_1, \dots, u_n))$  and  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u'_1, \dots, u'_n))$ , which must be equal. Thus  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u_1, \dots, u_n))$  and  $\text{sep}(\text{op}(u'_1, \dots, u'_n))$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .

– Substitution: Consider a substitution  $f$ , consider  $\frac{u = u'}{u[f] = u'[f]}$ .

Let  $t[s_x] := \text{sep}(u)$  and  $t'[s'_x] := \text{sep}(u')$ . The IH is that  $\overline{t[s_x]}^{\mathbb{T}} = \overline{t'[s'_x]}^{\mathbb{T}}$ . We start by separating all terms in the image of  $f$ . This gives another substitution  $g := \text{sep} \cdot f$ , and we denote  $t_y[s_z] := g(y)$  for all  $y \in \text{var}(u_1) \cup \text{var}(u_2)$ . By closure of  $=_{\mathbb{S}}$  and  $=_{\mathbb{T}}$  under substitution, we have

$$\overline{t[s_x[t_y[s_z]]]}^{\mathbb{T}} = \overline{t'[s'_x[t_y[s_z]]]}^{\mathbb{T}}.$$

Applying  $\mu^T \mu^S \cdot T\lambda S$  on both sides make us reach  $TS\mathcal{V}$ , and the two sides of the equation are the  $TS$ -equivalence classes of  $\text{sep}(u[f])$  and of  $\text{sep}(u'[f])$ , which must therefore be equal by  $\text{CR}_{\odot}$ . Hence  $\text{sep}(u[f])$  and  $\text{sep}(u'[f])$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 24 now follows from Lemmas 35 and 38.

The next theorem was given in Zwart's thesis [37, Theorem 3.9] but not published elsewhere. We have updated the reasoning and obtained a much shorter proof using the shortcut  $\mathbf{EM}(TS) \cong_{\text{conc}} \mathbf{Alg}(\lambda)$ .

**Theorem 39.** *Let  $S$  and  $T$  be the free algebra monads of algebraic theories  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ . If there is a distributive law  $\lambda : ST \Rightarrow TS$ , then the monad  $\langle TS, \eta^T \eta^S, \mu^T \mu^S \cdot T\lambda S \rangle$  is presented algebraically by  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ .  $\blacksquare$*

## 6 Axiomatisations of Composite Theories

In Theorem 24, we showed how to obtain an algebraic presentation  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  of the composite monad arising from a distributive law  $\lambda : ST \rightarrow TS$ . However, the set of equations  $E_\lambda$  accounting for the interactions between  $\mathbb{S}$ - and  $\mathbb{T}$ -terms is maximal in the sense that it contains all possible equations that consist of

representatives of some pair  $(u, \lambda(u))$  in the graph of  $\lambda$ . In practice, we would like to have a minimal description of  $E_\lambda$ , such as the one for `Ring` in Example 22, which only adds two distribution axioms to the theories of monoids and Abelian groups.

In this section, we identify criteria on the shape of axioms that allow us to prove that certain minimal subsets of  $E_\lambda$  suffice to generate the whole of  $E_\lambda$ . We apply term rewriting methods for proving the necessary claims.

The shape of axioms will be described in terms of *layers*.

**Definition 40.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  be two algebraic theories. Given a term  $s[t_x/x] \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}^* \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}^* \mathcal{V}$ , its *ST-layers* is the pair  $(m, n)$  of natural numbers where  $m := \text{depth}(s)$  and  $n := \max\{\text{depth}(t_x) \mid x \in \text{var}(s)\}$ , where  $\text{depth}$  denotes the maximal number of nested (possibly nullary) operation symbols. This corresponds to the inductively defined notion of depth of term trees where we define constants to have depth 1, and variables depth 0. *TS-layers* are defined similarly for terms in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}^* \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}^* \mathcal{V}$ .*

*Example 41.* We illustrate *ST-layers* with terms in `Ring` (where  $\mathbb{S} = \text{Mon}, \mathbb{T} = \text{AbGrp}$ ).

<i>ST-Layers</i>	(0, 0)	(0, 1)	(1, 0)	(1, 1)	(0, 2)	(2, 0)
<i>Examples</i>	$x$	$0$	$1$	$x \cdot 0$	$x + 0$	$x \cdot 1$
	$y$	$x + y$	$x \cdot y$	$(x + y) \cdot (y + z)$	$(x + y) + z$	$x \cdot (y \cdot z)$

For the remainder of this section, we assume that  $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}, \lambda, E_{\mathbb{S}}, E_{\mathbb{T}}, E_\lambda$ , and  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  are as in Theorem 24.

**Lemma 42.** *Let  $E' \subseteq E_\lambda$  be a set of equations defined as follows. For each  $f^{(n)} \in \mathbb{S}$ ,  $g^{(m)} \in \mathbb{T}$  and each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $E'$  contains one equation <sub>$n$</sub>  of the form  $l = r$ , where  $l = f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, g(\vec{y}), x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$  and  $r \in \lambda_{\mathbb{V}}(\vec{l})$ . The pair  $(\Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda} = \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}} \uplus \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, E')$  can now be seen a TRS. If this TRS is terminating, then  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E'$  generates the same congruence on  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -terms as  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E_\lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Let us show why  $(\Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda} = \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}} \uplus \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, E')$  is a TRS. First, no left-hand side is a variable by definition of  $E'$ . Second,  $A := \text{var}(s[t_x]) \supseteq \text{var}(\overline{t[s_y]})_{\mathbb{S}}$  holds for all  $(s[t_x], t[s_y]) \in E'$ . This is the case since  $\lambda_A : STA \rightarrow TSA : s[t_x] \mapsto \overline{t[s_y]}$  forces the equivalence class of  $t[s_y]$  to be in  $TSA$  and therefore to only use the variables in  $A$ .

Now let us argue why the congruence relation is left unchanged. Take an equation  $(u, u') \in E_\lambda \cup E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}}$ . The goal is to obtain this equation using only  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E'$ .

- First, using only equations in  $E'$ , the  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -terms  $u$  and  $u'$  can be separated. Indeed, we assume that the TRS  $(\Sigma_{\mathbb{U}^\lambda}, E')$  is terminating, thus both  $u$  and  $u'$  can be rewritten to normal forms. The equations  $E'$  are exhaustive in the following sense: every term containing a  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ -symbol below an  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}$ -symbol is reducible (not in normal form). Thus the normal forms of  $u$  and  $u'$  must be in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}^* \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}^* \mathcal{V}$ , i.e., separated. Let us denote them  $t[s_x/x]$  and  $t'[s'_y/y]$ .

- Since  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  is a composite theory (proven in Theorem 24), and the separated normal forms  $t[s_x/x]$  and  $t'[s'_y/y]$  are  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -equal, they must also be equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ . By equality modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ , we have a proof of  $t[s_x/x] = t'[s'_y/y]$  using only equations from  $E_{\mathbb{S}}$  and  $E_{\mathbb{T}}$  (explicitly so when using the equivalent formulation (4) of equality modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  in [37, Prop. 3.4]).  $\square$

Choosing a right-hand side  $r$  in Lemma 42 uses the axiom of choice, similarly to the definition of  $\text{sep}$  in Section 5. As pointed out in Remark 36, if the theories  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  can be oriented to obtain a confluent and terminating TRS, then the normal form is a natural choice for  $r$ . For example, in [29], the theory of left-zero monoids and the theory with a unary idempotent operation were both oriented, allowing for a practical presentation of the composite theory that the authors called CUT.

*Example 43.* Let us retrieve the axiomatisation of Ring as given in Example 22, but starting from its corresponding distributive law  $\lambda : LA \rightarrow AL$  [5, §4]. The set  $E$  will only contain equations whose left-hand side is among  $(x + y)z$ ,  $x(y + z)$ ,  $0 \cdot x$ ,  $x \cdot 0$ ,  $(-x)y$ , and  $x(-y)$ . For each of those, there are infinitely many choices for the right-hand side. For instance  $(x \cdot 0, 0)$ ,  $(x \cdot 0, 0 + 0)$ , etc. Thankfully, there is an easy choice for the right-hand side  $r$ , because the theory **Mon** can be oriented,  $(xy)z \rightarrow x(yz)$ ,  $1 \cdot x \rightarrow x$ , and  $x \cdot 1 \rightarrow x$ , as can the theory **AbGrp** without the symmetry axiom. Not taking the symmetry axiom into account simply means that we have to choose one equation between  $((x + y)z, xz + yz)$  and  $((x + y)z, yz + xz)$ . We end up with 6 equations:

$$\begin{array}{lll} (x + y)z = xz + yz, & x \cdot 0 = 0, & (-x)y = -(xy), \\ z(x + y) = zx + zy, & 0 \cdot x = 0, & x(-y) = -(xy). \end{array}$$

Reducing from 6 to only the 2 equations of left and right distributivity can be done using automated tools. In our case, we used Prover9 [26] and obtained the result instantaneously (see Section 8.7 in appendix).

Note that if  $E' \subseteq E_\lambda$  is not terminating, then the conclusion is not guaranteed to hold. The example below exhibits a situation where the set  $E'$  of equations as defined in Lemma 42 is not enough to generate all of the  $E_\lambda$  equations.

*Example 44.* We show that the subset of equations of  $E_\lambda$  where all left-hand sides have layers  $(1, 1)$  is not always sufficient (together with  $E_{\mathbb{S}}$  and  $E_{\mathbb{T}}$ ) to generate all  $E_\lambda$  equations obtained from a distributive law  $\lambda$ . This example is an extension of the well-known non-terminating TRS  $ab \rightarrow bbaa$  [34, Ex.2.3.9].

Consider the theories  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ , with signatures  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{S}} := \{a^{(1)}\}$  and  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}} := \{b^{(1)}\}$ , and equations  $E_{\mathbb{S}} := \{aaa = aa\}$  and  $E_{\mathbb{T}} := \{bbb = bb\}$ . We use some string rewriting notations, such as  $aa\bar{x}$  or  $a^2\bar{x}$  as shorthand for  $a(a(x))$ , etc. The set of equivalence classes of  $\mathbb{S}$  is  $S\mathcal{V} = \{\overline{a^2x}, \overline{ax}, \overline{x} \mid x \in \mathcal{V}\}$ . Similarly,

$T\mathcal{V} = \{\overline{b^2x}, \overline{bx}, \overline{x} \mid x \in \mathcal{V}\}$ . We define a mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda: ST\mathcal{V} &\rightarrow TS\mathcal{V} \\ \overline{a^n \overline{b^m x}} &\mapsto \overline{b^2 a^2 x}, \text{ for } n, m \in \{1, 2\} \\ \overline{a^n x} &\mapsto \overline{a^n x}, \text{ for } n \in \{1, 2\} \\ \overline{b^n x} &\mapsto \overline{b^n x}, \text{ for } n \in \{1, 2\} \\ \overline{x} &\mapsto x \end{aligned}$$

We show that  $\lambda$  is a distributive law:

- Unit law (8):  $\lambda_{\mathcal{V}}(S\eta_{\mathcal{V}}^T(\overline{a^n x})) = \lambda_{\mathcal{V}}(\overline{a^n x}) = \overline{a^n x} = \eta_{S\mathcal{V}}^T(\overline{a^n x})$ .
- Unit law (9):  $\lambda_{\mathcal{V}}(\eta_{T\mathcal{V}}^S(\overline{b^n x})) = \lambda_{\mathcal{V}}(\overline{b^n x}) = \overline{b^n x} = T\eta_{\mathcal{V}}^S(\overline{b^n x})$ .
- Multiplication law (10): We only show the case for  $n, m, k \geq 1$ . Other cases can be easily verified in a similar manner.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \overline{a^n a^m b^k x} \in SST & \xrightarrow{S\lambda} & \overline{a^n b^2 a^2 x} \in STS & \xrightarrow{\lambda S} & \overline{b^2 a^2 a^2 x} \in TSS \\ \mu^{ST} \downarrow & & & & \downarrow T\mu^S \\ \overline{a^{n+m} b^k x} \in ST & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \overline{b^2 a^2 x} = \overline{b^2 a^4 x} \in TS & & \end{array}$$

- Multiplication law (11): Analogous to the previous point.

From Theorem 24, defining the set  $E_\lambda$  of distributivity equations as below ensures that  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E_\lambda$  is an axiomatization of the composite theory  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ .

$$\begin{aligned} E_\lambda = & \{a^n b^m x = b^2 a^2 x \mid m, n \geq 1, x \in \mathcal{V}\} \cup \\ & \{a^n x = a^n x, b^n x = b^n x \mid n \in \{0, 1, 2\}, x \in \mathcal{V}\} \end{aligned}$$

The subset of equations of  $E_\lambda$  that have left-hand side with  $ST$ -layers (1,1) is  $E' = \{ab = b^2 a^2\}$ . However, we claim that  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E'$  cannot derive all equations in  $E_\lambda$ . Indeed, we observe that the distributivity equation  $aab =_{E_\lambda} bbaa$  cannot be derived. Trying to do so leaves us stuck in a loop: (we underline the part where an equation is applied)

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{aab} &=_{E'} \underline{ab}ba =_{E'} bba\underline{ab}aa =_{E'} bbabb\underline{aaaa} =_{E_{\mathbb{S}}} bb\underline{ab}baa \\ &=_{E'} \underline{bbb}baaba =_{E_{\mathbb{T}}} bba\underline{ab}aa =_{E'} \dots \text{ (loop)} \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to see that there are no other ways of proving  $aab = bbaa$  in  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E'$ . Hence  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E'$  does not generate the same congruence as  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E_\lambda$ . In line with Lemma 42, the above indeed also shows that  $E'$ , when viewed as a TRS, is not terminating. Note that Lemma 42 only says that termination is a sufficient condition for a (1,1)-axiomatisation. It does not exclude that in some composite theories, the set of equations  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E'$  might axiomatise  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$  even in presence of non-termination.

The next lemma identifies a class of equations where termination of the TRS  $(\Sigma_{\mathbb{U}} = \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}} \uplus \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}, E')$  is guaranteed. These are equations in which the right-hand sides have layers  $(n, 1)$ , which is inspired from similar results for string rewriting obtained by Zantema & Geser [36].



**Lemma 45.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  be two algebraic theories. Let  $R$  be a set rules of the form  $s[t_x/x] \rightarrow t[s_y/y]$ . Let  $Z = \{t_x \mid t_x \text{ is a variable}\}$ , i.e., all  $z \in Z$  occur directly below an  $\mathbb{S}$ -operation in  $s[t_x/x]$ . If each  $s[t_x/x]$  has  $ST$ -layers  $(1,1)$ , each  $t[s_y/y]$  has  $TS$ -layers  $(n,1)$  for some  $n$  not fixed, and each  $s_y$  is linear<sup>7</sup> in  $Z$ , then  $R$  is terminating. ■*

*Example 46.* We give some axiomatisations of composite theories resulting from distributive laws in the literature:

1. Let  $R(X) = X^A$  be the reader monad, with  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ . There is a distributive law of the finite distribution monad  $\mathcal{D}$  over  $R$ ,  $\lambda : \mathcal{D}R \rightarrow R\mathcal{D}$ , that sends  $p_1h_1 + \dots + p_nh_n$  to  $(a \mapsto p_1h_1(a) + \dots + p_nh_n(a))$  [16, Example 1.34]. Recall that  $R$  is presented algebraically by a single operation  $f^{(n)}$  with two equations [30], and  $\mathcal{D}$  is presented by convex algebras. The distribution axioms as described in Lemma 42 are in our case, for each  $p \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \oplus_p y &= f(x_1 \oplus_p y, \dots, x_n \oplus_p y). \\ x \oplus_p f(y_1, \dots, y_n) &= f(x \oplus_p y_1, \dots, x \oplus_p y_n). \end{aligned}$$

We see that the right-hand sides of these equations have layers  $(1,1)$  and both equations satisfy the linearity requirement of Lemma 45, thus ensuring termination. Hence by Theorem 24 and Lemma 42, the above equations together with the equations for  $f$  and for convex algebras present the composite monad on  $R\mathcal{D}$  induced by  $\lambda$ . Furthermore, we notice that each of the above equations can be derived from the other one using the axioms of convex algebras. Therefore, we only need to include one of them for each  $p$ .

2. There is a distributive law of multisets over distributions  $\lambda : \mathcal{M}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\mathcal{M}$  called the *parallel multinomial law* in [20], see also [9, 11] and [16, Ex. 1.37]. It sends  $\langle px_1 + (1-p)x_2, y \rangle$  to  $p\langle x_1, y \rangle + (1-p)\langle x_2, y \rangle$ , which can be expressed in the syntax of convex algebras and commutative monoids as

$$(x_1 \oplus_p x_2) \cdot y = (x_1 \cdot y) \oplus_p (x_2 \cdot y).$$

By Theorem 24, Lemma 42 and Lemma 45 these equations (one for each  $p \in [0, 1]$ ), together with the axioms of convex algebras and commutative monoids, present the composite monad on  $\mathcal{D}\mathcal{M}$  induced by  $\lambda$ .

3. There is a distributive law  $\lambda : L^+L^+ \rightarrow L^+L^+$  for the non-empty list monad over itself [25]. It sends a list of lists to the singleton list containing the list of all heads:  $[[a, b], [c], [d, e, f]] \mapsto [[a, c, d]]$ . We get the following distributivity axioms for the composite theory:

$$\begin{aligned} a * (b \star c) &= a * b \\ (a \star b) * c &= a * c. \end{aligned}$$

Again, the equations satisfy the conditions for Lemma 45, and our results imply that the above equations together with the semigroup axioms for  $*$  and  $\star$  present the composite monad on  $L^+L^+$  induced by  $\lambda$ .

<sup>7</sup> *Linear* in a TRS sense, i.e. variables appearing *at most once*.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we proved the correspondence between composite theories of  $\mathbb{T}$  after  $\mathbb{S}$  and distributive laws  $\lambda: ST \rightarrow TS$ . Furthermore, we gave sufficient criteria for when a minimal set  $E' \subseteq E_\lambda$  of distribution equations, along with  $E_\mathbb{S}$  and  $E_\mathbb{T}$ , axiomatises the composite theory.

The set  $E'$  itself is unlikely to turn many heads, as distributive laws are often informally described in the literature in terms of such simple distribution axioms. The surprise, however, comes from the fact that  $E'$  is not always enough (see Example 44). This is a possible pitfall similar to the ‘simplicity’ of the various false distributive laws of the powerset monad over itself [22].

There are several directions for future work. We showed that termination of  $E'$  (as TRS) is sufficient for  $E_\mathbb{S} \cup E_\mathbb{T} \cup E'$  to axiomatise the composite theory (Lemma 42), and that taking equations in  $E'$  to have layers  $(1, 1) \rightarrow (n, 1)$  ensures termination (Lemma 45). We would like to identify other criteria for termination, and make more use of term rewriting techniques. In fact, we did consider equations with layers  $(1, 1) \rightarrow (1, n)$ , but we were only able to prove termination (using dependency pairs) by adding a strong linearity requirement which seems too restrictive to be useful (see Lemma 55 in the appendix). We speculate that one could allow layers  $(1, 1) \rightarrow (2, 2)$  in which some symbol in the left-hand side is absent from the right-hand side in order to avoid problems such as in Example 44 with  $ab \rightarrow bbaa$ .

In light of negative results concerning monad compositions [22, 35, 38, 10], there has been much interest in understanding the limits of monad composition. Positive results using algebraic methods were given in [9]. Another approach has been to generalise to so-called weak distributive laws [14, 16]. Presentations of monads arising from the composition of monads via a weak distributive law, in particular monads for nondeterminism and probabilities, have been given in [6, 17]. These presentations are obtained by adding a simple distribution axiom to the two underlying theories, similar to our results in Section 6, but the resulting theory is no longer a composite theory as the essential uniqueness modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  is not guaranteed to hold. Another future line of work would be to extend the current correspondence to weak distributive laws [14, 16] thereby giving a definition of *weak composite theories*. Such a correspondence would allow for a more thorough study of weak distributive laws on the algebraic level, and could perhaps lead to no-go theorems for weak distributive laws.

**Acknowledgments:** Alois Rosset and Jörg Endrullis received funding from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) under the Innovational Research Incentives Scheme Vidi (project. No. VI.Vidi.192.004).

## References

1. Aczel, P., Adámek, J., Milius, S., Velebil, J.: Infinite trees and completely iterative theories: a coalgebraic view. *Theoretical Computer Science* **300**(1-3), 1–45 (2003). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(02\)00728-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(02)00728-4)
2. Arts, T., Giesl, J.: Termination of term rewriting using dependency pairs. *Theoretical Computer Science* **236**(1), 133–178 (2000). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(99\)00207-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(99)00207-8)
3. Awodey, S.: *Category Theory*. Oxford Logic Guides, Ebsco Publishing (2006)
4. Barr, M., Wells, C.: *Toposes, Triples and Theories*. Comprehensive studies in mathematics, Springer New York (1985)
5. Beck, J.: Distributive laws. In: *Seminar on triples and categorical homology theory*. p. 119–140. Springer (1969)
6. Bonchi, F., Sokolova, A., Vignudelli, V.: The theory of traces for systems with nondeterminism and probability. In: *34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2019*. pp. 1–14. IEEE (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2019.8785673>
7. Borceux, F.: *Handbook of categorical algebra. 2, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 51*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1994), categories and structures
8. Cheng, E.: Distributive laws for Lawvere theories. *Compositionality* (2020). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32408/compositionality-2-1>
9. Dahlqvist, F., Parlant, L., Silva, A.: Layer by layer – combining monads. In: Fischer, B., Uustalu, T. (eds.) *Theoretical Aspects of Computing (ICTAC 2018)*. *Lect. Notes Comp. Sci.*, vol. 11187. Springer (2018). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02508-3\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02508-3_9)
10. Dahlqvist, F., Neves, R.: Compositional semantics for new paradigms: probabilistic, hybrid and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.04145* (2018)
11. Dash, S., Staton, S.: A monad for probabilistic point processes. In: Spivak, D.I., Vicary, J. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual International Applied Category Theory Conference 2020, Cambridge, USA, 6-10th July 2020*. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 333, pp. 19–32. Open Publishing Association (2021). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.333.2>
12. Dershowitz, N.: Orderings for term-rewriting systems. *Theoretical Computer Science* **17**(3), 279–301 (1982). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(82\)90026-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(82)90026-3)
13. Dershowitz, N., Manna, Z.: Proving termination with multiset orderings. *Commun. ACM* **22**(8), 465–476 (1979). <https://doi.org/10.1145/359138.359142>
14. Garner, R.: The vietoris monad and weak distributive laws. *Applied Categorical Structures* **28**(2), 339–354 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10485-019-09582-w>
15. Giesl, J., Thiemann, R., Schneider-Kamp, P.: The dependency pair framework: Combining techniques for automated termination proofs. In: Baader, F., Voronkov, A. (eds.) *Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning, 11th International Conference, LPAR 2004, Montevideo, Uruguay, March 14-18, 2005*, *Proceedings*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 3452, pp. 301–331. Springer (2004). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32275-7\\_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-32275-7_21)
16. Goy, A.: On the compositionality of monads via weak distributive laws. (*Compositionnalité des monades par lois de distributivité faibles*). Ph.D. thesis, University of Paris-Saclay, France (2021), <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03426949>

17. Goy, A., Petrisan, D.: Combining probabilistic and non-deterministic choice via weak distributive laws. In: Hermanns, H., Zhang, L., Kobayashi, N., Miller, D. (eds.) LICS '20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science. pp. 454–464. ACM (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373718.3394795>
18. Hofbauer, D.: Termination proofs by multiset path orderings imply primitive recursive derivation lengths. *Theoretical Computer Science* **105**(1), 129–140 (1992). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(92\)90289-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(92)90289-R)
19. Jacobs, B.: Convexity, duality and effects. In: Calude, C.S., Sassone, V. (eds.) *Theoretical Computer Science - 6th IFIP TC 1/WG 2.2 International Conference, TCS 2010. Proceedings. IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*, vol. 323, pp. 1–19. Springer (2010). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15240-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15240-5_1)
20. Jacobs, B.: From multisets over distributions to distributions over multisets. In: *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science. LICS '21, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470678>
21. Jacobs, B., Silva, A., Sokolova, A.: Trace semantics via determinization. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **81**(5), 859–879 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2014.12.005>
22. Klin, B., Salamanca, J.: Iterated covariant powerset is not a monad. In: Staton, S. (ed.) *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, MFPS 2018. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 341, pp. 261–276. Elsevier (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2018.11.013>
23. MacLane, S.: *Categories for the Working Mathematician, Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 5. Springer-Verlag, New York (1971)
24. Manes, E.: *Algebraic Theories, Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 26. Springer (1976). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-9860-1>
25. Manes, E., Mulry, P.: Monad compositions. i: General constructions and recursive distributive laws. *Theory and Applications of Categories* **18**, 172–208 (2007)
26. McCune, W.: Release of prover9. In: *Mile high conference on quasigroups, loops and nonassociative systems*, Denver, Colorado (2005)
27. Moggi, E.: Notions of computation and monads. *Information and Computation* **93**(1), 55–92 (1991). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(91\)90052-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(91)90052-4), selections from 1989 IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science
28. Parlant, L.: *Monad composition via preservation of algebras. Ph.D. thesis, University College London, UK* (2020), <https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.819930>
29. Piróg, M., Staton, S.: Backtracking with cut via a distributive law and left-zero monoids. *Journal of Functional Programming* **27**, e17 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796817000077>
30. Plotkin, G.D., Power, J.: Notions of computation determine monads. In: Nielsen, M., Engberg, U. (eds.) *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures, 5th International Conference, FOSSACS 2002. Proceedings. LNCS*, vol. 2303, pp. 342–356. Springer (2002). [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45931-6\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45931-6_24)
31. Riehl, E.: *Category Theory in Context. Aurora: Dover Modern Math Originals, Dover Publications* (2017)
32. Rosset, A., Hansen, H.H., Endrullis, J.: Algebraic presentation of semifree monads. In: Hansen, H.H., Zanasi, F. (eds.) *Coalgebraic Methods in Computer Science*. pp. 110–132. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2022)

33. Schneider-Kamp, P., Thiemann, R., Annov, E., Codish, M., Giesl, J.: Proving termination using recursive path orders and SAT solving. In: Konev, B., Wolter, F. (eds.) *Frontiers of Combining Systems, 6th International Symposium, FroCoS 2007, Liverpool, UK, September 10-12, 2007, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 4720, pp. 267–282. Springer (2007). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74621-8\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74621-8_18)
34. Terese: *Term rewriting systems*, Cambridge tracts in theoretical computer science, vol. 55. Cambridge University Press (2003)
35. Varacca, D., Winskel, G.: Distributing probability over nondeterminism. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **16**, 87–113 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129505005074>
36. Zantema, H., Geser, A.: A complete characterization of termination of  $0^P 1^Q \rightarrow 1^R 0^S$ . *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.* **11**(1), 1–25 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S002009900019>
37. Zwart, M.: *On the Non-Compositionality of Monads via Distributive Laws*. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford (September 2020)
38. Zwart, M., Marsden, D.: No-Go Theorems for Distributive Laws. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **Volume 18, Issue 1** (Jan 2022). [https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18\(1:13\)2022](https://doi.org/10.46298/lmcs-18(1:13)2022)

## 8 Appendix

### 8.1 Preliminaries monads extra

---

$\frac{(s, t) \in E}{s = t} \text{Axiom}_E$	$\frac{}{t = t} \text{Reflexivity}$
$\frac{s = t}{t = s} \text{Symmetry}$	$\frac{t_1 = t_2 \quad t_2 = t_3}{t_1 = t_3} \text{Transitivity}$
$\frac{s_1 = t_1 \quad \dots \quad s_n = t_n}{\text{op}(s_1, \dots, s_n) = \text{op}(t_1, \dots, t_n)} \text{Congruence}$	$\frac{s = t}{s[f] = t[f]} \text{Substitution}$

---

**Table 1.** Inference rules of equational logic, with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\text{op}^{(n)} \in \Sigma$ , and  $f$  a substitution

### 8.2 Preliminaries TRS extra

We present the version of the multiset path order [33] that we will use.

**Definition 47 (Multiset ordering, [13, 12]).** *A transitive, irreflexive relation  $(A, \succ)$  can be extended to the multiset  $(\mathcal{M}A, \succ_{\mathcal{M}})$ , where a multiset is reduced by removing one or more elements and replacing them with any finite number (possibly 0) of elements, all smaller than one of the elements removed.*

The multiset ordering  $(\mathcal{M}A, \succ_{\mathcal{M}})$  is well-founded iff  $(A, \succ)$  is well-founded [13, Theorem §2].

*Example 48.* Taking the usual “greater than” on natural numbers  $(\mathbb{N}, >)$ , then  $\{2, 2, 0\} \succ_{\mathcal{M}} \{2, 1, 1\}$  in the multiset ordering, since an occurrence of 2 has been replaced by two 1’s, and an occurrence of 0 has been removed.

**Definition 49 ([18, §2]).** *Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be an algebraic theory. We define **permutation equivalence** of  $\mathbb{U}$ -terms by  $x \sim x$  for variables  $x \in \mathcal{V}$ , and  $f[t_1, \dots, t_n] \sim g[s_1, \dots, s_m]$  if and only if  $f = g$  (which implies  $m = n$ ) and for all  $i$ ,  $t_i \sim s_{\pi(i)}$  for some permutation  $\pi$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .*

**Definition 50 (Multiset path order, [33]).** *Let  $\mathbb{U}$  be an algebraic theory with a reflexive, transitive relation on its function symbols  $(\Sigma_{\mathbb{U}}, \leq)$ . Let  $< := (\leq \setminus \geq)$  denote the strict version and  $\approx := (\leq \cap \geq)$  denote the induced equivalence. We inductively define a transitive relation  $\succ$  on  $\mathbb{U}$ -terms as follows. Let  $l, r$  be  $\mathbb{U}$ -terms. We say that  $l \succ r$  if and only if  $l = f(l_1, \dots, l_n)$  for some  $f^{(n)} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}}$  and one of the following hold:*

1.  $l_i \succ r$  or  $l_i \sim r$  for some  $i$ ; or
2.  $r = g(r_1, \dots, r_m)$  for some  $g^{(m)} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{U}}$  and either
  - i.  $f > g$  and  $l \succ r_j$  for all  $j$ , or

ii.  $f \approx g$  and  $\{l_1, \dots, l_n\} \succ_{\mathcal{M}} \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$ .

**Lemma 51 ([18, §3]).** *The relation  $\succ$  of Definition 50 is a reduction order, i.e., is well-founded and closed under substitutions and contexts. Therefore, a TRS  $(\Sigma, R)$  is terminating if  $R \subseteq \succ$ .*

Let us explain the basics about *critical pairs* [34, §2.7]. We only give an informal description here, as the precise definition is quite technical. An overlap is when two rules, for instance  $f(g(x), y) \rightarrow f(x, g(y))$  and  $g(x) \rightarrow h(x)$ , can be applied with some symbols being shared, in our case  $g$ . They create the critical pair  $f(x, g(y)) \leftarrow f(g(x), y) \rightarrow f(h(x), y)$ . We say that a critical pair *converges* if the two terms can be rewritten to a common term, i.e.,  $f(x, g(y)) \twoheadrightarrow \cdot \leftarrow f(h(x), y)$  in our case.

### 8.3 Composite theories extra

To prove Proposition 20, let us recall the other definitions of composite theory from [37, Def. 3.2, Prop. 3.4].

- (I) The separated terms  $t[s_x]$  and  $t'[s'_y]$  are **equal modulo**  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  if there exist functions  $h : \text{var}(t) \rightarrow Z \leftarrow \text{var}(t') : h'$  such that
- (a)  $t[h] =_{\mathbb{T}} t'[h']$ .
  - (b)  $\forall x_1, x_2 \in \text{var}(t) : h(x_1) = h(x_2) \Rightarrow s_{x_1} =_{\mathbb{S}} s_{x_2}$ .
  - (c)  $\forall y_1, y_2 \in \text{var}(t') : h'(y_1) = h'(y_2) \Rightarrow s_{y_1} =_{\mathbb{S}} s_{y_2}$ .
  - (d)  $\forall x \in \text{var}(t), \forall y \in \text{var}(t') : h(x) = h'(y) \Rightarrow s_x =_{\mathbb{S}} s_y$ .
- (II) The separated terms  $t[s_x]$  and  $t'[s'_y]$  are **equal modulo**  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  if there exist functions  $h : X \rightarrow Z$ ,  $h' : Y \rightarrow Z$  and  $\mathbb{S}$ -terms  $\{s_z^* \mid z \in Z\}$  such that
- (i)  $t[h] =_{\mathbb{T}} t'[h']$ ,
  - (ii)  $\forall x \in X : s_x =_{\mathbb{S}} s_{h(x)}^*$ , and
  - (iii)  $\forall y \in Y : s'_y =_{\mathbb{S}} s_{h'(y)}^*$ .

*Proof of Proposition 20. 2  $\Rightarrow$  1:* We suppose equality modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  as given above in Item (II) and show that  $t[\overline{s_x^{\mathbb{S}}}/x] =_{\mathbb{T}} t'[\overline{s'_y^{\mathbb{S}}}/x]$ . We reason

$$\begin{aligned}
t[\overline{s_x^{\mathbb{S}}}/x] &=_{\mathbb{T}} t[\overline{s_{h(x)}^*}/x] && \text{by (ii)} \\
&=_{\mathbb{T}} t[h][\overline{s_z^*}/z] \\
&=_{\mathbb{T}} t'[h'][\overline{s_z^*}/z] && \text{by (i)} \\
&=_{\mathbb{T}} t'[\overline{s_{h'(y)}^*}/y] \\
&=_{\mathbb{T}} t'[\overline{s'_y^{\mathbb{S}}}/y] && \text{by (iii)}
\end{aligned}$$

**1  $\Rightarrow$  2:** We suppose that  $t[\overline{s_x^{\mathbb{S}}}/x] =_{\mathbb{T}} t'[\overline{s'_y^{\mathbb{S}}}/x]$  and prove Item (I) above. Taking  $Z := S\mathcal{V}$  and  $h : x \mapsto \overline{s_x^{\mathbb{S}}}$ , and  $h' : x \mapsto \overline{s'_x^{\mathbb{S}}}$ , (a) holds immediately. We check (b): if  $h(x_1) = h(x_2)$ , it means  $\overline{s_{x_1}^{\mathbb{S}}} = \overline{s_{x_2}^{\mathbb{S}}}$ , i.e.,  $s_{x_1} =_{\mathbb{S}} s_{x_2}$ . The reasoning for (c) and (d) is the same.  $\square$

### 8.4 Proofs of Section 4

**Lemma 52.**  $(TS, \eta^{TS} := \eta^T \eta^S, \mu^{TS})$  is a monad.

*Proof of Lemma 52.* Note that by definition of  $\phi$ , the unit  $\eta^{TS} := \eta^T \eta^S$  is the same as  $\phi \cdot \eta^U$ , as both send a variable  $v$  to  $\overline{\overline{v^T}}$ .

We prove the first of the three monad axioms.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^{TS} \cdot TS\eta^{TS} &= (\phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi\psi) \cdot (TS\phi \cdot TS\eta^U) && \text{def. } \mu^{TS} \text{ and } \eta^{TS} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi U \cdot TS\psi \cdot TS\phi \cdot TS\eta^U && \text{horizontal composition} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi U \cdot TS\eta^U && \phi, \psi \text{ inverses} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot U\eta^U \cdot \psi && \phi \text{ naturality} \\
&= \phi \cdot \psi && \text{unit axiom (1) for } U \\
&= \text{id} && \phi, \psi \text{ inverses}
\end{aligned}$$

The second axiom is proven similarly to the first one:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^{TS} \cdot \eta^{TS} TS &= (\phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi\psi) \cdot (\phi TS \cdot \eta^U TS) && \text{def. } \mu^{TS} \text{ and } \eta^{TS} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot U\psi \cdot \psi TS \cdot \phi TS \cdot \eta^U TS && \text{vertical composition} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot U\psi \cdot \eta^U TS && \phi, \psi \text{ inverses} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \eta^U U \cdot \psi && \eta^U \text{ naturality} \\
&= \phi \cdot \psi && \text{unit axiom (1) for } U \\
&= \text{id} && \phi, \psi \text{ inverses}
\end{aligned}$$

The third axiom is also just finding back the same axiom for  $U$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^{TS} TS \cdot \mu^{TS} &= (\phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi\psi) \cdot (TS\phi \cdot TS\mu^U \cdot TS\psi\psi) && \text{def. } \mu^{TS} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi U \cdot TS\psi \cdot TS\phi \cdot TS\mu^U \cdot TS\psi\psi && \text{vert. composition} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi U \cdot TS\mu^U \cdot TS\psi\psi && \phi, \psi \text{ inverses} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot U\mu^U \cdot \psi UU \cdot TS\psi\psi && \psi \text{ naturality} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \mu^U U \cdot \psi UU \cdot TS\psi\psi && \text{mult. axiom (4) for } U \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \mu^U U \cdot \psi\psi\psi && \text{vertical composition} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \mu^U U \cdot UU\psi \cdot \psi\psi TS && \text{vertical composition} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot U\psi \cdot \mu^U TS \cdot \psi\psi TS && \mu^U \text{ naturality} \\
&= (\phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot U\psi \cdot \psi TS) \cdot (\phi TS \cdot \mu^U TS \cdot \psi\psi TS) && \phi, \psi \text{ inverses} \\
&= \mu^{TS} \cdot \mu^{TS} TS && \text{def. } \mu^{TS}
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 53.** The nat. transformations  $\eta^T S$  and  $T\eta^S$  are monad morphisms. ■



*Proof of Lemma 53.* We show  $\eta^T S : S \Rightarrow TS$  is a monad morphism. The proof for  $T\eta^S$  is then analogous. There are two axioms to prove. The first one (3),  $\eta^T S \cdot \eta^T = \eta^{TS}$  is immediate, as both sides simply send a variable  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  to  $\overline{v}^{\mathfrak{S}}$ . The second one (4) is  $\mu^{TS} \cdot (\eta^T S)(\eta^T S) = \eta^T S \cdot \mu^S$ . Given any  $s[\overline{s_x}/x]$  in  $SS\mathcal{V}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu^{TS} \cdot (\eta^T S)(\eta^T S))(\overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}}) &= \mu^{TS}(\overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}}) && \eta^T S \text{ twice} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi\psi(\overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}}) && \text{def. } \mu^{TS} \text{ (18)} \\
&= \phi \cdot \mu^U(\overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{U}}) && \text{def. } \psi \text{ (17)} \\
&= \phi(\overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{U}}) && \text{applying multiplication} \\
&= \overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}} && \text{def. } \phi \text{ (16)} \\
&= \eta^T S(\overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}}) \\
&= (\eta^T S \cdot \mu^S)(\overline{s[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}}) && \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 54.** *The middle unitary law holds:  $\mu^{TS} \cdot T\eta^S\eta^T S = Id_{TS}$ .* ■

*Proof of Lemma 54.* Let  $\overline{t[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{T}}$  be any element of  $TS\mathcal{V}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu^{TS} \cdot T\eta^S\eta^T S)(\overline{t[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{T}}) &= \mu^{TS}(\overline{t[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{S}}) && \text{applying units} \\
&= (\phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi\psi)(\overline{t[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{T}\mathfrak{S}}) && \text{def. } \mu^{TS} \text{ (18)} \\
&= (\phi \cdot \mu^U)(\overline{t[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{U}}) && \text{def. } \psi \text{ (17)} \\
&= \phi(\overline{t[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{U}}) && \text{applying multiplication} \\
&= \overline{t[\overline{s_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{T}} && \text{def. } \phi \text{ (16)}
\end{aligned}$$

□


*End of proof of Theorem 23.* We show that  $\lambda = \mu^{TS} \cdot \eta^T ST\eta^S$  give the expression in the statement of the theorem. Let  $\overline{s[\overline{t_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}}$  be any element of  $ST\mathcal{V}$ , and  $t'[s'_x/x]$  be a separated term such that  $t'[s'_x/x] = \cup s[t_x/x]$  then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(\overline{s[\overline{t_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}}) &= (\mu^{TS} \cdot \eta^T ST\eta^S)(\overline{s[\overline{t_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}}) && \text{def. } \lambda \\
&= \mu^{TS}(\overline{s[\overline{t_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}}) && \text{applying units} \\
&= (\phi \cdot \mu^U \cdot \psi\psi)(\overline{s[\overline{t_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}}) && \text{def. } \mu^{TS} \text{ (18)} \\
&= (\phi \cdot \mu^U)(\overline{s[\overline{t_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{U}}) && \text{def. } \psi \text{ (17)} \\
&= \phi(\overline{s[\overline{t_x}/x]}^{\mathfrak{U}}) && \text{applying multiplication} \\
&= \overline{t'[s'_x/x]}^{\mathfrak{T}} && \text{def. } \phi \text{ (16)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

### 8.5 Proofs of Section 5

*Proof of Lemma 32.* The proof is identical to (ii) in [34, Theorem 1.2.1]. We prove by well-founded induction that for all term-functor  $A$ , we have  $\text{CR}\circlearrowleft(A)$  by showing that if all its descendent have  $\text{CR}\circlearrowleft$ , then  $A$  must have it too. The I.H. is that all proper descendants satisfy  $\text{CR}\circlearrowleft$ . Take  $C \leftarrow A \rightarrow B$ . The cases where one side is a 0-step are immediate. Otherwise, the reasoning can be summarized in one diagram, confluence is obtained with common reduct  $D_3$ , and the diagram commutes:  $\square$



*Proof of Lemma 33.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Suppose  $\text{WCR}\circlearrowleft$ . A critical pair is a one-step peak. By  $\text{WCR}\circlearrowleft$ , both reducts must have a common descendent, with the diagram commuting.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Take a peak  $T_0 \xleftarrow{S_0} T \xrightarrow{S_1} T_1$  with  $S_0 = L_0F$  with rule  $\rho_0 = (L_0 \rightarrow R_0)$  and substitution  $F$ , and  $S_1 = L_1G$  with rule  $\rho_1 = (L_1 \rightarrow R_1)$  and substitution  $G$ . The notation is usually with lowercase letters and lowercase Greek letters  $l_0\sigma$  and  $l_1\tau$ , but we choose for clarity to write functors as uppercase and natural transformations as lowercase. Indeed, if we write the variable at the end of our terms that is usually omitted in string rewriting we have  $l_0(\sigma(x))$  and the substitution  $\sigma(x)$  gives a term of rewriting system, i.e., a functor and thus we prefer to denote it as an uppercase letter, here  $F$ .

By [34, Def. 2.1.5 and Lem. 2.7.6], the redex occurrences  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  can be either *disjoint* (i.e., parallel positions), *nested* or *overlapped*. With only unary operations, the disjoint case is not possible in string rewriting systems.

- Suppose  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  are nested. Suppose w.l.o.g. that  $S_1$  is a subterm of  $S_0$ . Let  $C[\ ]$  be the context of  $S_0$  in  $T$ , i.e.,  $T = C[S_0] = C[L_0F]$ . We adopt the categorical convention of not writing parentheses or brackets when not needed, thus writing  $T = CL_0F$ . Since there is no overlap, the redex  $S_1$  occurs inside the term  $F$ . In other words,  $F = ES_1 = EL_1G$  for some context  $E$ . Observe that  $CR_0ER_1G$  is a common reduct and that the diagram commutes by naturality of  $\rho_0$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 T = CS_0 = CL_0EL_1G & \xrightarrow{CL_0E\rho_1G} & T_1 = CL_0ER_1G & & \\
 C\rho_0EL_1G \downarrow & & C(\rho_0 \text{ nat.}) & & \downarrow C\rho_0ER_1G \\
 T_0 = CR_0EL_1G & \xrightarrow{CR_0E\rho_1G} & CR_0ER_1G & & 
 \end{array}$$

- Suppose  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  overlap. Denote again  $C$  the context of  $S_0$  in  $T$  and  $S'_0$  and  $S'_1$  their respective contracta. If the overlap is trivial  $S_0 = S_1$  and  $\rho_0 = \rho_1$ , then

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 CS_0 = CS_1 & \xrightarrow{C\rho_1} & CS'_1 \\
 C\rho_0 \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \parallel \\
 CS'_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & CS'_0
 \end{array}$$

Suppose the overlap non-trivial, and w.l.o.g.  $S_1 \leq S_0$ . By [34, Lemma 2.7.12], the contracta  $S'_0, S'_1$  can be found as instances  $\langle H_0P, H_1P \rangle$  of a critical pair  $\langle H_0, H_1 \rangle$ . By hypothesis, the critical pair converge with a commuting diagram. Thus by applying  $C \circ - \circ \rho$  around, we have what we desire.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \xrightarrow{\beta} & H_1 \\ \alpha \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow \exists \gamma \\ H_0 & \xrightarrow{\exists \delta} & H_2 \end{array} \Rightarrow \begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \xrightarrow{C\beta P} & T_1 = CH_1P \\ C\alpha P \downarrow & \circlearrowleft & \downarrow C\gamma P \\ T_0 = CH_0P & \xrightarrow{C\delta P} & CH_2P \end{array}$$

□

*Proof of the missing cases of Lemma 38.* – Axiom: We distinguish when the axiom is taken in  $E_{\mathbb{S}}$ ,  $E_{\mathbb{T}}$  or  $E_{\lambda}$ :

- For  $(s_1, s_2) \in E_{\mathbb{S}}$ , by Lemma 37, we have  $\text{sep}(s_1) =_{\mathbb{S}} s_1 =_{\mathbb{S}} s_2 =_{\mathbb{S}} \text{sep}(s_2)$ , and hence  $\text{sep}(s_1) =_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}} \text{sep}(s_2)$ .
  - For  $(t_1, t_2) \in E_{\mathbb{T}}$ , there is no  $\mathbb{S}$ -part and, similarly to the previous point, we obtain  $\text{sep}(t_1) =_{\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T}} \text{sep}(t_2)$ .
  - For  $(s[t_x], t[s_y]) \in E_{\lambda}$ , then  $\lambda(\overline{s[t_x]}) = \overline{t[s_y]}$ . We already have a path  $\lambda$  from  $\text{type}(s[t_x]) = ST\mathcal{V}$  to the normal form  $TS\mathcal{V}$ . Therefore  $\overline{t[s_y]}$ , and the  $TS$ -equivalence classes of  $\text{sep}(s[t_x])$  and  $\text{sep}(t[s_y])$  must be equal by well-definedness of  $\text{sep}$ . In particular,  $\text{sep}(s[t_x])$  and  $\text{sep}(t[s_y])$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ .
- Reflexivity:  $\overline{u = u}$  Immediate, since  $\text{sep}(u)$  is equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  to itself.
- Symmetry:  $\frac{u_1 = u_2}{u_2 = u_1}$  The IH is that  $\text{sep}(u_1)$  and  $\text{sep}(u_2)$  are equal modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$ , which is what we desire.
- Transitivity:  $\frac{u_1 = u_2 \quad u_2 = u_3}{u_1 = u_3}$  Immediate from the IH, since equality modulo  $(\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{T})$  is transitive (visible using Proposition 20).

□

*Proof of Theorem 39.* Recall that the category of Eilenberg-Moore  $TS$ -algebras is concretely isomorphic to the category of  $\lambda$ -algebras, i.e.,  $\mathbf{EM}(TS) \cong_{\text{conc}} \mathbf{Alg}(\lambda)$ . To finish the proof, it suffices to show that  $\mathbf{Alg}(\lambda) \cong_{\text{conc}} \mathbf{Alg}(\mathbb{U}^\lambda)$ .

Our hypothesis that  $S$  and  $T$  are free algebra monads mean:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{EM}(S) \cong_{\text{conc}} \mathbf{Alg}(\mathbb{S}) & & \mathbf{EM}(T) \cong_{\text{conc}} \mathbf{Alg}(\mathbb{T}) \\ (\sigma : SX \rightarrow X) \mapsto (X, [\cdot]^\sigma) & & (\tau : TX \rightarrow X) \mapsto (X, [\cdot]^\tau) \\ (\sigma_{[\cdot]} : SX \rightarrow X) \leftarrow (X, [\cdot]) & & (\tau_{[\cdot]} : TX \rightarrow X) \leftarrow (X, [\cdot]) \end{array} \quad (20)$$

where  $[\cdot]^\sigma := \sigma(\overline{s})$ ,  $\sigma_{[\cdot]}(\overline{s}) := [s]$ ,  $[\cdot]^\tau := \tau(\overline{t})$ , and  $\tau_{[\cdot]}(\overline{t}) := [t]$ .

We construct mappings  $F : \mathbf{Alg}(\lambda) \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Alg}(\mathbb{U}^\lambda) : G$ . Let  $F$  and  $G$  be the identity on morphisms. On objects let  $G(X, [\cdot]) := (X, \sigma_{[\cdot]}, \tau_{[\cdot]})$ , where  $\sigma_{[\cdot]}$  and  $\tau_{[\cdot]}$  are defined as in (20), and let  $F(X, \sigma, \tau) := (X, [\cdot]^{\sigma\tau})$ , where  $[\cdot]^{\sigma\tau} := [\cdot]^\sigma \cup [\cdot]^\tau$ .

Let us show that  $F$  is a functor. We suppose that  $(X, \sigma, \tau)$  is a  $\lambda$ -algebra, i.e., the pentagon from Definition 6 commutes. We show that  $(X, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{\sigma\tau})$  is a  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -algebra. The interpretation  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^{\sigma\tau}$  satisfies the equations in  $E_{\mathbb{S}}$  and  $E_{\mathbb{T}}$  because respectively  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^\sigma$  and  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket^\tau$  do so. Moreover, any equation  $(s[t_x], t[s_y])$  in  $E_\lambda$  is also satisfied:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\overline{s[t_x]}^{\mathbb{S}} \in ST\mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \overline{t[s_y]}^{\mathbb{T}} \in TS\mathcal{V} \\
\downarrow S\tau & & \downarrow T\sigma \\
\overline{s[\tau(t_x)]}^{\mathbb{S}} \stackrel{(20)}{=} \overline{s[\llbracket t_x \rrbracket^\tau]}^{\mathbb{S}} \in S\mathcal{V} & & \overline{t[\sigma(s_y)]}^{\mathbb{T}} \stackrel{(20)}{=} \overline{t[\llbracket s_y \rrbracket^\sigma]}^{\mathbb{T}} \in T\mathcal{V} \\
& \searrow \sigma & \swarrow \tau \\
\llbracket s[\llbracket t_x \rrbracket^\tau] \rrbracket^\sigma = \llbracket s[t_x] \rrbracket^{\sigma\tau} & = & \llbracket t[s_y] \rrbracket^{\sigma\tau} = \llbracket t[\llbracket s_y \rrbracket^\sigma] \rrbracket^\tau
\end{array}$$

Let us show that  $G$  is a functor. We suppose that  $(X, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket)$  is a  $\mathbb{U}^\lambda$ -algebra, i.e.,  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  satisfies all equations in  $E_{\mathbb{S}} \cup E_{\mathbb{T}} \cup E_\lambda$ . We show that  $(X, \sigma_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket}, \tau_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket})$  is a  $\lambda$ -algebra. Take some  $\overline{s[t_x]}^{\mathbb{S}} \in ST\mathcal{V}$  and let  $\overline{t[s_y]}^{\mathbb{T}} \in TS\mathcal{V}$  be its image through  $\lambda$ . Thus  $(s[t_x], t[s_y])$  is an equation in  $E_\lambda$  which must be satisfied by  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ , hence the pentagon necessarily commutes on input  $\overline{s[t_x]}^{\mathbb{S}} \in ST\mathcal{V}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\overline{s[t_x]}^{\mathbb{S}} \in ST\mathcal{V} & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \overline{t[s_y]}^{\mathbb{T}} \in TS\mathcal{V} \\
\downarrow S\tau_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket} & & \downarrow T\sigma_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket} \\
\overline{s[\tau_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket}(t_x)]}^{\mathbb{S}} \stackrel{(20)}{=} \overline{s[\llbracket t_x \rrbracket]}^{\mathbb{S}} \in S\mathcal{V} & & \overline{t[\sigma_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket}(s_y)]}^{\mathbb{T}} \stackrel{(20)}{=} \overline{t[\llbracket s_y \rrbracket]}^{\mathbb{T}} \in T\mathcal{V} \\
& \searrow \sigma_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket} & \swarrow \tau_{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket} \\
\llbracket s[\llbracket t_x \rrbracket] \rrbracket = \llbracket s[t_x] \rrbracket & = & \llbracket t[s_y] \rrbracket = \llbracket t[\llbracket s_y \rrbracket] \rrbracket
\end{array}$$

To finish the proof, simply notice that  $F$  and  $G$  are inverses because they use the inverse constructions from (20).  $\square$

## 8.6 Extra section 6

*Proof of Lemma 45.* We will denote symbols in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}$  by  $f, f', \dots$  and symbols in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$  by  $g, g', \dots$ . We will establish termination using the multiset path order (see [18] or Definition 50) where all  $f, f' \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}$  are equivalent  $f \approx f'$ , all  $g, g' \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$  are equivalent  $g \approx g'$ , and all  $\mathbb{S}$ -symbols are greater than  $\mathbb{T}$ -symbols  $f > g$ . The goal is to show that  $R \subseteq \succ$ .

Consider  $s[t_x/x] \rightarrow t[s_y/y] \in R$ . We use induction on the structure of  $t$ :

- (i) For  $t[s_y/y]$  being a variable, we obtain  $s[t_x/x] \succ t[s_y/y]$  by repeated application of case 1. of Definition 50.
- (ii) For  $t$  being a variable  $y$  and  $s_y = f'(z_1, \dots, z_k)$ , then we are in case 2.ii. of Definition 50:
  - We have indeed  $f \approx f'$ .
  - For  $s = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , we also have  $\langle t_1, \dots, t_n \rangle \succ_{\mathcal{M}} \langle z_1, \dots, z_k \rangle$ . Consider  $z_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Since  $z_i$  is a variable, it must appear in some  $t_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . If  $t_j$  is a variable, then  $z_i = t_j$  and  $z_i$  appears only once in  $\langle z_1, \dots, z_k \rangle$  because  $s_z$  is linear in  $t_j$ . If  $t_j$  is not a variable, we have

- $t_j \succ z_i$  by repeated application of case 1. of Definition 50. Finally, at least one  $t_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m$  is not a variable (and thus replaced by 0 or more smaller elements).
- (iii) For  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ , we are in case 2.i. of Definition 50. We have  $s[t_x/x] \succ t_i[s_y/y]$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , by IH, and  $f > g$  by hypothesis.  $\square$

**Lemma 55.** *Let  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  be two algebraic theories. Let  $R$  be a set of rules of the form  $s[t_x/x] \rightarrow t[s_y/y]$ . Suppose each  $s[t_x/x]$  has layers  $(1, 1)$  and each  $t[s_y/y]$  has layers  $(1, n)$  for some  $n$  not fixed, and is linear. Then  $R$  is terminating.*

*Proof.* We show termination using dependency pairs [2, 15]. We therefore extend our signature by adding a marked version  $h_\#$  of each symbol  $h \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}} \uplus \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ . For terms  $t = h(\vec{u})$  we write  $t_\#$  for the term  $h_\#(\vec{u})$  obtained by marking the root symbol of  $t$ . We will denote symbols in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}$  by  $f, f', \dots$  and symbols in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$  by  $g, g', \dots$ .

The dependency pairs here are

$$\text{DP}(R) = \{ f_\#(\vec{t}) \rightarrow s'_\# \mid f(\vec{t}) \rightarrow g(s_1, \dots, s_q) \in R, \\ s'_i \text{ is a non-variable subterm of } s_i \text{ for some } i = 1, \dots, q \}.$$

We use the following polynomial interpretation with

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket f_\# \rrbracket(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \llbracket f \rrbracket(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_1 + \dots + x_n \\ \llbracket g_\# \rrbracket(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= \llbracket g \rrbracket(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_1 + \dots + x_n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

for all  $f \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{S}}$  and  $g \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ . This interpretation simply counts symbols in  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ . Then  $R \subseteq \geq$  since the rules  $s[t_x/x] \rightarrow t[s_y/y]$  contain at least 1  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ -symbol in  $s[t_x/x]$  (not all  $t_x$  are variables), only one  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ -symbol in  $t[s_y/y]$ , and the rules are non-duplicating. Similarly  $\text{DP}(R) \subseteq >$  since their right-hand sides contain no  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ -symbol.  $\square$

## 8.7 Identifying derivable equations using Prover 9

The ring axioms given as follows,

$$E_{\text{Mon}} := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z), \\ 1 \cdot x = x, \\ x \cdot 1 = x \end{array} \right\}, \quad E_{\text{AbGrp}} := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x + y) + z = x + (y + z), \\ x + (-x) = 0, \\ x + y = y + x, \\ x + 0 = x \end{array} \right\},$$

$$E_{\text{Ring}} := E_{\text{Mon}} \uplus E_{\text{AbGrp}} \uplus \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x \cdot (y + z) = (x \cdot y) + (x \cdot z), \\ (y + z) \cdot x = (y \cdot x) + (z \cdot x) \end{array} \right\},$$

imply the following equalities

$$x \cdot 0 = 0 \quad 0 \cdot x = 0 \quad (-x) \cdot y = -(x \cdot y) \quad x \cdot (-y) = -(x \cdot y)$$

This can be proven automatically by Prover9 [26] using the following input:

```

assign(max_seconds, 30).

formulas(sos).

  (x * y) * z = x * (y * z) # label(times_associativity).
  1 * x = x # label(times_neutral_left).
  x * 1 = x # label(times_neutral_right).

  (x + y) + z = x + (y + z) # label(plus_associativity).
  x + (-x) = 0 # label(plus_inverse).
  x + y = y + x # label(plus_commutativity).
  x + 0 = x # label(plus_neutral).

  (x + y) * z = (x * z) + (y * z) # label(distributivity_right).
  z * (x + y) = (z * x) + (z * y) # label(distributivity_left).

end_of_list.

set(restrict_denials).

formulas(goals).

  x * 0 = 0 # answer(times_zero_right).
  0 * x = 0 # answer(times_zero_left).
  (-x) * y = -(x * y) # answer(times_minus_left).
  x * (-y) = -(x * y) # answer(times_minus_right).

end_of_list.

Prover9 only needs a fraction of a second to proof all 4 equations:
----- Proof 1 ----- times_zero_left.
----- Proof 2 ----- times_zero_right.
----- Proof 3 ----- times_minus_left.
----- Proof 4 ----- times_minus_right.

```

THEOREM PROVED