

Container Morphisms for Composable Interactive Systems

André Videla

University of Strathclyde andre.videla@strath.ac.uk

Abstract. This paper provides a mathematical framework for client-server communication that results in a modular and type-safe architecture. It is informed and motivated by the software engineering practice of developing server backends with a database layer and a frontend, all of which communicate with a notion of request/response. I make use of dependent types to ensure the request/response relation matches and show how this idea fits in the broader context of containers and their morphisms. Using the category of containers and their monoidal products, I define monads on containers that mimic their functional programming counterparts, and using the Kleene star, I describe stateful protocols in the same system.

Keywords: API · Dependent types · Category of containers · Databases · Lenses · HTTP webserver

1 Introduction

There is a plethora of tools to write server backends (Ruby on Rails, Django, NodeJS), but those libraries do not draw from existing mathematical theories, such as the pi-calculus or other process calculi, and therefore, do not enjoy a common understanding driving their design. As a result, there is no overarching story around combining them together.




Fig. 1: A binary client-server model, events read clockwise.

Dually, servers await requests and provide responses to the client. What this picture does not tell us is how those requests and responses get further processed by each end. The lack of treatment for subsequent processing of request

To work towards an implementable theory that explains what they share and how their common parts enable them to be combined, I present a revised view of client-server communication that I contrast with a more “traditional” view of client-server interactions, characterised by being binary (fig 1). Indeed, in the binary view, clients send requests and expect matching responses from those

or response renders the binary model fundamentally *uncompositional*. A compositional framework should not only explain client-server communication but also handle hidden protocols within clients and servers, for example, a server calling another one as part of its core functionality.





Fig. 2: An illustration of my revised compositional client-server view. Each color represents a different piece of software, each boundary between colors represents a protocol with messages and responses. The lifecycle of a single interaction can be read clockwise starting from the *UI*.

Figure 2 shows a simplified example of the interaction model I explore here, where events emerge from a client, then are sent through multiple layers of software, and finally a response is produced. In this revised view of client-server communication, the focus is on the interface between multiple systems that communicate via different protocols. For a web application, the protocol is HTTP and the interface is a list of endpoints, traditionally called the “Application Programming Interface” or API. The server itself communicates with a database, the protocol is SQL, and the interface is the language of valid SQL queries.

My claim is that containers and their morphisms [7] accurately describe multi-tier applications like the one pictured in Figure 2. Containers themselves describe the allowed request-response patterns between components. Morphisms between containers describe how requests at one layer are translated to requests at the next, and moreover how matching responses are translated back. We shall see how containers’ ability to express the dependency of allowed responses on requests means that we can not only construct rich APIs but also describe in detail the implementation of those APIs in terms of other APIs. We shall see how the structure of the category of containers plays an important role in guiding us toward reusable abstractions 4. I have implemented this framework in Idris, which means that anyone can compile and run those programs. To demonstrate the expressiveness of the framework I construct an example To-do list application in Section 3.1 and implement an API to write files in a contemporary operating system in Section 3.2. Additionally, category theory offers the means to talk about Kleisli composition, monads, and comonads, which are primordial tools to compose effectful programs.

1.1 Contributions

My contributions are as follows:

1. I provide a new interpretation of containers as APIs, or “process boundaries”, and their morphisms as API-transformers.
2. I give a notion of session via the Kleene star on containers 14, and a notion of monadic computing 7.
3. For the above structure, I give mechanised proofs for their properties. They are accessible via the  icon. For the proofs, I use Idris2 [13,14] not only because it is an implementation of dependent type theory [23] but also because it provides bindings to common software libraries such as NodeJS, SQLite, and more.
4. I employ this model by building a to-do app using the same definitions as the ones used for proofs. This approach results in a correct-by-construction running executable with the expected functionality. As an example of a stateful API, I show how to replicate the interaction model of a filesystem.

1.2 Related Work

The work by Hancock and Setzer [22] showed us how to do effectful programming using containers and dependent types. Their approach centers on writing a program *within* a container, representing trees of potential interaction paths (what they call a “world”), rather than *between* containers. As we will see later 14, programs whose specification is given by a container do occur, and Hancock and Setzer’s IO Trees could be used for that. However, they won’t be the focus of this work. Hancock and Hyvernat [21] worked on a category of interfaces between processes but studied in the context of topology rather than application development.

In the work from Abbot, Altenkirch, Ghani, and McBride [9,7,8], they use containers to describe data structures, and operations on those data structures. In it, containers are defined by a set of shapes and a set of positions indexed by the shapes. I will use this terminology when referencing containers outside of the request/response semantics I present here.

The mathematical tools used here are very similar to the ones used by the applied category theory community. This work fits in the same family, however, the semantics are established in the software engineering practice of full-stack application development, rather than compositional game theory, machine learning, or cybernetics. Bolt et al. employ the category of lawless *lenses*, for game theory [12] and Capucci et al. use it for cybernetics [15].

request : Type
response : request \rightarrow Type

(a) Our interpretation of the interface of an interactive system.

response : Type
request : response \rightarrow Type

(b) Spivak and Niu’s interpretation of the interface for a dynamical system.

Spivak and his team focus on the category *Poly*, the category of Polynomial Functors and natural transformations between them, which is equivalent to our category of containers. They also use it for cybernetics/dynamical systems [24] as well as machine learning [19].

The biggest difference with their work on Poly lies in how we interpret containers as a type for requests/responses. What they consider responses, I think of as requests and their notion of request is a notion of response here, the relationship is flipped.

The container morphisms presented here have a structure very similar to lenses as data accessors for records. So much so that they could be conceptualised as *dependent lenses*, although they do not provide access to a data structure. Instead, these morphisms move between process boundaries, acting more like *process accessors*, that grant access to a *program*, rather than a data structure. The previous work related to the category of lenses [16] shows that lenses take part in software development as functional data accessors for databases [11] and data definitions [18,25,20]. This versatility suggests that we could reuse the data accessor aspect in this work, however, I will exclusively talk about processes and leave the integration for future work.

The industry has produced a number of solutions to the problem described here. Among those, we count the OpenAPI standard [1], GraphQL [2], Typespec [6], Protobuf [5], and more. These tools aim to simplify the task of writing client-server software by providing a unique source of truth and relying on code generation to provide implementations for both a client and a server. Similarly, libraries based on Object-Relational Mappings (ORMs ¹), like Django [3] or GORM [4], offer a way to unify the database model and the data structure of the program, removing the API barrier between the server code, and the database. These tools achieve a small part of this work, to ease the communication between binary processes. However, they do not say anything about the software that fits in between the interfaces they describe. What is more, because we do not have a formal definition of “interface” we cannot easily talk about the compatibility between those systems. A compositional framework ought to tell us in which way two interfaces are incompatible and what is missing to make them compatible.

My goal here is to advance the state of the art by proposing a unifying theory that describes composed systems interfacing with each other using different protocols. Additionally, this theory needs to be usable in the context of a programming language to write those systems, rather than purely describe them.

2 Containers & APIs

The drive for this paper is the idea that containers are request/response pairs. These request/response pairs can be conceptualised as the Application Program-

¹ Object-relational mapping, Wikipedia:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Object%E2%80%93relational_mapping

ming Interface² (API) of a given program. An API gives you what a program can expect as inputs and what output to expect for a given input. For example, a C header file defines the API of a C library, a list of endpoints defines the API of a microservice, etc. In what follows, I introduce the primary tool for API description and manipulation: the category of containers. I will not provide an introduction to category theory and will make use of functors, monads, comonads, and natural transformations³.

2.1 The category of containers

Containers form a category, and their morphisms allow to map from one container to another, in the interpretation of containers as APIs, morphisms are *API transformers*.

Definition 1 (⚙️). *A container consists of a type of requests, or queries $a : \mathbf{Type}$ and a type family of responses, or results $a' : a \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$.*

I write $(x : a \triangleright a' x)$ to build the container with types $a : \mathbf{Type}$ and $a' : a \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$. When I use a built-in type without a binder like $(\mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String})$ I mean that the second argument is *not* indexed by the first, it is equivalent to $(x : \mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String})$. I write \mathbf{Type} for the category of types and functions.

Definition 2 (⚙️). *Given two containers $a \triangleright a'$, $b \triangleright b'$, a container morphism $f \triangleleft f' : a \triangleright a' \rightarrow b \triangleright b'$ consists of a function $f : a \rightarrow b$ mapping requests to requests, and a family of functions $f' : \forall (x : a). b'(f x) \rightarrow a' x$ mapping responses in the codomain to responses in the domain.*

Intuition. If the domain of the morphism is the "surface-level" API and the codomain is the "underlying" API, then a morphism converts surface-level requests to underlying API requests. Additionally, it converts responses from the underlying API back into responses that the surface-level API exposes.

Because the second map of a morphism goes in the opposite direction as the first, I refer to the map on requests as the *forward part* of the morphism, and the map on responses as the *backward part* of the morphism, a terminology borrowed from lenses. In the rest of the paper, I use the terms *API transformer*, *container morphism*, and *lens*, interchangeably, and follow the naming convention of the related work.

We can develop the idea by studying an example. Let us imagine a web server with a client sending HTTP requests, and the server returning HTTP responses. We can define this API as the container:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HTTP} &: \text{Container} \\ \text{HTTP} &= (r : \text{HTTPRequest} \triangleright \text{HTTPResponse } r) \end{aligned}$$

² What is an API? by IBM: <https://www.ibm.com/topics/api>

³ Resources for learning category theory: <https://github.com/prathyvsh/category-theory-resources>

The implementation details of HTTP itself do not matter, we're only interested in providing the input/output relation here.

To implement such a server, we could provide a function ($r : \text{HTTPRequest} \triangleright \text{HTTPResponse}$ r) but this would be a very monolithic architecture. Instead, we can see a server as a *bidirectional program* built of multiple layers, one of which could be a translation layer between HTTP request/response to database query/response. If we assume there is a container to describe the API of a database we could describe our server as a morphism:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{DB} : \text{Container} & \text{Server} : \text{HTTP} \Rightarrow \text{DB} \\ \text{DB} = (q : \text{SQLQuery} \triangleright \text{SQLResponse } q) & \text{Server} = \dots \end{array}$$

Giving the implementation of a container morphism in one go still leads to a monolithic architecture. Instead, we would like to build larger servers from smaller reusable components. For this, we use the composition of container morphisms.

Definition 3 (⚙️). *Given two morphisms $q_1 \triangleleft r_1 : a \Rightarrow b$ and $q_2 \triangleleft r_2 : b \Rightarrow c$, the composition of container morphisms $(q_1 \triangleleft r_1); (q_2 \triangleleft r_2)$ is given by $q_2 \circ q_1 \triangleleft \lambda x. r_1(x) \circ r_2(q_1(x))$.*

Intuition. The main goal for composition is to translate requests from a surface-level API ($a \triangleright a'$) down to an underlying API ($c \triangleright c'$) *through* an intermediate layer ($b \triangleright b'$). This is achieved by function composition of the forward map. But the system also needs to *translate back* responses from the underlying API into the surface-level responses. This is why we need to compose the backward map in reverse, starting from the underlying responses c' we build responses back to the intermediate level b' then back to a' .

Remark. There are other valid notions of composition for containers, this one matches what we expect from our API-transformer semantics.

Using composition we can check that our structure is a category. The main benefit we get out of this is the insurance that the systems we build remain composable regardless of their complexity.

Proposition 4 (⚙️). *Containers form a category. Objects are containers 1, morphisms are container morphisms 2, composition is given by morphism composition 3, identity is given by the morphism $(id \triangleleft id)$.*

Proof. Because a container morphism is essentially a pair of morphisms in **Type** and in **Type^{op}** the laws hold by inheriting the laws from the underlying category.

When writing software, we often want to keep an internal representation of the data that we wish to work with. As an example, we can design a server architecture that works with an internal API ($x : \text{InternalQuery} \triangleright \text{InternalResponse } x$) and build the software around it. Using the composition of container morphisms we can attach morphisms to either end of this internal API to obtain different results, as we see in figure 4.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
CLI : (\mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String}) \Rightarrow \mathit{Internal} & CLIApp : (\mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String}) \Rightarrow \mathit{DB} \\
CLI = \dots & CLIApp = CLI; \mathit{toQuery} \\
\\
WEB : \mathit{HTTP} \Rightarrow \mathit{Internal} & WEBApp : \mathit{HTTP} \Rightarrow \mathit{DB} \\
WEB = \dots & WEBApp = WEB; \mathit{toQuery}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 4: Two applications with a reusable component $\mathit{toQuery} : \mathit{Internal} \Rightarrow \mathit{DB}$ and two different translation layers converting from different surface-level APIs

The domain and codomain of morphisms CLI or WEB in figure 4 are not particularly realistic since they never fail. In reality, parsing an HTTP request, or a string, can result in failure. So the API transformers need to model a potential failing translation as well.

2.2 The Maybe Monad on containers

Containers need to model the ability to fail or give partial results all while using total functions to remain within the realm of provably correct code. In the example of figure 4 the API transformer $(\mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String}) \Rightarrow \mathit{Internal}$ has a forward map that converts requests of type $\mathbf{String} \rightarrow \mathit{InternalQuery}$. But it is unlikely that every possible string of characters produces a valid query. Instead, we would like to represent the fact that only some strings result in a valid message with the function $\mathbf{String} \rightarrow \mathit{Maybe InternalQuery}$. This suggests that the morphism CLI should have the type:

$$\begin{array}{l}
CLI : (\mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String}) \Rightarrow (x : \mathit{Maybe InternalQuery} \triangleright \mathit{InternalResponse} \ x) \\
CLI = \dots
\end{array}$$

However, this does not typecheck because the $\mathit{InternalResponse}$ has type $\mathit{InternalQuery} \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ but we are supplying it a value wrapped around a Maybe . To fix this, we use the All unary relation on Maybe .

Definition 5 (⚙️).

Given a container $(q \triangleright r)$, we define
 $(m : \mathit{Maybe} \ q \triangleright All_r \ m)$ as the $\mathit{MaybeAll}$ map
on containers. With All defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\forall (p : a \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}) \\
All \ (Just \ x) \mapsto p \ x \\
All \ Nothing \mapsto \top
\end{array}$$

Where \top is the terminal object in \mathbf{Type} with constructor $()$. Using definition 5, we can write the type of the CLI' morphism as $(\mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String}) \Rightarrow \mathit{MaybeAll} \ \mathit{Internal}$.

This starts to look like good old functional programming with a maybe monad [27]. In fact, it is a monad in the category of containers:

Proposition 6 (⚙️). $\mathit{MaybeAll}$ is a functor in containers.

Proof. Using definition 5 as the map on objects, we define the map on morphisms: $(f \triangleleft f') \mapsto (\text{map } f \triangleleft \text{mapAll } f')$ Where map is the standard map from the *Maybe* type and mapAll is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mapAll} &: (\forall x.p(f \ x) \rightarrow q \ x) \rightarrow (x : \text{Maybe } a) \rightarrow \text{All}_p(\text{map } f \ x) \rightarrow \text{All}_q \ x \\ \text{mapAll } f' \ (\text{Just } x) \ v &= f' \ v \\ \text{mapAll } f' \ \text{Nothing } () &= () \end{aligned}$$

The proof is given in appendix A

Proposition 7 (⚙️). *MaybeAll is a monad in Cont.*

Proof. We inherit the tools we need from the fact that *Maybe* is a monad in **Type**, with the *unit* morphism given by $(\text{Just} \triangleleft \text{id})$ and the *join* by $(\text{join} \triangleleft \text{id})$. By relying on the underlying *Maybe* monad we ensure *unit* behaves as an identity for *join* and that *join* is associative. The identity in the backward map is one thanks to pattern matching on the index.

In the category of types and functions, we have that $\text{Maybe } x \approx 1 + x$ Naturally, one might ask whether this fact is also true in the category of containers. To check this, we first need to define the coproduct on containers.

Definition 8 (⚙️). $\forall a', b'.$
 Given two containers $(a \triangleright a')$ and $(b \triangleright b')$, the *choice* $(\text{inl } x) \mapsto a' \ x$
 coproduct is given by $(x : a + b \triangleright \text{choice } x).$ *choice* $(\text{inr } x) \mapsto b' \ x$

Intuition. The coproduct of two containers can be understood as building an API that accepts requests from either **a** or **b** and returns the corresponding answer. The *choice* eliminator computes the return type depending on what request was sent. If the request was of type *a*, then the response should be of type *a'*, and similarly with *b*. If the response was not dependent in this way we could be receiving responses of type *b'* after having sent a request of type *a*. We want to avoid that.

Equipped with the coproduct, we can ask if there is an equivalent to the isomorphism $\text{Maybe } x \approx 1 + x$ in **Type**. Indeed, there is if we define **1** in containers by $(\top \triangleright \top)$:

Proposition 9 (⚙️). *MaybeAll x is Isomorphic to 1 + x*

Proof. We need two isomorphisms, one for the forward part, and one for the backward part, the forward isomorphism is given by the known functional programming result that $\text{Maybe } x \cong \text{Either } \top \ x$. For the backward part, we need to prove the isomorphism between $\forall(m : \text{Maybe } x).\text{Any } x' \ m$ and $\forall(e : \top + x).\text{choice } \perp \ x' \ e$. For the backward part, we need to pattern match on the index to find out how the type changes. In the *Just v/inr v* case, the type is $x' \ v$ in both cases, when the index is *Nothing/inl ()*, the type is \top in both cases.

This indicates that our previous intuition about types and functions does translate to containers and their morphisms. Including features such as the diagonal map, which collapses two identical choices into one.

Definition 10 (⚙️). *The diagonal map $a + a \Rightarrow a$ is given by the morphism $dia \triangleleft id$ where dia is the diagonal on the coproduct in **Type**.*

As usual, the identity in the backward part depends on the value of the index. This representation makes the following map easy to write:

Definition 11 (⚙️). *$MaybeU : MaybeAll\ 1 \Rightarrow 1$ removes redundant $MaybeAll$*

And is defined by composing the diagonal from definition 10 with the co-product isomorphism from proposition 9.

Given a monad M , we can use Kleisli composition $\gg> : \forall a, b, c. (a \rightarrow M\ b) \rightarrow (b \rightarrow M\ c) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow M\ c)$ as a combinator to sequence multiple monadic programs. The following example shows the use of Kleisli composition with the $MaybeAll$ monad to sequence two potentially failing morphisms.

```

parse : (String ▷ String) ⇒ MaybeAll HTTP
parse = ...

router : HTTP ⇒ MaybeAll Internal
router = ...

system : (String ▷ String) ⇒ MaybeAll Internal
system = parse >>> router

```

2.3 Stateful Protocols via the Sequential Product

Some APIs expect the client to send multiple requests in a given order. Such APIs are sometimes referred to as “stateful protocols”, and an instance of successfully engaging in one is a “session”.

The sequential product, also known as the *substitution product*, describes an API that expects two queries, one after the other, and gives responses for each of them. We could imagine sending a pair, but if we did that, we could not choose what the second query should be depending on the first. Capturing this dependency is at the core of the sequential product. I use Σ -types instead of existential quantification to match the representation of the program in code. Subscript π_1 and π_2 are the projection functions from the Σ -type.

Definition 12 (⚙️). *Given two containers $(a \triangleright a')$ and $(b \triangleright b')$, their sequential product \gg is given by $(x : \Sigma(y : a). a' \ y \rightarrow b \triangleright \Sigma(z : a' \ x_{\pi_1}). b' \ (x_{\pi_2} \ z))$.*

Intuition. Sequencing two APIs should create one that will expect two inputs in sequence and will provide both results at once. In the query part, we see that we expect a query of type a , but we also require a *continuation* of type

$a' y \rightarrow b$ that tells the system the follow-up query given a response to a . In the response, we send both results of each query, but because the second one depends on the first, we return a Σ -type with the second response adjusted using the continuation in the query.

To effectively use sequential composition I introduce two maps to eliminate its neutral element $1 = (\top \triangleright \top)$, a container that will play a crucial role in section 17.

Definition 13 (⚙️). 1 is the neutral element for \gg given by the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \text{UnitL} : 1 \gg x &\Rightarrow x & \text{UnitR} : x \gg 1 &\Rightarrow x \\ \text{UnitL} &= (\pi_2 \triangleleft \lambda x, y. ((), y)) & \text{UnitR} &= (\pi_1 \triangleleft \lambda x, y. (y, ())) \end{aligned}$$

For the proof that it is a monoidal product, refer to Spivak [26]. I will only use this as a combinator to build programs.

An example of a stateful protocol is a file system with a file handle that needs to be accessed at first and closed at the end of the interaction. If we think of `Open`, `Close`, and `Write` as standalone APIs to a filesystem, then a successful interaction with the system is a sequence of `Open` followed by `Write` and ended with `Close`: `Open >> Write >> Close`. We could even define a *Read* container and write `Open >> (Write + Read) >> Close` if we wanted to indicate that the API allows both reads and writes by using the coproduct 8 on containers.

2.4 Kleene Star for Repeated Requests

We can represent a complete interaction with the filesystem by the composition of the three APIs `Open >> Write >> Close` in a way that is impossible to misuse the underlying protocol. One odd thing about this approach is that, with this API, we are only allowed to do one thing: Write the file exactly once. If we want to write to it multiple times, or if we want to close the file handle immediately after opening it, we cannot, because it would be a breach of the API. What we really want is to write something like this: `Open >> Write * >> Close` where the postfix `*` is the Kleene star. The Kleene star operator on containers is a repeated version of the sequential product 12 and mimics the way it works in regular expressions, indicating 0 or more occurrences of a term strung together sequentially.

Definition 14 (⚙️). Given a container $c = (a \triangleright a')$ the Kleene star with type $_* : \text{Container} \rightarrow \text{Container}$ is given using a data structure $\text{StarShp} : \text{Container} \rightarrow$

Type and a map $StarPos : \forall c. StarShp_c \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ as $(x : StarShp_c \triangleright StarPos_c x)$

data $StarShp : Container \rightarrow Type$ where

$Done : StarShp_{a \triangleright a'}$

$More : (x : a) \rightarrow (a' x \rightarrow StarShp_{a \triangleright a'}) \rightarrow StarShp_{a \triangleright a'}$

$StarPos : \forall (a \triangleright a' : Container). StarShp_{a \triangleright a'} \rightarrow Type$

$StarPos Done = \top$

$StarPos (More req cont) = \Sigma(x : a' req). StarPos_{a \triangleright a'}(cont x)$

The Kleene star gives the choice of sending 0 API calls using $Done$ or more requests by using $More$ to add to the list of requests to send. We can build a smart constructor $single : \forall (a \triangleright a' : Container). a \rightarrow StarShp_{a \triangleright a'}$ that will wrap one layer of $More$ around a value of type a and end the sequence with $Done$ effectively sending a single request: $single x \mapsto More x Done$.

Proposition 15 (⚙️). *Kleene star is a functor.*

Proof. The map on objects is given by $_* : Container \rightarrow Container$. The map on morphisms is given by:

$$map_* : a \Rightarrow b \rightarrow a_* \Rightarrow b_*$$

$$map_* m = (x : mapShp_m \triangleright mapPos_m x)$$

Where, for all pairs of morphisms a, b , given a morphism $(f \triangleleft f') : a \Rightarrow b$

$$mapShp : StarShp_a \rightarrow StarShp_b$$

$$mapShp Done = Done$$

$$mapShp (More x_1 x_2) = More(f x_1)(mapShp \circ x_2 \circ f'_{x_1})$$

$$mapPos : \forall (x : StarShp_a). StarPos_b(mapShp x) \rightarrow StarPos_a$$

$$mapPos (x = Done) \top = \top$$

$$mapPos (x = More x_1 x_2) (y_1, y_2) = (f'_{x_1} y_1, mapPos_{x_2(f'_{x_1} y_1)} y_2)$$

To prove the functor preserves identities and composition we need to prove that both $mapShp$ and $mapPos$ preserves identities and composition. That is, the four equations hold:

1. $mapShp_{id} = id$
2. $mapPos_{id} = id$
3. $mapShp_{f;g} = mapShp_f; mapShp_g$
4. $mapPos_{f;g} = mapPos_f; mapPos_g$

I prove each of these lemmas in appendix B.

We have almost all the pieces to build large-scale systems compositionally, but how do we run them? That is the topic of the next section.

2.5 Clients as State, Servers as Costate

A container morphism is not a complete program, it is a tool to compose different systems with matching APIs at their boundaries, but their definition as pairs of maps does not explain how to turn them into executable programs. In particular they are not *closed*, their left and right boundary are still open to further composition.

To close them, I borrow a technique that I learned from Jules Hedges in Open Games: Contexts, State, and Costate. The terminology itself is adapted from quantum computing [17].

Definition 16 (✿). *A State-Lens is a morphism from 1 into a container $(a \triangleright a')$. It is isomorphic to a value of type a . State $c \triangleq 1 \Rightarrow c$*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{state} : a \rightarrow 1 \Rightarrow (a \triangleright a') & \text{value} : 1 \Rightarrow (a \triangleright a') \rightarrow a \\ \text{state } x = (\lambda _ . x \triangleleft \lambda _ . \top) & \text{value } (f \triangleleft _) = f \top \end{array}$$

Definition 17 (✿). *A Costate-Lens is a morphism from $(a \triangleright a')$ into 1 and is isomorphic to a function $(x : a) \rightarrow a'x$. Costate $c \triangleq c \Rightarrow 1$*

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{costate} : ((x : a) \rightarrow a' x) \rightarrow (a \triangleright a') \Rightarrow 1 \\ \text{costate } f = (\lambda _ . \top, \lambda x _ . f x) \\ \text{exec} : (a \triangleright a') \Rightarrow 1 \rightarrow (x : a) \rightarrow a' x \\ \text{exec } (_ \triangleleft f) x = f x \top \end{array}$$

Definition 18 (✿). *A Context for a lens $(a \triangleright a') \Rightarrow (b \triangleright b')$ is a pair $a \times ((x : b) \rightarrow b'x)$, or equivalently, a state for $(a \triangleright a')$ and a costate for $(b \triangleright b')$.*

Intuition. The original intuition for containers as APIs is that a container $(a \triangleright a')$ gives us the type signature of a system that takes requests of a and return responses a' . The definition of the Costate-Lens materialises this idea by turning it into a morphism. Similarly, for requests, if an API $(a \triangleright a')$ accepts requests of type a , it should be that communicating with it requires producing values of type a .

Once taken together, state and costate give us a way to *run* morphisms in the same way they are run in Open Games [12].

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{run} : (st : \text{State}(a \triangleright a')) \rightarrow \text{Costate } (b \triangleright b') \rightarrow (a \triangleright a') \Rightarrow b \rightarrow a'(\text{value } st) \\ \text{run } st \text{ } co \text{ } m = \text{exec}(m; co)(\text{value } st) \end{array}$$

2.6 IO and Side-Effects

We are now able to use our API transformers to extract programs using a state, costate, and contexts. But something is still missing. In everything I showed until now, I only ever described pure functions, but a tool like a database library

will not expose a pure function as its API. Rather, it will perform side effects, such as IO or exceptions. How to model effectful programs is the topic of this section.

Assuming a container for a database with API $(q : \text{DBQuery} \triangleright \text{DBRes } q)$, it is unlikely a library implementing it would be a pure function. Rather, it would be an effectful one working in IO with type $(q : \text{DBQuery}) \rightarrow \text{IO } (\text{DBRes } q)$.

If we were to model this stateful function as a container it would be the new container $\text{DBIO} = (q : \text{DBQuery} \triangleright \text{IO } (\text{DBRes } q))$.

As with the Maybe monad on containers, we can define a map on containers, lifting from monads on Type to comonads on containers. Let us first see how to lift functors on Type to functors on containers:

Definition 19 (⚙️). *Given a functor $f : \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type}$, we define $Lift$, the map on containers from $(q \triangleright r)$ to $(q \triangleright f \circ r)$.*

Proposition 20 (⚙️). *Given a functor $f : \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type}$, $Lift f$ is an endofunctor in \mathbf{Cont} . The map on objects is given by $Lift f$, the map on morphisms is given by: $(g \triangleleft g') \mapsto g \triangleleft \text{map } f \circ g'$*

Proof. The proof follows from the fact that f is a functor, with the subtlety that the backward part of the morphism lives in \mathbf{Type}^{op} , and that duality also preserves the functor laws.

This construction matches the one given by Abou-Saleh et al. on *monadic lenses* [10]. Seeing it as a map on containers sheds light on an interesting fact about monadic programming in the category of lenses: Given a monad in Set , we obtain a comonad in Cont .

Proposition 21 (⚙️). *Given a monad in \mathbf{Type} ($T : \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type}$, $\text{unit} : \forall a.a \rightarrow T a$, $\text{mult} : \forall a.T (T a) \rightarrow T a$) with the appropriate laws, we build the endofunctor $Lift T : \mathbf{Cont} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cont}$ like above 20. The counit is given by the morphism $(id \triangleleft \text{unit})$ and the comultiplication by $(id \triangleleft \text{mult})$.*

Proof. Because only the backwards parts see any changes from $Lift T$, and it runs backward, the proof that *counit* and *comult* form a comonad follows from the fact that the dual of a monad is a comonad in the opposite category.

Using the fact that $Lift f$ is a functor, we can map a morphism $\text{HTTP} \Rightarrow \text{DB}$, and into an effectful program $Lift \text{IO } \text{HTTP} \Rightarrow Lift \text{IO } \text{DB}$ to interact with other effectful APIs. The counit gives us a way to interface a stateful API with a pure one. For example, a test database that runs in memory could have a pure signature, but the rest of the program will still expect to run with an IO effect, we can build the API transformer $Lift \text{IO } \text{DB} \Rightarrow \text{DB}$ to plug our program into a pure implementation of a database for testing purposes.

Finally, one handy tool is that $Lift f$ distributes around $+$, allowing us to combine effectful computation with ones that provide a choice of API.

Definition 22 (⚙️). *Given $f : \text{Type} \rightarrow \text{Type}$ an endofunctor, $\text{distrib}_+ : Lift f (a + b) \Rightarrow Lift f a + Lift f b$ is given by the morphism $id \triangleleft id$.*

The backward part is a bit tricky because it is only an identity *after* we pattern match on its index. Because of the relationship between coproducts and the *MaybeAll* map, we define a similar distributivity map for it around *Lift*:

Definition 23 (⚙️). *Given $f : \mathbf{Type} \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ an endofunctor, $\text{distrib}_{\text{Maybe}} : \text{Lift } f (\text{MaybeAll } a) \Rightarrow \text{MaybeAll } (\text{Lift } f a)$ is given by the morphism $\text{id} \triangleleft \text{id}$.*

Again the backward part is only an identity *after* pattern matching.

Our last combinator allows to combine multiple costates sequentially using monadic sequencing.

Definition 24 (⚙️). *For a given monad $m : \mathbf{Type} \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$, and two containers $a, b : \mathbf{Cont}$, we can run two effectful costates $m1 : \text{Cstate } (\text{Lift } m a)$ and $m2 : \text{Cstate } (\text{Lift } m b)$ in sequence to obtain a combined effectful API $\text{Cstate}(\text{Lift } m (a \gg b))$.*

The implementation is straightforward in its mechanised version.

3 Demo - Executing Interactive programs

It remains to demonstrate that this model is not only useful for abstractly talking about properties of larger compositional systems, but also for their implementation. To this end, I present two examples. First, a To-do app that communicates with a database, to show that the system is successfully compositional across multiple domains. Second, I implement the interface of a filesystem to show how stateful protocols can be described and run.

3.1 A Basic To-do App

A to-do app is a tool to manage lists of actionable items. Operations include creating a new item, marking an item as done and retrieving the list of all items. For space reasons, I will only show small relevant parts of the original source code. For the full source code, you can find it here: <https://andrevidela.com/aplas-code/SQL.html>.

The first choice to make is the model of interaction. A real app would use an HTTP interface to expose the functionality of the application. For simplicity, I will use a command-line interface via a Read-Eval-Print Loop (REPL).

```
repl : (String → IO String) → IO ⊤
```

This type suggests that a program interacting with the REPL has the API $(\mathbf{String} \triangleright \mathbf{String})$, I call this container *CLI*. The app handles 3 messages : *Create*, *MarkDone*, *ListAll*. As you can tell by their name, they allow the creation, update, and retrieval of todo items. Here is a data definition for it:

```
data TodoCommand = Create String | MarkComplete ID | RetrieveAll
```

For each message, we produce the type of responses. Except for *RetrieveAll*, all messages do not return any value. Instead, we will rely on effect lifting to perform side-effects for them.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TodoResponse} &: \text{TodoCommand} \rightarrow \text{Type} \\ \text{TodoResponse } \text{RetrieveAll} &= \mathbf{Table} \text{ TodoItem} \\ \text{TodoResponse } _ &= \top \end{aligned}$$

Where **Table** is the type of SQL tables returned by SQL queries. These two types form the internal API of the app: $\text{App} = (\text{cmd} : \text{TodoCommand} \triangleright \text{TodoResponse } \text{cmd})$.

To implement the database, I use SQLite3 binders in Idris. The library has two methods of interactions: Commands, and queries. They are implemented with the functions $\text{runCmd} : \mathbf{Cmd} \rightarrow \mathbf{IO} \top$ and $\text{runQuery} : (q : \mathbf{Query}) \rightarrow \mathbf{IO}(\mathbf{Table} \ q.type)$ respectively. These functions suggest a costate with an appropriate container. For space and legibility reasons, I write **IO** instead of *Lift IO*:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SQLCmd} &: \text{Container} & \text{SQLQuery} &: \text{Container} \\ \text{SQLCmd} &= (\mathbf{Cmd} \triangleright \top) & \text{SQLQuery} &= (q : \mathbf{Query} \triangleright \mathbf{Table} \ q.type) \\ \text{execCmd} &: \text{Cstate}(\mathbf{IO} \ \text{SQLCmd}) & \text{execQry} &: \text{Cstate}(\mathbf{IO} \ \text{SQLQuery}) \\ \text{execCmd} &= \text{cstate } \text{runCmd} & \text{execQry} &= \text{cstate } \text{runQuery} \end{aligned}$$

Each costate is combined with a coproduct to give the choice of the caller to interact with the database by supplying either a command or a query.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{execDB} &: \text{Cstate}(\mathbf{IO} \ (\text{SQLCmd} + \text{SQLQuery})) \\ \text{execDB} &= \text{distrib}_+; (\text{execCmd} + \text{execQuery}); \text{dia} \end{aligned}$$

Where distrib_+ distributes effects across the coproduct 22 and dia is the diagonal operator 10. We have all the *interface* pieces, now we need to implement the morphisms to translate between one API to the next. This is done via two morphisms, one that I call *parser* but performs two operations, parse incoming requests but also print responses for the command line to show. The second, called *toDB*, converts internal messages into database commands and queries, and converts backs responses from the database into internal messages.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{parser} &: \text{CLI} \Rightarrow \text{MaybeAll } \text{App} & \text{toDB} &: \text{App} \Rightarrow (\text{DBCmd} + \text{SQLQuery}) \\ \text{parser} &= \text{parse} \triangleleft \text{print} & \text{toDB} &= \dots \end{aligned}$$

I elide the implementation of *parse*, *print*, and *toDB* since their details are not relevant to this example.

It is worth noting that the mapping *toDB* is pure because, at this stage, we are only dealing with valid messages. Accordingly, all responses from the database will also be valid responses. Therefore, there is no need to concern ourselves with errors yet. It is only once we compose the API transformer with

an effectful database implementation that we start worrying about how to handle potential errors and effects.

With all those pieces, we can build the entire system by composing the parser, the message conversion, and the database execution.

```
app : Costate(I0 CLI)
app = mapIO(parser); distribMaybe; mapMaybe(mapIO(toDB); execDB); MaybeU
```

This makes use of composition 3, distributivity 23, the *MaybeAll* functor on containers 5, and the *Lift* functor 19. The extra piece at the end cleans up the bureaucracy brought on by *MaybeAll*.

The result of this is *app*, an implementation of the entire pipeline from parsing to database queries, going via internal messages and a bespoke database interaction model.

3.2 A filesystem Session

In section 2.3, I claimed that the sequential product describes sessions and that their type constrains the sequence of requests that need to be sent to constitute a valid session. The example I gave was the API for a filesystem with three different messages for opening a file handle, one for writing to a file handle, and one for closing a file handle. I will now elaborate on this example here with some code snippets to show how it looks in practice with a real file API. The full source code can be seen here: <https://andrevidela.com/aplas-code/fs.html>.

First, we need functions to perform the IO operations on the filesystem. I am going to rely on Idris' built-in functionality:

```
fPutStrLn : File → String → IO ⊤ | data OpenFile = MkOpen String
open : String → IO(FileError + ⊤) | data WriteFile = MkWrite String File
close : File → IO(FileError + ⊤) | data CloseFile = MkClose File
```

With those, I implement the *costate* using the *costate* function 17 that acts as the interpreter of the previously defined API.

```
FS : Container → Container
FS = Lift(I0 ∘ (FileError + ⊔))
writeMany : Costate(FS WriteC*) = costate fPutStrLn
openFile : Costate(FS OpenC) = costate open
closeFile : Costate(FS CloseC) = costate close
combined : Costate(FS (OpenC >> WriteC * >> CloseC))
combined = seqM (seqM openFile writeMany) closeFile
```


To run the program, we need to supply a valid input defined by the type of the session.

```

writeOnce, writeTwice, writeNone : StarShp WriteC
writeNone = Done
writeOnce = single(MkWrite file "hello")
writeTwice = More(MkWrite file "hello")(λ_.single (MkWrite file "world"))

```

We can embed any sequence of writes into a valid session by surrounding it with an opening and closing request. We turn it into a *State* using definition 16.

```

mkSession : StarShp WriteC → State (OpenC >> WriteC * >> CloseC)
mkSession writes = state(MkOpen "append", λfile.(writes, λ_.MkClosefile)

```

The pair of a state and costate forms a *context* that we can run. We run it using *run* 2.5.

```

main : IO ⊤
main = run (mkSession writeOnce) combined

```

And as expected, we can run all sorts of sessions that are also valid, like *writeNone* and *writeTwice* written above, using the same runner.

4 Conclusion & Future work

As I have shown in the two demos, using containers and their morphisms not only forms a compelling mathematical basis to study large compositional systems but also provides the programming infrastructure to build such systems.

From here, I see three different paths of further improvements. One could be to enhance the practical usability of the framework, build binders to more libraries, database systems, user interfaces, operating systems etc. Such that it becomes possible to build a broad range of programs, all the way from the TCP layer up to the GUI.

Another path could be to drill down on one specific use-case and elucidate problems that the framework encounters and solutions it provides as a way to further both the theory and the practice of the tool. Uses cases I am interested in include compilers, machine learning, and video game development.

Finally, the last axis of development would be to expand the theory with components from other systems. For example, developing a type theory for bidirectional systems, incorporating session types, or discussing the para-construction, all of which would contribute to making the research broader and compatible with other areas of research, such as cybernetics or categorical deep learning.

4.1 Acknowledgments.

I would like to thank my colleagues from MSP who offered deep and practical insight. In particular Bob, Fred, Guillaume, Sean who gave me precious feedback, Jules and Zanzi for encouraging me to write those ideas down, Shin-ya for teaching me how to

think in categories, and the team at NPL for supporting my work both emotionally and financially.

References

1. OpenAPI Specification v3.1.0 | Introduction, Definitions, & More, <https://spec.openapis.org/oas/v3.1.0>
2. GraphQL. GraphQL Foundation (Oct 2021), <https://graphql.org/>
3. Django. Django Software Foundation (May 2024), <https://www.djangoproject.com/>
4. GORM (Apr 2024), <https://gorm.io/>
5. Protocol Buffers. Google (Mar 2024), <https://protobuf.dev/>
6. Typespec. Microsoft (May 2024), <https://typespec.io/>
7. Abbott, M., Altenkirch, T., Ghani, N.: Categories of Containers. In: Gordon, A.D. (ed.) Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures, vol. 2620, pp. 23–38. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2003). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36576-1_2, http://link.springer.com/10.1007/3-540-36576-1_2
8. Abbott, M., Altenkirch, T., Ghani, N.: Containers: Constructing strictly positive types. Theoretical Computer Science **342**(1), 3–27 (Sep 2005). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2005.06.002>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397505003373>
9. Abbott, M., Altenkirch, T., Ghani, N., McBride, C.: Derivatives of Containers. In: Goos, G., Hartmanis, J., van Leeuwen, J., Hofmann, M. (eds.) Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, vol. 2701, pp. 16–30. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2003). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44904-3_2, http://link.springer.com/10.1007/3-540-44904-3_2
10. Abou-Saleh, F., Cheney, J., Gibbons, J., McKinna, J., Stevens, P.: Reflections on Monadic Lenses. In: Lindley, S., McBride, C., Trinder, P., Sannella, D. (eds.) A List of Successes That Can Change the World: Essays Dedicated to Philip Wadler on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday, pp. 1–31. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30936-1_1, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30936-1_1
11. Bohannon, A., Pierce, B.C., Vaughan, J.A.: Relational lenses: A language for updatable views. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems. pp. 338–347. PODS '06, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (Jun 2006). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1142351.1142399>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/1142351.1142399>
12. Bolt, J., Hedges, J., Zahn, P.: Bayesian open games (Oct 2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1910.03656>, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03656>
13. Brady, E.: Idris, a general-purpose dependently typed programming language: Design and implementation. Journal of Functional Programming **23**(5), 552–593 (Sep 2013). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095679681300018X>, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-functional-programming/article/idris-a-general-purpose-dependently-typed-programming-language/design-and-implementation>
14. Brady, E.: Idris 2: Quantitative Type Theory in Practice. arXiv:2104.00480 [cs] (Apr 2021), <http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.00480>

15. Capucci, M., Gavranović, B., Hedges, J., Rischel, E.F.: Towards Foundations of Categorical Cybernetics. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* **372**, 235–248 (Nov 2022). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.372.17>, <http://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06332>
16. Clarke, B., Elkins, D., Gibbons, J., Loregian, F., Milewski, B., Pillmore, E., Román, M.: Profunctor Optics, a Categorical Update (Mar 2022), <http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.07488>
17. Coecke, B., Kissinger, A.: *Picturing Quantum Processes*. Cambridge University Press (Mar 2017)
18. Edward A. Kmett: *Lens library* (May 2024), <https://hackage.haskell.org/package/lens-4.15.1>
19. Fong, B., Spivak, D.I., Tuyéras, R.: Backprop as Functor: A compositional perspective on supervised learning. arXiv:1711.10455 [cs, math] (Nov 2017), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.10455>
20. Foster, J.N., Greenwald, M.B., Moore, J.T., Pierce, B.C., Schmitt, A.: Combinators for bidirectional tree transformations: A linguistic approach to the view-update problem. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* **29**(3), 17 (May 2007). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1232420.1232424>, <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/1232420.1232424>
21. Hancock, P., Hyvernat, P.: Programming interfaces and basic topology (May 2009). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.0905.4063>, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0905.4063>
22. Hancock, P., Setzer, A.: Interactive Programs in Dependent Type Theory. In: Goos, G., Hartmanis, J., van Leeuwen, J., Clote, P.G., Schwichtenberg, H. (eds.) *Computer Science Logic*, vol. 1862, pp. 317–331. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2000). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44622-2_21, http://link.springer.com/10.1007/3-540-44622-2_21
23. Martin-Löf, P.: An Intuitionistic Theory of Types: Predicative Part. In: *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, vol. 80, pp. 73–118. Elsevier (1975). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X\(08\)71945-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0049-237X(08)71945-1), <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0049237X08719451>
24. Niu, N., Spivak, D.I.: Polynomial Functors: A Mathematical Theory of Interaction (Dec 2023), topos.site/poly-book.pdf
25. O’Connor, R.: Functor is to Lens as Applicative is to Biplate: Introducing Multiplate (Jul 2011), <http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.2841>
26. Spivak, D.I.: A reference for categorical structures on \mathbf{Poly} (Apr 2022), <http://arxiv.org/abs/2202.00534>
27. Wadler, P.: Monads for functional programming. In: Broy, M. (ed.) *Program Design Calculi*, vol. 118, pp. 233–264. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (1993). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-02880-3_8, http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-662-02880-3_8

A MaybeAll is a functor

The functor is given by *MaybeAll* on objects and given a morphism $(f \triangleleft f')$ the corresponding lifted morphism is given by $\text{mapMor}(f \triangleleft f') = (\text{map } f \triangleleft \text{mapAll } f')$

Lemma 1. *mapMor respects identity*

We want to prove that $\text{mapMor}(id \triangleleft id) = (\text{map } id \triangleleft \text{mapAll } id) = (id \triangleleft id)$.
Because *Maybe* is a functor we have that $\text{map } id \equiv id$. For $\text{mapAll } id \ v \ x \equiv x$ we need to proceed by case-analysis.

- When $v = \text{Nothing}$ in $\text{mapAll } id \ \text{Nothing} \ () = ()$
- When $v = \text{Just } v$ in $\text{mapAll } id \ (\text{Just } v) \ w = id \ w = w$

Lemma 2. *mapMor respects composition*

Given two morphisms $(f \triangleleft f') : (a \triangleright a') \Rightarrow (b \triangleright b')$ and $(g \triangleleft g') : (b \triangleright b') \Rightarrow (c \triangleright c')$ we want to prove that $\text{mapMor}(g \triangleleft g') \circ (\text{mapMor}(f \triangleleft f')) = \text{mapMor}((g \triangleleft g') \circ (f \triangleleft f'))$

By evaluating $(g \triangleleft g') \circ (f \triangleleft f') = (g \circ f \triangleleft \lambda x. f' \ x \circ (g' \ (f \ x)))$ we obtain the term $(\text{map}(g \circ f) \triangleleft \text{mapAll}(\lambda x. f' \ x \circ (g' \ (f \ x))))$.

By expanding the definition of mapMor we obtain on the left side $(\text{map } g \triangleleft \text{mapAll } g') \circ (\text{map } f \triangleleft \text{mapAll } f')$ by definition of container morphism composition we obtain $(\text{map } g \circ \text{map } f \triangleleft \lambda x. \text{mapAll } f' \ x \circ \text{mapAll } g' \ (\text{map } f \ x))$

Because *Maybe* preserves identities, we have $\text{map } g \circ \text{map } f \equiv \text{map } (g \circ f)$. It is left to prove that $\forall x, y. \text{mapAll } f' \ x (\text{mapAll } g' \ (\text{map } f \ x)) y = (\lambda z. f' \ z \circ (g' \ (f \ z))) \ x \ y$.

We do this by case-analysis on x :

- When $x = \text{Nothing}$ then
 $\text{mapAll } f' \ \text{Nothing} \ (\text{mapAll } g' \ \text{Nothing} \ ())$
 $= \text{mapAll } f' \ \text{Nothing} \ ()$
 $= () = \text{mapAll } (\lambda z. f' \ z \circ (g' \ (f \ z))) \ \text{Nothing} \ ()$
- When $x = \text{Just } v$ then
 $\text{mapAll } f' \ (\text{Just } v) (\text{mapAll } g' \ (\text{Just } (f \ v)) \ w)$
 $= \text{mapAll } f' \ (\text{Just } v) (g' \ (f \ v) \ w)$
 $= f' \ v \ (g' \ (f \ v) \ w)$
 $= \text{mapAll } (\lambda z. f' \ z \circ (g' \ (f \ z))) (\text{Just } v) \ w$

B Lemmas for Kleene as Functor

Lemma 3 (*mapShp preserves identities*).

$\forall (a : \text{Container}). \forall (x : \text{StarShp } a). \text{mapShp}_{id} x = x$.

Proof. We perform a proof by induction on x .

- In the base case where $x = \text{Done}$ we have $\text{map}_{id} \text{Done} = \text{Done}$, which completes the proof.
- In the inductive case where $x = \text{More } x_1 \ x_2$ then $\text{map}_{id} (\text{More } x_1 \ x_2)$ evaluates to $\text{More } x_1 \ (\lambda v. \text{mapShp}_{id} (x_2 \ v))$. The first argument is the same, the second is equal by induction $\text{mapShp}_{id} \circ x_2 = x_2$.

Lemma 4 (mapPos preserves identities).

$\forall(a : \text{Container}). \forall(x : \text{StarShp } a). \forall(y : \text{StarPos } a \ x). \text{mapPos}_{id} \ x \ y = y$

Proof. We perform a proof by induction on x

- In the base case where $x = \text{Done}$ then $y = \top$ and $\text{mapPos}_{id} \text{Done} \top$ evaluates to \top completing the proof.
- In the inductive case where $x = \text{More } x_1 \ x_2$ then the goal becomes $\text{mapPos}_{id}(\text{More } x_1 \ x_2)(y_1, y_2) = (y_1, y_2)$, the left side evaluates to $(y_1, \text{mapPos}_{id} \ y_1 \ y_2)$, which is identical to the goal by induction on (y_1, y_2) .

Lemma 5 (mapShp preserves composition).

$\forall(a, b, c : \text{Container})(f : a \Rightarrow b)(g : b \Rightarrow c). \forall(x : \text{StarShp } a). \text{mapShp}_{g \circ f} \ x = \text{mapShp}_g(\text{mapShp}_f \ x)$

Proof. We define $f = f_1 \triangleleft f_2, g = g_1 \triangleleft g_2$ to refer to the forward and backward maps of f and g , then proceed by induction on x as above.

- In the base case where $x = \text{Done}$ then $\text{mapShp}_{g \circ f} \text{Done}$ evaluates to Done completing the proof.
- In the inductive case where $x = \text{More } x_1 \ x_2$ then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{mapShp}_{g \circ f}(\text{More } x_1 \ x_2) \\
& \quad (\text{By definition of } f; g) \\
& \equiv \text{mapShp}_{g \circ f \triangleleft f' \circ g'}(\text{More } x_1 \ x_2) \\
& \quad (\text{By definition of mapShp}) \\
& \equiv \text{More}(g(f(x_1)))(\text{mapShp}_{g \circ f} \circ x_2 \circ f'_{x_1} \circ g'_{f(x_1)}) \\
& \quad (\text{By induction}) \\
& \equiv \text{More}(g(f(x_1)))(\text{mapShp}_g \circ \text{mapShp}_f \circ x_2 \circ f'_{x_1} \circ g'_{f(x_2)}) \\
& \quad (\text{By definition of mapShp}_g) \\
& \equiv \text{mapShp}_g(\text{More}(f(x_1))(\text{mapShp}_f \circ x_2 \circ f'_{x_1})) \\
& \quad (\text{By definition of mapShp}_f) \\
& \equiv \text{mapShp}_g(\text{mapShp}_f(\text{More } x_1 \ x_2))
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6 (mapPos preserves composition).

$\forall(a, b, c : \text{Container})(f : a \Rightarrow b)(g : b \Rightarrow c).$

$\forall(x : \text{StarShp } a). \forall(y : \text{StarPos}_{g \circ f}(\text{mapShp}_{g \circ f} \ x)). \text{mapPos}_{g \circ f} \ y = \text{mapPos}_g(\text{mapPos}_f \ y)$

Proof. Like above, we perform the proof by induction on x .

- In the base case where $x = \text{Done}$, then $\text{mapPos}_{g \circ f} \text{Done } \top$ evaluates to \top and so does $\text{mapPos}_f \text{Done } (\text{mapPos}_g \text{Done } \top)$ completing the proof.
- In the inductive case where $x = \text{More } x1 \ x2$, then the goal becomes $\text{mapPos}_{g \circ f} (\text{More } x1 \ x2) (y1, y2) = \text{mapPos}_f (\text{More } x1 \ x2) (\text{mapPos}_g (\text{mapShp}_f (\text{More } x1 \ x2)) (y1, y2))$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{mapPos}_{g \triangleleft g' \circ f \triangleleft f'} (\text{More } x1 \ x2) (y1, y2) \\
\equiv & \quad (\text{By definition of } g \triangleleft g' \circ f \triangleleft f') \\
& \text{mapPos}_{g \circ f \triangleleft \lambda x. f' x \circ (g' (fx))} (\text{More } x1 \ x2) (y1, y2) \\
\equiv & \quad (\text{By definition of } \text{mapPos}_{g \circ f \triangleleft \lambda x. f' x \circ (g' (fx))}) \\
& (f' y1 (g' (f y1)), \text{mapPos}_{g \circ f} (x2 (f' y1 (g' (f y1)))) y2) \\
\equiv & \quad (\text{By induction on the second projection}) \\
& (f' y1 (g' (f y1)), \text{mapPos}_f (x2 (f' x1 (g' (f x1) y1))) \\
& \quad (\text{mapPos}_g (\text{mapStarShp}_f (x2 (f' x1 (g' (f x1) y1)))) y2)) \\
\equiv & \quad (\text{By definition of } \text{mapPos}_f) \\
& \text{mapPos}_f (\text{More } x1 \ x2) (g' (f x1) y1, \\
& \quad \text{mapPos}_g (\text{mapStarShp}_f (x2 (f x1 (g' (f x1) y1)))) y2) \\
\equiv & \quad (\text{By definition of } \text{mapPos}_g) \\
& \text{mapPos}_f (\text{More } x1 \ x2) \\
& \quad (\text{mapPos}_g (\text{More } (f x1) (\text{mapStarShp}_f \circ x2 \circ (f' x1)))) (y1, y2) \\
\equiv & \quad (\text{By definition of } \text{mapShp}_f) \\
& \text{mapPos}_f (\text{More } x1 \ x2) (\text{mapPos}_g (\text{mapShp}_f (\text{More } x1 \ x2)) (y1, y2))
\end{aligned}$$