
EXTRACTING TOTAL AMB PROGRAMS FROM PROOFS

ULRICH BERGER ^a AND HIDEKI TSUIKI ^b

^a Swansea University, Swansea, UK
e-mail address: u.berger@swansea.ac.uk

^b Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
e-mail address: tsuiki@i.h.kyoto-u.ac.jp

ABSTRACT. We present a logical system CFP (Concurrent Fixed Point Logic) supporting the extraction of nondeterministic and concurrent programs that are provably total and correct. CFP is an intuitionistic first-order logic with inductive and coinductive definitions extended by two propositional operators, $B|_A$ (restriction, a strengthening of implication) and $\Downarrow(B)$ (total concurrency). The source of the extraction are formal CFP proofs, the target is a lambda calculus with constructors and recursion extended by a constructor *Amb* (for McCarthy’s *amb*) which is interpreted operationally as globally angelic choice and is used to implement nondeterminism and concurrency. The correctness of extracted programs is proven via an intermediate domain-theoretic denotational semantics. We demonstrate the usefulness of our system by extracting a nondeterministic program that translates infinite Gray code into the signed digit representation. A noteworthy feature of CFP is the fact that the proof rules for restriction and concurrency involve variants of the classical law of excluded middle that would not be interpretable computationally without *Amb*.¹

1. INTRODUCTION

Nondeterministic bottom-avoiding choice is an important and useful idea. With the widespread use of hardware supporting parallel computation, it can speed up practical computation and, at the same time, relates to computation over mathematical structures like real numbers [Esc96, Tsu02]. On the other hand, it is not easy to apply theoretical tools like denotational semantics to nondeterministic bottom-avoiding choice [HO89, Lev07], and guaranteeing correctness and totality of such programs is a difficult task.

To explain the subtleties of the problem, let us start with an example. Suppose that M and N are partial programs that, under the conditions A and $\neg A$, respectively, are guaranteed to terminate and produce values satisfying specification B . Then, by executing M and N in parallel and taking the result returned first, we should always obtain a result satisfying B . This kind of bottom-avoiding nondeterministic program is known as *McCarthy’s amb* (*ambiguous*) *operator* [McC63], and we denote such a program by $\mathbf{Amb}(M, N)$. \mathbf{Amb} is called the angelic choice operator and is usually studied as one of the three nondeterministic choice operators (the other two are erratic choice and demonic choice).

¹This is a revised and extended version of the conference paper [BT22].

If one tries to formalize this idea naively, one will face some obstacles. Let $M \mathbf{r} B$ (“ M realizes B ”) denote the fact that a program M satisfies a specification B and let $\Downarrow(B)$ be the specification that can be satisfied by a concurrent program of the form $\mathbf{Amb}(M, N)$ that always terminates and produces a value satisfying B . Then, the above inference could be written as

$$\frac{A \rightarrow (M \mathbf{r} B) \quad \neg A \rightarrow (N \mathbf{r} B)}{\mathbf{Amb}(M, N) \mathbf{r} \Downarrow(B)}$$

However, this inference is not sound for the following reason. Suppose that A does not hold, that is, $\neg A$ holds. Then, the execution of N will produce a value satisfying B . But the execution of M may terminate as well, and with a data that does not satisfy B since there is no condition on M if A does not hold. Therefore, if M terminates first in the execution of $\mathbf{Amb}(M, N)$, we obtain a result that may not satisfy B .

To amend this problem, we add a new operator $B|_A$ (pronounced “ B restricted to A ”) and consider the rule

$$\frac{M \mathbf{r} (B|_A) \quad N \mathbf{r} (B|_{\neg A})}{\mathbf{Amb}(M, N) \mathbf{r} \Downarrow(B)} \quad (1.1)$$

Intuitively, $M \mathbf{r} (B|_A)$ means two things: (1) If A holds, then M terminates, and (2) if M terminates, then the result satisfies B , even for the case A does not hold. As we will see in Section 5.1, the above rule is derivable in classical logic and can therefore be used to prove total correctness of Amb programs.

In this paper, we go a step further and introduce a logical system CFP whose formulas can be interpreted as specifications of nondeterministic programs although they do not talk about programs explicitly. CFP is defined by adding the two logical operators $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow(B)$ to the system IFP, a logic for program extraction [BT21] (see also [Ber11, BS12, BP18]). IFP supports the extraction of lazy functional programs from inductive/coinductive proofs in intuitionistic first-order logic. It has a prototype implementation in Haskell, called Prawf [BPT20]. A related approach has been developed in the proof system Minlog [Sch06, BMSS11, SW12].

We show that from a CFP-proof of a formula, both a program and a proof that the program satisfies the specification can be extracted (Soundness theorem, Theorem 5.2). For example, in CFP we have the rule

$$\frac{B|_A \quad B|_{\neg A}}{\Downarrow(B)} \text{ (Conc-lem)} \quad (1.2)$$

which is realized by the program $\lambda a. \lambda b. \mathbf{Amb}(a, b)$, and whose correctness is expressed by the rule (1.1). Programs extracted from CFP proofs can be executed in Haskell, implementing \mathbf{Amb} with the concurrent Haskell package.

Compared with program verification, the extraction approach has the benefit that (a) the proofs programs are extracted from take place in a formal system that is of a very high level of abstraction and therefore is simpler and easier to use than a logic that formalizes concurrent programs (in particular, programs do not have to be written manually at all); (b) not only the complete extracted program is proven correct but also all its sub-programs come with their specifications and correctness proofs since these correspond to sub-proofs. This makes it easier to locally modify programs without the danger of compromising overall correctness.

As an application, we extract a nondeterministic program that converts infinite Gray code to signed digit representation, where infinite Gray code is a coding of real numbers by

partial digit streams that are allowed to contain a \perp , that is, a digit whose computation does not terminate [DG99, Tsu02]. Partiality and multi-valuedness are common phenomena in computable analysis and exact real number computation [Wei00, Luc77]. This case study connects these two aspects through a nondeterministic and concurrent program whose correctness is guaranteed by a CFP-proof. The extracted Haskell programs are listed in the Appendix, and are also available in the repository [Ber].

Organization of the paper: In Sections 2 and 3 we present the denotational and operational semantics of a functional language with **Amb** and prove that they match (Theorems 3.2 and 3.3). Sections 4 and 5 describe the formal system CFP and its realizability interpretation which our program extraction method is based on (Theorems 5.2, 5.10, and 5.11). In Sections 6 we extract a concurrent program that converts representations of real numbers and study its behaviour in Section 7.

2. DENOTATIONAL SEMANTICS OF GLOBALLY ANGELIC CHOICE

In [McC63], McCarthy defined the ambiguity operator **amb** as

$$\mathbf{amb}(x, y) = \begin{cases} x & (x \neq \perp) \\ y & (y \neq \perp) \\ \perp & (x = y = \perp) \end{cases}$$

where \perp means ‘undefined’ and x and y are taken nondeterministically when both x and y are not \perp . This is called *locally* angelic nondeterministic choice since convergence is chosen over divergence for each local call for the computation of $\mathbf{amb}(x, y)$. It can be implemented by executing both of the arguments in parallel and taking the result obtained first. Despite being a simple construction, **amb** is known to have a lot of expressive power, and many constructions of nondeterministic and parallel computation such as erratic choice, countable choice (random assignment), and ‘parallel or’ can be encoded through it [LM99]. These multifarious aspects of the operator **amb** are reflected by the difficulty of its mathematical treatment in denotational semantics. For example, **amb** is not monotonic when interpreted over powerdomains with the Egli-Milner order [Bro86].

Alternatively, one can consider an interpretation of **amb** as *globally* angelic choice, where an argument of **amb** is chosen so that the whole ambient computation converges, if convergence is possible at all [CH85, SS92]. It can be implemented by running the *whole* computation for both of the arguments of **amb** in parallel and taking the result obtained first. The difference between the locally and the globally angelic interpretation of **amb** is highlighted by the fact that the former does not commute with function application. For example, if $f(0) = 0$ but $f(1)$ diverges, then, with the local interpretation, $\mathbf{amb}(f(0), f(1))$ will always terminate with the value 0, whereas $f(\mathbf{amb}(0, 1))$ may return 0 or diverge. On the other hand, the latter term will always return 0 if **amb** is implemented with a globally angelic semantics. Though globally angelic choice is not defined compositionally, one can, as suggested in [CH85], integrate it into the design of a programming language by using this commutation property.

Denotationally, globally angelic choice can be modelled by the Hoare powerdomain construction. However, this would not be suitable for analyzing total correctness because the ordering of the Hoare powerdomain does not discriminate X and $X \cup \{\perp\}$ [HM92, HO89]. Instead, we consider a two-staged approach (see Section. 2.2) and provide a simple denotational semantics for a language with angelic choice.

2.1. Programs and types. Our target language for program extraction is an untyped lambda calculus with recursion operator and constructors as in [BT21], but extended by an additional constructor **Amb** that corresponds to globally angelic version of McCarthy's **amb**. This could be easily generalized to **Amb** operators of any arity ≥ 2 .

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Programs } \ni M, N, L, P, Q, R ::= & a, b, \dots, f, g \quad (\text{program variables}) \\
& | \lambda a. M \mid M N \mid M \downarrow N \mid \mathbf{rec} M \mid \perp \\
& | \mathbf{Nil} \mid \mathbf{Left}(M) \mid \mathbf{Right}(M) \mid \mathbf{Pair}(M, N) \mid \mathbf{Amb}(M, N) \\
& | \mathbf{case} M \mathbf{of} \{ \mathbf{Left}(a) \rightarrow L; \mathbf{Right}(b) \rightarrow R \} \\
& | \mathbf{case} M \mathbf{of} \{ \mathbf{Pair}(a, b) \rightarrow N \} \\
& | \mathbf{case} M \mathbf{of} \{ \mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \rightarrow N \}
\end{aligned}$$

Denotationally, **Amb** is just another pairing operator. Its interpretation as globally angelic choice will come to effect only through its operational semantics (see Section 3). Though essentially a call-by-name language, it also has strict application $M \downarrow N$.

We use a, \dots, g for program variables to distinguish them from the variables x, y, z of the logical system CFP (Section 4). **Nil**, **Left**, **Right**, **Pair**, **Amb** are called *constructors*. Constructors different from **Amb** are called *data constructors* and C_{data} denotes the set of data constructors.

$\mathbf{Left} \downarrow M$ stands for $(\lambda a. \mathbf{Left}(a)) \downarrow M$, etc., and we sometimes write **Left** and **Right** for $\mathbf{Left}(\mathbf{Nil})$ and $\mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Nil})$. Natural numbers are encoded as $0 \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{Left}$, $1 \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Left})$, $2 \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Left}))$, etc.

Although programs are untyped, programs extracted from proofs will be typable by the following system of simple recursive types:

$$\text{Types } \ni \rho, \sigma ::= \alpha \quad (\text{type variables}) \mid \mathbf{1} \mid \rho \times \sigma \mid \rho + \sigma \mid \rho \Rightarrow \sigma \mid \mathbf{fix} \alpha. \rho \mid \mathbf{A}(\rho)$$

The intention of $\mathbf{A}(\rho)$ is to denote the type of programs which, if they terminate (see Section 3), reduce to a form $\mathbf{Amb}(M, N)$ with $M, N : \rho$.

To obtain a well-behaved semantics of types (see Section 2.2) we impose restrictions on the formation of $\mathbf{A}(\rho)$ and $\mathbf{fix} \alpha. \rho$: A type is *regular* if (1) for every subtype $\mathbf{A}(\rho)$, ρ is determined (see below) and (2) for every subtype $\mathbf{fix} \alpha. \rho$, ρ is properly strictly positive in α . Here, a type is *determined* if it is of the form $\mathbf{fix} \alpha_1 \dots \mathbf{fix} \alpha_n. \rho$ ($n \geq 0$) with ρ of the form $\mathbf{1}$, $\rho_1 \times \rho_2$, $\rho_1 + \rho_2$, or $\rho_1 \Rightarrow \rho_2$, and a type is *properly strictly positive in α* if it contains α free but is different from α and it has no free occurrence of α in the left side of a function type.

In the following we will tacitly assume that all types under consideration are regular.

The restrictions imposed on fixed point types ensures that every type transformer $\alpha \mapsto \rho$ has a unique fixed point, which is taken as the semantics of $\mathbf{fix} \alpha. \rho$. The restriction on the formation of $\mathbf{A}(\rho)$ enables the interpretation of **Amb** as a bottom-avoiding choice operator (see the explanation below Corollary 3.4). An example of a (regular) type is

$$\mathbf{nat} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{fix} \alpha. \mathbf{1} + \alpha,$$

the type of lazy partial natural numbers. Besides the natural numbers $0, 1, 2, \dots$ (represented in D as described above) this type contains the ‘partial natural numbers’ \perp , $\mathbf{Right}(\perp)$, $\mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Right}(\perp))$, \dots , as well as their supremum, $\mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Right}(\dots)) = \bigsqcup \{ \mathbf{Right}^n(\perp) \mid n \in \mathbf{N} \}$.

$\frac{\Gamma, a : \rho \vdash a : \rho}{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho}$	$\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Nil} : \mathbf{1}$	$\Gamma \vdash \perp : \rho$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Left}(M) : \rho + \sigma}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Right}(M) : \rho + \sigma}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Pair}(M, N) : \rho \times \sigma}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \rho}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Amb}(M, N) : \mathbf{A}(\rho)}$	
$\frac{\Gamma, a : \rho \vdash M : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda a. M : \rho \Rightarrow \sigma}$	$\frac{\Gamma, a : \rho \vdash M a : \rho \quad (a \text{ not free in } M)}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{rec } M : \rho}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho \Rightarrow \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \rho}{\Gamma \vdash M N : \sigma}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho \Rightarrow \sigma \quad \Gamma \vdash N : \rho}{\Gamma \vdash M \Downarrow N : \sigma}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho[\mathbf{fix } \alpha. \rho/\alpha]}{\Gamma \vdash M : \mathbf{fix } \alpha. \rho}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \mathbf{fix } \alpha. \rho}{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho[\mathbf{fix } \alpha. \rho/\alpha]}$	
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho + \sigma \quad \Gamma, a : \rho \vdash L : \tau \quad \Gamma, b : \sigma \vdash R : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{case } M \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Left}(a) \rightarrow L; \mathbf{Right}(b) \rightarrow R \} : \tau}$		
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \rho \times \sigma \quad \Gamma, a : \rho, b : \sigma \vdash N : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{case } M \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Pair}(a, b) \rightarrow N \} : \tau}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \mathbf{A}(\rho) \quad \Gamma, a, b : \rho \vdash N : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{case } M \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \rightarrow N \} : \tau}$	

Table 1: Typing rules

The typing rules, listed in Fig. 1, are valid w.r.t. the denotational semantics given in Section 2.2 and extend the rules given in [BT21]. Recursive types are equirecursive [Pie02] in that $M : \mathbf{fix } \alpha. \rho$ iff $M : \rho[\mathbf{fix } \alpha. \rho/\alpha]$.

Lemma 2.1. *Typing is closed under substitution of types and programs. In other words, typed programs are polymorphic and the cut-rule holds:*

- (1) (*Polymorphism*) If $\Gamma \vdash M : \rho$ and α is not free in Γ , then $\Gamma \vdash M : \rho[\sigma/\alpha]$ for every type σ .
- (2) (*Cut*) If $\Gamma, x : \rho \vdash M : \sigma$ and $\Gamma \vdash N : \rho$, then $\Gamma \vdash M[N/x] : \sigma$.

Proof. Induction on typing derivations □

As an example of a program consider

$$f \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda a. \mathbf{case } a \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Left}(_) \rightarrow \mathbf{Left}; \mathbf{Right}(_) \rightarrow \perp \} \quad (2.1)$$

which implements the function f discussed earlier, i.e., $f 0 = 0$ and $f 1 = \perp$. f has type $\mathbf{nat} \Rightarrow \mathbf{nat}$. Since $\mathbf{Amb}(0, 1)$ has type $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{nat})$, the application $f \mathbf{Amb}(0, 1)$ is not well-typed. Instead, we consider $\mathbf{mapamb } f \mathbf{Amb}(0, 1)$ where $\mathbf{mapamb} : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\beta)$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{mapamb} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda f. \lambda c. \mathbf{case } c \mathbf{ of } \mathbf{case } c \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \rightarrow \mathbf{Amb}(f \downarrow a, f \downarrow b) \}$$

This operator realizes the globally angelic semantics: $\mathbf{mapamb } f \mathbf{Amb}(0, 1)$ is reduced to $\mathbf{Amb}(f \downarrow 0, f \downarrow 1)$, and then $f \downarrow 0$ and $f \downarrow 1$ are computed concurrently and the whole expression is reduced to 0, using the operational semantics in Section 3. In Section 5, we will introduce a concurrent (or nondeterministic) version of Modus Ponens, ($\mathbf{Conc}\text{-mp}$), which will automatically generate an application of \mathbf{mapamb} .

$\llbracket a \rrbracket \eta$	$= \eta(a)$
$\llbracket \lambda a. M \rrbracket \eta$	$= \mathbf{Fun}(f)$ where $f(d) = \llbracket M \rrbracket \eta[a \mapsto d]$
$\llbracket M N \rrbracket \eta$	$= f(\llbracket N \rrbracket \eta)$ if $\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta = \mathbf{Fun}(f)$
$\llbracket M \downarrow N \rrbracket \eta$	$= f(\llbracket N \rrbracket \eta)$ if $\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta = \mathbf{Fun}(f)$ and $\llbracket N \rrbracket \eta \neq \perp$
$\llbracket \mathbf{rec} M \rrbracket \eta$	$=$ the least fixed point of f if $\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta = \mathbf{Fun}(f)$
$\llbracket C(M_1, \dots, M_k) \rrbracket \eta$	$= C(\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket \eta, \dots, \llbracket M_k \rrbracket \eta)$ (C a constructor (including \mathbf{Amb}))
$\llbracket \mathbf{case} M \mathbf{of} \vec{C}l \rrbracket \eta$	$= \llbracket K \rrbracket \eta[\vec{a} \mapsto \vec{d}]$ if $\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta = C(\vec{d})$ and $C(\vec{a}) \rightarrow K \in \vec{C}l$
$\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta$	$= \perp$ in all other cases, in particular $\llbracket \perp \rrbracket \eta = \perp$

η is an environment that assigns elements of D to variables.

Table 2: Denotational semantics of programs (Phase I)

2.2. Denotational semantics. The denotational semantics has two phases: *Phase I* interprets programs in a Scott domain D defined by the following recursive domain equation

$$D = (\mathbf{Nil} + \mathbf{Left}(D) + \mathbf{Right}(D) + \mathbf{Pair}(D \times D) + \mathbf{Amb}(D \times D) + \mathbf{Fun}(D \rightarrow D))_{\perp}.$$

where $+$ and \times denote separated sum and cartesian product, and the operation \cdot_{\perp} adds a least element \perp ([GHK⁺03] is a recommended reference for domain theory and the solution of domain equations).

Table 2 gives the denotational semantics of programs which interprets a program M as an element $\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta \in D$ for every environment η assigning domain elements to the free variables of M . Note that \mathbf{Amb} is interpreted (like \mathbf{Pair}) as a simple pairing operator.

Types are interpreted as subdomains, i.e. as subsets of D that are downward closed and closed under suprema of bounded subsets. To interpret the type constructors we use the following operations on subsets of D :

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\perp} &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} X \cup \{\perp\} \\ X + Y &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \{\mathbf{Left}(a) \mid a \in X\} \cup \{\mathbf{Right}(b) \mid b \in Y\} \\ X \times Y &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \{\mathbf{Pair}(a, b) \mid a \in X, b \in Y\} \\ X \Rightarrow Y &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \{\mathbf{Fun}(f) \mid f : D \rightarrow D \text{ continuous, } \forall a \in X (f(a) \in Y)\} \\ \mathbf{Amb}(X, Y) &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \{\mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \mid a \in X, b \in Y\} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, if X and Y are subdomains of D , so are $(X + Y)_{\perp}$, $(X \times Y)_{\perp}$, $\mathbf{Amb}(X, Y)_{\perp}$, $(X \Rightarrow Y)_{\perp}$. The denotational semantics of types, shown in Table 3, maps every type ρ to a subdomain D_{ρ}^{ζ} for every environment ζ that assigns subdomains to the free type variables of ρ . It is easy to see that the typing rules in Table 1 are sound w.r.t. this semantics.

In the following we will often write M instead of $\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta$ if it is clear from the context that we mean the denotation of M and not its syntax and if it is clear which assignment η we are referring to, or the assignment is irrelevant. Similarly, we will often write just ρ instead of D_{ρ}^{ζ} , hence $a \in \rho$, which we also write as $a : \rho$, means $a \in D_{\rho}^{\zeta}$, and $M \in \rho$ (or $M : \rho$) means $\llbracket M \rrbracket \eta \in D_{\rho}^{\zeta}$. We write $\vdash M : \rho$ if the typing is derivable by the typing rules.

In *Phase II* of the denotational semantics we assign to every $a \in D$ a set $\text{data}(a) \subseteq D$ that reveals the role of \mathbf{Amb} as a choice operator. The relation $\text{data}(a, d)$, also written

$D_\alpha^\zeta = \zeta(\alpha),$ $D_1^\zeta = \{\mathbf{Nil}, \perp\},$ $D_{\mathbf{fix}\ \alpha.\ \rho}^\zeta = \bigcap \{X \triangleleft D \mid D_\rho^\zeta[\alpha \mapsto X] \subseteq X\} \quad (X \triangleleft D \text{ means } X \text{ is a subdomain of } D)$ $D_{\mathbf{A}(\rho)}^\zeta = \mathbf{Amb}(D_\rho^\zeta, D_\rho^\zeta)_\perp$ $D_{\rho \diamond \sigma}^\zeta = (D_\rho^\zeta \diamond D_\sigma^\zeta)_\perp \quad (\diamond \in \{+, \times, \Rightarrow\})$ <p>ζ is a type environment that assigns subdomains of D to type variables.</p>

Table 3: Denotational semantics of types

‘ $d \in \text{data}(a)$ ’, is defined (coinductively) as the largest relation satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
d \in \text{data}(a) \quad \stackrel{\vee}{=} \quad & (a = \mathbf{Amb}(a', b') \wedge a' \neq \perp \wedge d \in \text{data}(a')) \vee \\
& (a = \mathbf{Amb}(a', b') \wedge b' \neq \perp \wedge d \in \text{data}(b')) \vee \\
& (a = \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp) \wedge d = \perp) \vee \\
& \bigvee_{C \in \mathbf{C}_{\text{data}}} \left(a = C(\vec{a}') \wedge d = C(\vec{d}') \wedge \bigwedge_i d'_i \in \text{data}(a'_i) \right) \vee \\
& (a = \mathbf{Fun}(f) \wedge d = a) \vee \\
& (a = d = \perp). \tag{2.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, every closed program M denotes the set $\text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket) \subseteq D$ containing all possible globally angelic choices derived from its denotation in D . For example, $\text{data}(\mathbf{Amb}(0, 1)) = \{0, 1\}$ and, for f as defined in (2.1), we have, as expected, $\text{data}(\text{mapamb } f \ \mathbf{Amb}(0, 1)) = \text{data}(\mathbf{Amb}(0, \perp)) = \{0\}$. In Section 3 we will define an operational semantics whose fair execution sequences starting with a regular-typed program M compute exactly the elements in $\text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$.

Remark 2.2. In [BT21] the meaning of the word ‘data’ is slightly different. There, it means that a domain element has no function component. Therefore, in IFP, ‘data’ means ‘no \mathbf{Fun} ’, whereas here, it means ‘no \mathbf{Amb} ’.

Example 1. Let $M = \mathbf{rec} \ \lambda a. \mathbf{Amb}(\mathbf{Left}(\mathbf{Nil}), \mathbf{Right}(a))$. M is a closed program of type $\mathbf{fix} \ \alpha. \mathbf{A}(1 + \alpha)$. We have $\text{data}(M) = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Thus, we can express countable choice (random assignment) with \mathbf{Amb} .

Lemma 2.3. *If $a \in \rho$ (w.r.t. some type environment) where ρ is a (regular) type but not a variable, then the following are equivalent: (i) $\perp \in \text{data}(a)$; (ii) $\{\perp\} = \text{data}(a)$; (iii) $a \in \{\perp, \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp)\}$.*

Proof. Obviously (iii) implies (ii), and (ii) implies (i). Therefore, it suffices to show that (i) implies (iii). By the definition of data , $\perp \in \text{data}(a)$ if and only if $a = \perp$ or $(a = \mathbf{Amb}(a', b')$ and $((a' \neq \perp$ and $\perp \in \text{data}(a'))$ or $(b' \neq \perp$ and $\perp \in \text{data}(b'))$ or $a' = b' = \perp)$. If $a = \perp$, then (iii) holds. If $a = \mathbf{Amb}(a', b')$, then, since ρ is not a variable (but regular), ρ must be of the form $\mathbf{fix} \ \alpha_1 \dots \mathbf{fix} \ \alpha_n. \mathbf{A}(\sigma)$ where σ is determined. Therefore, $a', b' \in \sigma$ (w.r.t. some type environment) and hence neither a' nor b' have the form $\mathbf{Amb}(a'', b'')$. It follows that, $\perp \in \text{data}(a')$ if and only if $a' = \perp$, and $\perp \in \text{data}(b')$ if and only if $b' = \perp$. Therefore, (iii) holds. \square

3. OPERATIONAL SEMANTICS

We define a small-step operational semantics that, in the limit, reduces each closed program M nondeterministically to an element in $\text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ (Theorem 3.2). If M has a regular type, the converse holds as well: For every $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ there exists a reduction sequence for M computing d in the limit (Theorem 3.3). If M denotes a compact data, then the limit is obtained after finitely many reductions. In the following, all programs and types are assumed to be closed.

3.1. Reduction to weak head normal form. A program is called a *weak head normal form (w.h.n.f.)* if it begins with a constructor (including **Amb**), or has the form $\lambda a.M$. In Table 4, we inductively define a small-step leftmost-outermost reduction relation \rightsquigarrow on programs.

Lemma 3.1. (1) \rightsquigarrow is deterministic (i.e., $M \rightsquigarrow M'$ for at most one M').
 (2) \rightsquigarrow preserves the denotational semantics (i.e., $\llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket M' \rrbracket$ if $M \rightsquigarrow M'$).
 (3) M is a \rightsquigarrow -normal form iff M is a w.h.n.f.
 (4) [Adequacy Lemma] If $\llbracket M \rrbracket \neq \perp$, then there is a w.h.n.f. V s.t. $M \rightsquigarrow^* V$.

Proof. (1) to (3) are easy. The proof of (4) is standard and is as the proof of Lemma 33 in [BT21] for the case that M begins with a constructor, and an easy consequence of Lemma 32 in [BT21] for the case that M is a λ -abstraction. \square

3.2. Making choices. Next, we define the reduction relation $\overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow}$ ('c' for 'choice') that reduces arguments of **Amb** in parallel as in Table 4. From this definition and Lemma 3.1, it is immediate that M is a $\overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow}$ -normal form iff M is a *deterministic weak head normal form (d.w.h.n.f.)*, that is, a w.h.n.f. that does not begin with **Amb**.

Finally, we define a reduction relation $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$ that reduces arguments of data constructors in parallel. Every (closed) program reduces under $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$ (easy proof by structural induction). For example, **Nil** $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$ **Nil** by (p-ii). In the following, all $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$ -reduction sequences are assumed to be infinite.

We call a $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$ -reduction sequence *unfair* if, intuitively, from some point on, one side of an **Amb** term is permanently reduced but not the other. More precisely, we inductively define $M_1 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_2 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$ to be unfair if

- each M_i is of the form **Amb**(L_i, R) (with fixed R) and $L_i \rightsquigarrow L_{i+1}$, or
- each M_i is of the form **Amb**(L, R_i) (with fixed L) and $R_i \rightsquigarrow R_{i+1}$, or
- each M_i is of the form $C(N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,n})$ (with a fixed n -ary data constructor C) and $N_{1,k} \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} N_{2,k} \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$ is unfair for some k , or
- the tail of the sequence, $M_2 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_3 \dots$, is unfair.

A $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$ -reduction sequence is *fair* if it is not unfair.

A *computation* of M is an infinite fair sequence $M = M_0 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_1 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$. Intuitively, computation proceeds as follows: A program L is head reduced by \rightsquigarrow to a w.h.n.f. L' , and if L' is a data constructor term, all arguments are reduced in parallel by (p-ii). If L' has the form **Amb**(M, N), two concurrent threads are invoked for the reductions of M and N in parallel, and the one reduced to a w.h.n.f. first is used. Fairness corresponds to the fact that the 'speed' of each thread is positive which means, in particular, that no thread

Rules of \rightsquigarrow :

$$(s-i) \quad (\lambda a. M) N \rightsquigarrow M[N/a]$$

$$(s-ii) \quad \frac{M \rightsquigarrow M'}{M N \rightsquigarrow M' N}$$

$$(s-iii) \quad (\lambda a. M)\downarrow N \rightsquigarrow M[N/a] \quad \text{if } N \text{ is a w.h.n.f.}$$

$$(s-iv) \quad \frac{M \rightsquigarrow M'}{M\downarrow N \rightsquigarrow M'\downarrow N} \quad \text{if } N \text{ is a w.h.n.f.}$$

$$(s-v) \quad \frac{N \rightsquigarrow N'}{M\downarrow N \rightsquigarrow M\downarrow N'}$$

$$(s-vi) \quad \mathbf{rec} M \rightsquigarrow M (\mathbf{rec} M)$$

$$(s-vii) \quad \mathbf{case} C(\vec{M}) \mathbf{of} \{ \dots; C(\vec{b}) \rightarrow N; \dots \} \rightsquigarrow N[\vec{M}/\vec{b}]$$

(C ranges over constructors including **Amb**)

$$(s-viii) \quad \frac{M \rightsquigarrow M'}{\mathbf{case} M \mathbf{of} \{ \vec{C}l \} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{case} M' \mathbf{of} \{ \vec{C}l \}}$$

$$(s-ix) \quad M \rightsquigarrow \perp \quad \text{if } M \text{ is } \perp\text{-like (see below)}$$

Rules of $\overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow}$:

$$(c-i) \quad \frac{M \rightsquigarrow M'}{M \overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow} M'}$$

$$(c-ii) \quad \frac{M_1 \rightsquigarrow M'_1}{\mathbf{Amb}(M_1, M_2) \overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow} \mathbf{Amb}(M'_1, M_2)}$$

$$(c-ii') \quad \frac{M_2 \rightsquigarrow M'_2}{\mathbf{Amb}(M_1, M_2) \overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow} \mathbf{Amb}(M_1, M'_2)}$$

$$(c-iii) \quad \mathbf{Amb}(M_1, M_2) \overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow} M_1 \quad \text{if } M_1 \text{ is a w.h.n.f.}$$

$$(c-iii') \quad \mathbf{Amb}(M_1, M_2) \overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow} M_2 \quad \text{if } M_2 \text{ is a w.h.n.f.}$$

Rules of $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$:

$$(p-i) \quad \frac{M \overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow} M'}{M \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M'}$$

$$(p-ii) \quad \frac{M_i \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M'_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, k)}{C(M_1, \dots, M_k) \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} C(M'_1, \dots, M'_k)} \quad (C \in C_{\text{data}})$$

$$(p-iii) \quad \lambda a. M \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \lambda a. M$$

\perp -like programs are such that their syntactic forms immediately imply that they denote \perp , more precisely they are of the form \perp , $C(\vec{M}) N$, $C(\vec{M})\downarrow N$, and $\mathbf{case} M \mathbf{of} \{ \dots \}$ where M is a lambda-abstraction or of the form $C(\vec{M})$ such that there is no clause in $\{ \dots \}$ which is of the form $C(\vec{a}) \rightarrow N$. W.h.n.f.s are never \perp -like, and the only typeable \perp -like program is \perp .

Table 4: Operational semantics of programs

can block another. Note that $\overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow}$ is not used for the reductions of M and N in (s-ii), (s-iv), (s-v) and (s-viii). This means that $\overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow}$ is applied only to the outermost redex. Also, (c-ii) is defined through \rightsquigarrow , not $\overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow}$, and thus no thread creates new threads. This ability to limit the bound of threads was not available in an earlier version of this language [Ber16] (see also the discussion in Section 8.1).

3.3. Computational adequacy: Matching denotational and operational semantics.

We define $M_D \in D$ by structural induction on programs:

$$\begin{aligned} C(M_1, \dots, M_k)_D &= C(M_{1D}, \dots, M_{kD}) && (C \in \mathbf{C}_{\text{data}}) \\ (\lambda a.M)_D &= \llbracket \lambda a.M \rrbracket \\ M_D &= \perp && \text{otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

Since clearly $M \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} N$ implies $M_D \sqsubseteq_D N_D$, for every computation sequence $M_0 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_1 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$, the sequence $((M_i)_D)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is increasing and therefore has a least upper bound in D . Intuitively, M_D is the part of M that has been fully evaluated to a data.

Theorem 3.2 (Computational Adequacy: Soundness). *For every computation $M = M_0 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_1 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$, $\sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (M_i)_D \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$.*

Proof. In the proof we will use the principle of coinduction for the binary predicate data which was defined coinductively in (2.2). In general, for a coinductive predicate $Q(\vec{x}) \stackrel{\nu}{=} \Phi(Q)(\vec{x})$ and any predicate P of the same arity, one can prove $P \subseteq Q$ by coinduction by proving $P \subseteq \Phi(P)$. This proof principle is formalized in IFP/CFP (last rule in Table 5 in Section 4).

Set $P(a, d) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} d = \sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (M_i)_D$ for some computation $M_1 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_2 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$ with $a = \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket$. We show $P \subseteq \text{data}$, that is, $P(a, d) \rightarrow d \in \text{data}(a)$, by coinduction. Therefore, we have to show $P(a, d) \rightarrow \Phi(P)(a, d)$ where $\Phi(P)(a, d)$ obtained by replacing in the right hand side of (2.2), the predicate data by P . Assume $P(a, d)$, witnessed by the computation, that is, fair reduction sequence $M = M_0 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_1 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$ with $a = \llbracket M \rrbracket$ and $d = \sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (M_i)_D$. We have to show that at least one of the following six conditions holds:

- (1) $a = \mathbf{Amb}(a', b') \wedge a' \neq \perp \wedge P(a', d)$
- (2) $a = \mathbf{Amb}(a', b') \wedge b' \neq \perp \wedge P(b', d)$
- (3) $a = \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp) \wedge d = \perp$
- (4) $a = C(\vec{a}') \wedge d = C(\vec{d}') \wedge \bigwedge_i P(a'_i, d'_i)$ for some data constructor C .
- (5) $a = \mathbf{Fun}(f) \wedge d = a$
- (6) $a = d = \perp$

Any computation $M = M_0 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_1 \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} \dots$ belongs to one the following categories:

Case a: All reductions $M_i \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_{i+1}$ are (p-i) derived from (c-i): That is, $M_0 \rightsquigarrow M_1 \rightsquigarrow \dots$. In this case, $d = \perp$ and (6) holds by Lemma 3.1 (2) and (4).

Case b: For some n , $M_i \rightsquigarrow M_{i+1}$ ($i < n$) and $M_i \overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow} M_{i+1}$ ($n \leq i$) by (c-ii) and (c-ii'): In this case, $M_i = \mathbf{Amb}(L_i, R_i)$ for $i \geq n$. We have $L_i \rightsquigarrow L_{i+1}$ and $R_i = R_{i+1}$ or $L_i = L_{i+1}$ and $R_i \rightsquigarrow R_{i+1}$. By fairness, both happen infinitely often and therefore (3) holds by Lemma 3.1 (2) and (4).

Case c: $M_i \rightsquigarrow M_{i+1}$ for $i < n$ and $M_i \overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow} M_{i+1}$ for $i \geq n$ by (p-iii): (5) holds by Lemma 3.1(2).

Case d: $M_i \rightsquigarrow M_{i+1}$ for $i < n$ and $M_i \xrightarrow{p} M_{i+1}$ for $i \geq n$ by (p-ii): M_i has the form $C(N_{i,1}, \dots, N_{i,k})$ for $i \geq n$ and $N_{n,j} \xrightarrow{p} N_{n+1,j} \xrightarrow{p} \dots$ are fair reductions. In addition, $a = C(\llbracket N_{i,1} \rrbracket, \dots, \llbracket N_{i,k} \rrbracket)$ and $d = C(\sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (N_{i,1})_D, \dots, \sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (N_{i,k})_D)$. Therefore, (4) holds.

Case e: $M_i \rightsquigarrow M_{i+1}$ for $i < n$, $M_n = \mathbf{Amb}(L, R)$, $M_i \xrightarrow{c} M_{i+1}$ for $n \leq i < m$ by (c-ii) and (c-ii'), $M_m \xrightarrow{c} M_{m+1}$ by (c-iii) or (c-iii'): $a = \mathbf{Amb}(a', b')$ with $a' = \llbracket L \rrbracket$ and $b' = \llbracket R \rrbracket$. $M_m = \mathbf{Amb}(L', R')$. If (c-iii) is used, $M_{m+1} = L'$ with $a' = \llbracket L \rrbracket = \llbracket L' \rrbracket \neq \perp$. Since the reduction sequence $M_{m+1} \xrightarrow{p} M_{m+2} \xrightarrow{p} \dots$ is fair again, $P(a', d)$ and hence (1) holds. Similarly, (2) holds for the case (c-iii') is used. \square

The converse does not hold in general, i.e. $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ does not necessarily imply $d = \sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} ((M_i)_D)$ for some computation of M . For example, for $M \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{rec} \lambda a. \mathbf{Amb}(a, \perp)$ (for which $\llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathbf{Amb}(M, \perp) \rrbracket$) one sees that $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ for every $d \in D$ while $M \xrightarrow{p^*} M$ and $M_D = \perp$. But M has the type $\mathbf{fix} \alpha. \mathbf{A}(\alpha)$ which is not regular (see Section 2.1). For programs of a regular type, the converse of Theorem 3.2 does hold.

Theorem 3.3 (Computational Adequacy: Completeness). *If M is a member of a regular type, then for every $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$, there is a computation $M = M_0 \xrightarrow{p} M_1 \xrightarrow{p} \dots$ with $d = \sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} ((M_i)_D)$.*

Proof. First, we observe that every regular type is semantically equal to a type $\mathbf{A}(\rho)$ or ρ where ρ is neither a fixed point type nor of the form $\mathbf{A}(\sigma)$. This follows from an easy modification of Lemma 7 in [BT21]. The key to the proof of the theorem is the following

Claim. Let e be a compact element of D . If M is a program with $M : \rho$ for some regular type ρ , $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ and $e \sqsubseteq d$, then there exists M' such that $M \xrightarrow{p^*} M'$, $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M' \rrbracket)$, and $e \sqsubseteq M'_D \sqsubseteq d$.

Proof of the Claim. Induction on the rank of e where the rank, $\mathbf{rk}(a) \in \mathbf{N}$, of a compact element of $a \in D$ is defined as $\mathbf{rk}(\perp) = \mathbf{rk}(\mathbf{Fun}(f)) = 0$ and $\mathbf{rk}(C(\vec{a})) = 1 + \max(\mathbf{rk}(\vec{a}))^1$. $D_\tau = D_{\mathbf{A}^k(\rho)}$ where $k \in \{0, 1\}$ and ρ is neither a fixed point type nor of the form $\mathbf{A}(\rho')$.

Case $e = \perp$. Then the assertion holds with $M' = M$, since clearly $M_D \sqsubseteq d$ for all $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ (induction on M).

Case $e = C(\vec{e}')$ with $C \neq \mathbf{Amb}$. Then $\vec{d} = C(\vec{d}')$ with $d'_i \sqsupseteq e'_i$.

If $k = 0$, then τ is semantically equal to a type of the form $\mathbf{1}$, $\rho_1 + \rho_2$ or $\rho_1 \times \rho_2$, and therefore $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ has the form $C(\vec{a}')$. By the Adequacy Lemma (Lemma 3.1 (4)), $M \rightsquigarrow^* C(\vec{M}')$ for some \vec{M}' and $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket) = \text{data}(C(\llbracket \vec{M}' \rrbracket))$. Therefore, by the definition of data, $d'_i \in \text{data}(\llbracket M'_i \rrbracket)$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.1 (2), $C(\vec{M}')$ has the same denotation as M and therefore, each M'_i has a denotation in some regular type (for example, if $\rho = \rho_1 \times \rho_2$, then $M'_1 : \rho_1$). Since the ranks of the e'_i are smaller than that of e , by induction hypothesis, there exists \vec{M}'' such that $M'_i \xrightarrow{p^*} M''_i$, $d'_i \in \text{data}(\llbracket M''_i \rrbracket)$ and $e'_i \sqsubseteq (M''_i)_D \sqsubseteq d'_i$. Therefore, $C(\vec{M}') \xrightarrow{p^*} C(\vec{M}'')$ by (p-ii), $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket C(\vec{M}'') \rrbracket)$, and $e \sqsubseteq C(\vec{M}'')_D \sqsubseteq d$. Since $M \rightsquigarrow^* C(\vec{M}')$, we are done.

If $k = 1$, then $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ has the form $\mathbf{Amb}(a', b')$. Since $d \sqsupseteq e \neq \perp$, $a' \neq \perp \wedge d \in \text{data}(a')$ or $b' \neq \perp \wedge d \in \text{data}(b')$. By the Adequacy Lemma, $M \rightsquigarrow^* \mathbf{Amb}(N_1, N_2)$. If $\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket \neq \perp \wedge d \in$

¹Every compact element has a rank since otherwise it could be approximated from elements strictly below. Our definition of rank differs slightly from the one in [BT21] where $\mathbf{rk}(\mathbf{Fun}(f)) > 0$.

$\text{data}(\llbracket N_1 \rrbracket)$ then $N_1 \rightsquigarrow^* K$ for some w.h.n.f. K and therefore $M \rightsquigarrow^c K$ by applying (c-i), (c-ii), and (c-iii), and thus $M \rightsquigarrow^p K$ by (p-i). Note that $K : \mathbf{A}^0(\rho)$ and $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket K \rrbracket)$. Therefore, there exists K' such that $K \rightsquigarrow^p K'$, $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket K' \rrbracket)$, and $e \sqsubseteq K'_D \sqsubseteq d$. Since $M \rightsquigarrow^p K'$, we have the result.

Case $e = \mathbf{Fun}(f)$. If $k = 0$, then $\llbracket M \rrbracket = \mathbf{Fun}(f)$ and therefore $d = \mathbf{Fun}(f)$. Furthermore, by the Adequacy Lemma, $M \rightsquigarrow^* M'$ for some M' in w.h.n.f. Since $\llbracket M' \rrbracket = \llbracket M \rrbracket = \mathbf{Fun}(f)$, M' is a λ -abstraction and hence $M'_D = \llbracket M' \rrbracket$. It follows that $e = M'_D = d$. If $k = 1$ the same argument as in the case $e = C(\vec{e}')$ applies. This completes the proof of the Claim.

To prove the Theorem, let $d \in \text{data}(M)$, and let $d_0 \sqsubseteq d_1 \sqsubseteq \dots$ be an infinite sequence of compact approximations of d such that $d = \sqcup_i d_i$. We construct a sequence $(M_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ such that $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M_i \rrbracket)$ and M_i has a regular type as follows. Let $M_0 = M$. By applying the Claim to d_i , d and M_i , we have M_{i+1} such that $M_i \rightsquigarrow^p M_{i+1}$ (hence, clearly, M_{i+1} has a regular type as well), $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M_{i+1} \rrbracket)$, and $d_i \sqsubseteq (M_{i+1})_D \sqsubseteq d$. By concatenating the reduction sequences, we have an infinite sequence $M = N_0 \rightsquigarrow^p N_1 \rightsquigarrow^p \dots$ such that $d = \sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} ((N_i)_D)$. \square

We say that a closed program M is *productive* if every computation $M = M_0 \rightsquigarrow^p M_1 \rightsquigarrow^p \dots$ produces a deterministic w.h.n.f. (i.e., some M_i is a deterministic w.h.n.f.). We consider productiveness a counterpart of termination for a nondeterministic infinite computation. By the first Adequacy Theorem and Lemma 2.3:

Corollary 3.4. *For a closed program M of regular type, the following are equivalent.*

- (1) M is productive.
- (2) Some computation $M = M_0 \rightsquigarrow^p M_1 \rightsquigarrow^p \dots$ produces a deterministic w.h.n.f.
- (3) $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ is neither \perp nor $\mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp)$.

Proof. Clearly, every program has a fair \rightsquigarrow^p -reduction sequences. Therefore, (1) implies (2). Next, assume (2). Then, by Theorem 3.2, $\text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ must contain a non-bottom element. By Lemma 2.3, (3) holds. Finally, if (3) holds, then by Lemma 2.3, $\perp \notin \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$. Hence, by Theorem 3.2, every \rightsquigarrow^p -reduction sequences of M reduces to a deterministic w.h.n.f. \square

The corollary does not hold without the regularity condition. For example, $M = \mathbf{Amb}(\mathbf{Amb}(\mathbf{Nil}, \mathbf{Nil}), \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp))$ can be reduced to $M_1 = \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp)$ and then repeats M_1 forever, whereas it can also be reduced to \mathbf{Nil} . McCarthy's **amb** operator is bottom-avoiding in that when it can terminate, it always terminates. Corollary 3.4 guarantees a similar property for our globally angelic choice operator **Amb**.

4. CFP (CONCURRENT FIXED POINT LOGIC)

In [BT21], the system IFP (Intuitionistic Fixed Point Logic) was introduced. IFP is an intuitionistic first-order logic with strictly positive inductive and coinductive definitions, from the proofs of which programs can be extracted. The system CFP is obtained by adding to IFP two propositional operators, $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow(B)$, that facilitate the extraction of nondeterministic and concurrent programs. In this section, we introduce CFP after a short overview of IFP.

4.1. IFP.

Language. The system IFP is defined relative to a many-sorted first-order language. IFP expressions consist of formulas, predicates, and operators. IFP Formulas have the form $A \wedge B$, $A \vee B$, $A \rightarrow B$, $\forall x A$, $\exists x A$, $s = t$ (s, t terms of the same sort), $P(\vec{t})$ (for a predicate P and terms \vec{t} of fitting arities). Predicates are either predicate constants (as given by the first-order language), or predicate variables (denoted X, Y, \dots), or comprehensions $\lambda \vec{x} A$ (where A is a formula and \vec{x} is a tuple of first-order variables), or fixed points $\mu(\Phi)$ and $\nu(\Phi)$ (least fixed point aka inductive predicate and greatest fixed point aka coinductive predicate) where Φ is a strictly positive (s.p.) operator. Every term has a fixed sort and every predicate variable has a fixed arity which is a tuple of sorts. We usually suppress sorts and arities, notationally. Operators are of the form $\lambda X Q$ where X is a predicate variable and Q is a predicate of the same arity as X . $\lambda X Q$ is s.p. if every free occurrence of X in Q is at a strictly positive position, that is, at a position that is not in the left part of an implication.

Notation: $P(\vec{t})$ will also be written $\vec{t} \in P$, and if Φ is $\lambda X Q$, then $\Phi(P)$ stands for $Q[P/X]$. Definitions (on the meta level) of the form $P \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \square(\Phi)$ ($\square \in \{\mu, \nu\}$) where $\Phi = \lambda X \lambda \vec{x} A$, will usually be written $P(\vec{x}) \stackrel{\square}{=} A[P/X]$. We write $P \subseteq Q$ for $\forall \vec{x} (P(\vec{x}) \rightarrow Q(\vec{x}))$, $\forall x \in P A$ for $\forall x (P(x) \rightarrow A)$, and $\exists x \in P A$ for $\exists x (P(x) \wedge A)$. $\neg A \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} A \rightarrow \mathbf{False}$ where $\mathbf{False} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mu(\lambda X X)$ and X has empty arity (i.e. X is a propositional variable). We identify $(\lambda \vec{x} A)(\vec{t})$ with $A[\vec{t}/\vec{x}]$ where $[\vec{t}/\vec{x}]$ means capture avoiding substitution. Formulas are identified with predicates of empty arity. Hence, every statement about predicates is also a statement about formulas.

Example 2 (Inductively defined predicates). In our examples and case studies, we work with an instance of IFP (and also its extension CFP) that contains a sort for real numbers, whose language includes constants, operations and relations such as $0, 1, +, -, *, <, | \cdot |, /$. In this instance, one can express the predicate $\mathbf{N}(x)$ that x is a natural number inductively as

$$\mathbf{N}(x) \stackrel{\mu}{=} x = 0 \vee \mathbf{N}(x - 1)$$

which is shorthand for $\mathbf{N} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mu(\lambda X \lambda x (x = 0 \vee X(x - 1)))$.

Proofs. The proof rules of IFP are the usual natural deduction rules for intuitionistic first-order logic with equality plus rules for induction and coinduction, as shown in Table 5. In the last four rules (called closure, induction, coclosure, coinduction), Φ is a s.p. operator, i.e. an abstraction $\lambda X Q$ where Q is a predicate that is strictly positive in the predicate variable X . The application $\Phi(P)$ is defined as $Q[P/X]$. The induction rule has a strong and a half strong variant where the premise is weakened to $\Phi(P \cap \mu(\Phi)) \subseteq P$ respectively $\Phi(P) \cap \mu(\Phi) \subseteq P$. Similarly, the coinduction rule has a strong and a half strong variant where the premise is weakened to $P \subseteq \Phi(P \cup \nu(\Phi))$ respectively $P \subseteq \Phi(P) \cup \nu(\Phi)$. Logically, these variants are redundant since they can be derived from the original versions. However, they can be given more efficient realizers than those that would be obtained by extraction from their derivations (see [BT21]).

Axioms. IFP is parametric in a set \mathcal{A} of *axioms*, which have to be closed *non computational (nc)* formulas, i.e., formulas containing no disjunctions. Axioms should be chosen such that they are true in an intended Tarskian model. Since Tarskian semantics admits classical logic, this means that a fair amount of classical logic is available through axioms. For example, for

$\Gamma, A \vdash A$	$\Gamma \vdash A$ (A a non computational axiom)
$\Gamma \vdash t = t$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A[s/x] \quad \Gamma \vdash s = t}{\Gamma \vdash A[t/x]}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \wedge B}{\Gamma \vdash B}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B \quad \Gamma, A \vdash C \quad \Gamma, B \vdash C}{\Gamma \vdash C}$
$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash B}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A}$ (x not free in Γ)	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \forall x A}{\Gamma \vdash A[t/x]}$
$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x A}$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \exists x A \quad \Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash B}$ (x not free in Γ, B)
$\Gamma \vdash \Phi(\mu(\Phi)) \subseteq \mu(\Phi)$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Phi(P) \subseteq P}{\Gamma \vdash \mu(\Phi) \subseteq P}$
$\Gamma \vdash \nu(\Phi) \subseteq \Phi(\nu(\Phi))$	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash P \subseteq \Phi(P)}{\Gamma \vdash P \subseteq \nu(\Phi)}$

Table 5: Derivation rules of IFP.

each nc-formula $A(\vec{x})$, stability, $\forall \vec{x} (\neg \neg A(\vec{x}) \rightarrow A(\vec{x}))$ can be postulated as an axiom. The significance of the restriction to nc-formulas is that these are identical to their (formalized) realizability interpretation given below. In particular, Tarskian and realizability semantics coincide for axioms, which is the base of the soundness of our realizability interpretation.

Realizability. From an IFP proof of a formula A , one can extract a program M that is a realization of the computational content of A . Program extraction is done by

- (1) defining, for each formula A , a type $\tau(A)$ and a predicate $\mathbf{R}(A)$ on the Scott-domain D (defined in Section 2.2) specifying which $a \in \tau(A)$ realizes A .
- (2) showing that if there is a proof of A , then there is a program satisfying $\mathbf{R}(A)$.

For a given instance of IFP, realizability is formalized in another instance of IFP, called RIFP, which extends IFP by additional sorts, constants, and axioms. RIFP has the new sorts δ for the domain D and δ^\triangleleft for the set of subdomains of D , a binary relation symbol $:$ for the typing relation as well as constants for the type and program constructs in Section 2, excluding \mathbf{A} , \mathbf{Amb} and \downarrow . It also has axioms describing the denotational semantics of RIFP programs and types, which can be found in [BT21]. In addition, RIFP has special predicate variables and type variables, corresponding to IFP predicate variables, as well as axioms connecting them, which we describe below.

To avoid ‘computational garbage’ we distinguish between formulas with (nontrivial) computational content and those with trivial computational content. The latter are called *Harrop formulas* and are defined as those IFP formulas which contain neither free predicate variables nor disjunctions (\vee) at strictly positive positions. Their trivial computational

$\tau(P(\vec{t})) = \tau(P)$	
$\tau(A \vee B) = \tau(A) + \tau(B)$	
$\tau(A \wedge B) = \tau(A) \times \tau(B)$	(A, B non-Harrop)
$\quad = \tau(A)$	(B Harrop, A non-Harrop)
$\quad = \tau(B)$	(A Harrop, B non-Harrop)
$\quad = \mathbf{1}$	(A, B Harrop)
$\tau(A \rightarrow B) = \tau(A) \Rightarrow \tau(B)$	(A, B non-Harrop)
$\quad = \tau(B)$	(otherwise)
$\tau(\diamond x A) = \tau(A)$	($\diamond \in \{\forall, \exists\}$)
$\tau(X) = \alpha_X$	(X a predicate variable, α_X a fresh type variable)
$\tau(P) = \mathbf{1}$	(P a predicate constant)
$\tau(\lambda \vec{x} A) = \tau(A)$	
$\tau(\diamond(\lambda X P)) = \mathbf{fix} \alpha_X . \tau(P)$	($\diamond \in \{\mu, \nu\}$, $\diamond(\lambda X P)$ non-Harrop)
$\quad = \mathbf{1}$	($\diamond \in \{\mu, \nu\}$, $\diamond(\lambda X P)$ Harrop)

Table 6: Types of IFP expressions.

content is represented by the program **Nil**. A formula is *non-Harrop* if it is not Harrop. The definition of the Harrop property can be extended to predicates in an obvious way.

Table 6 defines the type $\tau(A)$ of an IFP formula. Simultaneously, a type $\tau(P)$ is defined for every IFP predicate P . For a predicate variable, $\tau(X)$ is a fresh type variable α_X representing the unknown type of the unknown predicate X . One can see that $\tau(A) = \mathbf{1}$ iff A is a Harrop formula.

The realizability predicate $\mathbf{R}(A)$ is defined in Table 7 by structural recursion on the IFP formula A . We often write $a \mathbf{r} A$ for $\mathbf{R}(A)(a)$ (a realizes A) and $\mathbf{r} A$ for $\exists a a \mathbf{r} A$ (A is realizable). Simultaneously with $\mathbf{R}(A)$, we define for every IFP predicate P an RIFP-predicate $\mathbf{R}(P)$ with an extra argument for (potential) realizers. Since Harrop formulas have trivial computational content, it only matters whether they are realizable or not. Therefore, we define for a Harrop formula A , an RIFP-formula $\mathbf{H}(A)$ that represents the realizability of A . For a predicate variable, $\mathbf{R}(X)$ is a fresh type variable \tilde{X} representing the unknown computational content of the unknown predicate X .

The main difference of our interpretation to the usual realizability interpretation of intuitionistic number theory lies in the interpretation of quantifiers. While in number theory variables range over natural numbers, which have concrete computationally meaningful representations, we make no general assumption of this kind, since it is our goal to extract programs from proofs in abstract mathematics. This is the reason why we interpret quantifiers *uniformly*, that is, a realizer of a universal statement must be independent of the quantified variable and a realizer of an existential statement does not contain a witness. A similar uniform interpretation of quantifiers can be found in the Minlog system. The usual definition of realizability of quantifiers in intuitionistic number theory can be recovered by relativization to the inductively defined predicate \mathbf{N} in Example 2, i.e., by writing $\forall x (\mathbf{N}(x) \rightarrow A)$.

<p>R(A) for Harrop formulas A:</p> $\mathbf{R}(A) = \lambda a (a = \mathbf{Nil} \wedge \mathbf{H}(A))$ <p>R(A) for non-Harrop formulas A:</p> $\mathbf{R}(P(\vec{t})) = \lambda a (\mathbf{R}(P)(\vec{t}, a))$ $\mathbf{R}(A \vee B) = \lambda c (\exists a (c = \mathbf{Left}(a) \wedge a \mathbf{r} A) \vee \exists b (c = \mathbf{Right}(b) \wedge b \mathbf{r} B))$ $\mathbf{R}(A \wedge B) = \begin{cases} \lambda c (\exists a, b (c = \mathbf{Pair}(a, b) \wedge a \mathbf{r} A \wedge b \mathbf{r} B)) & (A, B \text{ non-Harrop}) \\ \lambda a (a \mathbf{r} A \wedge \mathbf{H}(B)) & (B \text{ Harrop}) \\ \lambda b (\mathbf{H}(A) \wedge b \mathbf{r} B) & (A \text{ Harrop}) \end{cases}$ $\mathbf{R}(A \rightarrow B) = \begin{cases} \lambda c (c : \tau(A) \Rightarrow \tau(B) \wedge \forall a (a \mathbf{r} A \rightarrow (c a) \mathbf{r} B)) & (A \text{ non-Harrop}) \\ \lambda b (b : \tau(B) \wedge (\mathbf{H}(A) \rightarrow b \mathbf{r} B)) & (A \text{ Harrop}) \end{cases}$ $\mathbf{R}(\diamond x A) = \lambda a (\diamond x (a \mathbf{r} A)) \quad (\diamond \in \{\forall, \exists\})$ <p>R(P) for non-Harrop predicates P:</p> $\mathbf{R}(X) = \tilde{X}$ $\mathbf{R}(\lambda \vec{x} A) = \lambda (\vec{x}, a) (a \mathbf{r} A)$ $\mathbf{R}(\square(\lambda X P)) = \square(\lambda \tilde{X} \mathbf{R}(P)[\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X . \tau(P)/\alpha_X]) \quad (\square \in \{\mu, \nu\})$ <p>H(A) for Harrop formulas A:</p> $\mathbf{H}(P(\vec{t})) = \mathbf{H}(P)(\vec{t})$ $\mathbf{H}(A \wedge B) = \mathbf{H}(A) \wedge \mathbf{H}(B)$ $\mathbf{H}(A \rightarrow B) = \mathbf{r} A \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(B)$ $\mathbf{H}(\diamond x A) = \diamond x \mathbf{H}(A) \quad (\diamond \in \{\forall, \exists\})$ <p>H(P) for Harrop predicates P:</p> $\mathbf{H}(P) = P \quad (P \text{ a predicate constant})$ $\mathbf{H}(\lambda \vec{x} A) = \lambda \vec{x} \mathbf{H}(A)$ $\mathbf{H}(\square(\lambda X P)) = \square(\lambda X \mathbf{H}_X(P)) \quad (\square \in \{\mu, \nu\})$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To each IFP predicate variable X there are assigned a fresh type variable α_X and a fresh RIFP predicate variable \tilde{X} with one extra argument for domain elements. • $\mathbf{H}_X(P) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{H}(P[\hat{X}/X])[X/\hat{X}]$ where \hat{X} is a fresh predicate constant assigned to the (non-Harrop) predicate variable X. This is motivated by the fact that $\lambda X P$ is Harrop iff $P[\hat{X}/X]$ is. The idea is that $\mathbf{H}_X(P)$ is the same as $\mathbf{H}(P)$ but considering X as a (Harrop) predicate constant.
--

Table 7: Realizability interpretation of IFP

Example 3 (Natural numbers). The type $\tau(\mathbf{N})$ assigned to the predicate \mathbf{N} (recall that $\mathbf{N}(x) \stackrel{\mu}{=} x = 0 \vee \mathbf{N}(x - 1)$) is the type of unary lazy natural numbers, $\mathbf{nat} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{fix} \alpha . 1 + \alpha$,

introduced in Section 2. Realizability for \mathbf{N} works out as

$$a \mathbf{r} \mathbf{N}(x) \stackrel{\mu}{=} (a = \mathbf{Left} \wedge x = 0) \vee \exists b (a = \mathbf{Right}(b) \wedge b \mathbf{r} \mathbf{N}(x - 1)).$$

Therefore, the formulas $\mathbf{N}(0)$, $\mathbf{N}(1)$, $\mathbf{N}(2)$, \dots are realized by the domain elements \mathbf{Left} ($= \mathbf{Left}(\mathbf{Nil})$), $\mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Left})$, $\mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Right}(\mathbf{Left}))$, \dots , which means that if x is a natural number, then the (unique) realizer of $\mathbf{N}(x)$ is the unary (domain) representation of x introduced in Section 2. Other ways of defining natural numbers may induce different (e.g. binary) representations.

Example 4 (Functions). As an example of an extraction of a program with function type, consider the formula expressing that the sum of two natural number is a natural number,

$$\forall x, y (\mathbf{N}(x) \rightarrow \mathbf{N}(y) \rightarrow \mathbf{N}(x + y)). \quad (4.1)$$

It has type $\mathbf{nat} \Rightarrow \mathbf{nat} \Rightarrow \mathbf{nat}$ and is realized by a function f that, given realizers of $\mathbf{N}(x)$ and $\mathbf{N}(y)$, returns a realizer of $\mathbf{N}(x + y)$, hence f performs addition of unary numbers.

Example 5 (Non-terminating realizer - this example will be used in Section 6). Let

$$\mathbf{D}(x) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} x \neq 0 \rightarrow (x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0).$$

Then $\tau(\mathbf{D}) = \mathbf{2}$ where $\mathbf{2} = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1}$, and $a \mathbf{r} \mathbf{D}(x)$ unfolds to

$$a : \tau(\mathbf{2}) \wedge (x \neq 0 \rightarrow (a = \mathbf{Left} \wedge x \leq 0) \vee (a = \mathbf{Right} \wedge x \geq 0)).$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{D}(x)$ is realized by \mathbf{Left} if $x < 0$ and by \mathbf{Right} if $x > 0$. If $x = 0$, any element of $\mathbf{2}$ realizes $\mathbf{D}(x)$, in particular \perp . Hence, nonterminating programs, which, by Lemma 4.1 (4), denote \perp , realize $\mathbf{D}(0)$. In contrast, *strict* formulas (defined in Section 4.2) are never realized by a nonterminating program, as shown in Lemma 4.1 (2).

4.2. CFP.

Language. CFP extends IFP by two propositional operators, $B|_A$ for restriction, and $\Downarrow(B)$ for concurrency. Logically, these operators are equivalent to $A \rightarrow B$ and B , respectively because the logical rules in Table 8 are valid in a Tarskian semantics provided we identify $B|_A$ with $A \rightarrow B$ and $\Downarrow(B)$ with B . Their importance relies exclusively on their realizability interpretations, which are meaningful only when the realizers of B are neither \perp nor of the form $\mathbf{Amb}(a, b)$. Therefore, we require in $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow(B)$ the formula B to be *strict* in the following inductively defined sense, where the notion of a *Harrop formula* is extended to CFP by requiring that in addition to disjunctions and predicate variables, also restriction and the concurrency operator are disallowed at strictly positive positions:

- Harrop formulas and disjunctions are strict.
- A non-Harrop conjunction is strict if either both conjuncts are non-Harrop or it is a conjunction of a Harrop formula and a strict formula.
- A non-Harrop implication is strict if the premise is non-Harrop.
- A formula of the form $\diamond x A$ ($\diamond \in \{\forall, \exists\}$) or $\square(\lambda X \lambda \vec{x} A)$ ($\square \in \{\mu, \nu\}$) is strict if A is strict.
- Formulas of other forms ($B|_A$, $\Downarrow(B)$, $X(\vec{t})$) are not strict.

$\frac{A \rightarrow (B_0 \vee B_1) \quad \neg A \rightarrow B_0 \wedge B_1}{(B_0 \vee B_1) _A} \text{ Rest-intro}$	$(A, B_0, B_1 \text{ Harrop})$
$\frac{B _A \quad B \rightarrow (B' _A)}{B' _A} \text{ Rest-bind}$	$\frac{B}{B _A} \text{ Rest-return}$
$\frac{A' \rightarrow A \quad B _A}{B _{A'}} \text{ Rest-antimon}$	$\frac{B _A \quad A}{B} \text{ Rest-mp}$
$\frac{}{B \mathbf{false}} \text{ Rest-efq}$	$\frac{B _A}{B \neg A} \text{ Rest-stab}$
$\frac{B _A \quad B \neg A}{\Downarrow(B)} \text{ Conc-lem}$	$\frac{B}{\Downarrow(B)} \text{ Conc-return}$
$\frac{A \rightarrow B \quad \Downarrow(A)}{\Downarrow(B)} \text{ Conc-mp}$	

Table 8: Inference rules for $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow B$.

$\tau(B _A) = \tau(B)$
$\tau(\Downarrow(B)) = \mathbf{A}(\tau(B))$
$\mathbf{R}(B _A) = \lambda b (b : \tau(B) \wedge (\mathbf{r} A \rightarrow b \neq \perp) \wedge (b \neq \perp \rightarrow b \mathbf{r} B))$
$\mathbf{R}(\Downarrow(B)) = \lambda c \exists a, b (c = \mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \wedge a, b : \tau(B) \wedge (a \neq \perp \vee b \neq \perp) \wedge (a \neq \perp \rightarrow a \mathbf{r} B) \wedge (b \neq \perp \rightarrow b \mathbf{r} B))$

Table 9: Typing and realizability for $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow B$.

Proofs. The inference rules of CFP are those of IFP extended with the rules in Table 8 where the formulas and predicates in the IFP rules run now over CFP. Since the rules do not change the assumptions of a sequent, we display them with formulas instead of sequents. Hence, each premise or conclusion A stands for a sequent $\Gamma \vdash A$ with the same Γ in each rule. The notion of strict positivity, which the well-formedness of the fixed points $\mu(\Phi)$ and $\nu(\Phi)$ refer to, is extended to CFP expressions by stipulating that the strictly positive positions in $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow(B)$ are exactly those in B . The rules in Table 8 are only applicable if all occurring formulas are well-formed, in particular, B must be strict in all occurring formulas of the form $B|_A$ or $\Downarrow(B)$.

Realizability. Typing and realizability interpretation of CFP-formulas are the extension of Table 6 and Table 7 with those in Table 9. Formally, realizability for CFP is expressed in an extension of RIFP by the type constructor \mathbf{A} , the amb operator \mathbf{Amb} and the strict application operator \Downarrow . This extension is called RCFP where the ‘C’ stands for ‘classical’ (rather than ‘concurrent’) since it is based on classical logic but does not have nonstandard constructs for concurrency. The proof rules of RCFP are those of RIFP (extended to RCFP formulas) plus the law of excluded middle, $A \vee \neg A$. In addition to the axioms of RIFP,

RCFP has axioms for strict application ($b \neq \perp \rightarrow a \downarrow b = ab$, $a \downarrow \perp = \perp$) and the type operator \mathbf{A} ($c : \mathbf{A}(\rho) \leftrightarrow (\exists a, b : \rho (c = \mathbf{Amb}(a, b)) \vee c = \perp)$).

Lemma 4.1. *For every CFP-formula A :*

- (1) $\tau(A)$ is a regular type.
- (2) If A is strict, then \perp and domain elements of the form $\mathbf{Amb}(a, b)$ do not realize A .
- (3) $\mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp)$ is not a realizer of A , and if $\mathbf{Amb}(a, b)$ realizes A , then neither a nor b is of the form $\mathbf{Amb}(u, v)$.
- (4) For a program M that realizes A , M is productive iff $\llbracket M \rrbracket \neq \perp$.

Proof. (1) and (2) are easily proved by structural induction on formulas. (3) follows from the fact that if A is of the form $\Downarrow(B)$, then B must be strict. (4) follows from (1), (3) and Corollary 3.4. \square

Remark 4.2. For a closed program M , we study the meanings of $\mathbf{R}(B|_A)(M)$ and $\mathbf{R}(\Downarrow(B))(M)$ (identifying M with $\llbracket M \rrbracket \in D$):

By combining the definition of $\mathbf{R}(B|_A)$ with Lemma 4.1(4), we see that $\mathbf{R}(B|_A)(M)$ says two things: (1) if A is realizable, then M is productive, and (2) if M is productive then M realizes B . Recall that ‘productive’ is the counterpart of ‘terminating’ for concurrent infinite computation. Therefore, one can consider (2) the ‘partial correctness’ of M with respect to the specification B .

(1) and (2) together imply that if A is realizable, then M realizes B , a property one can call ‘conditional correctness’ of M , and which is what $\mathbf{R}(A \rightarrow B)(M)$ means if A is Harrop (see Example 5). However, $\mathbf{R}(B|_A)(M)$ says more than that. It says that even if A is not realizable, all the defined (i.e., non-bottom) values obtained by computing M are correct. This is what we need for concurrent computation as we explained in the introduction.

To highlight the difference between restriction and implication in a more concrete situation, consider $(A \vee B)|_A$ vs. $A \rightarrow (A \vee B)$ where A is Harrop. Clearly **Left** realizes $A \rightarrow (A \vee B)$, but **Left** does not realize $(A \vee B)|_A$ if A is not realizable.

As to the intuitive meaning of the formula $\mathbf{R}(\Downarrow(B))(M)$, it says, by the Adequacy Lemma (3.1(4)), that M is reduced by \rightsquigarrow^* to $\mathbf{Amb}(N, K)$ such that both N and K are partially correct programs of B and at least one of N or K is productive. Therefore, by executing N and K concurrently and taking the one that produces some value (i.e., is reduced to a deterministic w.h.n.f.), one have a realizer of B . Hence, if $\mathbf{R}(\Downarrow(B))(M)$, then there is a program M' such that $M \rightsquigarrow^* M'$ and M' realizes B . This is a part of the program extraction theorem (Theorem 5.11).

The following lemma says that the result from [BT21] regarding the typability of realizers carries over to CFP. We use the notation

$$\Delta(\rho) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda(\vec{x}, a) (a : \rho),$$

so that $Q \subseteq \Delta(\rho)$ unfolds to $\forall(\vec{x}, a) (Q(\vec{x}, a) \rightarrow a : \rho)$.

Lemma 4.3. *If P is a CFP predicate, then RCFP proves $\mathbf{R}(P) \subseteq \Delta(\tau(P))$ from the assumptions $\tilde{X} \subseteq \Delta(\alpha_X)$ for every free predicate variable X in P . In particular, if P is a formula A , then $a \mathbf{r} A$ implies $a : \tau(A)$ under these assumptions.*

Proof. The proof is by structural induction on P and, in the largest parts, carries over from [BT21]. For the case that P is a predicate variable X , the assumption $\tilde{X} \subseteq \Delta(\alpha_X)$ is used. Looking at the definitions of realizability for $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow(B)$, one sees that they preserve the type correctness of realizers. \square

$\frac{b\mathbf{r}(A \rightarrow (B_0 \vee B_1)) \quad \mathbf{H}(\neg A \rightarrow B_0 \wedge B_1)}{(\text{leftright } b)\mathbf{r}(B_0 \vee B_1) _A} \quad \text{Rest-intro } (A, B_0, B_1 \text{ Harrop})$		
$\frac{a\mathbf{r}B}{a\mathbf{r}B _A} \quad \text{Rest-return}$	$\frac{a\mathbf{r}B _A \quad f\mathbf{r}(B \rightarrow (B' _A))}{c\mathbf{r}B' _A} \quad \text{Rest-bind}$	$\begin{array}{l} c = f\downarrow a \text{ if } B \text{ non-Harrop} \\ c = a\mathbf{seq}f \text{ if } B \text{ Harrop} \end{array}$
$\frac{\mathbf{r}(A' \rightarrow A) \quad a\mathbf{r}B _A}{a\mathbf{r}B _{A'}} \quad \text{Rest-antimon}$		$\frac{b\mathbf{r}B _A \quad \mathbf{r}A}{b\mathbf{r}B} \quad \text{Rest-mp}$
$\frac{}{\perp\mathbf{r}B _{\mathbf{False}}} \quad \text{Rest-efq}$		$\frac{b\mathbf{r}B _A}{b\mathbf{r}B _{\neg\neg A}} \quad \text{Rest-stab}$
$\frac{a\mathbf{r}B _A \quad b\mathbf{r}B _{\neg A}}{\mathbf{Amb}(a, b)\mathbf{r}\Downarrow(B)} \quad \text{Conc-lem}$		$\frac{a\mathbf{r}B}{\mathbf{Amb}(a, \perp)\mathbf{r}\Downarrow(B)} \quad \text{Conc-return}$
$\frac{f\mathbf{r}(A \rightarrow B) \quad c\mathbf{r}\Downarrow(A)}{d\mathbf{r}\Downarrow(B)} \quad \text{Conc-mp}$		$\begin{array}{l} d = \mathbf{mapamb} f c \text{ if } A \text{ non-Harrop} \\ d = \mathbf{Amb}(f, \perp) \text{ if } A \text{ Harrop} \end{array}$

Table 10: Realizers of the inference rules for $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow B$ with non-Harrop conclusions.

5. EXTRACTION OF CONCURRENT PROGRAMS FROM CFP PROOFS

We show that the realizability interpretation of CFP is sound in the sense that from every CFP derivation one can extract a program realizing the proven formula (Theorem 5.2). Proofs take place in the system RCFP introduced in Section 4.2 which is based on classical logic. Classical logic is needed since for the rules (Rest-intro), (Rest-stab), and (Conc-lem), the verification that the extracted programs are realizers uses the law of excluded middle. In Section 5.1 we show the realizability of the new proof rules and hence the soundness of the extracted programs. In Section 5.2 we show that, for a class of ‘admissible’ formulas, the data of an extracted program M (i.e., the elements of $\text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$) realize the formula obtained by deleting the operator \Downarrow and replacing every restriction by the corresponding implication. Recall that, by the Computational Adequacy Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, the elements of $\text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ are exactly the data computed by the operational semantics of M .

5.1. Soundness of extracted programs. The realizers of the proof rules for restriction and concurrency in Table 8 are depicted in Table 10 for those instances where the conclusion of the rule is non-Harrop. Proofs of the correctness of the realizers are given in Lemma 5.1. The cases where the conclusions of the rules are Harrop formulas are easy and the verification of the correctness of the realizability interpretation is skipped. We use the following typable programs:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{leftright} &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda b. \mathbf{case } b \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Left}(_) \rightarrow \mathbf{Left}; \mathbf{Right}(_) \rightarrow \mathbf{Right} \} : (\alpha + \beta) \rightarrow 1 + 1 \\ \text{mapamb} &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda f. \lambda c. \mathbf{case } c \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \rightarrow \mathbf{Amb}(f\downarrow a, f\downarrow b) \} : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\beta) \\ \text{seq} &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda a. \lambda b. (\lambda c. b)\downarrow a : \alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow \beta \quad (\text{used infix}) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.1. *The rules for restriction and concurrency are realizable.*

Proof.

$$\text{Rest-intro: } \frac{b \mathbf{r}(A \rightarrow (B_0 \vee B_1)) \quad \mathbf{H}(\neg A \rightarrow B_0 \wedge B_1)}{(\text{letright } b) \mathbf{r}(B_0 \vee B_1)|_A} \quad (A, B_0, B_1 \text{ Harrop}).$$

$b \mathbf{r}(A \rightarrow (B_0 \vee B_1))$ means $b : \tau(B_0 \vee B_1)$ and $\mathbf{H}(A) \rightarrow b \mathbf{r}(B_0 \vee B_1)$, and $\mathbf{H}(\neg A \rightarrow B_0 \wedge B_1) \equiv \neg \mathbf{H}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(B_0) \wedge \mathbf{H}(B_1)$. We claim that $(B_0 \vee B_1)|_A$ is realized by $\text{letright } b$. Assume $\mathbf{r} A$, that is, $\mathbf{H}(A)$. Then b realizes $B_0 \vee B_1$. Hence $b \in \{\mathbf{Left}, \mathbf{Right}\}$ and therefore $b \neq \perp$ and thus $\text{letright } b \neq \perp$. Now assume $\text{letright } b \neq \perp$. We do a (classical) case analysis on whether or not $\mathbf{H}(A)$ holds. If $\mathbf{H}(A)$, then $b \mathbf{r}(B_0 \vee B_1)$. If $\neg \mathbf{H}(A)$, then $\mathbf{H}(B_0)$ and $\mathbf{H}(B_1)$. Hence, \mathbf{Left} and \mathbf{Right} both realize $B_0 \vee B_1$. Since $b : \tau(B_0 \vee B_1)$ and $b \neq \perp$, $b \in \{\mathbf{Left}, \mathbf{Right}\}$. Therefore, $b \mathbf{r}(B_0 \vee B_1)$.

$$\text{Rest-return: } \frac{a \mathbf{r} B}{a \mathbf{r} B|_A}.$$

Since B is strict, $a \mathbf{r} B$ implies $a \neq \perp$. Therefore, clearly $a \mathbf{r} B|_A$.

$$\text{Rest-bind: } \frac{a \mathbf{r} B|_A \quad f \mathbf{r}(B \rightarrow (B'|_A))}{(f \downarrow a) \mathbf{r} B'|_A} \quad B \text{ non-Harrop}.$$

We have $\forall c(c \mathbf{r} B \rightarrow (f c) \mathbf{r} B'|_A)$. If $\mathbf{r} A$ then $a \neq \perp$ and $a \mathbf{r} B$, and therefore $f a$ realizes $B'|_A$. Therefore $f a \neq \perp$ because $\mathbf{r} A$. Note that $f \downarrow a = f a$ because $a \neq \perp$. If $f \downarrow a \neq \perp$, then $a \neq \perp$. Since $a \neq \perp$ and $a \mathbf{r} B|_A$, we have $a \mathbf{r} B$. Therefore, $f \downarrow a = f a$ realizes $B'|_A$. If B is Harrop, then $a \mathbf{seq} b$ realizes $B'|_A$ with a similar argument.

$$\text{Rest-antimon: } \frac{\mathbf{r}(A' \rightarrow A) \quad a \mathbf{r} B|_A}{a \mathbf{r} B|_{A'}}.$$

Clearly, $a \mathbf{r} B|_{A'}$ since $\mathbf{r} A'$ implies $\mathbf{r} A$.

$$\text{Rest-mp: } \frac{b \mathbf{r} B|_A \quad \mathbf{r} A}{b \mathbf{r} B}.$$

Clear from the definition of $b \mathbf{r} B|_A$.

$$\text{Rest-efq: } \perp \mathbf{r} B|_{\mathbf{False}} \text{ for strict } B.$$

Clear.

$$\text{Rest-stab: } \frac{b \mathbf{r} B|_A}{b \mathbf{r} B|_{\neg A}}.$$

We use classical logic. Clearly, $\mathbf{r}(\neg \neg A)$ is equivalent to $\neg \neg(\mathbf{r} A)$, and hence, by classical logic, equivalent to $\mathbf{r} A$. Therefore, premise and conclusion are equivalent.

$$\text{Conc-lem: } \frac{a \mathbf{r} B|_A \quad b \mathbf{r} B|_{\neg A}}{\mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \mathbf{r} \Downarrow(B)}.$$

By classical logic $\mathbf{r} A$, or $\neg(\mathbf{r} A)$ i.e. $\mathbf{r}(\neg A)$. In the first case $a \neq \perp$ and in the second case $b \neq \perp$. Further, if $a \neq \perp$, then a is a realizer of B since a realizes $B|_A$. Similarly for b .

$$\text{Conc-return: } \frac{a \mathbf{r} B}{\mathbf{Amb}(a, \perp) \mathbf{r} \Downarrow(B)}.$$

Clear.

$$\text{Conc-mp: } \frac{f \mathbf{r}(A \rightarrow B) \quad c \mathbf{r} \Downarrow(A)}{(\text{mapamb } f c) \mathbf{r} \Downarrow(B)} A \text{ non-Harrop}$$

We show that $\text{mapamb } f c$ realizes $\Downarrow(B)$. If $\mathbf{Amb}(a, b) \mathbf{r} \Downarrow(A)$, then $a \neq \perp \vee b \neq \perp$. If $a \neq \perp$, then $f \downarrow a = f a$ and $a \mathbf{r} A$, therefore $(f \downarrow a) \mathbf{r} B$. Since B is strict, we have $f \downarrow a \neq \perp$. In the same way, if $b \neq \perp$ then $f \downarrow b \neq \perp$. Therefore, we have $f \downarrow a \neq \perp \vee f \downarrow b \neq \perp$. If $f \downarrow a \neq \perp$, then $a \neq \perp$ and thus $(f \downarrow a) \mathbf{r} B$ as we have observed. If A is Harrop, then, since clearly $\mathbf{r} A$, it is realized by $\mathbf{Amb}(f, \perp)$. \square

Theorem 5.2 (Soundness Theorem I). *From a CFP-proof of a closed formula A from a set of axioms one can extract a program M such that the typing rules prove $M : \tau(A)$ and RIFP proves $M \mathbf{r} A$ from the same axioms.*

More generally, let Γ be a set of Harrop formulas and Δ a set of non-Harrop formulas. Then, from a CFP(\mathcal{A}) proof of a formula A from the assumptions Γ, Δ one can extract a program M with $\text{FV}(M) \subseteq \vec{u}$ such that $\vec{u} : \tau(\Delta) \vdash M : \tau(A)$ is derivable by the typing rules of Table 1 and $M \mathbf{r} A$ is provable in RCFP(\mathcal{A}) from the assumptions $\mathbf{H}(\Gamma), \vec{u} \mathbf{r} \Delta$.

Proof. Induction on CFP-proofs. Realizability of the rules of IFP was shown in [BT21]. The rules for restriction and concurrency are taken care of in Lemma 5.1. The type correctness of the extracted programs for Rest-intro, Rest-bind and Conc-mp follows from the typings of leftright, mapamb, and seq. \square

Lemma 5.3. *In CFP, one can prove all well-formed instances of the following formulas:*

- (1) $(B \rightarrow B') \rightarrow B|_A \rightarrow B'|_A$ (Rest-mon)
- (2) $B|_{A_0} \rightarrow B|_{A_1} \rightarrow \neg\neg(A_0 \vee A_1) \rightarrow \Downarrow(B)$ (Class-orelim)
- (3) $B_0|_{A_0} \rightarrow B_1|_{A_1} \rightarrow \neg\neg(A_0 \vee A_1) \rightarrow \Downarrow(B_0 \vee B_1)$
- (4) $A \rightarrow B|_{\neg A}$
- (5) $(A \vee B) \rightarrow B|_{\neg A}$
- (6) $(A \vee B)|_{A_0} \rightarrow B|_{A_0 \wedge \neg A}$

The extracted programs and their types for the case that B, B', B_0, B_1, A are non-Harrop are:

- (1) $\lambda f. \lambda b. f \downarrow b : (\tau(B) \rightarrow \tau(B')) \rightarrow \tau(B) \rightarrow \tau(B')$,
- (2) $\lambda a. \lambda b. \mathbf{Amb}(a, b) : \tau(B) \rightarrow \tau(B) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\tau(B))$,
- (3) $\lambda a. \lambda b. \mathbf{Amb}(\mathbf{Left} \downarrow a, \mathbf{Right} \downarrow b) : \tau(B_0) \rightarrow \tau(B_1) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\tau(B_0) + \tau(B_1))$,
- (4) $\lambda a. \perp : \tau(A) \rightarrow \tau(B)$,
- (5) $\lambda a. \text{case } a \text{ of } \{\mathbf{Left}(-) \rightarrow \perp; \mathbf{Right}(b) \rightarrow b\} : (\tau(A) + \tau(B)) \rightarrow \tau(B)$,
- (6) *The same as (5).*

Proof. (1) This is an immediate consequence of (Rest-bind) and (Rest-return).

(2) Assume $B|_{A_0}, B|_{A_1}$, and $\neg\neg(A_0 \vee A_1)$. By the second assumption and the rule (Rest-stab) we have $B|_{\neg\neg A_1}$. Since, by the third assumption, we have $\neg A_0 \rightarrow \neg\neg A_1$, $B|_{\neg A_0}$ follows by (Rest-antimon). Together with the first assumption and the rule (Conc-lem), we get $\Downarrow(B)$.

(3) Since $A_i \rightarrow A_0 \vee A_1$ ($i = 0, 1$), this is an immediate consequence of (Rest-mon) and (Class-orelim), i.e. (1) and (2).

(4) Immediate, from (Rest-efq) and (Rest-antimon).

(5) Suppose that $A \vee B$. If A , then $B|_{\neg A}$ by (Rest-efq) and (Rest-antimon). If B , then $B|_{\neg A}$ by (Rest-return).

(6) Suppose $(A \vee B)|_{A_0}$. By (Rest-antimon), $(A \vee B)|_{A_0 \wedge \neg A}$. By (Rest-antimon) and $(A \vee B) \rightarrow B|_{\neg A}$, we have $(A \vee B) \rightarrow B|_{A_0 \wedge \neg A}$. Therefore, by (Rest-bind), $B|_{A_0 \wedge \neg A}$. \square

Example 6. Continuing Example 5, we modify $\mathbf{D}(x)$ to

$$\mathbf{D}'(x) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} (x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0)|_{x \neq 0}.$$

A realizer of $\mathbf{D}'(x)$, which has type $\mathbf{2}$, may or may not terminate (non-termination occurs when $x = 0$). However, in case of termination, the result is guaranteed to realize $x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0$. Note that, a realizer of $\mathbf{D}(x)$ also has type $\mathbf{2}$ and may or may not terminate, but there is no guarantee that it realizes $x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0$ when it does terminate. Nevertheless, $\mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{D}'$ follows from (Rest-intro) (since $\mathbf{D}(x)$ is $x \neq 0 \rightarrow x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0$, and $\neg x \neq 0 \rightarrow x \leq 0 \wedge x \geq 0$ is provable using stability of equality) and is realized by `leftright`. $\mathbf{D}' \subseteq \mathbf{D}$ holds trivially.

Example 7. This builds on Examples 5 and 6 and will be used in Section 6. Let $\mathbf{t}(x) = 1 - 2|x|$ and consider the predicates $\mathbf{E}(x) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{D}(x) \wedge \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{t}(x))$ and

$$\mathbf{ConSD}(x) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \Downarrow((x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0) \vee |x| \leq 1/2).$$

We show $\mathbf{E} \subseteq \mathbf{ConSD}$: From $\mathbf{E}(x)$ and Example 6 we get $\mathbf{D}'(x)$ and $\mathbf{D}'(\mathbf{t}(x))$ which unfolds to $(x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0)|_{x \neq 0}$ and $(|x| \geq 1/2 \vee |x| \leq 1/2)|_{|x| \neq 1/2}$. By Lemma 5.3 (6), $(|x| \leq 1/2)|_{|x| < 1/2}$. Since $\neg \neg((x \neq 0) \vee |x| < 1/2)$, we have $\mathbf{ConSD}(x)$ by Lemma 5.3 (3). Moreover, $\tau(\mathbf{E}) = \mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{2}$ and $\tau(\mathbf{ConSD}) = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3})$ where $\mathbf{3} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{2} + \mathbf{1}$. The extracted realizer of $\mathbf{E} \subseteq \mathbf{ConSD}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{conSD} &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda c. \text{case } c \text{ of } \{ \\ &\quad \mathbf{Pair}(a, b) \rightarrow \mathbf{Amb}(\mathbf{Left}.\downarrow(\text{leftright } a), \\ &\quad \quad \mathbf{Right}.\downarrow(\text{case } b \text{ of } \{\mathbf{Left}(_) \rightarrow \perp; \\ &\quad \quad \quad \mathbf{Right}(_) \rightarrow \mathbf{Nil}\}))\} \end{aligned}$$

of type $\tau(\mathbf{E} \subseteq \mathbf{ConSD}) = \mathbf{2} \times \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3})$. Explanation of this program: a is `Left` or `Right` depending on whether $x \leq 0$ or $x \geq 0$ but may also be \perp if $x = 0$. b is `Left` or `Right` depending on whether $|x| \leq 1/2$ or $|x| \geq 1/2$ but may also be \perp if $|x| = 1/2$. Since $x = 0$ and $x = 1/2$ do not happen simultaneously, by evaluating a and b concurrently, we obtain one of them from which we can determine one of the cases $x \leq 0$, $x \geq 0$, or $|x| \leq 1/2$.

5.2. Soundness of extracted data. In CFP, we have a second Soundness Theorem which ensures the correctness of all computations, i.e. fair reduction paths, of an extracted program M . More precisely, we show that if M realizes a CFP formula A satisfying a certain syntactic admissibility condition (see below), then all $d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$ realize the formula A^- obtained from A by deleting all concurrency operators \Downarrow and replacing every restriction by the corresponding implication (Theorem 5.10). Hence, by Computational Adequacy, all computations of M converge to a realizer of A^- (Theorem 5.11). Since A^- is an IFP formula, this shows that the realizability interpretation of CFP is faithful to that of IFP. The proof of this result requires some preparation.

Since the domain D is algebraic (i.e. every element of D is the directed supremum of compact elements), subdomains of D can be characterized as follows.

Lemma 5.4. *A subset $X \subseteq D$ is a subdomain of D iff the following two conditions hold:*

- (i) *For all $a \in D$, a is in X iff all compact approximations are in X .*
- (ii) *If $a_0, b_0 \in X$ are compact and consistent (in D), then $a_0 \sqcup b_0 \in X$.*

Proof. The easy proof is omitted. □

We define coinductively two subsets of D . The first, **Data**, disallows the constructor **Amb** altogether, the second, **Reg**, disallows immediate nestings of **Amb** and can be seen as a semantic counterpart to the syntactic regularity property of types. We call elements of **Reg** *regular*.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Data} &\stackrel{\nu}{=} (\{\mathbf{Nil}\} \cup (\mathbf{Data} \times \mathbf{Data}) \cup (\mathbf{Data} + \mathbf{Data}) \cup (D \Rightarrow D))_{\perp} \\ \mathbf{Reg} &\stackrel{\nu}{=} (\{\mathbf{Nil}\} \cup (\mathbf{Reg} \times \mathbf{Reg}) \cup (\mathbf{Reg} + \mathbf{Reg}) \cup (D \Rightarrow D) \cup \\ &\quad \mathbf{Amb}(\mathbf{Reg} \setminus \mathbf{Amb}(D, D), \mathbf{Reg} \setminus \mathbf{Amb}(D, D)))_{\perp} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mathbf{Data} \subseteq \mathbf{Reg} \subseteq D$.

Lemma 5.5. (1) *Data and Reg are subdomains of D .*

- (2) *$\rho \subseteq \mathbf{Data}$ for every type ρ without **A** under the assumption that $\alpha \subseteq \mathbf{Data}$ for every free type variable of ρ .*
- (3) *$\rho \subseteq \mathbf{Reg}$ for every (regular) type ρ under the assumption that $\alpha \subseteq \mathbf{Reg}$ for every free type variable of ρ .*
- (4) *If all free predicate variables of P are strictly positive, then $\mathbf{R}(P) \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{Reg})$, under the assumption that $\tilde{X} \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{Reg})$ and $\alpha_X \subseteq \mathbf{Reg}$ for every free predicate variable X of P .*

Proof. The proof of Part (1) is easy using the characterization of subdomains in Lemma 5.4. We skip details..

Part (2) is proven by structural induction on ρ . For a type variable, this holds by assumption. For $\mathbf{1}, \rho \times \sigma, \rho + \sigma, \rho \Rightarrow \sigma$ it suffices to observe that \perp, \mathbf{Nil} and $\mathbf{Fun}(f)$ are data (for arbitrary $f \in [D \rightarrow D]$), and that the constructors **Pair**, **Left**, **Right** preserve the property **Data**. To show that $\mathbf{fix} \alpha . \rho \subseteq \mathbf{Data}$ it suffices to show that $\rho \subseteq \mathbf{Data}$ under the assumption that $\alpha \equiv \mathbf{Data}$. But this holds by the structural induction hypothesis.

Part (3) is proven again by structural induction on ρ , using the fact that for a determined type ρ the non-bottom elements of D_{ρ}^{ζ} are not of the form $\mathbf{A}(a)$.

We prove Part (4) first with a strengthening of the assumption $\alpha_X \subseteq \mathbf{Reg}$ to $\alpha_X \equiv \mathbf{Reg}$ (keeping the assumption $\tilde{X} \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{Reg})$ unchanged). Under this strengthened assumption, $\tilde{X} \subseteq \Delta(\alpha_X)$ and therefore $\mathbf{R}(P) \subseteq \Delta(\tau(P))$, by Lemma 4.3. But $\tau(P) \subseteq \mathbf{Reg}$, by Part (3). To prove Part (4) in general, we observe that, since all free predicate variables are s.p. in P , $\mathbf{R}(P)$ depends monotonically on α_X . Therefore, if $\alpha_X \subseteq \mathbf{Reg}$, the inclusion $\mathbf{R}(P) \subseteq \Delta(\mathbf{Reg})$ continues to hold. This proves part (4) provided the assumption $\alpha_X \equiv \mathbf{Reg}$ is consistent, that is, a type α_X satisfying it actually does exist. But, by Part (1), **Reg** is a subdomain of D and hence a possible value for α_X . □

Lemma 5.6. (1) *data(a) is nonempty for all $a \in D$.*

- (2) *If $a \in \mathbf{Data}$, then $\mathbf{data}(a) = \{a\}$.*
- (3) *If $a \in \mathbf{Reg}$, then $\mathbf{data}(a) \subseteq \mathbf{Data}$.*

Proof. (1) For every nonempty finite increasing sequence $\vec{a}, a_n = a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n$ of compact elements $a_i \in D$ ($i \leq n$) we define $\mathbf{cd}_{\vec{a}, a_n} \in D$ by recursion on the rank of a_n (where the rank of a compact element of D is defined as in the proof of Theorem 3.3):

If $a_n \in \{\perp, \mathbf{Nil}, \mathbf{Fun}(f)\}$, then $\text{cd}_{\vec{a}, a_n} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} a_n$.

If $a_n = \mathbf{Amb}(b_n, c_n)$, then let $\vec{b} = b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}$ and $\vec{c} = c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}$ such that $a_i = \mathbf{Amb}(b_i, c_i)$ if $a_i \neq \perp$, and $b_i = c_i = \perp$, otherwise. Now set

$$\text{cd}_{\vec{a}, a_n} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \begin{cases} \perp & \text{if } b_n = c_n = \perp \\ \text{cd}_{\vec{b}, b_n} & \text{if } b_n \neq \perp \text{ and, for all } i < n, b_i = \perp \text{ implies } c_i = \perp \\ \text{cd}_{\vec{c}, c_n} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If $a_n = \mathbf{Left}(b_n)$, then let $\vec{b} = b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}$ such that $a_i = \mathbf{Left}(b_i)$ if $a_i \neq \perp$, and $b_i = \perp$, otherwise. Set $\text{cd}_{\vec{a}, a_n} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{Left}(\text{cd}_{\vec{b}, b_n})$. The cases that a_n begins with **Right** or **Pair** are similar.

It is easy to see that if $a_n \sqsubseteq a_{n+1}$, then $\text{cd}_{\vec{a}, a_n} \sqsubseteq \text{cd}_{\vec{a}, a_{n+1}}$.

Now let $a \in D$. Since D is algebraic with a countable base, there exists an increasing sequence of compact elements, $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$, that has a as its supremum. We show that for $d \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \bigsqcup \{\text{cd}_{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n} \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$, we have $d \in \text{data}(a)$. To this end, we define the relation ‘ $d \in P(a)$ ’ as ‘ a is the supremum of an increasing sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ of compact elements such that $d = \bigsqcup \{\text{cd}_{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n} \mid n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ ’ and prove:

Claim. If $P(a, d)$ then $d \in \text{data}(a)$, for all $d, a \in D$.

We prove the Claim by coinduction: Assume $d \in P(a)$. We have to show that the right hand side of the definition of ‘ $d \in \text{data}$ ’ holds if data is replaced by P . Let a be the supremum of the increasing sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$ of compact elements.

Case $a = \mathbf{Amb}(b, c)$. Then, for some m , $a_k = \perp$ for all $k < m$ and $a_k = \mathbf{Amb}(b_k, c_k)$ for all $k \geq m$. Set $b_k = c_k = \perp$ for $k < m$. If $b = c = \perp$ then $\text{cd}_{a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n} = \perp$ for all k and therefore $d = \perp$ which is correct. If b and c are not both \perp , then there is a least $n \geq m$ such that $a_n = \mathbf{Amb}(b_n, c_n)$ and b_n, c_n are not both \perp . If $b_n \neq \perp$, then $\text{cd}_{a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k} = \text{cd}_{b_0, \dots, b_{k-1}, b_k}$ for all $k \geq n$. Since for $k < n$, $\text{cd}_{a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k} = \perp = \text{cd}_{b_0, \dots, b_{k-1}, b_k}$, $d \in P(b)$ and we are done. If $b_n = \perp$, then $c_n \neq \perp$ and, with a similar argument, $\text{cd}_{a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k} = \text{cd}_{c_0, \dots, c_{k-1}, c_k}$ for all $k \geq n$ which implies that $P(c, d)$ holds and we are done again.

The other cases are easy.

(2) To show that $a \in \text{Data}$ implies $\{a\} \subseteq \text{data}(a)$, one sets $P(a, b) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} a = b \in \text{Data}$ and shows $P \subseteq \text{data}$ by coinduction.

To show that $a \in \text{Data}$ implies $\text{data}(a) \subseteq \{a\}$, one proves that for all compact $a_0 \in D$, if $a \in \text{Data}$ and $d \in \text{data}(a)$, then $a_0 \sqsubseteq a$ iff $a_0 \sqsubseteq d$. The proof can be done by induction on $\text{rk}(a_0)$.

(3) One shows $\forall d (\exists a \in \text{Reg} (d \in \text{data}(a)) \rightarrow d \in \text{Data})$ by coinduction. \square

Remark 5.7. The proof of (1) is constructive since for every compact approximating sequence of a , a compact approximating sequence of some element in $\text{data}(a)$ is constructed. In particular, if a is computable, then $\text{data}(a)$ contains a computable element. However, there can be no computable function $f : D \rightarrow D$ such that $f(a) \in \text{data}(a)$ for all $a \in D$, since such a function cannot even be monotone: We would necessarily have $f(\mathbf{Amb}(0, \perp)) = 0$ and $f(\mathbf{Amb}(\perp, 1)) = 1$, hence f would map the consistent inputs $\mathbf{Amb}(0, \perp)$ and $\mathbf{Amb}(\perp, 1)$ (‘consistent’ meaning ‘having a supremum’) to the inconsistent outputs 0 and 1, which is impossible for a monotone function.

- Lemma 5.8.** (1) *If a_0 is compact (in D), then all elements of $\text{data}(a_0)$ are compact.*
(2) *If a_0 is a compact approximation of a , then for every $d_0 \in \text{data}(a_0)$ there exists some $d \in \text{data}(a)$ such that $d_0 \sqsubseteq d$.*
(3) *If a is regular and $d \in \text{data}(a)$, then for every compact approximation d_0 of d there exists a compact approximation a_0 of a such that $d_0 \in \text{data}(a_0)$.*
(4) *If a, b, c are compact such that $c = a \sqcup b$, then for every $w \in \text{data}(c)$, $w \in \text{data}(a) \cup \text{data}(b)$ or $w = u \sqcup v$ for some $u \in \text{data}(a)$ and $v \in \text{data}(b)$.*

Proof. (1) Easy induction on $\mathbf{rk}(a_0)$.

(2) Induction on $\mathbf{rk}(a_0)$. If $a_0 \in \{\perp, \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, \perp)\}$, then $d_0 = \perp$ and we can take d to be any element of $\text{data}(a)$ (which is nonempty, as shown in Lemma 5.6 (1)). If $a_0 = \mathbf{Amb}(b_0, c_0)$ where, w.l.o.g., $b_0 \neq \perp$ and $d_0 \in \text{data}(b_0)$, then, since $a = \mathbf{Amb}(b, c)$ with $b_0 \sqsubseteq b$, by i.h. there is some $d \in \text{data}(b)$ (hence also $d \in \text{data}(a)$) with $d_0 \sqsubseteq d$. The other cases are easy.

(3) Induction on $\mathbf{rk}(d_0)$. The most complicated case is $a = \mathbf{Amb}(b, c)$ where $b \neq \perp$ and $d \in \text{data}(b)$. Since a is regular, b starts with one of the constructors **Fun**, **Left**, **Right**, **Pair**. W.o.l.g. assume $b = \mathbf{Pair}(b^1, b^2)$. Then $d = \mathbf{Pair}(d^1, d^2)$ with $d^i \in \text{data}(b^i)$ and $d_0 = \mathbf{Pair}(d_0^1, d_0^2)$ with $d_0^i \sqsubseteq d^i$. By i.h. there are compact approximations b_0^i of b^i such that $d_0^i \in \text{data}(b_0^i)$. Hence $\mathbf{Pair}(d_0^1, d_0^2) \in \text{data}(\mathbf{Pair}(b_0^1, b_0^2))$. Hence, $a_0 \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{Amb}(\mathbf{Pair}(b_0^1, b_0^2), \perp)$ is a compact approximation of a with $d_0 \in \text{data}(a_0)$.

(4) Induction on $\mathbf{rk}(c)$. We assume that a, b, c, w are all different from \perp , otherwise, the solution is easy.

Case $c = \mathbf{Amb}(c^1, c^2)$. Then $a = \mathbf{Amb}(a^1, a^2)$ and $b = \mathbf{Amb}(b^1, b^2)$ with $c^i = a^i \sqcup b^i$, and, w.l.o.g., $c^1 \neq \perp$ and $w \in \text{data}(c^1)$. By i.h., there are two cases: 1. $w \in \text{data}(a^1) \cup \text{data}(b^1)$, say $w \in \text{data}(a^1)$. Then $a^1 \neq \perp$ and $w \in \text{data}(a)$. 2. $w = u \sqcup v$ for some $u \in \text{data}(a^1)$ and $v \in \text{data}(b^1)$. If $a^1 = \perp$ or $b^1 = \perp$, say $a^1 = \perp$, then $u = \perp$ and $w = v$ and $w \in \text{data}(b)$. If a^1 and b^1 are both different from \perp , then $u \in \text{data}(a)$ and $v \in \text{data}(b)$ and we are done as well.

The other cases are easy. □

For the Faithfulness Theorem to hold, an admissibility condition must be imposed on A which we describe now.

A CFP formula is a *functional implication* if it is of the form $A \rightarrow B$ where A and B are both non-Harrop (hence realizers of $A \rightarrow B$ are functions).

A CFP expression is *quasi-closed* if it contains no free predicate variables.

A CFP expression is *admissible* if it is quasi-closed, the concurrency operator and restriction occur only at s.p. positions, every restriction $B|_A$ has a Harrop premise A , and every occurrence of a functional implication is part of a quasi-closed subexpression without \Downarrow and restriction.²

For example, $\Downarrow(\mu(\lambda X \lambda x (x = 0 \vee \forall y (\mathbf{N}(y) \rightarrow X(f(x, y))))))$ is admissible, whereas the expression $\mu(\lambda X \lambda x \Downarrow(x = 0 \vee \forall y (\mathbf{N}(y) \rightarrow X(f(x, y)))))$ is not since it contains the functional implication $\mathbf{N}(y) \rightarrow X(f(x, y))$ for which the only quasi-closed subexpression it is contained in is $\lambda X \lambda x \Downarrow(x = 0 \vee \forall y (\mathbf{N}(y) \rightarrow X(f(x, y))))$ which does contain \Downarrow .

Further examples of admissible expressions are the predicate **ConSD** from Example 7, $\lambda x \Downarrow((x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0) \vee |x| \leq 1/2)$, as well as the coinductive predicate **S₂** from Sect. 6, $\nu(\lambda X \lambda x (|x| \leq 1 \wedge \Downarrow(\exists d(\mathbf{SD}(d) \wedge X(2x - d)))))$.

²The definition of admissibility in [BT22] is similar but disallows restrictions.

Theorem 5.9 (Faithfulness). *If $a \in D$ realizes an admissible formula A , then all $d \in \text{data}(a)$ realize A^- .*

Formally, RCFP proves $\forall \vec{x} \forall a (\mathbf{R}(A)(a) \rightarrow \text{data}(a) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(A^-))$ where \vec{x} are the free object variables of A .

Proof. The proof is accomplished through a series of definitions and claims.

We call a CFP expression *parametrically admissible* (*p-admissible*) if it satisfies the same conditions as an admissible expression except that it is no longer required to be quasi-closed but s.p. occurrences of predicate variables are allowed. Hence, a CFP expression is p-admissible iff the concurrency operator \Downarrow , restriction, and predicate variables occur only at s.p. positions, every restriction has a Harrop premise, and every occurrence of a functional implication is part of a quasi-closed subexpression without \Downarrow or restriction.

A *p-admissible type* is a type that contains type variables and \mathbf{A} only at s.p. positions and every function type is part of a closed sub type without \mathbf{A} .

Clearly, if P is p-admissible, then $\tau(P)$ is p-admissible (easy structural induction on P).

We call an RCFP predicate P whose last argument place ranges over D *regular* if $P(\vec{x}, a)$ implies that a is regular. More precisely, “ P is regular” stands for the formula $\forall \vec{x} \forall a (P(\vec{x}, a) \rightarrow \text{Reg}(a))$.

For any RCFP predicate P whose last argument place ranges over D we define a regular predicate P' of the same arity by

$$P'(\vec{x}, a) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} a \in \text{Reg} \wedge \forall d \in \text{data}(a) P(\vec{x}, d).$$

We also define

$$\text{data}(P)(\vec{x}, d) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \exists a \in D (P(\vec{x}, a) \wedge d \in \text{data}(a)).$$

Clearly, if P is regular, then $P \subseteq Q'$ iff $\text{data}(P) \subseteq Q$.

For the special case of a subdomain α , considered as the unary predicate $\lambda a. a : \alpha$, $\text{data}(\alpha) \equiv \bigcup \{\text{data}(a) \mid a : \alpha\}$, and if α is regular, then $\alpha \subseteq \beta'$ iff $\text{data}(\alpha) \subseteq \beta$.

Claim 1. If α is a subdomain of D , then so is α' .

Proof of Claim 1. Let α be a subdomain of D . We show that α' satisfies the characterizing properties (i) and (ii) of subdomains from Lemma 5.4.

(i) Let $a \in \alpha'$ and a_0 a compact approximation of a . We have to show that $a_0 \in \alpha'$. Hence assume $d_0 \in \text{data}(a_0)$. Then, by Lemma 5.8 (2), there exists some $d \in \text{data}(a)$ such that $d_0 \sqsubseteq d$. Since $a \in \alpha'$, $d \in \alpha$. Hence $d_0 \in \alpha$, since, being a subdomain, α is downward closed. Conversely, assume all compact approximations of a are in α' and let $d \in \text{data}(a)$. We have to show that $d \in \alpha$. Since α is a subdomain, it suffices to show that all compact approximations of d are in α . Hence let d_0 be a compact approximation of d . Then, by Lemma 5.8 (3) (by Lemma 5.5 (1), a is regular since all its compact approximations are), there is some compact approximation a_0 of a such that $d_0 \in \text{data}(a_0)$. Since, by assumption, $a_0 \in \alpha'$, it follows $d_0 \in \alpha$.

(ii) Let a_0, b_0 be compact and consistent elements of α' . We have to show that $c_0 \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} a_0 \sqcup b_0 \in \alpha'$. Hence let $d_0 \in \text{data}(c_0)$. By Lemma 5.8 (4), $d_0 \in \text{data}(a_0) \cup \text{data}(b_0)$, in which case $d_0 \in \alpha$ since $a_0, b_0 \in \alpha'$, or there are $a_1 \in \text{data}(a_0)$ and $b_1 \in \text{data}(b_0)$ such that $d_0 = a_1 \sqcup b_1$, in which case, since $a_1, b_1 \in \alpha$ and α is a subdomain, $d_0 \in \alpha$ as well. This completes the proof of Claim 1.

For any type ρ and $i = 1, 2$ let $\rho[i]$ be obtained from ρ by replacing each free type variable α by the fresh type variable α_i . Further, let ρ^- be obtained from ρ by deleting all occurrences of \mathbf{A} .

Claim 2. For every p-admissible type ρ , $\rho[1] \subseteq \rho^-[2]'$ under the assumption that $\alpha_i \subseteq \text{Reg}$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha'_2$ for every free type variable α of ρ .

Proof of Claim 2. Induction on ρ .

If ρ is closed and doesn't contain \mathbf{A} (by p-admissibility, this includes the case that ρ is a function type), then $\rho[1] = \rho^-[2] = \rho$ and, by Lemma 5.5 (2) $\rho \subseteq \text{Data}$. Hence $\text{data}(\rho) \subseteq \rho$, by Lemma 5.6 (2), and we are done.

Now assume that the above case does not apply.

If ρ is a type variable α , then $\rho[1] = \alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha'_2 = \rho^-[2]'$.

If $\rho = \mathbf{A}(\sigma)$, then $\rho^- = \sigma^-$ and, by the i.h., $\sigma[1] \subseteq \sigma^-[2]'$. Let $a : \rho[1]$. Then either $a = \perp$, in which case $\text{data}(a) = \{\perp\} \subseteq \sigma^-[2]$, or else $a = \mathbf{Amb}(b, c)$ with $b, c : \sigma[1]$, in which case $\text{data}(a) = \text{data}(b) \cup \text{data}(c) \subseteq \sigma^-[2]$.

If $\rho = \mathbf{fix} \alpha . \sigma$, then we have, up to bound renaming, $\rho[1] = \mathbf{fix} \alpha_1 . \sigma[1]$ and $\rho^-[2] = \mathbf{fix} \alpha_2 . \sigma^-[2]$. Since $\rho^-[2]$ is a subdomain and hence, by Claim 1, so is $\rho^-[2]'$, we can set

$$(1) \alpha_1 \equiv \rho^-[2]'$$

and achieve our goal (of proving $\rho[1] \subseteq \rho^-[2]'$) by proving $\sigma[1] \subseteq \alpha_1$. Setting further

$$(2) \alpha_2 \equiv \rho^-[2]$$

we have $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha'_2$ and therefore, by the induction hypothesis, $(\rho^-[2]'$ and $\rho^-[2]$ are both regular subdomains, and σ is p-admissible, since otherwise we would be in the first case), $\sigma[1] \subseteq \sigma^-[2]'$. We further have $\sigma^-[2] \equiv \rho^-[2]$, by (2). Therefore,

$$\sigma[1] \subseteq \sigma^-[2] \equiv \rho^-[2] \equiv \alpha_1.$$

The cases that ρ is a product or a sum are easy. This completes the proof of Claim 2.

For any CFP predicate P and $i = 1, 2$, let $\mathbf{R}(P)[i]$ be obtained from $\mathbf{R}(P)$ by replacing each free predicate variable \tilde{X} by the fresh predicate variable \tilde{X}_i and each free type variable α_X by the fresh type variable $(\alpha_X)_i$.

Claim 3. If P is p-admissible, then $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] \subseteq \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]'$ under the assumption that $(\alpha_X)_i \subseteq \text{Reg}$ ($i = 1, 2$), and furthermore $(\alpha_X)_1 \subseteq (\alpha_X)'_2$ and $\tilde{X}_1 \subseteq \tilde{X}'_2$, for every free predicate variable X of P .

Proof of Claim 3. If P is a Harrop predicate, then it contains neither free predicate variables, nor \Downarrow , nor restriction, and therefore $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] = \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2] = \mathbf{H}(P)$. Hence, the required inclusion reduces to $\forall a ((a = \mathbf{Nil} \wedge \mathbf{H}(P)) \rightarrow \forall d \in \text{data}(a) (d = \mathbf{Nil} \wedge \mathbf{H}(P)))$, which is a triviality since $\text{data}(\mathbf{Nil}) = \{\mathbf{Nil}\}$.

From now on we assume that P is non-Harrop.

If P is quasi-closed and contains neither \Downarrow nor restriction (because of p-admissibility, this includes the case that P is a functional implication), then $\mathbf{R}(P)$ is quasi-closed and $P = P^-$. Therefore, $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] = \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2] = \mathbf{R}(P)$. By Lemma 5.5 (2) and Lemma 4.3, $\mathbf{R}(P) \subseteq \text{Data}$. Hence $\text{data}(\mathbf{R}(P)) = \mathbf{R}(P)$ by Lemma 5.6 (2), and we are done.

If P is a predicate variable X , then we have to prove $\tilde{X}_1 \subseteq \tilde{X}'_2$ which holds by the assumption.

From now on we assume that none of the above cases applies.

If P is $A \rightarrow B$, then A has no free predicate variables and B is non-Harrop. Since the case of a functional implication is excluded, A must be Harrop. Assume $\mathbf{R}(A \rightarrow B)[1](b)$, that is, $b : \tau(B)[1]$ and $\mathbf{H}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(B)[1](b)$. We have to show $\mathbf{R}(A \rightarrow B^-)[2]'(b)$, that is, $b \in \text{Reg}$ and $\forall d \in \text{data}(b) \mathbf{R}(A \rightarrow B^-)[2](d)$, that is, for all $d \in \text{data}(b)$, $d : \tau(B^-)[2]$ and $\mathbf{H}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(B^-)[2](d)$. $b \in \text{Reg}$ holds since, by Claim 2, $\tau(B)[1] \subseteq \tau(B^-)[2]' \subseteq \text{Reg}$, and $\tau(B^-) = \tau(B)^-$. Let $d \in \text{data}(b)$. $d : \tau(B^-)[2]$ holds, since, by Claim 2, $b : \tau(B^-)[2]'$ (to apply Claim 2 we need the assumptions $\alpha_1 \subseteq \alpha_2'$). Assume $\mathbf{H}(A)$. Then $\mathbf{R}(B)[1](b)$ and, by the structural induction hypothesis (clearly, B is again p-admissible), $\mathbf{R}(B^-)[2](d)$.

If P is $B|_A$ where A is a Harrop formula, then P^- is $A \rightarrow B^-$. Assume $\mathbf{R}(P)[1](b)$. Then, clearly, $\mathbf{R}(A \rightarrow B)[1](b)$. Hence, the rest of the proof is exactly as in the previous case.

If P is $\Downarrow(B)$, then $\mathbf{R}(P^-)[2] = \mathbf{R}(B^-)[2]$ and, since B is again p-admissible, by the induction hypothesis, $\mathbf{R}(B)[1] \subseteq \mathbf{R}(B^-)[2]'$. Assume $\mathbf{R}(P)[1](c)$ and $d \in \text{data}(c)$. Then $c = \mathbf{Amb}(a, b)$ with $a, b : \tau(B)[1]$ and

$$(a \neq \perp \wedge d \in \text{data}(a) \wedge \mathbf{R}(B)[1](a)) \vee (b \neq \perp \wedge d \in \text{data}(b) \wedge \mathbf{R}(B)[1](b)).$$

In either case, it follows $\mathbf{R}(B^-)[2](d)$.

If P is $\mu(\lambda X. Q)$, then $\mathbf{R}(P)$ is $\mu(\lambda \tilde{X}. \mathbf{R}(Q)[\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q)/\alpha_X])$ whereas $\mathbf{R}(P^-)$ is $\mu(\lambda \tilde{X}. \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q^-)/\alpha_X])$. Hence, setting

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha_X)_1 &\equiv (\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q))[1] \\ (\alpha_X)_2 &\equiv (\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q^-))[2] \end{aligned}$$

we have $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] \equiv \mu(\lambda \tilde{X}_1. \mathbf{R}(Q)[1])$, and $\mathbf{R}(P^-)[2] \equiv \mu(\lambda \tilde{X}_2. \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2])$. Therefore, we can prove the assertion of Claim 3 (which is $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] \subseteq \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]'$) by s.p. induction i.e., it suffices to show $\mathbf{R}(Q)[1] \subseteq \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]'$ under the assumption

$$\tilde{X}_1 \equiv \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]'$$

Setting further

$$\tilde{X}_2 \equiv \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]$$

we have $\tilde{X}_1 \subseteq (\tilde{X}_2)'$, trivially, and furthermore, by Claim 2, $(\alpha_X)_1 \subseteq ((\alpha_X)_2)'$ since $(\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q))^- = \mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q^-)$. Therefore, by the structural induction hypothesis (Q is p-admissible since otherwise we would be in the second case), $\mathbf{R}(Q)[1] \subseteq \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2]'$. By the closure axiom, $\mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2] \subseteq \tilde{X}_2$. Hence, $\mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2]' \subseteq (\tilde{X}_2)'$ by the monotonicity of the operation $'$. But $(\tilde{X}_2)' \equiv \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]'$.

If P is $\nu(\lambda X. Q)$, then we work with $\text{data}(\cdot)$ instead of $'$ using the earlier mentioned fact that if $Y \subseteq \text{Reg}$, then $Y \subseteq Z'$ iff $\text{data}(Y) \subseteq Z$. Since the condition $\tilde{Y}_1 \subseteq \tilde{Y}_2'$ implies that $\tilde{Y}_1 \subseteq \Delta(\text{Reg})$ for all free predicate variables Y of P , and these variables are all s.p., Lemma 5.5 (4) yields that $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] \subseteq \text{Reg}$. Therefore, the assertion to be proven is equivalent to $\text{data}(\mathbf{R}(P)[1]) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]$. $\mathbf{R}(P)$ is $\nu(\lambda \tilde{X}. \mathbf{R}(Q)[\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q)/\alpha_X])$ and $\mathbf{R}(P^-)$ is $\nu(\lambda \tilde{X}. \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[\mathbf{fix} \alpha_X. \tau(Q^-)/\alpha_X])$. This means that, setting $(\alpha_X)_i$ as before, we have that $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] \equiv \nu(\lambda \tilde{X}_1. \mathbf{R}(Q)[1])$, and $\mathbf{R}(P^-)[2] \equiv \nu(\lambda \tilde{X}_2. \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2])$. Therefore, $\text{data}(\mathbf{R}(P)[1]) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(P^-)[2]$ can be proven by s.p. coinduction, that is, we show $\text{data}(\mathbf{R}(P)[1]) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2]$ under the assumption

$$\tilde{X}_2 \equiv \text{data}(\mathbf{R}(P)[1]).$$

Setting

$$\tilde{X}_1 \equiv \mathbf{R}(P)[1]$$

we have $\text{data}(\tilde{X}_1) \subseteq \tilde{X}_2$, hence $\tilde{X}_1 \subseteq \tilde{X}_2'$, since $\mathbf{R}(P)[1] \subseteq \text{Reg}$. Therefore, by the structural induction hypothesis, $\mathbf{R}(Q)[1] \subseteq \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2]'$, i.e. $\text{data}(\mathbf{R}(Q)[1]) \subseteq \mathbf{R}(Q^-)[2]$. Finally, by the coclosure axiom, $\tilde{X}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{R}(Q)[1]$ and therefore, by the monotonicity of the operation $\text{data}(\cdot)$, we get $\text{data}(\mathbf{R}(P)[1]) \subseteq \text{data}(\mathbf{R}(Q)[1])$.

Proof of the Faithfulness Theorem. The theorem is a special case of Claim 3: If $a \in D$ realizes the admissible formula A , then, by Claim 3, $\mathbf{R}(A^-)'(a)$ and therefore all $d \in \text{data}(a)$ realize A^- . \square

Theorems 5.2 and 5.9 imply:

Theorem 5.10 (Soundness Theorem II). *From a CFP proof of an admissible formula A from a set of axioms one can extract a program $M : \tau(A)$ such that RCFP proves $\forall d \in \text{data}(\llbracket M \rrbracket) d \mathbf{r} A^-$ from the same axioms.*

Theorems 5.10 and 3.2, together with and classical soundness yield:

Theorem 5.11 (Program Extraction). *From a CFP proof of an admissible formula A from a set of axioms one can extract a program $M : \tau(A)$ such that for any computation $M = M_0 \xrightarrow{p} M_1 \xrightarrow{p} \dots$, the limit, $\sqcup_{i \in \mathbf{N}} (M_i)_D$, realizes A^- in every model of the axioms.*

Remark 5.12. The theorems above can be generalized by weakening the admissibility condition in two ways:

(1) The condition that restrictions must have Harrop premises may be dropped. The definition of A^- must then be modified by replacing $B|_A$, where A is non-Harrop, by $\neg\neg A \rightarrow B$ (instead of $A \rightarrow B$). Since, by the the rules (rest-antimon) and (rest-stab), the formulas $B|_A$ and $B|_{\neg\neg A}$ are equivalent and, moreover, have the same realizers, the proof of Theorem 5.9 requires only minimal changes and the Theorems 5.10 and 5.11 are unchanged.

(2) Arbitrary free predicate variables may be permitted. The statement of Theorems 5.9 and 5.10 are then to be modified by adding the assumptions $\tilde{Y} \subseteq \Delta(\text{Data})$ and $\alpha_Y \subseteq \text{Data}$ for all free predicate variables Y of A . In the proof of Theorem 5.9, the definition of $\rho[i]$, used in Claim 2, refers only to other free type variables of ρ . Claim 3 is modified in a similar way. The proof hinges on the fact that for $a \in \text{Data}$, $\text{data}(a) = \{a\}$ (Lemma 5.6 (2)). Generalization (2) applies to Theorem 5.11 only in the restricted form that free predicate variable must not occur at strictly positive positions. This is necessary, since the extracted program M must be closed.

6. APPLICATION

As our main case study, we extract a concurrent conversion program between two representations of real numbers in $[-1, 1]$, the signed digit representation and infinite Gray code. In the following, we also write $d : p$ for $\mathbf{Pair}(d, p)$.

The signed digit representation is an extension of the usual binary expansion that uses the set $\mathbf{SD} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \{-1, 0, 1\}$ of *signed digits*. The following predicate $\mathbf{S}(x)$ expresses coinductively that x has a signed digit representation.

$$\mathbf{S}(x) \stackrel{\nu}{=} |x| \leq 1 \wedge \exists d \in \mathbf{SD} \mathbf{S}(2x - d),$$

with $\mathbf{SD}(d) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} (d = -1 \vee d = 1) \vee d = 0$. The type of \mathbf{S} is $\tau(\mathbf{S}) = \mathbf{3}^\omega$ where $\mathbf{3} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1}) + \mathbf{1}$ and $\rho^\omega \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{fix} \alpha . \rho \times \alpha$, and its realizability interpretation is

$$p \mathbf{r} \mathbf{S}(x) \stackrel{\nu}{=} |x| \leq 1 \wedge \exists d \in \mathbf{SD} \exists p' (p = d : p' \wedge p' \mathbf{r} \mathbf{S}(2x - d))$$

which expresses indeed that p is a signed digit representation of x , that is, $p = d_0 : d_1 : \dots$ with $d_i \in \mathbf{SD}$ and $x = \sum_i d_i 2^{-(i+1)}$. Here, we identified the three digits $d = -1, 1, 0$ with their realizers **Left**(**Left**), **Left**(**Right**), **Right**.

Infinite Gray code ([DG99, Tsu02]) is an almost redundancy free representation of real numbers in $[-1, 1]$ using the partial digits $\{-1, 1, \perp\}$. A stream $p = d_0 : d_1 : \dots$ of such digits is an infinite Gray code of x iff $d_i = \text{sgb}(\mathbf{t}^i(x))$ where \mathbf{t} is the tent function $\mathbf{t}(x) = 1 - |2x|$ and sgb is a multi-valued version of the sign function for which $\text{sgb}(0)$ is any element of $\{-1, 1, \perp\}$ (see also Example 7). One easily sees that $\mathbf{t}^i(x) = 0$ for at most one i . Therefore, this coding has little redundancy in that the code is uniquely determined and total except for at most one digit which may be undefined. Hence, infinite Gray code is accessible through concurrent computation with two threads. The coinductive predicate

$$\mathbf{G}(x) \stackrel{\nu}{=} |x| \leq 1 \wedge \mathbf{D}(x) \wedge \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(x)),$$

where \mathbf{D} is the predicate $\mathbf{D}(x) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} x \neq 0 \rightarrow (x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0)$ from Example 5, expresses that x has an infinite Gray code (identifying $-1, 1, \perp$ with **Left**, **Right**, \perp). Indeed, $\tau(\mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{2}^\omega$ and

$$p \mathbf{r} \mathbf{G}(x) \stackrel{\nu}{=} |x| \leq 1 \wedge \exists d, p' (p = d : p' \wedge (x \neq 0 \rightarrow d \mathbf{r} (x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0)) \wedge p' \mathbf{r} \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(x))).$$

In [BT21], the inclusion $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{G}$ was proved in IFP and a sequential conversion function from signed digit representation to infinite Gray code extracted. On the other hand, a program producing a signed digit representation from an infinite Gray code cannot access its input sequentially from left to right since it will diverge when it accesses \perp . Therefore, the program needs to evaluate two consecutive digits concurrently to obtain at least one of them. With this idea in mind, we define a concurrent version of \mathbf{S} as

$$\mathbf{S}_2(x) \stackrel{\nu}{=} |x| \leq 1 \wedge \Downarrow (\exists d \in \mathbf{SD} \mathbf{S}_2(2x - d)),$$

so that $\tau(\mathbf{S}_2) = \mathbf{fix} \alpha . \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3} \times \alpha)$, and prove $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_2$ in CFP (Thm. 6.3). Then we can extract from the proof a concurrent algorithm that converts infinite Gray code to signed digit representation. Note that, while the formula $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_2$ is *not* admissible, the formula $\mathbf{S}_2(x)$ *is*. Therefore, if for some real number x we can prove $\mathbf{G}(x)$, the proof of $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_2$ will give us a proof of $\mathbf{S}_2(x)$ to which Theorem 5.11 applies. Since $\mathbf{S}_2(x)^-$ is $\mathbf{S}(x)$, this means that we have a nondeterministic program all whose fair computation paths will result in a (deterministic) signed digit representation of x .

Now we carry out the proof of $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_2$. For simplicity, we use pattern matching on constructor expressions for defining functions. For example, we write $\mathbf{f}(a : t) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} M$ for $\mathbf{f} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda x. \mathbf{case} \ x \ \mathbf{of} \ \{\mathbf{Pair}(a, t) \rightarrow M\}$.

The crucial step in the proof is accomplished by Example 7, since it yields nondeterministic information about the first digit of the signed digit representation of x , as expressed by the predicate

$$\mathbf{ConSD}(x) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \Downarrow ((x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0) \vee |x| \leq 1/2).$$

Lemma 6.1. $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbf{ConSD}$.

Proof. $\mathbf{G}(x)$ implies $\mathbf{D}(x)$ and $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{t}(x))$, and hence \mathbf{ConSD} , by Example 7. \square

The extracted program $\text{gscomp} : \mathbf{2}^\omega \Rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3})$ uses the program conSD defined in Example 7:

$$\text{gscomp} (a : b : p) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \text{conSD} (\mathbf{Pair}(a, b)).$$

We also need the following closure properties of \mathbf{G} :

Lemma 6.2. *Assume $\mathbf{G}(x)$. Then:*

- (1) $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(x))$, $\mathbf{G}(|x|)$, and $\mathbf{G}(-x)$;
- (2) if $x \geq 0$, then $\mathbf{G}(2x - 1)$ and $\mathbf{G}(1 - x)$;
- (3) if $|x| \leq 1/2$, then $\mathbf{G}(2x)$.

Proof. This follows directly from the definition of \mathbf{G} and elementary properties of the tent function (recall $\mathbf{t}(x) = 1 - |2x|$). The extracted programs consist of simple manipulations of the given digit stream realizing $\mathbf{G}(x)$, concerning only its tail and first two digits. No nondeterminism is involved.

We only use the fixed point property of \mathbf{G} , namely that for all y , $\mathbf{G}(y)$ is equivalent to $|y| \leq 1 \wedge \mathbf{D}(y) \wedge \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(y))$.

This equivalence has computational content which will show up in the programs extracted from the proofs below: If it is used from left to right a stream (the realizer of $\mathbf{G}(y)$) is split into its head (realizer of $\mathbf{D}(y)$) and tail (realizer of $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(y))$). Using it from right to left corresponds to the converse operation of adding a digit to a stream.

Proofs of (1-3):

(1) follows directly from the equivalence above and the fact that $\mathbf{t}(x) = \mathbf{t}(-x)$. The three extracted programs are $\mathbf{f}_1(d : p) = p$, $\mathbf{f}_2(d : p) = 1 : p$, and $\mathbf{f}_3(p) = \text{nh } p$ where $\text{nh } (d : p) = \text{not } d : p$.

(2) Assume in addition $x \geq 0$. Then $\mathbf{t}(x) = 1 - 2x$. Since $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(x))$ and, by (1), \mathbf{G} is closed under negation, we have $\mathbf{G}(2x - 1)$. Furthermore, since $0 \leq 1 - x \leq 1$ we have $|1 - x| \leq 1$ and $\mathbf{D}(1 - x)$. Therefore, to establish $\mathbf{G}(1 - x)$, it suffices to show $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(1 - x))$. But $\mathbf{t}(1 - x) = 1 - 2(1 - x) = 2x - 1$ and we have shown $\mathbf{G}(2x - 1)$ already. The extracted programs are $\mathbf{f}_4(d : p) = \text{nh } p$ and $\mathbf{f}_5(d : p) = 1 : \text{nh } p$.

(3) Now assume $|x| \leq 1/2$. Then $1 - |2x| \geq 0$ and we have $\mathbf{G}(1 - |2x|)$ (since $\mathbf{G}(x)$). Therefore, by (2), $\mathbf{G}(|2x|)$. Hence $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(|2x|))$ and therefore also $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(2x))$ since $\mathbf{t}(2x) = \mathbf{t}(|2x|)$. Since $|x| \leq 1/2$ implies $|2x| \leq 1$ and $\mathbf{G}(x)$ implies $\mathbf{D}(x)$ and hence $\mathbf{D}(2x)$, it follows $\mathbf{G}(2x)$. The extracted program is $\mathbf{f}_6(d : p) = d : 1 : \text{nh } p$. \square

Theorem 6.3. $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbf{S}_2$.

Proof. By coinduction. Setting $A(x) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \exists d \in \mathbf{SD} \mathbf{G}(2x - d)$, we have to show

$$\mathbf{G}(x) \rightarrow |x| \leq 1 \wedge \Downarrow(A(x)). \quad (6.1)$$

Assume $\mathbf{G}(x)$. Then $\mathbf{ConSD}(x)$, by Lemma 6.1. Therefore, it suffices to show

$$\mathbf{ConSD}(x) \rightarrow \Downarrow(A(x)) \quad (6.2)$$

which, with the help of the rule (Conc-mp), can be reduced to

$$(x \leq 0 \vee x \geq 0 \vee |x| \leq 1/2) \rightarrow A(x). \quad (6.3)$$

(6.3) can be easily shown using Lemma 6.2: If $x \leq 0$, then $\mathbf{t}(x) = 2x + 1$. Since $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{t}(x))$, we have $\mathbf{G}(2x - d)$ for $d = -1$. If $x \geq 0$, then $\mathbf{G}(2x - d)$ for $d = 1$ by (2). If $|x| \leq 1/2$, then $\mathbf{G}(2x - d)$ for $d = 0$ by (3). \square

The program $\text{onedigit} : \mathbf{2}^\omega \Rightarrow \mathbf{3} \Rightarrow \mathbf{3} \times \mathbf{2}^\omega$ extracted from the proof of (6.3) from the assumption $\mathbf{G}(x)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{onedigit } (a : b : p) \ c &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{case } c \text{ of } \{ \\ &\quad \mathbf{Left}(d) \rightarrow \mathbf{case } d \text{ of } \{ \\ &\quad\quad \mathbf{Left}(-) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pair}(-1, b : p); \\ &\quad\quad \mathbf{Right}(-) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pair}(1, (\text{not } b) : p)\}; \\ &\quad \mathbf{Right}(-) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pair}(0, a : (\text{nh } p)) \} \\ \text{not } a &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \mathbf{case } a \text{ of } \{ \mathbf{Left}(-) \rightarrow \mathbf{Right}; \\ &\quad \mathbf{Right}(-) \rightarrow \mathbf{Left} \} \\ \text{nh } (a : p) &\stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} (\text{not } a) : p \end{aligned}$$

This is lifted to a proof of (6.2) using mapamb (the realizer of (Conc-mp)). Hence the extracted realizer $\mathbf{s} : \mathbf{2}^\omega \Rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3} \times \mathbf{2}^\omega)$ of (6.1) is

$$\mathbf{s} \ p \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \text{mapamb } (\text{onedigit } p) \ (\text{gscomp } p)$$

The main program extracted from the proof of Theorem 6.3 is obtained from the step function \mathbf{s} by a special form of recursion, commonly known as *coiteration*. Formally, we use the realizer of the coinduction rule $\mathbf{COIND}(\Phi_{\mathbf{S}_2}, \mathbf{G})$ where $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}_2}$ is the operator used to define \mathbf{S}_2 as largest fixed point, i.e.

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{S}_2} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda X \lambda x \ |x| \leq 1 \wedge \Downarrow (\exists d \in \mathbf{SD} \ X(2x - d)).$$

The realizer of coinduction (whose correctness is shown in [BT21]) also uses a program $\text{mon} : (\alpha_X \Rightarrow \alpha_Y) \Rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3} \times \alpha_X) \Rightarrow \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3} \times \alpha_Y)$ extracted from the canonical proof of the monotonicity of $\Phi_{\mathbf{S}_2}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mon } f \ p &= \text{mapamb } (\text{mon}' \ f) \ p \\ \text{where } \text{mon}' \ f \ (a : t) &= a : f \ t \end{aligned}$$

Putting everything together, we obtain the *infinite Gray code to signed digit representation conversion program* $\text{gtos} : \mathbf{2}^\omega \Rightarrow \mathbf{fix} \ \alpha . \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{3} \times \alpha)$

$$\text{gtos} \stackrel{\text{rec}}{=} (\text{mon } \text{gtos}) \circ \mathbf{s}$$

Using the equational theory of RCFP, one can simplify gtos to the following program. The soundness of RIFP axioms with respect to the denotational semantics and the adequacy property of our language guarantees that these two programs are equivalent.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{gtos } (a : b : t) &= \mathbf{Amb} (\\ &\quad (\mathbf{case } a \text{ of } \{ \mathbf{Left}(-) \rightarrow -1 : \text{gtos } (b : t); \\ &\quad\quad \mathbf{Right}(-) \rightarrow 1 : \text{gtos}((\text{not } b) : t)\}), \\ &\quad (\mathbf{case } b \text{ of } \{ \mathbf{Right}(-) \rightarrow 0 : \text{gtos}(a : (\text{nh } t))\}), \\ &\quad \mathbf{Left}(-) \rightarrow \perp \}). \end{aligned}$$

In [Tsu05], a Gray-code to signed digit conversion program was written with the locally angelic \mathbf{Amb} operator that evaluates the first two cells a and b in parallel and continues the computation based on the value obtained first. In that program, if the value of b is first

obtained and it is **Left**, then it has to evaluate a again. With globally angelic choice, as the above program shows, one can simply neglect the value to use the value of the other thread. Globally angelic choice also has the possibility to speed up the computation if the two threads of **Amb** are computed in parallel and the *whole* computation based on the secondly-obtained value of **Amb** terminates first.

7. IMPLEMENTATION

Since our programming language can be viewed as a fragment of Haskell, we can execute the extracted program in Haskell by implementing the **Amb** operator with the Haskell concurrency module. We comment on the essential points of the implementation. The full code is listed in the Appendix.

First, we define the domain D as a Haskell data type:

```
data D = Nil | Le D | Ri D | Pair(D, D) | Fun(D -> D) | Amb(D, D)
```

The \rightsquigarrow -reduction, which preserves the Phase I denotational semantics and reduces a program to a w.h.n.f. with the leftmost outermost reduction strategy, coincides with reduction in Haskell. Thus, we can identify extracted programs with programs of type D that compute that phase.

The $\overset{c}{\rightsquigarrow}$ reduction that concurrently calculates the arguments of **Amb** can be implemented with the Haskell concurrency module. In [DBPLT02], the (locally angelic) **amb** operator was implemented in Glasgow Distributed Haskell (GDH). Here, we implemented it with the Haskell libraries `Control.Concurrent` and `Control.Exception` as a simple function `ambL :: [b] -> IO b` that concurrently evaluates the elements of a list and writes the result first obtained in a mutable variable.

Finally, the function `ed :: D -> IO D` produces an element of $\text{data}(a)$ from $a \in D$ by activating `ambL` for the case of **Amb**(a, b). It corresponds to $\overset{p}{\rightsquigarrow}$ -reduction though it computes arguments of a pair sequentially. This function is nondeterministic since the result of executing `ed (Amb a b)` depends on which of the arguments a, b delivers a result first. The set of all possible results of `ed a` corresponds to the set $\text{data}(a)$.

We executed the program extracted in Section 6 with `ed`. As we have noted, the number 0 has three Gray-codes (i.e., realizers of $\mathbf{G}(0)$): $a = \perp : 1 : (-1)^\omega$, $b = 1 : 1 : (-1)^\omega$, and $c = -1 : 1 : (-1)^\omega$. On the other hand, the set of signed digit representations of 0 is $A \cup B \cup C$ where $A = \{0^\omega\}$, $B = \{0^k : 1 : (-1)^\omega \mid k \geq 0\}$, and $C = \{0^k : (-1) : 1^\omega \mid k \geq 0\}$, i.e., $A \cup B \cup C$ is the set of realizers of $\mathbf{S}(0)$. One can calculate

$$\text{gtoS}(a) = \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, 0 : \mathbf{Amb}(\perp, 0 : \dots))$$

and $\text{data}(\text{gtoS}(a)) = A$. Thus $\text{gtoS}(a)$ is reduced uniquely to $0 : 0 : \dots$ by the operational semantics. On the other hand, one can calculate $\text{data}(\text{gtoS}(b)) = A \cup B$ and $\text{data}(\text{gtoS}(c)) = A \cup C$. They are subsets of the set of realizers of $\mathbf{S}(0)$ as Theorem 5.10 says, and $\text{gtoS}(b)$ is reduced to an element of $A \cup B$ as Theorem 5.11 says.

We wrote a program that produces a $\{-1, 1, \perp\}$ -sequence with the speed of computation of each digit (-1 and 1) be controlled. Then, apply it to `gtoS` and then to `ed` to obtain expected results.

8. CONCLUSION

We introduced the logical system CFP by extending IFP [BT21] with two propositional operators $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow(A)$, and developed a method for extracting nondeterministic and concurrent programs that are provably total and satisfy their specifications.

While IFP already imports classical logic through nc-axioms that need only be true classically, in CFP the access to classical logic is considerably widened through the rule (Conc-lem) which, when interpreting $B|_A$ as $A \rightarrow B$ and identifying $\Downarrow(A)$ with A , is constructively invalid but has nontrivial nondeterministic computational content.

We applied our system to extract a concurrent translation from infinite Gray code to the signed digit representation, thus demonstrating that this approach not only is about program extraction ‘in principle’ but can be used to solve nontrivial concurrent computation problems through program extraction.

After an overview of related work, we conclude with some ideas for follow-up research.

8.1. Related work. The CSL 2016 paper [Ber16] is an early attempt to capture concurrency via program extraction and can be seen as the starting point of our work. Our main advances, compared to that paper, are that it is formalized as a logic for concurrent execution of partial programs by a globally angelic choice operator which is formalized by introducing a new connective $B|_A$, and that we are able to express bounded nondeterminism with complete control of the number of threads while [Ber16] modelled nondeterminism with countably infinite branching, which is unsuitable or an overkill for most applications. Furthermore, our approach has a typing discipline, a sound and complete small-step reduction, and has the ability to switch between global and local nondeterminism (see Sect. 8.2 below).

As for the study of angelic nondeterminism, it is not easy to develop a denotational semantics as we noted in Section 2, and it has been mainly studied from the operational point of view, e.g., notions of equivalence or refinement of processes and associated proof methods, which are all fundamental for correctness and termination [LM99, MSC03, Las06, SSS08, CHS05, Lev07]. Regarding imperative languages, Hoare logic and its extensions have been applied to nondeterminism and proving totality from the very beginning ([AO19] is a good survey on this subject). [Mam15] studies angelic nondeterminism with an extension of Hoare Logic.

There are many logical approaches to concurrency. An example is an approach based on extensions of Reynolds’ separation logic [Rey02] to the concurrent and higher-order setting [O’H07, Bro07, JKJ⁺18]. Logics for session types and process calculi [Wad14b, CPT16, KNHH16] form another approach that is oriented more towards the formulae-as-types/proofs-as-programs [How80, Wad14a] or rather proofs-as-processes paradigm [Abr92]. All these approaches provide highly specialized logics and expression languages that are able to model and reason about concurrent programs with a fine control of memory and access management and complex communication patterns.

8.2. Modelling locally angelic choice. We remarked earlier that our interpretation of **Amb** corresponds to *globally* angelic choice. Surprisingly, *locally* angelic choice can be modelled by a slight modification of the restriction and the total concurrency operators: We simply replace A by the logically equivalent formula $A \vee \mathbf{False}$, more precisely, we set $B|'_A \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} (B \vee \mathbf{False})|_A$ and $\Downarrow'(A) \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \Downarrow(A \vee \mathbf{False})$. Then the proof rules in Sect. 4 with $|$ and \Downarrow replaced by $|'$ and \Downarrow' , respectively but without the strictness condition, are


theorems of CFP. To see that the operator \Downarrow' indeed corresponds to locally angelic choice it is best to compare the realizers of the rule (Conc-mp) for \Downarrow and \Downarrow' . Assume A, B are non-Harrop and f is a realizer of $A \rightarrow B$. Then, if $\mathbf{Amb}(a, b)$ realizes $\Downarrow(A)$, then $\mathbf{Amb}(f \downarrow a, f \downarrow b)$ realizes $\Downarrow(B)$. This means that to choose, say, the left argument of \mathbf{Amb} as a result, a must terminate and so must the ambient (global) computation $f \downarrow a$. On the other hand, the program extracted from the proof of (Conc-mp) for \Downarrow' takes a realizer $\mathbf{Amb}(a, b)$ of $\Downarrow'(A)$ and returns $\mathbf{Amb}(\text{up} \circ f \circ \text{down}) \downarrow a, (\text{up} \circ f \circ \text{down}) \downarrow b$ as realizer of $\Downarrow'(B)$, where up and down are the realizers of $B \rightarrow (B \vee \mathbf{False})$ and $(A \vee \mathbf{False}) \rightarrow A$, namely, $\text{up} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda a. \mathbf{Left}(a)$ and $\text{down} \stackrel{\text{Def}}{=} \lambda c. \mathbf{case } c \mathbf{ of } \{ \mathbf{Left}(a) \rightarrow a \}$. Now, to choose the left argument of \mathbf{Amb} , it is enough for a to terminate since the non-strict operation up will immediately produce a w.h.n.f. without invoking the ambient computation. By redefining realizers of $B|_A$ and $\Downarrow(A)$ as realizers of $B|'_A$ and $\Downarrow'(A)$ and the realizers of the rules of CFP as those extracted from the proofs of the corresponding rules for $|'$ and \Downarrow' , we have another realizability interpretation of CFP that models locally angelic choice.

8.3. Markov's principle with restriction. So far, (Rest-intro) is the only rule that derives a restriction in a non-trivial way. However, there are other such rules, for example

$$\frac{\forall x \in \mathbf{N}(P(x) \vee \neg P(x))}{\exists x \in \mathbf{N} P(x) |_{\exists x \in \mathbf{N} P(x)}} \text{Rest-Markov}$$

If $P(x)$ is Harrop, then (Rest-Markov) is realized by minimization. More precisely, if f realizes $\forall x \in \mathbf{N}(P(x) \vee \neg P(x))$, then $\min(f)$ realizes the formula $\exists x \in \mathbf{N} P(x) |_{\exists x \in \mathbf{N} P(x)}$, where $\min(f)$ computes the least $k \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $f k = \mathbf{Left}$ if such k exists, and does not terminate, otherwise. One might expect as conclusion of (Rest-Markov) the formula $\exists x \in \mathbf{N} P(x) |_{(\neg \exists x \in \mathbf{N} P(x))}$. However, because of (Rest-stab) (which is realized by the identity), this wouldn't make a difference. The rule (Rest-Markov) can be used, for example, to prove that Harrop predicates that are recursively enumerable (re) and have re complements are decidable. From the proof one can extract a program that concurrently searches for evidence of membership in the predicate and its complement.

8.4. Further directions for research. The undecidability of equality of real numbers, which is at the heart of our case study on infinite Gray code, is also a critical point in Gaussian elimination where one needs to find a non-zero entry in a non-singular matrix. As shown in [BSST22], our approach makes it possible to search for such 'pivot elements' in a concurrent way. A further promising research direction is to extend the work on coinductive presentations of compact sets in [Spr21] to the concurrent setting.

Acknowledgements.  This work was supported by IRSES Nr. 612638 CORCON and Nr. 294962 COMPUTAL of the European Commission, the JSPS Core-to-Core Program, A. Advanced research Networks and JSPS KAKENHI 15K00015 and 23H03346 as well as the Marie Curie RISE project CID (H2020-MSCA-RISE-2016-731143).

REFERENCES

- [Abr92] S. Abramsky. Proofs as processes. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 135(1):5–9, April 1992. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(94)00103-0.
- [AO19] K. Apt and E. Olderog. Fifty years of Hoare’s logic. *Formal Aspects of Computing*, 31:751 – 807, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00165-019-00501-3.
- [Ber] U. Berger. CFP (concurrent fixed point logic) repository. URL: <https://github.com/ujberger/cfp>.
- [Ber11] U. Berger. From coinductive proofs to exact real arithmetic: theory and applications. *Logical Methods in Comput. Sci.*, 7(1):1–24, 2011. doi:10.2168/LMCS-7(1:8)2011.
- [Ber16] U. Berger. Extracting Non-Deterministic Concurrent Programs. In J.-M. Talbot and L. Regnier, editors, *25th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2016)*, volume 62 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 26:1–26:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2016.26.
- [BMSS11] U. Berger, K. Miyamoto, H. Schwichtenberg, and M. Seisenberger. Minlog - a tool for program extraction for supporting algebra and coalgebra. In *CALCO-Tools*, volume 6859 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 393–399. Springer, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-22944-2_29.
- [BP18] U. Berger and O. Petrovska. Optimized program extraction for induction and coinduction. In *CiE 2018: Sailing Routes in the World of Computation*, volume 10936 of *LNCS*, pages 70–80. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-94418-0_7.
- [BPT20] U. Berger, O. Petrovska, and H. Tsuiki. Prawf: An interactive proof system for program extraction. In M. Anselmo, G.D. Vedova, F. Manea, and A. Pauly, editors, *Beyond the Horizon of Computability - 16th Conference on Computability in Europe, CiE 2020*, volume 12098 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 137–148. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-51466-2_12.
- [Bro86] M. Broy. A theory for nondeterminism, parallelism, communication, and concurrency. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 45:1 – 61, 1986. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(86)90040-X.
- [Bro07] S. Brookes. A semantics for concurrent separation logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 375:227–370, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2006.12.034.
- [BS12] U. Berger and M. Seisenberger. Proofs, programs, processes. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 51(3):213–329, 2012. doi:10.1007/s00224-011-9325-8.
- [BSST22] U. Berger, M. Seisenberger, D. Spreen, and H. Tsuiki. Concurrent Gaussian Elimination. In *Mathematics for Computation (M4C)*, pages 193–217. World Scientific, Singapore, 2022. doi:10.1142/12500.
- [BT21] U. Berger and H. Tsuiki. Intuitionistic fixed point logic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 172(3):102903, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.apal.2020.102903. An updated and corrected version is available at [arXiv:2104.14669](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.14669).
- [BT22] U. Berger and H. Tsuiki. Extracting total amb programs from proofs. In *Programming Languages and Systems, 31st European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2022, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2022, Munich, Germany, April 2-7, 2022, Proceedings*, pages 85–113, 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-99336-8.
- [CH85] W. Clinger and C. Halpern. Alternative semantics for McCarthy’s amb. In Winskel G. Brookes S.D., Roscoe A.W., editor, *Seminar on Concurrency. CONCURRENCY 1984*, volume 197 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 1985. doi:10.1007/3-540-15670-4_22.
- [CHS05] A. Carayol, D. Hirschhoff, and D. Sangiorgi. On the representation of mccarthy’s amb in the π -calculus. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 330(3):439 – 473, 2005. Expressiveness in Concurrency. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2004.10.005.
- [CPT16] L. Caires, F. Pfenning, and B. Toninho. Linear logic propositions as session types. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 26:367–423, 2016. doi:10.1017/S0960129514000218.
- [DBPLT02] A.R. Du Bois, R.F. Pointon, H.-W. Loidl, and P.W. Trinder. Implementing declarative parallel bottom-avoiding choice. In *14th Symposium on Computer Architecture and High Performance Computing (SBAC-PAD 2002), 28-30 October 2002, Vitoria, Espirito Santo, Brazil*, pages 82–92. IEEE Computer Society, 2002. doi:10.1109/CAHPC.2002.1180763.
- [DG99] P. Di Gianantonio. An abstract data type for real numbers. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 221(1-2):295–326, 1999. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(99)00036-5.
- [Esc96] M. H. Escardo. PCF extended with real numbers. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 162:79–115, 1996. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(95)00250-2.

- [GHK⁺03] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott. *Continuous Lattices and Domains*, volume 93 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [HM92] J. Hughes and A. Moran. A semantics for locally bottom-avoiding choice. In John Launchbury and Patrick M. Sansom, editors, *Functional Programming, Glasgow 1992, Proceedings of the 1992 Glasgow Workshop on Functional Programming, Ayr, Scotland, UK, 6-8 July 1992*, Workshops in Computing, pages 102–112. Springer, 1992. doi:10.1007/978-1-4471-3215-8_9.
- [HO89] John Hughes and John O’Donnell. Expressing and reasoning about non-deterministic functional programs. In Kei Davis and John Hughes, editors, *Functional Programming, Proceedings of the 1989 Glasgow Workshop, 21-23 August 1989, Fraserburgh, Scotland, UK*, Workshops in Computing, pages 308–328. Springer, 1989.
- [How80] W. A. Howard. The formulae-as-types notion of construction. In J. P. Seldin and J. R. Hindley, editors, *To H.B. Curry: Essays on Combinatory Logic, Lambda Calculus and Formalism*, pages 479–490. Academic Press, 1980.
- [JKJ⁺18] R. Jung, R. Krebbers, J.-H. Jourdan, A. Bizjak, L. Birkedal, and D. Dreyer. Iris from the ground up. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 28:1–73, 2018. doi:10.1017/S0956796818000151.
- [KNHH16] D. Kouzapas, Y. Nobuko, R. Hu, and K. Honda. On asynchronous eventful session semantics. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 26:303–364, 2016. doi:10.1017/S096012951400019X.
- [Las06] S. B. Lassen. Normal Form Simulation for McCarthy’s Amb. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 155:445 – 465, 2006. Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference on Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS XXI). doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2005.11.068.
- [Lev07] P. B. Levy. Amb breaks Well-Pointedness, Ground Amb doesn’t. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 173:221 – 239, 2007. Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Conference on Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS XXIII). doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2007.02.036.
- [LM99] S. B. Lassen and A. Moran. Unique Fixed Point Induction for McCarthy’s Amb. In M Kutylowski, L. Pacholski, and T. Wierzbicki, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 1999, 24th International Symposium, MFCS’99, Szklarska Poreba, Poland, September 6-10, 1999, Proceedings*, volume 1672 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 198–208. Springer, 1999. doi:10.1007/3-540-48340-3_18.
- [Luc77] H. Luckhardt. A fundamental effect in computations on real numbers. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 5(3):321–324, 1977. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(77)90048-2.
- [Mam15] K. Mamouras. Synthesis of strategies and the hoare logic of angelic nondeterminism. In Andrew M. Pitts, editor, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 18th International Conference, FoSSaCS 2015*, volume 9034 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 25–40. Springer, 2015. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0_2.
- [McC63] J. McCarthy. A basis for a mathematical theory of computation. In P. Braffort and D. Hirschberg, editors, *Computer Programming and Formal Systems*, volume 35 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 33 – 70. Elsevier, 1963. doi:10.1016/S0049-237X(08)72018-4.
- [MSC03] A. Moran, D. Sands, and M. Carlsson. Erratic fudgets: a semantic theory for an embedded coordination language. *Science of Computer Programming*, 46(1):99 – 135, 2003. Special Issue on Coordination Languages and Architectures. doi:10.1016/S0167-6423(02)00088-6.
- [O’H07] P. O’Hearn. Resources, concurrency, and local reasoning. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 375(1):271–307, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2006.12.035.
- [Pie02] B. C. Pierce. *Types and Programming Languages*. The MIT Press, 2002.
- [Rey02] J. C. Reynolds. Separation logic: A logic for shared mutable data structures. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS ’02*, pages 55–74, Washington, DC, USA, 2002. IEEE Computer Society. doi:10.1109/LICS.2002.1029817.
- [Sch06] H. Schwichtenberg. Minlog. In F. Wiedijk, editor, *The Seventeen Provers of the World*, number 3600 in *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intell.*, pages 151–157, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.jlap.2004.07.005.
- [Spr21] D. Spreen. Computing with continuous objects: a uniform co-inductive approach. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 31(2):144–192, 2021. doi:10.1017/S0960129521000116.
- [SS92] H. Sondergard and P. Sestoft. Non-determinism in Functional Languages. *The Computer Journal*, 35(5):514–523, 1992. doi:10.1093/comjnl/35.5.514.

- [SSS08] D. Sabel and M. Schmidt-Schauss. A call-by-need lambda calculus with locally bottom-avoiding choice: context lemma and correctness of transformations. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 18(3):501–553, 2008. doi:10.1017/S0960129508006774.
- [SW12] H. Schwichtenberg and S. S. Wainer. *Proofs and Computations*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [Tsu02] H. Tsuiki. Real number computation through Gray code embedding. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 284(2):467–485, 2002. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(01)00104-9.
- [Tsu05] H. Tsuiki. Real number computation with committed choice logic programming languages. *J. Log. Algebr. Program.*, 64(1):61–84, 2005. doi:10.1016/j.jlap.2004.07.005.
- [Wad14a] P. Wadler. Propositions as sessions. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 24:384–418, 2014. doi:10.1017/S095679681400001X.
- [Wad14b] P. Wadler. Propositions as types. *Communications of the ACM*, 58(12):75–84, 2014. doi:10.1145/2699407.
- [Wei00] K. Weihrauch. *Computable Analysis*. Springer, 2000.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A. IMPLEMENTATION

We explain the program and experiments of Section 7 in more detail. The source code (GraySD.hs) is available from the archive [Ber].

A.1. Nondeterminism. Using the primitives of the Haskell libraries `Concurrent` and `Exception` we can implement nondeterministic choice through a program `ambL` that picks from a list nondeterministically a terminating element (if exists). Although in our application we need only binary choice, we implement arbitrary finite choice since it is technically more convenient and permits more applications, e.g. Gaussian elimination (Section 8.4).

```
import Control.Concurrent
import Control.Exception

ambL :: [a] -> IO a
ambL xs =
  do { m <- newEmptyMVar ;
      acts <- sequence
        [ forkIO (do { y <- evaluate x ; putMVar m y }
                  | x <- xs ) ;
        z <- takeMVar m ;
        x <- sequence_ (map killThread acts) ;
        seq x (return z)
      }
```

Comments:

- `newEmptyMVar` creates an empty mutable variable,
- `forkIO` creates a thread,
- `evaluate` evaluates its argument to head normal form,
- `putMVar m y` writes `y` into the mutable variable `m` provided `m` is empty,
- the line `seq x (return z)` makes sure that the threads are killed before the final result `z` is returned.

A.2. Extracting data. We define the domain D (Section 2) and a program `ed` on D ('extract data') that, using `ambL`, nondeterministically selects a terminating argument of the constructor `Amb`.

```
data D = Nil | Le D | Ri D | Pair(D, D) | Fun(D -> D) | Amb(D, D)
```

```
ed :: D -> IO D
ed (Le d) = do { d' <- ed d ; return (Le d') }
ed (Ri d) = do { d' <- ed d ; return (Ri d') }
ed (Pair d e) = do { d' <- ed d ; e' <- ed e ; return (Pair d' e') }
ed (Amb a b) = do { c <- ambL [a,b] ; ed c } ;
ed d = return d
```

`ed` can be seen as an implementation of the operational semantics in Section 3.

A.3. Gray code to Signed Digit Representation conversion. We read-off the programs extracted in the Sections 5 and 6 to obtain the desired conversion function. Note that this is nothing but a copy of the programs in those sections with type annotations for readability. The programs work without type annotation because Haskell infers their types. The Haskell types contain only one type D . Their types as CFP-programs are shown as comments in the code below.

From Section 5.

```
mapamb :: (D -> D) -> D -> D -- (B -> C) -> A(B) -> A(C)
      -- (A(B) is the type of Amb(a,b) where a,b are of type B)
mapamb = \f -> \c -> case c of {Amb(a,b) -> Amb(f $! a, f $! b)}
```

```
leftright :: D -> D -- B + C -> B + C
leftright = \b -> case b of {Le _ -> Le Nil; Ri _ -> Ri Nil}
```

```
conSD :: D -> D -- 2 x 2 -> A(3)
      -- (2 = 1+1, etc. where 1 is the unit type)
conSD = \c -> case c of {Pair(a, b) ->
  Amb(Le $! (leftright a),
    Ri $! (case b of {Le _ -> bot; Ri _ -> Nil}))}
```

From Section 6.

```
gscomp :: D -> D -- [2] -> A(3)
gscomp (Pair(a, Pair(b, p))) = conSD (Pair(a, b))
```

```
onedigit :: D -> D -> D -- [2] -> 3 -> 3 x [2]
onedigit (Pair(a, Pair (b, p))) c = case c of {
  Le d -> case d of {
    Le _ -> Pair(Le(Le Nil), Pair(b,p));
    Ri _ -> Pair(Le(Ri Nil), Pair(notD b,p))
  };
  Ri _ -> Pair(Ri Nil, Pair(a, nhD p))}
```

```
notD :: D -> D -- 2 -> 2
notD a = case a of {Le _ -> Ri Nil; Ri _ -> Le Nil}
```

```
nhD :: D -> D -- [2] -> [2]
nhD (Pair (a, p)) = Pair (notD a, p)
```

```
s :: D -> D -- [2] -> A(3 x [2])
s p = mapamb (onedigit p) (gscomp p)
```

```
mon :: (D -> D) -> D -> D -- (B -> C) -> A(3 x B) -> A(3 x C)
mon f p = mapamb (mond f) p
  where mond f (Pair(a,t)) = Pair(a, f t)
```

```
gtos :: D -> D -- [2] -> [3]
```

```
gtos = (mon gtos) . s
```

A.4. Gray code generation with delayed digits. Recall that Gray code has the digits 1 and -1 , modelled as $Ri\ Nil$ and $Le\ Nil$. A digit may as well be undefined (\perp) in which case it is modelled by a nonterminating computation (such as `bot` below). To exhibit the nondeterminism in our programs we generate digits with different computation times. For example, `graydigitToD 5` denotes the digit 1 computed in 500000 steps, while `graydigitToD 0` does not terminate and therefore denotes \perp .

```
delay :: Integer -> D
delay n | n > 1      = delay (n-1)
        | n == 1    = Ri Nil
        | n == 0    = bot
        | n == (-1) = Le Nil
        | n < (-1)  = delay (n+1)
bot = bot

graydigitToD :: Integer -> D
graydigitToD a | a == (-1) = Le Nil
               | a == 1    = Ri Nil
               | True      = delay (a*100000)
```

The function `grayToD` lifts this to Gray codes, that is, infinite sequences of partial Gray digits represented as elements of D :

```
-- list to Pairs
ltop :: [D] -> D
ltop = foldr (\x -> \y -> Pair(x,y)) Nil

grayToD :: [Integer] -> D
grayToD = ltop . (map graydigitToD)
```

For example, `grayToD (0:5:-3:[-1,-1..])` denotes the Gray code $\perp : 1 : -1 : -1, -1, \dots$ where the first digit does not terminate, the second digit (1) takes 500000 steps to compute and the third digit (-1) takes 300000 steps. The remaining digits (all -1) take one step each.

A.5. Truncating the input and printing the result. The program `gtos` transforms Gray code into signed digit representation, so both, input and output are infinite. To observe the computation, we truncate the input to some finite approximation which `gtos` will map to some finite approximation of the output. This finite output is a nondeterministic element of D (i.e. it may contain the constructor `Amb`) from which we then can extract nondeterministically a deterministic data using the function `ed` which can be printed.

In the following we define the truncation and the printing of deterministic finite data.

