

# Formalising inductive and coinductive containers

Stefania Damato  

University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

Thorsten Altenkirch  

University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

Axel Ljungström   

Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

---

## Abstract

Containers capture the concept of strictly positive data types in programming. The original development of containers is done in the internal language of Locally Cartesian Closed Categories (LCCCs) with disjoint coproducts and  $W$ -types. Although it is claimed that these developments can also be interpreted in extensional Martin-Löf type theory, this interpretation is not made explicit. Moreover, as a result of extensionality, these developments freely assume Uniqueness of Identity Proofs (UIP), so it is not clear whether this is a necessary condition. In this paper, we present a formalisation of the result that ‘containers preserve least and greatest fixed points’ in `Cubical Agda`, thereby giving a formulation in intensional type theory, and showing that UIP is not necessary. Our main incentive for using `Cubical Agda` is that its path type restores the equivalence between bisimulation and coinductive equality. Thus, besides developing container theory in a more general setting, we also demonstrate the usefulness of `Cubical Agda`’s path type to coinductive proofs.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation  $\rightarrow$  Type theory

**Keywords and phrases** type theory; container; initial algebra; terminal coalgebra; `Cubical Agda`

**Funding** *Axel Ljungström*: This author is supported by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet) under Grant No. 2019-04545.

**Acknowledgements** The authors would like to thank Tom de Jong, Nicolai Kraus, Anders Mörtberg, and Chris Purdy for fruitful discussions on this work, as well as the `Agda Zulip` and `Discord` communities for useful inputs and valuable comments.

## 1 Introduction

An inductive type is a type given by a list of constructors, each specifying a way to form an element of the type. Defining types inductively is a central notion in Martin-Löf Type Theory (MLTT), with examples including the natural numbers, lists, and finite sets. In order for our inductive definitions to ‘make sense’, i.e. for us to be able to express their induction principle and for the induction principle to not cause inconsistencies (see [19, Section 5.6]), we need to impose conditions on the general form of a constructor. The condition we would like to impose on our inductive definitions is that they are *strictly positive*. Dual to inductive types is the notion of a coinductive type, which is given by a list of destructors. While inductive types are described by the different ways we can construct them, coinductive types are described by the ways we can break them apart. Coinductive types are typically infinite structures, and examples include the conatural numbers and streams. As explained for inductive definitions, coinductive definitions also ought to be strictly positive in order to avoid inconsistencies.<sup>1</sup> We therefore would like a semantic description of strict positivity in order for our systems to only admit such types. Containers do precisely this.

---

<sup>1</sup> To be precise, in both cases we mean that the signature functor is strictly positive.

The theory of containers [1–4] (also referred to as polynomial functors in the literature [13]) was developed to capture the concept of strictly positive data types in programming, and has been very useful in providing semantics for inductive types and inductive families. The original development of containers uses a categorical language to develop the theory. Containers are presented as constructions in the internal language of Locally Cartesian Closed Categories (LCCCs) with disjoint coproducts and W-types (so-called Martin-Löf categories), and a standard set-theoretic metatheory is used. Abbott et al. claim in [3] that these developments can also be interpreted as constructions in extensional type theory. While Seely, Hofmann, and others show that this translation can be done in principle [14, 17], the construction in type theory is not actually carried out.

In this paper, instead of using the categorical framework of LCCCs, we develop existing results on containers in (MLTT), and more specifically, without assuming Uniqueness of Identity Proofs (UIP), so that our work can be interpreted in the more recent development of Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT). The results on containers that we focus on here state that ‘container functors preserve fixed points’, or in other words, ‘container functors have initial algebras and terminal coalgebras’. As a vehicle for our presentation, we use `Cubical Agda`, which is a direct implementation of (a cubical flavour of [10]) Homotopy Type Theory and Univalent Foundations (HoTT/UF). The main reason we use `Cubical Agda` is not because we need univalence (in fact we do not use univalence at all), but rather because its treatment of equality as a path type restores the symmetry between inductive and coinductive reasoning in Agda. In intensional type theory and therefore in vanilla Agda, working with inductive types is facilitated by using structural recursion and pattern matching, and although for coinductive types we do have copattern matching and some guarded corecursion, we cannot get very far when working in this setting. In particular, many equalities on coinductive types are impossible to prove in much the same way that equalities on function types cannot be proved: this requires some form of extensionality. Fortunately, `Cubical Agda` makes function extensionality provable, and many of the equalities on coinductive types that were previously impossible in vanilla Agda also become provable.

Formalising these results highlighted many subtleties in the existing constructions on containers, especially for them to be interpreted in an intensional setting. These included questions on whether or not certain *h-set* assumptions<sup>2</sup> are required (it turns out they are not) and ensuring that our use of corecursion is productive. It also revealed some issues with Agda’s current termination checker, namely that it incorrectly flags a composition of productive calls as a termination error. Moreover, we believe that our presentation reflects the intuitive ideas behind the constructions more clearly to the general type theorist. We assume a basic understanding of category theory but not necessarily of models of type theory like LCCCs or Categories with Families (CwFs). Lastly, not only do we contribute to the `agda/cubical` library [18] by mechanising proofs on containers, but we also demonstrate that in terms of important practical developments brought to MLTT by cubical type theory, there is much more than just computational univalence. Namely, its use of path types allows us to prove properties of coinductive types we could not prove in plain intensional type theory. Therefore, the goal of this paper is twofold: we aim to formalise results on containers in a different and more generalised setting than is present in the literature, while also demonstrating the usefulness of `Cubical Agda`’s path type for coinduction.

Our formalisation is available at <https://github.com/agda-enthusiast/cubical/blob/master/Cubical/Papers/Containers.agda> in a fork of the `agda/cubical` library. We have

---

<sup>2</sup> By *h-set* we mean a type satisfying UIP.

type-checked it using versions 2.6.4.3 and 2.6.5 of Agda. We remark that we have taken some liberties concerning the typesetting in this paper and that, although it should still be easy to follow, the formalisation may differ slightly (with respect to syntax) from the paper.

## 2 Background

In this section, we briefly present some background material that aids in understanding the rest of the paper. We start by giving an overview of Cubical Agda concepts that will be used throughout the paper. We then review **W**- and **M**-types, containers, and container functors.

### 2.1 Cubical Agda

Agda is a dependently typed functional programming language and proof assistant. It supports inductive data types, e.g. the unit type, the empty type, the natural numbers

```
data ⊤ : Type where
  tt : ⊤

data ⊥ : Type where

data ℕ : Type where
  zero : ℕ
  suc  : ℕ → ℕ
```

and record types, e.g.  $\Sigma$ -types and (coinductive) streams.

```
record Σ (A : Type) (B : A → Type) : Type where
  constructor _,_
  field
    fst : A
    snd : B fst

record Stream (A : Type) : Type where
  coinductive
  field
    hd : A
    tl : Stream A
```

When defining a function with an inductive type in its domain, Agda allows us to *pattern match* on arguments of that type, i.e. generate separate clauses for each possible way that argument can be constructed. Dually, when defining a function whose codomain is a record or coinductive type, Agda allows us to *copattern match* on the result, i.e. separate the different projections of the result into clauses.

```
isEven : ℕ → Type
isEven zero = ⊤
isEven (suc zero) = ⊥
isEven (suc (suc n)) = isEven n

from : ℕ → Stream ℕ
hd (from n) = n
tl (from n) = from (suc n)
```

Being based on the propositions as types paradigm, each program in Agda can be viewed as a proof in intensional type theory. For a very rudimentary example, consider the following program which proves that being an even number is preserved by addition by 2.

```
isEven+ : (n : ℕ) → isEven n → isEven (2 + n)
isEven+ n p = p
```

We may note above that Agda uses the syntax  $(a : A) \rightarrow B a$  rather than  $\Pi_{a:A} B a$ . We will use both notations interchangeably in this paper with a preference for the former whenever the paper margins can contain it. We also remark that the syntax  $\{a : A\} \rightarrow B a$  is available in Agda and denotes the same construction but with  $a$  an implicit argument.

Cubical Agda [20] extends Agda with primitives from cubical type theory [10, 11]. While the original motivation behind this extension was arguably to allow for native support for

## 4 Formalising inductive and coinductive containers

Voevodsky's univalence axiom [21] and higher inductive types [16], we are primarily interested in Cubical Agda's representation of equality. The equality type in Cubical Agda, also called the *path type*, restores the equivalence between bisimilarity and equality for coinductive types. In order to explain how, let us briefly introduce some of the elementary machinery of Cubical Agda.

The main novelty of Cubical Agda is the addition of an interval (pre-)type  $\mathbb{I}$ . This type has two terms  $i0, i1 : \mathbb{I}$  denoting the endpoints of the interval. It comes equipped with meet and join operations  $\_ \wedge \_, \_ \vee \_ : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$  and a reversal  $\sim : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$  turning  $\mathbb{I}$  into a De Morgan algebra. This allows us to interalise the usual homotopical notion of a path and take that as our definition of equality. Indeed, an equality  $p$  between two points  $x, y : A$ , denoted  $p : x \equiv y$ , is a path in  $A$  between  $x$  and  $y$ , i.e. a function  $p : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow A$  such that  $p \ i0$  is definitionally equal to  $x$  and  $p \ i1$  is definitionally equal to  $y$ . To showcase some elementary constructions of paths in Cubical Agda, consider e.g. the constructions/proofs of reflexivity and symmetry.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{refl} & : \{x : A\} \rightarrow x \equiv x & \_^{-1} & : x \equiv y \rightarrow y \equiv x \\ \text{refl } \{x = x\} \ i & = x & (p^{-1}) \ i & = p (\sim i) \end{aligned}$$

There is also a primitive operation called `hcomp` which, very simplified, can be used to complete cubical diagrams of paths. Consider, for instance, the incomplete square of paths below. The `hcomp` operation allows us to construct the missing path on the top.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & z & \xrightarrow{\text{top}} & w \\ & \uparrow p & & \uparrow r \\ j \uparrow & x & \xrightarrow{q} & y \\ & \downarrow i & & \downarrow \end{array} \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{top} : z \equiv w \\ \text{top } i & = \text{hcomp } (\lambda j \rightarrow \lambda \{(i = i0) \rightarrow p \ j ; \\ & \qquad (i = i1) \rightarrow r \ j\}) \text{ -- left side} \\ & (q \ i) \text{ -- bottom} \end{aligned}$$

We get transitivity of our equality type (also called path composition) in the special case when  $p$  is set to `refl`.

Since equality is interpreted as non-dependent functions of the form  $p : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow A$ , it makes sense to ask whether this has a dependent analogue. Given a dependent type  $A : \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \text{Type}$ , and two points  $x : A \ i0$  and  $y : A \ i1$ , we call a dependent function  $p : (i : \mathbb{I}) \rightarrow A \ i$  computing to  $x$  at  $i0$  and  $y$  at  $i1$  a *dependent path* between  $x$  and  $y$ . The intuition here should be that  $A$  in fact is an equality between  $A \ i0$  and  $A \ i1$  and that asking for a dependent path between  $x$  and  $y$  is just asking whether they are equal modulo  $A$ . In Cubical Agda, the type of such dependent paths is primitive and is denoted `PathP`  $(\lambda i \rightarrow A \ i) \ x \ y$ . In fact, the usual non-dependent path type `\_\equiv\_\` is simply defined as the special case when the family  $A$  is constant. The constructions we have given so far all have analogous dependent versions in terms of `PathP`.

We remark here that the more common treatment of dependent paths in terms of transports is still available to us. The Cubical Agda primitives allow us to define `transport` :  $A \equiv B \rightarrow A \rightarrow B$  and, for any  $p : A \equiv B$ , the type `PathP`  $(\lambda i \rightarrow p \ i) \ a \ b$  is equivalent to the type `transport`  $p \ a \equiv b$ . An important special case of `transport` is the following

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subst} & : (B : A \rightarrow \text{Type}) \{x \ y : A\} \rightarrow x \equiv y \rightarrow B \ x \rightarrow B \ y \\ \text{subst } B \ p \ b & = \text{transport } (\lambda i \rightarrow B \ (p \ i)) \ b \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to the `transport` function of the HoTT book [19, Lemma 2.3.1].

One of the key advantages of Cubical Agda's treatment of equality is that it renders function extensionality a triviality:

```

funExt : ((x : A) → f x ≡ g x) → f ≡ g
funExt p i x = p x i

```

A consequence of this is that we can use the types  $f \equiv g$  and  $(x : A) \rightarrow f x \equiv g x$  interchangeably without having to worry about introducing any bureaucracy when moving from one to the other. In Cubical Agda, equality of functions *is by definition* pointwise equality. In a similar way, and especially important for us, the equality type of a coinductive type *is* bisimulation modulo copattern matching. In particular, `id` below can be shown to be an equivalence [5].

```

record _≈_ (xs ys : Stream A) : Set where
  coinductive
  field
    hd≡ : hd xs ≡ hd ys
    tl≈ : tl xs ≈ tl ys
  id : (xs ys : Stream A) → xs ≈ ys → xs ≡ ys
  hd (id xs ys p i) = hd≡ p i
  tl (id xs ys p i) = id (tl xs) (tl ys) (tl≈ p) i

```

For our purposes, this is an indispensable feature which, to the best of our knowledge, is unique to Cubical Agda.

## 2.2 The W-type and the M-type

$\mathbf{W}$  is the type of well-founded, labelled trees. A tree of type  $\mathbf{W}$  can be infinitely branching, but any path in the tree will be finite.  $\mathbf{W}$  takes two parameters  $S : \mathbf{Type}$  and  $P : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ . We think of  $S$  as the type of shapes of the tree, and for a given shape  $s : S$ , the tree has  $(P s)$ -many positions. The key property of  $\mathbf{W}$  is that it is the universal type for strictly positive inductive types, i.e. any strictly positive type can be expressed using  $\mathbf{W}$ . The basic definition of a container arises from the  $\mathbf{W}$ -type.

```

data W (S : Type) (P : S → Type) : Type where
  sup-W : (s : S) → (P s → W S P) → W S P

```

► **Example 1.** We encode the type of natural numbers  $\mathbf{N}$  by defining  $S$  and  $P$  as below.

```

S = T ⊔ T
P (inl _) = ⊥
P (inr _) = T,

```

$S$  encodes the possible constructors we can choose (`inl` is for `zero`, `inr` is for `succ`), and  $P$  encodes the number of subtrees (or recursive arguments) each choice of  $S$  has. Thus  $\mathbf{W} S P$  encodes  $\mathbf{N}$ . For example, `zero` is represented by the tree on the left, `succ zero` by the tree on the right, and so on.



$\mathbf{M}$  is the type of non-well-founded, labelled trees. A tree of type  $\mathbf{M}$  can have both finite and infinite paths.  $\mathbf{M}$  also takes two parameters  $S : \mathbf{Type}$  and  $P : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ , and we think of them similarly as for  $\mathbf{W}$ . Dually to  $\mathbf{W}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}$  is the universal type for strictly positive coinductive types.

```

record M (S : Type) (P : S → Type) : Type where
  coinductive


```

```

field
  shape : S
  pos : P shape → M S P

```

► **Example 2.** If we define  $S$  and  $P$  as in Example 1, we get an encoding of the conatural numbers  $\mathbb{N}^\infty$  as  $M S P$ . Apart from having all the natural numbers as its elements,  $\mathbb{N}^\infty$  also has an ‘infinite number’ whose predecessor is itself. This is represented by the infinite tree shown below.



We will see in Section 4 that it is useful to have an explicit account of the coinduction principle of  $M$  which states that any two  $m_0, m_1 : M S Q$  which can be related by a bisimulation are equal. In Cubical Agda, we can define the type of bisimulations on  $M$  by

```

record M-R {S : Type} {Q : S → Type} (R : M S Q → M S Q → Type)
  (m0 m1 : M S Q) : Type where
field
  s-eq : shape m0 ≡ shape m1
  p-eq : (q0 : Q (shape m0)) (q1 : Q (shape m1))
    (q-eq : PathP (λ i → Q (s-eq i)) q0 q1) → R (pos m0 q0) (pos m1 q1)

```

and prove the coinduction principle using interval abstraction and copattern matching.

```

MCoind : {S : Type} {Q : S → Type} (R : M S Q → M S Q → Type)
  (is-bisim : {m0 m1 : M S Q} → R m0 m1 → M-R R m0 m1)
  {m0 m1 : M S Q} → R m0 m1 → m0 ≡ m1
shape (MCoind R is-bisim r i) = s-eq (is-bisim r) i
pos (MCoind {S = S} {Q} R is-bisim {m0 = m0} {m1 = m1} r i) q =
  MCoind R is-bisim {m0 = pos m0 q0} {m1 = pos m1 q1} (p-eq (is-bisim r) q0 q1 q2) i

```

Above,  $q_0$ ,  $q_1$ , and  $q_2$  are all of the form `transport ... q`. The constructions of these transports use some rather technical cube algebra; we omit the details and refer the interested reader to the formalisation.

## 2.3 Containers

We present here the standard definitions of containers and their corresponding functors on `Set`, however, we point out that our work does not make any h-set assumptions. Our formalisation also works if we replace `Set` by the universe of types in HoTT – or, more precisely, Cubical Agda’s universe `Type` – so that a container functor is then a functor on the wild category of types. However, fully defining the container theory for this wild category goes beyond the scope of this paper, so we review containers as they are presented in existing literature and leave this for future work.

► **Definition 3.** A container is given by a pair of types  $S : \text{Set}$  and  $P : S \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , which we write as  $S \triangleleft P$ .

In practice, many data types are parameterised by one or more types. `List A : Type` and `Vec A : ℕ → Type` are both parameterised by the type  $A$  of data to be stored in them. In order to be able to reason about these data types, as well as to compose and construct fixed points of containers, we will need containers parameterised by some (potentially infinite) indexing type  $I$ . We call these  $I$ -ary containers.

► **Definition 4.** An  $I$ -ary container is given by a pair  $S : \text{Set}$  and  $\mathbf{P} : I \rightarrow S \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , which we write as  $S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}$ .

Ordinary containers are trivially  $I$ -ary containers (when  $I$  is the unit type), so from now on we will only consider  $I$ -ary containers.

To every container  $S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}$  we associate a functor which maps a family of h-sets<sup>3</sup>  $\mathbf{X}$  to a choice of shape  $s : S$ , and for every  $i : I$  and position  $\mathbf{P} \ i \ s$  associated to  $s$ , a value of type  $\mathbf{X} \ i$  to be stored at that position.

► **Definition 5.** The container functor associated to an  $I$ -ary container  $S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}$  is the functor  $\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P} \rrbracket : \text{Set}^I \rightarrow \text{Set}$  with the following actions on objects and morphisms.

- Given an  $\mathbf{X} : \text{Set}^I$ ,  $\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P} \rrbracket \mathbf{X} := \sum_{s:S} ((i : I) \rightarrow \mathbf{P} \ i \ s \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \ i)$ .
- Given  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} : \text{Set}^I$  and a morphism  $f : (i : I) \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \ i \rightarrow \mathbf{Y} \ i$ ,

$$\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P} \rrbracket f(s, g) := (s, f \circ g)$$

for  $s : S$  and  $g : (i : I) \rightarrow \mathbf{P} \ i \ s \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \ i$ .

As a special case of the above definition, given an  $(I + 1)$ -ary container  $F = S \triangleleft \mathbf{R}$ , we will later need to write it in a way where we single out one component from it. We split  $\mathbf{R}$  into  $\mathbf{P}$  and  $Q$  and write  $F$  as having components  $S : \text{Set}, \mathbf{P} : I \rightarrow S \rightarrow \text{Set}, Q : S \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , and use the notation  $F = (S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q)$ . Given  $\mathbf{X} : I \rightarrow \text{Set}$  and  $Y : \text{Set}$ , then  $S, \mathbf{P}$ , and  $Q$  satisfy the below.

$$\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q \rrbracket (\mathbf{X}, Y) = \sum_{s:S} \left( (i : I) \rightarrow \mathbf{P} \ i \ s \rightarrow \mathbf{X} \ i \right) \times (Q \ s \rightarrow Y).$$

### 3 Setting up

In this section, we state precisely what it is that we want to prove and start attacking the problem. We construct a candidate initial algebra and terminal coalgebra for a general container functor, which in the following section we prove to be correct.

Given a container functor  $\llbracket F \rrbracket : \text{Set}^{I+1} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ , which we write as  $F = (S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q)$ , we need to specify container functors

$$\llbracket A_\mu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\mu \rrbracket : \text{Set}^I \rightarrow \text{Set}$$

$$\llbracket A_\nu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\nu \rrbracket : \text{Set}^I \rightarrow \text{Set}$$

such that

$$\llbracket A_\mu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \cong \mu Y. \llbracket F \rrbracket (\mathbf{X}, Y),$$

$$\llbracket A_\nu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \cong \nu Y. \llbracket F \rrbracket (\mathbf{X}, Y).$$

Above, and for the remainder of the paper,  $\cong$  is used to denote an equivalence of types<sup>4</sup>. The symbols  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  denote partial operators taking a functor  $F$  to the carrier of its initial algebra

<sup>3</sup> As stated at the beginning of the subsection, we will not actually restrict the h-level of this family in our formalisation but use ‘h-set’ in this statement as the definition of a functor technically requires it.

<sup>4</sup> In HoTT, there are several different notions of type equivalence. In our formalisation, we primarily use a definition in terms of *quasi-inverses* [19, Definition 2.4.6.], i.e. a function with an explicit inverse. All statements in this paper are independent of this particular choice and can be read with any other reasonable notion of equivalence in mind.

or terminal coalgebra respectively, if they exist. The notation  $\mu Y. \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, Y)$  is shorthand for the initial algebra of the functor  $G$  defined by  $G Y := \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ , and similarly for  $\nu$ .

We now illustrate how we calculate containers  $(A_\mu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\mu)$  and  $(A_\nu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\nu)$  in  $I$  parameters to make the above isomorphisms hold.

Calculating  $A_\mu$  and  $A_\nu$  is straightforward. If we set  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{1}$  in the above, we get

$$A_\mu \cong \llbracket A_\mu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{1} \cong \mu Y. \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{1}, Y) \cong \mu Y. \sum_{s:S} (Q s \rightarrow Y) \cong \mu Y. \llbracket S \triangleleft Q \rrbracket Y \cong \mathbf{W} S Q$$

$$A_\nu \cong \llbracket A_\nu \triangleleft \mathbf{B}_\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{1} \cong \nu Y. \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{1}, Y) \cong \nu Y. \sum_{s:S} (Q s \rightarrow Y) \cong \nu Y. \llbracket S \triangleleft Q \rrbracket Y \cong \mathbf{M} S Q.$$

The last step follows from the fact that the least (resp. greatest) fixed point of the container functor in one variable  $\llbracket S \triangleleft Q \rrbracket$  is  $\mathbf{W} S Q$  ( $\mathbf{M} S Q$ ), the W-type (M-type) with shapes  $S$  and positions  $Q$ .

Calculating  $\mathbf{B}_\mu : I \rightarrow \mathbf{W} S Q \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_\nu : I \rightarrow \mathbf{M} S Q \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$  is a bit more involved. Our reasoning applies to both  $\mathbf{W} S Q$  and  $\mathbf{M} S Q$ , so we consider any fixed point  $\phi$  of the container functor  $\llbracket S \triangleleft Q \rrbracket$  and construct  $\mathbf{B} : I \rightarrow \phi \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ . Being a fixed point of  $\llbracket S \triangleleft Q \rrbracket$  means that  $\phi$  consists of a carrier  $\mathbf{C} : \mathbf{Type}$  together with an isomorphism,  $\chi : \llbracket S \triangleleft Q \rrbracket \mathbf{C} \cong \mathbf{C}$ .

```
record FixedPoint : Type1 where
  field
    C : Type
    χ : (Σ [ s ∈ S ] (Q s → C)) ≅ C
```

In particular, we have  $\mathbf{WAlg} : \mathbf{FixedPoint}$  whose carrier is  $\mathbf{W} S Q$  and  $\mathbf{MAlg} : \mathbf{FixedPoint}$  whose carrier is  $\mathbf{M} S Q$ .

If  $\llbracket \mathbf{C} \triangleleft \mathbf{B} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is to be a fixed point of  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ , by Lambek's theorem [15], the following isomorphism is induced.

$$\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \llbracket \mathbf{C} \triangleleft \mathbf{B} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}) \cong \llbracket \mathbf{C} \triangleleft \mathbf{B} \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \tag{1}$$

By massaging the left hand side of this isomorphism, we can write it as a container functor in terms of only  $\mathbf{X}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s:S} \left( \left( \prod_i (\mathbf{P} i s \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i) \right) \times (Q s \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{C} \triangleleft \mathbf{B} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{s:S} \left( \left( \prod_i (\mathbf{P} i s \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i) \right) \times \left( Q s \rightarrow \sum_{c:\mathbf{C}} \left( \prod_i (\mathbf{B} i c \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i) \right) \right) \right) && \text{definition of } \llbracket \_ \rrbracket \\ &\cong \sum_{s:S} \left( \left( \prod_i (\mathbf{P} i s \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i) \right) \times \sum_{f: Q s \rightarrow \mathbf{C}} \left( \prod_{q:Q s} \prod_i (\mathbf{B} i (f q) \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i) \right) \right) && \text{distributivity of } \Pi \\ & && \text{over } \Sigma \\ &\cong \sum_{(s,f): \sum_{s:S} (Q s \rightarrow \mathbf{C})} \left( \prod_i \left( \mathbf{P} i s + \sum_{q:Q s} (\mathbf{B} i (f q)) \right) \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i \right) && \text{commutativity of} \\ & && \times \text{ and } (A \rightarrow C) \times (B \rightarrow C) \cong (A + B) \rightarrow C \\ &= \llbracket \sum_{s:S} (f: Q s \rightarrow \mathbf{C}) \triangleleft \left( \lambda i. \mathbf{P} i s + \sum_{q:Q s} (\mathbf{B} i (f q)) \right) \rrbracket \mathbf{X} && \text{definition of } \llbracket \_ \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

The induced isomorphism (1) can then be written as

$$\llbracket \sum_{s:S} (f: Q s \rightarrow \mathbf{C}) \triangleleft \left( \lambda i. \mathbf{P} i s + \sum_{q:Q s} \mathbf{B} i (f q) \right) \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \cong \llbracket \mathbf{C} \triangleleft \mathbf{B} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}.$$



We already have the isomorphism  $\chi: \sum_{s:S}(f: Q s \rightarrow \mathbf{C}) \cong \mathbf{C}$  on shapes. We start using the notation  $(\phi \chi^{-1}_0) c$  and  $(\phi \chi^{-1}_1) c$  for the first and second projections of  $(\chi^{-1} c)$ . We will also need the below isomorphism on positions for  $i: I$  and  $c: \mathbf{C}$ .

$$\left( \mathbf{P} i ((\phi \chi^{-1}_0) c) + \sum_{q: Q ((\phi \chi^{-1}_0) c)} \mathbf{B} i ((\phi \chi^{-1}_1) c q) \right) \cong \mathbf{B} i c$$

We use this as our definition of  $\mathbf{B}$ , which we hereafter call **Pos**, as an inductive family over  $\mathbf{C}$ . In our code, **Pos** is also parameterised by a fixed point  $\phi$ .

```
data Pos (phi : FixedPoint) (i : I) : phi.C -> Type where
  here : {c : phi.C} -> P i ((phi chi^-1_0) c) -> Pos phi i c
  below : {c : phi.C} (q : Q ((phi chi^-1_0) c)) -> Pos phi i ((phi chi^-1_1) c q) -> Pos phi i c
```

It turns out that **Pos** works for both cases: we set  $\mathbf{B}_\mu = \mathbf{Pos} \text{ WAlg}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_\nu = \mathbf{Pos} \text{ MAlg}$ . We note that it is not immediately obvious that choosing  $\mathbf{B}_\nu$  to be an inductive (and not coinductive) family over  $\mathbf{MSQ}$  would be the right choice in the coinductive case. Intuitively, we can think of **Pos** as the type of finite paths through a **W** or **M** tree. Although **M** trees can have infinite paths, any position (i.e. data stored in the tree) is obtained via a finite path, so **Pos** is precisely what is required. We verify this is actually the case in the next section.

We take the opportunity to mention the induction principle for **Pos**. In general, given a fixed point  $\phi$ , an index  $i: I$ , and a family of types  $A: (c: \phi.C) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos} \phi i c \rightarrow \text{Type}$  equipped with

- $h: \{c: \phi.C\} (p: P i ((\phi \chi^{-1}_0) c)) \rightarrow A c$  (**here**  $p$ )
- $b: \{c: \phi.C\} (q: Q ((\phi \chi^{-1}_0) c)) (p: \mathbf{Pos} \phi i ((\phi \chi^{-1}_1) c q)) \rightarrow A ((\phi \chi^{-1}_1) c q) p \rightarrow A c$  (**below**  $q p$ )

induces, in the obvious way, a dependent function  $(c: \phi.C) (p: \mathbf{Pos} \phi i c) \rightarrow A c p$ . In Cubical Agda, this is precisely the induction principle we get from performing a standard pattern matching. In practice, however, this induction principle is quite limited. The primary difficulty we run into is in the case  $A$  is only defined over  $(d: D)$  and  $\mathbf{Pos} \phi i (f d)$  for some fixed function  $f: D \rightarrow \phi.C$ . In this case, the induction principle above does not apply since  $A$  is not defined over all of  $\phi.C$  (this is entirely analogous to how path induction does not apply to paths with fixed endpoints). There are, of course, special cases when the induction principle is still applicable: for instance, when  $f$  is a retraction. In fact, we only need  $f$  to satisfy a weaker property, namely the following.

► **Definition 6.** Given a fixed point  $\phi$ , a function  $f: D \rightarrow \phi.C$  is called a  $\phi$ -retraction if for any  $d: D$ , the lift  $\widehat{f}_d$  in the diagram to the right exists.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D & & \\ \widehat{f}_d \uparrow & \searrow f & \\ Q((\phi \chi^{-1}_0) (f d)) & \xrightarrow{(\phi \chi^{-1}_1) (f d)} & C \end{array}$$

► **Lemma 7** (Generalised **Pos** induction). Let  $\phi$  be fixed point,  $i: I$  an index, and  $f: D \rightarrow \phi.C$  a  $\phi$ -retraction. Let  $A: (d: D) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos} \phi i (f d) \rightarrow \text{Type}$  be a dependent type equipped with

- $h: \{d: D\} (p: P i ((\phi \chi^{-1}_0) (f d))) \rightarrow A d$  (**here**  $p$ )
- $b: \{d: D\} (q: Q ((\phi \chi^{-1}_0) (f d))) (p: \mathbf{Pos} \phi i ((\phi \chi^{-1}_1) (f d) q)) \rightarrow A (\widehat{f}_d q) \widehat{p} \rightarrow A d$  (**below**  $q p$ )

where  $\widehat{p}$  is  $p$  transported along the witness of the fact the diagram in Definition 6 commutes. This data induces a dependent function  $(d: D) (p: \mathbf{Pos} \phi i (f d)) \rightarrow A d p$ .

**Proof sketch.** The induction principle follows immediately from the usual induction principle for **Pos** but with the family  $\widehat{A}: (c: \phi.C) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos} \phi i c \rightarrow \text{Type}$  defined by

$$\widehat{A} c p = (d: D)(t: c \equiv f d) \rightarrow A d (\text{subst} (\mathbf{Pos} \phi i) t p)$$

We obtain the appropriate statement by setting  $c = f d$ . ◀

#### 4 Fixed points

Let us now show that the constructions from Section 3 are correct:  $\llbracket \mathbf{W} S Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos} \mathbf{WAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the initial  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -algebra and  $\llbracket \mathbf{M} S Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos} \mathbf{MAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the terminal  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -coalgebra. The proofs in this section mostly follow those given in [3], although various adjustments needed to be made for Theorem 9. As was mentioned in Section 2, our work does not make any h-set assumptions, and therefore it holds more generally than for functors  $\mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , however we do not make this precise here.

We start off by showing that  $\llbracket \mathbf{W} S Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos} \mathbf{WAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the initial  $\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -algebra. This proof is relatively straightforward.

► **Theorem 8.** *Let  $F = (S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q)$  be a container in  $\text{Ind}+1$  parameters with  $S : \mathbf{Type}$ ,  $\mathbf{P} : \text{Ind} \rightarrow S \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ ,  $Q : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ . For any fixed  $\mathbf{X} : \text{Ind} \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ , the type  $\llbracket \mathbf{W} S Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos} \mathbf{WAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the carrier set of the initial algebra of  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -) : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , i.e.*

$$\llbracket \mathbf{W} S Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos} \mathbf{WAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \cong \mu Y. \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, Y).$$

Before proving Theorem 8, we spell out what we need to show. We write  $\mathbf{W}$  for  $\mathbf{W} S Q$  and  $\mathbf{Pos}\mu$  for  $\mathbf{Pos} \mathbf{WAlg}$ . We start by constructing an  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -algebra with carrier  $\llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$ . We define a morphism

$$\text{into} : \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}) \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$$

by induction on  $\mathbf{Pos}\mu$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{fst}(\text{into}((s, f), g, h)) &= \text{sup-}\mathbf{W} s f \\ \text{snd}(\text{into}((s, f), g, h)) \text{ ind}(\text{here } p) &= g \text{ ind } p \\ \text{snd}(\text{into}((s, f), g, h)) \text{ ind}(\text{below } q b) &= h \text{ ind } q b \end{aligned}$$

Then  $(\llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}, \text{into})$  is an  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -algebra. What we have to show is that it is initial, i.e. for any other algebra  $(Y, \alpha)$ , we need to define  $\bar{\alpha} : \llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \rightarrow Y$  uniquely, such that the below diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}) & \xrightarrow{\text{into}} & \llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \\ \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \bar{\alpha}) \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{\alpha} \\ \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, Y) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Y \end{array} \quad (2)$$

**Proof of Theorem 8.** We define  $\bar{\alpha} : \sum_{w:\mathbf{W}} ((i : \text{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\mu i w \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i) \rightarrow Y$  by induction on  $\mathbf{W}$ , as shown below. (Technically, this definition raises a termination checking error, but this is easily fixed in the actual code by defining the uncurried version first then writing  $\bar{\alpha}$  in terms of it.)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha} &: \Sigma [w \in \mathbf{W} S Q] ((i : \text{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\mu i w \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i) \rightarrow Y \\ \bar{\alpha}(\text{sup-}\mathbf{W} s f, k) &= \alpha(s, \mathbf{g}, \lambda q \rightarrow \bar{\alpha}(f q, \lambda i \rightarrow \mathbf{h} i q)) \\ \text{where} \\ \mathbf{g} &: (i : \text{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{P} i s \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i \\ \mathbf{h} i p &= k i(\text{here } p) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h &: (i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow (q : Q\ s) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\mu\ i\ (f\ q) \rightarrow X\ i \\ h\ i\ q\ b &= k\ i\ (\mathbf{below}\ q\ b) \end{aligned}$$

That (2) commutes then follows definitionally.

The only thing left to show is that  $\bar{\alpha}$  is unique. We assume there is another arrow  $\tilde{\alpha}: \llbracket \mathbf{W} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\mu \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \rightarrow Y$  making (2) commute, i.e.

$$\tilde{\alpha} \circ \mathbf{into} \equiv \alpha \circ \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\alpha}), \quad (3)$$

then we prove that for  $w : \mathbf{W}, k : \mathbf{Pos}\mu\ i\ w \rightarrow \mathbf{X}\ i$ , we have  $\tilde{\alpha}(w, k) \equiv \bar{\alpha}(w, k)$ . By induction on  $\mathbf{W}$ , we just have to show that for  $s : S, f : Q\ s \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ , we have  $\tilde{\alpha}(\mathbf{sup}\text{-}\mathbf{W}\ s\ f, k) \equiv \bar{\alpha}(\mathbf{sup}\text{-}\mathbf{W}\ s\ f, k)$ . This follows easily from  $\bar{\alpha}$ 's definition, assumption (3), and our inductive hypothesis.  $\blacktriangleleft$

Next, we show that  $\llbracket \mathbf{M}\ S\ Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\ \mathbf{MAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the terminal  $\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -coalgebra. This proof is significantly more challenging than the previous one, both theoretically, in that we come up with a modified version of the induction principle for  $\mathbf{Pos}$ , and also technically, in that we have to go through some workarounds for `Cubical Agda` to accept our proof. It also required us to use a considerable amount of path algebra to prove coherences that are not needed when assuming UIP, which is the setting of the original proof, although it is hard to pinpoint exactly the extent to which UIP would simplify matters in this case.

**► Theorem 9.** *Let  $F = (S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q)$  be a container in  $\mathbf{Ind}+1$  parameters with  $S : \mathbf{Type}, \mathbf{P} : \mathbf{Ind} \rightarrow S \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ , and  $Q : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ . For any fixed  $\mathbf{X} : \mathbf{Ind} \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}$ , the type  $\llbracket \mathbf{M}\ S\ Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\ \mathbf{MAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the carrier set of the terminal coalgebra of  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -) : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , i.e.*

$$\llbracket \mathbf{M}\ S\ Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\ \mathbf{MAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \cong \nu Y. \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, Y).$$

Before we prove Theorem 9, let us spell out what it is we need to show. We write  $\mathbf{M}$  for  $\llbracket \mathbf{M}\ S\ Q \rrbracket$  and  $\mathbf{Pos}\nu$  for  $\llbracket \mathbf{Pos}\ \mathbf{MAlg} \rrbracket$ . First, we will need to construct an  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -coalgebra with carrier  $\llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$ . This is very direct. Indeed, we can define a morphism

$$\mathbf{out} : \llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X})$$

roughly as  $\mathbf{into}^{-1}$ , where  $\mathbf{into}$  is the function from Theorem 8.

$$\mathbf{out}\ (m, k) = (\mathbf{shape}\ m, \mathbf{pos}\ m), ((\lambda\ ind\ p \rightarrow k\ ind\ (\mathbf{here}\ p)), (\lambda\ ind\ q\ b \rightarrow k\ ind\ (\mathbf{below}\ q\ b)))$$

So  $(\llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{out})$  is an  $\llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, -)$ -coalgebra. Thus, Theorem 9 will follow if we can show that this coalgebra is terminal. In other words, for any other algebra  $(Y, \beta)$ , we will need to define  $\bar{\beta} : Y \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  uniquely, such that the below diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, Y) \\ \bar{\beta} \downarrow & & \downarrow \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \bar{\beta}) \\ \llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{out}} & \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, \llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}) \end{array} \quad (4)$$

To this end, from now on we fix  $\beta : Y \rightarrow \llbracket F \rrbracket(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ . This  $\beta$  consists of the following data.

$$\begin{aligned} \beta s &: Y \rightarrow S \\ \beta g &: (y : Y) (i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}\ i\ (\beta s\ y) \rightarrow \mathbf{X}\ i \\ \beta h &: (y : Y) \rightarrow Q\ (\beta s\ y) \rightarrow Y. \end{aligned}$$

We have proved Theorem 9 if we (i) construct  $\bar{\beta} : Y \rightarrow \sum_{m:\mathbf{M}} ((i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\nu\ i\ m \rightarrow \mathbf{X}\ i)$  such that (4) commutes and (ii) show that this  $\bar{\beta}$  is unique. This will be the content of Lemmas 10 and 11.

► **Lemma 10.** *There is a function  $\bar{\beta}: Y \rightarrow \sum_{m:\mathbf{M}} ((i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\nu i m \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i)$  making (4) commute.*

**Proof/construction.** We will define  $\bar{\beta}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta} &: Y \rightarrow \Sigma [ m \in \mathbf{M} ] ((i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\nu ind m \rightarrow X ind) \\ \bar{\beta} y &= \bar{\beta}_1 y, \bar{\beta}_2 y \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{\beta}_1: Y \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$  and  $\bar{\beta}_2: (y : Y) (i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\nu i (\bar{\beta}_1 y) \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i$  are to be constructed. We define  $\bar{\beta}_1$  by coinduction on  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\bar{\beta}_2$  by induction on  $\mathbf{Pos}\nu$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\beta}_1 &: Y \rightarrow \mathbf{M} & \bar{\beta}_2 &: (y : Y) (i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\nu ind (\bar{\beta}_1 y) \rightarrow X ind \\ \mathbf{shape} (\bar{\beta}_1 y) &= \beta s y & \bar{\beta}_2 y ind (\mathbf{here} p) &= \beta g y ind p \\ \mathbf{pos} (\bar{\beta}_1 y) &= \bar{\beta}_1 \circ (\beta h y) & \bar{\beta}_2 y ind (\mathbf{below} q p) &= \bar{\beta}_2 (\beta h y q) ind p \end{aligned}$$

This construction makes (4) commute by definition. ◀

To show that  $\bar{\beta}$  is unique, we assume there is another arrow  $\tilde{\beta}: Y \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{M} \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos}\nu \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  making the above diagram commute, i.e.

$$\mathbf{out} \circ \tilde{\beta} \equiv \llbracket F \rrbracket (\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\beta}) \circ \beta, \quad (5)$$

then show that  $\tilde{\beta} \equiv \bar{\beta}$ . Naming  $\tilde{\beta}$ 's first and second projections  $\tilde{\beta}_1$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_2$ , assumption (5) can be split up into the paths shown below.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathit{comm}_1 &: (y : Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{shape} (\tilde{\beta}_1 y) \equiv \beta s y \\ \mathit{comm}_2 &: (y : Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{PathP} (\lambda i \rightarrow Q (\mathit{comm}_1 y i) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}) \\ & \quad (\mathbf{pos} (\tilde{\beta}_1 y)) (\lambda q \rightarrow \tilde{\beta}_1 (\beta h y q)) \\ \mathit{comm}_3 &: (y : Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{PathP} (\lambda i \rightarrow (i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow P ind (\mathit{comm}_1 y i) \rightarrow X ind) \\ & \quad (\lambda ind p \rightarrow \tilde{\beta}_2 y ind (\mathbf{here} p)) (\beta g y) \\ \mathit{comm}_4 &: (y : Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{PathP} (\lambda i \rightarrow (i : \mathbf{Ind}) (q : Q (\mathit{comm}_1 y i)) \rightarrow \\ & \quad \mathbf{Pos}\nu ind (\mathit{comm}_2 y i q) \rightarrow X ind) \\ & \quad (\lambda ind q b \rightarrow \tilde{\beta}_2 y ind (\mathbf{below} q b)) \\ & \quad (\lambda ind q b \rightarrow \tilde{\beta}_2 (\beta h y q) ind b) \end{aligned}$$

These equations express the fact that for  $\tilde{\beta}$  to make the above diagram commute,  $\tilde{\beta}_1$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_2$  have to be defined in the same way component-wise as  $\bar{\beta}_1$  and  $\bar{\beta}_2$ , up to a path.

► **Lemma 11.** *The function  $\bar{\beta}: Y \rightarrow \sum_{m:\mathbf{M}} ((i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\nu i m \rightarrow \mathbf{X} i)$  from Lemma 10 is unique. In other words, under the assumption of the existence of  $\mathit{comm}_1$ – $\mathit{comm}_4$  above, we can construct the following paths*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{fstEq} &: (y : Y) \rightarrow \tilde{\beta}_1 y \equiv \bar{\beta}_1 y \\ \mathbf{sndEq} &: (y : Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{PathP} (\lambda i \rightarrow (i : \mathbf{Ind}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Pos}\nu ind (\mathbf{fstEq} y i) \rightarrow X ind) (\tilde{\beta}_2 y) (\bar{\beta}_2 y) \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of Lemma 11, part 1: construction of  $\mathbf{fstEq}$ .** Recall the coinduction principle  $\mathbf{MCoind}$  from Section 2. Using this, we can prove  $\mathbf{fstEq}$  in a rather straightforward manner. To apply it, we need to construct a binary relation  $\mathbf{R}$  on  $\mathbf{M}$ . We construct it as an inductive family that relates precisely those terms we need to prove equal, i.e.  $\tilde{\beta}_1 y$  and  $\bar{\beta}_1 y$ .

```
data R : M → M → Type where
  R-intro : (y : Y) → R (β̃1 y) (β1 y)
```

We then prove that it is a bisimulation using copattern matching.

```
isBisimR : {m0 m1 : M} → R m0 m1 → M-R R m0 m1
s-eq (isBisimR (R-intro y)) = comm1 y
p-eq (isBisimR (R-intro y)) q0 q1 q-eq = transport (λ i → R (comm2 y (~ i) (q-eq (~ i)))
  (β̃1 (βh y q1)))
  (R-intro (βh y q1))
```

This allows us to finish the construction of `fstEq`.

```
fstEq y = MCoind R isBisimR (R-intro y) ◀
```

Before we continue with the construction of `sndEq`, let us briefly discuss some of the finer points concerning the construction of `fstEq`. Because we used `MCoind` and `isBisimR` to construct `fstEq`, its definition is somewhat opaque. Fortunately, the construction is well-behaved on `shape` and thus the action of `shape` on `(fstEq y)` computes definitionally to `comm1 y`. This means that the action of `pos` on `(fstEq y)` can be viewed as an element of type `PathP (λ i → Q (comm1 y i) → M) (pos (β̃1 y)) (β1 ∘ (βh y))`. There is another canonical element of this type obtained by simply composing `comm2` with a corecursive call of `fstEq`, namely:

```
fstEqPos y i q = hcomp (λ j → λ { (i = i0) → pos (β̃1 y) q ;
  (i = i1) → fstEq (βh y q) j })
  (comm2 y i q)
```

We can now ask whether `pos` computes to `(fstEqPos y)` on `(fstEq y)` (which in essence just says that `fstEq` satisfies the obvious coinductive computational rule). This would be entirely trivial if we had assumed UIP but now becomes something we cannot take for granted. Fortunately, it turns out we can still prove it.

► **Lemma 12.** *For all  $y : Y$ , we have  $\text{fstEqPos } y \equiv (\lambda i \rightarrow \text{pos } (\text{fstEq } y \ i))$ .*

One may reasonably ask why this is a lemma and not simply the *definition* of `fstEq`. This has to do with Agda’s termination checker and will be discussed at the end of this section.

**Proof sketch of Lemma 12.** The lemma is proved by abstracting and applying function extensionality and path induction on `comm1`. In this special case, i.e. when `comm1 y = refl`, one can simplify the instances of `isBisimR` and `MCoind` used in the construction of `fstEq`. We omit the details which are just technical path algebraic manipulations and refer the reader to the formalisation. ◀

Finally, we are ready to construct `sndEq` and thereby finish the proof of Lemma 11.

**Proof of Lemma 11, part 2: construction of `sndEq`.** We first note that, by function extensionality and the interchangeability of `PathP` and `transport`, constructing `sndEq` is equivalent to showing that

$$\tilde{\beta}_2 y \text{ ind } (\text{subst } (\text{Pos} \nu \text{ ind}) ((\text{fstEq } y)^{-1}) t) \equiv \bar{\beta}_2 y \text{ ind } t \quad (6)$$

for  $ind : Ind$  and  $t : Pos\nu\ ind\ (\bar{\beta}_1\ y)$ . We would like to apply Lemma 7 in order to induct on  $t$ . In order to do this, we need to check that  $\bar{\beta}_1$  is an **MAI**g-retraction. Unfolding definitions, this means that we need to construct, for each  $(y : Y)$  a function  $\hat{f}_y : Q\ (\beta s\ y) \rightarrow Y$  such that the following identity holds for each  $q : Q\ (\beta s\ y)$ .

$$\bar{\beta}_1 y\ (\hat{f}_y\ q) \equiv_M \bar{\beta}_1 y\ (\beta h\ y\ q) \quad (7)$$

Defining  $\hat{f}_y = \beta h\ y$  makes (7) hold definitionally, and hence  $\bar{\beta}_1$  is an **MAI**g-retraction and we are justified in showing (6) by induction on  $t$  via Lemma 7.

When  $t$  is of the form **here**  $p$ , there is not much to show. Indeed, by transferring this instance of (6) back into **PathP** format, we see that the data is given precisely by  $comm_3$ .

When  $t$  is of the form **below**  $q\ p$ , we may assume inductively that we have a path

$$\tilde{\beta}_2\ (\beta h\ y\ q)\ ind\ (\text{subst}\ (Pos\nu\ ind)\ ((fstEq\ (\beta h\ y\ q))^{-1})\ p) \equiv \bar{\beta}_2\ (\beta h\ y\ q)\ ind\ p \quad (8)$$

and the goal is to show that

$$\tilde{\beta}_2\ y\ ind\ (\text{subst}\ (Pos\nu\ ind)\ ((fstEq\ y)^{-1})\ (\text{below}\ q\ p)) \equiv \bar{\beta}_2\ y\ ind\ (\text{below}\ q\ p) \quad (9)$$

The RHS of (9) is, by definition, equal to the RHS of (8). By commuting transports with **below** and using  $comm_4$ , we can rewrite the LHS of (8) to a term of the form  $\tilde{\beta}_2\ y\ ind\ (\text{below}\ (\text{transport}\ \dots\ q)\ (\text{transport}\ \dots\ p))$ . Commuting transports with **below** in the LHS of (9), we get a term of the same form, albeit with transports over slightly different families. Thus, it remains to equate these families. We spare the reader the technical details and simply point out that this task, after some path algebra, boils down to precisely Lemma 12. This concludes the proof of Lemma 11 and thus also of Theorem 9. ◀

We end this section with a short remark about the proof. As pointed out earlier, Lemma 12 appears superfluous. Indeed, if we want this identity to hold, could we not simply have *defined it* to hold when constructing **fstEq**? In Agda, we should simply be able to define **fstEq** by introducing a path variable  $i$  and then using copattern matching on **M** as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{shape}\ (fstEq\ y\ i) &= comm_1\ y\ i \\ \text{pos}\ (fstEq\ y\ i)\ q &= \text{hcomp}\ (\lambda\ j \rightarrow \lambda\ \{ (i = i0) \rightarrow \text{pos}\ (\tilde{\beta}_1\ y)\ q ; \\ &\quad (i = i1) \rightarrow \text{fstEq}\ (\beta h\ y\ q)\ j \}) \\ &\quad (comm_2\ y\ i\ q) \end{aligned}$$

This construction makes Lemma 12 hold definitionally. However, Agda does not accept this definition and raises a termination checking error. We believe this to be an issue with Agda's current termination checker. Generally speaking, in order to check whether a corecursive function terminates, Agda needs to ensure its output can be produced in a finite amount of steps. We call such functions *productive*. In the cases when it is not obvious from the structure of the code that it is productive, e.g. if we make a corecursive call and do something else with it before returning, rather than returning directly, Agda usually raises a termination error. While this is justified in general, composing productive calls using **hcomp** should be productive, but Agda still raises an error. This was raised as a GitHub issue [6] and we await the Agda developers to provide their feedback. If this issue is solved, our proof of Theorem 9 could be made significantly shorter as we would not need to use coinduction principle **MCoind** from Section 2.

## 5 Conclusion & Future Work

In this paper, we presented a formalisation of the following results on containers.

$\llbracket \mathbf{W} \ S \ Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos} \ \mathbf{WAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the initial  $\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q \rrbracket (\mathbf{X}, -)$ -algebra, and

$\llbracket \mathbf{M} \ S \ Q \triangleleft \mathbf{Pos} \ \mathbf{MAlg} \rrbracket \mathbf{X}$  is the terminal  $\llbracket S \triangleleft \mathbf{P}, Q \rrbracket (\mathbf{X}, -)$ -coalgebra.

While the first proof is relatively straightforward, the second proof needs more careful consideration. In particular, it uses a modified version of `Pos`'s induction principle and also exposes an issue in Agda's current termination checker that meant we had to come up with various workarounds. Our formalisation presents results on containers that were previously done in the categorical language of LCCCs in intensional type theory, and demonstrates how `Cubical Agda`'s path type enables proofs on coinductive types.

The formalisation of the results presented in this paper is part of a bigger ongoing formalisation effort covering most of the existing literature on containers; however, the latter result presented here was easily the most challenging one yet. Our survey of the results on containers was originally motivated by our ongoing work on generalising containers to provide a canonical way to represent quotient inductive and quotient inductive-inductive specifications that admit an initial algebra, i.e. the strictly positive ones. This parallels the way that containers and indexed containers provide canonical representations for strictly positive ordinary inductive types and inductive families respectively. As a first step to this generalisation, we worked out a number of restrictions to be applied to the semantics given in [7], with the main restriction being that functors encoding constructors of a type ought to be container functors [8]. Due to the type of these functors being more general than the literature on containers currently covers, 'generalised containers' were defined, which differ from ordinary containers in that they are parameterised over a category  $\mathbf{C}$ , and the positions  $P$  are a family over  $S$  of objects of  $\mathbf{C}$  (as opposed to being a family of h-sets). This was another motivation for us not to assume UIP and to work in `Cubical Agda` for this formalisation: we are interested in inductive types with equality constructors, for which `Cubical Agda` offers native support, and we hope to eventually adapt our ideas to the general class of higher inductive types, which obviously contradict UIP. For our approach in [8] to fully make sense, a prerequisite is having a container model of type theory, whose objects are ordinary containers and whose types are generalised containers [9, 12]. This is another avenue that we are currently looking into.

---

## References

- 1 Michael Abbott, Thorsten Altenkirch, and Neil Ghani. Categories of containers. In Andrew D. Gordon, editor, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, pages 23–38, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 2 Michael Abbott, Thorsten Altenkirch, and Neil Ghani. Representing nested inductive types using W-types. In *Automata, Languages and Programming, 31st International Colloquium (ICALP)*, pages 59 – 71, 2004.
- 3 Michael Abbott, Thorsten Altenkirch, and Neil Ghani. Containers: Constructing strictly positive types. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 342(1):3–27, 2005. Applied Semantics: Selected Topics. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397505003373>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2005.06.002>.
- 4 Michael Gordon Abbott. *Categories of Containers*. PhD thesis, University of Leicester, 2003.
- 5 Benedikt Ahrens, Paolo Capriotti, and Régis Spadotti. Non-Wellfounded Trees in Homotopy Type Theory. In Thorsten Altenkirch, editor, *13th International Conference on Typed Lambda*

- Calculi and Applications (TLCA 2015)*, volume 38 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 17–30, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. URL: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/entities/document/10.4230/LIPIcs.TLCA.2015.17>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.TLCA.2015.17.
- 6 Thorsten Altenkirch. Cubical primitives should preserve guardedness. <https://github.com/agda/agda/issues/4740>, 2020. Online.
  - 7 Thorsten Altenkirch, Paolo Capriotti, Gabe Dijkstra, Nicolai Kraus, and Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg. *Quotient Inductive-Inductive Types*, page 293–310. Springer International Publishing, 2018. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89366-2\\_16](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89366-2_16), doi:10.1007/978-3-319-89366-2\_16.
  - 8 Thorsten Altenkirch and Stefania Damato. Specifying QIITs using Containers, 2023. Talk abstract at HoTT/UF 2023, available at [https://stefaniatadama.com/talks/abstract\\_hott\\_uf\\_2023.pdf](https://stefaniatadama.com/talks/abstract_hott_uf_2023.pdf).
  - 9 Thorsten Altenkirch and Ambrus Kaposi. A container model of type theory, 2021. Talk abstract at TYPES, available at <https://types21.liacs.nl/download/a-container-model-of-type-theory/>.
  - 10 Cyril Cohen, Thierry Coquand, Simon Huber, and Anders Mörtberg. Cubical Type Theory: A Constructive Interpretation of the Univalence Axiom. In Tarmo Uustalu, editor, *21st International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2015)*, volume 69 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 5:1–5:34, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2018. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.TYPES.2015.5.
  - 11 Thierry Coquand, Simon Huber, and Anders Mörtberg. On higher inductive types in cubical type theory. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS '18*, page 255–264, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3209108.3209197.
  - 12 Stefania Damato and Thorsten Altenkirch. Coherences for the Container Model of Type Theory, 2024. Talk abstract at HoTT/UF 2024, available at [https://stefaniatadama.com/talks/abstract\\_hott\\_uf\\_2024.pdf](https://stefaniatadama.com/talks/abstract_hott_uf_2024.pdf).
  - 13 Nicola Gambino and Martin Hyland. Wellfounded trees and dependent polynomial functors. In Stefano Berardi, Mario Coppo, and Ferruccio Damiani, editors, *Types for Proofs and Programs*, pages 210–225, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
  - 14 Martin Hofmann. On the interpretation of type theory in locally cartesian closed categories. In *Selected Papers from the 8th International Workshop on Computer Science Logic, CSL '94*, page 427–441, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1994. Springer-Verlag.
  - 15 Joachim Lambek. A fixpoint theorem for complete categories. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 103:151–161, 1968. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/170906>.
  - 16 Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine and Michael Shulman. Semantics of higher inductive types. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 169(1):159–208, 2020. doi:10.1017/S030500411900015X.
  - 17 R.A.G. Seely. Locally cartesian closed categories and type theory. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 95:33–48, 1984.
  - 18 The Agda Community. Cubical Agda Library, February 2024. URL: <https://github.com/agda/cubical>.
  - 19 The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. <https://homotopytypetheory.org/book>, Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
  - 20 Andrea Vezzosi, Anders Mörtberg, and Andreas Abel. Cubical Agda: A dependently typed programming language with univalence and higher inductive types. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 31:e8, 2021. doi:10.1017/S0956796821000034.
  - 21 Vladimir Voevodsky. The equivalence axiom and univalent models of type theory. (Talk at CMU on February 4, 2010), 2014. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.5556>, arXiv:1402.5556.