

# Induction and Recursion Principles in a Higher-Order Quantitative Logic

Giorgio Bacci

Department of Computer Science  
Aalborg University, Denmark  
grbacci@cs.aau.dk

Rasmus Ejlers Møgelberg

IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark  
mogel@itu.dk

**Abstract**—Quantitative logic reasons about the degree to which formulas are satisfied. This paper studies the fundamental reasoning principles of higher-order quantitative logic and their application to reasoning about probabilistic programs and processes.

We construct an affine calculus for 1-bounded complete metric spaces and the monad for probability measures equipped with the Kantorovic distance. The calculus includes a form of guarded recursion interpreted via Banach’s fixed point theorem, useful, e.g., for recursive programming with processes. We then define an affine higher-order quantitative logic for reasoning about terms of our calculus. The logic includes novel principles for guarded recursion, and induction over probability measures and natural numbers.

Examples of reasoning in the logic include proofs of upper bounds on distances of processes. We also show how our logic can express coupling proofs —a powerful technique for comparing probabilistic processes.

**Index Terms**—Quantitative logic, probabilistic processes, affine logic, guarded recursion, metric spaces

## I. INTRODUCTION

Program logics are traditionally designed for proving precise qualitative properties of programs, such as program equality. In many modern applications, especially those that involve probabilistic programming, one is often interested in proving quantitative properties of programs, such as upper limits on program distances, sensitivity of program outputs to program inputs, or convergence of sequences of programs. Such properties are important in diverse application areas such as differential privacy [15], [33], security [3], [5] and machine learning [32]. In process algebra, it has long been known that for probabilistic processes, the notion of bisimilarity should be stated quantitatively to be robust to small perturbations that may otherwise compromise the exact comparison of behaviours [17], [22].

So far, most research in this area has been concerned with designing program logics for proving operational properties of programs, such as relational Hoare logics or weakest precondition logics [1], [2], [5]. The goal of this paper is to study quantitative logic as a logic for reasoning about metric spaces, using equality to reason about program distances. We wish to develop the fundamental principles for this logic, in

particular rules for equality elimination, induction and guarded recursion.

There are two approaches to quantitative logic: Quantitative equational logic [28] is a Boolean-valued logic where equalities  $x =_\epsilon y$  are indexed by a non-negative real number  $\epsilon$  stating that the distance between  $x$  and  $y$  is at most  $\epsilon$ . The other approach is to interpret propositions as non-negative real numbers (more generally elements of a Lawvere quantale) [7], [13], [14], [26]. For example, the statement  $x = y$  is interpreted as the distance between the elements  $x$  and  $y$ . Note that this means that 0 is true, and judgements  $\phi \vdash \psi$  should be interpreted as  $\phi \geq \psi$ . This leads naturally to an affine logic, because the triangle inequality  $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$  (one of the axioms of metric spaces) can be stated logically as  $x = y, y = z \vdash x = z$  if comma is interpreted as sum. In this paper we take the latter approach.

### A. A sensitivity calculus for complete metric spaces

Before we define the logic, we need a language for the terms the logic should reason about. The language should be an internal language for a category of metric spaces. It is important that typing statements record sensitivity of output to changes in input, so the natural notion of morphism between metric spaces is that of non-expansive functions. This category is symmetric monoidal closed, and the monoidal structure is affine in the sense of having projections, but no general diagonals. There is a rescaling operation on metric spaces  $c \cdot X$ , which scales all distance by the factor  $c$ . General Lipschitz maps with Lipschitz factor  $c$  then correspond to non-expansive maps  $c \cdot X \rightarrow Y$ . We will refer to  $c$  as the *sensitivity* factor.

Metric spaces do not model general recursion, but they do model a form of guarded recursion via the Banach fixed point theorem: Any non-expansive map  $f: c \cdot X \rightarrow X$  has a unique fixed point if  $c < 1$  and  $X$  is complete and non-empty. Guarded recursion on this form has previously been studied using modal operators  $c \cdot (-)$  for a fixed  $c$ , but (to our knowledge) only in the special case of ultra-metric spaces [16]. That setting is simpler, because it models simply typed lambda calculus and intuitionistic logic. Generalising to the affine setting of general metric spaces has surprising consequences. For example, in the ultra-metric setting, the fixed point operator defines a non-expansive map  $(c \cdot X \rightarrow X) \rightarrow X$  whereas in the general metric setting, this must be weakened

to  $(c \cdot X \multimap X) \rightarrow (1 - c) \cdot X$  where  $\multimap$  is the closed monoidal structure. To model guarded recursion, we restrict attention to complete non-empty spaces.

There is a monad  $\mathcal{D}$  mapping a complete metric space to the set of Radon probability measures with the Kantorovich distance. When applied to a discrete metric space (one where all distances are either 0 or 1) it coincides with the total variation metric, a standard notion of distance on distributions over discrete sets, such as the natural numbers [18]. We restrict to 1-bounded metric spaces (all distances are at most 1) because it means that non-expansive maps out of discrete spaces are just set-theoretic maps, and this allows us to define e.g., recursion principles for natural numbers. We write **CMet** for the resulting category of complete, 1-bounded metric spaces and non-expansive maps (keeping non-emptiness as a side condition).

The monad  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfies a universal condition stating essentially that it is generated by the operations  $\delta$  mapping an element to the Dirac distribution and  $\oplus_p$  taking a convex combination of distributions for  $p \in (0, 1)$ . This has previously been proved using quantitative equational logic to state the sensitivity of  $\oplus_p$  in its arguments [28]. Here we use the equivalent formulation of the sensitivity condition as a non-expansive morphism

$$\oplus_p : p\mathcal{D}X \otimes (1 - p)\mathcal{D}X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}X \quad (1)$$

This slight change of viewpoint allows us to use the Banach fixed point theorem for programming. For example, the geometric distribution can be defined as  $\text{geo}_p = \text{geo}'_p 0$  where  $\text{geo}'_p : \mathbb{N} \multimap \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$  satisfies  $\text{geo}'_p n = \delta(n) \oplus_p (\text{geo}'_p (n + 1))$  and can be expressed as a fixed point of a map of type  $(1 - p)(\mathbb{N} \multimap \mathcal{D}\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{N} \multimap \mathcal{D}\mathbb{N})$ . This works because the defining equation for  $\text{geo}'_p$  is productive: it only calls itself recursively with probability  $1 - p < 1$ . We also show that guarded fixed points are useful for programming with certain types of Markov processes such as the ones given by coalgebras for the functor  $F(X) = A \otimes c \cdot \mathcal{D}(X)$  with  $c \in (0, 1)$  and for defining bisimilarity for those as well.

We define a calculus for programming in **CMet**. In typing judgments variables are annotated with sensitivity factors  $p \in [0, \infty]$  to be thought of as Lipschitz-factors, similarly to the language Fuzz [33].

### B. A higher-order quantitative logic

We define a quantitative predicate logic on top of the calculus in which propositions are interpreted as elements of the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ . In fact, the unit interval is itself an element in **CMet**, so predicates are simply morphisms in **CMet** into that. We refer to  $[0, 1]$  as **Prop** when thinking of it this way. It is well-known that **Prop** carries the structure of a quantale, in particular, it is a closed monoid with structure given by non-expansive maps  $\bullet, \dashv : \text{Prop} \otimes \text{Prop} \rightarrow \text{Prop}$ . Moreover, there is an operation  $c \cdot (-) : c \cdot \text{Prop} \rightarrow \text{Prop}$  for all  $c \in [0, \infty]$  for rescaling propositions, and non-expansive operations for universal and existential quantification. We can therefore write predicates as terms in our calculus. Since

the logic allows quantification over all objects of **CMet**, including exponents of **Prop**, it is a higher-order logic.

Using rescaling of propositions we can express a logical principle of guarded recursion. In a closed context this states that if we can prove  $\phi$  from  $p \cdot \phi$  for some  $p < 1$ , then  $\phi$  holds. Similarly to the unusual type for the fixed point combinator, we need to be careful when referring to contexts, so the general form is that if  $(1 - p)\Psi, p\phi \vdash \phi$  holds, then also  $\Psi \vdash \phi$ .

We also study recursion principles, both for natural numbers and for the probability measure monad  $\mathcal{D}$ . In the latter case, the principle states that any element of  $\mathcal{D}$  can be defined inductively using dirac distributions  $\delta$  and convex combinations. The proof obligation for the inductive case is  $p(\phi[t/x]), (1 - p)\phi[u/x] \vdash \phi[t \oplus_p u/x]$ , i.e., that the convex sum of the induction hypotheses implies the combined case. Since the finite distributions are only dense in  $\mathcal{D}X$ , this has side condition that  $x$  appears in  $\phi$  with finite sensitivity, so that  $\phi$  is continuous in  $x$ .

When stating the elimination rule for the equality predicate, one must take sensitivity into account. More precisely, if  $x$  has sensitivity  $p$  in  $\phi$  then  $\phi[t/x], p(t = s) \vdash \phi[s/x]$ . This was previously observed by Dagnino and Pasquali [12] in a propositional logic and we adapt one of their rules as an elimination principle for equality. We show that the rule has wide ranging consequences, including that equality can be proved symmetric and transitive.

Combining the equality elimination principle with the type of  $\oplus_p$  (1) one can prove that  $p(x = y), (1 - p)(z = w) \vdash x \oplus z = y \oplus w$ . Using this, we show that guarded recursion can be used to prove upper bounds on distances of processes, both those defined by productive guarded fixed points, as well as those that are elements of the guarded types of processes mentioned above. The combination of induction for  $\mathcal{D}$  and the elimination principle for equality also has surprisingly many applications. For example, it implies an internalisation in the logic of the usual external definition of the Kantorovich distance on  $\mathcal{D}$ , which in turn can be used to construct coupling proofs [27] of distances between distributions.

In summary we make the following contributions

- We formulate the Banach fixed point theorem as a principle of guarded recursion in an affine calculus for sensitivity;
- We formulate a first (to our knowledge) higher-order logic for quantitative reasoning in which equality is interpreted as distance in metric spaces. This includes new rules for recursion over natural numbers and probability measures, as well as a guarded recursion principle;
- We show by example how to use the logic to reason about processes, convergence in temporal learning and for coupling arguments, illustrating the power of the combination of the above mentioned principles.

*Overview:* The paper is organised as follows. We first discuss preliminaries on metric spaces in Section II. Sections III and IV discuss the Banach fixed point operator and the probability measure monad. Sections V and VI discuss the syntax and semantics of the calculus and the logic,

respectively. Section VII shows how to prove basic properties of the logic, including that equality is a congruence which is equivalent to an internalisation of the usual definition of the Kantorovic measure. Section VIII shows applications to markov processes, Section IX shows an application to temporal learning, and Section X illustrates how to use coupling arguments in the logic. Finally, Section XI discusses related work, and Section XII concludes.

## II. PRELIMINARIES ON METRIC SPACES

A (1-bounded) *metric space* is a set  $X$  equipped with a distance function  $d_X : X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying (*reflexivity*)  $d(x, y) = 0$  iff  $x = y$ ; (*symmetry*)  $d_X(x, y) = d_X(y, x)$ ; and (*triangular inequality*)  $d_X(x, z) \leq d_X(x, y) + d_X(y, z)$ .

A function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  between metric spaces is *c-Lipschitz continuous*, for  $c \geq 0$ , if  $c \cdot d_X(x, x') \geq d_Y(f(x), f(x'))$ ; *non-expansive* when  $c = 1$ ; and a *contraction* when  $c < 1$  and  $X = Y$ . A metric space is complete if all Cauchy sequences converge.

In this paper, we work with 1-bounded complete metric spaces. These form a category  $\mathbf{CMet}$  with non-expansive maps as morphisms. Restricting to 1-bounded spaces allows us to include sets as *discrete* metric spaces by setting all distances between distinct elements to 1. This defines a left adjoint to the forgetful functor from  $\mathbf{CMet}$  to  $\mathbf{Set}$ : if  $X$  is discrete, then all maps  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  are non-expansive. As a consequence, we can regard  $\mathbf{Set}$  as a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{CMet}$ .

The category  $\mathbf{CMet}$  is both complete and cocomplete. The categorical product  $X \times Y$  combines spaces by equipping the Cartesian product with the point-wise maximum distance. There is another natural structure on the Cartesian product, the *tensor*  $X \otimes Y$ , that combines distances as

$$d_{X \otimes Y}((x, y), (x', y')) = \min\{d_X(x, x') + d_Y(y, y'), 1\}$$

*i.e.*, by adding them up using 1-bounded truncated sum. Also the tensor product has non-expansive projections  $X \otimes Y \rightarrow X$  and  $X \otimes Y \rightarrow Y$ , but generally no diagonal  $X \rightarrow X \otimes X$ , unless  $X$  is discrete. Note the following universal property of  $\otimes$ : A map from  $X \otimes Y$  to  $Z$  is non-expansive if and only if it is non-expansive in each variable.

Unlike the categorical product,  $\otimes$  allows currying and function application. More precisely,  $(\mathbf{CMet}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$  is a symmetric monoidal category, with the singleton set  $\mathbf{1}$  as unit, and adjunction  $(- \otimes X) \dashv (X \multimap -)$  making this structure closed. Here,  $X \multimap Y$  denotes the set of non-expansive functions from  $X$  to  $Y$  endowed with point-wise supremum metric  $d_{X \multimap Y}(f, g) = \sup_{x \in X} d_Y(f(x), g(x))$ . The counit of the adjunction is function evaluation  $\text{ev} : (X \multimap Y) \otimes X \rightarrow Y$ .

Nonexpansive morphisms in  $\mathbf{CMet}$  subsume the notion of Lipschitz continuity through the rescaling operation  $c \cdot X$  which rescales distances by a scalar factor  $c > 0$  as

$$d_{c \cdot X}(x, x') = \min\{c \cdot d_X(x, x'), 1\}$$

Indeed, by unpacking the definition,  $f : c \cdot X \rightarrow Y$  is a morphism in  $\mathbf{CMet}$  iff  $f$  considered as a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$

is *c-Lipschitz* continuous. For convenience we allow rescaling also for  $c = 0$  and  $c = \infty$ , and define  $0 \cdot X$  as  $\mathbf{1}$ , the one-point metric space, and  $\infty \cdot X$  as the discrete metric space on  $X$ .

The next theorem states the properties of the interaction between the monoidal product and scaling. First recall that  $[0, \infty]$  is an ordered semiring with  $\leq$ , addition and multiplication defined as usual in most cases, and by  $\infty \cdot 0 = 0$  and  $0 \cdot \infty = 0$ . The properties together imply that the scaling operation is a  $[0, \infty]$ -graded comonad on  $\mathbf{CMet}$  in the sense of [11, Definition 13] and [19, Section 5.2].

**Theorem 1.** *There are natural transformations of types*

$$\begin{aligned} m_{r,A,B} : r \cdot A \otimes r \cdot B &\rightarrow r \cdot (A \otimes B) & n_r : \mathbf{1} &\rightarrow r \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ c_{r,s,A} : (r + s) \cdot A &\rightarrow r \cdot A \otimes s \cdot A & w_A : 0 \cdot A &\rightarrow \mathbf{1} \\ \pi_{r,s,A} : (rs) \cdot A &\rightarrow r \cdot (s \cdot A) & \epsilon_A : 1 \cdot A &\rightarrow A \\ \kappa_{r,s,A} : r \cdot A &\rightarrow s \cdot A & (\text{for } s \leq r) & \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

- The underlying map of  $c_{r,s,A}$  is the diagonal; the identity for all the other maps.
- If  $s \leq 1$  or  $r \geq 1$  then  $\pi_{r,s,A}$  is an isomorphism.
- If  $r \geq 1$  then  $m_{r,A,B}$  is an isomorphism.

Note that without the conditions given above,  $\pi_{r,s,A}$  and  $m_{r,A,B}$  need not be isomorphisms. For example, if  $A$  is discrete then  $\frac{1}{2}(2A) = \frac{1}{2}A$ .

## III. FIXED POINTS

The Banach fixed point theorem [9] states that any contractive function on a non-empty complete metric space has a unique fixed point. If  $f : X \otimes cY \rightarrow Y$  for  $c < 1$  then, for any  $x \in X$ , the map  $f(x, -) : cY \rightarrow Y$  corresponds to a contraction on  $Y$  and so has a unique fixed point  $\text{fp}(f)(x)$ . The next proposition states that both  $\text{fp}(f)$  and the fixed point operator are themselves non-expansive maps.

**Proposition 2.** *If  $f : (1-c)X \otimes cY \rightarrow Y$  then  $\text{fp}(f) : X \rightarrow Y$ . There is a non-expansive map  $\text{fix} : (cY \multimap Y) \rightarrow (1-c)Y$  mapping functions to fixed points.*

## IV. PROBABILITY MEASURES

In this section, we introduce the *Radon probability monad* on  $\mathbf{CMet}$  and recall its presentation as the free monad for the quantitative equational theory of complete interpolative barycentric algebras [29].

A (Borel) probability measure  $\mu$  on a metric space  $X$  is *Radon* if for any Borel set  $E \subseteq X$ ,  $\mu(E)$  is the supremum of  $\mu(K)$  over all compact subsets  $K$  of  $E$ . Examples of Radon probability measures are Dirac measures, (the Borel restriction of) the Lebesgue measure over the unit interval, any finitely supported probability measure, and probability measures over complete metric spaces with a countable dense subset.

A *coupling* between two probability measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  on  $X$  is a probability measure  $\omega$  on  $X \times X$  whose left and right marginals are, respectively,  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  (*i.e.*,  $\omega(E \times X) = \mu(E)$  and  $\omega(X \times E) = \nu(E)$ , for all Borel sets  $E$ ). Observe that,

the product measure  $\mu \times \nu$  is always a coupling between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ . Moreover, if  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are Radon, so is  $\omega$ .

For  $X$  a metric space, denote by  $\mathcal{D}X$  the space of Radon probability measures over  $X$  equipped with the *Kantorovich distance*, defined by

$$d_{\mathcal{D}X}(\mu, \nu) = \min_{\omega} \int d_X(x, x') \omega(dx, dx') \quad (2)$$

where  $\omega$  runs over the couplings between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ . If  $X$  is a complete metric space, so is  $\mathcal{D}X$ .

The definition above extends to a monad  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\mathbf{CMet}$ , called *Radon probability monad*, with underlying functor acting on morphisms  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  as  $\mu \in \mathcal{D}X \mapsto \mu \circ f^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}Y$  (a.k.a., the pushforward measure along  $f$ ). The unit of  $\mathcal{D}$  is the Dirac measure  $\delta_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}X$ , but rather than describing the multiplication, we recall that this monad has an algebraic presentation as the free complete *interpolative barycentric algebra* [28], [29].

**Definition 3 (IB Algebra).** A (complete) interpolative barycentric algebra is a complete metric space  $X$  together with non-expansive operations  $\otimes_p: pX \otimes (1-p)X \rightarrow X$ , for all  $p \in (0, 1)$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} x \oplus_p x &= x && \text{(IDEM)} \\ x \oplus_p y &= y \oplus_{1-p} x && \text{(COMM)} \\ (x \oplus_p y) \oplus_q z &= x \oplus_{pq} (y \oplus_{\frac{q-pq}{1-pq}} z) && \text{(ASSOC)} \end{aligned}$$

A homomorphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  of IB algebras is a non-expansive map such that  $f(x \oplus_p y) = f(x) \oplus_p f(y)$  holds for all  $x, y \in X$  and  $p \in (0, 1)$ .

The axioms are those of barycentric algebras (a.k.a., convex algebras), axiomatizing probabilistic choice by means of binary convex combination operations  $x \oplus_p y$ . Note that the associativity axiom can be stated as a commutative diagram as follows (writing  $\bar{p}$  for  $1-p$  and  $r$  for  $\frac{q-pq}{1-pq}$ )

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (pq)X \otimes (\bar{p}q)X \otimes \bar{q}X & \longrightarrow & q(pX \otimes \bar{p}X) \otimes \bar{q}X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ (pq)X \otimes (\bar{p}q)(rX \otimes \bar{r}X) & \longrightarrow & X \end{array}$$

where the right and bottom arrows correspond to the two sides of the equations, while the top and left arrows are composed from the maps of Theorem 1.

The definition above is equivalent to that in [29], as the type imposed on the operations  $\oplus_p$  is equivalent to requiring

$$d_X(x \oplus_p y, x' \oplus_p y') \leq pd_X(x, x') + (1-p)d_X(y, y').$$

The formulation proposed in Definition 3 is preferable in our context because it incorporates the Lipschitz constants directly into the type of the operation. This not only enables the remaining conditions to be expressed purely as equations but also ensures the well-definition of fixed points through type checking, as illustrated in the following example.

**Example 4.** The geometric distribution  $\text{geo}_p: \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$  describes the process of flipping a coin with bias  $p$ , counting the number

of coin flips until head is observed. In order to define this, we need to keep track of the number of coin flips so far at each step of the process, so we define  $\text{geo}_p = \text{geo}'_p \circ 0$  where  $\text{geo}'_p: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$ . The latter should satisfy  $\text{geo}'_p n = \delta(n) \oplus_p (\text{geo}'_p (n+1))$ , and can be defined as the fixed point of the curried version of a map

$$\mathbb{N} \otimes (1-p)(\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$$

To define that, first split the first argument using  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow p\mathbb{N} \otimes (1-p)\mathbb{N}$ , then use the maps of Theorem 1, the evaluation map and the successor map to define a map

$$\mathbb{N} \otimes (1-p)(\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})) \rightarrow p\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N}) \otimes (1-p)\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$$

which can be composed with  $\oplus_p$ .

In the next section we define a calculus in which the above example can be expressed more simply.

It is not difficult to show that, for any  $X \in \mathbf{CMet}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}X$  is a complete interpolative barycentric algebra, by interpreting the operations as  $\mu \oplus_p \nu = p\mu + (1-p)\nu$ , for all  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{D}X$ . The next result states that  $\mathcal{D}X$  is the free algebra with respect to all Lipschitz maps, which follows as a corollary of [29, Theorem 3.8]. Before we state it, note that if  $A$  and  $B$  are IB-algebras, the equational definition of IB-homomorphism extends to Lipschitz maps  $f: rA \rightarrow B$ . In terms of diagrams, this notion can alternatively be defined as commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (pr)A \otimes (\bar{p}r)A & \xrightarrow{m} & r(pA \otimes \bar{p}A) \longrightarrow rA \\ \pi \otimes \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ p(rA) \otimes \bar{p}(rA) & \xrightarrow{pf \otimes \bar{p}f} & pB \otimes \bar{p}B \longrightarrow B \end{array}$$

**Proposition 5.** If  $f: \Gamma \otimes rX \rightarrow Y$  (with  $r < \infty$ ) and  $Y$  is an IB algebra, there exists a unique  $\bar{f}: \Gamma \otimes r\mathcal{D}X \rightarrow Y$  which is a homomorphism in its second argument, satisfying  $f = \bar{f} \circ (\Gamma \otimes r\delta_X)$ .

Observe that the special case of  $r = 1$  and  $\Gamma = 1$  in Proposition 5 can be rephrased as  $\mathcal{D}$  being the left adjoint to the forgetful functor from the category of IB algebras to  $\mathbf{CMet}$ . It therefore forms a monad on the category  $\mathbf{CMet}$ . This monad is moreover strong. The restriction on  $r$  being finite means that  $\bar{f}$  is continuous. This is necessary to ensure uniqueness, because the other requirements otherwise only determine the value of  $\bar{f}$  on finite distributions, which form a dense subset of  $\mathcal{D}X$ .

**Lemma 6.** If  $B$  is an IB algebra, so are  $A \rightarrow B$ , for any  $A$ , and  $rB$  for any  $r \leq 1$ .

## V. A CALCULUS FOR $\mathbf{CMet}$

We now define a calculus for programming in the category  $\mathbf{CMet}$ . Although rescaling of metric spaces played a central role in the previous section, we will not take that as a primitive type former. Instead, it will be part of the tensor and function type constructors. This choice was made to minimise the book keeping necessary for scalars in terms. In fact, scalars mostly appear in types and as *sensitivity factors* on variables.

## A. Syntax

The *types* of the calculus are defined by the grammar

$$A, B ::= b \mid \mathbb{N} \mid A \times B \mid A_p \otimes_q B \mid A \multimap_p B \mid \mathcal{D}A$$

where  $b$  ranges over a collection of base types,  $\mathbb{N}$  is the type of natural numbers,  $A \times B$  the product type,  $A_p \otimes_q B$  the  $(p, q)$ -scaled tensor type,  $A \multimap_p B$  is the  $p$ -scaled exponential type, for  $p, q \in [0, \infty]$ , and  $\mathcal{D}A$  is the Radon probability type.

Typing context are constructed according to the following formation rules

$$\frac{}{\langle \rangle :: \text{ctx}} \quad \frac{\Gamma :: \text{ctx} \quad x \notin \Gamma \quad p \in [0, \infty]}{\Gamma, x :^p A :: \text{ctx}}$$

Note that typing assumptions  $x :^p A$  are annotated with a sensitivity factor  $p \in [0, \infty]$ , which is used to keep track of the sensitivity of the term on each variable, separately.

For convenience, we identify contexts up to rearranging the order of assumptions, e.g.,  $(x :^p A, y :^q B) = (y :^q B, x :^p A)$ . We define the operation of context sum as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma + \langle \rangle &= \Gamma = \langle \rangle + \Gamma \\ (\Gamma, x :^p A) + (\Gamma', x :^q A) &= (\Gamma + \Gamma'), x :^{p+q} A \\ (\Gamma, x :^p A) + \Gamma' &= (\Gamma + \Gamma'), x :^p A \quad (\text{where } x \notin \Gamma') \\ \Gamma + (\Gamma', x :^p A) &= (\Gamma + \Gamma'), x :^p A \quad (\text{where } x \notin \Gamma) \end{aligned}$$

and of rescaling by  $c \in [0, \infty]$  as

$$c \cdot \langle \rangle = \langle \rangle \quad c \cdot (\Gamma, x :^p A) = c \cdot \Gamma, x :^{c \cdot p} A$$

**Lemma 7.** *Context sum and rescaling satisfy the equalities*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma + \Gamma' &= \Gamma' + \Gamma & (\Gamma + \Gamma') + \Gamma'' &= \Gamma + (\Gamma' + \Gamma'') \\ 1 \cdot \Gamma &= \Gamma & c \cdot (\Gamma + \Gamma') &= c \cdot \Gamma + c \cdot \Gamma' \\ (c + c') \cdot \Gamma &= c \cdot \Gamma + c' \cdot \Gamma & (c \cdot c') \cdot \Gamma &= c \cdot (c' \cdot \Gamma) \end{aligned}$$

The terms of the calculus are formed according to the typing rules in Figure 1. The denotational semantics defined below will interpret types as non-empty, 1-bounded complete metric spaces and terms as Lipschitz maps with, for each variable  $x$  in the context, Lipschitz factor given by the sensitivity annotation in the typing context. The rule for variable introduction reflects the fact that projection can be given any Lipschitz factor  $p \geq 1$ . We allow all such  $p$ , and not just  $p = 1$  to build weakening into the calculus.

A term of type  $A \multimap_p B$  denotes a function with Lipschitz factor  $p$ . When applying such a term to an argument, the sensitivity factor for the argument must be scaled accordingly. Note that in the rule for function application, the contexts  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$  need not be disjoint. For variables that occur in both, the sensitivity factors are added. The term  $\delta(t)$  denotes a Dirac distribution, and  $t \oplus_p u$  the convex sum of  $t$  and  $u$ . Note that the corresponding convex sum of contexts is used in the rule for  $\oplus_p$ . In the rule for natural number recursion, the successor case term  $s$  can have additional variables to  $x$  and  $y$ . However,  $s$  must be applied  $n$  times, and therefore the sensitivity of  $\Gamma'$  must scaled by  $n$ . Since  $n$  is not known statically, the only possible upper limit is  $\infty$ . The type of the

fixed point operator reflects Proposition 2. The elimination rule for  $\mathcal{D}$  uses the judgement of a type being an IB algebra. These are defined by the grammar

$$B ::= \mathcal{D}A \mid A \multimap_p B$$

as justified by Lemma 6.

**Example 8** (The geometric distribution). *We now show how to represent the geometric distribution of Example 4 in the calculus. Recall that to keep track of the number of coin flips, we must define a term  $\text{geo}'_p$  of type  $\mathbb{N} \multimap_1 \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$  using the argument as an internal state. Since*

$$f :^{1-p} \mathbb{N} \multimap_1 \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N}), n :^1 \mathbb{N} \vdash \delta(n) \oplus_p f(s(n)) : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$$

*we can define  $\text{geo}'_p$  as  $\text{fix } f.\lambda n.\delta(n) \oplus_p f(s(n))$ . Note how the book keeping of the morphisms of Theorem 1 is hidden in the term using, in particular, the sharing of the variable  $n$ .*

As usual, terms are considered equal up to  $\alpha$ -equivalence. We denote by  $t[u/x]$  the capture-avoiding substitution of the term  $u$  for the free variable  $x$  in  $t$ .

**Lemma 9** (Weakening). *If  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ , then  $\Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash t : A$ .*

**Lemma 10** (Substitution). *If  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B$  and  $\Gamma' \vdash u : A$ , then  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash t[u/x] : B$ .*

The judgemental equality relation on terms is the least congruence relation generated by the rules in Figure 2. We use the symbol  $\equiv$  for judgemental equality to distinguish it from the propositional equality  $t = u$  which is a predicate in the logic to be defined in Section VI. Formally, judgemental equality is a relation on terms of the same type, and we will sometimes underline that by writing  $\Gamma \vdash t \equiv u : A$ . Similarly, the rules of Figure 2 are to be understood as equalities in a typing context in which both sides have the same type. For example, in the case of the  $\eta$ -rule for function types,  $t$  is assumed to have function type.

## B. Semantics

The denotation of types and contexts is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket &\triangleq \mathbb{N} & \llbracket A \times B \rrbracket &\triangleq \llbracket A \rrbracket \times \llbracket B \rrbracket \\ \llbracket A_p \otimes_q B \rrbracket &\triangleq p \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes q \llbracket B \rrbracket & \llbracket A \multimap_p B \rrbracket &\triangleq p \llbracket A \rrbracket \multimap \llbracket B \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket &\triangleq \mathcal{D} \llbracket A \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \langle \rangle \rrbracket &\triangleq \mathbf{1} & \llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \rrbracket &\triangleq \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket A \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the singleton set. Note that the denotation of any type is an object in  $\mathbf{CMet}$ , which is, moreover, non-empty, if all base types are interpreted as non-empty types.

Terms are interpreted as morphisms

$$\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$$

in  $\mathbf{CMet}$ . The interpretation of terms is for most parts the usual set-theoretic interpretation. For example, function abstraction and application are precisely the usual set-theoretic abstractions and applications. The exercise when defining the interpretation is ensuring the Lipschitz and contractivity

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \geq 1}{\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash x : A} \text{ (VAR)} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.t : A \multimap_p B} \text{ (ABS)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \multimap_p B \quad \Gamma' \vdash u : A}{\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash tu : B} \text{ (APP)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Gamma' \vdash u : B}{\Gamma \vdash \langle t, u \rangle : A \times B} \text{ (PAIR)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \times B}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_1 t : A} \text{ (\pi}_1\text{)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \times B}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_2 t : B} \text{ (\pi}_2\text{)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Gamma' \vdash u : B}{p \cdot \Gamma + q \cdot \Gamma' \vdash (t, u) : A_p \otimes_q B} \text{ (\otimes)} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash t : C \quad \Gamma' \vdash u : A_p \otimes_q B}{\Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = u \text{ in } t : C} \text{ (LET-}\otimes\text{)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A}{\Gamma \vdash \delta t : \mathcal{D}A} \text{ (\delta)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A \quad \Gamma' \vdash u : \mathcal{D}A \quad p \in (0, 1)}{p \cdot \Gamma + (1-p) \cdot \Gamma' \vdash t \oplus_p u : \mathcal{D}A} \text{ (\oplus}_p\text{)} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B \quad \Gamma' \vdash u : \mathcal{D}A \quad B \text{ IB algebra} \quad p < \infty}{\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \text{let } x = u \text{ in } t : B} \text{ (LET)} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash z : \mathbb{N}} \text{ (ZERO)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mathbb{N}}{\Gamma \vdash s(t) : \mathbb{N}} \text{ (SUCC)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash z : A \quad \Gamma', x :^1 A, y :^1 \mathbb{N} \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma'' \vdash n : \mathbb{N}}{\Gamma + \infty \cdot \Gamma' + \Gamma'' \vdash \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n) : A} \text{ (REC)} \\
\frac{(1-p) \cdot \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : A \quad p < 1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fix } x.t : A} \text{ (FIX)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1. Typing rules.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(\lambda x.t)u \equiv t[u/x] & t \equiv (\lambda x.t)x \\
\pi_i(\langle t_1, t_2 \rangle) = t_i & \langle \pi_1(t), \pi_2(t) \rangle \equiv t \\
\text{let } (x, y) = (s, t) \text{ in } u \equiv u[s/x, t/y] & u[t/z] \equiv \text{let } (x, y) = t \text{ in } u[(x, y)/z] \\
\text{let } x = \delta(t) \text{ in } u \equiv u[t/x] & \text{let } x = s \oplus_p t \text{ in } u \equiv (\text{let } x = s \text{ in } u) \oplus_p (\text{let } x = t \text{ in } u) \\
\text{let } x = (\text{let } y = s \text{ in } t) \text{ in } u \equiv \text{let } y = s \text{ in } (\text{let } x = t \text{ in } u) & \text{fix } x.t = t[\text{fix } x.t/x] \\
\text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, z) \equiv z & \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, s(n)) \equiv s[\text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n)/x, n/y]
\end{array}$$

Fig. 2. Judgemental equality. To these should be added the axioms of IB algebras of Definition 3 for  $\oplus$ .

conditions associated with types and typing judgements. This can be done entirely on the abstract category theoretic level, using maps such as those of Theorem 1. One key point in doing so is that there exist maps

$$\text{split} : \llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \quad (3)$$

$$\text{dist} : \llbracket p \cdot \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow p \cdot \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \quad (4)$$

easily defined by induction on  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$  using the morphisms  $m$  and  $c$  of Theorem 1. Note that neither of these is generally an isomorphism, but  $\text{dist}$  is when  $p \geq 1$ . Using these, one can interpret function application  $\llbracket tu \rrbracket$  using the composition of

$$\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket t \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket u \rrbracket} \llbracket A \multimap_p B \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket A \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \llbracket B \rrbracket$$

with  $(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes \text{dist}) \circ \text{split} : \llbracket \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket$ . A similar argument can be used for the interpretation of most other constructions in the language, including  $t \oplus_p u$  which is interpreted using the IB algebra structure on  $\mathcal{D}\llbracket A \rrbracket$ . Let binding is interpreted using Proposition 5, and for the interpretation of natural number recursion, in the inductive case we use the fact that  $\infty X$  is discrete for any  $X$ , and so can be copied  $\infty X \rightarrow \infty X \otimes \infty X$ .

The interpretation is sound in the following sense.

**Theorem 11** (Soundness). *If  $\Gamma \vdash t \equiv u : A$  then  $\llbracket t \rrbracket = \llbracket u \rrbracket$ .*

The proof of Theorem 11 relies on a substitution lemma. To state it, note that there is a semantic weakening map

$$\text{weakening} : \llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$$

obtained by composing  $\text{split}$  with the first projection.

**Lemma 12** (Semantic Weakening and Substitution). *Assume that  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash u : B$  and  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash t : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket \circ \text{weakening} \\
\llbracket \Delta + p\Gamma \vdash u[t/x] : B \rrbracket &= \llbracket u \rrbracket \circ (\Delta \otimes (p \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket \circ \text{dist}) \circ \text{split})
\end{aligned}$$

## VI. LOGIC

In this section, we introduce a higher-order logic to reason about the terms of the calculus. Compared to standard logics, which have a Boolean semantics, our logic is interpreted over the commutative unital quantale

$$\mathbf{Prop} = ([0, 1], \geq, \oplus, \multimap, 0)$$

with truncated sum  $x \oplus y = \min\{x+y, 1\}$  as tensor, unit 0, and adjoint  $x \multimap y = \max\{y-x, 0\}$  defined as truncated reversed subtraction. Observe that the order in  $\mathbf{Prop}$  corresponds to the reverse order in  $[0, 1]$ : the bottom element is 1, the top element is 0, meet is sup and join is inf. This fits with the idea of interpreting equality as distance in metric spaces: The

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{tt} : \text{Prop}} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{ff} : \text{Prop}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Gamma' \vdash s : A}{\Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash t =_A s : \text{Prop}} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop} \quad \Gamma' \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}}{\Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \varphi \bullet \psi : \text{Prop}} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop} \quad \Gamma' \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}}{\Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \varphi \dashv\bullet \psi : \text{Prop}} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop} \quad p \in (0, \infty]}{p \cdot \Gamma \vdash p\varphi : \text{Prop}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}}{\Gamma \vdash \neg\varphi : \text{Prop}} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \varphi_i : \text{Prop} \quad (i = 1, 2)}{\Gamma \vdash \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 : \text{Prop}} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \varphi_i : \text{Prop} \quad (i = 1, 2)}{\Gamma \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 : \text{Prop}} \\
\frac{\Gamma, x :^\infty A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}}{\Gamma \vdash \exists x : A.\varphi : \text{Prop}} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x :^\infty A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}}{\Gamma \vdash \forall x : A.\varphi : \text{Prop}} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop} \quad \Gamma' \vdash \psi : \text{Prop} \quad p \in (0, 1)}{p\Gamma + (1-p)\Gamma' \vdash \varphi \oplus_p \psi : \text{Prop}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3. Typing rules for logical predicates.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\llbracket \text{tt} \rrbracket \triangleq 0 \\
\llbracket \text{ff} \rrbracket \triangleq 1 \\
\llbracket t =_A s \rrbracket \triangleq d_{\llbracket A \rrbracket} \circ (\llbracket t \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket s \rrbracket) \circ \text{split} \\
\llbracket \varphi \bullet \psi \rrbracket \triangleq \oplus \circ (\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \psi \rrbracket) \circ \text{split} \\
\llbracket \varphi \dashv\bullet \psi \rrbracket \triangleq \dashv \circ (\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \psi \rrbracket) \circ \text{split} \\
\llbracket p\varphi \rrbracket \triangleq \min\{p \cdot -, 1\} \circ p\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \circ \text{dist} \\
\llbracket \neg\varphi \rrbracket \triangleq 1 - \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \varphi \wedge \psi \rrbracket \triangleq \max \circ \langle \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket, \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \rangle \\
\llbracket \varphi \vee \psi \rrbracket \triangleq \min \circ \langle \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket, \llbracket \psi \rrbracket \rangle \\
\llbracket \exists x : A.\varphi \rrbracket \triangleq \inf \circ \text{curry}(\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \forall x : A.\varphi \rrbracket \triangleq \sup \circ \text{curry}(\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \phi \oplus_p \psi \rrbracket \triangleq \oplus_p \circ (p\llbracket \phi \rrbracket \otimes (1-p)\llbracket \psi \rrbracket)
\end{array}$$

Fig. 4. Interpretation of logical predicates.

logical statement  $t = u$  is true in the model if its interpretation as the distance between  $t$  and  $u$  is 0.

The formulas of the logic are well-typed *predicates* in our calculus. Formally, we extend the calculus with **Prop** as base type with usual Euclidean distance on  $[0, 1]$  and add terms to the syntax, with typing rules as in Figure 3. We will often omit the type subscript from  $=$  in examples. Observe that weakening and substitution lemmas for typing judgments (Lemmas 9 and 10) are still valid after the extension of the calculus. We also add **Prop** to the judgement of being an IB-algebra and add the axioms of IB-algebras (Definition 3) to the judgemental equality theory.

The interpretation of predicates is defined in Figure 4. These are non-expansive maps because the maps used in their

interpretation define non-expansive maps as follows

$$\begin{array}{l}
\oplus, \dashv : \text{Prop} \otimes \text{Prop} \rightarrow \text{Prop} \\
\min\{p \cdot -, 1\} : p \cdot \text{Prop} \rightarrow \text{Prop} \quad (\text{for } p \in (0, \infty]) \\
\text{sup}, \text{inf} : (\infty \cdot X \dashv \text{Prop}) \rightarrow \text{Prop} \\
\text{max}, \text{min} : \text{Prop} \times \text{Prop} \rightarrow \text{Prop} \\
d_X : X \otimes X \rightarrow \text{Prop}
\end{array}$$

In the latter case this is proved using the triangle inequality.

A *predicate in context*  $\Gamma$  is a term  $\phi$  such that  $\Gamma \vdash \phi : \text{Prop}$ . One consequence of this is that predicates can be constructed not just using the constructions of Figure 3 but also using other constructions in our calculus. For example, since **Prop** is an IB algebra, if  $\phi$  is a predicate in context  $\Gamma, x :^p A$  and  $\mu : \mathcal{D}A$ , then (let  $x = \mu$  in  $\phi$ ) is also a predicate.

Logical reasoning on the terms of the calculus is done via the inference of logical judgments. The judgments of the logic are of the form

$$\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi,$$

where  $\Delta$  is a typing context,  $\Psi = \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n$  is a list of formulas (*logical context*), and  $\varphi$  a formula (*conclusion*).

Hereafter, we always assume to work with well-formed logical judgments:

**Definition 13** (Well-formed logical judgments). A *logical judgment*  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is well-formed if

- $\Delta$  is a discrete context, i.e., all variables in  $\Delta$  have sensitivity annotation  $\infty$ .
- all occurring predicates are well-typed in context  $\Delta$ , i.e.,  $\Delta \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$  and  $\Delta \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}$ , for all  $\psi \in \Psi$ .

The reason for the first restriction is that sensitivity factors for terms variables in logical predicates are irrelevant for logical judgments, and keeping track of these in logical judgements adds unnecessary complications to the logic. Note that by Lemma 9,  $\infty$  is the most general sensitivity annotation possible: If  $\Delta \vdash t : A$  then also  $\Delta' \vdash t : A$  where  $\Delta'$  is obtained from  $\Delta$  by setting all sensitivity annotations to  $\infty$ . In logical judgements we use the notation  $\Delta, x : A$  as shorthand for the rigorous  $\Delta, x :^\infty A$ .

The inference rules for the logic are given in Figure 5. The notation  $p\Psi$  means to multiply each proposition in  $\Psi$  by  $p$ . Rules given by double line are double rules, so can be used in both directions. The logic is sound with respect to the semantic interpretation of logical judgments in the following sense.

**Theorem 14** (Soundness). *If  $\Delta \mid \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, then for all  $\delta \in \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$ ,  $\llbracket \psi_1 \rrbracket(\delta) \oplus \dots \oplus \llbracket \psi_n \rrbracket(\delta) \geq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta)$ .*

The logic is affine, but not relevant: Weakening is derivable but contraction is not.

**Lemma 15.** *If  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, so is  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \psi \vdash \varphi$ .*

**Lemma 16.** *Derivability is closed under weakening and substitution in the term context in the sense that*

- 1) *If  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, so is  $\Delta, x : A \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \text{tt}} \text{ (TRUE)} \quad \frac{}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \text{ff} \vdash \varphi} \text{ (FALSE)} \quad \frac{}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi \vdash \varphi} \text{ (ASS)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi, \psi, \Psi' \vdash \rho}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \psi, \varphi, \Psi' \vdash \rho} \text{ (EX)} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi}{\Delta \mid p\Psi \vdash p\varphi} \text{ (PR)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, (p+q)\varphi \vdash \psi}{\Delta \mid \Psi, p\varphi, q\varphi \vdash \psi} \text{ (DUP)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, \psi \vdash \phi}{\Delta \mid \Psi, 1\psi \vdash \phi} \text{ (DER)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, p\psi \vdash \phi \quad p \leq q}{\Delta \mid \Psi, q\psi \vdash \phi} \text{ (INC)} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, r(s\psi) \vdash \varphi}{\Delta \mid \Psi, (rs)\psi \vdash \varphi} \text{ (ASSOC}_1\text{)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, (rs)\psi \vdash \varphi \quad s \leq 1 \text{ or } r \geq 1}{\Delta \mid \Psi, r(s\psi) \vdash \varphi} \text{ (ASSOC}_2\text{)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid (1-p)\Psi, p\varphi \vdash \varphi \quad p \in (0, 1)}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi} \text{ (G-REC)} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \quad \Delta \mid \Psi' \vdash \varphi'}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \Psi' \vdash \varphi \bullet \varphi'} \text{ (\bullet-I)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi, \psi \vdash \rho}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi \bullet \psi \vdash \rho} \text{ (\bullet-E)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi \vdash \psi}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \dashv\bullet \psi} \text{ (\dashv\bullet-I)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \dashv\bullet \psi \quad \Delta \mid \Psi' \vdash \varphi}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \Psi' \vdash \psi} \text{ (\dashv\bullet-E)} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi \vdash \text{ff}}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \neg \varphi} \text{ (\neg-I)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \quad \Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \psi}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \wedge \psi} \text{ (\wedge-I)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \wedge \psi}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi} \text{ (\wedge-EL)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \wedge \psi}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \psi} \text{ (\wedge-ER)} \\
\frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, \neg \varphi \vdash \text{ff}}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi} \text{ (\neg-E)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \vee \psi} \text{ (\vee-IL)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \psi}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi \vee \psi} \text{ (\vee-IR)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi \vdash \rho \quad \Delta \mid \Psi, \psi \vdash \rho}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi \vee \psi \vdash \rho} \text{ (\vee-E)} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash t : A \quad \Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \exists x : A. \varphi} \text{ (\exists-I)} \quad \frac{\Delta, x : A \mid \Psi, \varphi \vdash \psi}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \exists x : A. \varphi \vdash \psi} \text{ (\exists-E)} \quad \frac{\Delta, x : A \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \forall x : A. \varphi} \text{ (\forall-I)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \forall x : A. \varphi \quad \Delta \vdash t : A}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]} \text{ (\forall-E)} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash t : A}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash t = t} \text{ (EQ-I)} \quad \frac{\Delta, x : {}^p A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop} \quad \Delta \vdash t : A \quad \Delta \vdash s : A \quad \Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x] \quad \Delta \mid \Psi' \vdash p(t = s)}{\Delta \mid \Psi, \Psi' \vdash \varphi[s/x]} \text{ (EQ-E)} \\
\frac{\Delta, x : {}^p A, y : {}^q B \mid \Psi[(x, y)/z] \vdash \varphi[(x, y)/z] \quad \Delta \vdash t : A_p \otimes_q B}{\Delta \mid \Psi[t/z] \vdash \varphi[t/z]} \text{ (IND}_{\otimes}\text{)} \quad \frac{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[z/n]}{\Delta, n : \mathbb{N} \mid \varphi \vdash \varphi[s(n)/n]} \quad \frac{\Delta \vdash t : \mathbb{N}}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/n]} \text{ (IND}_{\mathbb{N}}\text{)} \\
\frac{r < \infty \quad \Delta, x : {}^r \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop} \quad \Delta, \mu : \mathcal{D}A, \nu : \mathcal{D}A \mid p\varphi[\mu/x], (1-p)\varphi[\nu/x] \vdash \varphi[\mu \oplus_p \nu/x] \quad \Delta \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A}{\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]} \text{ (IND}_{\mathcal{D}}\text{)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5. Logic. (The logical judgments appearing above are assumed to be well-formed)

2) If  $\Delta, x : A \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, and  $\Delta \vdash t : A$ , then  $\Delta \mid \Psi[t/x] \vdash \varphi[t/x]$  is also derivable.

Note the similarity between the rule for guarded recursion (G-REC) and the typing rule for fixed points. The rules include the classical rule ( $\neg$ -E), because it is verified by the model, but our examples below do not use it. The rule (EQ-E) for elimination of equality is perhaps most easily understood via a sketch proof of soundness: The sensitivity of  $\phi$  in  $x$  ensures that  $\phi[s/x]$  is at most distance  $p(t = s)$  from  $\phi[t/x]$ . Therefore, since  $\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \geq \llbracket \phi[t/x] \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket \geq \llbracket p(t = s) \rrbracket$ , also  $\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket \geq \llbracket \phi[s/x] \rrbracket$ .

One consequence of the induction principles is that judgments involving predicates defined using recursion and let-bindings can be proved. For example, by (IND<sub>⊗</sub>), to prove  $\Gamma \mid \text{let } (x, y) = t \text{ in } \phi \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = t \text{ in } \psi$ , it suffices to prove that  $\Gamma, x : {}^p A, y : {}^q B \mid \phi \vdash \psi$ . The induction principle for  $\mathbb{N}$  requires the induction case to be proved not using  $\Psi$ , so that  $\Psi$  is only used once, at the base case. The restriction of finiteness of the sensitivity factor in the induction principle for  $\mathcal{D}$  ensures that  $\phi$  is continuous in  $x$ , and is necessary for the same reason as for Proposition 5. Note the use of the convex combination on the induction hypotheses in the inductive case.

## VII. PROVING BASIC PROPERTIES

This section shows some basic consequences of the rules of the logic, focusing on equality. We first show that the rule for equality elimination (EQ-E) implies that equality is symmetric and transitive. The derivations mimic the derivations of the same rules for identity types in type theory (see e.g. [34]), although the setting of affine logic used here is different.

**Proposition 17.** *Propositional equality is symmetric and transitive in the sense that*

$$\begin{array}{l}
x : A, y : A \mid p(x = y) \vdash p(y = x) \\
x : A, y : A, z : A \mid p(x = y), p(y = z) \vdash p(x = z)
\end{array}$$

*Proof.* We just prove transitivity. Let  $\Delta \triangleq x : {}^p A, y : {}^p A, z : {}^p A$  and apply (EQ-E) to  $\Delta, w : {}^p A \vdash p(x = w) : \text{Prop}$ . Since  $\Delta \mid p(x = y) \vdash p(x = y)$  we conclude  $\Delta \mid p(x = y), p(y = z) \vdash p(x = z)$ .  $\square$

Equality is also a congruence relation.

**Proposition 18.** *If  $\Gamma, x : {}^p A \vdash t : B$  and  $\Delta \vdash u : A$  and  $\Delta \vdash s : A$ , then  $p(u = s) \vdash t[u/x] = t[s/x]$ .*

*Proof.* Apply (EQ-E) to  $\Gamma, p \cdot \Delta, y : {}^p A \vdash t[u/x] = t[s/x]$ .  $\square$



As a special case note that

$$p(x = y), (1 - p)(z = w) \vdash x \oplus_p z = y \oplus_p w \quad (5)$$

Since **Prop** is a type in our calculus, the logic is higher order. We can define types of predicates and relations

$$\mathbf{Pred}_p(X) \triangleq X \multimap_p \mathbf{Prop} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathbf{Rel}_{p,q}(X, Y) \triangleq X \multimap_p Y \multimap_q \mathbf{Prop} \quad (7)$$

One can prove that equality is equivalent to Leibniz equality.

**Proposition 19.** *The predicates  $\forall \phi : \mathbf{Pred}_p(A). \phi(x) \multimap \phi(y)$  and  $p(x =_A y)$  are equivalent.*

#### A. Internalising the Kantorovic distance

We show that the Kantorovic distance (2) can be internalised in the logic. This will allow us to reason using couplings to prove equalities of distributions. The integral in the definition of the Kantorovic distance computes the mean of the distances  $d_X(x, x')$  as  $x, x'$  range over the given coupling  $\omega : \mathcal{D}(A_1 \otimes_1 A)$ . We start by defining, more generally, the mean  $E_{x \sim \mu}[\phi]$  of a predicate  $\phi : \mathbf{Pred}_1(A)$  over a distribution  $\mu : \mathcal{D}A$  as

$$E_{x \sim \mu}[\phi] \triangleq \text{let } x = \mu \text{ in } \phi(x) \quad (8)$$

This defines a mean because it satisfies the equations

$$\begin{aligned} E_{x \sim \delta(y)}[\phi] &\equiv \phi(y) \\ E_{x \sim \mu \oplus_p \mu'}[\phi] &\equiv p(E_{x \sim \mu}[\phi]) \bullet (1 - p)(E_{x \sim \mu'}[\phi]) \end{aligned}$$

When  $\omega : \mathcal{D}(A_1 \otimes_1 A)$  we will write  $E_{(x,y) \sim \omega}[x = y]$  for  $E_{z \sim \omega}[\phi(z)]$ , where  $\phi(z) \triangleq \lambda z. \text{let } (x, y) = z \text{ in } (x =_A y)$ . Finally, we must take the infimum of  $E_{(x,y) \sim \omega}[x = y]$  as  $\omega$  ranges over all couplings. We express the notion of coupling quantitatively in the logic as

$$\omega \in \mathbf{Cpl}(\mu, \nu) \triangleq (\mathcal{D}(\pi_1)\omega = \mu) \bullet (\mathcal{D}(\pi_2)\omega = \nu) \quad (9)$$

and use the fact that existential quantification is interpreted as infimum to arrive at

$$K(\mu, \nu) \triangleq \exists \omega. \omega \in \mathbf{Cpl}(\mu, \nu) \bullet E_{(x,y) \sim \omega}[x = y]$$

where  $\omega$  ranges over  $\mathcal{D}(A_1 \otimes_1 A)$ .

**Theorem 20.** *The predicates  $K(\mu, \nu)$  and  $\mu = \nu$  are equivalent.*

*Proof.* To prove that  $\mu = \nu$  implies  $K(\mu, \nu)$  it suffices to show

$$\mu : \mathcal{D}A \mid \cdot \vdash K(\mu, \mu)$$

Define  $\mu :^2 \mathcal{D}A \vdash \omega(\mu) : \mathcal{D}(A_1 \otimes_1 A)$  as  $\text{let } a = \mu \text{ in } \delta(a, a)$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}\pi_1(\omega(\mu)) \equiv \mu$  and  $\mathcal{D}\pi_2(\omega(\mu)) \equiv \mu$ . Moreover,  $\cdot \vdash E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu)}[a = a']$  can be proved by induction on  $\mu$  as follows: If  $\mu = \delta(a)$  then  $E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu)}[a = a']$  reduces to  $a = a$  which is true. If  $\mu = \mu_1 \oplus_p \mu_2$ , we must show  $E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu_1 \oplus_p \mu_2)}[a = a']$  in context

$$p(E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu_1)}[a = a']), (1 - p)(E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu_2)}[a = a'])$$

which holds because  $\omega(\mu_1 \oplus_p \mu_2) \equiv \omega(\mu_1) \oplus_p \omega(\mu_2)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu_1) \oplus_p \omega(\mu_2)}[a = a'] \\ = p(E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu_1)}[a = a']) \bullet (1 - p)(E_{(a,a') \sim \omega(\mu_2)}[a = a']) \end{aligned}$$

For the other direction it suffices to show that  $E_{(x,y) \sim \omega}[x = y]$  implies  $\mathcal{D}(\pi_1)(\omega) = \mathcal{D}(\pi_2)(\omega)$ . This can be done by induction on  $\omega$ .  $\square$

#### B. Uniqueness of fixed points

One might hope that the uniqueness of fixed points from the Banach fixed point theorem can be internalised in our logic as the statement that

$$x = f(x), y = f(y) \vdash x = y$$

whenever  $f : X \multimap_p X$  for  $p < 1$ . However, this is not true. Take for example  $f : \mathbf{Prop} \multimap_{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{Prop}$  to be multiplication by  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $x$  to be 0 and  $y$  to be 1. Then the semantics of the above statement evaluates to the false statement  $\frac{1}{2} \geq 1$ . However, if we assume that  $x$  is a fixed point for  $f$  in the global sense, then it equals the unique fixed point.

**Lemma 21.** *If  $f :^1 X \multimap_p X$  and  $\text{tt} \vdash x = f(x)$ , then*

$$\text{tt} \vdash x = \text{fix } y. f(y).$$

*Proof.* By guarded recursion, it suffices to prove that

$$p(x = \text{fix } y. f(y)) \vdash x = \text{fix } y. f(y)$$

which follows from Proposition 18.  $\square$

## VIII. APPLICATION: MARKOV PROCESSES

Markov processes describe systems with memoryless transitions between states, governed by probabilities. Formally, they consist of a set of states  $\mathcal{S}$ , a transition function  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S})$  that specifies the probabilities of moving to the next state, and a labeling function  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow A$  that assigns labels to states. Following [35], we treat  $A$  as a metric space and analyze the behavior of Markov processes quantitatively using distances that discount future differences in observations by means of a discount factor  $c \in (0, 1]$ . The smaller  $c$  is, the more the focus shifts toward short-term differences. Categorically, this corresponds to interpret Markov processes as coalgebras  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow A \otimes c\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S})$  in  $\mathbf{CMet}$ . The behaviour of a state is abstractly characterised as an element of the final coalgebra<sup>1</sup>, corresponding to the coinductive solution  $\mathbb{P}_c$  to the functorial equation  $\mathbb{P}_c \cong A \otimes c\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{P}_c)$ . The behavioral distance is just the distance in  $\mathbb{P}_c$  between behaviours [36].

In order to program with  $\mathbb{P}_c$  we extend the calculus with types  $\mathbb{P}_c$  and  $A$  as well as terms

$$\text{ufld} : \mathbb{P}_c \multimap_1 A_1 \otimes_c \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{P}_c)$$

$$\text{fld} : A_1 \otimes_c \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{P}_c) \multimap_1 \mathbb{P}_c$$

We will write  $a; m$  for  $\text{fld}(a, m)$ . Finally we add equalities stating that  $\text{fld}$  and  $\text{ufld}$  are inverses of each other.

<sup>1</sup>The final coalgebra always exists as  $A \otimes c\mathcal{D}(-)$  is an accessible functor. See [35], [36] for details.

As a first example, consider a process  $m$  satisfying the recursive definition  $m \equiv a; (\delta(m) \oplus_{\frac{1}{3}} \delta(z))$  where  $z$  is some other given process. This recursive definition is productive in the sense that it only calls itself with probability  $\frac{1}{3}$ . Therefore it can be defined as a term of type  $\mathbb{P}_1$  similarly to the definition of the geometric distribution of Example 8. Precisely, because

$$z : \frac{2}{3} \mathbb{P}_1, m : \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{P}_1 \vdash a; (\delta(m) \oplus_{\frac{1}{3}} \delta(z)) : \mathbb{P}_1$$

we can define  $z : \mathbb{P}_1 \vdash m : \mathbb{P}_1$  as

$$m \triangleq \text{fix } m.a; (\delta(m) \oplus_{\frac{1}{3}} \delta(z))$$

which then by the equality for fixed point unfolding satisfies the desired equality.

Now, let  $n$  satisfying  $n \equiv a; (\delta(n) \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}} \delta(z))$  be defined similarly. Using the logic we will now show that the distance between  $m$  and  $n$  is at most  $\frac{1}{4}$ , which in the logic corresponds to showing that  $\frac{1}{4} \cdot \text{ff} \vdash m = n$ . In the following we simply write  $c$  for  $c \cdot \text{ff}$ . By guarded recursion, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3} (m = n) \vdash m = n$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} n &= a; (\delta(n) \oplus_{\frac{1}{3}} (\delta(n) \oplus_{\frac{1}{4}} \delta(z))) \\ m &= a; (\delta(m) \oplus_{\frac{1}{3}} (\delta(z) \oplus_{\frac{1}{4}} \delta(z))) \end{aligned}$$

by (5) it suffices to show

$$\frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3} (m = n) \vdash \frac{1}{3} (m = n) \bullet \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{1}{4} (n = z) \bullet \frac{3}{4} (z = z) \right)$$


which in turn reduces to the following three judgements

$$m = n \vdash m = n \quad \text{ff} \vdash n = z \quad \text{tt} \vdash z = z$$

all of which are true.

### A. A Biased Coin Tossing Process

The next example describes a probabilistic process generated by a coin toss with a biased coin, where the current state remembers the result of the last coin toss.



The label space is the discrete set  $A = \{\text{Hd}, \text{Tl}\}$  and the two states should satisfy the mutually recursive equations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hd}_\epsilon &= \text{Hd}; (\delta(\text{hd}_\epsilon) \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \delta(\text{tl}_\epsilon)) \\ \text{tl}_\epsilon &= \text{Tl}; (\delta(\text{hd}_\epsilon) \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \delta(\text{tl}_\epsilon)). \end{aligned}$$

Unlike the previous example, this definition is not productive, so  $\text{hd}_\epsilon, \text{tl}_\epsilon$  cannot be defined by guarded recursion as elements of  $\mathbb{P}_1$ . However, they can be defined as elements of  $\mathbb{P}_c$  for

any  $c \in (0, 1)$ . We define  $\text{hd}_\epsilon, \text{tl}_\epsilon$  by mutual recursion as the projections of the fixed point of a contraction on  $\mathbb{P}_c \times \mathbb{P}_c$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hdtl}_\epsilon &\triangleq \text{fix } x. \langle \text{Hd}; \text{flip}_\epsilon(x), \text{Tl}; \text{flip}_\epsilon(x) \rangle \\ \text{hd}_\epsilon &\triangleq \pi_1(\text{hdtl}_\epsilon) \\ \text{tl}_\epsilon &\triangleq \pi_2(\text{hdtl}_\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{flip}_\epsilon(x) \triangleq \delta(\pi_1(x)) \oplus_{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \delta(\pi_2(x))$ . Observe that  $\text{hdtl}_\epsilon$  is well-defined as

$$x : \mathbb{P}_c \times \mathbb{P}_c \vdash \langle \text{Hd}; \text{flip}_\epsilon(x), \text{Tl}; \text{flip}_\epsilon(x) \rangle : \mathbb{P}_c \times \mathbb{P}_c.$$

Consider the special case of a fair coin  $\text{hd} \triangleq \text{hd}_0, \text{tl} \triangleq \text{tl}_0$ . We now show that the distance between  $\text{hd}$  and  $\text{hd}_\epsilon$  is at most  $\frac{c\epsilon}{1-c-c\epsilon}$ . Logically, this correspond to the statement

$$\frac{c\epsilon}{1-c-c\epsilon} \vdash \text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon \quad (10)$$

The statement (10) must be proved simultaneously with a similar statement for the two tail states, and by guarded recursion it suffices to prove that

$$c(d_{c,\epsilon} \dashv \bullet (\text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon \wedge \text{tl} = \text{tl}_\epsilon)) \vdash (d_{c,\epsilon} \dashv \bullet (\text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon \wedge \text{tl} = \text{tl}_\epsilon))$$

where  $d_{c,\epsilon} \triangleq \frac{c\epsilon}{1-c+c\epsilon}$ . We show that

$$c(d_{c,\epsilon} \dashv \bullet (\text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon \wedge \text{tl} = \text{tl}_\epsilon)), d_{c,\epsilon} \vdash \text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon \quad (11)$$

The case for  $\text{tl} = \text{tl}_\epsilon$  is similar. By (5) to show  $\text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon$  it suffices to show  $c$  times the below formula

$$\left( \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \right) (\text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon) \bullet \epsilon (\text{hd} = \text{tl}_\epsilon) \bullet \frac{1}{2} (\text{tl} = \text{tl}_\epsilon) \quad (12)$$

and so (11) reduces by rule (PR) to showing (12) in context

$$d_{c,\epsilon} \dashv \bullet (\text{hd} = \text{hd}_\epsilon \wedge \text{tl} = \text{tl}_\epsilon), \frac{\epsilon}{1-c+c\epsilon} \quad (13)$$

This can be done using

$$\frac{\epsilon}{1-c+c\epsilon} = \left( \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \right) d_{c,\epsilon} + \epsilon + \frac{1}{2} d_{c,\epsilon}$$

We omit the remaining details for space reasons.

We remark that the upperbound shown above is tight, in the sense that it is the actual behavioural distance between the two states. This can be checked by direct calculations because, as observed in [37], it corresponds to the  $c$ -discounted bisimilarity distance of Desharnais et al. [17].

### B. Bisimulation

Let  $\xi: X \rightarrow A \otimes c\mathcal{D}(X)$  be a Markov process, and decompose  $\xi$  into two maps:  $\xi_1: X \rightarrow A$  for labels and  $\xi_2: X \rightarrow c\mathcal{D}(X)$  for probabilistic transitions. A probabilistic bisimulation [25] for  $\xi$  is a binary relation on  $X$  such that  $R(x, y)$  implies (i)  $\xi_1(x) = \xi_1(y)$ , states have the same label; and (ii) that there exists an  $R$ -coupling  $\rho$  (i.e., a coupling  $\rho$  for  $\xi_2(x)$  and  $\xi_2(y)$  whose support is in  $R$ ) ensuring the probabilistic behaviors of  $x$  and  $y$  remain related under the bisimulation.

While exact equivalence is often too rigid, metrics offer a quantitative, more flexible alternative. Next, we internalise the definition of bisimilarity in our logic.

First, let  $R : \mathbf{Rel}(X, X)$  where  $\mathbf{Rel}(X, X) \triangleq \mathbf{Rel}_{1,1}(X, X)$  defined as in (7). Define the notion of  $\rho : \mathcal{D}(X \otimes_1 X)$  being an  $R$ -coupling from  $\mu : \mathcal{D}(X)$  to  $\nu : \mathcal{D}(X)$  as a refinement of the quantitative statement in (9) as follows:

$$\rho \in \mathbf{Cpl}_R(\mu, \nu) \triangleq E_{(x,y) \sim \rho} [R(x, y)] \bullet (\rho \in \mathbf{Cpl}(\mu, \nu)).$$

Using this, we can define  $\mathbf{Bisim}(R) : \mathbf{Prop}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x, y : X. R(x, y) \multimap \text{let } (l, \mu) = \xi(x), (l', \nu) = \xi(y) \\ \text{in } l = l' \bullet c(\exists \rho. \rho \in \mathbf{Cpl}_R(\mu, \nu)) \end{aligned}$$

In the case where  $c \in (0, 1)$ , we can define the bisimilarity relation  $\sim : \mathbf{Rel}(X, X)$  by guarded recursion as

$$\begin{aligned} \sim \triangleq \text{fix } R. \lambda x. \lambda y. \text{let } (l, \mu) = \xi(x), (l', \nu) = \xi(y) \\ \text{in } l = l' \bullet c(\exists \rho. \rho \in \mathbf{Cpl}_R(\mu, \nu)) \end{aligned}$$

using that  $R$  occurs with grade  $c$  in the body of the fixed point. Note that this definition uses the combination of higher-order logic and guarded recursion. The following can be proved using guarded recursion.

**Proposition 22.** *Bisimilarity is equivalent to equality in  $\mathbb{P}_c$ .*

Since the distance in  $\mathbb{P}_c$  coincides with probabilistic bisimilarity distance, Proposition 22 shows that  $\sim : \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{P}_c, \mathbb{P}_c)$  is interpreted as bisimilarity distance.

## IX. APPLICATION: TEMPORAL LEARNING

The next example showcases the expressivity of our calculus and a use of natural number induction. The example is adapted from Aguirre et al [2].

A *Markov decision process* comprises a set of states  $\mathcal{S}$ , a set of actions  $\mathcal{A}$ , a transition function  $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S})$  and a reward function  $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}([0, R])$ . We will consider  $\mathcal{A}$  a discrete set, and assume that states  $\mathcal{S}$  is a finite discrete set. Moreover, for simplicity we will assume that  $\mathcal{S}$  is simply the set  $\mathcal{S} = \{0, \dots, N-1\}$  for some  $N$ , so that  $\mathcal{S} \multimap X$  can be expressed as an  $N$ -fold product  $X^N$ . Finally, we will assume that  $R = 1$ , so that we can give the type of  $\mathcal{R}$  internally in the calculus as  $\mathcal{S} \otimes_1 \mathcal{A} \multimap \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Prop})$ . The latter is in practice not a restriction, as the actual values of rewards is inessential, and so the reward function can be appropriately scaled. However, it is necessary, as we need the reward space to be an IB-algebra and a 1-bounded metric space.

When doing reinforcement learning, one must estimate a value function  $V : \mathbf{Prop}^N$  mapping states to rewards, for a given policy  $\pi : \mathcal{A}^N$ . *Temporal difference* is one approach to doing this, which works by iteratively refining the value function  $V$  as follows: For each state  $i$ , sample an action  $a$  from the policy distribution  $\pi(i)$ , sample a reward  $r$  from the reward distribution  $\mathcal{R}(a, i)$ , and sample a transition  $j$  from the transition function  $\mathcal{P}(a, i)$ . From this the updated value function  $V'$  at  $i$  can be defined as the convex combination

$$V'(i) = (1 - \alpha)V(i) + \alpha(r + \gamma V(j))$$

of the previous value  $V(i)$  and the reward associated with the next state  $j$ , for fixed values  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ . Of course,  $V'(i)$  should be a distribution, since the definition above involves sampling.

We will show that this refinement function can be defined and proved convergent in our calculus. We first define the function taking one step of the refinement as

$$\Gamma, V : {}^k \mathbf{Prop}^N \vdash \text{TDstep } V : \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Prop}^N)$$

where  $k \triangleq 1 - \alpha + \gamma\alpha$ . The context  $\Gamma$  is

$$\mathcal{P} : {}^\infty \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{S})^N, \mathcal{R} : {}^\infty \mathcal{S} \otimes_1 \mathcal{A} \multimap \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Prop}), \pi : {}^\infty \mathcal{A}^N$$

where all the parameters of the reinforcement learning setup are given grade  $\infty$ , because these are assumed to be closed terms that will be called repeatedly. We define  $\text{TDstep } V$  as  $\text{st}(\text{TDstep}' V)$  where

$$\text{st} : \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Prop})^N \multimap \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Prop}^N)$$

is defined in the standard way by induction on  $N$ . Define  $\text{TDstep}' V$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TDstep}' V \triangleq \langle \text{let } a = \pi(i), r = \mathcal{R}(a, i), j = \mathcal{P}(a, i) \\ \text{in } \delta((1 - \alpha)V(i) \bullet \alpha(r \bullet \gamma V(j))) \rangle_{i \leq N} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $k < 1$ , one can define the refinement function as the fixed point of  $\text{TDstep}$ . In practice, however, refinement is only iterated some finite number  $n$  of times, defining  $\text{TD} : \mathbf{Prop}^N \multimap \mathbb{N} \multimap \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Prop}^N)$  by recursion on the second argument as

$$\text{TD } V \ 0 \triangleq V$$

$$\text{TD } V \ (n+1) \triangleq \text{let } V' = (\text{TD } V \ n) \text{ in } \text{TDstep}' V'$$

Then, since  $k(V = W) \vdash \text{TDstep } V = \text{TDstep } W$ , one can prove by induction on  $n$  that

$$\Gamma \mid k^n(V = W) \vdash \text{TD } V \ n = \text{TD } W \ n$$

## X. APPLICATION: HYPERCUBE WALK

This section shows how the internalisation of the Kantorovic distance (Theorem 20) can be used for coupling proofs in our logic. The example is a random walk on a hypercube adapted from Aguirre et al. [2]. Much of the example is done by reasoning in the model, as is most natural. Our logic is then used as an internal language of the model to apply Theorem 20 in the last step.

A position on an  $N$ -dimensional hypercube is an element of  $\mathbf{Bool}^N$  and we consider this a metric space with the normalised hamming distance: The distance between  $p$  and  $q$  is  $\frac{1}{N}$  times the number of positions where  $p$  and  $q$  differ. In other words, the metric space of positions can be defined as

$$\text{Pos} \triangleq \bigotimes_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{Bool}$$

Let  $\text{unif}_{0,N} : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N})$  be the uniform distribution on  $\{0, \dots, N\}$ , and let  $\text{flip}_i : \text{Pos} \rightarrow \text{Pos}$  be the operation that flips the  $i$ th coordinate of a position if  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , and otherwise does nothing. Define the one-step hypercube random walk as

$$\text{hwalk} : \text{Pos} \multimap_1 \mathcal{D}(\text{Pos})$$

$$\text{hwalk} \triangleq \lambda p. \text{let } i = \text{unif}_{0,N} \text{ in } \text{flip}_i(p)$$

We show that

$$\frac{N-1}{N+1}(p = q) \vdash \text{hwalk } p = \text{hwalk } q \quad (14)$$

from which one can show that repeated iteration of  $\text{hwalk}$  converges. To prove this, first construct, for each pair of positions  $p$  and  $q$ , a bijection  $\sigma_{p,q}$  of  $\{0, \dots, N\}$  to itself by cases:

- If  $p$  and  $q$  are equal take  $\sigma_{p,q}$  to be the identity
- If  $p$  and  $q$  differ in exactly one position  $i$ , let  $\sigma_{p,q}$  be the permutation that swaps  $i$  and  $0$
- If  $p$  and  $q$  differ in positions  $i_1, \dots, i_n$  for  $n > 1$ , let  $\sigma_{p,q}$  be the permutation that cycles  $i_1, \dots, i_n$ .

Below we just write  $\sigma$  for  $\sigma_{p,q}$ . One can then show that

$$\frac{N-1}{N+1}(p = q) \vdash \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{N+1} (\text{flip}_i p = \text{flip}_{\sigma(i)} q) \quad (15)$$

holds in the model. This is done by analysing cases of  $p$  and  $q$ . For example, if  $p$  and  $q$  differ in exactly one position  $j$ , then  $\text{flip}_i p = \text{flip}_{\sigma(i)} q$  is 0 for  $i = j$  and  $i = 0$ , and at all other values it equals  $p = q$ , from which the judgement follows.

Now, define  $\rho : \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{N}_1 \otimes_1 \mathbb{N})$  as the uniform distribution on  $\{(0, \sigma(0)), \dots, (N, \sigma(N))\}$ , and define  $\rho' : \mathcal{D}(\text{Pos}_1 \otimes_1 \text{Pos})$  as

$$\text{let } ij = \rho \text{ in } (\text{let } (i, j) = ij \text{ in } (\text{flip}_i p, \text{flip}_j q))$$

Then

$$E_{(x,y) \sim \rho'}[x = y] = \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{N+1} (\text{flip}_i p = \text{flip}_{\sigma(i)} q)$$

so that (15) can be read as

$$\frac{N-1}{N+1}(p = q) \vdash E_{(x,y) \sim \rho'}[x = y]$$

An easy argument shows that the two equalities

$$\mathcal{D}(\pi_1)(\rho') = \text{hwalk } p \quad \mathcal{D}(\pi_2)(\rho') = \text{hwalk } q$$

can be proved in the empty context, so that we have shown

$$\frac{N-1}{N+1}(p = q) \vdash \exists \rho'. E_{(x,y) \sim \rho'}[x = y] \bullet (\mathcal{D}(\pi_1)(\rho') = \text{hwalk } p) \bullet (\mathcal{D}(\pi_2)(\rho') = \text{hwalk } q)$$

which, by Theorem 20 is equivalent to (14).

## XI. RELATED WORK

Our calculus is essentially an extension of Fuzz [33] with probability distributions, except that Fuzz has recursive types, and we have guarded recursion. Fuzz is not a calculus of metric spaces, since these do not model general recursion. Indeed de Amorim et al. [15] use metric CPOs to model Fuzz. The calculus is also related to graded lambda calculus [11], [19]

Dagnino and Pasquali [12] were the first to notice that sensitivity of predicates must be taken into account when expressing elimination principles for equality in quantitative logic. They present an affine propositional logic for quantitative reasoning about terms written in a first-order language, and study categorical models of this. One of the rules they

present for equality is our rule (EQ-E), but transitivity is a separate axiom, and they do not study applications like the ones studied here.

The idea of using metric spaces and guarded recursion using scaling factors  $c < 1$  for programming and reasoning about probabilistic processes goes back at least to the late 1990s [8], [16]. To our knowledge, however, all previous work has used ultra-metric spaces, which means that one can use simply typed lambda calculus and a simpler type for fixed points, as explained in the introduction. The category of complete bisected ultrametric spaces forms a subcategory of the topos of trees [10], and that strain of work therefore relates directly to later work on reasoning about processes using guarded recursion [1], [23]. In these later works, guarded recursion is formulated with respect to a modal operator  $\triangleright$ , which is not related to probabilities. Equality therefore is not interpreted as distance like in this work.

The work on quantitative equational logic [28]–[30] is also related to ours. However, their equational approach fundamentally differs from ours by using a Boolean valued logical relation  $=_\epsilon$  to reason about distances. Scaling of propositions and guarded recursion as used here would not work for a Boolean valued logic. Indeed, the upper bound shown in Section VIII-A can be proven in quantitative equational logic only by using the infinitary rule (Arch) [6]. We are unaware of any extensions of quantitative equational logic to higher-order.

There is a long line of work on developing logics for reasoning about probabilistic programs including Hoare logics and weakest precondition logics [21], [31], [32]. Only a few of these are designed for reasoning about program distances [2], which has also been done using semantic methods [24]. Our goal here is different, namely to develop a logic where equality is interpreted as distance. In that sense the works on quantitative equational logic, and especially the work by Dagnino and Pasquali are closer to ours.

## XII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We defined an affine calculus for sensitivity and a higher-order logic for reasoning about it. The calculus include a form of guarded recursion, where the guards are sensitivities in the open interval  $(0, 1)$ , and we saw how this could be used for programming recursive processes. The logic likewise includes guarded recursion, which can be used, e.g., for proving upper bounds on distances on processes. We also saw how the principles of induction in the logic, in particular the one for induction over  $\mathcal{D}$  are powerful principles. For example, we saw how they lead to proofs by coupling.

One might ask to what extend the semantics of our logic generalises to other settings. Our goal has been to reason about metric spaces, and CMet is essentially the largest possible category in which the entire logic can be interpreted soundly. For example, we need to include discrete sets into the category to model natural numbers. This requires either an upper limit on distances as we do, or allowing  $\infty$  as a possible distance. The latter choice, however invalidates both the Banach fixed point theorem and the guarded recursion principle.

In future work it would be interesting to explore if coinductive types can be encoded using guarded recursion as in multiclocked guarded recursion [4], [23] or Gatsby [20]. The hope is that the arguments of Section VIII-A could be used to reason not just about  $\mathbb{P}_c$  for  $c < 1$ , but also for  $\mathbb{P}_1$  using that the latter is the limit of the former, as  $c \rightarrow 1$ . At the moment however, it is very unclear what the precise model should be.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Maaike Zwart for helpful discussions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Alejandro Aguirre, Gilles Barthe, Lars Birkedal, Ales Bizjak, Marco Gaboardi, and Deepak Garg. Relational reasoning for markov chains in a probabilistic guarded lambda calculus. In Amal Ahmed, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems - 27th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2018, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2018, Thessaloniki, Greece, April 14-20, 2018, Proceedings*, volume 10801 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 214–241. Springer, 2018.
- [2] Alejandro Aguirre, Gilles Barthe, Justin Hsu, Benjamin Lucien Kaminski, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Christoph Matheja. A pre-expectation calculus for probabilistic sensitivity. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(POPL):1–28, 2021.
- [3] José Bacelar Almeida, Manuel Barbosa, Gilles Barthe, Benjamin Grégoire, Vincent Laporte, Jean-Christophe Léchenet, Tiago Oliveira, Hugo Pacheco, Miguel Quaresma, Peter Schwabe, Antoine Séré, and Pierre-Yves Strub. Formally verifying cyber part I: implementation correctness. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, page 215, 2023.
- [4] Robert Atkey and Conor McBride. Productive coprogramming with guarded recursion. In Greg Morrisett and Tarmo Uustalu, editors, *ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP'13, Boston, MA, USA - September 25 - 27, 2013*, pages 197–208. ACM, 2013.
- [5] Martin Avanzini, Gilles Barthe, Benjamin Grégoire, Georg Moser, and Gabriele Vanoni. Hopping proofs of expectation-based properties: Applications to skiplists and security proofs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(OOPSLA1):784–809, 2024.
- [6] Giorgio Bacci, Giovanni Bacci, Kim G. Larsen, and Radu Mardare. A complete quantitative deduction system for the bisimilarity distance on markov chains. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 14(4), 2018.
- [7] Giorgio Bacci, Radu Mardare, Prakash Panangaden, and Gordon D. Plotkin. Propositional logics for the lawvere quantale. In *MFPS*, volume 3 of *EPTICS*. EpiSciences, 2023.
- [8] Christel Baier and Marta Z. Kwiatkowska. Domain equations for probabilistic processes. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 10(6):665–717, 2000.
- [9] Stefan Banach. Sur les opérations dans les ensembles abstraits et leur application aux équations intégrales. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 3(1):133–181, 1922.
- [10] Lars Birkedal, Rasmus Ejlers Møgelberg, Jan Schwinghammer, and Kristian Støvring. First steps in synthetic guarded domain theory: step-indexing in the topos of trees. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 8(4), 2012.
- [11] Aloïs Brunel, Marco Gaboardi, Damiano Mazza, and Steve Zdancewic. A core quantitative coefficient calculus. In Zhong Shao, editor, *Programming Languages and Systems - 23rd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2014, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2014, Grenoble, France, April 5-13, 2014, Proceedings*, volume 8410 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 351–370. Springer, 2014.
- [12] Francesco Dagnino and Fabio Pasquali. Logical foundations of quantitative equality. In Christel Baier and Dana Fisman, editors, *LICS '22: 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Haifa, Israel, August 2 - 5, 2022*, pages 16:1–16:13. ACM, 2022.
- [13] Fredrik Dahlqvist and Renato Neves. A complete v-equational system for graded lambda-calculus. In Marie Kerjean and Paul Blain Levy, editors, *Proceedings of the 39th Conference on the Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics, MFPS XXXIX, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA, June 21-23, 2023*, volume 3 of *EPTICS*. EpiSciences, 2023.
- [14] Fredrik Dahlqvist and Renato Neves. The syntactic side of autonomous categories enriched over generalised metric spaces. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 19(4), 2023.
- [15] Arthur Azevedo de Amorim, Marco Gaboardi, Justin Hsu, Shin-ya Katsumata, and Ikram Cherigui. A semantic account of metric preservation. In Giuseppe Castagna and Andrew D. Gordon, editors, *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2017, Paris, France, January 18-20, 2017*, pages 545–556. ACM, 2017.
- [16] Erik P. de Vink and Jan J. M. M. Rutten. Bisimulation for probabilistic transition systems: A coalgebraic approach. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 221(1-2):271–293, 1999.
- [17] J. Desharnais, V. Gupta, R. Jagadeesan, and P. Panangaden. Approximation of labeled Markov processes. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual IEEE Symposium On Logic In Computer Science*, pages 95–106. IEEE Computer Society Press, June 2000.
- [18] Weiming Feng, Liqiang Liu, and Tianren Liu. On deterministically approximating total variation distance. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1766–1791. SIAM, 2024.
- [19] Marco Gaboardi, Shin-ya Katsumata, Dominic A. Orchard, Flavien Breuvert, and Tarmo Uustalu. Combining effects and coefficients via grading. In Jacques Garrigue, Gabriele Keller, and Eijiro Sumii, editors, *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming, ICFP 2016, Nara, Japan, September 18-22, 2016*, pages 476–489. ACM, 2016.
- [20] Daniel Gratzer. A modal deconstruction of löb induction. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 9(POPL), January 2025.
- [21] Simon Oddershede Gregersen, Alejandro Aguirre, Philipp G. Haselwarter, Joseph Tassarotti, and Lars Birkedal. Asynchronous probabilistic couplings in higher-order separation logic. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(POPL):753–784, 2024.
- [22] Alessandro Giacalone Chi-Chang Jou and Scott A. Smolka. Algebraic reasoning for probabilistic concurrent systems. In *PROCOMET*, pages 443–458. North Holland, 1994.
- [23] Magnus Baunsgaard Kristensen, Rasmus Ejlers Møgelberg, and Andrea Vezzosi. Greatest hits: Higher inductive types in coinductive definitions via induction under clocks. In Christel Baier and Dana Fisman, editors, *LICS '22: 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Haifa, Israel, August 2 - 5, 2022*, pages 42:1–42:13. ACM, 2022.
- [24] Ugo Dal Lago and Francesco Gavazzo. Effectful program distancing. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 6(POPL):1–30, 2022.
- [25] Kim Guldstrand Larsen and Arne Skou. Bisimulation through probabilistic testing. *Information and Computation*, 94(1):1–28, 1991.
- [26] William F. Lawvere. Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories. In *Seminario Mat. e. Fis. di Milano*, volume 43, pages 135–166. Springer, 1973.
- [27] Torngny Lindvall. *Lectures on the Coupling Method*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley, New York, 1992.
- [28] Radu Mardare, Prakash Panangaden, and Gordon D. Plotkin. Quantitative algebraic reasoning. In Martin Grohe, Eric Koskinen, and Natarajan Shankar, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS '16, New York, NY, USA, July 5-8, 2016*, pages 700–709. ACM, 2016.
- [29] Radu Mardare, Prakash Panangaden, and Gordon D. Plotkin. Free complete wasserstein algebras. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 14(3), 2018.
- [30] Radu Mardare, Prakash Panangaden, and Gordon D. Plotkin. Fixed-points for quantitative equational logics. In *LICS*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2021.
- [31] Carroll Morgan, Annabelle McIver, and Karen Seidel. Probabilistic predicate transformers. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 18(3):325–353, 1996.
- [32] Federico Olmedo, Benjamin Lucien Kaminski, Joost-Pieter Katoen, and Christoph Matheja. Reasoning about recursive probabilistic programs. In Martin Grohe, Eric Koskinen, and Natarajan Shankar, editors, *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS '16, New York, NY, USA, July 5-8, 2016*, pages 672–681. ACM, 2016.
- [33] Jason Reed and Benjamin C. Pierce. Distance makes the types grow stronger: a calculus for differential privacy. In Paul Hudak and Stephanie Weirich, editors, *Proceeding of the 15th ACM SIGPLAN international conference on Functional programming, ICFP 2010, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, September 27-29, 2010*, pages 157–168. ACM, 2010.

- [34] The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. <https://homotopytypetheory.org/book>, Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
- [35] Franck van Breugel. A behavioural pseudometric for metric labelled transition systems. In *CONCUR*, volume 3653 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 141–155. Springer, 2005.
- [36] Franck van Breugel, Claudio Hermida, Michael Makkai, and James Worrell. An accessible approach to behavioural pseudometrics. In *ICALP*, volume 3580 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1018–1030. Springer, 2005.
- [37] Franck van Breugel and James Worrell. A behavioural pseudometric for probabilistic transition systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 331(1):115–142, 2005.

A. Omitted proofs of Section II

We start by reviewing some known facts about  $\mathbf{CMet}$  as their are crucial for the technical development of the paper.

$\mathbf{CMet}$  is a symmetric monoidal closed category with monoidal product  $X \otimes Y$  being the metric space with underlying set  $X \times Y$  and distance function  $d_{X \otimes Y}((x, y)(x', y')) = d_X(x, x') \oplus d_Y(y, y')$ . The internal hom  $X \multimap Y$  is the set of non-expansive maps from  $X$  to  $Y$  with point-wise supremum metric  $d_{X \multimap Y}(f, g) = \sup_{x \in X} d_Y(f(x), g(x))$ . For  $A \in \mathbf{CMet}$ , the adjunction  $(- \otimes A) \dashv (A \multimap -)$  has counit  $\text{ev}: A \otimes (A \multimap X) \rightarrow X$  given by  $\text{ev}(a, f) = f(a)$  (the evaluation map). Note that  $\otimes$  is not the categorical product in  $\mathbf{CMet}$ , for which the distance function would have  $\max$  in place of  $\oplus$ , as  $\mathbf{CMet}$  is not Cartesian closed [26].

The symmetric monoidal closed structure of  $\mathbf{CMet}$  originates from the commutative unital quantale  $([0, 1], \geq, \oplus, \multimap, 0)$  over which distances take value. The tensor is truncated sum  $x \oplus y = \min\{x + y, 1\}$ , the unit is 0, and adjoint is truncated reversed subtraction  $x \multimap y = \max\{y - x, 0\}$ . Indeed, for all  $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$

$$x \oplus y \geq z \iff x + y \geq z \iff x \geq z - y \iff x \geq y \multimap z.$$

Observe that  $[0, 1]$  is taken with reverse order: the bottom element is 1, the top element is 0, meet is sup and join is inf.

The monoidal bifunctor  $\otimes: \mathbf{CMet} \times \mathbf{CMet} \rightarrow \mathbf{CMet}$  acts as

$$\textbf{Objects: } (X, d_X) \otimes (Y, d_Y) = (X \times Y, d_{X \otimes Y}) \quad \textbf{Morphisms: } (f \otimes g)(x, y) = (f(x), g(y)).$$

where  $d_{X \otimes Y}((x, y), (x', y')) = d_X(x, x') \oplus d_Y(y, y')$  is the truncated sum of the 1-bounded metrics  $d_X$  and  $d_Y$ .

**Proposition 23.**  $\otimes: \mathbf{CMet} \times \mathbf{CMet} \rightarrow \mathbf{CMet}$  is well-defined.

*Proof.* Let  $X, Y \in \mathbf{CMet}$ . We shall prove that  $d_{X \otimes Y}$  is a metric. Let  $x, x', x'' \in X, y, y', y'' \in Y$ . Then,

$$d_{X \otimes Y}((x, y)(x', y')) = 0 \iff d_X(x, x') = 0 \text{ and } d_Y(y, y') = 0 \iff x = x' \text{ and } y = y' \iff (x, y) = (x', y').$$

Symmetry follows by commutativity of  $\oplus$ . Observe that for 1-bounded metrics triangular inequality is equivalent to  $\forall a, b, c. d(a, c) \leq d(a, b) \oplus d(b, c)$ . Then, by associativity and commutativity of  $\oplus$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{X \otimes Y}((x, y)(x'', y'')) &= d_X(x, x'') \oplus d_Y(y, y'') \\ &\leq (d_X(x, x') \oplus d_X(x', x'')) \oplus (d_Y(y, y') \oplus d_Y(y', y'')) \\ &= d_{X \otimes Y}((x, y)(x', y')) \oplus d_{X \otimes Y}((x', y')(x'', y'')). \end{aligned}$$

On morphisms we shall prove that, if  $f: X \rightarrow Z$  and  $g: Y \rightarrow W$  are non-expansive maps, so is  $f \otimes g$ . Let  $x, x' \in X$  and  $y, y' \in Y$ . Then, by monotonicity of  $\oplus$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{X \otimes Y}((x, y), (x', y')) &= d_X(x, x') \oplus d_Y(y, y') \\ &\geq d_Z(f(x), f(x')) \oplus d_W(g(y), g(y')) \\ &= d_{Z \otimes W}((f(x), g(y)), (f(x'), g(y'))) \\ &= d_{Z \otimes W}((f \otimes g)(x, y), (f \otimes g)(x', y')). \end{aligned}$$

Functoriality of  $\otimes$  (i.e.,  $id_X \otimes id_Y = id_{X \otimes Y}$  and  $(f \circ g) \otimes (h \circ k) = (f \otimes h) \circ (g \otimes k)$ ) follows by routine calculations.  $\square$

Associativity and symmetry of the monoidal structure on  $\mathbf{CMet}$  is a direct consequence of the associativity and commutativity of truncated sum  $\oplus$  in  $[0, 1]$ .

The monoidal structure just described on  $\mathbf{CMet}$  is closed, that is, for any  $A \in \mathbf{CMet}$  the endofunctor  $(- \otimes A)$  has right adjoint  $(A \multimap -): \mathbf{CMet} \rightarrow \mathbf{CMet}$  defined by

$$\textbf{Objects: } A \multimap (X, d_X) = (\mathbf{CMet}(A, X), d_{A \multimap X}) \quad \textbf{Morphisms: } (A \multimap f)(g) = f \circ g.$$

where  $\mathbf{CMet}(A, X)$  the homset of non-expansive maps from  $A$  to  $X$  and  $d_{A \multimap X}(g, g') = \sup_{a \in A} d_X(g(a), g'(a))$ .

**Proposition 24.**  $(A \multimap -): \mathbf{CMet} \rightarrow \mathbf{CMet}$  is well-defined.

*Proof.* Let  $X \in \mathbf{CMet}$ . We shall prove that  $d_{A \multimap X}$  is a metric. Reflexivity and symmetry are trivial. Triangular inequality follows by (Scott-)continuity of sum

$$\begin{aligned} d_{A \multimap X}(g, h) &= \sup_{a \in A} d_X(g(a), h(a)) \leq \sup_{a \in A} d_X(g(a), k(a)) + d_X(k(a), h(a)) \\ &= \sup_{a \in A} d_X(g(a), k(a)) + \sup_{a \in A} d_X(k(a), h(a)). \end{aligned}$$

The functor  $(A \multimap -)$  is well-defined on morphisms because the composition of non-expansive functions is non-expansive. Functoriality follows routinely by definition of  $(A \multimap -)$  on morphisms.  $\square$

**Proposition 25.** For all  $A \in \mathbf{CMet}$ ,  $(- \otimes A) \dashv (A \multimap -)$ .

*Proof.* For  $A, B \in \mathbf{CMet}$ , the counit  $\text{ev}: A \otimes (A \multimap B) \rightarrow B$  is defined as the *evaluation map*:  $\text{ev}(a, g) = g(a)$ , for  $a \in A$  and  $g \in A \multimap B$ . Non-expansiveness follows by

$$d_{A \otimes (A \multimap B)}((a, g), (a', g')) = d_A(a, a') \oplus \sup_{b \in A} d_B(g(b), g'(b)) \geq \sup_{b \in A} d_B(g(b), g'(b)) = d_B(\text{ev}(a, g), \text{ev}(a', g')).$$

Naturality of  $\text{ev}_B^A$  on  $B$  follows by standard arguments.

We shall now prove the universal property of the adjunction. Let  $f: A \otimes X \rightarrow B$  a morphism in  $\mathbf{CMet}$  (i.e., a non-expansive map) then the map  $h: X \rightarrow (A \multimap B)$ , defined as  $h(x)(a) = f(a, x)$ . It easy to show that  $h$  is the only map such that  $f = \text{ev} \circ A \otimes h = f$ . We are left to show that  $h$  is non-expansive:

$$d_X(x, x') = \sup_{a \in A} d_{A \otimes X}((a, x), (a, x')) \geq \sup_{a \in A} d_B(f(a, x), f(a, x')) = d_{A \multimap B}(h(x), h(x')). \quad \square$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* The maps  $n_r$  and  $w_A$  are clearly non-expansive as  $\mathbf{1}$  is a discrete space and  $0 \cdot A = \mathbf{1}$ . Non-expansiveness of  $\kappa_{r,s,A}$  follows by monotonicity of multiplication.

The map  $m_{r,A,B}$  is non-expansive because

$$\begin{aligned} d_{r(A \otimes B)}((a, b), (a', b')) &= \min\{rd_A(a, a') + rd_B(b, b'), r, 1\} \\ &\leq \min\{rd_A(a, a') + rd_B(b, b'), 1\} \\ &= d_{rA \otimes rB}((a, b), (a', b')) \end{aligned}$$

If  $r \geq 1$  the middle inequality is an equality.

For  $c_{r,s,A}$ , note that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{(r+s)A}(a, a') &= \min\{(r+s)d_A(a, a'), 1\} \\ &= \min\{rd_A(a, a') + sd_A(a, a'), 1\} \\ &\geq \min\{d_{rA}(a, a') + d_{sA}(a, a'), 1\} \\ &= d_{rA \otimes sA}((a, a), (a', a')) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for  $\pi_{r,s,A}$ , note that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{(rs)A}(a, a') &= \min\{rsd_A(a, a'), 1\} \\ &\geq \min\{r \min\{sd_A(a, a'), 1\}, 1\} \\ &= d_{r(sA)}(a, a') \end{aligned}$$

and if  $s \leq 1$  or  $r \geq 1$ , then the inequality is an equality.  $\square$

### B. Omitted proofs of Section III

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Let  $f, f': cY \rightarrow Y$ . Since  $f(\text{fix}(f)) = \text{fix}(f)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d(\text{fix}(f), f(\text{fix}(f'))) &\leq cd(\text{fix}(f), \text{fix}(f')) \\ d(f(\text{fix}(f')), \text{fix}(f')) &\leq d(f, f') \end{aligned}$$

so that  $d(\text{fix}(f), \text{fix}(f')) \leq cd(\text{fix}(f), \text{fix}(f')) + d(f, f')$ , and

$$(1-c)d(\text{fix}(f), \text{fix}(f')) \leq d(f, f')$$

as desired. For the second statement, by currying  $f$  and composing with  $\text{fp}$  we see that

$$\text{fp}(f): (1-c)X \rightarrow (1-c)Y$$

which implies  $\text{fp}(f): X \rightarrow Y$  since  $\frac{1}{1-c}((1-c)X) = X$ .  $\square$



### C. Omitted proofs of Section IV

The Radon probability monad  $\mathcal{D}$  on  $\mathbf{CMet}$ , takes objects  $X \in \mathbf{CMet}$  to the space of Radon probability distributions over  $X$  and morphisms  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  to  $\mathcal{D}f: \mathcal{D}X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}Y$ , defined as  $\mathcal{D}f(\mu)(E) = \mu(f^{-1}(E))$ , for  $\mu \in \mathcal{D}X$  and  $E$  a Borel set in  $Y$  (a.k.a., the pushforward measure along  $f$ ). The unit  $\delta_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}X$  and multiplication  $m_X: \mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}X$ , are defined as follows, for  $x \in X$ ,  $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}X$ , and Borel set  $E \subseteq X$

$$\delta_X(x) = \delta_x, \quad m_X(\Phi)(E) = \int \mu(E) \Phi(d\mu),$$

where  $\delta_x$  is the Dirac measure at  $x$ .

In [29, Theorem 3.8], it is shown that the Radon probability monad can be characterized as the free IB algebra over complete metric spaces. This provides us with the following universal property for  $\mathcal{D}X$ : For any IB algebra  $Y$  and non-expansive map  $X \rightarrow Y$ , there exists a unique non-expansive map  $f^\sharp: \mathcal{D}X \rightarrow Y$  making the following diagrams commute, for all  $p \in (0, 1)$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p\mathcal{D}X \otimes \bar{p}\mathcal{D}X & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}X \xleftarrow{\delta_X} X \\ p f^\sharp \otimes \bar{p} f^\sharp \downarrow & & f^\sharp \downarrow \swarrow f \\ pY \otimes \bar{p}Y & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array}$$

where  $\bar{p} = (1 - p)$  and the maps without labels are the interpretations of  $\oplus_p$  in the respective IB algebras. The map  $f^\sharp$  is called *homomorphic extension* of  $f$ .

The proof of Proposition 5 follows from the universal property above.

*Proof of Proposition 5.* We first show the case where  $\Gamma$  is 1 (so can be ignored), and prove the cases  $r = 0$ ,  $0 < r \leq 1$ , and  $1 < r < \infty$  separately.

CASE  $r = 0$ : Follows by defining  $\bar{f} = f$  as  $0X = \mathbf{1} = 0\mathcal{D}X$ . Uniqueness of the map also follows trivially.

CASE  $0 < r \leq 1$ : Observe that in this cases, the spaces  $r\mathcal{D}X$  and  $\mathcal{D}(rX)$  are equal. Indeed,  $X$  and  $rX$  have same topology and Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. Therefore  $\mathcal{D}X$  and  $\mathcal{D}(rX)$  have same underlying set of Radon measures. Moreover, by linearity of the integral:

$$d_{r\mathcal{D}X}(\mu, \nu) = r \left( \min_{\omega} \int d_X \omega \right) = \min_{\omega} \int r d_X \omega = d_{\mathcal{D}(rX)}(\mu, \nu).$$

Let  $f^\sharp: \mathcal{D}(rX) \rightarrow Y$  be the homomorphic extension of  $f: rX \rightarrow Y$ . By the equality  $r\mathcal{D}X = \mathcal{D}(rX)$ , a good candidate for  $\bar{f}: r\mathcal{D}X \rightarrow Y$  is  $f^\sharp$ . So let  $\bar{f} = f^\sharp$ . Clearly,  $\bar{f}$  is non-expansive. As  $X$  and  $rX$  have some Borel sets,  $r\delta_X(x) = \delta_x = \delta_{rX}(x)$ , therefore  $f = \bar{f} \circ r\delta_X$ . Furthermore, the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (pr)\mathcal{D}X \otimes (\bar{p}r)\mathcal{D}X & \xrightarrow{m} & r(p\mathcal{D}X \otimes \bar{p}\mathcal{D}X) \longrightarrow r\mathcal{D}X \\ \pi \otimes \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{f} \\ p(r\mathcal{D}X) \otimes \bar{p}(r\mathcal{D}X) & \xrightarrow{p\bar{f} \otimes \bar{p}\bar{f}} & pY \otimes \bar{p}Y \longrightarrow Y \end{array}$$

can be easily established by direct calculation using the fact that  $f^\sharp$  is an homomorphism of IB algebras and the maps from Theorem 1 are identities.

CASE  $1 < r < \infty$ : Observe that, for  $1 \leq r < \infty$ , there is an adjunction  $r \cdot (-) \dashv \frac{1}{r} \cdot (-)$  on  $\mathbf{CMet}$  between scaling functor. Thus, define  $\tilde{f}: X \rightarrow \frac{1}{r}Y$  the adjoint of  $f: rX \rightarrow Y$ . Note that  $f$  and  $\tilde{f}$  have the same underlying set map. As  $\frac{1}{r} \leq 1$ , by Lemma 6,  $\frac{1}{r}Y$  is a IB algebra, with algebra structure  $p(\frac{1}{r}Y) \otimes \bar{p}(\frac{1}{r}Y) = \frac{1}{r}(pY) \otimes \frac{1}{r}(\bar{p}Y) \xrightarrow{m} \frac{1}{r}(pY \otimes \bar{p}Y) \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{r} \oplus_p} \frac{1}{r}Y$ . Note that the algebra structure of  $B$  and  $\frac{1}{r}B$  have the same underlying set-maps. Then, it make sense to define  $\tilde{f}: r\mathcal{D}X \rightarrow Y$  as the adjoint of  $(\tilde{f})^\sharp: \mathcal{D}X \rightarrow \frac{1}{r}Y$ , which is obtained as the unique homomorphic extension of  $\tilde{f}$ . The commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (pr)\mathcal{D}X \otimes (\bar{p}r)\mathcal{D}X & \xrightarrow{m} & r(p\mathcal{D}X \otimes \bar{p}\mathcal{D}X) \longrightarrow r\mathcal{D}X \\ \pi \otimes \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{f} \\ p(r\mathcal{D}X) \otimes \bar{p}(r\mathcal{D}X) & \xrightarrow{p\tilde{f} \otimes \bar{p}\tilde{f}} & pY \otimes \bar{p}Y \longrightarrow Y \end{array}$$

can be established by direct calculation using the fact that  $(\tilde{f})^\sharp$  is an homomorphism of IB algebras and  $\tilde{f}$  has the same underlying map of  $(\tilde{f})^\sharp$ , since the maps from Theorem 1 are identities.

The more general case where  $\Gamma$  is not assumed to be 1 can now be proved using Lemma 6. □

*Proof of Lemma 6.* The operation on  $A \multimap B$  can be defined as the adjoint correspondent to the operation

$$A \otimes p(A \multimap B) \otimes (1-p)(A \multimap B) \rightarrow B$$

defined as a composition using the maps

$$\begin{aligned} c_{p,1-p,A} : A &\rightarrow pA \otimes (1-p)A \\ m_{p,A,A \multimap B} : pA \otimes p(A \multimap B) &\rightarrow p(A \otimes (A \multimap B)) \end{aligned}$$

function evaluation and the operation on  $B$ .

For the algebra structure on  $rB$ , note that since  $r \leq 1$ ,

$$p(rB) \otimes (1-p)(rB) \cong r(pB) \otimes r(1-p)B$$

The algebra structure can therefore be defined using the natural transformation  $m$  from Theorem 1.  $\square$

#### D. Omitted proofs of Section V

*Proof of Lemma 7.* We prove each equality separately.

$\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 = \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_1$ : By induction on  $\Gamma_1$ . (Base case) Trivial. (Inductive step) Let  $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma'_1, x :^p A$ . By cases:

CASE  $x \in \Gamma_2$ : By compatibility,  $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2, x :^q A$ . Then  $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 = (\Gamma'_1 + \Gamma'_2), x :^{p+q} A = (\Gamma'_2 + \Gamma'_1), x :^{q+p} A = \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_1$ .

CASE  $x \notin \Gamma_2$ : Similar.

$\Gamma_1 + (\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3) = (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3$ : By induction on  $\Gamma_1$ . (Base case) Let  $\Gamma_1 = \langle \rangle$ . Then,  $\langle \rangle + (\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3) = \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 = (\langle \rangle + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3$ .

(Inductive step) Let  $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma'_1, x :^{p_1} A$ . By cases:

CASE  $x \in \Gamma_2, x \in \Gamma_3$ : By compatibility,  $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2, x :^{p_2} A$  and  $\Gamma_3 = \Gamma'_3, x :^{p_3} A$ . Then

$$\Gamma_1 + (\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3) = (\Gamma'_1 + (\Gamma'_2 + \Gamma'_3)), x :^{p_1 + (p_2 + p_3)} A = ((\Gamma'_1 + \Gamma'_2) + \Gamma'_3), x :^{(p_1 + p_2) + p_3} A = (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3.$$

CASE  $x \in \Gamma_2, x \notin \Gamma_3$ : By compatibility,  $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2, x :^{p_2} A$ .

$$\Gamma_1 + (\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3) = (\Gamma'_1 + (\Gamma'_2 + \Gamma_3)), x :^{p_1 + p_2} A = ((\Gamma'_1 + \Gamma'_2) + \Gamma_3), x :^{p_1 + p_2} A = (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) + \Gamma_3.$$

CASE  $x \notin \Gamma_2$  AND  $x \in \Gamma_3$ : Similar.

CASE  $x \notin \Gamma_2$  AND  $x \notin \Gamma_3$ : Similar.

$1 \cdot \Gamma = \Gamma$ : By definition.

$c \cdot (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) = c \cdot \Gamma_1 + c \cdot \Gamma_2$ : Induction on  $\Gamma_1$ . (Base case) Let  $\Gamma_1 = \langle \rangle$ . Then  $c \cdot (\langle \rangle + \Gamma_2) = c \cdot \Gamma_2 = \langle \rangle + c \cdot \Gamma_2 = c \cdot \langle \rangle + c \cdot \Gamma_2$ .

(Inductive step) Let  $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma'_1, x^p A$ . By cases

CASE  $x \in \Gamma_2$ : By compatibility,  $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2, x :^q A$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} c \cdot (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2) &= c \cdot ((\Gamma'_1 + \Gamma'_2), x :^{p+q} A) = c \cdot (\Gamma'_1 + \Gamma'_2), x :^{c(p+q)} A \\ &= (c \cdot \Gamma'_1 + c \cdot \Gamma'_2), x :^{cp+cq} A = (c \cdot \Gamma'_1, x :^c p) + (c \cdot \Gamma'_2, x :^c q) = c \cdot \Gamma_1 + c \cdot \Gamma_2 \end{aligned}$$

CASE  $x \notin \Gamma_2$ : Similar.

$(c+d) \cdot \Gamma = c \cdot \Gamma + d \cdot \Gamma$ : Induction on  $\Gamma$ . (Base case) Let  $\Gamma = \langle \rangle$ . Then we have  $(c+d) \cdot \langle \rangle = \langle \rangle = \langle \rangle + \langle \rangle = c \cdot \langle \rangle + d \cdot \langle \rangle$ .

(Inductive step) Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma', x^p A$ . Then,

$$(c+d) \cdot \Gamma = ((c+d) \cdot \Gamma'), x :^{(c+d)p} A = (c \cdot \Gamma' + d \cdot \Gamma'), x :^{cp+dp} A = (c \cdot \Gamma', x :^{cp} A) + (d \cdot \Gamma', x :^{dp} A) = c \cdot \Gamma + d \cdot \Gamma.$$

$(cd) \cdot \Gamma = c \cdot (d \cdot \Gamma)$ : Induction on  $\Gamma$ . (Base case) Let  $\Gamma = \langle \rangle$ . Then  $(cd) \cdot \langle \rangle = \langle \rangle = c \cdot \langle \rangle = c \cdot (d \cdot \langle \rangle)$ . (Inductive step) Let

$\Gamma = \Gamma', x^p A$ . Then,  $(cd) \cdot \Gamma = ((cd) \cdot \Gamma'), x :^{(cd)p} A = (c \cdot (d \cdot \Gamma')), x :^{c(dp)} A = c \cdot (d \cdot \Gamma', x :^{dp} A) = c \cdot (d \cdot \Gamma)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 9.* By induction on  $t$ , we show that  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  implies  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash t : A$ , whenever  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined.

CASE  $t = x$ . Then,  $\Gamma = \Gamma', x :^p A$ , for some  $p \geq 1$ . Let  $\Delta$  be a context such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined. If  $x \in \Delta$ , then  $\Delta = \Delta', x :^q A$  and  $\Gamma + \Delta = (\Gamma' + \Delta'), x^{p+q} A$ ; if  $x \notin \Delta$ , then  $\Gamma + \Delta = (\Gamma' + \Delta), x^p A$ . In both cases apply (VAR) to derive  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash x : A$ .

CASE  $t = \lambda y.u$ . Then,  $\Gamma, y :^p B \vdash u : C$  and  $A = B \multimap_p C$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined. Without loss of generality, assume that  $y \notin \Delta$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). By inductive hypothesis,  $(\Gamma, y :^p B) + \Delta \vdash u : C$ . As  $y \notin \Delta$ , we have  $(\Gamma, y :^p B) + \Delta = (\Gamma + \Delta), y :^p B$ . Apply (ABS) to get  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \lambda y.u : B \multimap_p C$ .

CASE  $t = uv$ . Then,  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + p \cdot \Gamma'', \Gamma' \vdash u : B \multimap_p A$  and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : B$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined, thus so is  $\Gamma' + \Delta$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma' + \Delta \vdash u : B \multimap_p A$ . Apply (APP) to obtain  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + p \cdot \Gamma'' \vdash uv : A$  and note that  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + p \cdot \Gamma'' = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = \langle u, v \rangle$ . Then  $A = B \times C$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash u : B$ , and  $\Gamma \vdash v : C$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash u : B$ , and  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash v : C$ . Apply (PAIR) to obtain  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \langle u, v \rangle : B \times C$ .

CASE  $t = \pi_i u$  ( $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ). Then  $A = A_i$  and  $\Gamma \vdash u : A_1 \times A_2$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash u : A_1 \times A_2$ . Apply ( $\pi_i$ ) to obtain  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \pi_i u : A_i$ .

CASE  $t = (u, v)$ . Then,  $A = B_p \otimes_q C$ ,  $\Gamma = p \cdot \Gamma' + q \cdot \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash u : B$  and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : C$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined. Then, also  $\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta$  is well-defined. By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta \vdash u : B$ . Apply ( $\otimes$ ) to get  $p \cdot (\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta) + q \cdot \Gamma'' \vdash (u, v) : B_p \otimes_q C$  and note that  $p \cdot (\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta) + q \cdot \Gamma'' = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = \text{let } (x, y) = u \text{ in } v$ . Then, we have  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma', x :^p B, y :^q C \vdash v : A$  and  $\Gamma'' \vdash u : B_p \otimes_q C$ . As  $\Delta$  is such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$ , then so is  $\Gamma'' + \Delta$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma'' + \Delta \vdash u : B_p \otimes_q C$ . Now in are in a position to apply (LET- $\otimes$ ) to get  $\Gamma' + (\Gamma'' + \Delta) \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = u \text{ in } v : A$  and note that  $\Gamma' + (\Gamma'' + \Delta) = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = \delta u$ . Then  $A = \mathcal{D}B$  and  $\Gamma \vdash u : B$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined. By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash u : B$ . Apply ( $\delta$ ) to obtain  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \delta u : \mathcal{D}B$ .

CASE  $t = u \oplus_p v$ . Then  $A = \mathcal{D}B$ ,  $\Gamma = p \cdot \Gamma' + (1-p) \cdot \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash u : \mathcal{D}B$  and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : \mathcal{D}B$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined, then so is  $\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta \vdash u : \mathcal{D}B$ . Apply ( $\oplus_p$ ) to obtain  $p \cdot (\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta) + (1-p) \Gamma'' \vdash u \oplus_p v : \mathcal{D}B$  and note that  $p \cdot (\Gamma' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta) + (1-p) \Gamma'' = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = \text{let } x = u \text{ in } v$ . Then,  $A$  is an IB algebra,  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + p \cdot \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma', x :^p C \vdash v : A$  and  $\Gamma'' \vdash u : \mathcal{D}A$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined, then so is  $\Gamma'' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma'' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta \vdash u : \mathcal{D}A$ . Apply (LET) to get  $\Gamma' + p \cdot (\Gamma'' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta) \vdash \text{let } x = u \text{ in } v : A$  and observe that  $\Gamma' + p \cdot (\Gamma'' + \frac{1}{p} \cdot \Delta) = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = z$ . Apply (ZERO).

CASE  $t = s(u)$ . Then,  $A = \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Gamma \vdash u : \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined. By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash u : \mathbb{N}$ . Apply (SUCC) to get  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash s(u) : \mathbb{N}$ .

CASE  $t = \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n)$ . Then  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + \infty \cdot \Gamma'' + \Gamma'''$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash z : A$ ,  $\Gamma'', x :^1 A, y :^1 \mathbb{N} \vdash s : A$  and  $\Gamma''' \vdash n : \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined, then so is  $\Gamma' + \Delta$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma' + \Delta \vdash z : A$ . Apply (REC) to get  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + \infty \cdot \Gamma'' + \Gamma''' \vdash \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n) : A$  and note that  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + \infty \cdot \Gamma'' + \Gamma''' = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = \text{fix } y.u$ . Then  $(1-p) \cdot \Gamma, y :^p A \vdash u : A$  for some  $p < 1$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined, then so is  $\Gamma + \frac{1}{1-p} \cdot \Delta$ . Without lost of generality, assume that  $y \notin \Delta$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). By inductive hypothesis,  $((1-p) \cdot \Gamma, y :^p A) \frac{1}{1-p} \cdot \Delta \vdash u : A$ . Observe that, as  $y \notin \Delta$ , by definition sum of contexts and Lemma 7 we have  $((1-p) \cdot \Gamma, y :^p A) + \frac{1}{1-p} \cdot \Delta = ((1-p) \cdot (\Gamma + \Delta), y :^p A)$ . Apply (FIX) to obtain  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \text{fix } y.u : A$ .

We continue the induction also considering the terms of the calculus extended with predicates defined as in Section VI. We will show only a few cases as the others are similar.

CASE  $t = (u = v)$ . Then  $A = \text{Prop}$ ,  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash u : B$ , and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : B$ , for some  $B$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined, then so is  $\Gamma' + \Delta$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma' + \Delta \vdash u : B$ . Apply ( $=$ ) to get  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + \Gamma'' \vdash u = v : \text{Prop}$  and note that  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + \Gamma'' = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = \varphi \bullet \psi$ . Then  $A = \text{Prop}$ ,  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ , and  $\Gamma'' \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined, then so is  $\Gamma' + \Delta$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma' + \Delta \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ . Apply ( $\bullet$ ) to get  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + \Gamma'' \vdash \varphi \bullet \psi : \text{Prop}$  and note that  $(\Gamma' + \Delta) + \Gamma'' = \Gamma + \Delta$  by Lemma 7.

CASE  $t = \varphi \wedge \psi$ . Then  $A = \text{Prop}$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ , and  $\Gamma \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined. By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ , and  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}$ . Apply ( $\wedge$ ) to get  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \varphi \wedge \psi : \text{Prop}$ .

CASE  $t = \exists x : B. \varphi$ . Then  $A = \text{Prop}$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p B \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be such that  $\Gamma + \Delta$  is well-defined. Without lost of generality, assume that  $x \notin \Delta$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). By inductive hypothesis,  $(\Gamma, x :^p B) + \Delta \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ . As  $x \notin \Delta$ , we have that  $(\Gamma, x :^p B) + \Delta = (\Gamma + \Delta), x :^p B$ . Apply ( $\exists$ ) to get  $\Gamma + \Delta \vdash \exists x : B : \varphi$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 10.* By induction on  $t$ , we show that  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B$  and  $\Gamma' \vdash u : A$  implies  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash t[u/x] : B$ , whenever  $\Gamma + \Gamma'$  is well-defined. (In the following, Lemma 7 will be applied implicitly.)

CASE  $t = y$ . We distinguish two sub-cases. If  $y = x$ , then  $p \geq 1$ ,  $A = B$ , and  $t[u/x] = u$ . By weakening (Lemma 9), we get  $\Gamma' + (\Gamma + (p-1) \cdot \Gamma') \vdash u : A$ . This corresponds to  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash u : A$  as  $\Gamma' + (\Gamma + (p-1) \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$ . If  $y \neq x$ , then  $t[u/x] = y$  and  $\Gamma = \Gamma'' + y :^q B$  for some  $q \geq 1$ . Apply (VAR) to obtain  $\Gamma \vdash y : B$ . Then, by weakening (Lemma 9), we obtain  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash y : B$ .

CASE  $t = \lambda y.v$ . Then  $B = C \multimap_q D$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p A, y :^q C \vdash v : D$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $y \notin \Gamma'$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). As  $\Gamma, y :^q C, x :^p A = \Gamma, x :^p A, y :^q C$ , by inductive hypothesis,  $(\Gamma, y :^q C) + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : D$ . As  $y \notin \Gamma'$ , we have  $(\Gamma, y :^q C) + p \cdot \Gamma' = (\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'), y :^q C$ . Then, apply (ABS) on  $(\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'), y :^q C \vdash v[u/x] : D$  to obtain  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \lambda y.v[u/x] : C \multimap_q D$  and note that  $t[u/x] = \lambda y.v[u/x]$ .

CASE  $t = vw$ . Then,  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash v : C \multimap_q B$  and  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash w : C$ , where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + q \cdot \Gamma_2$  and  $p = p_1 + q \cdot p_2$ . By inductive hypothesis we respectively get  $\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : C \multimap_q B$  and  $\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash w[u/x] : C$ . Now apply (APP) to obtain  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + q \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash v[u/x]w[u/x] : B$  and observe that  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + q \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$  and  $t[u/x] = v[u/x]w[u/x]$ .

CASE  $t = \langle v, w \rangle$ . Then,  $B = C \times D$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash v : C$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash w : D$ . By inductive hypothesis we respectively get,  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : C$  and  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash w[u/x] : D$ . Now apply (PAIR) to obtain  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \langle v[u/x], w[u/x] \rangle : C \times D$  and observe that  $t[u/x] = \langle v[u/x], w[u/x] \rangle$ .

CASE  $t = \pi_i v$  ( $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ). Then  $B = B_i$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash v : B_1 \times B_2$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : B_1 \times B_2$ . Now apply ( $\pi_i$ ) to obtain  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \pi_i(v[u/x]) : B_i$  and observe that  $t[u/x] = \pi_i(v[u/x])$ .

CASE  $t = (v, w)$ . Then,  $B = C_{q_1 \otimes q_2} D$ ,  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash v : C$  and  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash w : D$ , where  $\Gamma = q_1 \cdot \Gamma_1 + q_2 \cdot \Gamma_2$  and  $p = q_1 \cdot p_1 + q_2 \cdot p_2$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : C$  and  $\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash w[u/x] : D$ . Apply ( $\otimes$ ) to obtain  $q_1 \cdot (\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + q_2 \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash (v[u/x], w[u/x]) : C_{q_1 \otimes q_2} D$  and note that  $q_1 \cdot (\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + q_2 \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$  and  $t[u/x] = (v[u/x], w[u/x])$ .

CASE  $t = \text{let } (y, z) = v \text{ in } w$ . Assume  $y, z \notin \Gamma'$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). Then,  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash v : C_{q \otimes r} D$  and  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} A, y :^q C, z :^r D \vdash w : B$ , where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$  and  $p = p_1 + p_2$ . By inductive hypothesis, we respectively obtain that  $(\Gamma_1, y :^q C, z :^r D) + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash w[u/x] : B$  and  $\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : C_{q \otimes r} D$ . By observing that  $(\Gamma_1, y :^q C, z :^r D) + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' = (\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma'), y :^q C, z :^r D$  we can apply (LET- $\otimes$ ) to obtain  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash \text{let } (y, z) = v[u/x] \text{ in } w[u/x] : B$ . Now just observe that  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$  and  $t[u/x] = \text{let } (y, z) = v[u/x] \text{ in } w[u/x]$ .

CASE  $t = \delta v$ . Then  $B = DC$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash v : C$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : C$ . Apply ( $\delta$ ) to obtain  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \delta(v[u/x]) : DC$  and note that  $t[u/x] = \delta(v[u/x])$ .

CASE  $t = v \oplus_e w$ . Then,  $B = DC$ ,  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} \vdash v : DC$  and  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} \vdash w : DC$ , where  $\Gamma = e \cdot \Gamma_1 + (1 - e) \cdot \Gamma_2$  and  $p = e \cdot p_1 + (1 - e) \cdot p_2$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : DC$  and  $\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash w[u/x] : DC$ . Apply ( $\oplus_e$ ) to obtain  $e \cdot (\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (1 - e) \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash v[u/x] \oplus_p w[u/x] : DC$  and note that  $e \cdot (\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (1 - e) \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$  and  $t[u/x] = v[u/x] \oplus_p w[u/x]$ .

CASE  $t = (\text{let } y = v \text{ in } w)$ . Assume  $y \notin \Gamma'$  and  $y \neq x$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). Then,  $B$  is a IB algebra,  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} A, y :^q C \vdash w : B$  and  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash v : DC$ , where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + q \cdot \Gamma_2$  and  $p = p_1 + q \cdot p_2$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $(\Gamma_1, y :^q C) + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash w[u/x] : B$  and  $\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : DC$ . After observing the equality  $(\Gamma_1, y :^q C) + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' = (\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma'), y :^q C$ , apply (LET) to obtain  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + q \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash \text{let } y = v[u/x] \text{ in } w[u/x] : B$  and note that  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + q \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$  and  $t[u/x] = (\text{let } y = v[u/x] \text{ in } w[u/x])$ .

CASE  $t = z$ . Note that  $z[u/x] = z$  and apply (ZERO).

CASE  $t = s(v)$  Then  $B = \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash v : \mathbb{N}$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : \mathbb{N}$ . Apply (SUCC) to obtain  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash s(v[u/x]) : \mathbb{N}$  and note that  $t[u/x] = s(v[u/x])$ .

CASE  $t = \text{rec}(z, (y, y').s, n)$  Assume  $y, y' \notin \Gamma'$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). Then,  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash z : B$ ,  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} A, y :^1 B, y' :^1 \mathbb{N} \vdash s : B$ , and  $\Gamma_3, x :^{p_3} A \vdash n : \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \infty \cdot \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3$  and  $p = p_1 + \infty \cdot p_2 + p_3$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash z[u/x] : B$ ,  $(\Gamma_2, y :^1 B, y' :^1 \mathbb{N}) + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash s[u/x] : B$ , and  $\Gamma_3 + p_3 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash n[u/x] : \mathbb{N}$ . As  $(\Gamma_2, y :^1 B, y' :^1 \mathbb{N}) + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' = (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma'), y :^1 B, y' :^1 \mathbb{N}$ , we can apply (REC) to obtain

$$(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + \infty \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_3 + p_3 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash \text{rec}(z[u/x], (y, y').s[u/x], n[u/x]) : B$$

Now notice that  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + \infty \cdot (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_3 + p_3 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$  and  $t[u/x] = \text{rec}(z[u/x], (y, y').s[u/x], n[u/x])$ .

CASE  $t = \text{fix } y.v$ . Assume  $y \notin \Gamma'$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). Then,  $(1 - q) \cdot (\Gamma + x^p : A), y :^q B \vdash v : B$ , for some  $q < 1$ . As  $(1 - q) \cdot (\Gamma + x^p : A), y :^q B = (1 - q) \cdot \Gamma, y :^q B, x :^{(1-q)p} A$ , by inductive hypothesis we obtain that  $((1 - q) \cdot \Gamma, y :^q B) + ((1 - q)p) \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : B$ . Since  $((1 - q) \cdot \Gamma, y :^q B) + ((1 - q)p) \cdot \Gamma' = (1 - q) \cdot (\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'), y :^q B$ , we can apply (FIX) to obtain  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \text{fix } y.v[u/x] : B$ . Now note that  $t[u/x] = \text{fix } y.v[u/x]$ .

We continue the induction also considering the terms of the calculus extended with predicates defined as in Section VI. We will show only a few cases as the others are similar.

CASE  $t = (v = w)$ . Then,  $B = \text{Prop}$ ,  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash v : C$  and  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash w : C$  where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$  and  $p = p_1 + p_2$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash v[u/x] : C$  and  $\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash w[u/x] : C$ . Apply ( $=$ ) to get  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash v[u/x] = w[u/x] : \text{Prop}$  and observe that  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$  and  $t[u/x] = (v[u/x] = w[u/x])$ .

CASE  $t = \varphi \bullet \psi$ . Then,  $B = \text{Prop}$ ,  $\Gamma_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$  and  $\Gamma_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}$  where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$  and  $p = p_1 + p_2$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \varphi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$  and  $\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \psi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$ . Apply ( $\bullet$ ) to get  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') \vdash \varphi[u/x] \bullet \psi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$  and observe that  $(\Gamma_1 + p_1 \cdot \Gamma') + (\Gamma_2 + p_2 \cdot \Gamma') = \Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'$ .

CASE  $t = \varphi \wedge \psi$ . Then  $B = \text{Prop}$ ,  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ , and  $\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}$ . By inductive hypothesis we get  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \varphi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$ , and  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \psi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$ . Apply ( $\wedge$ ) to get  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \varphi[u/x] \wedge \psi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$  and observe that  $t[u/x] = \varphi[u/x] \wedge \psi[u/x]$ .

CASE  $t = \exists y : C.\varphi$ . Assume  $y \notin \Gamma'$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $t$ ). Then  $B = \text{Prop}$  and  $\Gamma, x^p A, y :^q C \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}$ . By inductive hypothesis we get  $(\Gamma, y :^q C) + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \varphi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$ . As  $(\Gamma, y :^q C) + p \cdot \Gamma' = (\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma'), y :^q C$ , we can apply ( $\exists$ ) and get  $\Gamma + p \cdot \Gamma' \vdash \exists y : C.\varphi[u/x] : \text{Prop}$ . Now note that  $t[u/x] = \exists y : C.\varphi[u/x]$ .  $\square$

Next we provide the omitted details about the definitions of the morphisms split and dist.

**Proposition 26.** For typing contexts  $\Gamma, \Delta$  and  $p \in [0, \infty]$  there exists morphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \text{split}_{\Gamma, \Delta} &: [\Gamma + \Delta] \rightarrow [\Gamma] \otimes [\Delta] \\ \text{dist}_{p, \Gamma} &: [p \cdot \Gamma] \rightarrow p \cdot [\Gamma] \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We define the maps simultaneously by induction on  $\Gamma$ .

BASE CASE: Let  $\Gamma = \langle \rangle$ . Define split as the left-unitor for  $\otimes$  and dist as the identity on  $\mathbf{1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{split}_{\langle \rangle, \Delta} &: [\langle \rangle + \Delta] = [\Delta] \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbf{1} \otimes [\Delta] = [\langle \rangle] \otimes [\Delta] \\ \text{dist}_{p, \langle \rangle} &: [p \cdot \langle \rangle] = \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbf{1} = p \cdot \mathbf{1} = p \cdot [\langle \rangle] \end{aligned}$$

INDUCTIVE STEP: Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma', x :^q A$ .

Thus,  $[p \cdot \Gamma] = [p \cdot \Gamma', x^{pq} A] = [p \cdot \Gamma'] \otimes (pq) \cdot [A]$ . Then, we define dist as the composite

$$\text{dist}_{p, \Gamma} : [p \cdot \Gamma'] \otimes (pq) \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\text{dist}_{p, \Gamma'} \otimes \delta} p \cdot [\Gamma'] \otimes p \cdot (q \cdot [A]) \xrightarrow{m} p \cdot ([\Gamma'] \otimes q \cdot [A]).$$

The definition split is given differently, according to whether  $x$  belongs to  $\Delta$  or not.

If  $x \in \Delta$ , then  $\Delta = \Delta', x :^q A$ . Thus,  $[\Gamma + \Delta] = [(\Gamma' + \Delta'), x^{p+q} A] = [\Gamma' + \Delta'] \otimes (p+q) \cdot [A]$ . Then, we define split as the composition

$$\text{split}_{\Gamma, \Delta} : [\Gamma' + \Delta'] \otimes (p+q) \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\text{split}_{\Gamma', \Delta'} \otimes c} ([\Gamma'] \otimes [\Delta']) \otimes (p \cdot [A] \otimes q \cdot [A]) \xrightarrow{\cong} [\Gamma] \otimes [\Delta]$$

where the last isomorphism is obtained from the associator and swap morphisms for  $\otimes$ , by observing that  $[\Gamma] \otimes [\Delta] = ([\Gamma'] \otimes p \cdot [A]) \otimes ([\Delta'] \otimes q \cdot [A])$ .

If  $x \notin \Delta$ , then  $[\Gamma + \Delta] = [(\Gamma' + \Delta), x^p A] = [\Gamma' + \Delta] \otimes p \cdot [A]$ . Define split as the composition

$$\text{split}_{\Gamma, \Delta} : [\Gamma' + \Delta] \otimes p \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\text{split}_{\Gamma', \Delta} \otimes p[A]} ([\Gamma'] \otimes [\Delta]) \otimes p \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\cong} [\Gamma] \otimes [\Delta]$$

where the last isomorphism is obtained from the associator and swap morphisms for  $\otimes$ , by observing that  $[\Gamma] \otimes [\Delta] = ([\Gamma'] \otimes p \cdot [A]) \otimes [\Delta]$ .  $\square$

Next we provide the omitted details about the interpretation of the terms of the calculus. Recall that only well-formed terms have an interpretation, which is given as a morphism in **CMet** of type

$$[\Gamma \vdash t : A] : [\Gamma] \rightarrow [A]$$

The interpretation of  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$  is given by induction on its formation trees, build according to the typing rules in Figure 1. Observe that the exercise when giving the definition is ensuring the maps are non-expansive. This will be implicit as we give the definitions as composite of non-expansive maps. (In the following, we use  $\llbracket t \rrbracket$  as a shorthand for the more formal  $[\Gamma \vdash t : A]$  when the types are clear from the contexts.)

CASE  $t = x$ . Then  $\Gamma = \Gamma', x :^p A$  and  $p \geq 1$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket x \rrbracket$  as the composition

$$\llbracket x \rrbracket : [\Gamma'] \otimes p \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\pi_2} p \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathbf{1} \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\epsilon} [A].$$

CASE  $t = \lambda x.u$ . Then,  $A = B \multimap_p C$  and  $\Gamma, x :^p B \vdash u : C$ . By induction we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : [\Gamma] \otimes p \cdot [B] \rightarrow [C]$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket \lambda x.u \rrbracket$  as

$$\llbracket \lambda x.u \rrbracket : [\Gamma] \xrightarrow{\text{curry}(\llbracket u \rrbracket)} [B \multimap_p C].$$

CASE  $t = uv$ . Then,  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + p \cdot \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash u : B \multimap_p A$ , and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : B$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : [\Gamma'] \rightarrow [B \multimap_p A]$  and  $\llbracket v \rrbracket : [\Gamma''] \rightarrow [B]$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket uv \rrbracket$  as the composition

$$\llbracket uv \rrbracket : [\Gamma' + p \cdot \Gamma''] \xrightarrow{\text{split}} [\Gamma'] \otimes [p \cdot \Gamma''] \xrightarrow{[\Gamma'] \otimes \text{dist}} [\Gamma'] \otimes p \cdot [\Gamma''] \xrightarrow{[\llbracket u \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket v \rrbracket \rrbracket]} [B \multimap_p A] \otimes p \cdot [A] \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} [A]$$

CASE  $t = \langle u, v \rangle$ . Then,  $A = B \times C$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash u : B$ , and  $\Gamma \vdash v : C$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : [\Gamma] \rightarrow [B]$  and  $\llbracket v \rrbracket : [\Gamma] \rightarrow [C]$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket \langle u, v \rangle \rrbracket$  as

$$\llbracket \langle u, v \rangle \rrbracket : [\Gamma] \xrightarrow{\langle \llbracket u \rrbracket, \llbracket v \rrbracket \rrbracket} [B \times C]$$

CASE  $t = \pi_i u$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Then,  $A = A_i$ ,  $\Gamma \vdash u : A_1 \times A_2$ . By induction we have,  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : [\Gamma] \rightarrow [A_1] \times [A_2]$ . Then we define  $\llbracket \pi_i u \rrbracket$  as the composition

$$\llbracket \pi_i u \rrbracket : [\Gamma] \xrightarrow{\llbracket u \rrbracket} [A_1] \times [A_2] \xrightarrow{\pi_i} [A_i]$$

CASE  $t = (u, v)$ . Then  $\Gamma = p \cdot \Gamma' + q \cdot \Gamma''$ ,  $A = B_{p \otimes q} C$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash u : B$ , and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : C$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket v \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket C \rrbracket$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket (u, v) \rrbracket$  as the composition

$$\llbracket (u, v) \rrbracket : \llbracket p \cdot \Gamma' + q \cdot \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{split}} \llbracket p \cdot \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket q \cdot \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{dist} \otimes \text{dist}} p \cdot \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes q \cdot \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{p \llbracket u \rrbracket \otimes q \llbracket v \rrbracket} \llbracket B_{p \otimes q} C \rrbracket$$

CASE  $t = \text{let } (x, y) = v \text{ in } u$ . Then  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma', x :^p B, y :^q C \vdash u : A$  and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : B_{p \otimes q} C$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket B_{p \otimes q} C \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket v \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket B_{p \otimes q} C \rrbracket$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket \text{let } (x, y) = v \text{ in } u \rrbracket$  as

$$\llbracket \text{let } (x, y) = v \text{ in } u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma' + \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{split}} \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket v \rrbracket} \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket B_{p \otimes q} C \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket u \rrbracket} \llbracket A \rrbracket$$

CASE  $t = \delta(u)$ . Then  $A = \mathcal{D}B$  and  $\Gamma \vdash u : B$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket$ . Then, define  $\llbracket \delta(u) \rrbracket$  as

$$\llbracket \delta(u) \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket u \rrbracket} \llbracket B \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\delta_B} \llbracket \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket$$

CASE  $t = u \oplus_p v$ . Then  $A = \mathcal{D}B$ ,  $\Gamma = p \cdot \Gamma' + (1 - p) \cdot \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma' \vdash u : \mathcal{D}B$  and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : \mathcal{D}B$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\llbracket B \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket v \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\llbracket B \rrbracket$ . Then, define  $\llbracket u \oplus_p v \rrbracket$  as the following composite, where  $\bar{p} = (1 - p)$ :

$$\llbracket u \oplus_p v \rrbracket : \llbracket p \cdot \Gamma' + \bar{p} \cdot \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{(\text{dist} \otimes \text{dist}) \circ \text{split}} p \cdot \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes \bar{p} \cdot \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{p \llbracket u \rrbracket \otimes \bar{p} \llbracket v \rrbracket} p \cdot \mathcal{D}\llbracket B \rrbracket \otimes \bar{p} \cdot \mathcal{D}\llbracket B \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\oplus_p} \llbracket \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket$$

CASE  $t = \text{let } x = v \text{ in } u$ . Then  $\llbracket A \rrbracket$  is an IB algebra,  $\Gamma = \Gamma' + p \cdot \Gamma''$ ,  $\Gamma', x :^p B \vdash u : A$ , and  $\Gamma'' \vdash v : \mathcal{D}B$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes p \cdot \llbracket B \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket v \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\llbracket B \rrbracket$ . By Proposition 5, from  $\llbracket u \rrbracket$  we obtain  $\overline{\llbracket u \rrbracket} : \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes p \cdot \mathcal{D}\llbracket B \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket \text{let } x = v \text{ in } u \rrbracket$  as the composite

$$\llbracket \text{let } x = v \text{ in } u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma' + p \cdot \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{(\llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes \text{dist}) \circ \text{split}} \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes p \cdot \llbracket \Gamma'' \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket v \rrbracket} \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \otimes p \cdot \mathcal{D}\llbracket B \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\overline{\llbracket u \rrbracket}} \llbracket A \rrbracket$$

CASE  $t = z$ . Then  $A = \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $0 : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be the constant 0-map. Then, we define  $\llbracket z \rrbracket$  as the composite

$$\llbracket z \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\cong} \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes \mathbf{1} \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \mathbf{1} \xrightarrow{0} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket$$

CASE  $t = s(u)$ . Then  $A = \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Gamma \vdash u : \mathbb{N}$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . Then, we define  $\llbracket s(u) \rrbracket$  as

$$\llbracket s(u) \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket u \rrbracket} \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{-+1} \llbracket \mathbb{N} \rrbracket$$

CASE  $t = \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n)$ . Then  $\Gamma = \Gamma_z + \infty \cdot \Gamma_s + \Gamma_n$ ,  $\Gamma_z \vdash z : A$ ,  $\Gamma_s, x :^1 A, y :^1 \mathbb{N} \vdash s : A$ , and  $\Gamma_n \vdash n : \mathbb{N}$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket z \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma_z \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$ ,  $\llbracket s \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma_s \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$ , and  $\llbracket n \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma_n \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $F = \llbracket A \rrbracket \multimap \mathbb{N} \multimap \llbracket A \rrbracket$ . Define the morphisms  $\text{iterate}(n) : \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty \cdot F \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$  by induction on  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{iterate}(0) &: \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty \cdot F \xrightarrow{\pi_1} \llbracket A \rrbracket \\ \text{iterate}(m+1) &: \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty \cdot F \xrightarrow{(\llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \text{copy})} \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty \cdot F \otimes \infty \cdot F \\ &\dots \xrightarrow{\text{iterate}(n) \otimes \kappa} \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes F \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \mathbb{N} \multimap \llbracket A \rrbracket \xrightarrow{m \otimes (\mathbb{N} \multimap \llbracket A \rrbracket)} \mathbb{N} \otimes \mathbb{N} \multimap \llbracket A \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\text{ev}} \llbracket A \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

where  $m : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is the constant  $m$ -map and  $\text{copy} : \infty \cdot F \rightarrow \infty \cdot F \otimes \infty \cdot F$  is the diagonal function, which is non-expansive as  $\infty \cdot F$  is discrete. Observe that for discrete spaces  $X$ , the isomorphism  $Y \otimes X \cong \coprod_{x \in X} Y$  holds. Thus, as  $\mathbb{N}$  is discrete, we can combine the morphisms above, into a single one defined as follows

$$\text{iterate} : \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty \cdot F \otimes \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\cong} \coprod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} (\llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty \cdot F) \xrightarrow{\coprod_n \text{iterate}(m)} \llbracket A \rrbracket$$

From the morphisms above we define the interpretation of  $\llbracket \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n) \rrbracket$  as the composite

$$\llbracket \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n) \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma_z + \infty \cdot \Gamma_s + \Gamma_n \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma_z \rrbracket + \infty \cdot \llbracket \Gamma_s \rrbracket + \llbracket \Gamma_n \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket z \rrbracket \otimes \infty s' \otimes \llbracket n \rrbracket} \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty \cdot F \otimes \mathbb{N} \xrightarrow{\text{iterate}} \llbracket A \rrbracket$$

where the first morphism is obtained using split and dist, and  $s' = \text{curry}(\text{curry}(\llbracket s \rrbracket))$  is the curried version of  $\llbracket s \rrbracket$ .

CASE  $t = \text{fix } x.u$ . Then  $(1 - p)\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : A$  and  $p < 1$ . By induction, we have  $\llbracket u \rrbracket : \llbracket (1 - p) \cdot \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \cdot \llbracket A \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$ . Then we define  $\llbracket \text{fix } x.u \rrbracket$  as the application of the map  $\text{fp}$  from Proposition 2 to  $(\text{dist} \otimes p \llbracket A \rrbracket) \circ \llbracket u \rrbracket : (1 - p) \cdot \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \cdot \llbracket A \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$ :

$$\llbracket \text{fix } x.u \rrbracket : \Gamma \xrightarrow{\text{fp}((\text{dist} \otimes p \llbracket A \rrbracket) \circ \llbracket u \rrbracket)} \llbracket A \rrbracket$$

**Notation 1** (Implicit use of split and dist). *In order to simplify certain arguments in the coming proofs, we will use the maps split and dist implicitly. With the following consequences in the notation:*

- When we write  $\llbracket \Gamma_1 + p\Gamma_2 \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ , the arguments should be interpreted as  $\gamma_i = \pi_i \circ (\llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket \otimes \text{dist}) \circ \text{split}(\gamma)$ , for some  $\gamma \in \llbracket \Gamma_1 + p\Gamma_2 \rrbracket$ . Thus, in the previous case,  $\gamma_1 \in \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket$  and  $\gamma_2 \in p\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket$ .
- Note that, split duplicates the arguments associated with variables used multiple times in separate contexts. This is reflected in the notation, e.g.,  $\llbracket (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2), x :^{p+q} A \vdash t : B \rrbracket((\gamma_1, \gamma_2), a) = \llbracket (\Gamma_1, x :^p A) + (\Gamma_2, x :^q A) \vdash t : B \rrbracket((\gamma_1, a), (\gamma_2, a))$ .
- We will also strictly follow a positional notation, so, as in the previous example, the order of the arguments will always match that of the contexts and variables appearing on the left-hand-side of the turnstile. However, to avoid an excessive use of parenthesis  $\llbracket (\Gamma_1, x :^p A) + (\Gamma_2, x :^q A) \vdash t : B \rrbracket((\gamma_1, a), (\gamma_2, a)) = \llbracket (\Gamma_1, x :^p A) + (\Gamma_2, x :^q A) \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\gamma_1, a, \gamma_2, a)$ .

What follows is the explicit definition for the interpretations of the terms of the calculus. Note that the maps split and dist are used implicitly as per Notation 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash x : A \rrbracket(\gamma, a) &= a \\
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \lambda x.t : A \multimap_p B \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \text{curry}(\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\gamma)) \\
\llbracket \Gamma + p\Gamma \vdash tu : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \multimap_p B \rrbracket(\gamma)(p\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : A \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \langle t, u \rangle : A \times B \rrbracket(\gamma) &= (\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma), \llbracket \Gamma \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\gamma)) \\
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \pi_i t : A_i \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \pi_i(\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A_1 \times A_2 \rrbracket(\gamma)) \\
\llbracket p\Gamma + q\Gamma' \vdash (t, u) : A_p \otimes_q B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= (p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma), q\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\
\llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = u \text{ in } t : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash t : C \rrbracket(\gamma, \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : A_p \otimes_q B \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \delta(t) : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \delta_{\llbracket A \rrbracket}(\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma)) \\
\llbracket p\Gamma + (1-p)\Gamma' \vdash t \oplus_p u : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma) \oplus_p (1-p)\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma') \\
\llbracket \Gamma + p\Gamma' \vdash \text{let } x = u \text{ in } t : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\gamma, p\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma'))} \\
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash z : \mathbb{N} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= 0 \\
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash s(u) : \mathbb{N} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \llbracket \Gamma \vdash u : \mathbb{N} \rrbracket(\gamma) + 1 \\
\llbracket \Gamma + \infty\Gamma' + \Gamma'' \vdash \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n) : A \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'') &= \text{iterate}(z(\gamma), \infty s(\gamma'), n(\gamma'')) \\
&\text{where } z = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash z : A \rrbracket \\
&\quad s = \text{curry} \circ \text{curry} \circ \llbracket \Gamma', x :^1 A, y :^1 \mathbb{N} \vdash s : A \rrbracket \\
&\quad n = \llbracket \Gamma'' \vdash n : \mathbb{N} \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \text{fix } x.t : A \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \text{fp}(\llbracket (1-p)\Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma))
\end{aligned}$$

and iterate:  $\llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \infty(\llbracket A \rrbracket \multimap \mathbb{N} \multimap \llbracket A \rrbracket) \otimes \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$  is defined by induction on  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{iterate}(a, f, 0) &= a \\
\text{iterate}(a, f, n+1) &= f(\text{iterate}(a, f, n))(n).
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 12 (Semantic Weakening).* By using the maps split and dist implicitly, as we did for the semantic interpretation of terms, the statement to prove simplifies to

$$\llbracket \Delta + \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma) = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma)$$

We proceed by induction on the derivation of  $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ . (We select only the cases that are interesting).

CASE (VAR). Let  $\Gamma, x :^c A \vdash x : A$  and  $\Delta$  an arbitrary context. Without loss of generality, we can express  $\Delta + \Gamma$  as  $(\Delta' + \Gamma), x :^{p+q} A$  for some  $\Delta'$  and  $q \in [0, \infty]$ . We need to show  $\llbracket (\Delta' + \Gamma), x :^{p+q} A \vdash x : A \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, a) = \llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash x : A \rrbracket(\gamma, a)$ . This follows by definition of the semantic for term variables.

CASE (ABS). Let  $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.t : A \multimap_p B$  and  $\Delta$  a context. Assume  $x \notin \Delta$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \lambda x.t : A \multimap_p B \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \text{curry}(\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\gamma)) \\
&= \text{curry}(\llbracket (\Delta + \Gamma), x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma)) \\
&= \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma \vdash \lambda x.t : A \multimap_p B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is justified by

$$\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\gamma, a) \stackrel{(\text{ind.hp})}{=} \llbracket \Delta + (\Gamma, x :^p A) \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, a) = \llbracket (\Delta + \Gamma), x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, a)$$

which formally correspond to the equality of the maps  $\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket \circ (\text{weakening} \otimes \llbracket A \rrbracket) = \llbracket (\Delta + \Gamma), x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket$ .

CASE (APP): Let  $\Gamma + p\Gamma' \vdash tu : B$  and  $\Delta$  arbitrary contexts. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Gamma + p\Gamma' \vdash tu : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \multimap_p B \rrbracket(\gamma)(p\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : A \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma \vdash t : A \multimap_p B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma)(p\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : A \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma + p\Gamma' \vdash tu : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \gamma') \end{aligned} \quad (\text{ind.hp})$$

CASE ( $\otimes$ ) Let  $p\Gamma + q\Gamma' \vdash (t, u) : A_{p \otimes q} B$  and  $\Delta$  an arbitrary context. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket p\Gamma + q\Gamma' \vdash (t, u) : A_{p \otimes q} B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= (p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma), q\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ &= (p\llbracket \Delta + \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma), q\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ &= \llbracket p(\Delta + \Gamma) + q\Gamma' \vdash (t, u) : A_{p \otimes q} B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \gamma') \\ &= \llbracket p\Delta + p\Gamma + q\Gamma' \vdash (t, u) : A_{p \otimes q} B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \gamma') \end{aligned} \quad (\text{ind.hp})$$

By the generality of  $\Delta$ , the above is enough to prove the claim.

CASE (LET- $\otimes$ ) Let  $\Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = u \text{ in } t : B$  and  $\Delta, \Delta'$  arbitrary contexts. Assume without loss of generality that  $x \notin \Delta$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = u \text{ in } t : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : A_{p \otimes q} B \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta + (\Gamma, x :^p A) \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : A_{p \otimes q} B \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta + \Gamma), x :^p A \vdash t : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash u : A_{p \otimes q} B \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = u \text{ in } t : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \gamma') \end{aligned} \quad (\text{ind.hp})$$

CASE (REC) Let  $\Gamma + \infty\Gamma' + \Gamma'' \vdash \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n) : A$  and  $\Delta$  arbitrary context. For convenience, let  $t = \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n)$  in the following. By definition of semantic interpretation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Gamma + \infty\Gamma' + \Gamma'' \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'') &= \text{iterate}(z(\gamma), \infty s(\gamma'), n(\gamma'')) \\ &\quad \text{where } z = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash z : A \rrbracket \\ &\quad \quad s = \text{curry} \circ \text{curry} \circ \llbracket \Gamma', x :^1 A, y :^1 \mathbb{N} \vdash s : A \rrbracket \\ &\quad \quad n = \llbracket \Gamma'' \vdash n : \mathbb{N} \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

Define  $\text{zw} \triangleq \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma \vdash z : A \rrbracket$  and observe that by inductive hypothesis  $\text{zw}(\delta, \gamma) = z(\gamma)$ . Thus we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Gamma + \infty\Gamma' + \Gamma'' \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'') &= \text{iterate}(z(\gamma), \infty s(\gamma'), n(\gamma'')) \\ &= \text{iterate}(\text{zw}(\delta, \gamma), \infty s(\gamma'), n(\gamma'')) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma + \infty\Gamma' + \Gamma'' \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \gamma', \gamma'') \end{aligned}$$

We remark that the proof follows similarly also for the terms of the calculus extended with the logical formulas defined in Section VI. (See below for an explicit definition of the interpretation of formulas).  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 12 (Semantic Substitution).* By using the maps split and dist implicitly, as we did for the semantic interpretation of terms, the statement to prove simplifies to:

$$\llbracket \Delta + p\Gamma \vdash u[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma) = \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\delta, p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma))$$

We proceed by induction on the derivation of  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash u : B$ . (We show only few interesting cases).

CASE (VAR) We have two cases: when the variable gets substituted or not.

- Let  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash x : A$ . Then  $x[t/x] = t$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Delta + p\Gamma \vdash x[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma) &= \llbracket p\Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma) && (\text{SemWeak (Lemma 12)}) \\ &= p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma) && (\text{implicit dist}) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A \vdash x : A \rrbracket(\delta, p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma)) \end{aligned}$$

- Let  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash y : B$  for  $y \neq x$ . Then,  $\Delta = \Delta', y :^q B$  and  $y[t/x] = y$ .

$$\llbracket (\Delta', y :^q B) + p\Gamma \vdash y[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta', b, \gamma) = b = \llbracket (\Delta', y :^q B), x :^p A \vdash y : B \rrbracket(\delta', b, p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma))$$



CASE (ABS) Let  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \lambda y.v : B \multimap_q C$ . Assume  $y \notin \Gamma$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion). By definition of semantic interpretation we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Delta + p\Gamma \vdash (\lambda y.v)[t/x] : B \multimap_q C \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma) &= \text{curry}(\llbracket (\Delta + p\Gamma), y :^q B \vdash v[t/x] : C \rrbracket)(\delta, \gamma) \\ &= \text{curry}(\llbracket \Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash v : C \rrbracket)(\delta, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \quad (*) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A \vdash \lambda y.v : B \multimap_q C \rrbracket(\delta, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is justified by the fact that, for all  $b \in \llbracket B \rrbracket$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\Delta + p\Gamma), y :^q B \vdash v[t/x] : C \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, b) &= \llbracket (\Delta, y :^q B) + p\Gamma \vdash v[t/x] : C \rrbracket(\delta, b, \gamma) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta, y :^q B, x :^p A \vdash v : C \rrbracket(\delta, b, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \quad (\text{ind.hp}) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash v : C \rrbracket(\delta, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma), b) \end{aligned}$$

CASE (APP) Let  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash uv : B$ . This means that  $\Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash u : C \multimap_q B$  and  $\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash v : C$  for some  $\Delta_i$  and  $p_i$  such that  $\Delta = \Delta_1 + q\Delta_2$  and  $p = p_1 + qp_2$ . By definition of semantic interpretation and inductive hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\Delta_1 + q\Delta_2) + p\Gamma \vdash (uv)[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \delta_2, \gamma) &= \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma) + q(\Delta_2 + p_2\Gamma) \vdash (uv)[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \gamma, \delta_2, \gamma) \quad (\text{implicit split}) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma \vdash u[t/x] : C \multimap_q B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \gamma)(q[\Delta_2 + p_2\Gamma \vdash v[t/x] : C](\delta_2, \gamma)) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash u : C \multimap_q B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma))(q[\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash v : C](\delta_2, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma))) \quad (\text{ind.hp}) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A) + q(\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A) \vdash uv : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma), \delta_2, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma)) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1 + q\Delta_2), x :^p A \vdash uv : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \delta_2, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma)) \quad (\text{implicit split}) \end{aligned}$$

CASE ( $\otimes$ ) Let  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash (u, v) : B_{q \otimes_r} C$ . This means that  $\Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash u : A$  and  $\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash v : B$  for some  $\Delta_i$  and  $p_i$  such that  $\Delta = q\Delta_1 + r\Delta_2$  and  $p = qp_1 + rp_2$ . By definition of semantic interpretation and inductive hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket q\Delta_1 + r\Delta_2 + p\Gamma \vdash (u, v)[t/x] : B_{q \otimes_r} C \rrbracket(\delta_1, \delta_2, \gamma) &= \\ &= \llbracket q(\Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma) + r(\Delta_2 + p_2\Gamma) \vdash (u, v)[t/x] : B_{q \otimes_r} C \rrbracket(\delta_1, \gamma, \delta_2, \gamma) \quad (\text{implicit split}) \\ &= (q[\Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma \vdash u[t/x] : A](\delta_1, \gamma), r[\Delta_2 + p_2\Gamma \vdash v[t/x] : B](\delta_2, \gamma)) \\ &= (q[\Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A \vdash u : A](\delta_1, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma)), r[\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash v : B](\delta_2, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma))) \quad (\text{ind.hp}) \\ &= \llbracket q(\Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A) + r(\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A) \vdash (u, v) : B_{q \otimes_r} C \rrbracket(\delta_1, p_1[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma), \delta_2, p_2[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \\ &= \llbracket (q\Delta_1 + r\Delta_2), x :^p A \vdash (u, v) : B_{q \otimes_r} C \rrbracket(\delta_1, \delta_2, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \quad (\text{implicit split}) \end{aligned}$$

CASE (LET) Let  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \text{let } y = u \text{ in } v : B$  and assume  $y \notin \Gamma$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion). Then we must have that  $\Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A, y :^q C \vdash v : B$  and  $\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash u : DC$  for some  $q < \infty$ ,  $\Delta_i$ , and  $p_i$  such that  $\Delta = \Delta_1 + q\Delta_2$  and  $p = p_1 + qp_2$ . By definition of semantic interpretation and inductive hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\Delta_1 + q\Delta_2) + p\Gamma \vdash (\text{let } y = u \text{ in } v)[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \delta_2, \gamma) &= \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma) + q(\Delta_2 + p_2\Gamma) \vdash (\text{let } y = u \text{ in } v)[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \gamma, \delta_2, \gamma) \quad (\text{implicit split}) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma), y :^q C \vdash v[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \gamma, q[\Delta_2 + p_2\Gamma \vdash u[t/x] : DC](\delta_2, \gamma)) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma), y :^q C \vdash v[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \gamma, q[\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash u : DC](\delta_2, p_2[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma))) \quad (\text{ind.hp}) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta_1, x^{p_1} A, y :^q C \vdash v : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, p_1[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma), q[\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A \vdash u : DC](\delta_2, p_2[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma))) \quad (*) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1, x :^{p_1} A) + q(\Delta_2, x :^{p_2} A) \vdash \text{let } y = u \text{ in } v : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, p_1[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma), \delta_2, p_2[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1 + q\Delta_2), x :^p A \vdash \text{let } y = u \text{ in } v : B \rrbracket(\delta_1, \delta_2, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \quad (\text{implicit split}) \end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is justified by uniqueness of the homomorphic extension (Proposition 5) and the following equality

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket (\Delta_1 + p_1\Gamma), y :^q C \vdash v[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, c) &= \llbracket (\Delta_1, y :^q C) + p_1\Gamma \vdash v[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta, c, \gamma) \\ &= \llbracket (\Delta_1, y :^q C), x^{p_1} A \vdash v : B \rrbracket(\delta, c, p_1[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \quad (\text{ind.hp}) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta_1, x^{p_1} A, y :^q C \vdash v : B \rrbracket(\delta, p_1[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma), c) \end{aligned}$$

CASE (FIX) Let  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \text{fix } y.u : B$  and assume  $y \notin \Gamma$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion). By definition of semantic interpretation, for some  $q < 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Delta + p\Gamma \vdash (\text{fix } y.u)[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma) &= \text{fp}(\llbracket (1 - q)(\Delta + p\Gamma), y :^q B \vdash u[t/x] : B \rrbracket)(\delta, \gamma) \\ &= \text{fp}(\llbracket (1 - q)(\Delta, x :^p A), y :^q B \vdash u : B \rrbracket)(\delta, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \quad (*) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A \vdash (\text{fix } y.u) : B \rrbracket(\delta, p[\Gamma \vdash t : A](\gamma)) \end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is justified by well-definition of Proposition 2 and the following equality

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket (1-q)(\Delta + p\Gamma), y :^q B \vdash u[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, b) \\
&= \llbracket ((1-q)\Delta, y :^q B) + (1-q)p\Gamma \vdash u[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\delta, b, \gamma) \\
&= \llbracket (1-q)\Delta, y :^q B, x :^{(1-q)p} A \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\delta, b, (1-q)p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma)) \quad (\text{ind.hp}) \\
&= \llbracket (1-q)(\Delta, x :^p A), y :^q B \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\delta, (1-q)p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma), b)
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that the proof follows similarly also for the terms of the calculus extended with the logical formulas defined in Section VI. (See below for an explicit definition of the interpretation of formulas).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 11(Soundness).* As the interpretation of terms is for most parts the usual set-theoretic one, we will avoid showing soundness of the standard judgmental equalities, such as  $\beta$  and  $\eta$  rules and those for paring and pairing.

CASE LET- $\otimes$ : We prove soundness for the two judgmental equalities involving the let- $\otimes$  binding operator.

The first one is  $\text{let } (x, y) = (s, t) \text{ in } u \equiv u[s/x, t/y]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Delta + p\Gamma + q\Gamma \vdash u[s/x, t/y] : C \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \gamma') &= \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash u : C \rrbracket(\delta, p\llbracket \Gamma \vdash s : A \rrbracket, q\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash t : B \rrbracket) \quad (\text{Lemma 12}) \\
&= \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash u : C \rrbracket(\delta, \llbracket p\Gamma + q\Gamma' \vdash (s, t) : A_{p\otimes q}B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma')) \\
&= \llbracket \Delta + p\Gamma + q\Gamma \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = (s, t) \text{ in } u : C \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma, \gamma')
\end{aligned}$$

The second one is  $u[t/z] \equiv \text{let } (x, y) = t \text{ in } u[(x, y)/z]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma \vdash \text{let } (x, y) = t \text{ in } u[(x, y)/z] : C \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma) \\
&= \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash u[(x, y)/z] : C \rrbracket(\delta, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A_{p\otimes q}B \rrbracket(\gamma)) \\
&= \llbracket \Delta, z :^1 A_{p\otimes q}B \vdash u : C \rrbracket(\delta, \llbracket x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash (x, y) : A_{p\otimes q}B \rrbracket(\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A_{p\otimes q}B \rrbracket(\gamma))) \quad (\text{Lemma 12}) \\
&= \llbracket \Delta, z :^1 A_{p\otimes q}B \vdash u : C \rrbracket(\delta, \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A_{p\otimes q}B \rrbracket(\gamma)) \quad (*) \\
&= \llbracket \Delta + \Gamma \vdash u[t/z] : C \rrbracket(\delta, \gamma) \quad (\text{Lemma 12})
\end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is justified by the following equality, where  $(a, b) = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A_{p\otimes q}B \rrbracket(\gamma)$  (thus,  $a \in p\llbracket A \rrbracket$  and  $b \in q\llbracket B \rrbracket$ ):

$$\llbracket x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash (x, y) : A_{p\otimes q}B \rrbracket(a, b) = (p\llbracket x :^1 A \vdash x : A \rrbracket(a), q\llbracket y :^1 B \vdash y : B \rrbracket(b)) = (a, b)$$

CASE LET: We prove soundness for the three judgmental equalities involving the let binding operator.

Unit law:  $\text{let } x = \delta(t) \text{ in } u \equiv u[t/x]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Gamma + p\Gamma' \vdash \text{let } x = \delta(t) \text{ in } u : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : B \rrbracket}(\gamma, p\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash \delta(t) : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\
&= \overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : B \rrbracket}(\gamma, p\delta_{\llbracket A \rrbracket}(\llbracket \Gamma' \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma'))) \\
&= \llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma')) \quad (\text{Proposition 5}) \\
&= \llbracket \Gamma + p\Gamma' \vdash u[t/x] : B \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') \quad (\text{Lemma 12})
\end{aligned}$$

Associativity law:  $(\text{let } x = (\text{let } y = s \text{ in } t) \text{ in } u) \equiv (\text{let } y = s \text{ in } (\text{let } x = t \text{ in } u))$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \Gamma + p(\Delta + q\Delta') \vdash \text{let } x = (\text{let } y = s \text{ in } t) \text{ in } u : A \rrbracket(\gamma, \delta, \delta') \\
&= \overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : C \rrbracket}(\gamma, p\llbracket \Delta + q\Delta' \vdash \text{let } y = s \text{ in } t : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\delta, \delta')) \\
&= \overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : C \rrbracket}(\gamma, p\llbracket \Delta, y :^q B \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\delta, q\llbracket \Delta' \vdash s : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta')))) \\
&= \overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : C \rrbracket}(\gamma, p\llbracket \Delta, y :^q B \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\delta, pq\llbracket \Delta' \vdash s : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta')))) \quad (*) \\
&= \overline{\llbracket (\Gamma + p\Delta), y :^{pq} B \vdash \text{let } x = t \text{ in } u : C \rrbracket}(\gamma, \delta, pq\llbracket \Delta' \vdash s : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta')) \\
&= \llbracket \Gamma + p(\Delta + q\Delta') \vdash \text{let } y = s \text{ in } (\text{let } x = t \text{ in } u) : C \rrbracket(\gamma, \delta, \delta')
\end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is justified by the fact that  $\overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : C \rrbracket} \circ (\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p\llbracket \Delta, y :^q B \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket \circ m)$  is the unique homomorphic extension of  $\overline{\llbracket \Gamma, x :^p A \vdash u : C \rrbracket} \circ (\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p\llbracket \Delta, y :^q B \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket \circ m)$  in the sense of Proposition 5 as the following commuting diagram shows and the fact that the natural transformation  $m$  from Theorem 1 has the identity as underlying set-map:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \otimes pq \llbracket B \rrbracket & \xrightarrow{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \otimes pq \delta_{\llbracket B \rrbracket}} & \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \otimes pq \mathcal{D} \llbracket B \rrbracket \\
\downarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes m & \text{(naturality)} & \downarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes m \\
\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p(\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket) \otimes q \llbracket B \rrbracket & \xrightarrow{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p(\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket) \otimes q \delta_{\llbracket B \rrbracket}} & \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p(\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket) \otimes q \mathcal{D} \llbracket B \rrbracket \\
& \text{(Prop. 5)} & \downarrow \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket t \rrbracket \\
& \xrightarrow{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \llbracket t \rrbracket} & \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \otimes p \mathcal{D} \llbracket A \rrbracket \\
& & \downarrow \llbracket u \rrbracket \\
& & \llbracket C \rrbracket
\end{array}$$

Homomorphism: let  $x = s \oplus_p t$  in  $u \equiv (\text{let } x = s \text{ in } u) \oplus_p (\text{let } x = t \text{ in } u)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \Gamma + q(p\Delta + (1-p)\Delta') \vdash \text{let } x = s \oplus_p t \text{ in } u : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma, \delta, \delta') \\
&= \bar{u}(\gamma, q \llbracket (p\Delta + (1-p)\Delta') \vdash s \oplus_p t : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta, \delta')) \\
&= \bar{u}(\gamma, pq \llbracket \Delta \vdash s : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta) \oplus_p (1-p)q \llbracket \Delta' \vdash t : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta')) \\
&= p\bar{u}(\gamma, q \llbracket \Delta \vdash s : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta)) \oplus_p (1-p)\bar{u}(\gamma, q \llbracket \Delta' \vdash t : \mathcal{D}B \rrbracket(\delta')) \quad (\bar{u} \text{ homo}) \\
&= p \llbracket \Gamma + q\Delta \vdash \text{let } x = s \text{ in } u : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma, \delta) \oplus_p (1-p) \llbracket \Gamma + q\Delta' \vdash \text{let } x = t \text{ in } u : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma, \delta') \\
&= \llbracket \Gamma + q(p\Delta + (1-p)\Delta') \vdash (\text{let } x = s \text{ in } u) \oplus_p (\text{let } x = t \text{ in } u) : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(\gamma, \delta, \delta')
\end{aligned}$$

where  $u = \llbracket \Gamma, x :^q \mathcal{D}B \vdash u : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket$  and, by Proposition 5,  $\bar{u}$  is an homomorphism of IB algebras on its second component.

CASE REC: The judgmental equalities regarding recursion on natural numbers

$$\text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, z) \equiv z \quad \text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, s(n)) \equiv s[\text{rec}(z, (x, y).s, n)/x, n/y]$$

follow by definition of the iterate map and Lemma 12. The only thing to observe is that both sides of the equalities are well typed in the same context thanks to weakening (Lemma 12).

CASE FIX: The judgmental equality regarding fixed points

$$\text{fix } x.t = t[\text{fix } x.t/x]$$

follows directly by definition of the fixed point operator fp and Lemma 12. □

### E. Omitted proofs of Section VI

**Lemma 27.** *The following are non-expansive maps*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oplus, \multimap : \mathbf{Prop} \otimes \mathbf{Prop} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop} \\
& \min\{p \cdot -, 1\} : p \cdot \mathbf{Prop} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop} \quad (\text{for } p \in (0, \infty]) \\
& \text{sup, inf} : (\infty \cdot X \multimap \mathbf{Prop}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop} \\
& \text{max, min} : \mathbf{Prop} \times \mathbf{Prop} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop} \\
& d_X : X \otimes X \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We prove non-expansiveness separately for each function:

CASE  $\oplus$ : Let  $a, a', b, b' \in \mathbf{Prop}$ . We need to prove the following two inequalities:

$$(|a - a'| \oplus |b - b'|) + (a \oplus b) \geq a' \oplus b' \quad \text{and} \quad (|a - a'| \oplus |b - b'|) + (a' \oplus b') \geq a \oplus b.$$

We prove only the latter, as the former follows similarly as  $|x - y| = |y - x|$ .

If  $|a - a'| + |b - b'| + a' + b' \geq 1$  we are done. Otherwise

$$\begin{aligned}
(|a - a'| \oplus |b - b'|) + (a' \oplus b') &= |a - a'| + |b - b'| + a' + b' \\
&\geq (a - a') + (b - b') + a' + b' \\
&= a + b \\
&\geq a \oplus b.
\end{aligned}$$

CASE  $\multimap$ : Let  $a, a', b, b' \in \mathbf{Prop}$ . We need to prove the following two inequalities:

$$(|a - a'| \oplus |b - b'|) + (a \multimap b) \geq a' \multimap b' \quad \text{and} \quad (|a - a'| \oplus |b - b'|) + (a' \multimap b') \geq a \multimap b.$$

We prove only the former, as the latter follows.

If  $|a - a'| + |b - b'| \geq 1$  or  $b' - a' \leq 0$  we are done, as both sides of the inequalities are in  $[0, 1]$ . Otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} (|a - a'| \oplus |b - b'|) + (a \multimap b) &= |a - a'| + |b' - b| + (a \multimap b) \\ &\geq (a - a') + (b' - b) + (b - a) \\ &= b' - a' \\ &= a' \multimap b'. \end{aligned}$$

CASE  $\min\{p \cdot -, 1\}$ : Let  $a, b \in \mathbf{Prop}$  and  $p \in (0, \infty]$ . We need to prove the following two inequalities

$$\min\{p|a - b|, 1\} + \min\{pa, 1\} \geq \min\{pb, 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \min\{p|a - b|, 1\} + \min\{pb, 1\} \geq \min\{pa, 1\}$$

We prove only the latter, as the other follows similarly using the fact that  $|x - y| = |y - x|$ .

If  $p|a - b| + pb \geq 1$  we are done. Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{p|a - b|, 1\} + \min\{pb, 1\} &= p|a - b| + pb \\ &\geq p(a - b) + pb \\ &= pa \\ &\geq \min\{pa, 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

CASE  $\sup$ : Let  $f, g: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be set-maps (thus, elements of the metric space  $\infty \cdot X \multimap \mathbf{Prop}$ ). We need to prove that

$$\sup_x |f(x) - g(x)| \geq |\sup_x f(x) - \sup_x g(x)|.$$

First notice that

1) For any  $A \subseteq [-1, 1]$ ,  $|\sup A| \leq \sup |A|$ , where  $|A| = \{|a| \mid a \in A\}$ .

Indeed, because  $a \leq |a|$ , we have  $\sup A \leq \sup |A|$ . If  $\sup A \geq 0$  we are done. If  $\sup A < 0$ , let  $-A \triangleq \{-a \mid a \in A\}$ .

Then  $|A| = -A$ . Moreover,  $|\sup A| = -\sup A = \inf(-A) = \inf |A| \leq \sup |A|$ .

2) For any  $h, i: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $\sup_x (h(x) + i(x)) \leq \sup_x h(x) + \sup_x i(x)$ .

Indeed,  $\sup_x (h(x) + i(x)) = \sup B$  and  $\sup_x h(x) + \sup_x i(x) = \sup B'$  where  $B \triangleq \{h(x) + i(y) \mid x, y \in X \text{ and } x = y\}$  is a subset of  $B' \triangleq \{h(x) + i(y) \mid x, y \in X\}$ .

By instantiating (1) with  $A = \{f(x) - g(x) \mid x \in X\}$ , we get  $\sup_x |f(x) - g(x)| \geq |\sup_x (f(x) - g(x))|$ ; and by instantiating (2) with  $h = f - g$  and  $i = g$  we get  $\sup_x (f(x) - g(x)) \geq \sup_x f(x) - \sup_x g(x)$ .

From the above we conclude that

$$\sup_x |f(x) - g(x)| \geq |\sup_x (f(x) - g(x))| \geq \sup_x (f(x) - g(x)) \geq \sup_x f(x) - \sup_x g(x). \quad (16)$$

If  $\sup_x f(x) \geq \sup_x g(x)$  we are done. Otherwise, if  $\sup_x f(x) < \sup_x g(x)$ , we have that

$$\sup_x |f(x) - g(x)| = \sup_x |g(x) - f(x)| \geq \sup_x g(x) - \sup_x f(x) = |\sup_x f(x) - \sup_x g(x)|$$

where the inequality follows as for (16) by inverting the roles of  $f$  and  $g$ .

CASE  $\inf$ : Let  $f, g: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be set-maps (thus, elements of the metric space  $\infty \cdot X \multimap \mathbf{Prop}$ ). Non-expansiveness follows by non-expansiveness of  $\sup$  (shown above) by noticing the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_x |f(x) - g(x)| &= \sup_x |(1 - f)(x) - (1 - g)(x)| \\ &\geq |\sup_x (1 - f)(x) - \sup_x (1 - g)(x)| \quad (\text{sup non-exp}) \\ &= |(1 - \inf_x f(x)) - (1 - \inf_x g(x))| \\ &= |\inf_x f(x) - \inf_x g(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

CASE  $\max$ : Let  $a, a', b, b' \in \mathbf{Prop}$ . We need to prove the following inequalities:

$$\max\{|a - a'|, |b - b'|\} + \max\{a, b\} \geq \max\{a', b'\} \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{|a - a'|, |b - b'|\} + \max\{a', b'\} \geq \max\{a, b\}.$$

We prove only the latter, as the former follows similarly by using the fact that  $|x - y| = |y - x|$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{|a - a'|, |b - b'|\} + \max\{a', b'\} &\geq \max\{|a - a'|, |b - b'|\} + a' \\ &\geq (a - a') + a' \\ &= a \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,  $\max\{|a - a'|, |b - b'|\} + \max\{a', b'\} \geq b$ . Thus, conclude  $\max\{|a - a'|, |b - b'|\} + \max\{a', b'\} \geq \max\{a, b\}$ .

CASE  $\min$ : It follows from non-expansiveness of  $\max$  by noticing that  $\min\{a, b\} = 1 - \max\{1 - a, 1 - b\}$  and that  $|a - b| = |(1 - a) - (1 - b)|$ .

CASE  $d_X$ : Let  $a, a', b, b' \in \mathbf{Prop}$ . We need to prove the following two inequalities:

$$(d_X(a, a') \oplus d_X(a, b')) + d_X(a, b) \geq d_X(a', b') \quad \text{and} \quad (d_X(a, a') \oplus d_X(a, b')) + d_X(a', b') \geq d_X(a, b).$$

We prove only the former, as the latter follows similarly. If  $d_X(a, a') \oplus d_X(a, b') \geq 1$ , we are done. Otherwise,

$$\begin{aligned} (d_X(a, a') \oplus d_X(a, b')) + d_X(a, b) &= d_X(a, a') + d_X(a, b') + d_X(a, b) \\ &= d_X(a', a) + d_X(a, b) + d_X(a, b') && \text{(symmetry)} \\ &\geq d_X(a', b'). && \text{(triangular inequality)} \end{aligned}$$

□

Next we provide the explicit definition for the interpretations of logical formulas. As we did for the interpretation of terms, the maps  $\text{split}$  and  $\text{dist}$  are used implicitly as per Notation 1.

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \text{tt} : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= 0 \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \text{ff} : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= 1 \\ \llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash t =_A s : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= d_{\llbracket A \rrbracket}(\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : A \rrbracket(\gamma), \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash s : A \rrbracket(\gamma')) \\ \llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \varphi \bullet \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) \oplus \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma') \\ \llbracket \Gamma + \Gamma' \vdash \varphi \bullet\!\!\bullet \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) \multimap \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma') \\ \llbracket p\Gamma \vdash p\varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \min\{p \cdot \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma), 1\} \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \neg\varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= 1 - \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi \wedge \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \max\{\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma), \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma)\} \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi \vee \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \min\{\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma), \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma)\} \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \exists x : A. \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \inf_{a \in \llbracket A \rrbracket} \llbracket \Gamma, x :^\infty A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma, a) \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \forall x : A. \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) &= \sup_{a \in \llbracket A \rrbracket} \llbracket \Gamma, x :^\infty A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma, a) \\ \llbracket p\Gamma + (1 - p)\Gamma' \vdash \phi \oplus_p \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma, \gamma') &= p \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \phi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma) \oplus_p (1 - p) \llbracket \Gamma' \vdash \psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\gamma') \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Theorem 14 (Soundness).* We need to show that all the rules of inference in Figure 5 preserve soundness. Observe that the rules (TRUE), (FALSE), (EX), ( $\bullet$ -I), ( $\bullet$ -E), ( $\multimap$ -I), ( $\multimap$ -E), ( $\wedge$ -I), ( $\wedge$ -EL/R), ( $\vee$ -I/R), and ( $\vee$ -E) are sound with the expected interpretation on a generic commutative quantale. Thus they are sound also in  $\mathbf{Prop}$ . The remaining cases are considered below.

As for most cases, the typing context is understood, we simply write  $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$  for  $\llbracket \Delta \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket$ . Also, for  $\Psi = \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n$  a list of predicates, we define  $\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket(\delta) \triangleq \bigoplus_i \llbracket \psi_i \rrbracket(\delta)$ .

RULE (PR): Let  $p > 0$  and assume  $\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket(\delta) \geq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta)$ , for all  $\delta \in \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$ . Let  $\delta \in \Delta$ . If  $\llbracket p\Psi \rrbracket(\delta) = 1$  then  $\llbracket p\Psi \rrbracket(\delta) \geq \llbracket p\varphi \rrbracket(\delta)$  holds trivially. Let  $\llbracket p\Psi \rrbracket(\delta) < 1$ . Clearly,  $\llbracket p\psi_i \rrbracket(\delta) < 1$ , for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Moreover,

$$\llbracket p\Psi \rrbracket(\delta) = \bigoplus_i \min\{p \cdot \llbracket \psi_i \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} = p \cdot \sum_i \llbracket \psi_i \rrbracket(\delta) \geq p \cdot \bigoplus_i \llbracket \psi_i \rrbracket(\delta) = p \cdot \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket(\delta) \geq p \cdot \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta) \geq \llbracket p\varphi \rrbracket(\delta).$$

RULE (DUP): Soundness of both directions of the rule follows by the following equality

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket p\varphi \rrbracket(\delta) \oplus \llbracket q\varphi \rrbracket(\delta) &= \min\{p \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} \oplus \min\{q \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} \\ &= \min\{p \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta) + q \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} \\ &= \min\{(p + q) \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} \\ &= \llbracket (p + q)\varphi \rrbracket(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

RULE (DER): Soundness of both directions follows by  $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket(\delta) = \min\{\llbracket \psi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} = \min\{1 \cdot \llbracket \psi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} = \llbracket 1\psi \rrbracket(\delta)$ .

RULE (INC): Soundness follows by monotonicity of  $\oplus$  (in both arguments) and the fact that, whenever  $p \leq q$ , we have

$$\llbracket p\psi \rrbracket(\delta) = \min\{p \cdot \llbracket \psi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} \leq \min\{q \cdot \llbracket \psi \rrbracket(\delta), 1\} = \llbracket q\psi \rrbracket(\delta).$$

RULE (ASSOC<sub>1</sub>): Soundness follows by monotonicity of  $\oplus$  (in both arguments) and the following inequality

$$\llbracket r(s\psi) \rrbracket(\delta) = \min\{r \cdot \min\{s \llbracket \psi \rrbracket, 1\}, 1\} = \min\{rs \cdot \llbracket \psi \rrbracket, r, 1\} \leq \min\{rs \cdot \llbracket \psi \rrbracket, 1\} = \llbracket (rs)\psi \rrbracket.$$

RULE (ASSOC<sub>2</sub>): Soundness follows by monotonicity of  $\oplus$  (in both arguments) and the fact that the inequality proven in the case (ASSOC<sub>1</sub>) is an equality when  $s \leq 1$  or  $r \geq 1$ .

RULE (G-REC): Soundness follows, as for  $p \in (0, 1)$  we have  $(1-p)[\Psi](\delta) \oplus p[\varphi](\delta) = (1-p)[\Psi](\delta) + p[\varphi](\delta)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} (1-p)[\Psi](\delta) + p[\varphi](\delta) \geq [\varphi](\delta) &\iff (1-p)[\Psi](\delta) \geq (1-p)[\varphi](\delta) \\ &\iff [\Psi](\delta) \geq (1-p)[\varphi](\delta). \end{aligned}$$

RULE ( $\neg$ -I): Soundness follows by the fact that  $\neg$  is right adjoint to  $\oplus$  and the interpretation of ff. Indeed,

$$[\Psi](\delta) \oplus [\varphi](\delta) \geq [\text{ff}](\delta) \iff [\Psi](\delta) \geq [\varphi](\delta) \neg [\text{ff}](\delta)$$

and  $[\varphi](\delta) \neg [\text{ff}](\delta) = \max\{1 - [\varphi](\delta), 0\} = 1 - [\varphi](\delta) = [\neg\varphi](\delta)$ .

RULE ( $\neg$ -E): Soundness follows by the fact that  $\neg$  is right adjoint to  $\oplus$  and the interpretation of ff. Indeed,

$$[\Psi](\delta) \oplus [\neg\varphi](\delta) \geq [\text{ff}](\delta) \iff [\Psi](\delta) \geq [\neg\varphi](\delta) \neg [\text{ff}](\delta)$$

and  $[\neg\varphi](\delta) \neg [\text{ff}](\delta) = \max\{1 - [\neg\varphi](\delta), 0\} = \max\{[\varphi](\delta), 0\} = [\varphi](\delta)$ .

RULE ( $\exists$ -I) Soundness follows by the following:

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta) &\geq [\Delta \vdash \varphi[t/x] : \text{Prop}](\delta) && \text{(premise)} \\ &= [\Delta + \infty\Delta \vdash \varphi[t/x] : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) && \text{(implicit split)} \\ &= [\Delta, x : A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta, [\Delta \vdash t : A](\delta)) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \\ &\geq \inf_{a \in [A]} [\Delta, x : A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a) \\ &= [\Delta \vdash \exists x : A. \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta). \end{aligned}$$

RULE ( $\exists$ -E): Assume  $[\Delta, x : A \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a) \oplus [\Delta, x : A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a) \geq [\Delta, x : A \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a)$ , for all  $\delta \in [\Delta]$  and  $a \in [A]$ . As the logical judgment appearing in the conclusion of the rule is well-formed, we know that  $\Delta \vdash \Psi$  and  $\Delta \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}$ . Thus, by Lemma 12, we have

$$[\Delta, x : A \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a) = [\Delta \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta) \quad \text{and} \quad [\Delta, x : A \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a) = [\Delta \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}](\delta)$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} [\Delta \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}](\delta) &\leq \inf_{a \in [A]} ([\Delta \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta) \oplus [\Delta, x : A \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a)) \\ &= [\Delta \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta) \oplus \inf_{a \in [A]} [\Delta, x : A \vdash \psi : \text{Prop}](\delta, a) \\ &= [\Delta \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta) \oplus [\Delta \vdash \exists x : A. \varphi : \text{Prop}]. \end{aligned}$$

RULE ( $\forall$ -I/E) The proof of soundness follows similarly to those for existential quantifier, only that reasoning has to be thought with the order reversed.

CASE (EQ-I): Soundness follows as a direct consequence of the interpretation of equality as a distance. Indeed

$$[t =_A t](\delta) = d_{[A]}([t](\delta), [t](\delta)) = 0 \leq [\Psi](\delta).$$

CASE (EQ-E): For the soundness, observe that the judgments appearing in the rule are well-formed. Thus,  $\Delta$  is discrete and all formulas are well-typed for the typing context of the logical judgment where they appear. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &[\Delta \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta) \oplus [\Delta \vdash \Psi' : \text{Prop}](\delta) \\ &= [\Delta + p\Delta \vdash \Psi : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) \oplus [p(\Delta + \Delta) \vdash \Psi' : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \\ &\geq [\Delta + p\Delta \vdash \varphi[t/x] : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) \oplus [p(\Delta + \Delta) \vdash p(t = s) : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) && \text{(premise)} \\ &= [\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta, p[\Delta \vdash t : A](\delta)) \oplus [p(\Delta + \Delta) \vdash p(t = s) : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \end{aligned}$$

If  $[p(\Delta + \Delta) \vdash p(t = s) : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) = 1$ , we immediately conclude. Otherwise:

$$\begin{aligned} &= [\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta, p[\Delta \vdash t : A](\delta)) \oplus p \cdot p[\Delta + \Delta \vdash t = s : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) \\ &= [\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta, p[\Delta \vdash t : A](\delta)) \oplus p \cdot d_{p[A]}(p[\Delta \vdash t : A](\delta), p[\Delta \vdash s : A](\delta)) \\ &\geq [\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \text{Prop}](\delta, p[\Delta \vdash s : A](\delta)) && (*) \\ &= [\Delta + p\Delta \vdash \varphi[s/x] : \text{Prop}](\delta, \delta) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \\ &= [\Delta \vdash \varphi[s/x] : \text{Prop}](\delta) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \end{aligned}$$

where (\*) follows as  $\llbracket \Delta, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, -) : p\llbracket A \rrbracket \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is non-expansive.

CASE  $\text{IND}_{\otimes}$ : Assume  $\llbracket \Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash \Psi[(x, y)/z] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, a, b) \geq \llbracket \Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \vdash \varphi[(x, y)/z] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, a, b)$  holds for all  $\delta \in \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$ ,  $a \in p\llbracket A \rrbracket$ , and  $b \in p\llbracket B \rrbracket$ . Then, by Lemma 12 and interpretation of terms, also the following inequality holds for all  $\delta \in \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$ ,  $c \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_{p \otimes q B}$ :

$$\llbracket \Delta, z :^1 A_{p \otimes q B} \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, c) \geq \llbracket \Delta, z :^1 A_{p \otimes q B} \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, c) \quad (17)$$

From this we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Delta \vdash \Psi[t/z] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta) &= \llbracket \Delta, z :^1 A_{p \otimes q B} \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, \llbracket \Delta \vdash t : A_{p \otimes q B} \rrbracket) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \\ &\geq \llbracket \Delta, z :^1 A_{p \otimes q B} \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, \llbracket \Delta \vdash t : A_{p \otimes q B} \rrbracket) && \text{(by (17))} \\ &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash \varphi[t/z] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \end{aligned}$$

CASE  $\text{IND}_{\mathbb{N}}$ : From the assumption on the soundness of the premises and interpretation of the terms  $z$  and  $s(n)$  we have that for all  $\delta \in \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$  the following two properties hold:

- $\llbracket \Delta, n : \mathbb{N} \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, 0) \leq \llbracket \Delta \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta)$ ;
- $\llbracket \Delta, n : \mathbb{N} \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, m+1) \leq \llbracket \Delta, n : \mathbb{N} \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, m)$ , for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Thus, by induction proof principle on the natural numbers, we have that the following inequality holds for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\llbracket \Delta, n : \mathbb{N} \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, m) \leq \llbracket \Delta \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta)$$

From the above and the fact that  $\Delta$  is a discrete context we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Delta \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta) &\geq \llbracket \Delta, n : \mathbb{N} \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, \llbracket \Delta \vdash t : \mathbb{N} \rrbracket(\delta)) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta + \infty \Delta \vdash \varphi[t/n] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \\ &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash \varphi[t/n] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta). \end{aligned}$$

CASE  $\text{IND}_{\mathcal{D}}$ : First, observe that any finitely supported Borel probability measure can be expressed as a convex sum of Dirac distributions at elements from its support.

Now notice that, from the assumption on the soundness of the premises and interpretation of the terms  $\delta$  and  $\mu \oplus_p \nu$  we obtain that the following two properties hold, for all  $e \in \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$ ,  $a \in \llbracket A \rrbracket$ , and  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{D}\llbracket A \rrbracket$ ,

- $\llbracket \Delta, x : \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e, \delta_{\llbracket A \rrbracket}(a)) \leq \llbracket \Delta \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e)$ ;
- $\llbracket \Delta, x : \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e, \mu \oplus_p \nu) \leq p\llbracket \Delta, x : \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e, \mu) + (1-p)\llbracket \Delta, x : \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e, \nu)$ .

From the above, by an easy induction, we have that

$$\llbracket \Delta, x : \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e, \mu) \leq \llbracket \Delta \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e) \quad (18)$$

holds for any finitely supported Borel probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\llbracket A \rrbracket$ .

Since, finitely supported Borel probability measures are dense in  $\mathcal{D}A$  ([29, Theorem 2.7]), and by assumption  $\llbracket \Delta, x : \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(\delta, -) : r\mathcal{D}\llbracket A \rrbracket \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is  $r$ -Lipschitz for  $r < \infty$  (thus, continuous), we have that the inequality (18) extends to the entire set of Randon probability measures in  $\mathcal{D}\llbracket A \rrbracket$ . From this and the fact that  $\Delta$  is discrete, for all  $e \in \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Delta \vdash \Psi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e) &\geq \llbracket \Delta, x : \mathcal{D}A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e, \llbracket \Delta \vdash t : \mathcal{D}A \rrbracket(e)) \\ &= \llbracket \Delta + \infty \Delta \vdash \varphi[t/x] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e) && \text{(Lemma 12)} \\ &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash \varphi[t/x] : \mathbf{Prop} \rrbracket(e). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 15.* We want to show that, if  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, so is  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \vartheta \vdash \varphi$ .

The proof is by induction on the derivation of  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$ . Below we show only a few selected interesting cases, as the others are proved similarly. The cases below correspond to the last rule applied in the derivation. For convenience we use the same symbols appearing in Figure 5 and reserve  $\vartheta$  as the generic formula for which we do weakening.

CASE (FALSE): Apply (FALSE) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \vartheta, \text{ff} \vdash \varphi$  and then (EX) to obtain the format required by the statement.

CASE (EX): Then  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi, \psi, \Psi' \vdash \rho$  is derivable and by inductive hypothesis, so is  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi, \psi, \Psi', \vartheta \vdash \rho$ . Apply (EX) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \varphi, \psi, \Psi', \vartheta \vdash \rho$ .

CASE (DUP): Then  $\Delta \mid \Psi, (p+q)\varphi \vdash \psi$  is derivable. By inductive hypothesis we have  $\Delta \mid \Psi, (p+q)\varphi, \vartheta \vdash \psi$ . Apply (EX) and (DUP) to get  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \vartheta, p\varphi, q\varphi \vdash \psi$ , and then (EX) twice to recover syntactic format required by the statement.

CASE (G-REC): Then, for some  $p \in (0, 1)$   $\Delta \mid (1-p)\Psi, p\varphi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable. Apply the inductive hypothesis on  $(1-p)\vartheta$  to obtain  $\Delta \mid (1-p)\Psi, p\varphi, (1-p)\vartheta \vdash \varphi$ . Apply (EX) and (G-REC) to get  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \vartheta \vdash \varphi$ .

CASE ( $\bullet$ -I): Then  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  and  $\Delta \mid \Psi' \vdash \varphi'$  are derivable. Apply the inductive hypothesis on to get  $\Delta \mid \Psi', \vartheta \vdash \varphi'$ , and then ( $\bullet$ -I) to finally derive  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \Psi', \vartheta \vdash \varphi \bullet \varphi'$ .

CASE (EQ-E): Then  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop}$ ,  $\Delta \vdash t : A$ ,  $\Delta \vdash s : A$ ,  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]$ , and  $\Delta \mid \Psi' \vdash p(t = s)$ . Apply the inductive hypothesis to the latter to get  $\Delta \mid \Psi', \vartheta \vdash p(t = s)$ , and then (EQ-E) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi, \Psi', \vartheta \vdash \varphi[s/x]$ .

CASE (IND $_{\otimes}$ ): Then  $\Delta \vdash t : A_{p \otimes_q B}$  and  $\Delta, x^p A, y :^q B \mid \Psi[(x, y)/z] \vdash \varphi[(x, y)/z]$ . Assume, without loss of generality that  $z$  does not occur among the free variables of  $\vartheta$  (otherwise all free occurrences of  $z$  in the judgment for a fresh variable not occurring in  $\vartheta$ ). Apply the inductive hypothesis to obtain  $\Delta, x^p A, y :^q B \mid \Psi[(x, y)/z], \vartheta \vdash \varphi[(x, y)/z]$ . As  $\vartheta[(x, y)/z] = \vartheta$ , we can apply (IND $_{\otimes}$ ) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi[t/z], \vartheta \vdash \varphi[t/z]$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 28.** *Derivability is closed under weakening and substitution in the term context in the sense that*

- 1) If  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, so is  $\Delta, x : A \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$
- 2) If  $\Delta, x : A \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, and  $\Delta \vdash t : A$ , then  $\Delta \mid \Psi[t/x] \vdash \varphi[t/x]$  is also derivable.

*Proof of Lemma 16.1.* Next we show that if  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, so is  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$ , for  $e \notin \Delta$ .

The proof proceeds by induction on the derivation of  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$ . In most cases, the result follows directly from a straightforward application of the inductive hypothesis. Below, we focus only two interesting cases, as the others are similar. For clarity, we use the same symbols as in Figure 5 and designate  $e : E$  as the generic variable used for weakening.

CASE (EQ-I): Then,  $\Delta \vdash t : A$ . By Lemma 9 we have  $\Delta, e : E \vdash t : A$ . Now apply (EQ-I) to obtain  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash t = t$ .

CASE (EQ-E): Then,  $\Delta, x^p A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop}$ ,  $\Delta \vdash t : A$ ,  $\Delta \vdash s : A$ ,  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]$  and  $\Delta \mid \Psi' \vdash p(t = s)$ . By Lemma 9 we have  $\Delta, e : E, x^p A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop}$ ,  $\Delta, e : E \vdash t : A$ ,  $\Delta, e : E \vdash s : A$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]$  and  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi' \vdash p(t = s)$ . Apply (EQ-E) to obtain  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi, \Psi' \vdash \varphi[s/x]$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 16.2.* Next we show that if  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$  is derivable, and  $\Delta \vdash u : E$ , then  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash \varphi[u/e]$  is also derivable.

The proof proceeds by induction on the derivation of  $\Delta \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$ . Below, we focus on the most interesting cases, as the others are similar. For clarity, we use the same symbols as in Figure 5 with an exception for typing context which we assume to be  $\Delta, e : E$ . We designate  $u$  as the generic term to be substituted for  $e$ .

CASE (TRUE): Apply (TRUE) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash \mathbf{tt}$  and note that  $\mathbf{tt} = \mathbf{tt}[u/e]$ . Moreover, as  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash \mathbf{tt}$  is well-formed, so is  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash \mathbf{tt}$  by Lemma 10.

CASE (PR): Then,  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi$ . By inductive hypothesis we have  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash \varphi[u/e]$ . Apply (PR) to obtain  $\Delta \mid p\Psi[u/e] \vdash p\varphi[u/e]$ .

CASE ( $\exists$ -I): Then,  $\Delta, e : E \vdash t : A$  and  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $x \neq e$  (otherwise apply  $\alpha$ -conversion to  $\exists x : A.\varphi$ ). By Lemma 10 we have  $\Delta \vdash t[u/e] : A$  and by inductive hypothesis  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash (\varphi[t/x])[u/e]$ . As  $x \neq e$ ,  $(\varphi[t/x])[u/e] = (\varphi[u/e])[t/x]$ . Thus we can apply ( $\exists$ -I) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash \exists x : A.\varphi[u/e]$  and notice that  $\exists x : A.\varphi[u/e] = (\exists x : A.\varphi)[u/e]$ .

CASE ( $\exists$ -E): Then,  $\Delta, e : E, x : A \mid \Psi, \varphi \vdash \psi$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Delta, x : A \mid \Psi[u/e], \varphi[u/e] \vdash \psi[u/e]$ . Now apply ( $\exists$ -E) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e], \exists x : A.\varphi[u/e] \vdash \psi[u/e]$  and notice that  $\exists x : A.\varphi[u/e] = (\exists x : A.\varphi)[u/e]$ .

CASE (EQ-I): Then  $\Delta, e : E \vdash t : A$ . By Lemma 10 we obtain  $\Delta \vdash t[u/e] : A$ . Apply (EQ-I) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash t[u/e] = t[u/e]$  and observe that  $t[u/e] = t[u/e] = (t = t)[u/e]$ .

CASE (EQ-E): Then  $\Delta, e : E, x :^p A \vdash \varphi : \mathbf{Prop}$ ,  $\Delta, e : E \vdash t : A$ ,  $\Delta, e : E \vdash s : A$ ,  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi \vdash \varphi[t/x]$  and  $\Delta, e : E \mid \Psi' \vdash p(t = s)$ . By Lemma 10 we get  $\Delta, x :^p A \vdash \varphi[u/e] : \mathbf{Prop}$ ,  $\Delta \vdash t[u/e] : A$ , and  $\Delta \vdash s[u/e] : A$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e] \vdash (\varphi[t/x])[u/e]$  and  $\Delta \mid \Psi'[u/e] \vdash p(t[u/e] = s[u/e])$ . ] Note that  $x \neq e$  and  $e \notin \Delta$ . Thus  $(\varphi[t/x])[u/e] = (\varphi[u/e])[t/x]$ . Thus, we can apply (EQ-E) to obtain  $\Delta \mid \Psi[u/e], \Psi'[u/e] \vdash (\varphi[u/e])[t/x]$ . Once again,  $(\varphi[s/x])[u/e] = (\varphi[u/e])[s/x]$ .

CASE (IND $_{\otimes}$ ): Then  $\Delta, e : E, x :^p A, y :^q B \mid \Psi[(x, y)/z] \vdash \varphi[(x, y)/z]$  and  $\Delta, e : E \vdash t : A_{p \otimes_q B}$ . By Lemma 10, we get  $\Delta \vdash t[u/e] : A_{p \otimes_q B}$ . By inductive hypothesis,  $\Delta, x :^p A, y :^q B \mid (\Psi[(x, y)/z])[u/e] \vdash (\varphi[(x, y)/z])[u/e]$ . As  $x \neq e$  and  $e \notin \Delta$ , since judgments are well-formed,  $(\Psi[u/e])[(x, y)/z] = (\Psi[(x, y)/z])[u/e]$  and  $(\varphi[u/e])[(x, y)/z] = (\varphi[(x, y)/z])[u/e]$ . Apply (IND $_{\otimes}$ ) to obtain  $\Delta \mid (\Psi[u/e])[t/z] \vdash (\varphi[u/e])[t/z]$ . Once again, as  $x \neq e$  and  $e \notin \Delta$ , we have  $(\Psi[u/e])[t/z] = (\Psi[t/z])[u/e]$  and  $(\varphi[u/e])[t/z] = (\varphi[t/z])[u/e]$ .

The remaining cases are similar.  $\square$

## F. Omitted proofs of Section X

We just show the missing case for (15), where  $p$  and  $q$  differ in more than one position. Recall that this states that

$$\frac{N-1}{N+1}(p = q) \vdash \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{N+1}(\text{flip}_i p = \text{flip}_{\sigma(i)} q)$$



If  $p$  and  $q$  differ in positions  $i_1, \dots, i_n$  for  $n > 1$ , let  $\sigma_{p,q}$  be the permutation that cycles  $i_1, \dots, i_n$ , then,  $p = q$  has value  $\frac{n}{N}$ . For  $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ ,  $\text{flip}_i$  and  $\text{flip}_{\sigma(i)}$  differ in  $n - 2$  positions, so that  $\text{flip}_i = \text{flip}_{\sigma(i)}$  equals  $\frac{n-2}{N}$ . If  $i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ , then  $\text{flip}_i$  and  $\text{flip}_{\sigma(i)}$  differ in  $n$  positions. So

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{N+1} (\text{flip}_i p = \text{flip}_{\sigma(i)} q) &= \frac{1}{N+1} \left( n \cdot \frac{n-2}{N} + (N+1-n) \frac{n}{N} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N+1} \left( \frac{n^2 - 2n + nN + n - n^2}{N} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N+1} \left( \frac{(N-1)n}{N} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which equals  $\frac{N-1}{N+1}(p = q)$  proving

$$\frac{N-1}{N+1}(p = q) \vdash \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{1}{N+1} (\text{flip}_i p = \text{flip}_{\sigma(i)} q)$$