

Polyregular Model Checking

Aliaume Lopez*

Rafał Stefański[†]

2025-02-11 23:44:01 +0100 – 0d339e71e130bf8ef2c215aee1b11c4af0f4d5c4[‡]

Abstract

We reduce the model checking problem for a subset of Python to the satisfiability of a first-order formula over finite words, which is known to be decidable. The reduction is based on the theory of polyregular functions, a recently developed generalization of regular languages to polynomial output string-to-string functions. We implemented this reduction in a verification tool called PolyCheck, that can use both automata-based solvers and classical SMT solvers as backends.

1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to define a programming language that is expressive enough to capture a wide range of functions, and yet simple enough to be amenable to formal verification. Specifically, we want to be able to verify Hoare triples of the form $\{P\} \text{code} \{Q\}$, where P and Q are predicates and `code` is a program, meaning that whenever the input satisfies property P , the output of the program satisfies property Q .

To design our language, we leverage the theory of [polyregular functions](#) that originated in the extension of automata theory to string-to-string functions of polynomial growth — that is, $|f(w)|$ is bounded by a polynomial in $|w|$ — [11, 5]. For such functions, it is decidable whether a given Hoare triple holds, when P and Q are given as formulas in the monadic second order logic on words [5, Theorem 1.7]. However, this result is of theoretical nature (no implementation or complexity bounds are given), and writing programs using this model is cumbersome and error-prone. Furthermore, relying on monadic second order logic implies that one cannot use the vast majority of SMT solvers, which only handle first-order logic.

Contributions. In this paper our contributions are threefold. First, we introduce a programming language that corresponds to a rich subset of Python, which we argue is expressive enough to be usable in practice. Second, we demonstrate that this language can be compiled into a certain type of [polyregular functions](#). Third, we prove that for these polyregular functions, the verification of [Hoare triples](#) (specified using [first-order logic](#) on words) effectively reduces to a satisfiability problem of a first-order formula on finite words. While this last step was known to be theoretically possible, an efficient and effective implementation was lacking. Because we are using [first-order logic](#) as a target language, we are not restricted to using automata based tools like *MONA* [12], but can also employ general purpose SMT solvers like *Z3* [14] and *CVC5* [19], generating proof obligations in the SMT-LIB format [1].

We implemented all of these conversions in a Haskell program, and tested it on a number of examples with encouraging results.¹

*University of Warsaw, Poland. Aliaume Lopez was supported by the Polish National Science Centre (NCN) grant “Polynomial finite state computation” (2022/46/A/ST6/00072).

[†]University of Warsaw, Poland.

[‡]branch main at [git@github.com:AliaumeL/polyregular-model-checking.git](https://github.com:AliaumeL/polyregular-model-checking.git)

¹An anonymized version of our code is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/polyregular-model-checking-73A0>.

Outline. The structure of the paper is as follows. We introduce our [high-level language](#) in Section 2. In Section 3, we recall the theory of [polyregular functions](#) by introducing them in terms of [simple for-programs](#) and [FO-interpretations](#). We will also provide an efficient reduction of the verification of Hoare triples to the satisfiability of a [first-order formula on words](#) in Section 3.4. In order to verify [for-programs](#), we compile them into [simple for-programs](#) in Section 4, and then compile [simple for-programs](#) into [FO-interpretations](#) in Section 5. Then, in Section 6, we present benchmarks of our implementation on various examples, discussing the complexity of the transformations and the main bottlenecks of our approach. Finally, we conclude in Section 7 by discussing potential optimizations and future work.

Related work. The correspondence between subsets of string to string functions and first order logic dates back to the origins of automata theory and the seminal results of [16, 17, 13], establishing the equivalence between *star-free languages*, *first order definable languages*, and *counter free automata*. Extensions of this correspondence to functions has been an active area of research [7, 15], which we leverage in this work via the theory of [polyregular functions](#) [11, 5, 4, 3].

2 High Level For Programs

In this section, we introduce our [high-level language](#) for describing list-manipulating functions which can be seen as a subset of Python, which we call [\(high-level\) for-programs](#). Our goal is to reason algorithmically about the programs written in this language, so it needs to be highly restricted. To illustrate those restrictions, let us present in Figure 1 a comprehensive example written in a subset of Python.²

For the sake of readability, we implicitly coerce generators (created using the `yield` keyword) to lists. Our programs will only deal with three kinds of values: booleans (\mathbb{B}), non-negative integers (\mathbb{N}), and [\(nested\) words](#) (\mathcal{W}), i.e. characters (\mathcal{W}_0), words (\mathcal{W}_1), lists of words (\mathcal{W}_2), etc. These lists can be created by *yielding* values in a loop, such as in ② of Figure 1. In order to ensure decidable verification of Hoare triples,³ we also will enforce the following conditions, which are satisfied in our example:

- (I) **Loop Constructions.** We only allow `for` loops iterating forward or backward over a list, as in ⑥ and ⑦. In particular, `while` loops and recursive functions are forbidden, which guarantees termination of our programs.
- (II) **Mutable Variables.** The only mutable variables are booleans. The values of integer variables are introduced by the `for` loop as in ⑥, and their values are fixed during each iteration. Mutable integer variables could serve as unrestricted counters, resulting in undecidable verification. Similarly, we prohibit mutable list variables, as their lengths could be used as counters. However, we still allow the use of immutable list variables, as in ⑧.
- (III) **Equality Checks.** We disallow equality checks between two [nested words](#), unless one of them is a constant expression. This is what happens in point ④ of our Figure 1. Without this restriction, verification would also be undecidable (Lemma 3).
- (IV) **Integer Comparisons.** The only allowed operations on integers are usual comparisons operators (equality, inequalities). However, we only allow comparisons between integers that are indices of the same list. Every integer is associated to a list expression. For instance, in points ⑥ and ⑦ of our example, the variables i and j are associated to the same list variable `word`. Similarly, for the comparison of point ① to be valid, the variables k , i , and j should all be associated to the same list variable l .

²The corresponding program in the syntax accepted by our solver is given in Figure 6.

³Using [first-order logic on words](#) as a specification language.

```

1 def getBetween(l, i, j):
2     """ Get elements between i and j """
3     for (k, c) in enumerate(l):
4         if i <= k and k <= j: ①
5             yield c ②
6
7 def containsAB(w):
8     """ Contains "ab" as a subsequence """
9     seen_a = False ③
10    for (x, c) in enumerate(w):
11        if c == "a": ④
12            seen_a = True ⑤
13        elif seen_a and c == "b":
14            return True
15    return False
16
17 def subwordsWithAB(word):
18    """ Get subwords that contain "ab" """
19    for (i,c) in enumerate(word): ⑥
20        for (j,d) in reversed(enumerate(word)): ⑦
21            s = getBetween(word, i, j) ⑧
22            if containsAB(s):
23                yield s

```

Figure 1: A small Python program that outputs all subwords of a given word containing **ab** as a scattered subword

To ensure this compatibility, we designed the following type system, containing Booleans, [nested words](#) of a given depth (characters are of depth 0), and integers associated to a [list expression](#) (the set of which is denoted by \mathbf{LExp} , and will be defined in Figure 13):

$$\tau ::= \mathbf{Bool} \mid \mathbf{Pos}_o \mid \mathbf{List}_n \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, o \in \mathbf{LExp} \quad .$$

These types can be inferred from the context, except in the case of function arguments, in which case we explicitly specify to which list argument integer variables are associated, as shown in Figure 6.

Without this restriction, the equality predicate between two lists can be redefined (as shown in Figure 8).

- (V) **Variable Shadowing.** We disallow shadowing of variable names, as it could be used to forge the origin of integers, leading to unrestricted comparisons (as shown in Figure 10).
- (VI) **Boolean Arguments.** We disallow functions to take boolean arguments, as it would allow to forge the origin of integers, by considering the function `switch(b, 11, 12)` which returns either 11 or 12 depending on the value of `b` (as in Figure 9).
- (VII) **Boolean Updates.** Boolean variables are initialized to `false` as in ③, and once they are set to `true` as in ⑤, they cannot be reset to `false`. We depart here from the semantics of Python by considering lexical scoping of variables; in particular a variable declared in a loop is not accessible outside this loop.

This restriction allows us to reduce the verification problem to the satisfiability of a [first-order formula](#) on finite words. This problem is not only decidable but also solvable by

well-engineered existing tools, such as automata-based solvers (e.g., [MONA](#)) and classical SMT solvers (e.g., [Z3](#), and [CVC5](#)). Without this restriction, the problem would require the use of the monadic second order logic on words which is still decidable but not supported by the SMT solvers.

Formal Syntax and Typing. We extend the typing system to functions by grouping input positions with the list they are associated to. For instance, the function `getBetweenIndicesBeforeStop(l, i, j)` has type $(\text{List}_2, 2) \rightarrow \text{List}_2$, that is, we are given an input list l together with two pointers to indices of this list. Similarly, the function `containsAB(w)` has type $(\text{List}_1, 0) \rightarrow \text{Bool}$, while the function `subwordsWithAB(word)` has type $(\text{List}_1, 0) \rightarrow \text{List}_2$. We implemented a linear-time algorithm for the type checking and inference problems.

The formal syntax of our language is given in Figures 11 to 15. They define the syntax of *boolean expressions* (BExpr), *constant expressions* (CExpr), *list expressions* (LExp), and *control statements* (Stmt). For readability, we distinguish boolean variables \mathbb{V}_{bool} (b, p, q, \dots), position variables \mathbb{V}_{pos} (i, j, \dots), list variables \mathbb{V}_{list} (x, y, u, v, w, \dots), and function variables \mathbb{V}_{fun} (f, g, h, \dots). A *for-program* is a list of function definitions together with a *main* function of type $\text{List}_1 \rightarrow \text{List}_1$.

Semantics. Given an *evaluation context* that assigns values (functions, positions, booleans, nested words) to variables, the semantics of *boolean expressions* into booleans \mathbb{B} , *constant expressions* into *nested words*, and *list expressions* into *nested words* pose no difficulty. For the *control statements*, there is a crucial design choice regarding the semantics of backward iteration. While the semantics of forward iteration is unambiguous, the backward iteration `for←(i, x) in l do s` could be understood in two different ways, provided that l evaluates to a list $[x_0, \dots, x_k]$:

- Executing the statement s for pairs $(k, x_k), \dots, (0, x_0)$. This corresponds to Python’s `for (i, x) in reversed(enumerate(l)) ;`
- Executing the statement s for pairs $(0, x_k), \dots, (k, x_0)$. This corresponds to Python’s `for (i, x) in enumerate(reversed(l)).`

As shown in our example program, we use the first interpretation (see [7](#)). In fact, the second interpretation would allow us to define the equality predicate between two lists, leading to undecidable verification.

3 Polyregular Functions

To obtain a decision procedure for the verification of *Hoare triples* for *for-programs*, we will prove that they can be compiled to *first-order polyregular functions* – a class of transductions introduced in [5] whose model checking problem is decidable [5, Theorem 1.7]. We provide two equivalent definitions of the *first-order polyregular functions*: one using *first-order simple for-programs* [5, p. 19] and one using the logical model of *first-order string-to-string interpretations* [4, Definition 4], the equivalence of which was proven in [5].

To make the models more suitable for large alphabets (such as the Unicode characters), we present them in a symbolic setting (which uses a simplified version of the ideas presented in [10] or in [3, Section 3.1]). This will dramatically reduce the size of the *first-order string-to-string interpretations*, and in turn, of the *first-order formula* that we will feed to the solvers. We will prove in Section 5 that every *first-order simple for-programs* can be transformed into a *first-order string-to-string interpretation* in the symbolic setting. We believe that the other inclusion should also hold, but do not prove it, as it is out of this paper’s scope.

3.1 Symbolic transductions

Consider the program in Figure 2, which swaps all `as` to `bs` in a string. Even though it operates on the entire Unicode alphabet, it only distinguishes between three types of characters: `a`, `b` and the rest. To formalize this observation, we model the Unicode alphabet as an infinite set \mathcal{D} , and we define a function $T : \mathcal{D}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^*$ to be *supported by* a set $A \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, if for every function $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ that does not *touch* elements of A (i.e. $\forall a \in A, f^{-1}(a) = \{a\}$), it holds that:

$$\forall_w T(f^*(w)) = f^*(T(w)) \quad ,$$

Where f^* is the extension of f to \mathcal{D}^* , defined by applying f to every letter.

Functions defined by *for-programs* (of type $\text{List}_1 \rightarrow \text{List}_1$) are supported by the finite set A of letter constants that they use. This is also going to be the case for the *simple for-programs* that we introduce in Section 3.2. In Section 3.3, we will define a version of the *first-order string-to-string interpretations* in a way that only depends on the size of their support A , and not on the number of the Unicode characters.

```
def asToBs(w):  
    for (i, c) in enumerate(w):  
        if c == 'a':  
            yield 'b'  
        else:  
            yield c
```

Figure 2: The `swapAsToBs` program.

3.2 First-Order Simple For-Programs

First-order simple for-programs — originally introduced in [5, p. 19] — can be seen as simplified⁴ version of the *for-programs*. The main difference is that the *simple for-programs* only define transductions of type $\text{List}_1 \rightarrow \text{List}_1$. Here is an example in a Python syntax:

```
1  # The program reverses all space-separated words  
2  # in the input string. e.g  
3  #     "hello world" -> "olleh dlrow"  
4  seen_space_top = False ①  
5  # first we handle all words except of the final one  
6  for i in input: ②  
7      seen_space = False ③  
8      if label(i) == ' ': ④  
9          for j in reversed(input): ⑤  
10             if j < i:  
11                 if label(j) == ' ':  
12                     seen_space = True  
13                 if not seen_space:  
14                     print(label(j)) ⑥  
15             print(' ') ⑦  
16  
17  # then we handle the final word  
18  for j in reversed(input):  
19      if label(j) == ' ':  
20          seen_space_top = True  
21  if not seen_space_top:  
22      print(label(j))
```

⁴Actually, the *for-programs* were designed as an extended version *first-order simple for-programs*.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi, \psi := & \forall_x \varphi \mid \exists_x \varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \psi \mid \varphi \vee \psi \mid \neg\varphi \\ & \mid x = y \mid x < y \mid x =_L \mathbf{a}, \text{ where } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

Figure 3: First-order logic on words.

We disallow constructing intermediate word-values, there are no variables of type List_n for any n , and it is not possible to define functions (other than the main function). As a consequence, the for-loops can only iterate over the positions of the input word as in ① and ②. The character at a given position can be accessed using the keyword `label`, whether when testing it (⑤) or when printing it in (⑥). As we are considering a restriction of `for-programs`, we only allow comparing labels to constant characters (R. III). Finally, we only allow introducing boolean variables at the top of the program (①) or at the beginning of a for loop (③).

3.3 First-Order String-To-String Transductions

First-order string-to-string interpretations forms an other model that defines functions $\mathcal{D}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^*$. It is based on the *first-order logic on words* (**FO**), the syntax of which we recall in Figure 3. To evaluate such a formula φ on a word $w \in \mathcal{D}^*$ we perform the quantifications over the positions in w . The predicates $x = y$ and $x < y$ have the natural meaning, and $x =_L \mathbf{a}$ is checks if the x -th letter of w is equal to \mathbf{a} . Let us recall that the *quantifier rank* of a formula is the maximal number of nested quantifications in it.

An important property of **FO**, is that it has decidable *emptiness*, i.e. given a formula φ , one can decide if there is a word w such that φ holds for w . For finite alphabets, this property is well-know [6], and for the infinite alphabet \mathcal{D} it is the consequence of the finite-alphabet case (Lemma 4).

Having discussed the *first-order logic on words*, we are now ready to define the *first-order string-to-string interpretations*.

Definition 1. A *first-order string-to-string interpretation* consists of:

1. A finite set of *character constants* $A \subset_{\text{fin}} \mathcal{D}$.
2. A finite set T of *tags*.
3. An *arity function* $\text{ar} : T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.
4. An *output function* $\text{out} : T \rightarrow A + \{1, \dots, \text{ar}(t)\}$.
5. A *domain formula* $\varphi_{\text{dom}}^t(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t)})$ for every tag $t \in T$.
6. An *order formula* $\varphi_{\leq}^{t,t'}(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t)}, y_1, \dots, y_{\text{ar}(t')})$ for every $t, t' \in T$.

The *order* and *domain* formulas should only use constants from A .

The interpretation's output for a word $w \in \mathcal{D}^*$ is obtained as follows:

1. Take the set $P = \{1, \dots, |w|\}$ of the positions in w , and construct the set of *elements* as the set $T(P) = (t : T) \times P^{\text{ar}(t)}$ of all tags from T equipped with position tuples of the appropriate arity.
2. Filter out the elements that do not satisfy the domain formula.
3. Sort the remaining elements according to the order formula. Typically, we want the order formula to define a total order on the remaining elements of $T(P)$ – if this is not the case, the interpretation returns an empty word.

4. Assign a letter to each element according to the output function: For an element $t(p_1, \dots, p_k)$, we look at $\text{out}(t)$: If it returns $a \in A$ the output letter is a . If it returns $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we copy the output letter from the p_i -th position of the input.

For example, let us present a [first-order word-to-word interpretation](#) for the function `swapAsToBs` in Figure 4. It has two tags `printB` and `copy`, both of arity 1. The element `printB(x)` outputs the letter `b` and `copy(x)` outputs the letter of x -th position of the input word. The element `printB(x)` is present in the output if x is labelled with the letter `b` in the input, otherwise the element `copy(x)` is present: The tags are sorted by their positions, with ties resolved in favour of `printB`.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{out}(\text{printB}) = \text{b} \qquad \text{out}(\text{copy}) = 1 \\ \varphi_{\text{dom}}^{\text{printB}}(x) : x =_L \text{b} \qquad \varphi_{\text{dom}}^{\text{copy}}(x) : x \neq_L \text{b} \end{array}$$

φ_{\leq}	<code>printB(x₁)</code>	<code>copy(x₁)</code>
<code>printB(x₂)</code>	$x_1 \leq x_2$	$x_1 < x_2$
<code>copy(x₂)</code>	$x_1 \leq x_2$	$x_1 \leq x_2$

Figure 4: The `swapAsToBs` interpretation.

3.4 Hoare Triple Verification

We say that the Hoare triple $\{\varphi\} F \{\psi\}$ is valid if for every word w that satisfies φ , the output $F(w)$ satisfies ψ . An important property [first-order string-to-string interpretations](#) is that they admit a direct reduction of the [first-order Hoare triple](#) verification problem to the [emptiness problem](#) for the [first-order logic on words](#) [5, Theorem 1.7]. However, the resulting construction is not efficient. We provide a direct construction of a first-order formula $\chi(\phi, F, \psi)$ that is [unsatisfiable](#) if and only if the triple $\{\phi\} F \{\psi\}$ is valid. Moreover, the size and the [quantifier rank](#) of χ are bounded by the following low-degree polynomials:

$$\text{qr}(\chi) \leq \max(\text{qr}(\phi), \text{qr}(\psi) \cdot (\text{ar}(F) + 1) + \text{qr}(F)) \quad |\chi| = \mathcal{O}(|\phi| + |F| \cdot |\psi|)$$

Here $|F|$ denotes the sum of the sizes of formulas in F , $\text{qr}(F)$ denotes quantifier depth of the deepest formula in F , and $\text{ar}(F)$ denotes the maximal arity of the tags in F .

To construct the formula χ , we introduce a [pullback operator](#) $\pi(F, \psi)$ that transforms the formula ψ applied to the output F , to a formula $\pi(F, \psi)$ that can be applied directly the input word, corresponding to a form of [weakest precondition](#) [18, Chapter 7]. The pull-back operation is defined in such a way that $F(w)$ satisfies ψ if and only if w satisfies $\pi(F, \psi)$. Once we have the pull-back operation, we can define $\chi(\phi, F, \psi)$ as $\phi \wedge \neg \pi(F, \psi)$. In the rest of this section, we show how to efficiently construct $\pi(F, \psi)$.

Naïve Pullback Definition. Let us start with a simple but inefficient construction of the [pullback operation](#). Every position from $F(w)$ corresponds to a tag t and a tuple of $\text{ar}(t)$ positions of the input word w , so we can replace each quantification in ψ with a conjunction or disjunction over the tags, and use respectively the [order formula](#) and [output function](#) to implement the predicates over positions of $F(w)$. For example:

$$\forall_x, \psi \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \bigwedge_{t_x \in T} \forall_{x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t)}} (\varphi_{\text{dom}}^t(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t)}) \Rightarrow \psi'_t)$$

A similar transformation can be done for the existential quantifications. Then, one can implement the \leq predicate by consulting the [order formula](#):

$$x \leq y \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \psi_{\leq}^{t_x, t_y}(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t_x)}, y_1, \dots, y_{\text{ar}(t_y)})$$

Similarly the $=_L$ predicate can be handled by consulting the [output function](#), and $x = y$ predicate can be handled by comparing equality of the [tags](#) and the positions of x and y . This construction, although correct, is unfortunately inefficient: Replacing each quantification with a disjunction or conjunction over tags, results in an exponential blow-up of the formula.

Efficient Pullback Definition. Let us introduce an additional finite sort T to the logic, which allows us to quantify over the **tags** using $\forall_{t \in T} \varphi$ and $\exists_{t \in T} \varphi$. This does not add expressive power to the logic, as the new quantifiers can be replaced by a finite conjunction (resp. disjunction) that goes through the tags. However, this new sort will allow us to construct the **pullback operator** in a more efficient way, that can be understood by the solvers (we discuss it in more details at the end of this section). With the new sort of **tags**, we can pull back the quantifiers in the following way:

$$\pi(F, \forall_x \psi) = \forall_{t_x \in T} \forall_{x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(F)}} (\text{dom}(t_x, x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(F)}) \Rightarrow \pi(F, \psi))$$

Where **dom** is the following predicate based on the **domain formula**:

$$\text{dom}(t, x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t)}) := \bigvee_{t' \in T} (t = t' \wedge \varphi_{\text{dom}}^{t'}(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t')}))$$

In order to implement the atomic predicates, we use formulas similar to **dom**, but based the **order formula** and **output function**:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(F, x \leq y) &= \bigvee_{t_1, t_2 \in T} (t_x = t_1 \wedge t_y = t_2 \wedge \varphi_{\leq}^{t_1, t_2}(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{ar}(t_1)}, y_1, \dots, y_{\text{ar}(t_2)})) \\ \pi(F, x =_L \mathbf{a}) &= \left(\bigvee_{t \in T \wedge \text{out}(t) = \mathbf{a}} t = t_x \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{t \in T \wedge \text{out}(t) \notin A} (t = t_x \wedge x_{\text{out}(t)} =_L \mathbf{a}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

This way, we push the disjunction over **tags** all the way down in the formula, thus avoiding the exponential blow-up of the naïve approach.

Encoding tags. Finally, let us briefly discuss how we handle the tags in the formulas fed to solvers. For the SMT-solvers, we use the `smtlib v2.6` format with logic set to `UFDTLIA` [1], which allows us to add finite sorts and quantify over them. For the MONA solver, which only supports the sort of positions, we encode the tags as the first $|T|$ positions of the input word.

4 From High Level to Low Level For Programs

In this section, we provide a compilation from **high-level for-programs** to **simple for-programs**. To smoothen the conversion, we introduce **generator expressions** to the language, as a way to inline function calls. We distinguish between **nested-word** generators $\langle s \rangle_1$ and boolean generators $\langle s \rangle_b$.

Generator Expressions. Let us briefly discuss the new typing rules and semantics of these **generator expressions**. The meaning of $\langle s \rangle_1$ is to evaluate the statement s in the current context and collect its output. For instance, $\langle \text{return } x \rangle_1$ is equivalent to x , and $\langle \text{yield } x ; \text{yield } y \rangle_1$ is equivalent to $\text{list}(x, y)$. Similarly, $\langle s \rangle_b$ is used to evaluate a boolean statement and return its value. The type of a **generator expression** is equal to the type of the statement s it contains. Importantly, when evaluating the statement s in a generator, we hide all boolean variables from the **evaluation context**. In particular, `let mut b = false in return $\langle \text{return } b \rangle_b$` is an *invalid program*, because the variable b is undefined in the context of the generator expression $\langle b \rangle_b$. The formal typing rules of **generator expressions** can be found in Figure 21.

Hiding the booleans from the context, ensures that the evaluation order of the expressions is irrelevant, allowing us to freely substitute expressions during the compilation process.

Rewriting Steps. We will convert **for-programs** to **simple for-programs** by a series of rewriting steps listed below. While most of the steps make can be applied to any **for-program**, some of them only apply to programs of type $\text{List}_1 \rightarrow \text{List}_1$.

- (A) *Elimination of Literal Equalities*, i.e., of expressions $c =_{\text{lit}} o$ where $c \in \text{CExpr}$ and $o \in \text{LExp}$. This is done by replacing those tests with a call to a function that checks for equality with the constant c by traversing its input. We define these functions by induction on c . Note that this is only possible because equalities are always between a variable and a constant (R. III).
- (B) *Elimination of Literal Productions*, i.e., of constant expressions in the construction of **LExp**, except single characters. This is done by replacing a constant c by a function call. For instance, $\text{list}(\text{char}(a_1), \text{char}(a_2))$ is replaced by a call to a function with body $\text{yield char}(a_1) ; \text{yield char}(a_2)$.
- (C) *Elimination of Function Calls*, by replacing them with **generator expressions**. Given a function f with body s and arguments x_1, \dots, x_n , we replace a call $f(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ by $\langle s[a_1/x_1, \dots, a_n/x_n] \rangle_1$ (or $\langle \dots \rangle_b$ for boolean functions). This is valid because functions do not take booleans as arguments (R. VI).
- (D) *Elimination of Boolean Generators*. Note that $\langle s \rangle_b$ can only appear in a conditional test, and let us illustrate this step on an example. Consider the following statement: **if** $\langle s_1 \rangle_b$ **then** s_2 **else** s_3 . We replace it by **let mut** $b_1 = \text{false}$ **in** $(s'_1 ; \text{if } b_1 \text{ then } s_2 \text{ else } s_3)$, where s'_1 is obtained by replacing boolean return statements (**return** b) by assignments of the form (**if** b **then** $b_1 \leftarrow \text{true}$ **else skip**).
- (E) *Elimination of Let Output Statements*, i.e., of statements of the form **let** $x = e$ **in** s . This is done by textually replacing **let** $x = e$ **in** s by $s[x \mapsto e]$.
- (F) *Elimination of Return Statements for list expressions*. First, to make sure that the program does not produce any output after the first return statement, we introduce a boolean variable **has_returned**, and guard every yield statement by a check on this variable. Then, we replace every statement **return** e by a for loop **for** \rightarrow (i, x) **in** e **do yield** x . This is not possible if the return statement is of type List_0 , and for this edge case, we refer the readers to our implementation.
- (G) *Expansion of For Loops*, ensuring that every for loop iterates over a single list variable. This is the key step of the compilation, and it will be thoroughly explained later in this section.
- (H) *Defining booleans at the beginning of for loops*. This is a technical step that ensures that all boolean variables are defined at the beginning of the program or at the beginning of a for loop. Thanks to the no-shadowing rule (R. V), we can safely move all boolean definitions to the top of their scopes.

Theorem 2. *The rewriting steps (Step A — Step H) all terminate and preserve typing. Moreover, normalized for-programs of type $\text{List}_1 \rightarrow \text{List}_1$ are isomorphic to simple for-programs.*

Forward For Loop Expansion. We now focus on the **expansion of for loops**, that is, Step G. The case of forward iterations is simpler and will illustrate a first difficulty. We replace each loop of the form **for** \rightarrow (i, x) **in** $\langle s_1 \rangle_1$ **do** s_2 by the statement s_1 where every statement **yield** e is replaced by $s_2[x \mapsto e]$. This rewriting is problematic because it leaves the variable i undefined in s_2 . The key observation allowing us to circumvent this issue is that the variable i can only be used in *comparisons*, and can only be compared with variables j that are iterating over $\langle s_1 \rangle_1$

(thanks to R. IV). It is therefore sufficient to order the outputs of s_1 to effectively remove the variable i from the program.

One can recover the ordering between outputs of s_1 by storing the position of the `yield` e responsible for the output, together with all position variables visible at that point. Let us illustrate this in a simple example:

```
(for← (j, y) in e do (yield y ; yield char(a))) ; yield char(b)
```

$p_1(j)$ $p_2(j)$ p_3

In this example, there are three `yield` statements at positions p_1 , p_2 and p_3 . We can compute the *happens (strictly) before* relation between outputs of the various `yield` statements:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{before}(p_1(j), p_2(j)) &= \text{true} & \text{before}(p_2(j), p_3) &= \text{true} & \text{before}(p_1(j), p_3) &= \text{true} \\ \text{before}(p_1(j), p_1(j')) &= j > j' & \text{before}(p_2(j), p_2(j')) &= j > j' \\ \text{before}(p_1(j), p_2(j')) &= j \geq j' \end{aligned}$$

In the case of $j = j'$, the output of $p_1(j)$ happens before the output of $p_2(j')$, because p_1 is the first `yield` statement in the loop. When $j > j'$, the output of $p_1(j)$ happens before the output of $p_2(j')$ because the loop is iterating in reverse order.

Backward For Loop Expansion. The case of backward iterations adds a new layer of complexity, namely to perform a non-reversible computation s in a reversed order: indeed, in the for loop `for← (i, x) in <s1>1 do s2`, s_1 can contain the command $b \leftarrow \text{true}$ which cannot be reversed.

Let us consider as an example `for← (i, x) in <s1>1 do yield x`, where the statement s is defined to print all elements of a list u except the first one, namely:

$$s := \text{let mut } b = \text{false in for}^{\rightarrow} (j, y) \text{ in } u \text{ do if } b \text{ then yield } y \text{ else } b \leftarrow \text{true}$$

The semantics of `for← (i, x) in <s1>1 do yield x` is to print all elements of u in reverse order, skipping the last loop iteration. To compute this new statement, we will use the following *trick* that can be traced back to [5, Lemma 8.1 and Figure 6, p. 68]: we will use two versions of the statement s , the first one s_{rev} , will be s where all boolean introductions are removed, if statements `if e then s1 else s2` are replaced by sequences $s_1 ; s_2$, every loop direction is swapped, and every sequence of statements is reversed. Its intended semantics is to reach all possible `yield` statements of s in the reversed order. In our case:

$$s_{\text{rev}} := \text{for}^{\leftarrow} (j', y') \text{ in } u \text{ do yield } y'$$

Some `yield` statements are reachable in s_{rev} , but not when iterating over s in reverse order. To ensure that we only output correct elements, we replace every `yield` statement in s_{rev} by a copy of s , leading to the programs $s' = s_{\text{rev}}[\text{yield } \cdot \mapsto s]$. In our case:

$$s' := \text{for}^{\leftarrow} (j', y') \text{ in } u \text{ do } s$$

It is now possible to replace every `yield` statement in this new program by a conditional check ensuring that the output would actually be produced by the original program s .




Figure 5: Backward for loop expansion.

$$s'' = s'[\text{yield } e \mapsto \text{if } i = j' \text{ then yield } e]$$

In our case, the final program is described in Figure 5. This rewriting can be generalised to any program of the form $\text{for}^{\leftarrow}(i, x) \text{ in } \langle s_1 \rangle_1 \text{ do } s_2$ combining the construction illustrated here with the one taking care of position variables in the case of forward loops.

5 Simple For Programs and Interpretations

In this section, we show how to compile a [simple for-program](#) into a [first-order interpretation](#) in the symbolic setting. Recall that this is already known to be theoretically possible in the non-symbolic case [5]. However, this existing construction is not efficient: It requires computing a normal form of the [simple for-program](#) ([5, Lemma 5.2]), and goes through the model of pebble transducers [5, Section 5] — both of these steps significantly increase the complexity of the generated formulas.

To transform a [simple for-program](#) into a [first-order interpretation](#), we use as [transduction tags](#) the set of all print statements in the program, remembering their location in the source code. The [arity](#) of a print statement is the number of the position variables present in its scope. The [output function](#) of a print statement is easy to define: if the print statement outputs a fixed character c , then the [output function](#) returns c ; otherwise, if the print statement outputs $\text{label}(i)$, then the [output function](#) returns the De Bruijn index [8] of the variable i . For the [ordering formula](#) between two print statements, we use the technique for comparing addresses of the print statements, described in the [for loop expansion](#) procedure: In order to compare of two print statements, we compare their shared position variables, breaking the ties using their ordering in the source code. Observe that such [ordering formulas](#) do not use quantifiers.

The hardest part is the [domain formula](#). This difficulty is akin to the one of the [for loop expansion](#) procedure for the reverse loop: given a print statement $p(i_1, \dots, i_k)$, where i_1, \dots, i_k are the position variables in the scope of the print, we need to check whether it can be reached. This amounts to taking the conjunction of the [if-conditions](#), or their negations depending on the [if-branch](#), along the path from the root of the program to the print statement. The only difficulty in defining this conjunction is using the first-order logic to compute the values of the boolean variables used in the [if-conditions](#). We do this, by defining [program formulas](#), which are [first-order formulas](#) that describe how a program statement transforms the values of its boolean variables.

5.1 Program Formulas

A [program formula](#) is a [first-order formula](#) where every free variable is either: an [input boolean variable](#) $\text{in}_{\mathbb{B}}(b)$, an [output boolean variable](#) $\text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(b)$, or an [input position variable](#) $\text{in}_{\mathbb{N}}(i)$. In order to accommodate the boolean variables, we introduce a new two-element sort \mathbb{B} . We handle it in the same way as the tag sort from Section 3.4.

Given a fixed word $w \in \mathcal{D}^*$, a [program formula](#) φ defines a relation between the input boolean variables $\text{in}_{\mathbb{B}}(b_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\mathbb{B}}(b_n)$, input position variables $\text{in}_{\mathbb{N}}(1), \dots, \text{in}_{\mathbb{N}}(k)$, and the output boolean variables $\text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(b_1), \dots, \text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(m)$. We are only interested in the [program formulas](#) that define [functions](#) between the input and output variables, for every w .

In this section we show how to compute [program formulas](#) for every program statement s , that describes how the statement transforms its state. The formulas are constructed inductively on the structure of the statement. We start with the simplest case of $\mathbf{b} := \text{True}$, whose program formula is defined as $\Phi_{\text{setTrue}} := \text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(b)$. Similarly, the program formula for a print statement is defined as $\Phi_{\text{print}} := \top$ (as it does not input or output any variables). For the induction step, we need to consider three constructions: conditional branching, sequencing, and iteration.

Conditional Branching. Given two [program formulas](#) Φ_1 and Φ_2 and a formula φ that only uses input variables (position and booleans), we simulate the [if then else](#) construction in the

following way:

$$\Phi_{\text{if } \varphi \text{ then } \Phi_1 \text{ else } \Phi_2} := (\varphi \wedge \Phi_1) \vee (\neg\varphi \wedge \Phi_2) \quad .$$

This construction only works if Φ_1 and Φ_2 have the same output variables. If this is not the case, we can extend Φ_1 and Φ_2 with identity on the missing output variables, by adjoining them with conjunctions of the form $\text{in}_{\mathbb{B}}(b) \iff \text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(b)$ for each missing variable.

Composition of Program Formulas. Let us consider two [program formulas](#) Φ_1 and Φ_2 , and denote their input and output boolean variables as $B_1^{\text{in}}, B_1^{\text{out}}$ and $B_2^{\text{in}}, B_2^{\text{out}}$. Let us start with the case where $B_2^{\text{in}} = B_1^{\text{out}} = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$. In this case, we can compose the two program formulas in the following way:

$$\Phi_1; \Phi_2 := \exists_{b_1:\mathbb{B}} \dots \exists_{b_n:\mathbb{B}} \quad \Phi_1[\text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(x) \mapsto x] \wedge \Phi_2[\text{in}_{\mathbb{B}}(x) \mapsto x]$$

If the sets B_1^{out} and B_2^{in} are not equal, we can deal with it by first ignoring every output variable b of Φ_1 that is not consumed by Φ_2 . Interestingly, this requires an existential quantification: $\Phi'_1 := \exists_{b':\mathbb{B}} \Phi_1[\text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(b) \mapsto b']$. Then, for each variable b that is consumed by Φ_2 but not produced by Φ_1 , we add the identity clause $(\text{in}_{\mathbb{B}}(b) \iff \text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(b))$ to Φ'_1 obtaining Φ''_1 . After this modification, we can compose Φ''_1 and Φ_2 with no problems.

This definition of composition requires us to quantify over all variables from $B_1^{\text{out}} \cup B_2^{\text{in}}$, which influences the quantifier rank of the resulting program formula. In our implementation, we are a bit more careful, and only quantify over the variables from $B_1^{\text{out}} \cap (B_2^{\text{in}} \cup B_2^{\text{out}})$, obtaining the following bound:

$$\text{qr}(\Phi_1; \Phi_2) \leq \max(\text{qr}(\Phi_1), \text{qr}(\Phi_2)) + |B_1^{\text{out}} \cap (B_2^{\text{in}} \cup B_2^{\text{out}})| \quad .$$

Iteration of Program Formulas. The most complex operation on program formulas is the iteration. We explain this on a representative case of a [program formula](#) Φ which has a single [input position variable](#) $\text{in}_{\mathbb{N}}(i)$, and whose [output boolean variables](#) are the same as the [input boolean variables](#) ($B^{\text{in}} = B^{\text{out}}$).

Given a word $w \in \mathcal{D}^*$, evaluating a forward loop over i in the range 0 to $|w|$ amounts to the following composition:

$$\Phi[\text{in}_{\mathbb{N}}(i) \mapsto 0]; \Phi[\text{in}_{\mathbb{N}}(i) \mapsto 1]; \dots ; \Phi[\text{in}_{\mathbb{N}}(i) \mapsto |w|] \quad , \tag{1}$$

The main difficulty is to compute this composition independently of the length of the word w , while keeping the formula and its [quantifier rank](#) small.

To that end, we observe that Φ uses a finite number of boolean variables, and that each of those variables can only be set to **True** once (R. VII). As a consequence, in the composition in Equation (1), there are at most $|B^{\text{out}}|$ steps that actually modify the boolean variables. Based on this observation, one can *accelerate* the computation of the composition by guessing the sequence of those steps $(p_1, \dots, p_{|B^{\text{out}}|})$. The resulting [program formula](#) Φ^* is given below (we assume that Φ contains at least 3 boolean variables, and we denote their set as $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ – the cases for

$n \leq 2$ are either analogous or trivial):

$$\Phi^* := \exists_{p_1 \leq \dots \leq p_n: \mathbb{N}} \quad (2)$$

$$\exists_{\vec{b}_0, \vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_{n+1}: \mathbb{B}^n} \quad (3)$$

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \Phi(p_j; \vec{b}_{j-1}; \vec{b}_j) \quad (4)$$

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n+1} \forall_{p_{j-1} \leq p \leq p_j: \mathbb{N}} \Phi(p; \vec{b}_{j-1}; \vec{b}_{j-1}) \quad (5)$$

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\vec{b}_0)_i = \text{in}_{\mathbb{B}}(b_i) \quad (6)$$

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\vec{b}_{n+1})_i = \text{out}_{\mathbb{B}}(b_i) \quad (7)$$

The structure of this formula is as follows: In Equation (2), it guesses the steps p_1, \dots, p_n that actually modify the boolean variables. In Equation (3), it guesses the intermediate values of the boolean variables (\vec{b}_j 's denote vectors of n boolean variables). In Equation (4), it asserts that the guesses where *correct*, i.e., that the [program formula](#) Φ applied to position p_j and the boolean variables \vec{b}_{j-1} produces the boolean variables \vec{b}_j . In Equation (5), it ensures that no position different than the p_i 's modifies the boolean variables. (In this equation, p_0 and p_{n+1} denote the first and the last position of the word.) Finally, in Equation (6) and Equation (7), it ensures that the initial and final values of the boolean variables are correctly set to the input and output values. The formula for the reverse loop is similar, but guesses the positions p_i in a decreasing order.

Our construction ensures the following bound on the quantifier rank of the resulting [program formula](#), which shows that the number of modified boolean variables is a crucial parameter for the complexity of the overall procedure:

$$\text{qr}(\Phi^*) \leq \text{qr}(\Phi) + |B^{\text{out}}|^2 + |B^{\text{out}}| + 1 \quad (8)$$

6 Benchmarks

We implemented all the transformations expressed in this paper in a `Haskell` program. To measure the complexity of these transformations, we associated to a [high-level for-program](#) the following parameters: its *size* (number of control flow statements), its *loop depth* (the maximum number of nested loops), and its *boolean depth* (the maximum number of boolean variables visible at any point in the program). We compute the same parameters for the corresponding [simple for-program](#). In the case of [first-order interpretations](#), we only compute its *size* (number of nodes in the formula) and its *quantifier rank*. This allowed us to benchmark our transformations on a small set of programs that we present in Table 1. Then, we used several existing solvers to verify basic [first-order Hoare triples](#) for these programs. Because the goal of this paper was to showcase the usage of the theory of [polyregular functions](#), we did not focus on optimizing the input for a particular solver: all solvers (except `MONA`) were given an input in the `SMT-LIB` format. We illustrate in Table 2 the behaviour of the solvers on various verification tasks, with a timeout of 5 seconds for every solver.

Observations on the Compilation Process. Let us highlight that in the simplest cases of Table 1, our compilation procedure is able to eliminate all boolean variables, thus producing a *quantifier-free* formula. This is the case for the `identity.pr`, `reverse.pr` and `prefixes.pr` programs, respectively computing the identity function, the word reversal function, and the list of all prefixes.

Table 1: Benchmark results for the transformations. Here FP is a **for-program**, S.FP is a **simple for-program**, and FO-I is a **first-order interpretation**. The columns **l.d.**, **b.d.** and **q.r.** stand respectively for the **loop depth**, **boolean depth** and **quantifier rank**.

filename	FP			S.FP			FO-I	
	size	l.d.	b.d.	size	l.d.	b.d.	size	q.r.
identity.pr	3	1	0	2	2	0	1	0
reverse.pr	3	1	0	2	2	0	1	0
subwords_ab.pr	24	2	1	15	4	3	956	14
map_reverse.pr	36	2	1	18	4	1	285	5
prefixes.pr	6	2	0	5	3	0	2	0
get_last_word.pr	18	1	1	23	4	2	8553	15
get_first_word.pr	22	1	1	5	2	0	103	4
compress_as.pr	12	1	1	12	3	2	209	10
litteral_test.pr	29	1	1	129	3	12	3.2×10^4	82
bibtex.pr	110	2	1	802	6	29	13.7×10^6	136

Table 2: Verification of **first-order Hoare triples** over sample **for-programs**. We specify the preconditions and postconditions as regular languages, writing \mathcal{L}_{ab} as a shorthand for $\mathcal{D}^*ab\mathcal{D}^*$, and similarly for \mathcal{L}_{aa} , \mathcal{L}_{ba} , etc. In the columns corresponding to the solvers, a checkmark indicates a positive reply, a cross mark indicates a negative reply, and a question mark indicates a timeout or a memory exhaustion. We indicate the size and the **quantifier rank (q.r.)** of the **first-order formulas** that are fed to the solvers.

Name	Pre.	Post.	q.r.	size	MONA	CVC5	Z3
compress_as.pr	\mathcal{L}_{ab}	\mathcal{L}_{ab}	16	763	✓	?	?
reverse_add_hash.pr	\mathcal{L}_{ab}	\mathcal{L}_{ba}	9	380	?	✓	?
get_last_word.pr	\mathcal{D}^*a	\mathcal{L}_{aa}	27	28274	?	?	✗
subwords_ab.pr	\mathcal{L}_{ab}	\mathcal{L}_{ab}	26	3276	?	?	?
map_reverse.pr	\mathcal{D}^*a	$a\mathcal{D}^*$	13	801	?	?	?

We can observe that the **boolean depth** of the **simple for-program** is a good indicator of the **quantifier rank** of the generated **first-order interpretation**. Furthermore, we demonstrate the **elimination of literals** is responsible for a significant increase in the complexity of the formulas, as one can see in the `assets/HighLevel/litteral_test.pr` benchmark. This is explained by the fact that the elimination of literals introduces a *sequential* structure in the program which is simulated by introducing boolean variables. We found it interesting that our compilation process is non-symmetric when transforming **high-level for-programs** into **simple for-programs**: this can be seen in the `get_first_word.pr` and `get_last_word.pr`, leading to vastly different **quantifier ranks** for the resulting **first-order interpretations**.

Observations on the Solver Performance. We can observe in Table 2 that the solvers are complementary. Indeed, the **MONA** solver is theoretically complete, but can run out of memory and be slower than the other solvers on some specific instances. We can also see that the goals generated have reasonable size and **quantifier rank**. A negative result is the inability of all solvers to witness the fact that if a word w contains ab as a subword, then the concatenation of all its subwords containing ab as a (scattered) subword does contain ab as a subword. Understanding this result would require further investigation and its resolution may depend on a more refined encoding of our proof obligations.

7 Conclusion

We have show that the theory of [polyregular functions](#) can be used to verify close to real-world programs, and have implemented a prototype tool that can discharge simple verification goals to existing solvers. We believe that there is potential for further investigations in this direction.

Optimizations. The benchmarks indicate that one of the most promising source of optimizations is managing the [boolean depth](#) of the generated [simple for-programs](#) during compilation. This can be achieved by post-compilation optimizations (constant propagation, dead code elimination), or by improving the code generation mechanism itself, which are low-hanging fruits for future work. One source of the boolean variables seems to be the [elimination of Literal Equality](#) step (Step B), which could be mitigated by adding explicit successor and predecessor predicates to the language of [simple for-programs](#).

At the level of [first-order interpretations](#), we have identified several directions for improving their efficiency. One optimization is computing the sequential composition of programs in a way that minimizes the number of quantified boolean variables. Similarly, there seems to be potential for performing direct substitutions instead of quantifying over the variables in a lot of cases. Finally, our current approach for handling loops introduces universal quantifiers, whose number could be reduced by exploiting the monotonicity of the state transformations.

Solver Integration. There is a lot of potential for optimizing the input and parameters of the solvers for our particular use-case. An interesting research direction would be to reduce the verification problem to emptiness of LTL formulas, allowing us to use LTL solvers such as SPOT [9].

Modular Verification. The benchmarks show that one of the main bottlenecks of our approach is the expansion of loops (whether in the translation to [simple for-programs](#) or in the translation to [first-order interpretations](#)). For this reason, the ability to verify statements of the form `for (i, e) in enumerate(f(x)) do s done`, based on a specification of f given as a Hoare triple, would be a significant improvement. However, it remains unclear how to integrate such modular verification in our current approach.

Language Design. As mentioned in Section 2, [for-programs](#) extended with unrestricted booleans also enjoy a decidable verification of Hoare triples. However, the verification algorithm uses of monadic second-order logic (MSO) over words instead of first-order logic. While this prohibits the use of traditional SMT solvers, this logic can be handled by the [MONA](#) solver, and it might be interesting to implement and benchmark the unrestricted version of the language.

Another interesting extension of the language would be to allow the use of complex types, such as pairs and records. This would make the language closer to real use cases such as configuration management and data processing. It would require extending the specification language to structured data types, bypassing the current limitation that we can only verify string-to-string transformations.

Integration with Existing Tools. It would be a natural next step to integrate our tool inside frameworks for program verification or testing. This could be by checking goals generated by a tool such as [Why3](#) [2], or by verifying properties of Python programs using decorated functions.

References

- [1] Clark Barrett, Pascal Fontaine, and Cesare Tinelli. The SMT-LIB Standard: Version 2.6. Technical report, Department of Computer Science, The University of Iowa, 2017. Available at www.SMT-LIB.org.
- [2] François Bobot, Jean-Christophe Filliâtre, Claude Marché, and Andrei Paskevich. Why3: Shepherd your herd of provers. In *Boogie 2011: First International Workshop on Intermediate Verification Languages*, pages 53–64, Wrocław, Poland, August 2011. <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00790310>.
- [3] Mikołaj Bojańczyk. On the growth rates of polyregular functions. In *2023 38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2023.
- [4] Mikołaj Bojańczyk, Sandra Kiefer, and Nathan Lhote. String-to-string interpretations with polynomial-size output. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13190*, 2019.
- [5] Mikołaj Bojańczyk. Polyregular functions, 2018. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.08760v1>, arXiv:1810.08760v1.
- [6] J. Richard Büchi. Weak second-order arithmetic and finite automata. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 6(1-6):66–92, 1960. doi:10.1002/malq.19600060105.
- [7] Olivier Carton and Luc Dartois. Aperiodic Two-way Transducers and FO-Transductions. In Stephan Kreutzer, editor, *24th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2015)*, volume 41 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 160–174, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2015. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. URL: <https://drops-dev.dagstuhl.de/entities/document/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2015.160>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2015.160.
- [8] N.G de Bruijn. Lambda calculus notation with nameless dummies, a tool for automatic formula manipulation, with application to the church-rosser theorem. *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, 75(5):381–392, 1972. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1385-7258\(72\)90034-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1385-7258(72)90034-0), doi:10.1016/1385-7258(72)90034-0.
- [9] Alexandre Duret-Lutz, Etienne Renault, Maximilien Colange, Florian Renkin, Alexandre Gbaguidi Aisse, Philipp Schlehuber-Caissier, Thomas Medioni, Antoine Martin, Jérôme Dubois, Clément Gillard, and Henrich Lauko. From Spot 2.0 to Spot 2.10: What’s new? In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV’22)*, volume 13372 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 174–187. Springer, August 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-13188-2_9.
- [10] Loris D’Antoni and Margus Veanes. The power of symbolic automata and transducers. In *Computer Aided Verification: 29th International Conference, CAV 2017, Heidelberg, Germany, July 24-28, 2017, Proceedings, Part I 30*, pages 47–67. Springer, 2017.
- [11] Joost Engelfriet and Sebastian Maneth. Two way finite state transducers with nested pebbles. In Krzysztof Diks and Wojciech Rytter, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2002*, volume 2420, pages 234–244, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45687-2_21, doi:10.1007/3-540-45687-2_19.
- [12] Nils Klarlund and Anders Møller. *MONA Version 1.4 User Manual*. BRICS, Department of Computer Science, University of Aarhus, January 2001. Notes Series NS-01-1. Available from <http://www.brics.dk/mona/>.

- [13] Robert McNaughton and Seymour A. Papert. *Counter-Free Automata*. The MIT Press, 1971. doi:10.5555/1097043.
- [14] Microsoft Research. Z3 theorem prover, 2008. swH:1:dir:d6e5b24a3751b89fb1a4844c5a80a6393c2c1fa6. URL: <https://github.com/Z3Prover/z3>.
- [15] Anca Muscholl and Gabriele Puppis. The Many Facets of String Transducers. In Rolf Niedermeier and Christophe Paul, editors, *36th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2019)*, volume 126 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 2:1–2:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2019. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. URL: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/entities/document/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2019.2>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2019.2.
- [16] Dominique Perrin and Jean-Éric Pin. First-order logic and star-free sets. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 32(3):393–406, 1986. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0022000086900371>, doi:10.1016/0022-0000(86)90037-1.
- [17] Marcel P. Schützenberger. On finite monoids having only trivial subgroups. *Information and Control*, 8(2):190–194, 1965. doi:10.1016/S0019-9958(65)90108-7.
- [18] Glynn Winskel. *The formal semantics of programming languages: an introduction*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1993. doi:10.7551/mitpress/3054.001.0001.
- [19] Haniel Barbosa Zohar, Clark W. Barrett, Martin Brain, Gereon Kremer, Hanna Lachnitt, Makai Mann, Abdalrhman Mohamed, Mudathir Mohamed, Aina Niemetz, Andres Nötzli, Alex Ozdemir, Mathias Preiner, Andrew Reynolds, Ying Sheng, Cesare Tinelli, and Yoni. cvc5: A versatile and industrial-strength SMT solver. In Dana Fisman and Grigore Rosu, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 28th International Conference, TACAS 2022, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2022, Munich, Germany, April 2-7, 2022, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 13243 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 415–442. Springer, 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-99524-9_24.

A Appendix

Lemma 3. *Allowing unrestricted equality checks between two **nested words** results in the undecidability of the model checking problem.*

Proof. For every instance of the Post Correspondence Problem (PCP), we can construct a function $f(x : \text{list}[\text{list}[\text{Char}]]) : \text{Bool}$ in the **high-level language** with unrestricted equality checks, such that $f(x) = \text{true}$ if and only if x encodes a solution to the PCP instance. For example the PCP instance $\{(ab, a), (b, aa), (ba, b)\}$ can be encoded as the following function:

```
def top(x : list[list[chr]]) -> list[chr]:
  for elem in x:
    if elem == "one":
      yield "a"
      yield "b"
    elif elem == "two":
      yield "a"
    elif elem == "three":
      yield "b"
```

```

        yield "a"

def bottom(x : list[list[chr]]) -> list[chr]:
    for elem in x:
        if elem == "one":
            yield "a"
        elif elem == "two":
            yield "a"
            yield "a"
        elif elem == "three":
            yield "b"

def pcpx(x : list[list[str]]) -> bool :
    return list(top(x)) == list(bottom(x))

```

□

Lemma 4. *The emptiness problem for the first-order logic on words is decidable for the infinite alphabet \mathcal{D} .*

Proof. Take a formula φ and observe that it contains only a finite number of constants from \mathcal{D} – call this set A . It is not hard to see that the truth value of φ is supported by A : for every function $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ that does not touch elements of A , the truth value of φ is the same for w and $f^*(w)$. (Remember that f^* is the pointwise application of f). Let $\mathbf{blank} \in \mathcal{D}$ be a letter that does not appear in A , and observe that the formula φ is satisfied for some word in \mathcal{D}^* if and only if it is satisfied by some word in $(A \cup \{\mathbf{blank}\})^*$. Indeed, if we take a function $g : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ that does not touch elements of A and maps all other letters to \mathbf{blank} , we can use it to map \mathcal{D}^* to $(A \cup \{\mathbf{blank}\})^*$ in a way that preserves the truth value of φ . This finishes the proof of the lemma, as we have reduced the general problem to a finite alphabet $A \cup \{\mathbf{blank}\}$. □

```

1  def getBetween( l : [Char] with (i,j) ) : [Char] :=
2    for (k,c) in enumerate(l) do
3      if i <= k and k <= j then
4        yield c
5      endif
6    done
7
8  def containsAB(w : [Char]) : Bool :=
9    let mut seen_a := False in
10   for (i, c) in enumerate(w) do
11     if c === 'a' then
12       seen_a := True
13     else if c === 'b' and seen_a then
14       return True
15     endif endif
16   done
17   return False
18
19  def subwordsWithAB(w : [Char]) : [[Char]] :=
20   for (i,c) in enumerate(w) do
21     for (j,d) in reversed(enumerate(w)) do
22       let s := getBetween(w with (i,j)) in
23       if containsAB(s) then
24         yield s
25       endif
26     done
27   done
28
29  def main (w : [Char]) : [Char] :=
30   let subwrds := subwordsWithAB(w) in
31   for (j,s) in enumerate(subwrds) do
32     for (i,c) in enumerate(s) do
33       yield c
34     done
35     yield '#'
36   done

```

Figure 6: The `for-program` computing all subwords of a word containing the substring `ab`, corresponding to the Python code in Figure 1.

```

1  for i in input do
2    for j in reversed(input) do
3      let b2, b3, b4 := false in
4      for k in input do
5        if (i <= k) and (k <= j) then
6          if label(k) == 'a' then
7            b4 := true
8          else
9            if (label(k) == 'b') and (b4) then
10             if b3 then
11               skip
12             else
13               b3 := true
14               b2 := true
15             endif
16           else
17             skip
18           endif
19         endif
20       else
21         skip
22       endif
23     done
24     if b2 then
25       for l in input do
26         if (i <= l) and (l <= j) then
27           print label(l)
28         else
29           skip
30         endif
31       done
32       print '#'
33     else
34       skip
35     endif
36   done
37 done

```

Figure 7: The [simple for-program](#) computing all subwords of a word containing the substring ab , corresponding to the Python code in Figure 1, and obtained by compiling Figure 6.

```

def eq(u, v):
    for (i, ui) in enumerate(u):
        for (j, vj) in enumerate(v):
            if i == j and ui != vj:
                return False
    return True

```

Figure 8: Encoding the equality of two words u and v in Python, using a comparison between indices of two different lists.


```

def switch(b, u, v):
    if b:
        return u
    else:
        return v

def eq(u, v):
    b = False
    for (i, ui) in enumerate(switch(b, u, v)):
        b = True
        for (j, vj) in enumerate(switch(b, u, v)):
            if i == j and ui != vj:
                return False
    return True

```

Figure 9: Encoding the equality of two words u and v in Python, using a function taking a boolean as input.

```

def eq(u, v):
    w = u
    for (i, ui) in enumerate(w):
        w = v
        for (j, vj) in enumerate(w):
            if i == j and ui != vj:
                return False
    return True

```

Figure 10: Encoding the equality of two words u and v in Python, using the shadowing of a variable to switch between two lists.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{BBin} &:= \wedge \mid \vee \mid \Rightarrow \mid \Leftrightarrow \\
 \text{PComp} &:= = \mid \neq \mid < \mid \leq \mid > \mid \geq \\
 \text{BExpr} &:= \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid \neg \text{BExpr} \\
 &\mid \text{BExpr BBin BExpr} \\
 &\mid i \text{ PComp } j && i, j \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{pos}} \\
 &\mid f(\text{BExpr}) && f \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{fun}} \\
 &\mid \text{CExpr} =_{\text{lit}} \text{LEExpr}
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 11: The syntax of **boolean expressions**.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{CExpr} &:= \text{char } c && c \in \Sigma \\
 &\mid \text{list}(\text{CExpr}_1, \dots, \text{CExpr}_n)
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 12: The syntax of **constant expressions**.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{LExpr} := x \\
\quad | \text{CExpr} \\
\quad | \text{list}(\text{LExpr}_1, \dots, \text{LExpr}_n) \\
\quad | f(\text{AExpr}_1, \dots, \text{AExpr}_n)
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
x \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{list}} \\
\\
\\
f \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{fun}}
\end{array}$$

Figure 13: The syntax of list expressions.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{Stmt} := \text{if BExpr then Stmt else Stmt} \\
\quad | \text{yield LExpr} \\
\quad | \text{return LExpr} \\
\quad | \text{let } x = \text{LExpr} \text{ in Stmt} \\
\quad | \text{let mut } x = \text{false} \text{ in Stmt} \\
\quad | x \leftarrow \text{true} \\
\quad | \text{for}^{\rightarrow} (i, x) \text{ in LExpr do Stmt} \\
\quad | \text{for}^{\leftarrow} (i, x) \text{ in LExpr do Stmt} \\
\quad | \text{Stmt ; Stmt}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\\
\\
\\
x \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{list}} \\
x \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{bool}} \\
x \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{bool}} \\
(i, x) \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{pos}} \times \mathbb{V}_{\text{list}} \\
(i, x) \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{pos}} \times \mathbb{V}_{\text{list}} \\
\\
\end{array}$$

Figure 14: The syntax of high-level control statements.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{AExpr} := (\text{LExpr}, p_1, \dots, p_n) \\
\text{Fun} := \text{def } f(\text{AExpr}_1, \dots, \text{AExpr}_n) \{ \text{Stmt} \} \\
\text{Program} := ([\text{Fun}_1, \dots, \text{Fun}_n], f)
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\forall 1 \leq i \leq n, p_i \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{pos}} \\
f \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{fun}} \\
f \in \mathbb{V}_{\text{fun}}
\end{array}$$

Figure 15: The syntax of high-level for-programs.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{arg} ::= (\text{List}_n, \ell) \\
\text{fun} ::= \text{arg}_1 \times \dots \times \text{arg}_k \rightarrow \text{Bool} \\
\quad | \text{arg}_1 \times \dots \times \text{arg}_k \rightarrow \text{List}_n
\end{array}
\quad
\ell \in \mathbb{N}$$

Figure 16: Possible types of for-programs and their functions.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{true} : \text{Bool}} \text{(T-True)} \\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}} \text{(T-False)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \text{Bool}}{\Gamma \vdash \neg e : \text{Bool}} \text{(T-Not)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \text{Bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \text{Bool}}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 \text{ op } e_2 : \text{Bool}} \text{(T-BBin)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash i : \text{Pos}_{o_i} \quad \Gamma \vdash j : \text{Pos}_{o_j} \quad o_i = o_j}{\Gamma \vdash i \text{ op } j : \text{Bool}} \text{(T-PComp)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 17: Typing rules for boolean expressions.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Gamma, x : \text{List}_n \vdash x : \text{List}_n} \text{(T-OVar)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_i : \text{List}_n \text{ for all } i}{\Gamma \vdash \text{list}(e_1, \dots, e_n) : \text{List}_{n+1}} \text{(T-OList)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 18: Typing rules for list expressions and constant expressions.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{Bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash s_1 : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash s_2 : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{if } e \mathbf{ then } s_1 \mathbf{ else } s_2 : \tau} \text{ (T-If)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{List}_n}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{yield } e : \mathbf{List}_{n+1}} \text{ (T-Yield)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{List}_n}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{return } e : \mathbf{List}_n} \text{ (T-Return)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{Bool}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{return } e : \mathbf{Bool}} \text{ (T-Return)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{List}_n \quad \Gamma, x : \mathbf{List}_n \vdash s : \tau \quad x \notin \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{let } x = e \mathbf{ in } s : \tau} \text{ (T-LetOut)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : \mathbf{Bool} \vdash s : \tau \quad x \notin \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{let mut } x = \mathbf{false in } s : \tau} \text{ (T-LetBool)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash o : \mathbf{List}_n \quad \Gamma, i : \mathbf{Pos}_o, x : \mathbf{List}_n \vdash s : \tau \quad n > 0}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{for}^{\rightarrow} (i, x) \mathbf{ in } o \mathbf{ do } s : \tau} \text{ (T-For)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash o : \mathbf{List}_n \quad \Gamma, i : \mathbf{Pos}_o, x : \mathbf{List} \vdash s : \tau \quad n > 0}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{for}^{\leftarrow} (i, x) \mathbf{ in } o \mathbf{ do } s : \tau} \text{ (T-ForRev)} \\
\\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash x \leftarrow \mathbf{true} : \tau} \text{ (T-SetTrue)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash s_1 : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash s_2 : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash s_1 ; s_2 : \tau} \text{ (T-Seq)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 19: Typing rules for control statements.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash o : \mathbf{List}_n \quad \Gamma \vdash p_i : \mathbf{Pos}_o \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n}{\Gamma \vdash (o, p_1, \dots, p_n) : (\mathbf{List}_n, n)} \text{ (T-AExpr)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash a_i : \tau_i \text{ for all } i \quad \Gamma \vdash s : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{def } f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \{s\} : (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \rightarrow \tau} \text{ (T-Fun)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash f : (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n) \rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash a_i : \tau_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n}{\Gamma \vdash f(a_1, \dots, a_n) : \tau} \text{ (T-App)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, (f_j : \tau_j)_{j < i} \vdash f_i : \tau_i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n \quad f = f_j \text{ for some } 1 \leq j \leq n}{\Gamma \vdash ([f_1, \dots, f_n], f) : \tau_j} \text{ (T-Prog)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 20: Typing rules of for-programs.

$$\frac{\Gamma' \vdash s : \mathbf{Bool} \quad \Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma' \text{ contains no boolean variables}}{\Gamma \vdash \langle s \rangle_b : \mathbf{Bool}} \text{ (B-Gen)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma' \vdash s : \mathbf{List}_n \quad \Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma \quad \Gamma' \text{ contains no boolean variables}}{\Gamma \vdash \langle s \rangle_1 : \mathbf{List}_n} \text{ (L-Gen)}$$

Figure 21: The syntax of **generator expressions**.