# Higher-order Interpretations for Higher-order Complexity

Emmanuel Hainry & Romain Péchoux

LPAR, 11 may 2017

CNRS, INRIA, Université de Lorraine & LORIA, Nancy, France

# Introduction

## First-order computability and complexity

- Computability is well understood:
  - Definitions, hierarchies (Turing degree)
  - Church-Turing's thesis
- Computational Complexity is well understood:
  - Definitions, classes
  - Various characterizations:
    - machine based characterizations
    - machine independent characterizations
      - $\rightarrow$  Implicit Computational Complexity

## Higher-order computability and complexity

- Computability is (well) understood:
  - Order 2 = computations over reals.
  - No Church-Turing's thesis!
    - General Purpose Analog Computer by Shannon,
    - Blum-Shub-Smale model,
    - Computable Analysis (CA) by Weihrauch,
    - Oracle TM, ...



## Higher-order computability and complexity

- Computability is (well) understood:
  - Order 2 = computations over reals.
  - No Church-Turing's thesis!
    - General Purpose Analog Computer by Shannon,
    - Blum-Shub-Smale model,
    - Computable Analysis (CA) by Weihrauch,
    - Oracle TM, ...
- Complexity is not well understood.
  - Polytime complexity on OTM = Basic Feasible Functions (BFF) by Constable, Melhorn
  - Polytime complexity in  $CA = P(\mathbb{R})$  by Ko
  - No homogeneous theory for higher-order:

 $P(\mathbb{R}) \neq BFF$ 

BLC- FURN	
MPROENTON PROD MAL 13, 1914.	
1,817,915. Estented Oct. 7,	1989.
Frig. 1.	
2 2 2 1 u	
4 7 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
→ \ #19 F 13 # 7 5	J
	9
Nin / COU	1
	1000
1400-000 m 240 04	
· · · · · · ·	
	101
Haunstal & Ford	-
Woundaring Switchiget Co.	*

- not developping a new complexity theory for higher-order,
- adapting first-order tools for program complexity analysis,
- **validating** the theory by capturing existing higher-order complexity classes

- not developping a new complexity theory for higher-order,
- adapting first-order tools for program complexity analysis,
- **validating** the theory by capturing existing higher-order complexity classes

#### Framework:

- tool = (polynomial) interpretations
- target =  $BFF_i$ , the Basic Feasible Functionals at any order.

## **First-order interpretations**

- Defined in the 70s for showing TRS termination:
  - $\forall b \text{ of arity } n, (|b|) : \mathbb{N}^n \to^{\uparrow} \mathbb{N}$
  - $\forall l \rightarrow r \in R, \ (l) > (r)$

additive: for any constructor symbol c, (c)(X) = X + k,  $\in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $PI_{add}$  be the set of functions computed by TRS admitting an additive polynomial interpretation.

Theorem (Bonfante et al.)

 $PI_{add} \equiv FPTIME$ 

#### Example

 $double(\epsilon) \rightarrow \epsilon$  $double(s(x)) \rightarrow s(s(double(x)))$ 

#### Example

$$double(\epsilon) 
ightarrow \epsilon$$
  
 $double(s(x)) 
ightarrow s(s(double(x)))$ 

 $(\epsilon) = 0, (s)(X) = X + 1, (double)(X) = 3X + 1$ 

## Example

$$double(\epsilon) 
ightarrow \epsilon$$
  
 $double(s(x)) 
ightarrow s(s(double(x)))$ 

$$(\epsilon) = 0, (s)(X) = X + 1, (double)(X) = 3X + 1$$

$$(|double \epsilon|) = 1 > 0 = (|\epsilon|)$$
  
 $(|double s(x)|) = 3X + 4 > 3X + 3 = (|s(s(double(x))|))$ 

#### Example

$$double(\epsilon) 
ightarrow \epsilon$$
  
 $double(s(x)) 
ightarrow s(s(double(x)))$ 

$$(\epsilon) = 0, (s)(X) = X + 1, (double)(X) = 3X + 1$$

$$(|double \epsilon|) = 1 > 0 = (|\epsilon|)$$
  
 $(|double s(x)|) = 3X + 4 > 3X + 3 = (|s(s(double(x))|))$ 

Additivity  $\Rightarrow \llbracket double \rrbracket : x \mapsto 2x \in FPTIME$ 

#### • Termination:

• Van De Pol (1993) adapted interpretations for showing termination of higher-order TRS.

#### • Termination:

• Van De Pol (1993) adapted interpretations for showing termination of higher-order TRS.

#### • Complexity:

 Férée et al. (2010) adapted interpretations to first-order stream programs for characterizing BFF (BFF<sub>2</sub>) and P(ℝ).

#### • Termination:

• Van De Pol (1993) adapted interpretations for showing termination of higher-order TRS.

## • Complexity:

- Férée et al. (2010) adapted interpretations to first-order stream programs for characterizing BFF (BFF<sub>2</sub>) and P(ℝ).
- Baillot & Dal Lago (2016) adapted interpretations to higher-order Simply Typed TRS for characterizing FPtime.

 $\rightarrow\,$  a first step towards a better expressivity

Higher-order language

#### Definition (Functional Language)

 $\begin{array}{lll} M & := & x \\ & \mid & c \\ & \mid & op \\ & \mid & M_1 \ M_2 \\ & \mid & \lambda x.M \\ & \mid & \text{case } M \text{ of } c_1 \rightarrow M_1 | c_2 \rightarrow M_2 | ... | c_n \rightarrow M_n \\ & \mid & \text{letRec } f = M \end{array}$ 

+ Inductive Typing

#### Example

$$\label{eq:letRec} \begin{split} \mathsf{letRec} \ \mathsf{map} &= \lambda \mathsf{g}.\lambda \mathsf{x}.\mathsf{case} \ \mathsf{x} \ \mathsf{of} \ \mathsf{c} \ \mathsf{y} \ \mathsf{z} \to \mathsf{c} \ (\mathsf{g} \ \mathsf{y}) \ (\mathsf{map} \ \mathsf{g} \ \mathsf{z}) \\ & | \ \mathsf{nil} \to \mathsf{nil} \end{split}$$

$$List(\alpha) ::= \mathsf{nil} \mid \mathsf{c} \ \alpha \ List(\alpha)$$
  
map:  $(A \to B) \to List(A) \to List(B)$ 

## Semantics

Four kinds of reductions:

•  $\beta$  reduction:

$$\lambda x.M \ N \longrightarrow_{\beta} M\{N/x\}$$

• case reduction:

case 
$$c_j N_j$$
 of  $c_1 \rightarrow M_1 | ... | c_n \rightarrow M_n \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{case}} M_j N_j$ 

• letRec reduction:

$$\mathsf{letRec}\ f = M \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{letRec}} M\{\mathsf{letRec}\ f = M/f\}$$

• Operator reduction (total functions over terms):

$$op \ M \rightarrow_{op} \llbracket op \rrbracket(M)$$

+Left-most outermost reduction strategy

# **Higher-order interpretations**

## Definition

- $(b) = \overline{\mathbb{N}} = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\top\}$
- $(T \to T') = (T) \to^{\uparrow} (T')$

## Definition

•  $f: A \rightarrow^{\uparrow} B$  a monotonic function from A to B.

• 
$$x <_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}} y$$
 iff  $x < y$  or  $y = \exists$ 

•  $f <_{A \to \uparrow B} g$  iff  $\forall x \in A$ ,  $f(x) <_B g(x)$ 

**Example (map:**  $(A \to B) \to List(A) \to List(B)$ ) (*map*) is in  $(\bar{\mathbb{N}} \to^{\uparrow} \bar{\mathbb{N}}) \to^{\uparrow} \bar{\mathbb{N}} \to^{\uparrow} \bar{\mathbb{N}}$ . Lattices

#### Lemma

For any type T,  $((T), \leq, \sqcup, \sqcap, \top, \bot)$  is a complete lattice.

$$n \oplus_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}} = \Lambda X.(n+X)$$
$$n \oplus_{(T \to T')} : \Lambda F.\Lambda X.(n \oplus_{(T')} F(X))$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (|x|) &=& X\\ (|c|) &=& 1 \oplus (\Lambda X_1 \dots \Lambda X_n \dots \sum_{i=1}^n X_i)\\ (|M| N|) &=& (|M|) (|N|) \end{array}$$

$$n \oplus_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}} = \Lambda X.(n+X)$$
$$n \oplus_{(T \to T')} : \Lambda F.\Lambda X.(n \oplus_{(T')} F(X))$$

$$n \oplus_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}} = \Lambda X.(n+X)$$
$$n \oplus_{(T \to T')} : \Lambda F.\Lambda X.(n \oplus_{(T')} F(X))$$

$$(|x|) = X$$

$$(|c|) = 1 \oplus (\Lambda X_1 \dots \Lambda X_n \dots \sum_{i=1}^n X_i)$$

$$(|M \ N|) = (|M|) (|N|)$$

$$(|\lambda x.M|) = 1 \oplus (\Lambda (|x|) \dots (|M|))$$

$$(|case \ M \ of \ \dots c_i \to M_i \dots) = 1 \oplus \bigsqcup_i \{ (|M_i|) R_i \mid (|c_i|) R_i < (|M|) \}$$

$$n \oplus_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}} = \Lambda X.(n+X)$$
$$n \oplus_{(T \to T')} : \Lambda F.\Lambda X.(n \oplus_{(T')} F(X))$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \|x\| &=& X\\ \|(c\|) &=& 1 \oplus (\Lambda X_1 \dots \Lambda X_n \dots \sum_{i=1}^n X_i)\\ \|(M \ N\|) &=& \|(M\|)\|N\|\\ \|(\lambda x.M\|) &=& 1 \oplus (\Lambda\|x\|) \dots \|M\|)\\ \|(case \ M \ of \ \dots c_i \to M_i \dots) &=& 1 \oplus \bigsqcup_i \{\|M_i\|R_i \mid \|c_i\|R_i \le \|M\|\}\\ \|(letRec \ f = M\|) &=& \sqcap \{F \mid F \ge 1 \oplus (\Lambda\|f\|) \|M\|\}F\} \end{array}$$

$$n \oplus_{\bar{\mathbb{N}}} = \Lambda X.(n+X)$$
$$n \oplus_{(T \to T')} : \Lambda F.\Lambda X.(n \oplus_{(T')} F(X))$$

#### **Definition (Interpretations)**

$$\begin{aligned} \|X\| &= X \\ \|(c\|) &= 1 \oplus (\Lambda X_1 \dots \Lambda X_n, \sum_{i=1}^n X_i) \\ \|(M \ N\|) &= \|(M\|)\|N\| \\ \|(\lambda x.M\|) &= 1 \oplus (\Lambda\|x\|, \|M\|) \\ \|(case \ M \ of \ \dots c_i \to M_i \dots) &= 1 \oplus \bigsqcup_i \{\|M_i\|R_i \mid \|c_i\|R_i \le \|M\|\} \\ \|(letRec \ f = M\|) &= \sqcap \{F \mid F \ge 1 \oplus (\Lambda(f\|, \|M\|)F\} \end{aligned}$$

 $(\!(op \ \mathtt{M})\!) \geq ([\![op]\!](\mathtt{M})\!)$ 

#### Theorem

Any term M has an interpretation.

Knaster-Tarski:  $lfp(\Lambda X.1 \oplus ((\Lambda (f). (M))X))$ 

#### Lemma

If  $M \longrightarrow N$ , then  $(M) \ge (N)$ .

If  $M \longrightarrow_{\alpha} N$ ,  $\alpha \neq op$ , then (M) > (N).

#### Lemma

If M :: B and  $(M) \neq \top$  then M terminates in time O((M)).

(*letRec* map =  $\lambda g.\lambda x.case x$  of **c**  $y \ z \rightarrow c \ (g \ y) \ (map \ g \ z)|\mathbf{nil} \rightarrow \mathbf{nil}$ ) = ... : = ... =  $\square \{F \mid F \ge 5 \oplus (\Lambda G.\Lambda X. \sqcup \{((G \ Y) \oplus (F \ G \ Z)) \mid X \ge 1 \oplus Y \oplus Z\}\}$ with 1 (letRec), 2 (Lambda), 1 (Case), 2 (Cons **c**), 2 (Cons **nil**)  $(letRec map = \lambda g.\lambda x.case \ x \ of \ \mathbf{c} \ y \ z \rightarrow \mathbf{c} \ (g \ y) \ (map \ g \ z)))$ 

 $= \sqcap \{F \mid F \ge 5 \oplus (\Lambda G.\Lambda X. \sqcup \{((G Y) \oplus (F G Z)) \mid X \ge 1 \oplus Y \oplus Z\}\}$ 

$$(|letRec map = \lambda g.\lambda x.case \ x \ of \ \mathbf{c} \ y \ z \to \mathbf{c} \ (g \ y) \ (map \ g \ z)))$$

 $= \sqcap \{F \mid F \geq 5 \oplus (\Lambda G.\Lambda X. \sqcup \{((G Y) \oplus (F G Z)) \mid X \geq 1 \oplus Y \oplus Z\}\}$ 

 $\leq \sqcap \{F \mid F \geq 5 \oplus (\Lambda G.\Lambda X.((G (X - 1)) \oplus (F G (X - 1))))\}$ 

(constraint upper bound)

$$(|letRec map = \lambda g.\lambda x.case \ x \ of \ \mathbf{c} \ y \ z \to \mathbf{c} \ (g \ y) \ (map \ g \ z)))$$

 $= \sqcap \{F \mid F \geq 5 \oplus (\Lambda G.\Lambda X. \sqcup \{((G Y) \oplus (F G Z)) \mid X \geq 1 \oplus Y \oplus Z\}\}$ 

 $\leq \sqcap \{F \mid F \geq 5 \oplus (\Lambda G.\Lambda X.((G (X - 1)) \oplus (F G (X - 1))))\}$ (constraint upper bound)

 $\leq \Lambda G.\Lambda X.(5 + G X)) \times X$ (min upper bound) A characterization of BFF<sub>i</sub>

A BTLP is a non-recursive and well-formed procedure *P* defined by:

$$P \qquad ::= v^{\tau_1 \times \dots \times \tau_n \to \mathbb{N}} (v_1^{\tau_1}, \dots, v_n^{\tau_n}) P^* V I^* \text{ Return } v_r^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ End}$$

$$V \qquad ::= v \text{ar } v_1^{\mathbb{N}}, \dots, v_n^{\mathbb{N}};$$

$$I \qquad ::= v^{\mathbb{N}} := E; \mid \textbf{Loop } v_0^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ with } v_1^{\mathbb{N}} \text{ do } I^* \text{ EndLoop };$$

$$E \qquad ::= 1 \mid v^{\mathbb{N}} \mid v_0^{\mathbb{N}} + v_1^{\mathbb{N}} \mid v_0^{\mathbb{N}} - v_1^{\mathbb{N}} \mid v_0^{\mathbb{N}} \# v_1^{\mathbb{N}} \mid$$

$$v^{\tau_1 \times \dots \times \tau_n \to \mathbb{N}} (A_1^{\tau_1}, \dots, A_n^{\tau_n})$$

$$A \qquad ::= v \mid \lambda v_1, \dots, v_n. v(v_1' \dots, v_m') \quad \text{with } v \notin \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$$

order(b) = 0 order( $T \rightarrow T'$ ) = max(order(T) + 1, order(T')) BFF<sub>i</sub> is the class of order *i* functionals computable by a BTLP program.

$$P_1 ::= c \in \mathbb{N} |X_0| P_1 + P_1 | P_1 \times P_1$$
  
 $P_{i+1} ::= P_i | P_{i+1} + P_{i+1} | P_{i+1} \times P_{i+1} | X_i(P_i)$ 

#### Definition

Let  $FP_i$ , i > 0, be the class of polynomial functionals at order i that consist in functionals computed by closed terms M such that:

- order(M) = i
- (M) is bounded by an order *i* polynomial  $(\exists P_i, (M) \leq P_i)$ .

Define the Safe Feasible Functionals at order *i*, SFF<sub>i</sub> by:

 $SFF_1 = BFF_1,$  $\forall i \ge 1, SFF_{i+1} = BFF_{i+1 \upharpoonright SFF_i}$ 

#### Theorem (Hainry Péchoux)

For any order i,  $FP_i = SFF_i$ .

In particular,  $FP_1$  is FPtime and  $FP_2$  is BFF with FPtime oracles.

# Conclusion

## Conclusion

## Results

- An interpretation theory for higher-order functional languages
- A characterization of well-known classes: BFF<sub>i</sub>

#### Issues and future work

- BFF<sub>i</sub> is known to be restricted
  - $\rightarrow$  see Férée's phD manuscript (2014)
- The interpretation synthesis problem is very hard.
- Interpretations for complexity analysis of real operators and real-based languages.
- Adapt the results to space: does it make sense?
- Adapt ICC techniques to characterize  $P(\mathbb{R})$ .