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Abstract

We develop a method to incrementally construct algebraic structures modelling programming languages. Our approach is categorical: layers of the language are described as monads, and we choose to combine them by building distributive laws. Our method identifies precise sufficient conditions for such laws to exist. We either (i) concretely construct a distributive law between two monads, i.e. layers of the language, which then provides a monad structure to the composition of layers, or (ii) pinpoint the algebraic obstacles to the existence of a distributive law and give a ‘best approximate’ language. The running example will involve three layers: a basic imperative language enriched first by adding non-determinism and then probabilistic choice. The first extension works seamlessly, but the second encounters an obstacle, which results in a ‘best approximate’ language structurally very similar to the probabilistic network specification language ProbNetKAT.
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1 Introduction

The practical objective of this paper is to provide a systematic and modular understanding of the design of recent programming languages such as NetKAT [9] and ProbNetKAT [8,26] by re-interpreting their syntax as a layering of monads. However, in order to solve this problem, we develop a very general technique for building distributive laws between monads whose applicability goes far beyond understanding the design of languages in the NetKAT family. Indeed, the combination of monads has been an important area of research in theoretical computer science ever since Moggi developed a systematic understanding of computational effects as monads in [23]. In this paradigm – further developed by Plotkin, Power and others in e.g. [24,5] – the question of how to combine computational effects can be treated systematically by studying the possible ways of combining monads. This work can also be understood as a contribution to this area of research.

Combining effects is in general a non-trivial issue, but diverse methods have been studied in the literature. A monad transformer, as described in [5], is a way to enrich any theory with a specific effect. These transformers allow a step-by-step construction of computational structures, later exploited by Hudak et al. [20,19]. In [11], Hyland, Plotkin and Power systematized the study of effect combinations by introducing two canonical constructions for combining monads, which in some sense lie at the extreme ends of the collection of possible combination procedures. At one end of the spectrum they define the sum of monads which consists in the juxtaposition of both theories with no interaction whatsoever between computational effects. At the other end of the spectrum they define the tensor of two monads where both theories are maximally interacting in the sense that “each operator of one theory commutes with each operation of the other” ([11]). In [10] they combine exceptions, side-effects, interactive input/output, non-determinism and continuations using these operations.

In some situations neither the sum nor the tensor of monads is the appropriate construction, and some intermediate level of interaction is preferable. From the perspective of understanding the design of recent programming languages which use layers of non-determinism and probabilities (e.g. ProbNetKAT), there are...
two reasons to consider combinations other than the sum or the tensor. First, there is the unavoidable mathematical obstacle which arises when combining sequential composition with non-deterministic choice (see the simple example below), two essential features of languages in the NetKAT family. When combining two monoid operations with the tensor construction, one enforces the equation \((p; q) + (r; s) = (p + r); (q + s)\) which means, by the Eckmann-Hilton argument, that the two operations collapse into a single commutative operation; clearly not the intended construction. Secondly, and much more importantly, the intended semantics of a language may force us to consider specific and limited interactions between its operations. This is the case for languages in the NetKAT family, where the intended trace semantics suggests distributive laws between operations, for instance that sequential composition distributes over non-deterministic choice (but not the converse). For this reason, the focus of this paper will be to explicitly construct distributive laws between monads.

Using a distributive law is a classic way to compose monads. This method produces a combined structure where effects of the ‘inner’ theory distribute over the ones of the ‘outer’ theory. King and Wadler’s [15] (in the same spirit as [14]) adapts this approach to functional programming and shows, assuming that the user provides the distributive law, how to use it to combine monads. We also choose this option but the main difference is that we offer a procedure aiming to explicitly build the distributive law. It is well-known that not all monads can be composed in this way. The most well-known example is the non-existence of a distributive law between the powerset monad and the distribution monad, first proved by Varacca [28] and discussed recently in [6]. Overcoming this issue is important, as this composition actually means combining non-determinism with probabilities in the transition function of certain automata. Achieving composition may then allow the use of classical tools such as determinisation or bisimulation. Our work provides a fine-grained method for determining (a) if a monad combination by distributive law is possible, (b) if it is not possible, exactly which the features of the original language are broken by the extension and (c) suggests a way to fix the composition by modifying one of our monads. In other words, this enables informed design choices on which programming features we may accept to lose in order to achieve greater expressive power through a language extension.

A simple example. Let us consider a set \(P\) of atomic programs, and build a ‘minimal’ programming language as follows. Since sequential composition is essential to any imperative language we start by defining the syntax as:

\[
p ::= \text{skip} \mid p; p \mid a \in P
\]

and ask that the following programs be identified:

\[
p; \text{skip} = p = \text{skip}; p \quad \text{and} \quad p;(q; r) = (p; q); r
\]

The language defined by the operations of (1) and the equations of (2) can equally be described as the application of the free monoid monad \((-)^*\) to the set of atomic programs \(P\). If we assign a semantics to each basic program \(P\), the semantics of the extended language can be defined as finite sequences (or traces) of the basic semantics. In a next step, we might want to enrich this basic language by adding a non-deterministic choice operation \(+\) and the constant program \(\text{abort}\), satisfying the equations:

\[
\text{abort} + p = p = p + \text{abort} \quad p + p = p \quad p + q = q + p \quad p + (q + r) = (p + q) + r
\]

The signature \((\text{abort}, +)\) and the axioms (3) define join-semilattices, and the monad building free semilattices is the finitary powerset monad \(P\). To build our language in a modular fashion we thus want to apply \(P\) on top of our previous construction and consider the programming language where the syntax and semantics arise from \(P(P^*)\). For this purpose we combine both monads to construct a new monad \(P(-)^*\) by building a distributive law \((-)^*P \to P(-)^*\). As explained above, this approach is semantically justified by the intended trace semantics of the language, and will ensure that operations from the inner layer distribute over the outer ones, i.e.

\[
p;(q + r) = p; q + p; r \quad (q + r); p = q;p + r;p \quad p;\text{abort} = \text{abort};p = \text{abort}
\]

Our method proves and relies on the following theorem: if \(P\) preserves the structure of \((-)^*\)-algebra, defined by operations and equations, then the composition \(P(-)^*\) has a monad structure provided by the corresponding distributive law. Note that our result extends a similar proposition from [7]. Applying this theorem to our running example, the first step is to lift the signature (1), in other words to define new canonical interpretations in \(P(P^*)\) for \(;\) and \(\text{skip}\). Once this lifting is achieved, the equations in (2), arising from the inner layer, can be interpreted in \(P(-)^*\). We need to check if they still hold: is the new interpretation of \(;\) still associative? To answer this question, our method makes use of categorical diagrams to obtain precise conditions on our monadic constructs. Furthermore, in the case where equations fail to hold, we provide a way to identify exactly what stands in the way of monad composition. We can then offer tailor-made adjustments to achieve the composition and obtain a ‘best approximate’ language, with slightly modified monads.

Structure of this paper. Section 2 presents some basic facts about monads and distributive laws and fixes the notation. In Section 3 we show how a monad can lift the operations and equations defining another monad. It is well-known [27,22] that for a \(\text{Set}\)-monad, being symmetric monoidal is a sufficient condition for the
existence of a distributive law of any polynomial (or shapely) functor over this monad. We strengthen this result and show that for \( \text{Set} \)-monads being symmetric monoidal is in fact also necessary. This clarifies the role of the symmetry diagram (SYM) in the construction of distributive laws between \( \text{Set} \)-monads. Having shown when operations can be lifted by a monad in Section 3, we show when equations can be lifted in Section 4. We isolate two conditions on the lifting monad which guarantee that any equation can be lifted. These two conditions correspond to a monad being affine [16] and relevant [12]. We also characterise the general form of equations preserved by monads which only satisfy a subset of these conditions. Interestingly, together with the symmetry condition (SYM) which is necessary and sufficient to lift operations, we recover what are essentially the three structural laws of classical logic (see also [12]). In Section 5 that the *-free fragment of ProbNetKAT can be built in systematic way by construction distributive laws between the three layers of the language.

All omitted proofs can be found in the Appendix.

2 A primer on monads, algebras and distributive laws

Monads and \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebras. For the purposes of this paper, we will always consider monads on \( \text{Set} \) ([2,21,23]). The core language described in the introduction is defined by the signature \( \Sigma = \{ ;, \text{skip} \} \) and the set \( E \) of equations given by (2). More generally, we view programming languages as algebraic structures defined by a signature \((\Sigma, ar : \Sigma \to \mathbb{N})\) and a set of equations \( E \) enforcing program equivalence. To formalize this we first define a \( \Sigma \)-algebra to be a set \( X \) together with an interpretation \([\sigma] : X^{\text{ar}(\sigma)} \to X\) of each operation \( \sigma \in \Sigma \). A \( \Sigma \)-algebra can be conveniently represented as an algebra for the polynomial functor \( H_\Sigma = \coprod_{\sigma \in \Sigma} (\sigma) \) defined by the signature, i.e., as a set \( X \) together with a map \( \beta : H_\Sigma X \to X \). A \( \Sigma \)-algebra morphism between \( \beta : H_\Sigma X \to X \) and \( \gamma : H_\Sigma Y \to Y \) is a map \( f : X \to Y \) such that \( \gamma \circ H_\Sigma f = f \circ \beta \). The category of \( \Sigma \)-algebras and \( \Sigma \)-algebra morphisms is denoted \( \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \). In particular, the set \( F_\Sigma X \) of all \( \Sigma \)-terms is a \( \Sigma \)-algebra – the free \( \Sigma \)-algebra over \( X \) and \( F_\Sigma \) is a functor \( \text{Set} \to \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \) forming an adjunction

\[ F_\Sigma \vdash U_\Sigma : \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \to \text{Set} \]

(5)

Since it will not lead to any ambiguity we will usually overload the symbol \( F_\Sigma \) to also denote the monad \( U_\Sigma F_\Sigma : \text{Set} \to \text{Set} \) arising from this adjunction.

Given a \( \Sigma \)-algebra \( A \), a free \( \Sigma \)-term \( s \) build over variables in a set \( V \), and a valuation map \( v : V \to U_\Sigma A \), we define the interpretation \( [s]_v \) of \( s \) in \( A \) recursively in the obvious manner. We say that an equation \( s = t \) between free \( \Sigma \)-terms is valid in \( A \), denoted \( A \models s = t \), if for every valuation \( v : V \to U_\Sigma A \), \([s]_v = [t]_v \).

Given a set \( E \) of equations we define a \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebra as a \( \Sigma \)-algebra in which all the equations in \( E \) are valid. We denote by \( \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \) the subcategory of \( \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \) consisting of \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebras. There exists a functor \( F : \text{Set} \to \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \) building free \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebras which is left adjoint to the obvious forgetful functor:

\[ F \dashv U : \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \to \text{Set} \]

(6)

In our running example all monads arise from a finitary syntax, and thus from an adjunction of the type (6).

Eilenberg-Moore categories. An algebra for the monad \( T \) is a set \( X \) together with an map \( \alpha : TX \to X \) such that the diagrams in (7) commute. A morphism \( (X, \alpha) \xrightarrow{T} (Y, \beta) \) of \( T \)-algebras is a morphism \( X \xrightarrow{f} Y \) in \( \text{Set} \) verifying \( \beta \circ Tf = f \circ \alpha \).

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
TX & \xrightarrow{\mu_X} & TX \\
\downarrow T & \alpha & \downarrow T \\
TX & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
TX & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & TX \\
\downarrow T & \alpha & \downarrow T \\
TX & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X
\end{array} \]

(7)

The category of \( T \)-algebras and \( T \)-algebra morphisms is called the Eilenberg-Moore category of the monad \( T \), and denoted \( \mathcal{E}M(T) \). There is an obvious forgetful functor \( U_E : \mathcal{E}M(T) \to \text{Set} \) which sends an algebra to its carrier, it has a left-adjoint \( F_E : \text{Set} \to \mathcal{E}M(T) \) which sends a set \( X \) to the free \( T \)-algebra \( \mu_X : \mu_X : T^2X \to TX \).

Note that the adjunction \( F_E \dashv U_E \) gives rise to the monad \( T \). A lifting of a functor \( F : \text{Set} \to \text{Set} \) to \( \mathcal{E}M(T) \) is a functor \( \bar{F} \) on \( \mathcal{E}M(T) \) such that \( U_E \circ \bar{F} = F \circ U_E \).

Lemma 2.1 ([21] VI.8. Theorem 1) For any adjunction of the form (6), \( \mathcal{E}M(UF) \) and \( \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \) are equivalent categories.

The functors connecting \( \mathcal{E}M(UF) \) and \( \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \) are traditionally called comparison functors, and we will denote them by \( M : \mathcal{E}M(UF) \to \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \) and \( K : \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \to \mathcal{E}M(UF) \). Consider first the free monad \( F_\Sigma \) for a signature \( \Sigma \) (i.e. the monad generated by the adjunction (5)). The comparison functor \( M : \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \to \mathcal{E}M(F_\Sigma) \) maps the free \( F_\Sigma \)-algebra over \( X \mu_X \) \( X \to F_\Sigma X \) to the free \( H_\Sigma \)-algebra over \( X \) which we shall denote by \( \alpha_X : H_\Sigma F_\Sigma X \to F_\Sigma X \). It is well-known that \( \alpha_X \) is an isomorphism. Moreover, the maps \( \alpha_X \) define a natural transformation \( H_\Sigma F_\Sigma \to F_\Sigma \). Similarly in the presence of equations, if we consider the adjunction \( F \dashv U \) of
(6) and the associated monad $T = UF$, then the comparison functor $M' : \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E) \to \mathcal{EM}(T)$ sends the free $T$-algebra $\mu^T_X : T^2X \to TX$ to an $H_T$-algebra which we shall denote $\rho_X : H_TTX \to TX$. Again, the maps $\rho_X$ define a natural transformation $H_T \to T$, but in general $\rho_X$ is no longer an isomorphism. For example in the case of monoids and of a set $X$ with at least three elements $x, y, z$, we have $\rho_X(x:y;z) = \rho_X(x:y)z$.

**Distributive laws.** Let $(S, \eta^S, \mu^S)$ and $(T, \eta^T, \mu^T)$ be monads, a **distributive law of $S$ over $T$** (see [4]) is a natural transformation $\lambda : TS \to ST$ satisfying the following four conditions:

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \xrightarrow{\eta^T_S} TS & ST & \xrightarrow{\lambda} TS \quad \text{(DL. 1)} \\
& \xrightarrow{\psi^T} TS & ST & \xrightarrow{\lambda} TS \quad \text{(DL. 2)} \\
& \xrightarrow{\mu^S_T} STS & STS & \xrightarrow{\lambda} STS \quad \text{(DL. 3)} \\
& \xrightarrow{\mu^T_S} STS & STS & \xrightarrow{\lambda} STS \quad \text{(DL. 4)}
\end{align*}
\]

If $\lambda$ only satisfies (DL. 2) and (DL. 4), we will say that $\lambda$ is a distributive law of the the monad $S$ over **functor** $T$, or in the terminology of [13], an $\mathcal{EM}$-law of $S$ over $T$. Dually, if $\lambda$ only satisfies (DL. 1) and (DL. 3), $\lambda$ is known as a distributive law of the functor $S$ over the monad $T$, or $\mathcal{KL}$-law of $S$ over $T$ in the terminology of [13].

**Theorem 2.2** [4,13,3] $\mathcal{EM}$-laws $\lambda : SF \to FS$ and liftings of $F$ to $\mathcal{EM}(S)$ are in one-to-one correspondence.

If there exists a distributive law $\lambda : TS \to ST$ of the monad $T$ over the monad $S$, then the composition of $S$ and $T$ also forms a monad $(ST, u, m)$, whose unit $u$ and multiplication $m$ are given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
X & \xrightarrow{\eta^T_X} TX & STX & \xrightarrow{\lambda} STX \quad \text{(DL. 1)} \\
STX & \xrightarrow{S\eta^T_X} SSTX & STTX & \xrightarrow{\lambda} STTX \quad \text{(DL. 2)} \\
STTX & \xrightarrow{S\lambda} STTX & STTTX & \xrightarrow{\lambda} STTTX \quad \text{(DL. 3)} \\
STTTX & \xrightarrow{S\mu^T_X} STTX & STTX & \xrightarrow{\lambda} STTX \quad \text{(DL. 4)}
\end{align*}
\]

Algebraically, if $\mathcal{EM}(S) \simeq \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E)$ and $\mathcal{EM}(T) \simeq \text{Alg}(\Sigma', E')$, then a distributive law $ST \to TS$ implements the distributivity of the operations in $\Sigma$ over those of $\Sigma'$.

## 3 Building distributive laws between monads

In this section we will show how to construct a distributive law $\lambda : ST \to TS$ between monads via a **monoidal structure** on $T$. Although we will in practice only be interested in finitary monad on $\textbf{Set}$, we will present results in as much generality as possible in order to isolate the essential assumptions.

### 3.1 Monoidal monads

Let us briefly recall some relatively well-known categorical notion. A **lax monoidal functor** on a monoidal category $(C, \otimes, I)$, or simply a monoidal functor\(^2\), is an endofunctor $F : C \to C$ together with natural transformations $\psi_{X,Y} : FX \otimes FY \to F(X \otimes Y)$ and $\psi^0 : I \to FI$ satisfying the diagrams:

\[
\begin{align*}
FX \otimes I & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_F \otimes \psi^0} FX \otimes FI & I \otimes FX & \xrightarrow{\psi^0 \otimes \text{id}_F} FI \otimes FX & (FX \otimes FY) \otimes FZ & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{FY,FZ}} FX \otimes (FY \otimes FZ) \\
& \xrightarrow{\rho_F} F(X \otimes I) & & \xrightarrow{\rho'_F} F(I \otimes X) & (F(X \otimes Y) \otimes FZ) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} F((X \otimes Y) \otimes Z) \\
& \xrightarrow{F_{\psi_{X,I}}} F(X \otimes I) & & \xrightarrow{F_{\psi^0_{X,I}}} FI \otimes FX & & \xrightarrow{\psi_{X,Y,Z}} F((X \otimes Y) \otimes Z) \\
& \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes F \psi} F(X \otimes Y) \otimes FZ & & \xrightarrow{F \psi_{Y,Z}} F(I \otimes Y) \otimes FZ & (X,Y \otimes Z) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes F \psi_{Y,Z}} F((X \otimes Y) \otimes Z)
\end{align*}
\]

where $\alpha$ is the associator of $(C, \otimes, I)$ and $\rho, \rho'$ the left and right unitors respectively. The diagrams (MF. 1), (MF. 2) and (MF. 3) play a key role in the lifting of operations and equations in this section and the next. In particular they ensure that any unital (resp. associative) operation lifts to a unital (resp. associative) operation. We will sometimes refer to $\psi$ as the **Fubini transformation** of $F$.

\(^2\) We will never consider the notion of **strong** monoidal functor, so this terminology should not lead to any confusion.
A monoidal monad \( T \) on a monoidal category is a monad whose underlying functor is monoidal for a natural transformation \( \psi_{X,Y} : TX \otimes TY \to T(X \otimes Y) \) and whose unit and multiplication are monoidal natural transformations, that is to say:

\[
\begin{align*}
X \otimes Y &\xrightarrow{\eta_X \otimes \eta_Y} TX \otimes TY \quad \text{(MM.1)} \\
\psi_{X,Y} &\xrightarrow{\mu_X \otimes \mu_Y} T(X \otimes Y) \quad \text{(MM.2)}
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover, a monoidal monad is called symmetric monoidal if

\[
\begin{align*}
TX \otimes TY &\xrightarrow{\psi_{X,Y}} T(X \otimes Y) \\
\text{swap}_{TX,TY} &\xrightarrow{\text{swap}_{X,Y}} TY \otimes TX \xrightarrow{\psi_{Y,X}} T(Y \otimes X)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \text{swap} : (-) \times (-) \to (-) \times (-) \) is the argument-swapping transformation (natural in both arguments).

We now present a result which shows that for monoidal categories which are sufficiently similar to \((\text{Set}, \times, 1)\), being monoidal is equivalent to being symmetric monoidal. The criteria on \((C, \otimes, I)\) in the following theorem are due to [25] and generalize the strength unicity result of [23, Prop. 3.4]. Our usage of the concept of strength in what follows is purely technical, it is the monoidal structure which is our main object of interest. We therefore refer the reader to e.g. [23] for the definitions of strength and commutative monad.

**Theorem 3.1** Let \( T : C \to C \) be a monad over a monoidal category \((C, \otimes, I)\) whose tensor unit \( I \) is a separator of \( C \) (i.e. such that \( f, g : X \to Y \) and \( f \neq g \) implies \( \exists x : I \to X \) s.th. \( f \circ x \neq g \circ x \)) and that for any morphism \( z : I \to X \otimes Y \) there exist \( x : I \to X, y : I \to Y \) such that \( z = (x \otimes y) \circ \rho_I^{-1} \). Then t.f.a.e.

(i) There exists a unique natural transformation \( \psi_{X,Y} : TX \otimes TY \to T(X \otimes Y) \) making \( T \) monoidal
(ii) There exists a unique strength \( \text{st}_{X,Y} : X \times TY \to T(X \otimes Y) \) making \( T \) commutative
(iii) There exists a unique natural transformation \( \psi_{X,Y} : TX \otimes TY \to T(X \otimes Y) \) making \( T \) symmetric monoidal

In particular, monoidal monads on \((\text{Set}, \times, 1)\) are necessarily symmetric (and thus commutative). As we will see in the next section (Theorem 4.6), this symmetry has deep consequences: it means that a certain syntactically definable class of equations can always be lifted by monoidal monads.

### 3.2 Lifting operations

First though, we show that being monoidal is essential to lift operations. Among finitary \( \text{Set} \)-monads, which are monoidal in \((\text{Set}, \times, 1)\) precisely those which lift (necessarily uniquely) to the category \( \mathcal{EM}(F_\Sigma) \simeq \mathcal{Alg}(\Sigma) \) of \( \Sigma \)-algebras, for any finitary \( \Sigma \). The implication \((i) \Rightarrow (iii)\) in the following Theorem is well-known and can be found in e.g. [27,22] where it is shown to hold for any monad. Here we focus on finitary monads in order to prove a (partial) converse. Note however that the result generalizes straightforwardly to \( \kappa \)-accessible monads for any regular cardinal \( \kappa \).

**Theorem 3.2** Let \( T : \text{Set} \to \text{Set} \) be a finitary monad, then t.f.a.e.

(i) There exists a natural transformation \( \psi_{X,Y} : TX \times TY \to T(X \times Y) \) making \( T \) monoidal
(ii) There exists a unique distributive law \( \lambda : (-)^2T \to T(-)^2 \)
(iii) Given a finitary signature \( \Sigma \), there exists a unique distributive law \( \lambda^\Sigma : H_\Sigma T \to TH_\Sigma \) of the polynomial functor associated with \( \Sigma \) over \( T \)
(iv) Given a finitary signature \( \Sigma \), there exists a unique distributive law \( \rho^\Sigma : F_\Sigma T \to TF_\Sigma \) of the free monad associated with \( \Sigma \) over \( T \)

The distributive laws \( \lambda^\Sigma : H_\Sigma T \to TH_\Sigma \) built from a monoidal structure \( \psi \) on \( T \) in Theorem 3.2 have the general shape

\[
H_\Sigma TX = \prod_{s \in \Sigma} (TX)^{ar(s)} \xrightarrow{\prod_{s \in \Sigma} \psi_X^{(ar(s))}} TH_\Sigma X
\]

(8)

where \( \psi^{(0)} = \eta_T \), \( \psi^{(1)}_X = \text{id}_X \) and for \( k \geq 2 \), \( \psi^{(k)}_{X_1,\ldots,X_k} : TX_1 \times \cdots \times TX_k \to T(X_1 \times \cdots \times X_k) \) is the transformation natural (and monoidal) in \( k \) arguments built by repeated application of the Fubini transformation \( \psi \). In a
general monoidal category $\psi^{(k)}$ is only defined up to isomorphism, by virtue of Diagram (MF. 3), but in Set, we can use the same argument as in Theorem 3.2 to show that $\psi^{(k)}$ is in fact the unique transformations natural in $k$ arguments satisfying the $k$-fold versions of (MM.1) and (MM.2).

As shown in Theorem 3.2, $\lambda$ corresponds uniquely to a distributive law $\rho^\Sigma : F_{\Sigma}T \to TF_{\Sigma}$, which is to say, by Theorem 2.2, to a lifting $\bar{T}$ of $T$ to $EM(F_{\Sigma}) \cong \text{Alg}(\Sigma)$. Explicitly, given an $F_{\Sigma}$-algebra $\beta : F_{\Sigma}X \to X$, $\bar{T}(X, \beta)$ is defined as the $F_{\Sigma}$-algebra

$$ F_{\Sigma}TX \xrightarrow{\bar{T}} TF_{\Sigma}X \xrightarrow{T\beta} TX $$

(9)

Thus whenever $T$ is monoidal, we can ‘lift’ the operations of $\Sigma$, or, in programming language terms, we can define the operations of the outer layer ($T$) on the language defined by the operations of the inner layer ($F_{\Sigma}$).

### 3.3 Lifting equations

We now show how to go from a lifting of $T$ on $EM(F_{\Sigma}) \cong \text{Alg}(\Sigma)$ to a lifting of $T$ on $EM(S) \cong \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E)$. More precisely, we will now show how to ‘quotient’ the distributive law $\rho^\Sigma : F_{\Sigma}T \to TF_{\Sigma}$ into a distributive law $\lambda : ST \to TS$. Of course this is not always possible, but in the next section we will give sufficient conditions under which the procedure described below does work. The first step is to define the natural transformation $q : F_{\Sigma} \to S$ which quotients the free $\Sigma$-algebras by the equations of $E$ to build the free $(\Sigma, E)$-algebra. At each set $X$, let $EX$ denote the set of pairs $(s, t) \in F_{\Sigma}X$ such that $SX \models s = t$ and let $\pi_1, \pi_2$ be the obvious projections. Then $q$ can be constructed via the coequalizers:

$$ EX \xrightarrow{\pi_1} F_{\Sigma}X \xrightarrow{q_X} SX $$

(10)

By construction $q$ is a component-wise regular epi monad morphism ($q \circ \eta = \eta^S$ and $\mu^S \circ qq = q \circ \mu^T$), and it induces a functor $Q : EM(S) \to EM(F_{\Sigma})$ defined by

$$ Q(\xi) : SX \to X = \xi \circ q_X : F_{\Sigma}X \to X, \quad Q(f) = f $$

which is well defined by naturality of $q$. This functor describes an embedding, in particular it is injective on objects: if $Q(\xi_1) = Q(\xi_2)$ then $\xi_1 \circ q_X = \xi_2 \circ q_X$, and therefore $\xi_1 = \xi_2$ since $q_X$ is a (regular) epi.

Given two terms $u, v \in F_{\Sigma}V$, we will say that a lifting $\bar{T} : \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \to \text{Alg}(\Sigma)$ preserves the equation $u = v$, or by a slight abuse of notation that the monad $T$ preserves $u = v$, if $\bar{T}A \models u = v$ whenever $A \models u = v$. Similarly, we will say that $\bar{T}$ sends $(\Sigma, E)$-algebras to $(\Sigma, E)$-algebras if it preserves all the equations in $E$. Half of the following result can be found in [7] where a distributive law over a functor is built in a similar way.

**Lemma 3.3** If $q : F_{\Sigma} \to T$ is a component-wise epi monad morphism, $\rho^\Sigma$ is a distributive law of the monad $F_{\Sigma}$ over the monad $T$ and if there exists a natural transformation $\lambda : ST \to TS$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$ F_{\Sigma}T \xrightarrow{q_T} ST $$

(11)

then $\lambda$ is a distributive law of the monad $S$ over the monad $T$.

From this lemma we can give an abstract criterion which, when implemented concretely in the next section, will allow us to go from a lifting of $T$ on $EM(F_{\Sigma}) \cong \text{Alg}(\Sigma)$ to a lifting of $T$ on $EM(S) \cong \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E)$.

**Theorem 3.4** Suppose $T, S : \text{Set} \to \text{Set}$ are finitary monads, that $T$ is monoidal and that $EM(S) \cong \text{Alg}(\Sigma, E)$, and let $\bar{T} : \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \to \text{Alg}(\Sigma)$ be the unique lifting of $T$ defined via Theorems 3.2 and 2.2. If $\bar{T}$ sends $(\Sigma, E)$-algebras to $(\Sigma, E)$-algebras, then there exists a natural transformation $\lambda : ST \to TS$ satisfying (11), and therefore a distributive law of $S$ over $T$.

### 4 Checking equation preservation

In Section 3 we showed how to build a lifting of $T : \text{Set} \to \text{Set}$ to $\bar{T} : \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \to \text{Alg}(\Sigma)$ using a Fubini transformation $\psi$ via (8) and (9). In this section we provide a sound method to ascertain whether this lifting
sends \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebras to \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebras, by giving sufficient conditions for the preservation of equations. We assume throughout this section that \(T\) is monoidal, in particular \(T\) lifts to \(\text{Alg}(\Sigma)\) for any finitary signature \(\Sigma\). We will denote by \(U_{\Sigma} : \text{Alg}(\Sigma) \to \text{Set}\) the obvious forgetful functor.

4.1 Residual diagrams

We fix a finitary signature \(\Sigma\) and let \(u, v\) be \(\Sigma\)-terms over a set of variables \(V\). Recall that the monad \(T\) preserves the equation \(u = v\) if \(\hat{T}A \models u = v\) whenever \(A \models u = v\). If \(t\) is a \(\Sigma\)-term, we will denote by \(\text{Var}(t)\) the set of variables in \(t\) and by \(\text{Arg}(t)\) the list of arguments used in \(t\) ordered as they appear in \(t\). For example, the list of arguments of \(t = f(x_1, g(x_3, x_2), x_1)\) is \(\text{Arg}(t) = [x_1, x_3, x_2, x_1]\).

Let \(V\) be a set of variables and \(A\) be a \(\Sigma\)-algebra with carrier \(A\), we define the morphism \(\delta^A_V(t) : A|V| \to A^k\) where \(k = |\text{Arg}(t)|\) as the following pairing of projections:

\[
\text{if } \text{Arg}(t) = [x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, x_{i_3}, \ldots, x_{i_k}] \text{ then } \delta^A_V(t) = (\pi_{i_1}, \pi_{i_2}, \pi_{i_3}, \ldots, \pi_{i_k})
\]

Intuitively, this pairing rearranges, copies and duplicates the variables used in \(t\) so that they match the arguments. Next, we define \(\sigma^A_V(t) : A^k \to A\) inductively by:

\[
\sigma^V_A(x) = \text{id}_A \\
\sigma^V_A(f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = A^k \xrightarrow{\sigma^A_V(t_1) \times \cdots \times \sigma^A_V(t_n)} A^i \xrightarrow{f_A} A
\]

With \(f_A\) the interpretation of \(f \in \Sigma\) in \(A\). Finally we define \([t]^V_A\) as \(\sigma^V_A(t) \circ \delta^V_A(t)\). The following lemma follows easily from the definitions.

**Lemma 4.1** For any \(t \in F_{\Sigma}V\), \(\delta^V_A(t), \sigma^V_A(t)\), and therefore \([t]^V_A\), are natural in \(A\).

We can therefore re-interpret any term \(t \in F_{\Sigma}V\) as a natural transformation \([t]^V : (-)|V|U_{\Sigma} \to U_{\Sigma}\) which is itself the composition of two natural transformations. The first, \(\delta^V(t) : (-)|V|U_{\Sigma} \to (-)^kU_{\Sigma}\), ‘prepares’ the variables by swapping, copying and deleting them as appropriate. The second, \(\sigma^V(t) : (-)^kU_{\Sigma} \to U_{\Sigma}\), performs the evaluation at each given algebra. Of course, the usual soundness and completeness property of term functions still holds.

**Lemma 4.2** For \(A\) a \(\Sigma\)-algebra and \(u, v \in F_{\Sigma}V\), \([u]^V_A = [v]^V_A\) if and only if \(A \models u = v\).

Now consider the following diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (1) at (0,0) {\((-)^{|V|}U_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{\psi^{|V|}_{U_{\Sigma}}} T(-)^{|V|}U_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{\tau t} U_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_T} U_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\hat{T}}} U_{\Sigma}}};
\node (2) at (3,0) {\((-)^kU_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{\sigma^{|V|}_A(t)} U_{\Sigma} \xrightarrow{\hat{T}} U_{\Sigma}}};
\node (3) at (3,1) {[t]^V};
\path
(1) edge node {$\delta^{|V|}_A(t)$} (2)
(2) edge node {$\tau t$} (3)
(3) edge node {$\text{id}_{\hat{T}}$} (1);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{array}
\]

Since \(U_{\Sigma} \circ \hat{T} = T \circ U_{\Sigma}\) by definition of liftings it is clear that the vertical arrows \(\psi^{|V|}_{U_{\Sigma}}\) and \(\psi^{(k)}\) are well-typed. We define \(\text{Pres}(T, t, V)\) as the outer square of Diagram (12) and we call the left-hand square \(\Box\) the residual diagram \(R(T, t, V)\). The following observation lies at the heart of our method for building distributive laws.

**Lemma 4.3** If \(R(T, t, V)\) commutes, then \(\text{Pres}(T, t, V)\) commutes.

**Proof.** Let \(A\) be an algebra with carrier \(A\). We prove that for any \(t \in F_{\Sigma}V\), \(\Box\) commutes. We proceed by induction on the structure of \(t\):

- if \(t\) is a variable \(x\), then \(k = 1\), \(\sigma^{|V|}_A(t) = \psi^{(1)}_{t_A} = \text{id}_{T_A}\) and hence \(\Box\) trivially commutes.

\[7\]
If \( t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_i) \), let \( k = |\text{Arg}(t)|, k_j = |\text{Arg}(t_j)| \). Then \( k = k_1 + \cdots + k_i \). The diagram \( \bigcirc \) becomes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{ccc}
T(A^k) & \xrightarrow{\psi(k)} & (TA)^k \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
T(\sigma_A^k(t_1) \times \cdots \times \sigma_A^k(t_i)) & \xrightarrow{\psi(i)} & T(A^k) \times \cdots \times T(A^k) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
T(A^i) & \xrightarrow{\psi(i)} & (TA)^i \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

\( \bigcirc \) commutes by unicity of \( \psi(k) \) (Theorem 3.2); \( \bigcirc \) commutes by induction hypothesis for each term \( t_j \); \( \bigcirc \) commutes by naturality of \( \psi(i) \); \( \bigcirc \) commutes because, for \( f \in \Sigma \), \( f_{TA} = Tf_A \circ \psi(i) \) by definition of \( \hat{T} \).

The following soundness theorem follows immediately from Lemma 4.3.

**Theorem 4.4** If \( u, v \in F_\Sigma V \) are such that \( R(T, u, V) \) and \( R(T, v, V) \) commute, then \( T \) preserves \( u = v \).

**Proof.** If \( \mathcal{A} \models u = v \), then \([u]_{\mathcal{A}}^V = [v]_{\mathcal{A}}^V \) by Lemma 4.2 and thus \( T[u]_{\mathcal{A}}^V \circ \psi_A^{(IV)} = T[v]_{\mathcal{A}}^V \circ \psi_A^{(IV)} \). Since \( R(T, u, V) \) and \( R(T, v, V) \) commute, so do \( \text{Pres}(T, u, V) \) and \( \text{Pres}(T, v, V) \) by Lemma 4.3, and therefore \([u]_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \psi_A = [v]_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \psi_A \) that is to say \( T\mathcal{A} \models u = v \) by Lemma 4.2. 

Therefore residual diagrams act as sufficient conditions for equation preservation. Note that these diagrams only involve \( \psi \), projections and the monad \( T \), sometimes inside pairings. In other words, the actual operations of \( \Sigma \) appearing in an equation have no impact on its preservation. What matters is the variable rearrangement transformations \( \delta^V(u) \) and \( \delta^V(v) \), and how they interact with the Fubini transformation \( \psi \).

The converse of Theorem 4.4 does not hold. Consider the powerset monad \( \mathcal{P} \) and a \( \Sigma \)-algebra \( \mathcal{A} \) with \( \Sigma \) containing a binary operation \( \bullet \). Clearly \( \mathcal{P}\mathcal{A} = \{ x \bullet x = x \bullet x : \mathcal{A} \} \) whenever \( \mathcal{A} = \{ x \bullet x = x \bullet x \} \), because the equation trivially holds in any \( \Sigma \)-algebra. In other words, it is preserved by \( \mathcal{P} \). However \( R(\mathcal{P}, x \bullet x, \{ x \}) \) does not commute: provided that \( X \) has more than one element, it is easy to see that \( R(\mathcal{P}, x \bullet x, \{ x \}) \) evaluated at \( X \) is

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}} & (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A})^2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A}}} & (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{A})^2 \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \Delta \) is the diagonal transformation and \( - \times - \) is the monoidal structure for \( \mathcal{P} \) which takes the Cartesian product. This diagram does not commute (in other words \( \mathcal{P} \) is not ‘relevant’, see below).

### 4.2 Examples of residual diagrams

We need a priori two diagrams per equation to verify preservation. However, in many cases diagrams will be trivially commuting. For instance, associativity and unit produce trivial diagrams. For associativity we assume a binary operation \( \bullet \in \Sigma \), let \( V = \{ x, y, z \} \) and compute that \( \delta^V_A(x \bullet (y \bullet z)) = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3) : A^3 \to A^3 \) which is just \( \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}} \) as well. It follows that \( R(T, x \bullet (y \bullet z), V) \) commutes since \( \psi_A \circ \Gamma_{T\mathcal{A}} = T\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \psi_A^{(6)} \) which trivially holds. The argument for \( (x \bullet y) \bullet z \) is identical, thus associativity is always lifted. The same argument shows that units are always lifted as well. This is not completely surprising since we have built-in units and associativity via Diagrams (MF. 1), (MF. 2) and (MF. 3).

Let us now consider commutativity: \( x \bullet y = y \bullet x \). In this case, we put \( V = \{ x, y \} \) and hence \( \delta^V_A(x \bullet y) = \text{id}_A \) and \( R(T, x \bullet y, V) \) obviously commutes for the same reason as before. Similarly, it is not hard to check that \( R(T, y \bullet x, V) \) is just diagram (SYM), which we know holds by our assumption that \( T \) is monoidal and Theorem 3.1. It follows that:

**Theorem 4.5** Commutative monads preserve associativity, unit and commutativity.
Some equations are not always preserved by commutative monads, we present here two important examples.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Idempotency: } & x \cdot x = x & \text{Absorption: } x \cdot 0 = 0 \\
\mathcal{R}(T, x \cdot x, \{x\}) \text{ given by: } & \quad & \mathcal{R}(T, x \cdot 0, \{x\}) \text{ given by: }
\end{align*}
\]

These diagrams correspond to classes of monads studied in the literature. The residual diagram for idempotency can be expressed as the equation \( \psi_{A,A} \circ \Delta_{TA} = T \Delta_A \), where \( \Delta \) is the diagonal operator. A monad \( T \) verifying this condition is called relevant by Jacobs in [12]. Similarly, one easily shows that the commutativity of the absorption diagram is equivalent to the definition of affine monads in [16,12].

4.3 General criteria for equation preservation

As shown in lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.4, the interaction between \( T \) and the variable rearrangements operated by \( \delta^V \) can provide a sufficient condition for the preservation of equations. We will focus on three important types of interaction between a monad \( T \) and rearrangement operations. First, the residual diagram for commutativity, i.e. Diagram (SYM), which corresponds to saying that \( T \) preserves variable swappings’, i.e. that \( T \) is commutative/symmetric monoidal, or in logical term to the exchange rule. As we saw, this condition must be satisfied in order to simply lift operations, so we must take it as a basic assumption. Second, the residual diagram for idempotency (leftmost diagram of (13)) which corresponds to \( T \) preserves variable duplications’, i.e. that \( T \) is relevant, or in logical terms to the weakening rule. Finally the residual diagram for absorption (rightmost diagram of (13)) which corresponds to \( T \) allows to drop variables’, i.e. \( T \) is affine, or in logical terms to the contraction rule. To each of these residual diagrams corresponds a syntactically definable class of equations which are automatically preserved by a monad satisfying the residual diagram.

**Theorem 4.6** Let \( T \) be a commutative monad. If \( \text{Var}(u) = \text{Var}(v) \) and if each variable appears once in \( u \) and in \( v \), then \( T \) preserves \( u = v \).

Let us now treat the case where variables may appear several times.

**Theorem 4.7** Let \( T \) be a commutative relevant monad. If \( \text{Var}(u) = \text{Var}(v) \), then \( T \) preserves \( u = v \).

In light of previous results, commutative relevant monads seem to preserve many algebraic laws. However, in the case where both sides of the equation do not contain the same variables, for instance \( x \cdot 0 = 0 \), Theorem 4.7 does not apply. Intuitively, the missing piece is the ability to drop some of the variables in \( V \).

**Theorem 4.8** Let \( T \) be a commutative affine monad. If variables only appear once in \( u \) and in \( v \), then \( T \) preserves \( u = v \).

Combining the results of Theorems 4.7 and 4.8, one gets a very economical – if very strong – criterion for the preservation of all equations.

**Theorem 4.9** Let \( T \) be a commutative, relevant and affine monad. For all \( u \) and \( v \), \( T \) preserves \( u = v \).

Note that for \( T \) commutative monad, being both relevant and affine is equivalent to preserving products, as seen in [16]. This confirms that such a monad \( T \) preserves all equations of the underlying algebraic structure, in other words always has a distributive law with any other monad. This is however a very strong condition. An example of this type of monad is \( T(X) = X^Y \) for \( Y \) an object of \( \text{Set} \).

4.4 Building a ‘best approximate’ language when composition fails.

In the case where a residual diagram fails to commute, we cannot conclude that the validity of the corresponding equation transfers from \( A \) to \( \tilde{T}A \). Moreover, the non-commutativity of the diagram often provides a counter-example which shows that the equation is in fact not valid in \( \tilde{T}A \) (this is the case of idempotency and distributivity in the next section).

However, if our aim is to build a language combining all operations on programs used to define \( T \) and \( S \), then our method can provide an answer, since it allows us to identify precisely which equations fail to hold.
Let $E'$ be the subset of $E$ containing the equations preserved by $T$. A new monad $S'$ can be derived from signature $\Sigma'$ and equations $E'$ using an adjunction of type (6). Since $E'$ only contains equations preserved by $T$, by theorem 3.4 the composition $TS'$ creates a monad, and its algebraic structure contains all the constructs derived from the original signature $\Sigma$, as well as the new symbols arising from $T$.

This method for fixing a faulty monad composition follows the idea of loosening the constraints of the inner layer, meaning in this case modifying $S$ to construct a monad resembling $TS$. The best approximate language we obtain has the desired signature, but has lost some of the laws described by $S$. We illustrate this method in the following section.

## 5 Application

As sketched in the introduction, our method aims to incrementally build an imperative language: starting with sequential composition, we add a layer providing non-deterministic choice, then a layer for probabilistic choice.

**Adding the non-deterministic layer.** We start by lifting the constants and operations as sketched in the introduction, our method aims to incrementally build an imperative language: starting with

\[ S_{\text{add}} \]

we can now define the interpretation in $P$ of $A$.

\[ \lambda \]

We now add non-determinism via the finitary powerset monad $P$, which is simply the free join semi-lattice monad. To build this extension, we want to combine both monads to create a new monad $P((−)^*)$. As we have shown in Theorem 3.4, it suffices to build a lifting of monad $P$ to $\text{Mon}$, the category of algebras for the signature (1) and equations (2).

\[ \text{Theorem 4.4} \]

The first step is lifting $P$ to the category of $\{\text{skip, ;}\}$-algebras, which means lifting the operations of $A$ to $P(A′)$ using a Fubini map. It is well-known that the powerset monad is commutative, and it follows in particular that there exists a unique symmetric monoidal transformation $ψ: P × P → P(−×−)$ which is given by the Cartesian product: for $U ∈ P(X), V ∈ P(Y)$, we take $ψ_{X,Y}(U, V) = U × V$. Using this Fubini transformation, we can now define the interpretation in $P(A′)$ of $\text{skip}$ and $;$ as:

\[ \hat{\text{skip}} = \bar{P}(\text{skip}) \circ η_{\{(*\})} = \{ε\} \quad \hat{;} = \bar{P}(;) \circ ψ_{A*→A*}: (P^A)^2 → P^A, (U, V) ↦ \{u; v | u ∈ U, v ∈ V\} \]

To check that this lifting defines a lifting on $\text{Mon}$, we need to check that equations (2) hold in $P(A′)$. These equations describe associativity and unit: by Theorem 4.5, they are always preserved by a strong commutative monad like $P$.

From Theorem 3.4 and 4.4 that we obtain a distributive law $λ: (P(−))^* → P((−)^*)$ between monads $(−)^*$ and $P$, hence the composition $P((−)^*)$ is also a monad, allowing us to apply our method again and potentially add another monadic layer. The language $P(A′)$ contains the lifted versions $\text{skip}$ and $;$ of our previous constructs as well as the new operations arising from $P$, namely a non-deterministic choice operation $+$, which is associative, commutative and idempotent, and its unit $\text{abort}$. Note that since the monad structure on $P((−)^*)$ is defined by a distributive law $(−)^*$ over $P$, the set of equations $E$ is made of the equations (2) arising from $P$, the equations (3) arising from $P$, and finally the equations (4) expressing distributivity of operations of $(−)^*$ over those of $P$. The language we have built so far has the structure of an idempotent semiring.

**Adding the probabilistic layer.** We will now enrich our language further by adding a probabilistic layer. Specifically, we will add the family of probabilistic choice operators $\oplus_\lambda$ for $\lambda ∈ [0, 1]$ satisfying the axioms of convex algebras, i.e.

\[ P ⊕_\lambda q = \eta_{\lambda → q} + \eta_{1−\lambda → q} \quad P ⊕_\lambda (q ⊕_r r) = (P ⊕_\lambda q) ⊕_r (P ⊕_\lambda r) \quad (14) \]

From a monadic perspective, we want to examine the composition of monads $D(P((−)^*))$. It is known (see [28]) that $D$ does not distribute over $P$. We will see that our method confirms this result.

We start by lifting the constants and operations $\{\text{skip, abort, ;, +}\}$ of $P((−)^*)$ by defining a Fubini map $ψ : D(−) × D(−) → D(−×−)$. It is well-known that $D$ is a commutative monad and that the product of measures defines the Fubini transformation. In the case of finitely supported distributions the product of measures can be expressed simply as follows: given distributions $μ ∈ DX, ν ∈ DY, ν(μ, ν)$ is the distribution on $X × Y$ defined on singletons $(x, y) ∈ X × Y$ by $(ν(μ, ν))(x, y) = μ(x)ν(y)$. Theorem 4.6 tells us that this associativity, commutativity, and unit are preserved by $D$. It follows that the associativity of both $;$ and $+$ is preserved by the lifting operation, and the liftings of $\text{skip}$ and $\text{abort}$ are their respective units. Furthermore, the lifting of $+$ is commutative.
We know from Theorem 4.7 that the idempotency of + will be preserved if \( \mathcal{D} \) is relevant. It is easy to see that \( \mathcal{D} \) is badly non-relevant: consider the set \( X = \{ a, b \} \), \( a \neq b \) and any measure \( \mu \) on \( X \) which assigns non-zero probability to both \( a \) and \( b \). We have:

\[
\psi(\Delta_{\mathcal{D}X}(\mu))(a, b) = (\psi(\mu, \mu))(a, b) = \mu(a)\mu(b) \neq 0 = \mu(\emptyset) = \mu\{ x \in X \mid \Delta_X(x) = (a, b) \} = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_X)(\mu)(a, b)
\]

It follows that we cannot conclude that the lifting \( \hat{\mathcal{D}} : \text{Alg}(\{\text{skip, abort, } ; , +\}) \rightarrow \text{Alg}(\{\text{skip, abort, } ; , +\}) \) defined by the product of measures following (8) sends idempotent semirings to idempotent semirings, and therefore we cannot conclude that \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{P}(\cdot)\text{-}^\ast) \) is a monad (in fact we know it isn’t). It is very telling that idempotency also had to be dropped in the design of the probabilistic network specification language ProbNetKAT (see [8, Lemma 1]) which is very similar to the language we are trying to incrementally build in this Section.

Requiring that + be idempotent is an algebraic obstacle, so let us now remove it and replace as our inner layer the monad building free idempotent semirings – that is to say \( \mathcal{P}(-)\text{-}^\ast \) – by the monad building free semirings – that is to say \( \mathcal{M}(-)\text{-}^\ast \), where \( \mathcal{M} \) is the multiset monad \( \mathcal{M} \) can also be described as the free commutative monoid monad). Since we have already checked that the \( \mathcal{D} \)-liftings of binary operations preserve associativity, units and commutativity, it only remains to check that they preserve the distributivity of \( ; \) over +. The equation for distributivity belongs to the syntactic class covered by Theorem 4.7 since it has the same set of variables on each side (but one of them is duplicated, so we fall outside the scope of Theorems 4.6 and 4.8). Since we’ve just shown that \( \mathcal{D} \) is not relevant, it follows that we cannot lift the distributivity axioms. So we must weaken our inner layer even further and consider a structure consisting of two monoids, one of which is commutative. Interestingly, the failure of distributivity was also observed in the development of ProbNetKAT ([8, Lemma 4]), and therefore should not come as a surprise.

Having removed the two distributivity axioms we are left with only the absorption laws to check. In this case the equation has no variable duplication, but has not got the same number of variables on each side of the equation, absorption therefore falls in the scope of Theorem 4.8, and we need to check if \( \mathcal{D} \) is affine. Since \( \mathcal{D}1 \simeq 1 \), it is trivial to see that

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\mathcal{D}X & \text{id}_X & \mathcal{D}X \\
\hline
\mathcal{D}1 & \eta_1 & 1
\end{array}
\]

commutes, and hence \( \mathcal{D} \) is affine. By Theorem 4.8, the absorption law is therefore preserved by the probabilistic extension. It follows that the probabilistic layer \( \mathcal{D} \) can be composed with the inner layer consisting of the signature \( \{\text{abort, skip, } ; , +\} \) and the axioms

\[
\begin{align*}
(i) \quad p; \text{skip} &= \text{skip}; p = p \\
(ii) \quad (p; q); r &= p; (q; r) \\
(iii) \quad p + \text{abort} &= \text{abort} + p = p
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(iv) \quad p + q &= q + p \\
(v) \quad (p + q) + r &= p + (q + r) \\
(vi) \quad p; \text{abort} &= \text{abort} = \text{abort}; p
\end{align*}
\]

i.e. two monoids, one of them commutative, with the absorption law as the only interaction between the two operations. This structure, combined with the axioms of convex algebras (14) and the distributivity axioms

\[
\begin{align*}
(Dst \ i) \quad p; (q \oplus \lambda r) &= (p; q) \oplus \lambda (p; r) \\
(Dst \ ii) \quad (q \oplus \lambda r); p &= (q; p) \oplus \lambda (r; p) \\
(Dst \ iii) \quad p + (q \oplus \lambda r) &= (p + q) \oplus \lambda (p + r) \\
(Dst \ iv) \quad (q \oplus \lambda r) + p &= (q + p) \oplus \lambda (r + p)
\end{align*}
\]

forms the ‘best approximate language’ combining sequential composition, non-deterministic choice and probabilistic choice. Note that the distributive laws above makes good semantic sense, and indeed hold for the semantics of ProbNetKAT. What we have built modularly in this section is essentially the *-free and test-free fragment of ProbNetKAT.

6 Discussion and future work.

We have provided a principled approach to building programming languages by incrementally layering features on the top one another. We believe that our approach is close in spirit to how programming languages are typically constructed, that is to say by an incremental enrichment of the list of features, and to the search for modularity initiated by foundational papers [23] and [19].

We must however be careful about how layers are composed together: our approach yields distributive interactions between them, but one might want other sorts of interactions. Consider for example the minimal
programming language $P^*$ described in Section 1, and assume that we now want to add a concurrent composition operation $\parallel$ to this language with the following natural axiom:

$$p \parallel \text{skip} = p = p \parallel \text{skip}.$$  \hfill (15)

This addition is not as simple as the other layers, as the new constructs have to interact with the core layer in a whole new way: skip must be the unit of $\parallel$ as well. Similarly, one could want to layer the state monad in our construction to express memory manipulating operations. Unfortunately, like the free monoid this monad is not commutative and cannot be added as an outer layer.

In such cases our approach is not satisfactory, and we may have to combine it with Hyland and Power’s method ([11]) to experiment with layers based on sums and tensors when distributive laws are not suitable.

A comment about our ‘best approximate language’ strategy is also in order. As explained in Section 4, when an equation of the inner layer prevents the existence of a distributive law we choose to remove this equation, i.e. to loosen the inner layer. Another option is in principle possible: we could constrain the outer layer until it becomes compatible with the inner layer. We would obtain in this case a replacement candidate for one of our monads in order to achieve composition. In the case of $D(P(-)^*)$ this would be a particularly unproductive idea since the only elements of $D(P(-)^*)$ which satisfy the residual diagram for idempotency are Dirac deltas, i.e. we would get back the language $P(-)^*$.

Another obvious avenue of research is to extend our method to programming languages specified by more than just equations. One example is the so-called ‘exchange law’ in concurrency theory given by $(p \parallel r ; (q \parallel s) \equiv (p ; q) \parallel (r ; s)$ which involves a native pre-ordering on the collection of programs, i.e. moving from the category of sets to the category of posets. Another example are Kozen’s quasi-equations ([18]) axiomatizing the Kleene star operations, for example $p;x \leq x \Rightarrow p^*:x \leq x$. This problem is much more difficult and involves moving away from monads and distributive laws altogether since quasi-varieties are in general not monadic categories.
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Appendix (proofs)

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

The criteria on \((C, \otimes, I)\) given above are due to [25] and generalize the result on strength unicity of [23, Prop. 3.4]: in other words, under the given assumptions on \((C, \otimes, I)\), a tensorial strength \(st_{X,Y} : X \otimes TY \to T(X \otimes Y)\) exists and is uniquely determined.

We only show \((ii) \Rightarrow (i)\) since \((ii) \Rightarrow (iii)\) follows from a well-known result by Anders Kock [16,17] and \((iii)\) clearly implies \((i)\). Given \(\psi_{X,Y} : TX \otimes TY \to T(X \otimes X)\) making \(T\) a monoidal monad, we define following [17] a natural transformation \(st'_{X,Y} : TX \otimes Y \to TX \otimes TY\) via

\[ st_{X,Y} = \psi_{X,Y} \circ \eta_X \otimes id_{TY} \]

It was shown in [17, Prop. 2.1] that \(st\) is a strength for the monad \(T\). Dually we can define a co-strength transformation \(st'_{X,Y} : TX \otimes Y \to T(X \otimes Y)\) by

\[ st'_{X,Y} = \psi_{X,Y} \circ id_{TX} \otimes \eta_Y \]

Note that we can also define a co-strength directly from \(st\) via \(\overline{st}_{X,Y} = T\text{swap} \circ st_{Y,X} \circ \text{swap}\), and similarly we can define a strength \(\overline{st}_{X,Y} = T\text{swap} \circ st'_{Y,X} \circ \text{swap}\). By the unicity of the strength it follows that

\[ st_{X,Y} = \overline{st}_{X,Y} \quad \text{and} \quad st'_{X,Y} = \overline{st'}_{X,Y} \]

(16)

By definition, \(T\) is commutative if

\[ \mu_{X \otimes Y} \circ T(\overline{st}_{X,Y}) \circ st_{TX,Y} = \mu_{X \otimes Y} \circ T(st_{X,Y}) \circ \overline{st}_{TX,TY} \]

It follows from (16) that to show the equality above, one may replace \(\overline{st}'\) by \(\overline{st}\). We now calculate:

\[ \mu_{X \otimes Y} \circ Tst'_{X,Y} \circ st_{TX,Y} = \mu_{X \otimes Y} \circ T\psi_{X,Y} \circ T(id_{TX} \otimes \eta_Y) \circ \psi_{TX,Y} \circ (\eta_{TX} \otimes id_{TY}) \]

\[ = \mu_{X \otimes Y} \circ T\psi_{X,Y} \circ \psi_{TX,Y} \circ (T(id_{TX} \otimes \eta_Y) \circ (\eta_{TX} \otimes id_{TY})) \]

\[ = \mu_{X \otimes Y} \circ T\psi_{X,Y} \circ \psi_{TX,Y} \circ (\eta_{TX} \otimes T\eta_Y) \]

\[ = \psi_{X,Y} \circ (\mu_X \otimes \mu_Y) \circ (\eta_{TX} \otimes T\eta_Y) \]

\[ = \psi_{X,Y} \]

and the symmetric derivation shows that \(\psi_{X,Y} = \mu_{X \otimes Y} \circ Tst_{X,Y} \circ st'_{TX,TY},\) from which we conclude that \(T\) is indeed commutative.

\[ \square \]

Proof of Theorem 3.2.

\((i) \iff (ii)\) we show that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between natural transformations making \(T\) monoidal and distributive laws \((-)^2T \to T(-)^2\); the equivalence then follows from Theorem 3.1. Clearly, given \(\psi_{X,Y} : TX \times TY \to T(X \times Y)\) we can define \(\lambda_X^\psi = \psi_{X,X}\) which is trivially a distributive law by virtue of diagrams (MM.1) and (MM.2) commuting. To build a monoidal structure from a distributive law \(\lambda : (-)^2T \to T(-)^2\) we proceed as follows. Let \(X, Y\) be sets and recall that \(\text{Set}\) being a l.f.p. category (see [1]), there exists a small sub-category \(\omega\) of finite sets (which we take to be the finite ordinals) such that \(X = \text{colim} D\) where \(D\) is the filtered diagram \(D : \omega \downarrow X \to \text{Set}\) forgetting all but the domain of the objects in \(\omega \downarrow X\). Since filtered colimits commute with finite limits and finitary functors preserve filtered colimits we have that

\[ TX \times TY = \text{colim}_{m,n \in \omega, m \to X, n \to Y} Tm \times Tn \]

The inclusion \(I : \{(m,n) \mid n \in \omega, n \to X, n \to Y\} \to \{(m,m') \mid m, m' \in \omega, m \to X, m' \to Y\}\) is a cofinal functor: given \(m \to X, m' \to Y\) consider the coproduct \(m + m'\) (which belongs to \(\omega\)) as well as sections \(e_m : m \to m' \to m\) and \(e_m' : m + m' \to m'\) of the corresponding inclusions. This defines a pair of morphisms \(m + m' \to X, m + m' \to Y\) compatible with the morphisms \(m \to X\) and \(m' \to Y\) as desired. Similarly, given a span of (pairs of) morphisms \((p, p) \leftarrow (m, n) \to (q, q)\) we can first compute two pushouts which will remain in \(\omega\) (up to iso) followed by the coproduct construction of the previous step to find a co-cone \((p, p) \to (r, r) \leftarrow (q, q)\) for the span. It follows that

\[ TX \times TY = \text{colim}_{m \in \omega, m \to X, m \to Y} Tm \times Tm \]
and similarly, $T(X \times Y) = \text{colim}_{m \in \omega, m \to X, m \to Y} T(m \times m)$. Using the natural transformation $\lambda_m : Tm \times Tm \to T(m, m)$ it is clear that $T(m \times m)$ is a co-cone for the diagram $Tm \times Tm, m \in \omega, m \to X, m \to Y$. There must therefore exist a unique morphism:

$$\psi^\lambda_{X,Y} : TX \times TY \to T(X \times Y)$$

It is straightforward, if tedious, to check that since $\lambda$ is a distributive law, $\psi^\lambda$ makes $T$ monoidal. Finally, $\psi \mapsto \lambda^\psi \mapsto \psi \lambda^\psi = \psi$ by unicity of the component $\psi^\lambda_{X,Y}$ defined above, and similarly $\lambda \mapsto \psi^\lambda \mapsto \lambda^\psi = \lambda$, which concludes the proof that $(i) \iff (ii)$.

$(i) \iff (iii)$. Clearly, $(iii) \iff (ii)$ and thus $(iii) \iff (i)$ by the equivalence shown above. To prove the converse it is enough to show that $\psi$ determines a unique distributive law $\lambda(k) : (-)^k T \to T(-)^k$ for any $k \in \omega$. It follows from (MF. 3) that we can unambiguously (up to isomorphism) define a transformation natural in $k$-arguments

$$\psi^{(k)}_{X_1, \ldots, X_k} : T X_1 \times \ldots \times T X_k \to T(X_1 \times \ldots \times X_k)$$

by repeated application of the transformation $\psi$. Moreover $\psi^{(k)}$ satisfies the $k$-arguments equivalent of (MF. 1), (MF. 2), (MF. 3), (MM.1), and (MM.2), for example $\psi^{(k)}(\eta_{X_1} \times \ldots \times \eta_{X_k}) = \eta_{X_1 \times \ldots \times X_k}$. In particular we can define $\lambda(k)_{X} : (TX)^k \to T(X^k)$ and this will define a distributive law of $(-)^k T \to T(-)^k$, which proves that for each $k \in \omega$, $\lambda(k)$ is unique.

$(iii) \Rightarrow (iv)$. Given a distributive law $\lambda^\Sigma : \mathbb{H}_\Sigma T \to \mathbb{H}_\Sigma$, we can define a distributive law $\rho^\Sigma : F \Sigma T \to F \Sigma$ as follows. Recall that the free $\mathbb{H}_\Sigma$-algebra over a set $X$ is the initial $\mathbb{H}_\Sigma(-) + X$-algebra. We use this fact to build $\rho^\Sigma$ by putting a $\mathbb{H}_\Sigma(-) + TX$-algebra structure on $TF \Sigma X$:

$$H_\Sigma F \Sigma T X + TX \xrightarrow{H_\Sigma \rho^\Sigma_X + id_X} H_\Sigma TF \Sigma X + TX$$

where $\eta^\Sigma = \text{unit of } F \Sigma$, $\alpha_X$ is the structure map of the free $\mathbb{H}_\Sigma$-algebra $F \Sigma X$. Note that the collection of all structure maps in fact defines a natural transformation $\alpha : H_\Sigma F \Sigma \to F \Sigma$. It is not hard to check that the construction of Diagram (18) indeed defines a distributive law $\rho^\Sigma : F \Sigma T \to F \Sigma$. Let us now check that $\rho^\Sigma$ indeed defines a distributive law of $F \Sigma$ over $T$.

---

In fact in any monoidal category satisfying the condition of Theorem 3.1.
Diagram (DL. 1) commutes. The proof is by initiality – i.e. by induction. Consider the following three $H_{\Sigma}(-) + X$-algebra structures, for which $F_{\Sigma}X$ is initial.

![Diagram](image)

To see that the left front face of the diagram above commutes we simply compute

$$T \alpha_X \circ \lambda^\Sigma_{F_{\Sigma}X} \circ H_{\Sigma} \eta_{F_{\Sigma}X}^T = T \alpha_X \circ \eta^T_{F_{\Sigma}X} \circ \eta_X^T$$

$$= \eta^T_{F_{\Sigma}X} \circ \alpha_X$$

$\lambda^\Sigma$ is a distributive law by naturality of $\eta^T$.

The commutativity along the other half of the coproduct is tautological. Now consider the back face of the diagram above: it commutes because the structure map of free $H_{\Sigma}$-algebras defines a natural transformation $\alpha: H_{\Sigma}F_{\Sigma} \to F_{\Sigma}$. Finally, for the right front face, the commutativity along the first summands of the coproducts is given by definition of $\rho^\Sigma$. For the commutativity along the second summand we compute:

$$\rho^\Sigma_X \circ F_{\Sigma} \eta^T_X \circ \eta_X = \rho^\Sigma_X \circ \eta_{TX} \circ \eta^T_X$$

$$= T \eta_X \circ \eta^T_X$$

$$= \eta^T_{F_{\Sigma}X} \circ \eta_X$$

by naturality of $\eta$ by definition of $\rho^\Sigma$ by naturality of $\eta^T$

It follows that we have two $H_{\Sigma}$-morphisms from $F_{\Sigma}X$ to $T F_{\Sigma}X$ given by $\lambda^\Sigma_X \circ F_{\Sigma} \eta_X$ and $\eta_{F_{\Sigma}X}$ respectively, and by initiality of $F_{\Sigma}X$ it follows that they are equal.

Diagram (DL. 2) commutes. The identity $\rho^\Sigma_X \circ \eta_{TX} = T \eta_X$ can be read off immediately from Diagram (18), i.e. it holds by construction.

Diagram (DL. 3) commutes. We proceed by initiality once more. For notational clarity we consider the two morphisms which we want to show are equal separately. First, consider the following $H_{\Sigma}(-) + T^2X$-algebras:

![Diagram](image)

The diagram above commutes by naturality of $\alpha: H_{\Sigma}F_{\Sigma} \to F_{\Sigma}$ and by our tautological choice of structure map on the $T^2X$ component of the coproducts, thus $\rho^\Sigma_X \circ F_{\Sigma} \mu_X$ is an $H_{\Sigma}(-) + T^2X$-algebra morphism $F_{\Sigma}T^2X \to T F_{\Sigma}X$ from the initial such algebra, so it must be unique. Now consider the following diagram:
where for readability’s sake we’ve only displayed labels on morphisms from $T^2X$ it they are not $\text{id}_{F\Sigma X}$, and where the top row is understood to be $H_2(-) + \text{id}_{F\Sigma X}$ of the bottom row. The left-hand square commutes by definition of $\rho^\Sigma$. The top of the middle square commutes by naturality of $\lambda^\Sigma$. The bottom of the middle square commutes by applying $T$ to the definition of $\rho^\Sigma$. For the right-hand square we compute:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mu^\Sigma_X \circ T\alpha_X & \circ T\lambda^\Sigma_{T\Sigma X} \\
= T\alpha_X \circ \mu^\Sigma_{H_2\Sigma X} & \circ T\lambda^\Sigma_{T\Sigma X} \\
= T\alpha_X & \circ \lambda^\Sigma_{T\Sigma X} \circ H_2\mu^\Sigma_{T\Sigma X} \\
& = \text{by naturality of } \mu^T \\
& \lambda^\Sigma & \text{is a distributive law}
\end{align*}
$$

It remains to show that the two terms structures on the right-hand side of the two diagrams above are the same, but this follows easily:

$$
\begin{align*}
\rho^\Sigma_X & \circ F\Sigma \mu^T_X \circ \eta_{T\Sigma X} = \rho^\Sigma_X \circ \eta_{T\Sigma X} \circ \mu^T_X \\
= T\eta_X & \circ \mu^T_X \\
= \mu^\Sigma_X & \circ TT\eta_X \\
& = \text{by naturality of } \eta \\
& \text{by definition of } \rho^\Sigma_X \\
& \text{by naturality of } \mu^T
\end{align*}
$$

Thus we have two morphisms from an initial algebra into the same algebra, which must therefore be equal, i.e.

$$
\begin{align*}
\mu^\Sigma_X & \circ T\rho^\Sigma_X \circ \rho^\Sigma_T = \rho^\Sigma_X \circ F\Sigma \mu^T_X \\
& = \text{Diagram (DL. 4) commutes. Now consider the following morphism of } H_2(-) + F_2T\Sigma X\text{-algebras}
\end{align*}
$$

The left-hand square commutes by naturality of $\alpha$ and the monadic identities for $F\Sigma$, whilst the right-hand square is easily seen to commute by definition of $\rho^\Sigma$ in Diagram (18). This gives us our first morphism from the initial $H_2(-) + F_2T\Sigma X$-algebra to $TF\Sigma X$. A second such morphism is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
H_2F_2^2T\Sigma X + F_2T\Sigma X & \xrightarrow{H_2F_2T\Sigma X + \text{id}_{F_2T\Sigma X}} H_2F_2\Sigma X + F_2\Sigma X \\
\lambda_{F_2T\Sigma X}^\Sigma + \text{id}_{F_2T\Sigma X} & \quad \lambda_{F_2T\Sigma X}^\Sigma + \text{id}_{F_2T\Sigma X} \\
\alpha_{F_2T\Sigma X} & \circ \alpha_{F_2T\Sigma X} \\
\mu^\Sigma_X & \circ \mu^\Sigma_X \\
TF_2\Sigma X & \xrightarrow{T\rho^\Sigma_X} TF_2\Sigma X \\
\end{align*}
$$

where we’ve once again omitted to label the morphisms $\text{id}_{F_2T\Sigma X}$ and where the top row is understood to be $H_2(-) + \text{id}_{F_2T\Sigma X}$ of the bottom row. The left-hand square commutes by naturality of $\alpha$ and the middle square

$$
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$$
by definition of \( \rho^\Sigma \) in Diagram (18). The top-right hand square commutes by naturality of \( \lambda^\Sigma \). Commutativity along the second summands of the bottom right-hand square follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
T\mu_X \circ \rho^\Sigma_X \circ F^\Sigma\mu_X \circ \eta_{F^\Sigma\eta_X} &= T\mu_X \circ \rho^\Sigma_X \circ \eta_{TF^\Sigma\eta_X} \circ \rho^\Sigma_X \\
&= T\mu_X \circ T\eta_{F^\Sigma\eta_X} \circ \rho^\Sigma_X \\
&= \rho^\Sigma_X
\end{align*}
\]

Naturality of \( \eta \) Definition of \( \rho^\Sigma \) Monadic laws for \( F^\Sigma \)

To check commutativity along the first summands of the bottom right-hand square note first that we have a natural transformation \( \phi : H^\Sigma \to F^\Sigma \) embedding one-step ‘flat’ \( \Sigma \)-terms into the collection of all \( \Sigma \)-terms. This \( \phi \) has the property that \( \alpha = \mu \circ \phi F^\Sigma \), i.e. evaluating a flat \( \Sigma \)-term of terms amounts to multiplying it. From this it follows that \( \alpha_X \circ H^\Sigma \mu_X = \mu_X \circ \alpha_{F^\Sigma X} \) is just a particular case of the multiplication axiom of the monad: \( \mu \circ F^\Sigma \mu = \mu \circ \mu F^\Sigma \).

\([iv] \Rightarrow [iii]\) Given a distributive law \( \rho^\Sigma : F^\Sigma T \to TF^\Sigma \), we define a distributive law

\[
\lambda_X^\Sigma = H^\Sigma \rho_X^\Sigma \circ H^\Sigma \eta_{TX}.
\]

(19)

To see that the image of this map is indeed \( TH^\Sigma X \) we use the diagram specifying the interaction of \( \rho^\Sigma \) with \( \eta \):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
H^\Sigma T \lambda_X & \xrightarrow{H^\Sigma \eta_{TX}} & H^\Sigma T \eta_X \\
H^\Sigma T \rho^\Sigma_X & \xrightarrow{H^\Sigma \rho^\Sigma_X \circ H^\Sigma \eta_{TX}} & H^\Sigma T \eta_{TX}
\end{array}
\]

Since \( \eta_X \) is simply the embedding of the generators in \( X \) into the free-algebra, it is clear that \( \lambda_X^\Sigma \) as defined in (19) indeed takes its values in \( TF^\Sigma X \).

\[
\boxdot
\]

**Proof of Theorem 3.3.**

We will denote the unit and multiplication of \( F^\Sigma \) by \([0,1]\) and \( \mu \) respectively.

**Diagram (DL 1) commutes.** We compute:

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_X \circ S\eta_X^T \circ q_X &= \lambda_X \circ q_{TX} \circ F^\Sigma \eta_X^T \\
&= Tq_X \circ \rho_X^\Sigma \circ F^\Sigma \eta_X^T \\
&= Tq_X \circ T\eta_{F^\Sigma \eta_X} \\
&= \eta_{F^\Sigma \eta_X} \circ q_X
\end{align*}
\]

by naturality of \( q \) by naturality of \( S \eta^T \) by naturality of \( \eta^T \)

\( \rho^\Sigma \) is a distributive law.

From which it follows that \( \eta_{F^\Sigma \eta_X} = \lambda_X \circ S\eta_X^T \) as desired.

**Diagram (DL 3) commutes.** Consider the diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F^\Sigma TTX & \xrightarrow{\rho^\Sigma_X} & TF^\Sigma TX \\
\xrightarrow{q_{TX}} & \xrightarrow{T\eta_X} & \xrightarrow{T\lambda_X} & \xrightarrow{Tq_X} & \xrightarrow{\rho^\Sigma_X} & \xrightarrow{TTF^\Sigma X} \\
\xrightarrow{S\rho^\Sigma_X} & \xrightarrow{TSTX} & \xrightarrow{TTSX} & \xrightarrow{\mu^\Sigma_X} & \xrightarrow{F^\Sigma TX} & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & \xrightarrow{STX} & \xrightarrow{\lambda_X} & \xrightarrow{Tq_X} & \xrightarrow{\mu^\Sigma_X} & \xrightarrow{TF^\Sigma X}
\end{array}
\]

The outer square commutes by virtue of \( \rho^\Sigma \) being a distributive law, and each square connecting the outer with the inner squares commutes either by definition of \( \lambda \) of by naturality of \( \mu^T \). The result then follows by precomposing the inner square by \( q_{TX} \) which is epi.

**Diagram (DL 2) commutes.** We compute:

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_X \circ \eta_{TX}^S &= \lambda_X \circ q_{TX} \circ \eta_{TX} \\
&= Tq_X \circ \rho_X^\Sigma \circ \eta_{TX} \\
&= Tq_X \circ T\eta_X \\
&= T\eta_X^S
\end{align*}
\]

\( q \) is a monad morphism by naturality of \( q \)

\( \rho^\Sigma \) is a distributive law by naturality of \( \rho^\Sigma \).
Diagram (DL. 4) commutes. Consider the following diagram

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
F_\Sigma F_\Sigma TX & F_\Sigma TX & TF_\Sigma X & TFX \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
F_\Sigma STX & F_\Sigma TSX & TFSX & TFSTX \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
STX & TSX & TSSX & TFX \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
\Downarrow & \Downarrow & \Downarrow & \Downarrow \\
\end{array}
\]

It is not hard to check that this diagram commutes since each sub-diagram commutes either by virtue of \( q \) being a monad morphism, or by virtue of Diagram (11), or by naturality of \( q \) or of \( \rho^\Sigma \). Finally, \( q_{STX} \) is a reflexive coequalizer and \( F_\Sigma \) is a finitary monad, and it is known that finitary monads preserve reflexive coequalizers, from which it follows in particular that \( F_\Sigma q_{TX} \) is epi, and thus so is \( q_{STX} \circ F_\Sigma q_{TX} \), and the result follows by pre-composing the inner square by \( q_{STX} \circ F_\Sigma q_{TX} \).

Proof of Theorem 3.4.
Since this will not cause any ambiguity, we will denote algebras by their carriers. All algebras are to be understood as \( F_\Sigma \)-algebras, in particular \( S \)-algebras are viewed as \( F_\Sigma \)-algebra by application of the functor \( Q \). The free \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebra over the set \( TX \) carrier \( STX \) and is defined by the following universal property: given any \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebra \( A \) and valuation \( v : TX \to A \), there exists a unique \( \Sigma \)-algebra morphism \( \phi : STX \to A \) such that \( \phi \circ q_{TX} = v \), where \( v : F_\Sigma TX \to A \) is the unique morphism given by freeness of \( F_\Sigma TX \) among \( \Sigma \)-algebras.

By assumption, \( \bar{T} \) sends \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebras to \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebras, and thus in particular it sends the free \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebra \( SX \) to a \((\Sigma, E)\)-algebra \( TSX \) whose structure map is described by (9). Consider now the valuation \( T\eta_X^\Sigma : TX \to TSX \). By the universal property of \( STX \) we know that there exists a unique morphism \( \lambda_X : STX \to TSX \) such that the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
TX & \xrightarrow{T \eta_X} & TSX \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
\xrightarrow{T \eta_X} & \xrightarrow{T \eta_X} & \xrightarrow{T \eta_X} \\
F_\Sigma TX & \xrightarrow{F_\Sigma \eta_X} & STX \\
\end{array}
\]

The commuting triangles on the left-hand side are given by the fact that \( \rho^\Sigma \) is a distributive law and that \( q \) is a monad morphism. The fact that \( T\eta_X \circ \rho_X^\Sigma \) is the morphism \( F_\Sigma TX \to TSX \) associated with the chosen valuation follows by unicity and commutativity of the diagram above. Finally, note that the right-hand triangle is precisely (11).

Proof of Theorem 4.6.
If all variables appear exactly once in each term, then \( Arg(u) \) is a reordered version of \( V \), in other words \( \delta_\Sigma^V(u) = \langle \pi_{p(1)}, \ldots, \pi_{p(|V|)} \rangle \), where \( p \) an element of the symmetric group \( S_{|V|} \). Therefore \( p \) can be decomposed as a composition of adjacent transpositions. In our case, it means that \( \delta_\Sigma^V(u) = \langle \pi_{p(1)}, \ldots, \pi_{p(|V|)} \rangle = \alpha_i \circ \cdots \circ \alpha_1 \) with each \( \alpha_i \) realising an adjacent transposition, in other words \( \alpha_i \) is of the form:

\[
\langle \pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{j-1}, \pi_{j+1}, \pi_j, \pi_{j+2}, \ldots, \pi_k \rangle = \text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id} \times \text{swap} \times \text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id}
\]

Let us now prove that \( \mathcal{R}(T, u, V) \) commutes, by induction on the number \( l \) of adjacent transpositions. For the
of clarity, let us suppose that $\alpha_1 = \text{swap} \times \text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id}$.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
T(A^{[V]}) & \xrightarrow{\psi^{[V]}} & (TA)^{[V]} \\
T(\text{swap} \times \text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id}) & \xrightarrow{\psi^{[V]-1}} & (TA)^{[V]-1} \\
T(A^2) \times (TA)^{[V]-2} & \xrightarrow{\psi} & (TA)^{[V]} \\
T(\alpha_2 \circ \cdots \circ \alpha_1) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & (TA)^{[V]} \\
T(A^{[V]+1}) & \xrightarrow{\psi^{[V]+1}} & (TA)^{[V]+1}
\end{array} \]

$\circ$ and $\bullet$ commute by monoidality, $\otimes$ commutes by naturality of $\psi^{[V]-1}$, $\circ$ commutes because $T$ is symmetric, which proves the base case of our induction. Finally $\circ$ commutes by induction hypothesis. The same proof applies to $v$. In conclusion, $R(T, u, V)$ and $R(T, v, V)$ commute, therefore $T$ preserves $u = v$.

**Proof of Theorem 4.7.**

If $\text{Var}(u) = \text{Var}(v) = V$, then $\text{Arg}(u)$ is obtained from $V$ by duplicating some variables and rearranging them. In a similar fashion as in the previous proof, $\delta^V_A(u)$ can be written as $\alpha \circ \beta_m \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1$, where $\alpha = \alpha_1 \circ \cdots \circ \alpha_1$ and $\alpha_1$ as previously defined, and the $\beta_i$ are of the form $x \times \cdots \times x \times \Delta \times y \times \cdots \times y$. Intuitively, we first duplicate using $\Delta$ all the variables that need to appear several times, then we rearrange them. Proving that $R(T, u, V)$ and $R(T, v, V)$ commute is achieved in the same way as in the previous lemma, relying mostly on the following diagram, where we assume for the sake of clarity that $\alpha_1 = \Delta \times y \times \cdots \times y$.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
T(A^{[V]}) & \xrightarrow{\psi^{[V]}} & (TA)^{[V]} \\
T(\Delta \times \text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id}) & \xrightarrow{\psi^{[V]-1}} & (TA)^{[V]-1} \\
T(A^2) \times (TA)^{[V]-2} & \xrightarrow{\psi} & (TA)^{[V]} \\
T(A^{[V]+1}) & \xrightarrow{\psi^{[V]+1}} & (TA)^{[V]+1}
\end{array} \]

$\circ$ commutes by monoidality, $\otimes$ commutes by naturality of $\psi^{[V]}$, $\circ$ commutes because $T$ is relevant.

**Proof of Theorem 4.8.**

In a similar way to the previous results, for a term $u$ where no variable appears twice we decompose the morphism $\delta^V_A(u)$ as $\alpha \circ \gamma$ (for clarity, we also write $\delta^V_A(u) = \alpha \circ \gamma$ as only their type differs), where $\alpha$ realises a permutation, and $\gamma$ drops the unnecessary variables. Let $j = |\text{Arg}(u)|$. $\gamma$ is of the shape:

\[ (TA)^{[V]} \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id} \times \text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id}} (TA)^j \]

Let us first assume for the sake of clarity that $\gamma = ! \times \text{id} \times \cdots \times \text{id}$ (only the first variable is dropped) and prove that $\psi^{(j)} \circ \gamma = T\gamma \circ \psi^{[V]}$, i.e. that the following diagram commutes. $\circ$ commutes by monoidality, $\otimes$
commutes by naturality of $\psi^{(|V|)}$, $\circ$ commutes because $T$ is affine.

The general case for $\gamma$ is obtained by a simple induction on the number of variables dropped. Finally, using theorem 4.6 it becomes clear that, for $k = |Arg(u)|$, $\psi^{(k)} \circ \alpha \circ \gamma = T(\alpha \circ \gamma) \circ \psi^{(|V|)}$ i.e. $\psi^{(k)} \circ \delta^V_A(u) = T\delta^V_A(u) \circ \psi^{(|V|)}$ i.e. $Pres(T, u, V)$ commutes for such a term $u$, therefore equations in which variables appear once are preserved.

Proof of Theorem 4.9.
Combining previous approaches, we decompose the morphism $\delta^V_A(u)$ as $\alpha \circ \beta \circ \gamma$, where $\gamma$ drops the unnecessary variables, $\beta$ duplicates the ones that need copies, then $\alpha$ rearranges them to match the arguments of $u$. All variable combinations can be obtained this way, hence $T$ preserves $u = v$ for all terms $u$ and $v$. 