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A central goal of probabilistic programming languages (PPLs) is to separate modelling from inference. However, this goal is hard to achieve in practice. Users are often forced to re-write their models in order to improve efficiency of inference or meet restrictions imposed by the PPL. Conditional independence (CI) relationships among parameters are a crucial aspect of probabilistic models that captures a qualitative summary of the specified model and can facilitate more efficient inference.

We present an information flow type system for probabilistic programming that captures conditional independence (CI) relationships, and show that, for a well-typed program in our system, the distribution it implements is guaranteed to have certain CI-relationships. Further, by using type inference, we can statically deduce which CI-properties are present in a specified model.

As a practical application, we consider the problem of how to perform inference on models with mixed discrete and continuous parameters. Inference on such models is challenging in many existing PPLs, but can be improved through a workaround, where the discrete parameters are used implicitly, at the expense of manual model re-writing. We present a source-to-source semantics-preserving transformation, which uses our CI-type system to automate this workaround by eliminating the discrete parameters from a probabilistic program. The resulting program can be seen as a hybrid inference algorithm on the original program, where continuous parameters can be drawn using efficient gradient-based inference methods, while the discrete parameters are drawn using variable elimination.

We implement our CI-type system and its example application in SlicStan: a compositional variant of Stan.

1 INTRODUCTION

The number of probabilistic programming languages (PPLs) has grown far and wide, and so has the range of inference techniques they support. Some focus on problems that can be solved analytically, and provide a symbolic solution [Gehr et al. 2016], others are universal and use general-purpose inference algorithms [Wood et al. 2014]. Some use gradient-based methods [Carpenter et al. 2017], or message-passing methods [Minka et al. 2014] to provide an efficient solution at the cost of restricting the range of expressible programs. Each option presents its own challenges, whether in terms of speed, accuracy or inference constraints, which is why PPL users often are required to learn a set of model re-writing techniques: to be able to change the program until it can be feasibly used within the backend inference algorithm.

Take for example Stan [Carpenter et al. 2017], which is used by practitioners in a wide range of sciences and industries to analyse their data using Bayesian inference. While efficient inference algorithms exist for continuous-only and for some discrete-only models, it is much less clear what algorithm to use for arbitrary models with large numbers of both discrete and continuous (latent, i.e., unobserved) parameters. Stan has made a conscious choice not to support probabilistic

1The implementation is available at https://github.com/mgorinova/SlicStan.
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models with discrete parameters, so as to perform inference using (dynamic) Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) [Betancourt and Girolami 2015; Hoffman and Gelman 2014; Neal et al. 2011], which provides efficient, gradient-based inference for differentiable models. As a result, Stan has often been criticised [Gelman et al. 2015] for its lack What is usually overlooked is that many models with discrete parameters can, in fact, be accommodated in Stan, by manually marginalising (summing) out the discrete parameters and drawing them conditionally on the continuous parameters [Stan Development Team 2019, Chapter 15]. One of the core model rewriting techniques is marginalisation: summing over all possible values that a random variable can take to obtain a marginal density function that does not involve that variable. Marginalising efficiently is not always an obvious procedure, as it requires exploiting conditional independence relationships among the variables in the model. For probabilistic graphical models, there are well-known algorithms for enumerating all of the conditional independence assumptions implied by a model. But probabilistic programs are much more general, including control flow and assignment. For this more general case, it is much less clear how to determine conditional independence relationships automatically, and doing so requires combining ideas from traditional program analysis and from probabilistic graphical modelling.

In this paper, we introduce an information flow type system that can deduce conditional independence relationships between parameters in the program. Finding such relationships can be useful in many scenarios. As an example application, we implement a semantics-preserving source-to-source transformation, that automatically marginalises discrete parameters. We work in SlicStan [Gorinova et al. 2019], a form of Stan with a more compositional syntax than the original. Our system extends SlicStan to support discrete parameters in the case when the discrete parameter space is bounded. This transform corresponds to the variable elimination algorithm [Koller and Friedman 2009; Zhang and Poole 1994]: an exact inference algorithm, efficient in models with sparse structure. Combining this transformation with an efficient algorithm for continuous parameters, like HMC, gives us a model-specific, automatically derived inference strategy, which is a composition between variable elimination and the algorithm of choice. While we only focus on one application in this paper, our type system for conditional independence is applicable to program transformations of probabilistic programs more generally, and we believe can enable other composed-inference strategies.

In short, we make the following contributions:

(1) **Factorised semantics for SlicStan**: As basis for proving correctness of our transformation, we extend SlicStan’s type system, so that shredding (which slices a SlicStan program into Stan for execution) correctly separates well-typed programs into data preprocessing, main model, and purely generative code (Theorem 1).

(2) **Main theoretical result**: We introduce a conditional independence type system (§ 3) and establish a correspondence between well-typed programs and conditional independence properties of the probability distribution it implements (Theorem 2, Theorem 3).

(3) **Main practical result**: We describe and implement (in SlicStan) a source-to-source transformation that repeatedly uses the result from (2) to efficiently marginalise out the discrete parameters of the program and gives a generative procedure for drawing these parameters (§ 4), thus automating inference for mixed discrete-continuous models. We prove that our transformation is semantics-preserving (Theorem 4).

## 2 SLICESTAN: EXTENDED SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS

SlicStan [Gorinova et al. 2019] is a Stan-like probabilistic programming language. Compared to Stan, it adds extra compositionality by dropping the requirement that programs be block-structured.
SlicStan uses type inference in an information-flow type system [Abadi et al. 1999; Gordon et al. 2015; Volpano et al. 1996] to automatically rearrange the program into parts roughly corresponding to the blocks-structure of Stan: pre-processing (data), model and post-processing (generated quantities). Originally, this shredding was developed to compile SlicStan to Stan. In this paper, that it can be used, more generally, to automatically compile to an efficient program-specific inference scheme.

Like Stan, SlicStan is imperative and allows for deterministic assignment, for-loops, if-statements, probabilistic assignment, and factor-statements. One contribution of this work is that we present an updated version of SlicStan. For example, we expand on the meaning of ~ in SlicStan. In the original SlicStan paper [Gorinova et al. 2019], a statement such as \( x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \) was understood simply as a syntactic sugar for \( \text{factor}(\mathcal{N}(x \mid 0, 1)) \). This means those statements were always interpreted as part of the model block in Stan. In our updated version of SlicStan, the semantics of \( x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \) remains equivalent to that of \( \text{factor}(\mathcal{N}(x \mid 0, 1)) \), however it could be implemented differently depending on the context. In particular, \( x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \) could be implemented as a simple call to a random number generator in Stan, \( x = \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \), like in the example below.

Example of difference to previous version of SlicStan:

```plaintext
// Stan target program
data { real x; }
parameters { real \( \mu \); }
model { 
  x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, 1); 
}
generated quantities { 
  real x_pred = 
    \text{normal}_\text{rng}(\mu, 1); 
}
```

```
// SlicStan from POPL'19
real \( \mu \); 
data real x; 
x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, 1); 
real x_pred = 
  \text{normal}_\text{rng}(\mu, 1); 
```

```
// extended SlicStan
real \( \mu \); 
data real x; 
x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, 1); 
real x_pred = 
  \text{normal}_\text{rng}(\mu, 1); 
```

Treating ~ statements differently based on context is very similar in spirit to existing effect-handling based PPLs like Edward2 and Pyro, where ~ can be handled in different ways. However, in our case, this difference in treatment is determined statically, automatically, and only in the translation to Stan or another backend.

In the rest of this section, we give the updated formal syntax, typing and semantics of SlicStan and describe shredding — the procedure key to the translation of Stan / inference composition.

### 2.1 Syntax

SlicStan has the following types, programs, L-values, statements, and expressions. We highlight the difference with [Gorinova et al. 2019] with boxes.

**SlicStan Types:**

| \( \ell \) ::= DATA | MODEL | GENQUANT |
| \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) |
| \( \tau ::= \text{real} | \text{int} | \left[ \text{int}(n) \right] | \tau[n] \) |
| \( T ::= (\tau, \ell) \) |

**SlicStan Program:**

| \( P ::= \Gamma, S \) |

**SlicStan L-Values:**

| \( L ::= x[E_1] \cdots [E_n] \) |

**SlicStan Typing Environments:**

| \( \Gamma ::= \{ x_1 \mapsto T_1, \ldots, x_n \mapsto T_n \} \) |

The difference between SlicStan and Stan is that in Stan, \( x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \) is interpreted as a part of the model block, while in SlicStan, it is treated as a factor statement, which can be implemented differently depending on the context.

In the rest of this section, we give the updated formal syntax, typing and semantics of SlicStan.
SlicStan Statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S ::= statement</th>
<th>E ::= expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L = E</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_1;S_2</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for(x in E_1 : E_2) S</td>
<td>[E_1, ..., E_n] array</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if(E) S_1 else S_2</td>
<td>E_1[E_2] array element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skip</td>
<td>f(E_1, ..., E_n) function call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor(x)</td>
<td>[E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L ~ d(E_1, ..., E_n)</td>
<td>target(S) evaluating a density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SlicStan programs consist of a pair $\Gamma, S$ of a typing environment $\Gamma$ (a finite map which assigns global variables $x$ to their types $T$) and a statement $S$. Following the usual style of declaring variables in C-like languages, we informally present programs $\Gamma, S$ in examples by sprinkling the type declarations of $\Gamma$ throughout the statement $S$. For example, we write data real $x \sim$ normal(0,1) for the program $\{x \mapsto \text{(real, DATA)}, x \sim \text{normal}(0,1)\}$. Sometimes, we will leave out types or write incomplete types in our examples. In this case, we intend for the missing types to be determined using type inference.

As we discuss in detail in §§ 2.3, a factor($E$) statement can be read as multiplying the current weight of the program trace by the value of $E$. Conversely, a target($S$) expression initializes the weight to 1 and returns the weight that is accumulated after evaluating $S$. For example, if:

\[
S = x \sim \text{normal}(0,1); \quad y = 2 * x; \quad z \sim \text{normal}(y,1);
= \text{factor}((\text{normal_pdf}(x|0,1)); \quad y = 2 * x; \quad \text{factor}((\text{normal_pdf}(z|y,1)));
\]

Then target($S$) is semantically equivalent to $\text{normal_pdf}(x|0,1) * \text{normal_pdf}(z|2 * x,1)$.

We extend the base types of the language of [Gorinova et al. 2019] with int($n$), which denotes a positive integer constrained from above by an integer $n$. For example if $x$ is of type int(2), then $x$ can only be 1 or 2. These types allow us to specify the support of discrete variables, and they can easily be extended to include both upper and lower bounds. For the purpose of our typing rules, we treat int($n$) identically to int. We only differentiate between these types in § 4, where our transformation uses the size annotation to eliminate a discrete variable.

### 2.2 Typing

Types $T$ in SlicStan range over pairs $(\tau, \ell)$ of a base type $\tau$, and a level type $\ell$. The level types $\ell$ form a lattice $(\{\text{DATA, MODEL, GENQUANT}\}, \leq)$, where $\text{DATA} \leq \text{MODEL} \leq \text{GENQUANT}$. We write $\bigcup^n_{i=1} \ell_i$ for the least upper bound of the levels $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_n$. We call variables of level DATA data (variables), of level MODEL model parameters, and of level GENQUANT generated quantities. We refer to variables that are either of level MODEL or GENQUANT simply as parameters. Given a typing environment $\Gamma$, we can consider the well-typedness of expressions and statements, given the types assigned to variables by $\Gamma$. The judgment $\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$ means that expression $E$ has type $\tau$ and reads only level $\ell$ and below. The judgment $\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$ means that statement $S$ assigns only to level $\ell$ and above. We write $\Gamma \vdash S$ as a shorthand for $\Gamma \vdash S : \text{DATA}$.

The typing rules for expressions are those of [Gorinova et al. 2019] with added rules for the two constructs of array comprehensions and target($S$)-expressions. The typing rules for statements are as in [Gorinova et al. 2019], with three differences (highlighted in boxes). (FACTOR) and (SAMPLE) add typing rules for the new language constructs factor($E$) and $L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n)$. The language supports a finite number of built-in functions $f$ with type $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n \rightarrow \tau$ and (conditional) distributions $d \in \text{Dist}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n; \tau)$ over $\tau$ given values of types $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n$. 
### Typing Rules for Expressions:

**ESUB**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell) \quad \ell \leq \ell' \\
\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell')
\]

**VAR**
\[
\Gamma, x : T \vdash x : T
\]

**CONST**
\[
\text{ty}(c) = \tau \\
\Gamma \vdash c : (\tau, \mathsf{DATA})
\]

**PRIMCALL**
\[
\Gamma \vdash f(E_1, \ldots, E_n) : (\tau, \bigcup_{i=1}^n \ell_i)
\]

**ARREL**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E_1 : (\tau[n], \ell) \quad \Gamma \vdash E_2 : \mathsf{int}, \ell \\
\Gamma \vdash E_1[E_2] : (\tau, \ell)
\]

**TARGET**
\[
\Gamma \vdash S : \ell'' \quad \forall \ell' > \ell, \mathsf{R}_{\Gamma, \ell'}(S) = \emptyset \\
\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{target}(S) : (\mathsf{real}, \ell)
\]

**ARR**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E_i : (\tau, \ell) \quad \forall i \in 1..n \\
\Gamma \vdash [E_1, \ldots, E_n] : (\tau[n], \ell)
\]

**ARRCOMP**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E_1 : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \quad \Gamma \vdash E_2 : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \\
\Gamma, x : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \vdash E : (\tau, \ell) \\
x \notin \mathsf{dom}(\Gamma)
\]

**ASSIGN**
\[
\Gamma(\mathsf{L}) = (\tau, \ell) \\
\Gamma \vdash (\mathsf{L} = E) : \ell
\]

**IF**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E : (\mathsf{real}, \ell) \\
\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \ell \\
\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \ell \\
\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}(E) S_1 \mathsf{else} S_2 : \ell
\]

**SEQ**
\[
\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \ell \\
\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \ell \\
\mathcal{S}(S_1, S_2) \land \mathcal{G}(S_1, S_2) \\
\Gamma \vdash (S_1; S_2) : \ell
\]

**SAMPLE**
\[
(d \in \text{Dist}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n; \tau)) \\
\Gamma(\mathsf{L}) = (\tau, \ell') \\
\Gamma \vdash E_i : (\tau_i, \ell), \quad \forall i \in 1..n \\
\ell = \ell' \sqcup \mathsf{MODEL} \\
\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{L} \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n) : \ell
\]

**FOR**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E_1 : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \\
\Gamma \vdash E_2 : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \\
\Gamma, x : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \vdash E : \ell \\
x \notin \mathsf{dom}(\Gamma) \\
x \notin W(S)
\]

\[
\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{for}(x \mathsf{in} E_1 : E_2) S : \ell
\]

### Typing Rules for Statements:

**SSUB**
\[
\Gamma \vdash S : \ell' \quad \ell \leq \ell' \\
\Gamma \vdash S : \ell
\]

**ASSIGN**
\[
\Gamma \vdash (L = E) : \ell
\]

**IF**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E : (\mathsf{real}, \ell) \\
\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \ell \\
\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \ell \\
\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{if}(E) S_1 \mathsf{else} S_2 : \ell
\]

**SEQ**
\[
\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \ell \\
\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \ell \\
\mathcal{S}(S_1, S_2) \land \mathcal{G}(S_1, S_2) \\
\Gamma \vdash (S_1; S_2) : \ell
\]

**SAMPLE**
\[
(d \in \text{Dist}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n; \tau)) \\
\Gamma(\mathsf{L}) = (\tau, \ell') \\
\Gamma \vdash E_i : (\tau_i, \ell), \quad \forall i \in 1..n \\
\ell = \ell' \sqcup \mathsf{MODEL} \\
\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{L} \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n) : \ell
\]

**FOR**
\[
\Gamma \vdash E_1 : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \\
\Gamma \vdash E_2 : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \\
\Gamma, x : (\mathsf{int}, \ell) \vdash E : \ell \\
x \notin \mathsf{dom}(\Gamma) \\
x \notin W(S)
\]

\[
\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{for}(x \mathsf{in} E_1 : E_2) S : \ell
\]

In these rules, we make use of the following definitions (see Appendix A for precise definitions).

- \(R_{\Gamma, \ell}(S)\): the set of variables \(x\) that are read at level \(\ell\) in \(S\).
- \(W_{\Gamma, \ell}(S)\): the set of variables \(x\) of level \(\ell\) that have been assigned to in \(S\).
- \(\overline{W}_{\Gamma, \ell}(S)\): the set of variables \(x\) of level \(\ell\) that have been ~-ed in \(S\).
- \(W_{\Gamma, \ell}(S) = W_{\Gamma, \ell}(S) \cup \overline{W}_{\Gamma, \ell}(S)\)

**DEFINITION 1 (SHREDDABLE SEQ).** \(\mathcal{S}(S_1, S_2) \triangleq \forall \ell_1, \ell_2, (\ell_2 < \ell_1) \implies R_{\Gamma, \ell_1}(S_1) \cap W_{\Gamma, \ell_2}(S_2) = \emptyset\)

The intention in SlicStan is that statements of level \(\ell\) are executed before those of \(\ell'\) if \(\ell < \ell'\). In order to follow that implementation strategy without reordering possibly non-commutative pairs of statements, we impose the condition \(\mathcal{S}(S_1, S_2)\) when we sequence \(S_1\) and \(S_2\).

**DEFINITION 2 (GENERATIVE SEQ).** \(\mathcal{G}(S_1, S_2) \triangleq \forall \ell \neq \mathsf{MODEL} \overline{W}_{\Gamma, \ell}(S_1) \cap \overline{W}_{\Gamma, \ell}(S_2) = \emptyset \land W_{\Gamma, \ell}(S_1) \cap \overline{W}_{\Gamma, \ell}(S_2) = \emptyset\)

2We use \(\ell > \ell\) as a shorthand for \(\ell \leq \ell' \land \neg \ell' \leq \ell\)
To be able to read $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, depending on the context, either as a probabilistic assignment to $x$ or as a density contribution, we impose the condition $G(S_1,S_2)$ when we sequence $S_1$ and $S_2$.

### 2.3 Operational Semantics of SlicStan Statements

In this paper, we use a modified version of the semantics given in Gorinova et al. [2019]. We extend the call-by-value operational semantics given in that paper, and derive a more equational form that also includes the generated quantities.

We define a standard big-step operational semantics for SlicStan expressions and statements:

#### Big-step Relation

\[
\begin{align*}
(s, E) \Downarrow V & \quad \text{expression evaluation} \\
(s, S) \Downarrow (s', w) & \quad \text{statement evaluation}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, $s$ and $s'$ are states, $V$ is a value and $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is a weight. Our statements can read and write the state with arbitrary destructive updates. The weight can be thought of as a bit of state that stores a positive real value which only gets accessed by multiplying it with the value of an expression $E$, through the use of factor $(E)$-statements. It can only be read through a target $(S)$-statement which initialises the weight to 1, evaluates the statement $S$ and returns the final weight.

Formally, states and values are defined as follows.

#### Values and States:

\[
\begin{align*}
V & := \\
& \quad c \quad \text{constant} \\
& \quad [V_1, \ldots, V_n] \quad \text{array} \\
& \quad (x_1 \mapsto V_1, \ldots, x_n \mapsto V_n) \quad \text{state (finite map from variables to values)}
\end{align*}
\]

In the rest of the paper, we use the notation for states $s = x_1 \mapsto V_1, \ldots, x_n \mapsto V_n$:

- $s[x \mapsto V]$ is the state $s$, but where the value of $x$ is updated to $V$ if $x \in \text{dom}(s)$, or the element $x \mapsto V$ is added to $s$ if $x \notin \text{dom}(s)$.
- $s[-x]$ is the state $s$, but where $x$ is removed from the domain of $s$ (if it were present).

We also define lookup and update operations on values:

- If $U$ is an $n$-dimensional array value for $n \geq 0$ and $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ are suitable indexes into $U$, then the lookup $U[c_1] \ldots [c_n]$ is the value in $U$ indexed by $c_1, \ldots, c_n$.
- If $U$ is an $n$-dimensional array value for $n \geq 0$ and $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ are suitable indexes into $U$, then the (functional) update $U[c_1] \ldots [c_n] := V$ is the array that is the same as $U$ except that the value indexed by $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ is $V$.

The relation $\Downarrow$ is deterministic but partial, as we do not explicitly handle error states. The purpose of the operational semantics is to define a density function in §§ 2.4, and any errors lead to the density being undefined. The big-step semantics is defined as follows.

#### Operational Semantics of Expressions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Eval Const)</th>
<th>(Eval Var)</th>
<th>(Eval Arr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$V := s(x)$</td>
<td>$x \in \text{dom}(s)$</td>
<td>$(s, E_i) \Downarrow V_i \quad \forall i \in 1..n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(s, c) \Downarrow c$</td>
<td>$(s, x) \Downarrow V$</td>
<td>$(s, [E_1, \ldots, E_n]) \Downarrow [V_1, \ldots, V_n]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eval ARREL)</td>
<td>(Eval PrimCall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(s, E_1 \Downarrow V)$</td>
<td>$(s, E_2 \Downarrow c)$</td>
<td>$(s, f(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) \Downarrow V$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(s, E_1[E_2]) \Downarrow V[c]$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design of the type system ensures that information can flow from a level \( \ell \) to a higher one \( \ell' \geq \ell \), but not a lower one \( \ell' < \ell \): a noninterference result. To state this formally, we introduce the notions of \emph{conformance between a state \( s \) and a typing environment \( \Gamma \) and \( \ell \)-equality of states}.

We define a conformance relation on states \( s \) and typing environments \( \Gamma \). A state \( s \) \emph{conforms} to an environment \( \Gamma \), whenever \( s \) provides values of the correct types for the variables used in \( \Gamma \):

### Conformance Relation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Conformance Relation:} & \\
\models & \\
\text{Rule for the Conformance Relation:} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \( V \models \tau \) denotes that the value \( V \) is of type \( \tau \), and has the following definition:

- \( c \models \text{int} \), if \( c \in \mathbb{Z} \), and \( c \models \text{real} \), if \( c \in \mathbb{R} \).
- \( [V_1, \ldots, V_n] \models [\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_m] \), if \( \forall i \in 1 \ldots n \). \( V_i \models \tau_i \).

Definition 3 (\( \ell \)-equal states).

Given a typing environment \( \Gamma \), states \( s_1 \models \Gamma \) and \( s_2 \models \Gamma \) are \( \ell \)-equal for level \( \ell \) (written \( s_1 \approx_{\ell} s_2 \)), if they differ only for variables of a level strictly higher than \( \ell \):

\[
\text{Lemma 1 (Noninterference of \( \ell \)).} \\
\text{Suppose } s_1 \models \Gamma, \ s_2 \models \Gamma, \text{ and } s_1 \approx_{\ell} s_2 \text{ for some } \ell. \text{ Then for SlicStan statement } S \text{ and expression } E:
\]

\( f(V_1, \ldots, V_n) \) means applying the built-in function \( f \) on the values \( V_1, \ldots, V_n \).

\( \text{Here, we write } E[E'/x] \text{ for the usual capture avoiding substitution of } E' \text{ for } x \text{ in } E. \)

\( d(V|V_1, \ldots, V_n) \) we mean the result of evaluating the intended built-in conditional distribution \( d \) on \( V, V_1, \ldots, V_n \).
(1) If $\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$ and $(s_1, E) \Downarrow V_1$ and $(s_2, E) \Downarrow V_2$ then $V_1 = V_2$.

(2) If $\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$ and $(s_1, S) \Downarrow s_1', w_1$ and $(s_2, S) \Downarrow s_2', w_2$ then $s_1' \approx_{\ell} s_2'$.

Proof. (1) follows by rule induction on the derivation $\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$, and using that if $\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$, $x \in R(E)$ and $\Gamma(x) = (\tau', \ell')$, then $\ell' \leq \ell$. (2) follows by rule induction on the derivation $\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$ and using (1). \hfill $\square$

### 2.4 Density Semantics

The semantic aspect of a SlicStan program $\Gamma, S$ that we are the most interested in is the final weight $w$ obtained after evaluating the program $S$. This is the value the program computes for the unnormalised joint density $p^*(D, \theta, Q)$ over the data $D$, the model parameters $\theta$, and generated quantities $Q$ of the program. Given a program $\Gamma, S$, we separate the typing environment $\Gamma$ into disjoint parts: $\Gamma_{\sigma}$ and $\Gamma_{x}$, such that $\Gamma_{\sigma}$ contains precisely the variables that are assigned in $S$ and $\Gamma_{x}$ contains those which never get assigned:

$$\Gamma_{\sigma} = \{(x : \tau) \in \Gamma \mid x \in W(S)\} \quad \Gamma_{x} = \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_{\sigma}.$$  

Similarly, any conforming state $s \models \Gamma$ separates as $\sigma \cup x$ with

$$\sigma = \{(x \mapsto V) \in s \mid x \in W(S)\} \quad x = s \setminus \sigma.$$  

Then, $\sigma \models \Gamma_{\sigma}$ and $x \models \Gamma_{x}$.

The semantics of a SlicStan program $\Gamma_{\sigma}, \Gamma_{x}, S$ is a function $[S]_{\ast}$ on states $\sigma \models \Gamma_{\sigma}$ and $x \models \Gamma_{x}$, that yields a pair of a state $\sigma'$ and a weight $w$, such that:

$$[S]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x) = \sigma', w, \quad \text{where } \sigma \cup x, S \Downarrow \sigma' \cup x, w$$

We will sometimes refer only to one of the two elements of the pair $\sigma, w$. In those cases we use the notation: $[S]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x), [S]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x) = [S](\sigma)(x)$. We call $[S]_{\ast}$ the state semantics and $[S]_{\ast}$ the density semantics of $\Gamma, S$. We will be particularly interested in the density semantics.

The function $[S]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x)$ is some positive function $\phi$ on the parameters $x$. If $x_1, x_2$ is a partitioning of $x$ and $\int \phi(x)dx_1$ is finite, we say $\phi(x)$ is an unnormalised density $p(x_1 \mid x_2) = \phi(x) / \int \phi(x)dx_1$ and we write $[S]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x) \propto p(x_1 \mid x_2)$. Sometimes, when $\sigma$ is clear from context, we will leave it implicit and simply write $p(x)$ for $p(x; \sigma)$.

Next, we observe how the state and density semantics compose.

**Lemma 2 (Semantics Composes).** The state and density semantics compose as follows:

$$[S_1; S_2]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x) = [S_1]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x) \times [S_2]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x) \quad [S_1; S_2]_{\ast}(\tau)(x) = [S_1]_{\ast}(\tau)(x) \times [S_2]_{\ast}(\tau)(x)$$

Throughout the paper we use the following notation to separate the store in a concise way.

**Definition 4** ($\Gamma_{T}(s)$ or $s_{T}$).

For a typing environment $\Gamma$ and a store $s \models \Gamma$, let $\Gamma_{T}(s) = \{x \mapsto V \in s \mid \Gamma(x) = (\tau, \ell)\}$. When it is clear which typing environment the notation refers to, we write simply $s_{T}$ instead of $\Gamma_{T}(s)$.

Using this definition, we re-state the noninterference result in the following convenient form.

**Lemma 3 (Noninterference of $\vdash$ Reformulated).** Let $\Gamma_{\sigma}, \Gamma_{x} \vdash S$ be a well-typed SlicStan program. For all levels $\ell \in \{\text{DATA, MODEL, GENQUANT}\}$, there exist unique functions $f_{\ell}$, such that for all $\sigma \models \Gamma_{\sigma}, x \models \Gamma_{x}$ and $\sigma'$ such that $[S]_{\ast}(\sigma)(x) = \sigma'$, $\sigma' = f_{\ell}(\sigma_{\sigma}, x_{\ell} \mid \ell' \leq \ell)$.

### 2.5 Shredding and Translation to Stan

A key aim of SlicStan is to rearrange the input program into three phases of execution, corresponding to the levels of the type system: DATA preprocessing, core MODEL code to run MCMC or another inference algorithm on, and GENQUANT, or generated quantities, which amount to sample
post-processing after inference is performed. The motivation for these phases is that they all naturally appear in the workflow of probabilistic programming. The blocks of the Stan are built around this phase distinction, and compilation of SlicStan to Stan and comparable back-ends requires it.

The phases impose different restrictions on the code and make it incur differing computational costs. The model phase is by far the most expensive to evaluate: code in this phase tends to be executed repeatedly within the inner loop of an inference algorithm like an MCMC method. Further, it tends to be automatically differentiated [Griewank and Walther 2008] in case gradient-based inference algorithms are used, which restricts the available programming features and increases the space and time complexity of evaluation. Type inference in SlicStan combined with shredding allows the user to write their code without worrying about the performance of different phases, as code will be shredded into its optimal phase of execution.

The shredding relation is in the core of this rearrangement. Shredding takes a SlicStan statement $S$ and splits it into three single-level statements (Definition 16). That is, $S \vdash (S_D, S_M, S_Q)$ means we split $S$ into sub-statements $S_D, S_M, S_Q$, were $S_D$ mentions only DATA variables, $S_M$ mentions DATA and MODEL variables, and $S_Q$ is the rest of the program, and such that the composition $S_D; S_M; S_Q$ behaves the same as the original program $S$. When combined with type inference, shredding automatically determines optimal statement placement, such that only necessary work is executed in the ‘heavy-weight’ MODEL part of inference.

### Shredding Relation

$$S \vdash (S_D, S_M, S_Q)$$

statement shredding

We adapt the shredding from [Gorinova et al. 2019], so that the following holds for the three sub-statements of a shredded well-typed SlicStan program $\Gamma \vdash S$:

- $S_D$ implements deterministic data preprocessing: no contributions to the density are allowed.
- $S_M$ is the inference core: it is the least restrictive of the three slices — either or both of $S_D$ and $S_Q$ can be merged into $S_M$. It can involve contributions to the density which require advanced inference for sampling. Therefore, this is the part of the program which requires the most computation during inference (in Stan, what is run inside HMC);
- $S_Q$ represents sample post-processing: any contributions to the density are generative. That is, they can immediately be implemented using draws from random number generators.

In terms of inference, we can run $S_D$ once as a pre-processing step. Then use a suitable inference algorithm for $S_M$ (in the case of Stan, that’s HMC, but we can use other MCMC or VI algorithms) and finally, use ancestral sampling for $S_Q$.

### Shredding Rules for Statements:

#### (Shred Assign)

$$\begin{align*}
\Gamma(L) = (\_, \text{DATA}) &\rightarrow S_D = L = E, S_M = S_Q = \text{skip} \\
\Gamma(L) = (\_, \text{MODEL}) &\rightarrow S_M = L = E, S_D = S_Q = \text{skip} \\
\Gamma(L) = (\_, \text{GENQUANT}) &\rightarrow S_Q = L = E, S_D = S_M = \text{skip}
\end{align*}$$

$$\begin{align*}
L = E \vdash (S_D, S_M, S_Q)
\end{align*}$$

#### (Shred Seq)

$$\begin{align*}
S_1 \vdash (S_{D_1}, S_{M_1}, S_{Q_1}), \quad S_2 \vdash (S_{D_2}, S_{M_2}, S_{Q_2}) \\
S_1; S_2 \vdash (S_{D_1}; S_{D_2}), (S_{M_1}; S_{M_2}), (S_{Q_1}; S_{Q_2})
\end{align*}$$

#### (Shred Skip)

$$\begin{align*}
\text{skip} \vdash (\text{skip}, \text{skip}, \text{skip})
\end{align*}$$
As an extension of [Gorinova et al. 2019], we show that shredding induces a natural factorization of the density implemented by the program: \( p(\mathcal{D}, \theta, Q) = p(\theta, \mathcal{D}) p(Q | \theta, \mathcal{D}) \). This means that we
can separate the program into a deterministic preprocessing part, a part that uses a ‘heavy-weight’ inference algorithm, such as HMC, and a part that uses simple ancestral sampling.

**Theorem 1 (Shredding induces a factorisation of the density).**

Suppose $\Gamma \vdash S : \text{DATA}$ and $S \not\in \Gamma$; $S_D, S_M, S_Q$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_\sigma \cup \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_\theta \cup \Gamma_Q$. For all $\sigma, D, \theta$, and $Q$: if $\sigma, D, \theta, Q \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_D, \Gamma_\theta, \Gamma_Q$, and $[S]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) \propto p(D, \theta, Q)$ and $W(S_Q) = \text{dom}(\Gamma_Q)$ then:

1. $[S_M]_p(\sigma_D)(D, \theta, Q) \propto p(\theta, D)$
2. $[S_Q]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p(Q | \theta, D)$

where $\sigma_D = [S_D]_s(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q)$ and $\sigma_M = [S_M]_s(\sigma_D)(D, \theta, Q)$ and $p(D, \theta, Q) = p(D, \theta)p(Q | D, \theta)$.

**Proof.** This follows by proving a more general result using induction on the structure of $S$, Lemma 6, Lemma 2 and Lemma 4. See Appendix A for full proof. \(\square\)

The given SlicStan program $S$ defines a joint density $p(D, \theta, Q)$. By shredding we obtain a **MODEL** block $S_M$ that defines $p(\theta, D)$ and a **GENQUANT** block $S_Q$ that defines $p(Q | \theta, D)$. Hence, inference in Stan using these blocks recovers the semantics $p(D, \theta, Q)$ of the SlicStan program.

### 3 THEORY: CONDITIONAL INDEPENDENCE BY TYPING

This section presents the main theoretical contribution of the paper: an information flow type system for conditional independence. We present a type system and show that a well-typed program in that system is guaranteed to have certain conditional independencies in its density semantics.

Our aim is to optimise probabilistic programs by transforming abstract syntax trees or intermediate representations (as in the Stan compiler) that are close to abstract syntax. Hence, we seek a way to compute conditional dependencies by a type-based source analysis, rather than by explicitly constructing a separate factor graph.

Given three disjoint sets of random variables (RVs) $A$, $B$ and $C$, we say that $A$ is **conditionally independent** of $B$ given $C$, written $A \perp B \mid C$, if and only if their densities factorise as $p(A, B \mid C) = p(A \mid C)p(B \mid C)$. Deriving conditional independencies in the presence of a graphical model (such as a factor graph) is straightforward, which is why some PPLs focus on building and performing inference on graphs (for example, Infer.NET [Minka et al. 2014]). However, building and manipulating a factor graph in generative PPLs (e.g. Gen [Cusumano-Towner et al. 2019], Pyro [Uber AI Labs 2017], Edward2 [Tran et al. 2018], PyMC3 [Patil et al. 2010]) or imperative density-based PPLs (SlicStan, Stan) is not straightforward. Dependencies between modelled variables might be separated by various deterministic transformations, making it harder to track the information flow, and – more importantly – more difficult to isolate parts of the model needed for transformations such as variable elimination. For example, consider Program A:

**A. Simple Hidden Markov Model (HMM)**

\begin{align*}
\text{int}<2>& \text{ z1 } \sim \text{ bern}(\theta_0) ; \\
\text{real } & \theta_1 = \text{ foo}(\theta_0, z1) ; \\
\text{int}<2>& \text{ z2 } \sim \text{ bern}(\theta_1) ; \\
\text{real } & \phi_1 = \text{ foo}(1, z1) ; \\
\text{real } & \phi_2 = \text{ foo}(1, z2) ; \\
\text{int}<2>& \text{ y1 } \sim \text{ bern}(\phi_1) ; \\
\text{int}<2>& \text{ y2 } \sim \text{ bern}(\phi_2) ; \\
\end{align*}

When looking at the factor graph, it is straightforward to see that $z_1$ and $z_2$ are **not** conditionally independent, and neither are $z_1$ and $y_1$ nor $z_2$ and $y_2$, as there is a direct path between each of these
pairs [Frey 2002]. When looking at the program, however, we need to reason about the information flow through the deterministic variables $\theta_1, \phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ to reach the same conclusion.

Moreover, if we are to eliminate $z_1$ in the factor graph, using variable elimination (§§ 4.3), we would simply merge the factors directly connected to $z_1$, sum over $z_1$, and attach the new factors to all former neighbours of $z_1$ (in this case $y_1$ and $z_2$, but not $y_2$). However, in the case of an imperative program, we need to isolate all the statements that depend on $z_1$, and group them together without changing the meaning of the program beyond the elimination:

**B. HMM with $z_1$ marginalised out**

```
factor (sum([target(
  z1 ~ bern(\theta_0); real \theta_1 = foo(\theta_0, z1);
  z2 ~ bern(\theta_1); real \phi_1 = foo(1, z1);
  y1 ~ bern(\phi_1); ) | z in 1 : 2 ]))  ;
real \phi_2 = foo(1, z2);
int<2> y2 ~ bern(\phi_2);
```

We need a way to analyse the information flow to determine conditional independencies between variables. In the example above, we can leave $y_2$ out of the elimination of $z_1$, because $z_1$ and $y_2$ are conditionally independent given $z_2$, written $z_1 \perp y_2 \mid z_2$.

To analyse the information flow, we introduce a novel type system, which we write $\rightarrow_2$, that works with a lower semi-lattice $(\{l_1, l_2, l_3\}, \leq)$ of levels, where $l_1 \leq l_2$ and $l_1 \leq l_3$ and $l_2$ and $l_3$ unrelated. (Recall that a lower semi-lattice is a partial order in which any two elements $l_1, l_2$ have a greatest lower bound $l_1 \cap l_2$ but may fail to have any upper bound.) A well-typed program induces a conditional independence relationship for the variables in the program: $l_2$-RVs $\perp l_3$-RVs $\mid l_1$-RVs. This result allows us to eliminate $l_2$-variables, while only considering $l_1$-variables and knowing $l_3$-variables are unaffected by the elimination. In the example above, we eliminate $z_1$ ($l_2$), only involving its neighbours $y_1$ and $z_2$ ($l_1$), and leaving $y_2$ ($l_3$) out of the elimination.

We can use a shredding relation almost identical to that of §§ 2.5 to slice the program in a semantics-preserving way, and isolate the sub-statements needed for elimination. Here, $\theta_1$ and $\phi_1$ must be of level $l_2$ for the program to be well-typed. Thus, all statements involving $z_1$, $\theta_1$ or $\phi_1$ are of level $l_2$, and the shredding relation groups them together inside of the elimination loop for $z_1$.

Figure 1 shows the relationship between the levels $l_1$, $l_2$, $l_3$ and the shredding relation. Information flows from $l_1$ to $l_2$ and $l_3$, but there is no flow of information between $l_2$ and $l_3$ (Figure 1b). A $\rightarrow_2$-well-typed program $S$ is sliced by $\triangleright_1$ into $S_1$, $S_2$ and $S_3$, where $S_1$ only mentions $l_1$ variables, $S_2$ only mentions $l_1$ and $l_2$ variables, and $S_3$ only mentions $l_1$ and $l_3$ variables. This can be understood as a new factor graph formulation of the original program $S$, where each of the substatements $S_1$, $S_2$, $S_3$ defines a factor connected to any involved variables (Figure 1a).

Our approach relies on determining the $l_1, l_2, l_3$ level types by type inference, as they are not intrinsic to the variables or program in any way, but are designed solely to guide the variable elimination process. These types would never be accessible by the probabilistic programming user.

In the rest of this section, we give the $\rightarrow_2$ type system (§§ 3.1), state a standard result of noninterference (Lemma 7, Lemma 8) and show that semantics is preserved when shredding $\rightarrow_2$-well-typed programs (Lemma 10). We present the type system and transformation rules in a declarative style in this paper. The implementation relies on type inference, which we discuss in §§ 4.4. We derive a result about the way shredding factorises the density defined by the program (Theorem 2). Finally, we state and prove a conditional independence result (§§ 3.2, Theorem 3) and discuss the scope of our approach with examples (§§ 3.3).
We introduce a modified version of SlicStan’s type system. Once again, types $T$ range over pairs $(\tau, \ell)$ of a base type $\tau$, and a level type $\ell$, but levels $\ell$ are one of $l_1, l_2,$ or $l_3$, which form a lower semi-lattice $(\{l_1, l_2, l_3\}, \leq)$, where $l_1 \leq l_2$ and $l_1 \leq l_3$.

3.1 The $\tau_2$ Type System

We introduce a modified version of SlicStan’s type system. Once again, types $T$ range over pairs $(\tau, \ell)$ of a base type $\tau$, and a level type $\ell$, but levels $\ell$ are one of $l_1, l_2,$ or $l_3$, which form a lower semi-lattice $(\{l_1, l_2, l_3\}, \leq)$, where $l_1 \leq l_2$ and $l_1 \leq l_3$.

The type system is a standard information flow type system, very similar to the $\tau$ system introduced in §§ 2.2. We mark the only non-standard rules, (SAMPLE2), (FACTOR2), and (SEQ2), which also differ from those of $\tau$. (SAMPLE2) and (FACTOR2) both have the same effect as an assignment to an implicit weight variable that can be of any of the three levels. (SEQ2) is a less restrictive version of (SEQ) and exactly as in [Gorinova et al. 2019], and it makes sure the program can be sliced later.

Note also that the non-interference between $l_2$ and $l_3$ relies on the (PRIMCALL2) rule not being derivable when the least upper bound $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \ell_i$ does not exist.

### Typing Rules for Expressions:

**(ESUB2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell) \quad \ell \leq \ell'$$

$$\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell')$$

**(VAR2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash x : T$$

$$\Gamma, x : T \vdash x : T$$

**(CONST2)**

$$\ty(c) = \tau$$

$$\Gamma, x : T \vdash \text{ty}(c) = \tau$$

**(ARR2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash E_i : (\tau_i, \ell_i) \quad \forall i \in 1..n$$

$$\Gamma \vdash E_i : (\tau, \ell_i)$$

$$\Gamma, x : T \vdash x : T$$

$$\Gamma \vdash c : (\tau, \ell_1)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash [E_1, \ldots, E_n] : (\tau, \ell)$$

**(ARRREL2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash E_1 : (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma, x : (\text{int}, \ell) \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash f(E_1, \ldots, E_n) : (\tau, \ell)$$

**(PRIMCALL2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash f : (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n \rightarrow \tau)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash E_1 : (\tau_i, \ell_i) \quad \forall i \in 1..n$$

$$\Gamma \vdash E_1 : (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash f(E_1, \ldots, E_n) : (\tau, \ell)$$

**(ARRCOMP2)**

$$\forall i = 1, 2. \quad \Gamma \vdash E_i : (\text{int}, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma, x : (\text{int}, \ell) \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{target}(S) : (\text{real}, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash [E \mid x \in E_1 : E_2] : (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{target}(S) : (\text{real}, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{target}(S) : (\text{real}, \ell)$$

### Typing Rules for Statements:

**(SSUB2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell' \quad \ell' \leq \ell'$$

$$\Gamma (L) = (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash (L = E) : \ell$$

**(ASSIGN2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash (L = E) : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash E : (\tau, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell'$$

$$\forall \ell' > \ell. \quad \Gamma \vdash \text{R}_{\tau, \ell'} (S) = \emptyset$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{target}(S) : (\text{real}, \ell)$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S : \ell$$

**(SAMPLE2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{factor}(D(L \mid E_1, \ldots, E_n)) : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash L \sim \text{D}_{\text{dist}}(E_1, \ldots, E_n) : \ell$$

**(FACTOR2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{factor}(E) : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{factor}(D(L \mid E_1, \ldots, E_n)) : \ell$$

**(SEQ2)**

$$\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_1 \cdot S_2 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_1 \cdot S_2 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \ell$$

$$\Gamma \vdash S_1 \cdot S_2 : \ell$$
We state and prove a noninterference result for \( \vdash_2 \), which follows similarly to the result for \( \vdash \).

**Lemma 7 (Noninterference of \( \vdash_2 \)).** Suppose \( s_1 \models \Gamma, s_2 \models \Gamma, \) and \( s_1 \approx_\ell s_2 \) for some \( \ell \). Then for a SlicStan statement \( S \) and expression \( E \):

1. If \( \Gamma \vdash_2 E : (\tau, \ell) \) and \( (s_1, E) \downarrow V_1 \) and \( (s_2, E) \downarrow V_2 \) then \( V_1 = V_2 \).
2. If \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : \ell \) and \( (s_1, S) \downarrow s_1', w_1 \) and \( (s_2, S) \downarrow s_2', w_2 \) then \( s_1' \approx_\ell s_2' \).

**Proof.** (1) follows by rule induction on the derivation \( \Gamma \vdash_2 E : (\tau, \ell) \), and using that if \( \Gamma \vdash_2 E : (\tau, \ell) \), \( x \in R(E) \) and \( (\Gamma(x) = (\tau', \ell')) \), then \( \ell' \leq \ell \). (2) follows by rule induction on the derivation \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : \ell \) and using (1). \( \square \)

Once again we derive a more convenient form of the noninterference result. Because the level types \( \ell_2 \) and \( \ell_3 \) are not comparable in the order \( \leq \), changes in the store at \( \ell_2 \) do not affect the store at \( \ell_3 \) and vice versa.

**Lemma 8 (Noninterference of \( \vdash_2 \)-well-typed programs).** Let \( \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_x, S \) be a SlicStan program, and \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : \ell_1 \). There exist unique functions \( f, g \) and \( h \), such that for all \( \sigma \models \Gamma_\sigma, x \models \Gamma_x \) and \( \sigma' \) such that \( [S]_\sigma(\sigma)(x) = \sigma' \):

\[
\sigma'_{\ell_1} = f(\sigma_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_1}), \quad \sigma'_{\ell_2} = g(\sigma_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_2}, x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_2}), \quad \sigma'_{\ell_3} = h(\sigma_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_3}, x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_3})
\]

**Proof.** Follows from noninterference (Lemma 7). \( \square \)

Next, we extend the shredding relation from \( \S\ 2.5 \), and the concept of single-level statements, to SlicStan programs that are well-typed with respect to \( \vdash_2 \). This is done by simply treating \( \ell_1 \) as DATA, \( \ell_2 \) as MODEL, and \( \ell_3 \) as GENQUANT for the purpose of shredding. Thus, as before, shredding produces single-level statements, and shredding preserves semantics with respect to \( \vdash_2 \)-well-typed programs. We state and prove these results in Appendix A.

**Lemma 9 (Shredding produces single-level statements, \( \vdash_2 \)).**

If \( S \Downarrow_\Gamma S_1, S_2, S_3 \) then \( \Gamma \vdash_2 L_1(S_1), \Gamma \vdash_2 L_2(S_2), \) and \( \Gamma \vdash_2 L_3(S_3) \).

**Lemma 10 (Semantic preservation of \( \Downarrow_\Gamma, \vdash_2 \)).**

If \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : \ell_1 \) and \( S \Downarrow_\Gamma S_1, S_2, S_3 \) then \([S] = [S_1; S_2; S_3] \).

We prove a result about the effect of single-level statements on the store and weight of \( \vdash_2 \)-well-typed programs.

**Lemma 11 (Property of \( \vdash_2 \) single-level statements).**

Let \( \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_x, S \) be a SlicStan program, and \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : \ell_1 \), and \( S \) is single-level statement of level \( \ell, \Gamma \vdash_2 \ell(S) \). Then there exist unique functions \( f \) and \( \phi \), such that for any \( \sigma, x \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_x \):

1. If \( \ell = \ell_1 \), then \([S](\sigma)(x) = (f(\sigma_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_2}, \sigma_{\ell_3}), \phi(\sigma_{\ell_1})(x_{\ell_1}) \)
2. If \( \ell = \ell_2 \), then \([S](\sigma)(x) = (\sigma_{\ell_1}, f(\sigma_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_2}, x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_2}), \sigma_{\ell_3}), \phi(\sigma_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_2})(x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_2}) \)
3. If \( \ell = \ell_3 \), then \([S](\sigma)(x) = (\sigma_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_2}, f(\sigma_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_3}, x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_3}), \phi(\sigma_{\ell_1}, \sigma_{\ell_3})(x_{\ell_1}, x_{\ell_3}) \)
We give proofs for Lemma 9, 10, and 11 in Appendix A. These results allow us to derive the second key theorem of this paper, Theorem 2, which similarly to Theorem 1 gives us a result on the way shredding factorises the density defined by the program.

**Theorem 2 (Shredding induces a factorisation of the density (2)).** Suppose \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : L1 \) with \( \Gamma = \Gamma_0, \Gamma_{L1}, \Gamma_{L2}, \Gamma_{L3} \). Then for \( \sigma, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \models \Gamma_0, \Gamma_{L1}, \Gamma_{L2}, \Gamma_{L3} \), and \( \sigma', \sigma'' \) such that \([S_1]P(\sigma)(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \sigma' \), and \([S_2]P(\sigma')(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \sigma'' \) we have:

1. \([S_1]P(\sigma)(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \phi_1(\theta_1)\)
2. \([S_2]P(\sigma')(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \phi_2(\theta_1, \theta_2)\)
3. \([S_3]P(\sigma'')(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \phi_3(\theta_1, \theta_3)\)

**Proof.** By applying Lemma 11 to each of \( S_1, S_2, S_3 \), which are single-level statements (Lemma 9).

\[\square\]

### 3.2 Conditional Independence Result for \( \vdash_2 \)-Well-Typed Programs

Theorem 3 states the key theoretical result of this paper: the typing in programs well-typed with respect to \( \vdash_2 \) corresponds to a conditional independence relationship. In our proofs, we use the factorisation characterisation of conditional independence stated by Definition 6. This is a well-known result in the literature (e.g. [Murphy 2012, Theorem 2.2.1.]).

**Definition 6 (Characterisation of conditional independence as factorisation).** For variables \( x, y, z \) and a density \( p(x, y, z) \), \( x \) is conditionally independent of \( y \) given \( z \) with respect to \( p \), written \( x \perp_y | z \), if and only if \( \exists \phi_1, \phi_2 \) such that \( p(x, y, z) = \phi_1(x, z)p_2(y, z) \).

An equivalent formulation is \( p(x, y | z) = p(x | z)p(y | z) \).

We extend the notion of conditional independence to apply to a general function \( \phi(x, y, z) \), using the notation \( x \perp_\phi y | z \) to mean \( \exists \phi_1, \phi_2 \) such that \( \phi(x, y, z) = \phi_1(x, z)p_2(y, z) \).

**Theorem 3 (\( \vdash_2 \)-well-typed programs induce a conditional independence relationship).** For a SlicStan program \( \Gamma, S \) such that \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : L1 \), \( \Gamma = \Gamma_0, \Gamma_{L1}, \Gamma_{L2}, \Gamma_{L3} \), and for \( \sigma, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \models \Gamma_0, \Gamma_{L1}, \Gamma_{L2}, \Gamma_{L3} \), we have \( \theta_2 \perp_\phi \theta_3 | \theta_1 \).

When \([S_1]P(\sigma)(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \propto p(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)\), we have \( \theta_2 \perp_\phi \theta_3 | \theta_1 \).

**Proof.** Let \( \theta = \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, S \models \Gamma \) \( S_1, S_2, S_3 \), and let \( \sigma' \) and \( \sigma'' \) be such that \( \sigma' = \frac{[S_1]P(\sigma)(\theta)}{[S_2]P(\sigma')(\theta)} \)

Then, by semantic preservation of shredding (10), we have

\([S]P(\sigma)(\theta) = \frac{[S_1]P(\sigma)(\theta) \times [S_2]P(\sigma')(\theta) \times [S_3]P(\sigma'')(\theta)}{[S_3]P(\sigma'')(\theta)} \)

by Lemma 10

\[= \phi_1(\theta_1) \times \phi_2(\theta_1, \theta_2) \times \phi_3(\theta_1, \theta_3) \]

by Lemma 2

\[= \phi'(\theta_1, \theta_2) \times \phi_3(\theta_1, \theta_3) \]

by Theorem 2

for some \( \phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi'(\theta_1, \theta_2) = \phi_1(\theta_1) \times \phi_2(\theta_1, \theta_2) \). Thus \( \theta_2 \perp_\phi \theta_3 | \theta_1 \) by definition of \( \perp_\phi \).

Suppose \( \phi(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \propto p(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \). Then \( p(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) = \phi(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \times Z = \phi'(\theta_1, \theta_2) \times \phi_3(\theta_1, \theta_3) \times Z = \phi''(\theta_1, \theta_2) \times \phi''(\theta_1, \theta_3) \), where \( Z \) is a constant and \( \phi''(\theta_1, \theta_3) = \phi_3(\theta_1, \theta_3) \times Z \).

Therefore, \( \theta_2 \perp_\phi \theta_3 | \theta_1 \).

\[\square\]

### 3.3 Scope of the Conditional Independence Result

We have shown that \( \vdash_2 \)-well-typed programs exhibit a conditional independence relationship in their density semantics. However, it is not the case that every conditional independence relationship can be derived from the type system. In particular, we can only derive results of the form...
\( \theta_2 \perp \theta_3 \mid \theta_1 \), \( \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3 \) is a partitioning of \( \theta \mid \Gamma_x \) for a SlicStan program \( \Gamma_V, \Gamma_x, S \). That is, the relationship includes all parameters in the program.

We discuss the scope of our approach using an example and show a situation where trying to derive a conditional independence result that does not hold results in a failure to type check.  

3.3.1 Example of \( \Gamma_2 \)-well-typed program \( \rightarrow \) conditional independence.  

Consider the following SlicStan program (left), its directed graphical model (middle) and the conditional independence (CI) relationships that hold for that model (right).

### C. Simple ‘cross’ model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graphical model:</th>
<th>CI relationships:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>real x1 ~ normal((0,1))</td>
<td>( x_1 \perp x_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real x2 ~ normal((0,1))</td>
<td>( x_1 \perp {x_3} \cup A, \forall A \subseteq {x_2, x_3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real x3 ~ normal(x1+x2, 1)</td>
<td>( x_1 \perp {x_3} \cup A, \forall A \subseteq {x_2, x_4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real x4 ~ normal(x3, 1)</td>
<td>( x_2 \perp {x_3} \cup A, \forall A \subseteq {x_1, x_3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real x5 ~ normal(x3, 1)</td>
<td>( x_2 \perp {x_3} \cup A, \forall A \subseteq {x_1, x_4} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the many relationships above, we can derive all relationships that involve all the variables. That is, we can use our type system to derive all conditional independence relationships that hold and are of the form \( A \perp B \mid C \), where \( A, B, C \) is some partitioning of \( \{x_1, \ldots, x_5\} \). However, note the following properties of conditional independence:

\[
A \perp B \mid C \iff B \perp A \mid C \quad \text{and} \quad A \perp B_1, B_2 \mid C \iff A \perp B_1 \mid C \quad \text{and} \quad A \perp B_2 \mid C
\]

Some of the relationships above can be combined and written in other ways, e.g. \( x_1 \perp x_4 \mid x_2, x_3 \) and \( x_1 \perp x_3 \mid x_2, x_3 \) can be written as a single relationship \( x_1 \perp x_4, x_5 \mid x_2, x_3 \), thus expressing them as a single relationship that includes all variables in the program.

Exploring different mappings between the parameters \( x_1, \ldots, x_5 \) and the type levels \( l_1, l_2, l_3 \), for which the above program typechecks, we can derive all CI relationship that hold for this model, except for one: \( x_1 \perp x_2 \), which we cannot derive with our approach.

3.3.2 Conditional independence relationship does not hold \( \rightarrow \) type error.

Suppose we try to derive the result \( x_1 \perp x_2 \mid x_3, x_4, x_5 \). This does not hold for Program C. By Theorem 3, we have that a program being \( \Gamma_2 \)-well-typed implies that \( l_2 \perp l_3 \mid l_1 \). So, we can derive \( x_1 \perp l_2 \mid x_3, x_4, x_5 \) using Theorem 3 if we show that \( \Gamma_2 S : l_1 \), for \( \Gamma = \{x_1 : l_2, x_2 : l_3, x_3 : l_1, x_4 : l_1, x_5 : l_1\} \) and \( S \) being Program C.

To typecheck, we need to typecheck \( x_3 \sim \text{normal}(x_1 + x_2, 1) \) at some level \( \ell \), thus by (SAMPLE2) and (PRIMCALL2), \( x_1, x_2 \) and \( x_3 \) need to typecheck at that level \( \ell \). The types of \( x_1, x_2 \) and \( x_3 \) are \( l_2, l_3 \) and \( l_1 \) respectively, so using (ESUB2), it must be the case that \( l_2 \leq \ell \), and \( l_3 \leq \ell \), and \( l_1 \leq \ell \).

However, no such level exists in our lower semi-lattice, as \( l_2 \) and \( l_3 \) have no upper bound. Therefore, typechecking fails and we cannot derive \( x_1 \perp x_2 \mid x_3, x_4, x_5 \).

4 APPLICATION: DISCRETE PARAMETERS SUPPORT THROUGH A SEMANTIC-PRESERVING TRANSFORMATION

This section presents the main practical contribution of our work: a semantic-preserving procedure for transforming a probabilistic program to enable combined inference of discrete and continuous model parameters, which we have implemented for SlicStan. The procedure corresponds to variable elimination (VE) for discrete parameters implemented in the probabilistic program itself, which can be combined with gradient-based methods, such as HMC, to perform inference on all parameters.
PPLs that have gradient-based methods in the core of their inference strategy do not in general support directly working with discrete parameters. Stan disallows discrete model parameters altogether, while Pyro [Uber AI Labs 2017] and Edward2 [Tran et al. 2018] throw a runtime error whenever discrete parameters are used within a gradient-based method. However, working with discrete parameters in these languages is still possible, albeit in an implicit way. In many cases, discrete parameters can be marginalised out manually, and then drawn conditionally on the continuous parameters. Stan’s user guide shows many examples of this approach [Stan Development Team 2019, Chapter 15]. Pyro provides an on-request marginalisation functionality, which automates this implicit treatment for plated factor graphs [Obermeyer et al. 2019].

The key idea of the workaround is to marginalise out the discrete parameters by hand, so that the resulting program corresponds to a density function that does not depend on any discrete parameters. That is, the user writes a program that computes \( \sum_{\theta_d} p(\theta_d, \theta_c) = p(\theta_c) \), where the density semantics of the original program was \( p(\theta_d, \theta_c) \) for discrete parameters \( \theta_d \) and continuous parameters \( \theta_c \). This allows for continuous parameters of the program to be sampled with HMC, or other gradient-based inference algorithms, whereas that would have not been possible for the program with both discrete and continuous latent variables.

Because a SlicStan program computes a density directly, it is easy to modify it to marginalise a variable. For a SlicStan program \( \Gamma, S \), with parameters \( x \models \Gamma \), and a discrete parameter \( z \) of type \( \text{int}(K) \), the program \( \text{elim}(\text{int}(K) z) S \triangleq \text{factor}(\text{sum}([\text{target}(S) \mid z \text{ in } 1 : K])) \) marginalises \( z \):

\[
[factor(\text{sum}([\text{target}(S) \mid z \text{ in } 1 : K])))_{\rho}(\sigma)(x) = \sum_{z=1}^{K} [S]_{\rho}(\sigma)(x) \propto \sum_{z=1}^{K} p(x) = p(x \setminus \{z\})
\]

In other words, we can easily marginalise out all discrete variables in a probabilistic program, by encapsulating the entire program in nested loops (nested array comprehension expressions in our examples). However, this approach becomes infeasible for more than a few variables. Variable elimination [Koller and Friedman 2009; Zhang and Poole 1994] exploits the structure of a model to do as little work as possible. Consider the HMM snippet (Program D) with three discrete (binary) hidden states \( z_1, z_2 \) and \( z_3 \), and observed outcomes \( y_1, y_2 \) and \( y_3 \).
D. A Hidden Markov Model (HMM)

```c
int<2> z1 ~ bernoulli(theta[1]);
int<2> z2 ~ bernoulli(theta[z1]);
int<2> z3 ~ bernoulli(theta[z2]);
data real y1 ~ normal(phi[z1], 1);
data real y2 ~ normal(phi[z2], 1);
data real y3 ~ normal(phi[z3], 1);
```

E. Inefficient marginalisation

```c
factor(sum [target(
  factor(sum [target(
    z1 ~ bernoulli(theta[1]));
    z2 ~ bernoulli(theta[z1]));
    z3 ~ bernoulli(theta[z2]));
    y1 ~ normal(phi[z1], 1);
    y2 ~ normal(phi[z2], 1);
    y3 ~ normal(phi[z3], 1);
  | z1 in 1:2));
  | z2 in 1:2));
  | z3 in 1:2));
```

F. Efficient marginalisation

```c
real[2] f1 = // new factor on z2
  [sum([target(
    z1 ~ bernoulli(theta[1]));
    z2 ~ bernoulli(theta[z1]));
    y1 ~ normal(phi[z1], 1); )
  | z1 in 1:2))
  | z2 in 1:2]

real[2] f2 = // new factor on z3
  [sum([target(
    factor(f1[z2]);
    y2 ~ normal(phi[z2], 1);
    z3 ~ bernoulli(theta[z2])); )
  | z2 in 1:2))
  | z3 in 1:2]

factor(sum [target(
  factor(f2[z3]);
    y3 ~ normal(phi[z3], 1); )
  | z3 in 1:2));
```

Naively marginalising out the hidden states results in nested loops around the original program (Program E). In the general case of $N$ hidden states, the resulting program is of complexity $O(2^N)$.

However, this is wasteful: expressions like $z_3 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta[z_2])$ do not depend on $z_1$, and so do not need to be inside of the $z_1$-elimination loop. Variable elimination (VE) avoids this problem by pre-computing some of the work. Program E implements VE for this model: when eliminating a variable, say $z_1$, we pre-compute statements that involve $z_1$ for each possible value of $z_1$ and store the resulting density contributions in a new factor, $f_1$. This new factor depends on the variables involved in those statements — the neighbours of $z_1$ — in this case that is solely $z_2$. We then repeat the procedure for the other variables, re-using the already computed factors where possible.

In the special case of an HMM, and given a suitable elimination order, variable elimination recovers the celebrated forward algorithm, which has time complexity $O(N^2)$. Our goal is to automatically translate the source code of Program D to Program F, exploiting statically detectable independence properties in the model.

4.1 Goal

Our ultimate goal is to transform a program $S$ with continuous parameters $\theta_c$, discrete parameters $\theta_d$, data $\mathcal{D}$ and density semantics $[S]_p(\sigma)(\theta_d, \theta_c, \mathcal{D}) \propto p(\theta_d, \theta_c \mid \mathcal{D})$, into two subprograms: $S_{\text{HMC}}$ and $S_{\text{GEN}}$, such that:

- The density defined by $S_{\text{HMC}}$ is the marginal $\propto p(\theta_c \mid \mathcal{D})$, with the discrete parameters $\theta_d$ marginalised out. This first statement, $S_{\text{HMC}}$, represents the marginalisation part of the program (see §§ 4.3) and allows for Hamiltonian Monte Carlo HMC sampling of $\theta_c$, as it does not involve any discrete parameters.
- The density defined by $S_{\text{GEN}}$ is the conditional $p(\theta_d \mid \theta_c, \mathcal{D})$. This second statement, $S_{\text{GEN}}$, represents the generative part of the program (§§ 4.5) and it encodes a way to draw $\theta_d$ generatively, without using HMC or another heavy-weight inference algorithm.
Similarly to the extended SlicStan slicing based on information-flow type inference, here we also want to transform and slice into sub-programs, each focusing on a subset of the parameters, and preserving the overall meaning:

\[
[S]_p \propto p(\theta_d, \theta_c \mid D) = p(\theta_c \mid D) \times p(\theta_d \mid \theta_c, D) \propto [S_{\text{HMC}}]_p \times [S_{\text{GEN}}]_p = [S_{\text{HMC}}; S_{\text{GEN}}]_p
\]

Our approach performs a semantic-preserving transformation, guided by information-flow and type inference, which creates an efficient program-specific inference algorithm automatically, combining HMC with variable elimination.

### 4.2 Key Insight

The key practical insight of this work is to use an adaptation to SlicStan’s level types and its information-flow type system to rearrange the program in a semantic preserving way, so that discrete parameters can be forward-sampled, instead of sampled using a heavy-weight inference algorithm. We achieve this by a program transformation for each of the discrete variables. Assuming we are applying the transformation with respect to the variable \(z\), we use:

- The top-level information flow type system \(\Gamma \vdash S : \text{DATA}\) from §§ 2.2, which involves the level types \text{DATA} \leq \text{MODEL} \leq \text{GENQUANT}. When we use \(\vdash\) in conjunction with shredding \(S \Downarrow_{\Gamma} S_D, S_M, S_Q\) (§§ 2.5), we slice the statement \(S\) into a data part \(S_D\), a non-generative part \(S_M\) and a generative part \(S_Q\).
- The conditional independence information flow type system, \(\Gamma \vdash_2 S : l_1\) from § 3, which uses a lower semi-lattice of level types \(l_1 \leq l_2, l_1 \leq l_3\). A \(\vdash_2\)-well-typed program induced a conditional independence relationship: \(l_2\)-parameters are conditionally independent of \(l_3\)-parameters given \(l_1\)-parameters. When we use \(\vdash_2\) in conjunction with shredding \(S \Downarrow_{\Gamma} S_1, S_2, S_3\) (§§ 2.5), we isolate \(S_2\): a part of the program that does not interfere with \(S_3\). We can marginalise out \(l_2\)-parameters in that sub-statement only, keeping the rest of the program unchanged.
- The discrete variable transformation relation \(\Gamma, S \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma', S'\) (defined in §§ 4.6.2), which takes a SlicStan program \(\Gamma, S\) that has discrete model parameter \(z\), and transforms it to a SlicStan program \(\Gamma', S'\), where \(z\) is no longer a MODEL-level parameter but instead one of level GENQUANT. We define the relation in terms of \(\vdash\) and \(\vdash_2\) as per the (ELIM GEN) rule.

### 4.3 Variable Elimination

Variable elimination (VE) [Koller and Friedman 2009; Zhang and Poole 1994] is an exact inference algorithm often phrased in terms of factor graphs. It can be used to compute prior or posterior marginal distributions by eliminating, one by one, variables that are irrelevant to the distribution of interest. VE uses dynamic programming combined with a clever use of the distributive law of multiplication over addition to efficiently compute a nested sum of a product of expressions.

We already saw an example of variable elimination in § 3 (Program A and B). The idea is to eliminate (marginalise out) variables one by one. To eliminate a variable \(z\), we multiply all of the factors connected to \(z\) to form a single expression, then sum over all possible values for \(z\) to create a new factor, remove \(z\) from the graph, and finally connect the new factor to all former neighbours\(^7\) of \(z\). Recall Program D, where we have latent variables \(z_1, z_2, z_3\) and observed data \(y = y_1, y_2, y_3\). Figure 2 shows the VE algorithm step-by-step applied to this program. We eliminate

\[^{6}\text{This expression is simplified for readability.}^{7}\text{‘Neighbours’ refers to the variables which are connected to a factor which connects to } z.\]
The key property we are looking for, in order to be able to marginalise out a variable independently of another, is conditional independence given neighbouring variables. If we shred a factor graph corresponding to the program: it is as in Figure 3a. Eliminating all variables to be of level $\perp \perp$ holds for a concrete partitioning of the program parameters $x = x_{L1}, x_{L2}, x_{L3}$. But to find the Markov blanket of a variable $z$ we want to eliminate, we rely on type inference. We define a performance ordering between the level types $L3 < L1 < L2$, where our first preference is for variables to be of level $L3$, level $L1$ is our second preference, and $L2$ is our last resort. In our implementation, we use bidirectional type-checking [Pierce and Turner 2000] to synthesise hard constraints imposed by the type system, and resolve them, while optimising for the soft constraints given by the ordering. This maximises the number of variables that are conditionally

#### 4.4 Conditional Independence Relationships and Inferring the Markov Blanket

The key property we are looking for, in order to be able to marginalise out a variable independently of another, is conditional independence given neighbouring variables. If we shred a $\tau_2$-well-typed program into $S_1, S_2$ and $S_3$, and think of $[S_1]_P, [S_2]_P$ and $[S_3]_P$ as factors, it is easy to visualise the factor graph corresponding to the program: it is as in Figure 3a. Eliminating all $x_{L2}$ variables, ends up only modifying the $[S_2]_P$ factor (Figure 3b).

When using VE to marginalise out a parameter $z$, we want to find the smallest set of other parameters $A$, such that $z \perp B \mid A$, where $B$ is the rest of the parameters. The set $A$ is also called $z$’s *Markov blanket*. Once we know this set, we can ensure that we involve the smallest possible number of variables in $z$’s elimination, which is important to achieve a performant algorithm.

For example, when we eliminate $z_1$ in Program D, both $z_2$ and $y_1$ need to be involved, as $z_1$ shares a factor with them. By contrast, there is no need to include $y_2, z_3, y_3$ and the statements associated with them, as they are unaffected by $z_1$, given $z_2$. The variables $y_1$ and $z_2$ form $z_1$’s Markov blanket: given these variables, $z_1$ is conditionally independent of all other variables. That is, $z_1 \perp z_3, y_2, y_3 \mid z_2, y_1$.

The type system we present in § 3 can tell us if the conditional independence relationship $x_{L2} \perp x_{L3} \mid x_{L1}$ holds for a concrete partitioning of the program parameters $x = x_{L1}, x_{L2}, x_{L3}$. But to find the Markov blanket of a variable $z$ we want to eliminate, we rely on type inference. We define a performance ordering between the level types $L3 < L1 < L2$, where our first preference is for variables to be of level $L3$, level $L1$ is our second preference, and $L2$ is our last resort. In our implementation, we use bidirectional type-checking [Pierce and Turner 2000] to synthesise hard constraints imposed by the type system, and resolve them, while optimising for the soft constraints given by the $<$ ordering. This maximises the number of variables that are conditionally

Fig. 2. Step by step example of variable elimination.

$z_1$ to get the marginal on $z_2$ and $z_3$ (2a and 2b), then eliminate $z_2$ to get the marginal on $z_3$ (2c and 2d).
independent of \( z \) given its blanket (L3) and minimises the number of variables forming the blanket (L1). Fixing \( z \) to be of L2 level, and L2 being the least preferred option, ensures that only \( z \) and variables deterministically dependent on \( z \) are of that level.

### 4.5 Sampling the Discrete Parameters

Variable elimination gives a way to efficiently marginalise out a variable \( z \) from a model defining density \( p(x) \), to obtain a new density \( p(x \setminus \{z\}) \). In the context of SlicStan, this means we have the tools to eliminate all discrete parameters \( \theta_d \), from a density \( p(D, \theta_c, \theta_d) \) on data \( D \), continuous parameters \( \theta_c \) and discrete parameters \( \theta_d \). The resulting marginal \( \sum_{\theta_d} p(D, \theta_c, \theta_d) = p(D, \theta_c) \) does not involve discrete parameters, and therefore we can use gradient-based methods to infer \( \theta_c \). However, the method so far does not give us a way to infer the discrete parameters \( \theta_d \).

To infer these, we observe that \( p(x) = p(x \setminus \{z\})p(z \mid x \setminus \{z\}) \), which means that we can preserve the semantics of the original model (which defines \( p(x) \)), by finding an expression for the conditional \( p(z \mid x \setminus \{z\}) \). If \( x_1, x_2 \) is a partitioning of \( x \setminus \{z\} \) such that \( z \perp x_2 \mid x_1 \), then (from Definition 6) \( p(x) = \phi_1(z, x_1)\phi_2(x_1, x_2) \) for some functions \( \phi_1 \) and \( \phi_2 \). Thus, \( p(z \mid x \setminus \{z\}) = \phi_1(z, x_1) \cdot (\phi_2(x_1, x_2)/p(x \setminus \{z\}) \propto \phi_1(z, x_1) \).

In the case when \( z \) is a discrete variable of finite support, we can calculate the conditional probability exactly: \( p(z \mid x \setminus \{z\}) = \frac{\phi_1(z, x_1)}{\sum_{x_2} \phi_1(z, x_1)} \). We can apply this calculation to the factorisation of a program \( \Gamma \rightharpoonup S \) that is induced by shredding (Theorem 2). In that case, \( x_{l2}, x_{l1}, [S_2]_p \) play the roles of \( z, x_1, \) and \( \phi_1 \), respectively. Consequently, we obtain a formula for drawing \( x_{l2} \) conditional on the other parameters: \( x_{l2} \sim \text{categorical}(\frac{[S_2]_{p(x_{l2}, x_{l1})}}{\sum_{x_{l2}} [S_2]_{p(x_{l2}, x_{l1})}} \mid x_{l2} \in \text{supp}(x_{l2}) \).

### 4.6 A Semantics-Preserving Transformation Rule

We present a semantics-preserving transformation rule that re-writes a SlicStan program \( \Gamma, S \) with a discrete \texttt{MODEL}-level parameter \( z \), to a SlicStan program, where \( z \) is a \texttt{GENQUANT}-level parameter. Combining the rule with the shredding presented in §2 results in support for efficient inference (see §§§ 4.6.3 for discussion of limitations) of both discrete and continuous random variables, where continuous variables can be inferred using gradient-based methods, such as HMC or variational inference, while discrete variables are generated using ancestral sampling. In particular, the transformation allows for SlicStan programs with explicit use of discrete parameters to be translated to Stan.

#### 4.6.1 The \( \phi \), \texttt{elim} and \texttt{gen} derived forms.

We introduce three derived forms that allow us to state the rule concisely.

**Variable Elimination Derived Forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \texttt{elim}(\text{int}(K) \ z) S )</td>
<td>elimination statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi(\text{int}(K_1) z_{l1}, \ldots, \text{int}(K_N) z_N) S )</td>
<td>( \phi )-expression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{elim}(\text{int}(K) \ z) S \triangleq \text{factor} \left( \sum (\text{target}(S) \mid z \in 1:K) ) \right) \]

\[ \phi(\text{int}(K_1) z_{l1}, \ldots, \text{int}(K_N) z_N) S \triangleq [\ldots \text{target}(S) \mid z_{l1} \in 1:K_1] \mid \ldots \mid z_N \in 1:K_N] \]
\( \text{gen}(\text{int}(K) \ z) \ S \triangleq z \sim \text{categorical}( \text{target}(S) \mid z \ \text{in} \ 1 : K) \) generation statement

The elimination expression \( \text{elim}(\text{int}(K)z) S \) adds a new factor that is equivalent to marginalising \( z \) in \( S \). In other words, \( \llbracket \text{elim}(\text{int}(K)z) S \rrbracket(p)(\sigma)(x) = \sum_{z_1}^{K} \llbracket S \rrbracket(p)(\sigma)(x) \) (see Lemma 13). A \( \phi \)-expression \( \phi(\text{int}(K_1) \ z_1, \ldots, \text{int}(K_N) \ z_N) S \) simply computes the density of the statement \( S \) in a multidimensional array for all possible values of the variables \( z_1, \ldots, z_N \). In other words, \( \llbracket \phi(\text{int}(K_1) \ z_1, \ldots, \text{int}(K_N) \ z_N) \rrbracket(p)(\sigma)(x) \) (Lemma 13). The \( \phi \)-expression allows us to pre-compute all the work that we may need to do when marginalising other discrete variables, which results in efficient nesting. Finally, the generation expression computes the conditional of a variable \( z \) given the rest of the parameters, as in §§ 4.5 (see Lemma 14).

4.6.2 Eliminating a single variable \( z \). The (ELIM GEN) rule below specifies a semantic-preserving transformation that takes a SlicStan program with a discrete MODEL-level parameter \( z \), and transforms it to one where \( z \) is GENQUANT-level parameter. In practice, we apply this rule once per discrete MODEL-level parameter, which eliminates those parameters step-by-step, similarly to the variable elimination algorithm. And like VE, the ordering in which we eliminate those variables has impact on performance.

The elim-gen rule:

\[
(\text{ELIM GEN}) \\
\Gamma(z) = (\text{int}(K), \text{MODEL}) \quad \Gamma_{\text{ne}} = \text{ne}(\Gamma, \Gamma_{M}, z) \quad S' = S_{D}; S_{M}' ; S_{Q} \\
S_{M}' = S_{1} ; f = \phi(\Gamma_{\text{ne}}); (\text{elim}(\text{int}(K)z) \ S_{2}) ; \text{factor}(f[\text{dom}(\Gamma_{\text{ne}})]); S_{2} ; \text{gen}(z); S_{2} ; \text{store}(S_{2}) \\
\Gamma \vdash S : \text{DATA} \quad S \triangleright_{\Gamma} S_{D} ; S_{M} ; S_{Q} \quad \Gamma \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma_{M} \quad \Gamma_{M} \vdash_{2} S_{M} : \text{L1} \quad S_{M} \triangleright_{\Gamma_{M}} S_{1} ; S_{2} ; S_{3} \quad \Gamma' \vdash S' : \text{DATA} \\
\Gamma, S \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma', S'
\]

The (ELIM GEN) rule transforms a SlicStan program, with respect to a parameter \( z \), by:

1. separating out \( S_{M} \) — the MODEL-level sub-part of \( S \) — using the top-level type system \( \triangleright \);
2. separating out \( S_{2} \) — the part of \( S_{M} \) that involves the discrete parameter \( z \) — using the conditional independence type system \( \vdash_{2} \);
3. performing a single VE step by marginalising out \( z \) in \( S_{2} \);
4. sampling \( z \) from the conditional probability specified by \( S_{2} \).

All other sub-statements of the program, \( S_{D}, S_{1}, S_{3} \) and \( S_{Q} \), stay the same during the transformation. By isolating \( S_{2} \) and transforming only this part of the program, we make sure we do not introduce more work then necessary when performing variable elimination.

To efficiently marginalise out \( z \), we want to find the Markov blanket of \( z \) given all DATA and continuous MODEL parameters. Thus we are looking for the relationship: \( z \perp \theta_{{d_2}} \mid D, \theta_{{c}}, \theta_{{d_1}} \), where \( D \) is the data, \( \theta_{{c}} \) are the continuous MODEL-level parameters, \( \theta_{{d_1}} \) is a subset of the discrete MODEL-level parameters that is as small as possible (the Markov blanket), and \( \theta_{{d_2}} \) is the rest of the discrete MODEL-level parameters.

\( \Gamma_{M} \vdash_{2} S_{2} : \text{L1} \) induces a conditional independence relationship of the form \( x_{L2} \perp x_{L3} \mid x_{L1} \), where \( x \models \Gamma_{x} \) (Theorem 3). To make sure we are working with a relationship of the form we are interested in, \( z \perp \theta_{{d_2}} \mid D, \theta_{{c}}, \theta_{{d_1}} \), and that base types \( \triangleright \) are the same between \( \Gamma \) and \( \Gamma_{M} \), the relation \( \Gamma \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma_{M} \) constrains the form of \( \Gamma_{M} \) based on \( \Gamma \) (Definition 17). In particular, \( z \) is the only L2 parameter in \( \Gamma_{M} \) and all DATA and continuous MODEL-level parameters of \( \Gamma \) are L1 in \( \Gamma_{M} \).

The neighbours of \( z, \Gamma_{\text{ne}} \), are defined by the relation \( \text{ne}(\Gamma, \Gamma', z) \) (Definition 7), which looks for non-data and non-continuous L1-variables in \( \Gamma_{M} \).
Definition 7 (Neighbours of \( z \), \( \text{ne}(\Gamma, \Gamma', z) \)). For a \( \vdash \) typing environment \( \Gamma \), a \( \vdash_2 \) typing environment \( \Gamma' = \Gamma'_d \Gamma'_l \) and a variable \( z \in \text{dom}(\Gamma'_x) \), the neighbours of \( z \) are defined as:

\[
\text{ne}(\Gamma, \Gamma', z) = \{ x : (\tau, \ell) \in \Gamma'_x | \ell = l1 \text{ and } \Gamma(x) = (\text{int}(K), \text{MODEL}) \text{ for some } K \}
\]

Finally, \( \text{store}(S_2) \) (Definition 8) has the property \( \llbracket \text{store}(S_2) \rrbracket_s = \llbracket S_2 \rrbracket_s \), but \( \llbracket \text{store}(S_2) \rrbracket_p = 1 \). This ensures that the transformation preserves both the density semantics and the store semantics of \( S \).

Definition 8. Given a statement \( S \), we define the statement \( \text{store}(S) \) by replacing all factor \( (E) \)- and \( L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n) \)-substatements in \( S \) by skip (see Appendix A for the precise definition).

4.6.3 Relating to variable elimination. Assume \( D, \theta_d, \) and \( \theta_c \) are the data, discrete model-level parameters, and continuous model-level parameters respectively. As \( S_2 \) is a single-level statement of level \( l2 \), the density semantics of \( S_2 \) is of the form \( \psi(x_{L1}, x_{L2}) = \psi(D, \theta_c, \theta_{d,L1}, z) \) (Lemma 11).

As \( \text{elim}(\text{int}(K)z) \) binds the variable \( z \) and \( \phi(\text{int}(\text{ne})\{\_\}) \) binds the variables in \( \text{dom}(\text{ne}) \), the expression \( \phi(\text{int}(\text{ne})\{\_\}) \text{elim}(\text{int}(K)z) \) \( S_2 \) depends only on continuous parameters and data, and it contains no free mentions of any discrete variables. This means that the expression will be of level \( l1 \) and shredded into \( S_1 \) during the marginalisation of any subsequent discrete variable \( z' \). The substatement \( S_2 \) will always be some sub-statement of the original program (prior to any transformations), up to potentially several constant factors of the form factor \( (f[\text{int}(\text{ne})]) \).

This observation makes it easy to reason about how repeated application of the (Elim Gen) transform changes the complexity of the program. If the complexity of a SlicStan program with \( N \) discrete parameters of support \( 1, \ldots, K \), is \( O(S) \), then the complexity of a program where we naively marginalised out the discrete variables (Program E) will be \( O((S \times K)^N) \). In contrast, transforming with (Elim Gen) gives us a program of complexity at most \( O(N \times (S \times K)^{M+1}) \), where \( M \) is the largest number of direct neighbours in the factor graph induced by the program. Further, the complexity could be smaller depending on the elimination ordering of choice. This result is not surprising, as we conjecture that repeated application of (Elim Gen) is equivalent to variable elimination (though we do not formally prove this equivalence), which is of the same complexity.

It is clear from this complexity observation VE is not always efficient. When the dependency graph is dense, \( M \) will be close to \( N \), thus inference will be infeasible for large \( N \). Fortunately, in many practical cases (such as those discussed in \S 5), this graph is sparse (\( M << N \)) and our approach is suitable and efficient. We note that this is a general limitation of exact inference of discrete parameters, and it is not a limitation of our approach in particular.

4.7 Semantic Preservation of the Discrete Variable Transformation

The result we are interested in is the semantic preservation of the transformation rule \( \rightarrow \).

Theorem 4 (Semantic preservation of \( \rightarrow \)).

For SlicStan programs \( \Gamma, S \) and \( \Gamma', S' \), and a discrete parameter \( z: \Gamma, S \rightarrow \Gamma', S' \rightarrow [S] = [S'] \).

Proof. Note that shredding preserves semantics with respect to both \( \vdash \) and \( \vdash_2 \) (Lemma 6 and 10), examine the meaning of derived forms (Lemma 13 and 14), note properties of single-level statements (Lemma 11), and apply the results on factorisation of shredding (Theorem 1) and conditional independence (Theorem 3). We present the full proof in Appendix A.

The practical usefulness of this result stems from the fact that it allows us to separate inference for discrete and continuous parameters. After applying the (Elim Gen) transformation to each discrete Model-level parameter, we are left with a program that only has Genquant-level parameters (Lemma 15). We can then slice the program into \( S_{\text{Ham}} \) and \( S_{\text{Gen}} \) and infer continuous parameters by
using HMC (or other algorithms) on $S_{\text{HMC}}$ and, next, draw the discrete parameters using ancestral sampling by running forward $S_{\text{GEN}}$. Theorem 4 tells us that this is a correct inference algorithm.

5 APPLICATIONS AND DISCUSSION

The transformation we introduce can be useful for a variety of models, and it can be adapted to many PPLs to increase efficiency of inference and usability. Most notably, it can be used to extend PPLs, such as Stan, to allow for direct treatment of discrete variables, where previously that was not possible. When used in the context of a model with discrete parameters only, our approach corresponds to exact inference through VE. In the presence of discrete and continuous parameters, our transformation gives an analytical sub-solution for the discrete parameters in the model.

A limitation of our method is that, due to its density-based nature, it can only be applied to models of fixed size. It cannot, in its current form, support models where the number of random variables changes during inference, such as Dirichlet Processes. However, we note that this is not an unusual constraint adopted in Bayesian inference for efficiency. Another limitation is that discrete variables need to have finite (and fixed) support. For example, the method cannot be applied to transform a Poisson-distributed variable. In some but not all applications, truncating unbounded discrete parameters at a realistic upper bound would suffice to make the method applicable.

An advantage of our method is that it can be combined with any inference algorithm that requires a function proportional to the joint density of variables. This includes gradient-based algorithms, such as HMC and variational inference, but it can also be used with methods that allow for (e.g. unbounded) discrete variables, as an analytical sub-solution that can optimise inference.

We discuss several applications to specific classes of models, and point at examples in Appendix B.

Models for teaching and education. Often, beginners are introduced to probabilistic modelling through simple, discrete variable examples, as they are more intuitive to reason about, and often have analytical solutions. Unfortunately, one cannot express such examples directly in PPLs that do not support discrete parameters. One well-known discrete variable example, often used in tutorials on probabilistic modelling, is the ‘Sprinkler’ example. It models the relationship between cloudy weather, whether it rains, whether the garden sprinkler is on, and the wetness of the grass. On the next page, we show a version of the sprinkler model written in SlicStan with discrete parameters (left) and the marginalisation part of its corresponding transformed version (right).

As cloudy $\perp \perp$ wet | sprinkler, rain, we do not need to include wet in the elimination of cloudy, and the new factor is computed for different values of only sprinkler and rain (lines 2–6). The rest of the variables are eliminated one-by-one, involving all remaining variables (lines 7–15).

The snippet of the SlicStan code generated by our transformation is an exact implementation of the variable elimination algorithm for this model. This not only facilitates a platform for learning probabilistic programming using standard introductory models, but it can also be a useful tool for learning concepts such as marginalisation, conditional independence, and exact inference methods.

Hidden Markov models. We showed examples of HMMs throughout the paper (Program A, Program D). §§ B.1 works through a longer example, applying the (ELIM GEN) rule step by step for each variable. Our method can be applied to HMMs generally, improving significantly the amount of manual effort that was previously required for such models with discrete parameters, for example in Stan [Damiano et al. 2018]. However, the algorithm does not currently support arrays of discrete parameters, but only individual discrete parameters. In the cases where the size of an array of discrete parameters is statically known, the (ELIM GEN) procedure can be applied to a program where such arrays have been ‘flattened’ into a collection of individual discrete variables. But to be applicable more widely, the (ELIM GEN) rule needs to be generalised based on array element level
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Graphical model

SlicStan + discrete parameters support
1 data real[2] p_rain, p_sprinkler;
2 data real[2][2] p_wet;
3 real p ∼ beta(1, 1);
4 int<2> cloudy ∼ bern(p);
5 int<2> sprinkler ∼ bern(p_sprinkler[cloudy]);
6 int<2> rain ∼ bern(p_rain[cloudy]);
7 int<2> wet ∼ bern(p_wet[sprinkler][rain]);

SlicStan
1 ... 
2 f1 = φ(int<2> rain, int<2> sprinkler){
3 elimin(int<2> cloudy){
4 cloudy ∼ bern(p);
5 sprinkler ∼ bern(p_sprinkler[cloudy]);
6 rain ∼ bern(p_rain[cloudy]); }
7 f2 = φ(int<2> rain, int<2> wet){
8 elimin(int<2> sprinkler){
9 factor(f1[rain, sprinkler]);
10 wet ∼ bern(p_wet[sprinkler, rain]); }
11 f3 = φ(int<2> wet){ elimin(int<2> rain{
12 factor(f2[rain, wet]); }
13 f4 = φ(){ elimin(int<2> wet{
14 factor(f3[wet]); }
15 factor(f4); ... 

dependence analysis, for example by incorporating ideas from the polyhedral model [Feautrier 1992]. As the array level dependence analysis that would be required in most practical use-cases is very straightforward, we believe this would be a useful and feasible applied extension of our work.

Mixture models. Another useful application of mixed discrete and continuous variable models is found in mixture models. We show one such example of soft $k$-means clustering, where each data point belongs to an (unknown) Gaussian cluster in §§ B.2.

Causal inference. The question of how to adapt PPLs to causal queries, has been recently gaining popularity. One way to express interventions and reason about causality, is to assume a discrete variable specifying the direction (or absence of) causal relationship, and specify different behaviour for each case using if statements [Winn 2012]. We show a simple causal inference example in §§ B.3.

6 RELATED WORK

This paper provides a type system that induces conditional independence relationships, and discusses one practical application of such type system: an automatic marginalisation procedure for discrete parameters of finite support.

Conditional independence. The theoretical aim of our paper is similar to that of Barthe et al. [2019], who discuss a program logic for reasoning about conditional independence. One advantage of our method is that the verification of conditional independence is automated by type inference, while it would rely on manual reasoning in the work of Barthe et al. [2019]. On the other hand, their approach can be applied to a wider variety of verification tasks. Amtoft and Banerjee [2020] show a correspondence between variable independence and correctly slicing a discrete-variables-only probabilistic program. The biggest difference to our work is that Amtoft and Banerjee [2020] work considers only conditional independence of variables given the observed data, while in our case we are able to find CI relationships given any variables we are interested in, and type inference constitutes of a straightforward algorithm for finding such relationships. On the other hand,
Amtoft and Banerjee [2020] work permits unbounded number of variables (e.g. \( \text{while } (y > 0) y \sim \text{bernoulli}(0.2) \)), while it is not clear how to extend SlicStan/Stan to support this.

**Automatic marginalisation.** The most closely related previous work, in terms of the automatic marginalisation procedure, is that of Obermeyer et al. [2019] and that of Murray et al. [2018]. Obermeyer et al. [2019] implement efficient variable-elimination for plated factor graphs in Pyro [Uber AI Labs 2017]. Their approach uses effect-handlers and can be implemented in other effect-handling based PPLs, such as Edward2 [Tran et al. 2018]. Murray et al. [2018] introduce a ‘delayed sampling’ procedure in Birch [Murray and Schön 2018], which optimises the program via partial analytical solutions to sub-programs. Their method corresponds to automatic variable elimination and, more generally, automatic Rao–Blackwellization. While we focus on discrete variable elimination only, our conditional independence type system can be directly used for more general analysis. The method from \( \S \) § 4 can be extended to marginalise out and sample continuous variables whenever they are part of an analytically-tractable sub-program, similarly to delayed sampling in Birch. One key difference of our approach is that the program re-writes are guided by the type system and happen at compile time, before inference is run. In contrast, both Pyro and Birch maintain a dynamic graph that guides the analysis at runtime.

**Symbolic inference.** Where a full analytical solution is possible, several probabilistic programming languages can derive it via symbolic manipulation, including Hakaru [Narayanan et al. 2016] and PSI [Gehr et al. 2016, 2020], while Dice [Holtzen et al. 2020] performs exact inference for models with discrete parameters only, by analysing the program structure. In contrast, we focus on re-writing the program, and decomposing it into parts to be used with fast and more general asymptotically exact or approximate inference algorithms, like HMC, variational inference or others.

**Extending HMC to support discrete parameters.** The idea of modifying HMC to handle discrete variables and discontinuities has been previously explored [Nishimura et al. 2017; Pakman and Paninski 2013; Zhang et al. 2012]. More recently, Zhou et al. [2019] introduce the probabilistic programming language LF-PPL, which is designed specifically to be used with the Discontinuous Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (DHMC) algorithm [Nishimura et al. 2017]. The algorithm, and their framework can also be extended to support discrete parameters. LF-PPL provides support for an HMC version that itself works with discontinuities. Our approach is to statically rewrite the program to match the constraints of Stan, vanilla HMC, and its several well-optimised extensions, such as NUTS [Hoffman and Gelman 2014].

**Composable and programmable inference.** Recent years have seen a growing number of techniques that allow for tailored-to-the-program compilation to an inference algorithm. For example, Gen [Cusumano-Towner et al. 2019] can statically analyse the model structure to compile to a more efficient inference strategy. In addition, languages like Gen and Turing [Ge et al. 2018] facilitate composable and programmable inference [Mansinghka et al. 2018], where the user is provided with inference building blocks to implement their own model-specific algorithm. Our method can be understood as an automatic composition between two inference algorithms: variable elimination and HMC or any other inference algorithm that can be used to sample continuous variables.

### 7 CONCLUSION

This paper introduces an information flow type system that can be used to check and infer conditional independence relationships in a probabilistic programs, through type checking and inference, respectively. We present a practical application of this type system: a semantics-preserving transformation that makes it possible to use, and to efficiently and automatically infer discrete
parameters in SlicStan, Stan, and other density-based probabilistic programming languages. The transformed program can be seen as a hybrid inference algorithm on the original program, where continuous parameters can be drawn using efficient gradient-based inference methods, like HMC, while the discrete parameters are drawn using variable elimination.

While the variable elimination transformation uses results on conditional independence of discrete parameters, our type system is not restricted to this usage. Conditional independence relationships can be of interest in many context in probabilistic modelling, including more general use of variable elimination, message-passing algorithms, Rao-Blackwellization, and factorising a program for a composed-inference approach. We believe conditional independence by typing can enable interesting future work that automates the implementation of such methods.
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REFERENCES
A DEFINITIONS AND PROOFS

A.1 Definitions

Definition 9 (Assigns-to set $W(S)$). $W(S)$ is the set that contains the names of global variables that have been assigned to within the statement $S$. It is defined recursively as follows:

- $W(x[E_1] \ldots [E_n] = E) = \{x\}$
- $W(S_1; S_2) = W(S_1) \cup W(S_2)$
- $W(if(E) \ S_1 \ \ \ else \ \ \ S_2) = W(S_1) \cup W(S_2)$
- $W(for(x \ in \ E_1 : E_2) \ S) = W(S) \setminus \{x\}$

Definition 10 (Reads set $R(S)$). $R(S)$ is the set that contains the names of global variables that have been read within the statement $S$. It is defined recursively as follows:

- $R(x) = \{x\}$
- $R(c) = \emptyset$
- $R(E_1[E_2]) = R(E_1) \cup R(E_2)$
- $R(E_1[E_2]) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} R(E_i)$
- $R(f(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} R(E_i)$
- $R(if(E) \ S_1 \ \ \ else \ \ \ S_2) = R(E_1) \cup R(E_2) \cup R(S \setminus \{x\})$
- $R(for(x \ in \ E_1 : E_2) \ S) = R(E_1) \cup R(E_2) \cup R(S)$

Definition 11 (Samples-to set $\bar{W}(S)$). $\bar{W}(S)$ is the set that contains the names of global variables that have been sampled within the statement $S$. It is defined recursively as follows:

- $\bar{W}(L = E) = \emptyset$
- $\bar{W}(c) = \emptyset$
- $\bar{W}(E_1[E_2]) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \bar{W}(E_i)$
- $\bar{W}(f(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \bar{W}(E_i)$
- $\bar{W}(if(E) \ S_1 \ \ \ else \ \ \ S_2) = \bar{W}(S_1) \cup \bar{W}(S_2)$
- $\bar{W}(for(x \ in \ E_1 : E_2) \ S) = \bar{W}(S) \setminus \{x\}$

Definition 12 (Free variables $FV(S)$). $FV(S)$ is the set that contains the free variables that are used in a statement $S$. It is recursively defined as follows:

- $FV(x) = \{x\}$
- $FV(c) = \emptyset$
- $FV(E_1[E_2]) = FV(E_1) \cup FV(E_2)$
- $FV(f(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} FV(E_i)$
- $FV(if(E) \ S_1 \ \ \ else \ \ \ S_2) = FV(E_1) \cup FV(E_2) \cup FV(S \setminus \{x\})$
- $FV(for(x \ in \ E_1 : E_2) \ S) = FV(E_1) \cup FV(E_2) \cup FV(S)$
- $FV(S) = FV(S_1 \cup FV(S_2))$

Definition 13 ($R_{\Gamma \tau}(S)$). $R_{\Gamma \tau}(S)$ is the set that contains the names of global variables that have been read at level $\ell$ within the statement $S$. It is defined recursively as follows:

- $R_{\Gamma \tau}(x[E_1] \ldots [E_n] = E) = \ldots$
- $R_{\Gamma \tau}(c) = \emptyset$
- $R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_1[E_2]) = R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_1) \cup R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_2)$
- $R_{\Gamma \tau}(f(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_i)$
- $R_{\Gamma \tau}(if(E) \ S_1 \ \ \ else \ \ \ S_2) = R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_1) \cup R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_2) \cup R_{\Gamma \tau}(S_1) \cup R_{\Gamma \tau}(S_2)$

$R_{\Gamma \tau}(S) = R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_1) \cup R_{\Gamma \tau}(E_2) \cup R_{\Gamma \tau}(S_1) \cup R_{\Gamma \tau}(S_2)$

$R_{\Gamma \tau}(skip) = \emptyset$

$R_{\Gamma \tau}( factor(E)) = \ldots$

$R_{\Gamma \tau}(model) = \ldots$
\( R_{\Gamma, \ell}(L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) = \ldots \)
\( R(L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) \)
\( \ell = \bigvee \{ \ell' \mid \exists x \in \text{FV}(L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n) \).
\( \emptyset \bigvee \Gamma(x) = (\tau, \ell') \}
\( \) else
\( \)

**Definition 14** (\( W_{\Gamma, \ell}(S) \)). \( W_{\Gamma, \ell}(S) \triangleq \{ x \in W(S) \mid \Gamma(x) = (\tau, \ell) \text{ for some } \tau \}

**Definition 15** (\( \bar{W}_{\Gamma, \ell}(S) \)). \( \bar{W}_{\Gamma, \ell}(S) \triangleq \{ x \in \bar{W}(S) \mid \Gamma(x) = (\tau, \ell) \text{ for some } \tau \}

**Definition 16** (Single-level Statement \( \Gamma \vdash \ell(S) \)). We define single-level statements \( S \) of level \( \ell \) with respect to \( \Gamma \) (written \( \Gamma \vdash \ell(S) \)), by induction:

**Single Level Statements:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(ASSIGN SINGLE)</th>
<th>(SEQ SINGLE)</th>
<th>(FOR SINGLE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma(x) = (_, \ell) )</td>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(S) )</td>
<td>( \Gamma, x : (\text{int}, \ell) \vdash \ell(S) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(x[E_1] \ldots [E_n] = E) )</td>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(S; S') )</td>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(\text{for}(x \text{ in } E_1 : E_2) S) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(IF SINGLE)</th>
<th>(SKIP SINGLE)</th>
<th>(FACTOR SINGLE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(S_1) )</td>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(\text{skip}) )</td>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \text{MODEL}(\text{factor}(E)) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(\text{if}(E) \text{ S}_1 \text{ else } S_2) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \forall \ell' &lt; \ell \Gamma \not\vdash L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n) : \ell' )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Gamma \vdash \ell(L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition 17** (\( \Gamma \stackrel{z}{\rightarrow} \Gamma' \)).
For \( \vdash \) typing environment \( \Gamma \) and a \( \vdash_t \) typing environment \( \Gamma' \), a variable \( z \) and a statement \( S \), we have:

\( \Gamma \stackrel{z}{\rightarrow} \Gamma' = \begin{cases} \Gamma(z) = (\tau, \text{MODEL}) \text{ and } \Gamma'_{x:l_1} = \{ z : \tau, l_2 \} \text{ for some } \tau \\
\Gamma(x, \tau, \ell) \in \Gamma \text{ such that } \ell \leq \text{MODEL} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x : (\tau, \ell') \in \Gamma' \text{ for some } \ell' \in \{ l_1, l_2, l_3 \} \\
x : (\tau, \text{DATA}) \in \Gamma \rightarrow x : (\tau, l_1) \in \Gamma' \\
x : (\tau, \text{MODEL}) \in \Gamma_x \text{ and } \tau = \text{real or } \tau = \text{real}[\ldots] \rightarrow x : (\tau, l_1) \in \Gamma' \\
\end{cases} \)

**Definition 18**. Given a statement \( S \), we define the statement \( \text{store}(S) \) by structural induction on \( S \):

\( \text{store}(x[E_1] \ldots [E_n] = E) = x[E_1] \ldots [E_n] = E \)
\( \text{store}(S_1; S_2) = \text{store}(S_1) ; \text{store}(S_2) \)
\( \text{store}(\text{if}(E) \text{ S}_1 \text{ else } S_2) = \text{if}(E) \text{ store}(S_1) \text{ else store}(S_2) \)
\( \text{store}(\text{for}(x \text{ in } E_1 : E_2) S) = \text{for}(x \text{ in } E_1 : E_2) \text{ store}(S) \)
\( \text{store}(\text{skip}) = \text{skip} \)
\( \text{store}(\text{factor}(E)) = \text{skip} \)
\( \text{store}(L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n)) = \text{skip} \)

**Definition 19** (Neighbours of \( z \), \( \text{ne}(\Gamma, \Gamma', z) \)).
For a \( \vdash \) typing environment \( \Gamma \), a \( \vdash_t \) typing environment \( \Gamma' = \Gamma_{x,l_1} ', \Gamma_{x,l_2} ' \) and a variable \( z \in \text{dom}(\Gamma'_x) \), the neighbours of \( z \) are defined as:

\( \text{ne}(\Gamma, \Gamma', z) \triangleq \{ x : (\tau, \ell) \in \Gamma'_x \mid \ell = l_1 \text{ and } \Gamma(x) = (\text{int}(K), \text{MODEL}) \text{ for some } K \} \)
A.2 Proofs

Restatement of Lemma 4 (Shredding produces single-level statements)

\[ S \notin \Gamma (S_D, S_M, S_Q) \implies \Gamma \vdash DATA(S_D) \land \Gamma \vdash MODEL(S_M) \land \Gamma \vdash GENQUANT(S_Q) \]

Proof. By rule induction on the derivation of \( S \notin \Gamma S_D, S_M, S_Q \). 

Restatement of Lemma 5 (Property of single-level statements)

Let \( \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_x \vdash S \) be SlicStan program, such that \( S \) is single-level statement of level \( \ell \), \( \Gamma \vdash \ell(S) \). Then there exist unique functions \( f \) and \( \phi \), such that for any \( \sigma, x \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_x \):

\[ [S](\sigma)(x) = f(\sigma_{\leq \ell}, x_{\leq \ell}) \cup \sigma_{> \ell}, \phi(\sigma_{\leq \ell})(x_{\leq \ell}), \]

where we write \( \sigma_{\leq \ell} = \{ (x \mapsto V) \in \sigma \mid \Gamma_\sigma(x) = (\ldots, \ell) \} \) and \( \sigma_{> \ell} = \sigma \setminus \sigma_{\leq \ell} \).

Proof. This property follows from noninterference (Lemma 1), if we understand factor and sample statements as assignments to a reserved weight variables of different levels. Let \( \Gamma, S \) be a SlicStan program and suppose we obtain \( S' \) by:

- Substituting every \( \text{factor}(E) \) statement with \( w_\ell = w_\ell \ast E \), where \( \Gamma(E) = \text{real}, \ell \) and \( w_{\text{DATA}}, w_{\text{MODEL}} \) and \( w_{\text{GENQUANT}} \) are write-only, distinct and reserved variables in the program.
- Substituting every \( L \sim d(E_1, \ldots, E_n) \) statement with \( w_\ell = w_\ell \ast d_{\text{pdf}}(L \mid E_1, \ldots, E_n) \), where \( \Gamma(d_{\text{pdf}}(L \mid E_1, \ldots, E_n)) = \text{real}, \ell \).

Then for all \( \sigma, x \models \Gamma \), we have \( [S]_p(\sigma)(x) = \prod_{\ell} \sigma'_{(\ell)}(w_\ell) \), where \( \sigma' = [S']_s(\sigma, \forall \ell. w_\ell \mapsto 1)(x) \). By non-interference (Lemma 1), for any level \( \ell \) and store \( \sigma_2 \approx \sigma \), if \( \sigma'_2 = [S']_s(\sigma_2, \forall \ell. w_\ell \mapsto 1)(x) \), then \( \sigma'_2 \approx \sigma' \). Thus \( \sigma'_2(w_\ell) = \sigma_2(w_\ell') \) for \( \ell' \leq \ell \), and therefore, when \( S \) is a single-level statement of level \( \ell \), \( [S']_s(\sigma, \forall \ell. w_\ell \mapsto 1)(x) = f(\sigma_{\leq \ell}, x_{\leq \ell}), \sigma_{> \ell}, w_{\leq \ell} \mapsto \phi(\sigma_{\leq \ell}, x_{\leq \ell}), w_{> \ell} \mapsto 1 \), for some functions \( f \) and \( \phi \). Finally, this gives us \( [S]_s(\sigma, x) = (f(\sigma_{\leq \ell}, x_{\leq \ell}), \sigma_{> \ell}), [S]_p(\sigma, x) = \phi(\sigma_{\leq \ell}, x_{\leq \ell}) \).

Restatement of Lemma 6 (Semantic preservation of \( \notin \))

If \( \Gamma \vdash S : DATA \) and \( S \notin \Gamma (S_D, S_M, S_Q) \) then \( [S] = [S_D; S_M; S_Q] \).

Proof. Follows by adapting proof from [Gorinova et al. 2019].

Restatement of Lemma 10 (Semantic preservation of \( \notin ) \)

If \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S : L1 \) and \( S \notin \Gamma S_1, S_2, S_3 \) then \( [S] = [S_1; S_2; S_3] \).

Proof. Follows by adapting proof from [Gorinova et al. 2019].

Lemma 12. For a SlicStan expression \( E \) and a function \( \phi(x, y) = V \), where \( V \) is a value such that \( (\sigma, x, y), E \Downarrow V \) for every \( x \) and \( y \) and some \( \sigma \), if \( x \notin R(E) \), then:

\[ \exists \phi' \text{ such that } \phi(x, y) = \phi'(y) \text{ for all } x, y \]

Proof. By induction on the structure of \( E \).

Restatement of Theorem 1 (Shredding induces a factorisation of the density).

Suppose \( \Gamma \vdash S : DATA \) and \( S \notin \Gamma S_D, S_M, S_Q \) and \( \Gamma = \Gamma_\sigma \cup \Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_\theta \cup \Gamma_Q \). For all \( \sigma, D, \theta, \text{ and } Q \): if \( \sigma, D, \theta, Q \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_D, \Gamma_\theta, \Gamma_Q, \) and \( [S]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) \propto p(D, \theta, Q) \) and \( \omega(S_Q) = \text{dom}(\Gamma_Q) \) then:

1. \( [S_M]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) \propto p(\theta, D) \)
2. \( [S_Q]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p(Q \mid \theta, D) \)

where \( \sigma_D = [S_D]_s(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) \) and \( \sigma_M = [S_M]_s(\sigma_D)(D, \theta, Q) \).
PROOF. We prove this by establishing a more general result:

For $\sigma, D, \theta, Q \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_D, \Gamma_\theta, \Gamma_Q$, $A = \overline{W}(S_Q) \subseteq Q$ and some $B \subseteq Q \setminus A$, if $[S]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) \propto p(D, \theta, A | B)$ then:

1. $[S_D]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) = 1$
2. $[S_M]_p(\sigma_D)(D, \theta, Q) = p(\theta, D)$
3. $[S_Q]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p(A | \theta, D, B)$

Note that in the case where $\overline{W}(S_Q) = Q$, we have $A = Q$ and $B = \emptyset$, and the original statement of the theorem, $[S_Q]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p(Q | \theta, D)$, holds.

We prove the extended formulation above by induction on the structure of $S$ and use of Lemma 2, Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, Lemma 6.

Take any $\sigma, D, \theta, Q \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_D, \Gamma_\theta, \Gamma_Q$ and let

$\Phi(S, S_D, S_M, S_Q) \triangleq$

$\Gamma \vdash S : \text{data} \land S \not\models S_D, S_M, S_Q \land A = \overline{W}(S_Q)$

$\implies \exists B \subseteq Q \setminus A. \forall \sigma_D, \sigma_M.$

$[S]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) \propto p(D, \theta, A | B) \land [S_D](\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) = \sigma_D \land [S_M](\sigma_D)(D, \theta, Q) = \sigma_M$

$\implies [S_D]_p(\sigma)(D) = 1$

$\land [S_M](\sigma_D)(D, \theta) = p(\theta, D)$

$\land \exists B \subseteq Q \setminus \overline{W}(S_Q).[S_Q]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p(A | \theta, D, B)$

Take any $\Gamma, S, S_D, S_M, S_Q$ such that $S \not\models S_D, S_M, S_Q, A = \overline{W}(S_Q)$, and take any $\sigma, D, \theta, Q \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_D, \Gamma_\theta, \Gamma_Q$, an unnormalised density $p$ and $B \subseteq Q \setminus A$, such that $[S]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) \propto p(D, \theta, A | B)$. We prove by rule induction on the derivation of $S \not\models S_D, S_M, S_Q$ that $\Phi(S, S_D, S_M, S_Q)$.

(Shred Seq) Let $S = S_1; S_2$ and $S_1 \not\models S_{1D}, S_{1M}, S_{1Q}$ and $S_2 \not\models S_{2D}, S_{2M}, S_{2Q}$. Thus $S \not\models (S_{1D}; S_{2D}), (S_{1M}; S_{2M}), (S_{1Q}; S_{2Q})$.

Assume $\Phi(S_1, S_{1D}, S_{1M}, S_{1Q})$ and $\Phi(S_2, S_{2D}, S_{2M}, S_{2Q})$.

Let:

- $A_1 = \overline{W}(S_{1Q})$ and $B_1 \subseteq Q \setminus A_1$ is such that $[S_{1Q}]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p_1(A_1 | D, \theta, B_1)$.
- $[S_1]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) = \sigma'$.
- $[S_{1Q}]_p(\sigma_D)(B, \theta, Q) \propto p_1(D, \theta, A_1 | B_1)$.
- $A_2 = \overline{W}(S_{2Q})$ and $B_2 \subseteq Q \setminus A_2$ is such that $[S_{2Q}]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p_2(A_2 | D, \theta, B_2)$.
- $[S_2]_p(\sigma_D')(B, \theta, Q) \propto p_2(D, \theta, A_2 | B_2)$.

Thus, by Lemma 2, $[S]_p = [S_1; S_2]_p = [S_1]_p \times [S_2]_p$, so $p(D, \theta, A | B) \propto p_1(D, \theta, A_1 | B_1)p_2(D, \theta, A_2 | B_2)$.

For (1), we have $\forall \sigma \models \Gamma_\sigma. [S_{1D}]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) = [S_{2D}]_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) = 1$. Thus, by Lemma 2, $[S_{1D}; S_{2D}]_p = [S_{1D}]_p \times [S_{2D}]_p = 1$.

From $\Phi(S_1, S_{1D}, S_{1M}, S_{1Q})$ and $\Phi(S_2, S_{2D}, S_{2M}, S_{2Q})$ we also have:

- $[S_{1Q}]_p(\sigma_M)(D, \theta, Q) = p(A_1 | \theta, D, B_1)$
- $[S_{2Q}]_p(\sigma_M')(D, \theta, Q) = p(A_2 | \theta, D, B_2)$

$A = \overline{W}(S_Q) = \overline{W}(S_{1Q}; S_{2Q}) = \overline{W}(S_{1Q}) \cup \overline{W}(S_{2Q}) = A_1 \cup A_2$

From $S$ well typed, it must be the case that $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. Thus, we write $A = A_1, A_2$.

We prove that the property holds for $B = B_1 \cup B_2 \setminus A_1 \setminus A_2$.

By semantic preservation of $\not\models$ (Lemma 6), $[S_1]_p = [S_{1D}; S_{1M}; S_{1Q}]_p = [S_{1D}]_p \times [S_{1M}]_p \times [S_{1Q}]_p \propto 1 \times p_1(\theta, D) \times p_1(A_1 | \theta, D, B_1)$. Similarly, $[S_2]_p \propto 1 \times p_2(\theta, D) \times p_2(A_2 | \theta, D, B_2) = p_3(\theta, D)p_2(A_2 | \theta, D, A_1, B_1)$.

But $p(\theta, D, A | B) \propto p_1(\theta, D, A_1 | B_1)p_2(A_2 | \theta, D, B_2)$, so:

$p(\theta, D, A | B) \propto p_1(\theta, D)p_1(A_1 | \theta, D, B_1)p_2(\theta, D)p_2(A_2 | \theta, D, A_1, B_1)$
So,

\[ p(\theta, D) = \int p(D, \theta, A \mid B)p(B)dAdB \]

\[ \propto \int p_1(\theta, D)p_1(A_1 \mid \theta, D, B_1)p_2(\theta, D)p_2(A_2 \mid \theta, D, A_1, B_1)p(B)dA_1dA_2dB \]

\[ \propto p_1(\theta, D)p_2(\theta, D)\int p(B)p_1(A_1 \mid \theta, D, B_1)p_2(A_2 \mid \theta, D, A_1, B_1)dA_1dA_2dB \]

\[ = p_1(\theta, D)p_2(\theta, D)\int p(B)\left(\int p_1(A_1 \mid \theta, D, B_1)\left(\int p_2(A_2 \mid \theta, D, A_1, B_1)dA_2\right)dA_1\right)dB \]

\[ = p_1(\theta, D)p_2(\theta, D) \]

\[ \propto p_1(\theta, D)p_2(\theta, D) \]

Thus \[ [S_M]_p = [S_{1M}; S_{2M}]_p \propto p_1(\theta, D)p_2(\theta, D) \propto p(\theta, D) \]

Finally, for last property on \( S \), we use the chain rule of probability, semantics property of sequencing, and the result from above to get:

\[ p(A \mid D, \theta, B) = \frac{p(D, \theta, A \mid B)p(D, \theta \mid B)}{p(D, \theta)} \]

\[ \propto p_1(\theta, D)p_2(\theta, D)p_1(A_1 \mid \theta, D, B_1)p_2(A_2 \mid \theta, D, B_2) \]

\[ \propto p_1(A_1 \mid D, \theta, B_1)p_2(A_2 \mid D, \theta, B_2) \]

\[ = [S_{1Q}]_p[S_{2Q}]_p = [S_q]_p \]

Thus:

\[ p(A \mid D, \theta, B) = \frac{p_1(A_1 \mid D, \theta, B_1)p_2(A_2 \mid D, \theta, B_2)}{Z} \]

Where:

\[ Z = \int p_1(A_1 \mid D, \theta, B_1)p_2(A_2 \mid D, \theta, B_2)dA \]

\[ = \int p_1(A_1 \mid D, \theta, B_1)\left(\int p_2(A_2 \mid D, \theta, B_2)dA_2\right)dA_1 \]

\[ = 1 \]

So \( Z = 1 \), and \( p(A \mid D, \theta, B) = p_1(A_1 \mid D, \theta, B_1)p_2(A_2 \mid D, \theta, B_2) = [S_q]_p \).

Thus:

\[- [S_D]_p = [S_{1D}; S_{2D}]_p = 1 \]

\[- [S_M]_p = [S_{1M}; S_{2M}]_p \propto p_1(\theta, D)p_2(\theta, D) = p(\theta, D) \]

\[- [S_q]_p = [S_{1Q}; S_{2Q}]_p = p_1(A_1 \mid \theta, D, B_1)p_2(A_2 \mid \theta, D, A_1, B_1) = p(A_1, A_2 \mid \theta, D, B) \]

\[ \Phi((S_1; S_2), (S_{1D}; S_{2D}), (S_{1M}; S_{2M}), (S_{1Q}; S_{2Q})) \] from here.

\[ \square \]

**Restatement of Lemma 9 (Shredding produces single-level statements 2)**

\[ S \upmodels_{\Gamma} S_1, S_2, S_3 \implies \Gamma \vdash L_1(S_1) \land \Gamma \vdash L_2(S_2) \land \Gamma \vdash L_3(S_3) \]

**Proof.** By rule induction on the derivation of \( S \upmodels_{\Gamma} S_1, S_2, S_3 \).

\[ \square \]

**Restatement of Lemma 10 (Semantic preservation of \( \upmodels_{\Gamma, \vdash_2} \))**

If \( \Gamma \vdash_2 S \) and \( S \upmodels_{\Gamma} S_1, S_2, S_3 \) then \([S] = [S_1; S_2; S_3]\).
Restatement of Lemma 11 (Property of single-level statements 2)

Let $\Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_x, S$ be a SlicStan program, and $\Gamma \vdash_2 S : \iota.1$, and $S$ is single-level statement of level $\ell$, $\Gamma \vdash_2 \ell(S)$. Then there exist unique functions $f$ and $\phi$, such that for any $\sigma, x \models \Gamma_\sigma, \Gamma_x$:

1. If $\ell = 1.1$, then $[S]_s(\sigma)(x) = (f(\sigma_{L1}, x_{L1}), \sigma_{L2}, \sigma_{L3})$, $\phi(\sigma_{L1})(x_{L1})$
2. If $\ell = 1.2$, then $[S]_s(\sigma)(x) = (\sigma_{L1}, f(\sigma_{L1}, \sigma_{L2}, x_{L1}, x_{L2}), \sigma_{L3})$, $\phi(\sigma_{L1}, \sigma_{L2})(x_{L1}, x_{L2})$
3. If $\ell = 1.3$, then $[S]_s(\sigma)(x) = (\sigma_{L1}, \sigma_{L2}, f(\sigma_{L1}, \sigma_{L3}, x_{L1}, x_{L3}))$, $\phi(\sigma_{L1}, \sigma_{L3})(x_{L1}, x_{L3})$

Proof. By understanding factor and sample statements as assignment to a reserved weight variables of different levels (similarly to Lemma 5) and noninterference (Lemma 7). □

Lemma 13. Let $\Gamma, S$ be a SlicStan program, such that $\sigma, x \models \Gamma$, $[S]_s(\sigma)(x) = \sigma'$ and $[S]_p(\sigma)(x) = \psi(x)$ for some function $\psi$. If $f \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ is a fresh variable, $z, z_1, \ldots, z_n \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_x)$ are discrete variables of base types $\text{int}(K), \text{int}(K_1), \ldots, \text{int}(K_n)$ respectively, and $S'$ is a statement such that

$$S' = f = \psi(\text{int}(K_1)z_1, \ldots, \text{int}(K_n)z_n)$$

then $[S']_s(\sigma)(x) = \sigma''$ with $\sigma''[-f] = \sigma'$ and $[S']_p(\sigma)(x) = \sum_{z=1}^{x} \psi(x)$.

Proof. By examining the operational semantics of assignment, factor, and the derived forms $\text{elim}$ and $\phi$. □

Lemma 14. Let $\Gamma, S$ be a SlicStan program, such that $\sigma, x \models \Gamma$, $[S]_s(\sigma)(x) = \sigma'$ and $[S]_p(\sigma)(x) = \psi(x)$ for some function $\psi$. If $z \in \text{dom}(\Gamma_x)$ is a discrete variable of base type $\text{int}(K)$, and $S'$ is a statement such that

$$S' = \text{gen}(z) \quad \text{store}(S)$$

then $[S']_s(\sigma)(x) = \sigma'$, $\psi(x)$ is normalisable with respect to $z$ with $\psi(x) \propto p(z \mid x \setminus \{z\})$, and $[S']_p(\sigma)(x) = p(z \mid x \setminus \{z\})$.

Proof. By examining the operational semantics of $\sim$ and $\text{target}$, and by induction on the structure of $S$ to prove $[\text{store}(S)]_s = [S]_s$ and $[\text{store}(S)]_p = 1$. □

Typing Rules for Derived Forms:

\[
(\text{ELIM})\quad \Gamma' \vdash S : \text{DATA} \quad R_{\Gamma' \vdash \text{GENQUANT}}(S) = \emptyset \quad \Gamma' = \Gamma[z \mapsto \text{int}(K), \text{MODEL}] \quad \Gamma \vdash \text{elim}(\text{int}(K)z) S : \text{MODEL}
\]

\[
(\text{PHI})\quad \Gamma' \vdash S : \text{DATA} \quad \forall \ell' > \ell. R_{\Gamma' \vdash \ell'}(S) = \emptyset \quad \Gamma' = \Gamma[z_1 \mapsto (\text{int}(K_1), \ell), \ldots, z_N \mapsto (\text{int}(K_N), \ell)] \quad \Gamma \vdash \phi(\text{int}(K_1)z_1, \ldots, \text{int}(K_N)z_N) S : \text{real, } \ell
\]

\[
(\text{GEN})\quad \Gamma(z) = (\text{int, GENQUANT}) \quad \Gamma \vdash S : \text{DATA} \quad \Gamma \vdash \text{gen}(\text{int}(K)z) S : \text{GENQUANT}
\]

Lemma 15. For any SlicStan program $\Gamma, S$ such that $\Gamma \vdash S : \iota.1$, and a variable $z \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$ such that $\Gamma(z) = (\text{int}(K), \text{MODEL})$, there exists a SlicStan program $\Gamma', S'$, such that,

\[
\Gamma, S \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma', S' \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma'(z) = (\text{int}(K), \text{GENQUANT})
\]
PROOF. Take a SlicStan program $\Gamma, S$, a typing environment $\Gamma_M$, a variable $z$, and statements $S_D, S_M$ and $S_Q$, such that:

$$\Gamma(z) = (\mathbf{int}(K), \mathbf{MODEL}) \quad \Gamma \vdash S : \mathbf{DATA} \quad \Gamma \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma_M \quad S \not\in \Gamma, S_D, S_M, S_Q \quad \Gamma_M \vdash_2 S_M : \mathbf{L1}$$

Take also statements $S_1, S_2, S_3$, and $S'_M$, and a typing environment $\Gamma_{ne}$ such that

$$S_M \not\in \Gamma_M, S_1, S_2, S_3 \quad \Gamma_{ne} = \mathbf{ne}(\Gamma, \Gamma_M, z)$$

$$S'_M = S_1; f = \phi(\Gamma_{ne})\{\mathbf{elim}(\mathbf{int}(K)z) S_2\}; \mathbf{factor}(f[\mathbf{dom}(\Gamma_{ne})]) ; S_3 ; \mathbf{gen}(z) S_2 ; \mathbf{store}(S_2)$$

Let $\Gamma'$ be such that $\mathbf{dom}(\Gamma') = \mathbf{dom}(\Gamma) \cup \{f\}$ and for all $x : \tau, \ell \in \Gamma$:

$$\Gamma'(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
(\tau, \ell) & \text{if } \ell \neq \mathbf{MODEL} \\
(\tau, \ell) & \text{if } \ell = \mathbf{MODEL} \text{ and } \Gamma_M(x) \neq (\tau, \mathbf{L2}) \\
(\tau, \mathbf{GENQUANT}) & \text{if } \ell = \mathbf{MODEL} \text{ and } \Gamma_M(x) = (\tau, \mathbf{L2})
\end{array} \right.$$  

By semantic preservation of shredding (Lemma 6, Lemma 10) and type preservation of the operational semantics ([Gorinova et al. 2019]), $\Gamma \vdash S_D; S_1; S_2; S_3; S_Q : \mathbf{DATA}$, and thus, by (SEQ), $\Gamma \vdash S_D : \mathbf{DATA}, \Gamma \vdash S_1 : \mathbf{DATA}, \ldots, \Gamma \vdash S_Q : \mathbf{DATA}$.  

By definition of $\Gamma'$, $\Gamma'_{\mathbf{DATA}} \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathbf{DATA}}$. $S_D$ is single-level of level $\mathbf{DATA}$ and $\Gamma \vdash S_D : \mathbf{DATA}$, so $\Gamma_{\mathbf{DATA}} \vdash S_D : \mathbf{DATA}$ and thus $\Gamma' \vdash S_D : \mathbf{DATA}$. Similarly, $\Gamma \vdash S_1 : \mathbf{D}$ and $\Gamma \vdash S_3 : \mathbf{D}$.  

$\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \mathbf{DATA}$, so using (PHI), (ELIM) and (FACTOR), and noting that by definition $\mathbf{dom}(\Gamma_{ne}) \subseteq \mathbf{dom}(\Gamma_{M,L1})$, so $\Gamma_{ne} \in \Gamma$, we can derive:

$$\Gamma' \vdash f = \phi(\Gamma_{ne})\{\mathbf{elim}(\mathbf{int}(K)z) S_2\}; \mathbf{factor}(f[\mathbf{dom}(\Gamma_{ne})]) : \mathbf{DATA}$$

By $\Gamma \vdash S_2 : \mathbf{DATA}$ and the definition of $\Gamma'$, and using (GEN) and definition of store, we also derive:

$$\Gamma' \vdash \mathbf{gen}(z) S_2; \mathbf{store}(S_2) : \mathbf{GENQUANT}$$

Finally, $S_Q$ is a single-level statement of level $\mathbf{GENQUANT}$ and for all $x : \tau, \ell \in \Gamma$, $x : \tau, \ell' \in \Gamma$, where $\ell \leq \ell'$. Therefore, $\Gamma \vdash S_Q : \mathbf{DATA}$ implies $\Gamma \vdash S_Q : \mathbf{DATA}$.

Altogether, this gives us $\Gamma' \vdash S_D; S'_M; S_Q$, and so by (ELIM GEN), $\Gamma, S \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma', S_D; S'_M; S_Q$.

\square

RESTATEMENT OF THEOREM 4 (SEMANTIC PRESERVATION OF $\xrightarrow{z}$)

For SlicStan programs $\Gamma, S$ and $\Gamma', S'$, and a discrete parameter $z : \Gamma, S \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma', S' \rightarrow \llbracket S \rrbracket = \llbracket S' \rrbracket$.

PROOF.

Let $\Gamma, S$ and $\Gamma'$, $S'$ be SlicStan programs, and $z$ be a discrete parameter, such that $\Gamma, S \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma', S'$. Let $S \not\in \Gamma, S_D, S_M, S_Q, S \in \Gamma', S'_D, S'_M, S'_Q$, and $S_M \not\in \Gamma', S_1, S_2, S_3$ for $\Gamma''$ such that $\Gamma' \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma''$ and $\Gamma'' \vdash_2 S_M : \mathbf{L1}$.

Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_0, \Gamma_{\mathbf{DATA}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{MODEL}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{GENQUANT}}; \Gamma' = \Gamma_0', \Gamma_{\mathbf{DATA}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{MODEL}}, \Gamma_{\mathbf{GENQUANT}}$ and $\Gamma'' = \Gamma_0'', \Gamma_1'', \Gamma_2'', \Gamma_3''$ be the usual partitioning of each of the typing environments.

Let $z$ be a store such that $z \models \{z : \Gamma(z)\}$.  

Let $D, \theta$ and $Q$ be stores such that $D \models \Gamma_{\mathbf{DATA}}, z \models \Gamma_{\mathbf{MODEL}}$, and $Q \models \Gamma_{\mathbf{GENQUANT}}$.

Let $\theta_1, \theta_2$ and $\theta_3$ be a partitioning of $\theta$, such that $D, \theta_1 \models \Gamma''_{L_1}, z, \theta_2 \models \Gamma''_{L_2}$, and $\theta_3 \models \Gamma''_{L_3}$.

Then, by definition of $\Gamma \xrightarrow{z} \Gamma''$, $\theta_2 = z$.

By Theorem 1:

- $\llbracket S_D \rrbracket_p(\sigma)(D, z, \theta, Q) = 1$
- $\llbracket S_M \rrbracket_p(\sigma_D)(D, z, \theta, Q) \propto p(z, \theta, D)$
- $\llbracket S_Q \rrbracket_p(\sigma_M)(D, z, \theta, Q) = p(Q | z, \theta, D)$
Thus where \( \Gamma \) is semantics-preserving for well-typed programs with respect to both \( \vdash \) and \( \vdash_2 \) (Lemma 6 and Lemma 10). Thus \( [S] = [S'_d; S_1; S_2; S_3]. \)

We present a diagrammatic derivation of the change on store and density that each sub-part in the original and transformed program makes in Figure 4.

Combining all of these results gives that:

\[
[S']_s(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q) = \sigma'' = \sigma' [f \mapsto v] = [S]_s(\sigma)((D, \theta, Q))[f \mapsto v]
\]

In other words, the transformation \( \overset{z}{\rightarrow} \) preserves store semantics (up to creating of one new fresh variable \( f \)).

For the density, we get:

\[
[S']_p(\sigma)(D, \theta, Q)
\]

\[
= \phi_1(D, \theta_1) \left[ \sum_z \phi_2(D, \theta_1, z) \phi_3(D, \theta_1, \theta_3) p(z \mid D, \theta_1)p(Q \mid D, \theta) \right] \text{ from Figure 4}
\]

\[
= \left[ \sum_z \phi_1(D, \theta_1)\phi_2(D, \theta_1, z)\phi_3(D, \theta_1, \theta_3) \right] p(z \mid D, \theta_1)p(Q \mid D, \theta) \text{ by the distributive law}
\]

\[
\propto \left[ \sum_z p(D, \theta_1, z, \theta_2) \right] p(z \mid D, \theta_1)p(Q \mid D, \theta)
\]

\[
= p(D, \theta_1, \theta_2)p(z \mid D, \theta_1)p(Q \mid D, \theta) \text{ marginalisation of } z
\]

\[
= p(D, \theta_1, \theta_2)p(z \mid D, \theta_1, \theta_3)p(Q \mid D, \theta) \text{ by } z \independent \theta_3 \mid \theta_1 \text{ (Theorem 3)}
\]

\[
= p(D, \theta, Q) \text{ by the chain rule or probability}
\]

Together, this gives us \( [S] = [S'] \) (up to \( S' \) creating one new fresh variable \( f \)).
Conditional independence by typing

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma & \\
S_D & \rightarrow \\
\sigma_{(D),1} & \\
S_1 & \\
\phi_1(\sigma_{(D),1})(D, \theta_1) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 11

\[
\begin{align*}
\left(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}), \sigma_{(D)_3}\right), & \\
\phi_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta_1, z) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 11

\[
\begin{align*}
\left(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}), f_3(\sigma_{(D)_1}), \sigma_{(D)_3}\right), & \\
\phi_3(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta_1, \theta_2) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Theorem 1

\[
\begin{align*}
f_g(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}), f_3(\sigma_{(D)_1})), & \\
\phi_g(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta, Q) & = p(Q | D, \theta)
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 13

\[
\begin{align*}
\left(\sigma_{(D)_1}, \sigma_{(D)_2}, f \mapsto \nu, \sigma_{(D)_3}\right), & \\
\Sigma_{z} \phi_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta_1, z) & \\
S_2 & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 11 and \(f\) fresh

\[
\begin{align*}
\left(\sigma_{(D)_1}, \sigma_{(D)_2}, f \mapsto \nu, \sigma_{(D)_3}\right), & \\
\phi_3(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_3(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta_1, \theta_2) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 14

\[
\begin{align*}
f_g(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}), f_3(\sigma_{(D)_1})), & \\
p(z | D, \theta_1) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Theorem 1 and \(f\) fresh

\[
\begin{align*}
f_g(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}), f_3(\sigma_{(D)_1})), f \mapsto \nu, & \\
\phi_g(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta, Q) & = p(Q | D, \theta)
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 11

\[
\begin{align*}
\left(\sigma_{(D)_1}, \sigma_{(D)_2}, f \mapsto \nu, \sigma_{(D)_3}\right), & \\
\phi_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta_1, z) & \\
S_2' & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 13

\[
\begin{align*}
\left(\sigma_{(D)_1}, \sigma_{(D)_2}, f \mapsto \nu, \sigma_{(D)_3}\right), & \\
\phi_3(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_3(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta_1, \theta_2) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

by Lemma 14

\[
\begin{align*}
f_g(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}), f_3(\sigma_{(D)_1})), f \mapsto \nu, & \\
\phi_g(\sigma_{(D)_1}, f_2(\sigma_{(D)_1}))(D, \theta, Q) & = p(Q | D, \theta)
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 4. Diagrammatic proof of semantic preservation of \(\rightarrow\)
B  EXAMPLES

B.1  An extended HMM example

This section works through a full example, showing the different steps of our approach. All results (intermediate and final) are as output by our preliminary implementation, up to formatting changes.

We consider the HMM model from earlier (Program D, § 4), but reformulated to include transformed parameters:

\[
\text{real } \phi_0 \sim \beta(1, 1); \\
\text{real } \theta_0 \sim \beta(1, 1); \\
\text{int}<2> z_1 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta_0); \\
\text{real } \theta_1 = \theta_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_1); \\
\text{int}<2> z_2 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta_1); \\
\text{real } \theta_2 = \theta_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_2); \\
\text{int}<2> z_3 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta_2); \\
\text{real } \phi_1 = \phi_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_1); \\
\text{real } \phi_2 = \phi_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_2); \\
\text{real } \phi_3 = \phi_0 \times z_3 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_3); \\
data \text{ real } y_1 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_1, 1); \\
data \text{ real } y_2 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_2, 1); \\
data \text{ real } y_3 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_3, 1); \\
\text{real } \text{gentheta} = \theta_1 \times z_3 + (1 - \theta_1) \times (1 - z_3); \\
\text{int } \text{genz} \sim \text{bernoulli}(\text{gentheta});
\]

The type levels of each variable are as defined by \(\Gamma\):

\[
\Gamma = \{ y_{1,2,3} : (\text{real, DATA}), \\
\phi_0 : (\text{real, MODEL}), \theta_{0,1,2} : (\text{real, MODEL}), \phi_{1,2,3} : (\text{real, MODEL}), z_{1,2,3} : (\text{int}<2>, \text{MODEL}), \\
gen_{\theta} : (\text{real, \text{GENQUANT}}), \text{genz} : (\text{int}<2>, \text{GENQUANT}) \}
\]

The variables we are interested in transforming are \(z_1, z_2\) and \(z_3\): these are the \text{MODEL}-level discrete parameters of the model. The variable \text{genz} is already at \text{GENQUANT} level, so we can sample this with ancestral sampling (no need for automatic marginalisation).

B.1.1  Eliminating \(z_1\).

B.1.2  Standard shredding: \(S \uparrow_{\Gamma} S_D, S_M, S_Q\).

Firstly, we separate out the parts of the program, which depend on discrete parameters \textit{generatively}. That is any part of the program which would be in generated quantities \textit{w.r.t.} the original program. In our case, this includes the last two lines in \(S\). This would also include the \text{gen} parts of the transform program, that draw discrete parameters as generated quantities.

Thus, \(S \uparrow_{\Gamma} S_D, S_M, S_Q\), where \(S_D\) is empty, \(S_Q = \theta_1 \times z_3 + (1 - \theta_1) \times (1 - z_3)\); \text{genz} \sim \text{bernoulli} (gentheta), and \(S_M\) is the rest of the program.

B.1.3  Conditional independence shredding: \(S_M \uparrow_{\Gamma_M} S_1, S_2, S_3\).

In the next step, we want establish a conditional independence relationship \(z_1 \mid A \mid y, \phi_0, \theta_0, B\), where \(A, B\) is a partitioning of the rest of the discrete parameters in the model: \{\(z_2, z_3\}\}. We derive
a new, \(\Gamma_2\) typing environment \(\Gamma_M^{\rightarrow}\), using \(\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_M^{\rightarrow}\):

\[
\Gamma_M = \{ y_{1,2,3} : (\text{real}, \text{L1}), \phi_0 : (\text{real}, \text{L1}), \theta_0 : (\text{real}, \text{L1}), \\
z_1 : (\text{int}<2>, \text{L2}), z_2 : (\text{int}<2>,?), z_3 : (\text{int}<2>,?) \\
\theta_{1,2} : (\text{real},?), \phi_{1,2,3} : (\text{real},?) \}
\]

Here, we use the notation \(?\) for a type placeholder, which will be inferred using type inference.

The optimal \(\Gamma_M\) under the type inference soft constraint \(\Gamma_3 < \Gamma_1 < \Gamma_2\) such that \(\Gamma_M \rightarrow S_M : \Gamma_1\) is such that the levels of \(\theta_1\) and \(\phi_1\) are \(\Gamma_2\), \(z_2 \) is \(\Gamma_1\) and \(\theta_2\), \(\phi_2\) and \(\phi_3\) are \(\Gamma_3\). Shredding then gives us \(S_M \overset{\text{normalize}}{\Rightarrow} \Gamma_M, S_1, S_2, S_3\), where:

\[
S_1 = \phi_0 \sim \text{beta}(1, 1); \\
\theta_0 \sim \text{beta}(1, 1); \\
S_2 = z_1 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta_0); \\
\text{theta1} = (\theta_0 * z_1 + (1 - \theta_0) * (1 - z_1)); \\
z_2 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\text{theta1}); \\
\phi_1 = (\phi_0 * z_1 + (1 - \phi_0) * (1 - z_1)); \\
y_1 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_1, 1); \\
S_3 = \text{theta2} = (\theta_0 * z_2 + (1 - \theta_0) * (1 - z_2)); \\
z_3 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\text{theta2}); \\
\phi_2 = (\phi_0 * z_2 + (1 - \phi_0) * (1 - z_2)); \\
\phi_3 = (\phi_0 * z_3 + (1 - \phi_0) * (1 - z_3)); \\
y_2 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_2, 1); \\
y_3 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_3, 1);
\]

### B.1.4 Putting everything together.

Having rearranged the program into suitable sub-statements, we use \(\text{ELIM GEN}\) to get:

\[
\Gamma' = \{ y_{1,2,3} : (\text{real}, \text{DATA}), \phi_0 : (\text{real}, \text{MODEL}), \\
\theta_1 : (\text{real}, \text{GENQUANT}), \theta_{0,2} : (\text{real}, \text{MODEL}), \\
\phi_1 : (\text{real}, \text{GENQUANT}), \phi_{2,3} : (\text{real}, \text{MODEL}), \\
z_1 : (\text{int}, \text{GENQUANT}), z_{2,3} : (\text{int}<2>, \text{MODEL}), \\
gen_0 : (\text{real}, \text{GENQUANT}), genz : (\text{int}<2>, \text{GENQUANT}) \}
\]

And the program:

\[
\phi_0 \sim \text{beta}(1, 1); \\
\theta_0 \sim \text{beta}(1, 1); \\
\]

\[
f_1 = \phi([\text{int}<2> z_2]); \}
\text{elim} ([\text{int}<2> z_1] { \\
z_1 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta_0); \\
\text{theta1} = (\theta_0 * z_1 + (1 - \theta_0) * (1 - z_1)); \\
z_2 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\text{theta1}); \\
\phi_1 = (\phi_0 * z_1 + (1 - \phi_0) * (1 - z_1)); \\
y_1 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_1, 1); 
\} )
\]
factor(f1[z2]);

theta2 = (theta0 * z2 + (1 - theta0) * (1 - z2));
z3 ~ bernoulli(theta2);
phi2 = (phi0 * z2 + (1 - phi0) * (1 - z2));
phi3 = (phi0 * z3 + (1 - phi0) * (1 - z3));
y2 ~ normal(phi2, 1);
y3 ~ normal(phi3, 1);

gen(int z1){
  z1 ~ bernoulli(theta0);
  theta1 = (theta0 * z1 + (1 - theta0) * (1 - z1));
z2 ~ bernoulli(theta1);
  phi1 = (phi0 * z1 + (1 - phi0) * (1 - z1));
y1 ~ normal(phi1, 1);
}
theta1 = (theta0 * z1 + (1 - theta0) * (1 - z1));
phi1 = (phi0 * z1 + (1 - phi0) * (1 - z1));

gentheta = (theta0 * z3 + (1 - theta0) * (1 - z3));
gen ~ bernoulli(gentheta);

B.1.5 Eliminating $z_2$. We apply the same procedure to eliminate the next variable. The variable $z_1$ is no longer a model-level parameter, thus the only neighbouring parameter of $z_2$ is $z_3$. Note also that the computation of the factor $f_1$ does not include any free discrete parameters (both $z_1$ and $z_2$ are local to the computation due to elim and $\phi$). Thus, we do not need to include the computation of this factor anywhere else in the program (it does not get nested into other computations).

After rearranging, we get:

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_1 &= \theta_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_1), \\
\phi_1 &= \phi_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_1), \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_2 &= \theta_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_2), \\
\phi_2 &= \phi_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_2), \\
\phi_3 &= \phi_0 \times z_3 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_3), \\
y_2 &\sim \text{normal}(\phi_2, 1), \\
y_3 &\sim \text{normal}(\phi_3, 1), \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{gen}(\text{int } z_1)\{ \\
  &\text{z1 }\text{~ bernoulli}(\theta_0); \\
  &\text{theta1 }= \theta_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_1); \\
  &\text{z2 }\text{~ bernoulli}(\theta_1); \\
  &\text{phi1 }= \phi_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_1); \\
  &\text{y1 }\text{~ normal}(\phi_1, 1); \\
\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_1 &= \theta_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_1), \\
\phi_1 &= \phi_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_1), \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{gentheta }= \theta_0 \times z_3 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_3); \\
\text{gen }\text{~ bernoulli}(\text{gentheta}); \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f1 }\text{= }\phi([\text{int}<2> z_2]); \\
\text{elim(\text{int}<2> z1)}\{ \\
  &\text{z1 }\text{~ bernoulli}(\theta_0); \\
  &\text{theta1 }= \theta_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_1); \\
  &\text{z2 }\text{~ bernoulli}(\theta_1); \\
  &\text{phi1 }= \phi_0 \times z_1 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_1); \\
  &\text{y1 }\text{~ normal}(\phi_1, 1); \\
\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f2 }\text{= }\phi([\text{int}<2> z_3]); \\
\text{elim(\text{int}<2> z2)}\{ \\
  &\text{factor(f1[z2])}; \\
  &\text{theta2 }= \theta_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_2); \\
  &\text{z3 }\text{~ bernoulli}(\theta_2); \\
  &\text{phi2 }= \phi_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_2); \\
\}
\end{align*}
\]
y2 ~ normal(\phi2, 1);
}
}

_factor(f2[z3]);
phi3 = (\phi0 * z3 + (1 - \phi0) * (1 - z3));
y3 ~ normal(\phi3, 1);

gen(int z2){
  _factor(f1[z2]);
  theta2 = (\theta0 * z2 + (1 - \theta0) * (1 - z2));
  z3 ~ bernoulli(theta2);
  phi2 = (\phi0 * z2 + (1 - \phi0) * (1 - z2));
  y2 ~ normal(\phi2, 1);
}
theta2 = (\theta0 * z2 + (1 - \theta0) * (1 - z2));
phi2 = (\phi0 * z2 + (1 - \phi0) * (1 - z2));

gen(int z1){
  z1 ~ bernoulli(theta0);
  theta1 = (\theta0 * z1 + (1 - \theta0) * (1 - z1));
  z2 ~ bernoulli(theta1);
  phi1 = (\phi0 * z1 + (1 - \phi0) * (1 - z1));
  y1 ~ normal(\phi1, 1);
}
theta1 = (\theta0 * z1 + (1 - \theta0) * (1 - z1));
phi1 = (\phi0 * z1 + (1 - \phi0) * (1 - z1));

gentheta = (\theta0 * z3 + (1 - \theta0) * (1 - z3));
genz ~ bernoulli(gentheta);

B.1.6 Eliminating $z_3$. Finally, we eliminate $z_3$, which is the only discrete model-level parameter left in the program. Thus, $z_3$ has no neighbours and $f_3$ is of arity 0 — it is a real number instead of a vector.

The final program generated by our implementation is:

phi0 ~ beta(1, 1);
theta0 ~ beta(1, 1);

f1 = \phi(int<2> z2){
  elimin(int<2> z1){
    z1 ~ bernoulli(theta0);
    theta1 = (\theta0 * z1 + (1 - \theta0) * (1 - z1));
    z2 ~ bernoulli(theta1);
    phi1 = (\phi0 * z1 + (1 - \phi0) * (1 - z1));
    y1 ~ normal(\phi1, 1);
  }
}
}
\[
f_2 = \phi(\text{int}<2> \ z3) \{
\text{elim}(\text{int}<2> \ z2)\{
\text{factor}(f_1[z2])\;
\theta_2 = (\theta_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_2));
z_3 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta_2);
\phi_2 = (\phi_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_2));
y_2 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_2, 1);
\}
\}
f_3 = \phi()\{
\text{elim}(\text{int}<2> \ z3)\{
\text{factor}(f_2[z3])\;
\phi_3 = (\phi_0 \times z_3 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_3));
y_3 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_3, 1);
\}
\}
\text{factor}(f_3);
\}
g\text{en}(\text{int} \ z3)\{
\text{factor}(f_2[z3])\;
\phi_3 = (\phi_0 \times z_3 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_3));
y_3 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_3, 1);
\}
\phi_3 = (\phi_0 \times z_3 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_3));
\}
g\text{en}(\text{int} \ z2)\{
\text{factor}(f_1[z2])\;
\theta_2 = (\theta_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_2));
z_3 \sim \text{bernoulli}(\theta_2);
\phi_2 = (\phi_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_2));
y_2 \sim \text{normal}(\phi_2, 1);
\}
\theta_2 = (\theta_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - z_2));
\phi_2 = (\phi_0 \times z_2 + (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_2));
\}
g\text{en}(\text{int} \ z1)\{
\text{gen}(\text{int} \ z3 + (1 - \theta_0) \times (1 - \phi_0) \times (1 - z_3));
gm = \text{bernoulli}(\text{gentheta});
B.2 Soft-K-means model

Below, we present the standard soft-k-means clustering model as it is written in SlicStan with support for discrete model parameters (left). The right column shows the resulting code that our program transformation generates. This code consists of plain SlicStan code and no support for discrete model parameters is needed to perform inference on it.

The model can be used for (softly) dividing \( N \) data points \( y \) in \( D \)-dimensional Euclidean space into \( K \) clusters which have means \( \mu \) and probability \( \pi \).

---

### SlicStan + discrete

```plaintext
data int D;
data int K;
data real[K] pi;
data real N = 3;
data real[D][N] y;

real[D][K] mu;
for(d in 1 : D) {
  for(k in 1 : K){
    mu[d][k] ~ normal(0, 1);
  }
}

int<K> z1 ~ categorical(pi);
int<K> z2 ~ categorical(pi);
int<K> z3 ~ categorical(pi);

for(d in 1 : D) {
  y[d][1] ~ normal(mu[d][z1], 1);
y[d][2] ~ normal(mu[d][z2], 1);
y[d][3] ~ normal(mu[d][z3], 1);
}
```

### SlicStan

```plaintext
...
for(d in 1:D){
  for(k in 1:K){
    mu[d,k] ~ normal(0, 1);}

  factor( elim(int<K> z1){
    z1 ~ categorical(pi);
    for(data int d in 1:D){
      y[d,1] ~ normal(mu[d,z1], 1);})

  factor( elim(int<K> z2){
    z2 ~ categorical(pi);
    for(data int d in 1:D){
      y[d,2] ~ normal(mu[d,z2], 1);})

  factor( elim(int<K> z3){
    z3 ~ categorical(pi);
    for(data int d in 1:D){
      y[d,3] ~ normal(mu[d,z3], 1);})

  gen(int z3){
    z3 ~ categorical(pi);
    for(data int d in 1:D){
      y[d,3] ~ normal(mu[d,z3], 1);}
  }

  gen(int z2){
    z2 ~ categorical(pi);
    for(data int d in 1:D){
      y[d,2] ~ normal(mu[d,z2], 1);}}

  gen(int z1){
    z1 ~ categorical(pi);
    for(data int d in 1:D){
      y[d,1] ~ normal(mu[d,z1], 1);}}
```
B.3 A causal inference example

Using our technique, we can also easily implement causal inference in the style of [Winn 2012] (causality with gates). Again, we display how to write such a model in SlicStan with direct support for discrete parameters (left) and the code that our transformation generates (right) on which we can perform inference using a combination of e.g. HMC and ancestral sampling.

This model can be read as follows. Assume that we are in a situation where we want to answer a causal question. We want to answer this question based on \( \text{paired observations of } A \) and \( B \), in some of which we might have intervened (doB). Our model proceeds by drawing a (prior) probability that \( A \) causes \( B \) from a beta distribution, and then specifying \( A \) and \( B \) for different scenarios (intervention, \( A \) causes \( B \) and no intervention, \( B \) causes \( A \) and no intervention) using conditional statements.

### SlicStan + discrete

```stan
data real q;
data int N;
data int[N] A, B, doB;
data real prob_intervention;

real pAcausesB ~ beta(1, 1);
int<2> AcausesB ~ bernoulli(pAcausesB);

for (n in 1:N)
  if (doB[n] > 0)
    B[n] ~ bernoulli(prob_intervention);

if (AcausesB > 1){
  for (n in 1:N){
    A[n] ~ bernoulli(0.5);
    if (doB[n] < 1){
      if (A[n] > 0) { B[n] ~ bernoulli(q); }
      else { B[n] ~ bernoulli(1 - q); }
    }
  }
} else {
  for (n in 1:N){
    if (doB[n] < 1){ B[n] ~ bernoulli(0.5); }
    if (B[n] > 0){ A[n] ~ bernoulli(q); }
    else { A[n] ~ bernoulli(1 - q); }
  }
}
```

### SlicStan

```stan
data real q;
data int N;
data int[N] A, B, doB;
data real prob_intervention;

real pAcausesB ~ beta(1, 1);

for(data int n in 1:N)
  if(doB[n] > 0)
    B[n] ~ bernoulli(prob_intervention);

factor(elim(int<2> AcausesB)){
  AcausesB ~ bernoulli(pAcausesB);
  if(AcausesB > 1){
    for(data int n in 1:N){
      A[n] ~ bernoulli(0.5);
      if(doB[n] < 1){
        if(A[n] > 0){ B[n] ~ bernoulli(q); }
        else{ B[n] ~ bernoulli(1 - q); }
      }
    }
  }
  else{
    for(data int n in 1:N){
      if(doB[n] < 1){ B[n] ~ bernoulli(0.5); }
      if(B[n] > 0){ A[n] ~ bernoulli(q); }
      else{ A[n] ~ bernoulli(1 - q); }
    }
  }
}
```