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We propose the first framework for defining relational program logics for arbitrary monadic effects. The framework is embedded within a relational dependent type theory and is highly expressive. At the semantic level, we provide an algebraic characterization for relational specifications as a class of relative monads, and link computations and specifications by introducing relational effect observations, which map pairs of monadic computations to relational specifications in a way that respects the algebraic structure. For an arbitrary relational effect observation, we generically define the core of a sound relational program logic, and explain how to complete it to a full-fledged logic for the monadic effect at hand. We show that by instantiating our framework with state and unbounded iteration we can embed a variant of Benton’s Relational Hoare Logic, and also sketch how to reconstruct Relational Hoare Type Theory. Finally, we identify and overcome conceptual challenges that prevented previous relational program logics from properly dealing with effects such as exceptions, and are the first to provide a proper semantic foundation and a relational program logic for exceptions.

1 INTRODUCTION

Generalizing unary properties, which describe single program runs, relational properties describe relations between multiple runs of one or more programs [Abate et al. 2019; Clarkson and Schneider 2010]. Formally verifying relational properties has a broad range of practical applications. For instance, one might be interested in proving that the observable behaviors of two programs are related, showing for instance that the programs are equivalent [Blanchet et al. 2008; Chadha et al. 2016; Ştefan Ciobăcă et al. 2016; Godlin and Strichman 2010; Hur et al. 2012, 2014; Kundu et al. 2009; Timany et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2018; Yang 2007], or that one refines the other [Timany and Birkedal 2019]. In other cases, one might be interested in relating two runs of a single program, but, as soon as the control flow can differ between the two runs, the compositional verification problem becomes the same as relating two different programs. This is for instance the case for noninterference, which requires that a program’s public outputs are independent of its private inputs [Antonopoulos et al. 2017; Banerjee et al. 2016; Barthe et al. 2019; Clarkson and Schneider 2010; Nanevski et al. 2013; Sabelfeld and Myers 2003; Sousa and Dillig 2016]. The list of practical applications of relational verification is, however, much longer, including showing the correctness of program transformations [Benton 2004], cost analysis [Çiçek et al. 2017; Qu et al. 2019; Radicek et al. 2018], program approximation [Carbin et al. 2012; He et al. 2018], semantic diffing [Lahiri et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2018], cryptographic proofs [Barthe et al. 2009, 2013a, 2014; Petcher and Morrisett 2015; Unruh 2019], differential privacy [Barthe et al. 2013b, 2015; Gavazzo 2018; Zhang and Kifer 2017], and even machine learning [Sato et al. 2019].

As such, many different relational verification tools have been proposed, making different tradeoffs, for instance between automation and expressiveness (see §6 for further discussion). In this paper we focus on relational program logics, which are a popular formal foundation for various relational verification tools. Relational program logics are proof systems whose rules can be used to prove that a pair of programs meets a rich relational specification. As such they are very expressive, and can in particular handle situations in which verifying the desired relational properties requires showing the full functional correctness of certain pieces of code. Yet they can often greatly simplify reasoning by leveraging the syntactic similarities between the programs we
relate. Since Benton’s [2004] seminal Relational Hoare Logic, many relational program logics have been proposed [Aguirre et al. 2017; Banerjee et al. 2016; Barthe et al. 2013b, 2014, 2015, 2016; Carbin et al. 2012; Nanevski et al. 2013; Petcher and Morrisett 2015; Qu et al. 2019; Radicek et al. 2018; Sato et al. 2019; Sousa and Dillig 2016; Unruh 2019; Yang 2007; Zhang and Kifer 2017]. However, each of these logics is specific to a particular combination of side-effects that is completely fixed by the programming language and verification framework; the most popular side-effects these logics bake in are mutable state, general recursion, cost, and probabilities.

The goal of this paper is to distil the generic relational reasoning principles that work for all side-effects and that underlie all relational program logics. We do this by introducing the first framework for defining program logics for arbitrary monadic effects. Our framework is embedded within a dependent type theory, e.g., CoQ, which makes it highly expressive and simpler to describe.

**Syntactic rules.** To factor out the fully generic parts, the rules of the relational program logics derived in our framework are divided into three categories, following the syntactic shape of the monadic programs on which their operate:

- **R1** rules for pure language constructs, derived from the ambient dependent type theory (these rules target the elimination constructs for positive types, like if-then-else for booleans, recursors for inductive types, etc.);
- **R2** rules for the generic monadic constructs return and bind; and
- **R3** rules for effect-specific operations (e.g., get and put for the state monad, or throw and catch for the exception monad).

This organization allows us to clearly separate not only the generic parts (R1&R2) from the effect-specific ones (R3), but also the effect-irrelevant parts (R1) from the effect-relevant ones (R2&R3).

In its simplest form (§2), the judgment of the relational program logics of our framework has the shape: \( \vdash c_1 \sim c_2 \{ w \} \), where \( c_1 : M_1 A_1 \) is a computation in monad \( M_1 \) producing results of type \( A_1 \), where \( c_2 : M_2 A_2 \) is a computation in monad \( M_2 \) producing results of type \( A_2 \), and where \( w \) is a relational specification of computations \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) drawn from the type \( \text{W}^{\mathsf{St}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) \). Here \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) are two arbitrary and potentially distinct computation monads (e.g., the state monad \( \text{St} A = S \to A \times S \) and the exception monad \( \text{Exc} A = A + E \)), while \( w \) could, for instance, be a pair of a relational precondition and a relational postcondition, or a relational predicate transformer—below we will use relational weakest preconditions. For instance, for relating two stateful monads on states \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \), we often use relational specifications drawn from

\[
\text{W}^{\mathsf{St}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) = ((A_1 \times S_1) \times (A_2 \times S_2) \to \mathbb{P}) \to S_1 \times S_2 \to \mathbb{P}
\]

which are predicate transformers mapping postconditions relating two pairs of a result value and a final state to a precondition relating two initial states (here \( \mathbb{P} \) stands for the type of propositions of our ambient dependent type theory). As an example of the judgment above, consider the programs \( c_1 = \text{bind}^{\mathsf{St}}(\text{get}())(\lambda x. \text{put}(x + k)) \), which increments the content of a memory cell, and \( c_2 = \text{ret}^{\mathsf{St}}() \), which does nothing. These two programs are related by the specification \( w = \lambda \varphi(s_1, s_2). \varphi((((), s_1 + k), ((), s_2)): \text{W}^{\mathsf{St}}_{\text{rel}}(1, 1) \) saying that for the postcondition \( \varphi \) to hold for the final states of \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \), it is enough for it to hold for \( s_1 + k \) and \( s_2 \), where \( s_1 \) are \( s_2 \) are the computation’s initial states. Note that since \( c_1 \), \( c_2 \), and \( w \) are terms of our ambient type theory, free variables (like \( k \)) are handled directly by the type theory which save the simple judgment from an explicit context.

For pure language constructs R1, we try to use the reasoning principles of our ambient dependent type theory as directly as possible. For instance, our framework (again in its simplest incarnation from §2) provides the following rule for the if-then-else construct:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 & \sim c_2 \{ w^\top \} \quad \text{else } c_1 \sim c_2 \{ w^\bot \} \\
\vdash & c_1 \sim c_2 \{ \text{if } b \text{ then } w^\top \text{ else } w^\bot \}
\end{align*}
\]
In order to prove that \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) satisfy the relational specification \( \text{if } b \text{ then } w \top \text{ else } w \bot \), it is enough to prove that \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) satisfy both branches of the conditional in a context extended with the value of \( b \). Interestingly, this rule does not make any assumption on the shape of \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \). Relational program logics often classify each rule depending on whether it considers a syntactic construct that appears on both sides (synchronous), or only on one side (asynchronous). In the rule above, taking \( c_1 \) to be of the shape \( \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1^\top \text{ else } c_1^\bot \) and \( c_2 \) to be independent of \( b \), we can simplify the premise according to the possible values of \( b \) to derive an asynchronous variant of the rule:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \vdash c_1^\top \sim c_2 \{ w^\top \} \\
& \vdash c_1^\bot \sim c_2 \{ w^\bot \} \\
& \vdash \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1^\top \text{ else } c_1^\bot \sim c_2 \{ \text{if } b \text{ then } w^\top \text{ else } w^\bot \}
\end{align*}
\]

By requiring that both commands are conditionals, we can also derive the synchronous rule:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \vdash c_1^\top \sim c_2 \{ w^\top \} \\
& \vdash c_1^\bot \sim c_2 \{ w^\bot \} \\
& \vdash \text{if } b_1 \text{ then } c_1^\top \text{ else } c_1^\bot \sim \text{if } b_2 \text{ then } c_2^\top \text{ else } c_2^\bot \{ w^\star \}
\end{align*}
\]

where the relational specification \( w^\star = \lambda \varphi \ s_{12}, (b \equiv b_1) \land (b \equiv b_2) \land \text{if } b \text{ then } w^\top \varphi \ s_{12} \text{ else } w^\bot \varphi \ s_{12} \) ensures that the booleans \( b_1 \) and \( b_2 \) controlling the choice of the branch in each computation share the same value \( b \).

For the monadic constructs \( R2 \), the challenge is in lifting the binds and returns of the two computation monads \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) to the specification level. For instance, in a synchronous rule one would relate \( \text{bind}^{M_1} m_1 f_1 \) to \( \text{bind}^{M_2} m_2 f_2 \) by first relating computations \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \), say via relational specification \( w^m \), and then one would relate the two functions \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) pointwise via a function \( w^f \) mapping arguments in \( A_1 \times A_2 \) to relational specifications:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \vdash m_1 \sim m_2 \{ w^m \} \\
& \forall a_1, a_2 \vdash f_1 a_1 \sim f_2 a_2 \{ w^f (a_1, a_2) \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\vdash \text{bind}^{M_1} m_1 f_1 \sim \text{bind}^{M_2} m_2 f_2 \{ \text{bind}^{W_\text{rel}} w^m w^f \}
\]

In the conclusion of this rule, we need a way to compose \( w : W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) \) and \( w^f : A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}(B_1, B_2) \) to obtain a relational specification for the two binds. We do this via a bind-like construct:

\[
\text{bind}^{W_{\text{rel}}} : W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) \rightarrow (A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}(B_1, B_2)) \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}(B_1, B_2)
\]

For the concrete case of \( W_{\text{st}} \), this bind-like construct takes the form

\[
\text{bind}^{W_{\text{st}}} w^m w^f = \lambda \varphi \ s_{12}, w^m (\lambda (a_1, s'_1), (a_2, s'_2)). w^f (a_1, a_2) (s'_1, s'_2) \varphi (s_1, s_2).
\]

This construct is written in continuation passing style: the specification of the continuation \( w^f \) maps a postcondition \( \varphi : (B_1 \times S_1) \times (B_2 \times S_2) \rightarrow P \), to an intermediate postcondition \( (A_1 \times S_1) \times (A_2 \times S_2) \rightarrow P \), then \( w^m \) turns it into a precondition for the whole computation.

Asynchronous rules for bind can be derived from the rule above, by taking \( m_1 \) to be \( \text{ret}^{M_1} () \) or \( f_1 \) to be \( \text{ret}^{M_1} () \) above and using the monadic laws of \( M_1 \) (and symmetrically for \( M_2 \)):

\[
\begin{align*}
& \vdash \text{ret}^{M_1} () \sim m_2 \{ w^m \} \\
& \forall a_2 \vdash c_1 \sim f_2 a_2 \{ w^f a_2 \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
& \vdash c_1 \sim \text{bind}^{M_2} m_2 f_2 \{ \text{bind}^{W_{\text{rel}}} w^m (\lambda () , a_2). w^f a_2 \}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally, for the effect-specific operations \( R3 \), we provide a recipe for writing rules guided by our framework. For state, we introduce the following asynchronous rules for any \( a_1, a_2 \) and \( s \):

\[
\begin{align*}
& \vdash \text{get} () \sim \text{ret} a_2 \{ w_{\text{get}l} \} \\
& \vdash \text{ret} a_1 \sim \text{get} () \{ w_{\text{get}r} \}
\end{align*}
\]
where the last specification reduces to

\[ w_{\text{get}}' = \lambda \varphi \ (s_1, s_2), \ \varphi \ ((s_1, s_1), (a_2, s_2)), \]  
\[ w_{\text{put}}' = \lambda \varphi \ (s_1, s_2), \ \varphi \ ((s_1, s_1), (a_2, s_2)) \]  

and \( w_{\text{put}} = \lambda \varphi \ (s_1, s_2), \ \varphi \ ((s_1, s_1), ((s_1, s_2))) \). Each of these rules describes at the specification level the action of a basic stateful operation (get, put) from either the left or the right computations, namely returning the current state for get or updating it for put. From these rules, we can derive two synchronous rules:

\[ \vdash \text{get}() \sim \text{get}() \ \{ w_{\text{get}} \} \]  
\[ \vdash \text{put}() \sim \text{put}()' \ \{ w_{\text{put}} \} \]

where \( w_{\text{get}} = \lambda \varphi \ (s_1, s_2), \ \varphi \ ((s_1, s_1), (s_2, s_2)) \) and \( w_{\text{put}} = \lambda \varphi \ (s_1, s_2), \ \varphi \ ((s_1, s_1), ((s_1, s_2))) \). These rules can be derived from the rule for \( \text{bind}^{\mathcal{W}_{\text{md}}} \), since by the monadic equations we can replace for instance \( \vdash \text{get}() \sim \text{get}() \ \{ w_{\text{get}} \} \) by the following derivation

\[ \vdash \text{ret}() \sim \text{get}() \ \{ w_{\text{get}} \} \]  
\[ \vdash \text{bind}^{\mathcal{S}_1} (\text{ret}()) \sim \text{bind}^{\mathcal{S}_2} (\text{get}()) \ \{ \text{bind}^{\mathcal{W}_{\text{md}}} (\lambda (u, s_2), w_{\text{get}}') \} \]

where the last specification reduces to \( w_{\text{get}} \) using the definition of \( \text{bind}^{\mathcal{S}_1} \).

**Simple semantics.** To define a semantics for the \( \vdash \) judgment above, we generalize recent work on (non-relational) effect observations [Maillard et al. 2019] to the relational setting, which raises significant challenges though. We start from two ideas from the non-relational setting: (1) specifications are drawn from a monad, ordered by precision [Ahman et al. 2017; Delbianco and Nanevski 2013; Maillard et al. 2019; Nanevski et al. 2008a, b, 2013; Swamy et al. 2013, 2016] and (2) one can link any computation with its specification by defining a monad morphism, i.e., a mapping between two monads that respects their monadic structure. In the case of state, an example monad morphism is \( \theta^{\mathcal{S}_1}(c) = \lambda \varphi \ s_2, \ \varphi \ (c, s) : \mathcal{S}_1 A \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{\text{md}} A \) mapping a stateful computation to the unary specification monad \( \mathcal{W}_{\text{md}} A = (A\times S \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P \), by running it and then checking whether the postcondition holds of the result. Inspired by Katsumata [2014], Maillard et al. [2019] call such monad morphisms *effect observations* and use them to decouple the computational monad from the specification monad, which brings great flexibility in choosing the specification monad and verification style most suitable for the verification task at hand. Intuitively, an effect observation accounts for the various choices available when specifying computations with a particular effect, for instance total or partial correctness, angelic or demonic nondeterminism, ghost state, etc. In this paper we bring this flexibility to the relational verification world.

For this, we observe that even though \( W_{\text{md}}(A_1, A_2) \) is not a monad, it is a *relative monad* [Altenkirch et al. 2015] over the product \( (A_1, A_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2 \), as illustrated by the type of \( \text{bind}^{\mathcal{W}_{\text{md}}} \) above (4), where the continuation specification is passed a pair of results from the first specification. Similarly, we generalize monad morphisms to relative monads and observe that a relative monad morphism \( \theta_{\text{rel}} : M_1 \mathcal{A}_1 \times M_2 \mathcal{A}_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{md}}(A_1, A_2) \) can immediately give us a semantics for the judgment above:

\[ \models_{\theta_{\text{rel}}} c_1 \sim c_2 \ \{ w \} = \theta_{\text{rel}}(c_1, c_2) \leq w, \]

by asking that the specification obtained by \( \theta_{\text{rel}} \) is more precise than the user-provided specification \( w \). In the case of state, \( \theta^{\mathcal{S}_1}(c_1, c_2) = \lambda \varphi \ (s_1, s_2), \ \varphi \ (c_1 s_1, c_2 s_2) \) simply runs the two computations and passes the results to the postcondition. If we unfold this, and the definition of

\[ w' \leq W_{\text{md}} w = \forall \varphi \ s_1, s_2, w \varphi (s_1, s_2) \Rightarrow w' \varphi (s_1, s_2), \]

we obtain the standard semantics of a relational program logic for stateful computations (but without other side-effects):

\[ \models_{\theta_{\text{rel}}} c_1 \sim c_2 \ \{ w \} = \forall \varphi \ s_1, s_2, w \varphi (s_1, s_2) \Rightarrow \varphi (c_1 s_1, c_2 s_2) \]
Another important point is that the relational effect observation can help us in deriving simple effect-specific rules, such as the ones for `get` (7) and put (8) above. For deriving such rules, one first has to choose `c_1` and `c_2` (and we hope that the product programs of §5 can provide guidance on this in the future) and then one can simply compute the specification using `θ`. For instance, 
\[ w_{get} = λφ \: (s_1, s_2). \: φ ((s_1, s_1), (a_2, s_2)) \] in the first get rule (7) really is just \( θ(\text{get}(), \text{ret} \: a_2) \). This idea is further discussed in §2.6.

**Exceptions, and why the simple semantics is not enough.** While the simple construction we described so far works well for state, it does not work for exceptions. For relating computations that can raise exceptions, we often need to use expressive specifications that can tell whether an exception was raised or not in each of the computations. For instance, such relational specifications could be drawn from:

\[ W^\text{Exc}_{m}(A_1, A_2) = ((A_1 + E_1) \times (A_2 + E_2) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P. \]

A predicate transformer \( w : W^\text{Exc}_{m}(A_1, A_2) \) maps an exception-aware postcondition \( φ : (A_1 + E_1) \times (A_2 + E_2) \rightarrow P \) to a precondition, which is just a proposition in \( P \). However, more work is needed to obtain a compositional proof system. Indeed, suppose we have derivations for \( \vdash m_1 \sim m_2 \{ w^m \} \) and \( \forall a_1, a_2. \vdash f_1 \: a_1 \sim f_2 \: a_2 \{ w^f \: (a_1, a_2) \} \) with specifications \( w^m, w^f \) drawn from \( W^\text{Exc}_{m} \). In order to build a composite proof relating \( c_1 = \text{bind}^\text{Exc} m_1 \: f_1 \) and \( c_2 = \text{bind}^\text{Exc} m_2 \: f_2 \) we need to be able to compose \( w^m \) and \( w^f \) in some way. If \( w^m \) ensures that \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \) terminate both normally returning values, or throw an exception at the same time, we can compose with \( w^f \) or pass the exception to the final postcondition. Otherwise, a computation, say \( m_1 \), returns a value and the other, \( m_2 \), raises an exception. In this situation, the specification relating \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) needs a specification for the continuation \( f_1 \) of \( m_1 \), but this cannot be extracted out of \( w^f \) alone. In terms of the constructs of \( W^\text{Exc}_{m} \), this failure is an obstruction to complete the following tentative definition of \( \text{bind}^\text{Exc}_{m} \):

\[
\text{let } \text{bind}^\text{Exc}_{m} \: w_m \: (w_f : A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow (((B_1 + E_1) \times (B_2 + E_2)) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P) (φ : (B_1 + E_1) \times (B_2 + E_2) \rightarrow P) = w_m (λx : (A_1 + E_1) \times (A_2 + E_2). \:\text{match } x \text{ with} \: \begin{cases} \text{Inl } a_1, \text{Inl } a_2 & \rightarrow w_f \: a_1 \: a_2 \: φ \\ \text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inl } a_2 & \rightarrow φ \: (\text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inl } e_2) \\ _-> & \text{??? } \end{cases})
\]

Our solution is to pass in two independent unary (i.e., non-relational) specifications for the continuations \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) as additional arguments for bind:

\[
\text{let } \text{bind}^\text{Exc}_{m} \: w_m \: (w_{f_1} : A_1 \rightarrow ((B_1 + E_1) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P) (w_{f_2} : A_2 \rightarrow ((B_2 + E_2) \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P) w_f \: φ = w_m (λx : (A_1 + E_1) \times (A_2 + E_2). \:\text{match } x \text{ with} \: \begin{cases} \text{Inl } a_1, \text{Inr } e_2 & \rightarrow w_{f_1} \: a_1 \: (λe. \: φ \: be \: (\text{Inr } e_2)) \\ \text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inl } a_2 & \rightarrow w_{f_2} \: a_2 \: (λe. \: φ \: (\text{Inr } e_1) \: be) \end{cases})
\]

The first new case corresponds to when \( m_2 \) terminated with an exception whereas \( m_1 \) returned a value normally. In this situation, we use the unary specification \( w_{f_2} \) to further evaluate the first computation, independently of the second one, which already terminated. It turns out that this \( \text{bind}^\text{Exc}_{m} \) operation can still be used to define a relative monad, but in a more complex relational setting that we introduce in §3. As a consequence of moving to this more complex setting our relational judgment needs to also keep track of unary specifications, and its semantics also becomes more complex. We tame this complexity by working this out internally to a relational dependent
type theory [Tonelli 2013]. In practice we can still implement this relational dependent type theory inside our ambient type theory, in our case Coq, and continue using the same tools for verification. This paper makes the following contributions:

▶ We introduce the first generic framework for deriving relational program logics for arbitrary monadic effects, distilling the essence of previous relational program logics for specific effects. The proposed framework is highly expressive, and not only allows one to prove arbitrary relations between two programs with different monadic effects, but it also inherits the features of dependent type theory (higher-order logic, dependent types, polymorphism, lambdas, etc).

▶ We provide a generic semantics for these relational program logics based on the novel observations that (1) the algebraic structure of relational specifications can be captured by particular relative monads, and (2) the two considered computations can be mapped to their specifications by particular relative monad morphisms we call relational effect observations. Our framework provides great flexibility in choosing the kind of relational specifications and the effect observation best suited for the verification task at hand. Finally, our generic rules are proven sound for any specification monad and any effect observation.

▶ We illustrate our framework by proving information flow control specifications for stateful programs. More generally, we show that by instantiating our framework with state and unbounded iteration, we obtain a logic expressive enough to encode a variant of Benton’s [2004] Relational Hoare Logic (RHL) (§4.1). Finally, we also sketch how Nanevski et al.’s [2013] Relational Hoare Type Theory (RHTT) can be reconstructed on top of our framework (§4.2).

▶ We identify and overcome conceptual challenges that prevented previous relational program logics from properly dealing with effects such as exceptions [Barthe et al. 2016]. We provide a proper semantic account of exceptions and the first relational program logic for this effect.

▶ We propose a unifying monadic notion of product programs, underlying a popular proof methodology for relational reasoning.

Outline. After recalling how computational monads can express a wide range of effects, §2 introduces relational specification monads and effect observations, on top of which we build a simplified variant of our relational reasoning framework, which we illustrate for effects such as state, nondeterminism, and unbounded iteration, and also with proofs of noninterference. §3 then extends this simplified setting to account for all effects, in particular exceptions, based on a relational dependent type theory and also using relative monads as a unifying tool for the two settings. §4 explains how to embed RHL and the connection to RHTT. In §5 we discuss how our framework accounts for product programs, before reviewing the related work in §6 and concluding in §7. The ideas of this paper are supported by an accompanying Coq development in the supplementary material providing a proof of concept implementation: https://gitlab.inria.fr/kmaillar/dijkstra-monads-for-all/tree/relational

2 SIMPLIFIED FRAMEWORK

In this section we introduce a simple framework for relational reasoning about monadic programs based on (1) relational specification monads, capturing relations between monadic programs, and (2) relational effect observations, lifting a pair of computations to their specification. By instantiating this framework with specific effects, we show how the specific rules of previous relational program logics can be recovered in a principled way and illustrate by example how these rules can be used to prove relational properties of monadic programs, such as noninterference. But first, we recall the monadic presentation of a few effects such as state, exceptions, and nondeterminism.
\begin{align*}
\text{bind}^M (\text{ret}^M a) f = f a & \quad \text{bind}^M m \text{ ret}^M = m \\
\text{bind}^M m (\lambda x. \text{bind}^M (f x) g) = \text{bind}^M (\text{bind}^M m f) g
\end{align*}

A considerable number of effects are captured by monads, including stateful computations, exceptions, interactive input-output, nontermination, nondeterminism, and continuations [Benton et al. 2000]. Each monad comes with specific operations [Plotkin and Power 2002] that allow the computation to perform the actual effects that the monad provides. To fix notation, we recall the basic monads corresponding to the effects that we will use in the rest of the paper.

\textbf{Stateful computations.} State passing functions \(\text{St} A = S \to A \times S\) are used to model state, where \(S\) is the type of the state. The functions \(\text{ret}^{\text{St}}\) and \(\text{bind}^{\text{St}}\) are defined as
\begin{align*}
\text{let } \text{ret}^{\text{St}} a : \text{St} A = \lambda s. (a,s) & \quad \text{let } \text{bind}^{\text{St}} (m: \text{St} A) (f: A \to \text{St} B) : \text{St} B = \lambda s. \text{let } (a,s') = m s \text{ in } f a s'
\end{align*}

This monad comes with two operations
\begin{align*}
\text{let } \text{get} : \text{St} S = \lambda s. (s,s) & \quad \text{let } \text{put} (s:S) : \text{St} \; 1 = \lambda s_0. ((,), s)
\end{align*}
that permit reading and updating the state. A particular case of state store is with many locations of a particular type \(\nu\text{Val}\). If \(\mathcal{L}\) is a set of locations, then a computations with a store of type \(S = \mathcal{L} \to \nu\text{Val}\) are expressed by monad \(\text{St}_S\). In this case, we have custom operations that are parameterized by the location which we are accessing in the store:
\begin{align*}
\text{let } \text{get}^{\mathcal{L}}(l: \mathcal{L}) : \text{St} \; \nu\text{Val} = \lambda s. (s,l s) & \quad \text{let } \text{put}^{\mathcal{L}}(l: \mathcal{L})(v : \nu\text{Val}) : \text{St} \; 1 = \lambda s. ((,) , \text{upd} s l v)
\end{align*}
where \(\text{let } \text{upd} \; s \; l_1 \; v = \lambda l_2. \text{if } l_2 = l_1 \text{ then } v \text{ else } s \; l_2\).

\textbf{Exceptions.} Computations potentially throwing exceptions of type \(E\) are captured by the type constructor \(\text{Exc} A = A + E\). The monadic operations are
\begin{align*}
\text{let } \text{ret}^{\text{Exc}} a : \text{Exc} A = \text{Inl} a & \quad \text{let } \text{bind}^{\text{Exc}} (m: \text{Exc} A) (f: A \to \text{Exc} B) : \text{Exc} B = \text{match} m \text{ with } | \text{Inl} a \to f a | \text{Inr} e \to \text{Inr} e
\end{align*}
The operations provided are throwing and catching exceptions\(^1\):
\begin{align*}
\text{let } \text{throw}(e:E) : \text{Exc} \; 0 = \text{Inr} e & \quad \text{let } \text{catch} (m: \text{Exc} A) (mexc : E \to \text{Exc} A) : \text{Exc} A = \text{match} m \text{ with } | \text{Inl} a \to \text{Inl} a | \text{Inr} e \to \text{mexc} e
\end{align*}

\textbf{Interactive Input-output.} Computations doing interactive input of type \(I\) and output of type \(O\) are captured using monads as well. The type constructor has a tree-like form
\begin{align*}
\text{type } \text{IO} \; A = | \text{Ret} : A \to \text{IO} \; A | \text{Input} : (I \to \text{IO} \; A) \to \text{IO} \; A | \text{Output} : O \to \text{IO} \; A \to \text{IO} \; A
\end{align*}
which consists of three possible cases: either we are done with a return value (\(\text{Ret}\)), or we expect a new input and then continue (\(\text{Input}\)), or we output and the continue (\(\text{Output}\)). The monadic function \(\text{ret}^{\text{IO}}\) constructs a unique leaf tree using \(\text{Ret}\) and \(\text{bind}^{\text{IO}}\) does tree grafting. The operations perform input and output, and they are directly captured using the corresponding constructors.

\(^1\)Catching exceptions is the primary example of a \textit{handler} [Plotkin and Pretnar 2009]; we use here the term operation in a wide sense englobing both \textit{algebraic operations} (that we present as \textit{generic effects} [Plotkin and Power 2002]) and handlers.
When defining functions out of \textsc{Imp}, an important idea in the non-relational verification setting is to encapsulate the specification of a computation as a set of possible outcomes. The return operation maps a value \( v \) to the singleton \{\( v \}\}, and the bind operation uses union to collect all results, i.e., \( \text{bind}^{\text{Nd}} m f = \bigcup_{v \in m} f(v) \). The operation \( \text{pick} = \{\text{tt}, \text{ff}\} : \text{Nd} \to \text{E} \) nondeterministically select a boolean value.

**\textsc{Imp}-like effect.** To captures the syntax of simple imperative programs, manipulating state and unbounded iteration, we introduce the \textsc{Imp} monad:

\[
\text{let } \text{do\_while} (\text{body} : \text{Imp } \text{E}) : \text{Imp } \text{E} = \text{DoWhile} (\text{Ret}())
\]

The expected semantics of this operation is to take a computation \( \text{body} \) and to iterate \( \text{body} \) as long as it returns true, so that the following equation – that does not hold in \textsc{Imp} – is satisfied

\[
\text{do\_while } \text{body} = \text{bind}^{\text{imp}} \text{body}(\lambda b . \text{if } b \text{ then } \text{do\_while } \text{body} \text{ else } \text{ret}^{\text{imp}}())
\]

When defining functions out of \textsc{Imp}, we will thus make sure that it holds in the target.

### 2.2 Specifications as (relative) monads

An important idea in the non-relational verification setting is to encapsulate the specification of a monadic computation inside a monad [Ahman et al. 2017; Delbianco and Nanevski 2013; Maillard et al. 2019; Nanevski et al. 2008a,b, 2013; Swamy et al. 2013, 2016], giving the same algebraic footing to both computations and specifications. For instance, stateful computations returning values in \( A \) are elements of a state monad \( \text{St} A = S \to (A \times S) \) and can be given specifications drawn from the monad \( \text{W}^{\text{St}} A = (A \times S \to \text{P}) \to (S \to \text{P}) \) equipped with the monad structure given by

\[
\text{let } \text{ret}^{\text{W}^{\text{St}}} (a : A) : \text{W}^{\text{St}} A = \lambda \varphi. s. \varphi(a,s)
\]

\[
\text{let } \text{bind}^{\text{W}^{\text{St}}} (w m : \text{W}^{\text{St}} A) (\text{wf} : A \to \text{W}^{\text{St}} B) : \text{W}^{\text{St}} B = \lambda \varphi. s. \text{wm}(\lambda a. \text{wf} a \varphi) s
\]

Intuitively, a specification \( w : \text{W}^{\text{St}} A \) is a predicate transformer mapping postconditions, which are predicates on the return value and final state, to preconditions, which are predicates on the initial state. The monadic structure on \( \text{W}^{\text{St}} \) provides a canonical way to describe the monadic rules of a non-relational program logic, i.e.,

\[
\vdash v : A \quad \vdash m : \text{St} A \{ w^m \} \quad a : A \vdash a : \text{St} B \{ w^f \}
\]

\[
\vdash \text{bind}^{\text{St}} m f : \text{St} B \{ \text{bind}^{\text{W}^{\text{St}}} w^m w^f \}
\]

This is, in fact, the main idea behind Dijkstra monads [Ahman et al. 2017; Maillard et al. 2019; Swamy et al. 2013, 2016], which additionally internalize \( \text{St} A \{ w \} \) as a computation type.

Now moving to the relational setting, a relational specification for a pair of stateful computations \( c_1 : \text{St}_{S_1} A_1 \) and \( c_2 : \text{St}_{S_2} A_2 \) consist of a predicate transformer \( w \) mapping postconditions relating 2 pairs of a result value and a final state to a precondition relating 2 initial states, i.e.,

\[
\text{W}^{\text{St}_{S_1}} (A_1, A_2) = ((A_1 \times S_1) \times (A_2 \times S_2) \to \text{P}) \to S_1 \times S_2 \to \text{P}.
\]

(10)

\( \text{W}^{\text{St}} \) does not possess the monad structure present on its unary variant. To begin with it is not even an endofunctor: it takes two types as input and produces one. However, the monadic operations of the unary variant do extend to the relational setting

\[
\text{let } \text{ret}^{\text{W}^{\text{St}_{S_1}}} (a_1, a_2) : A_1 \times A_2 : \text{W}^{\text{St}_{S_1}} (A_1, A_2) = \lambda \varphi. (s_1, s_2). \varphi((a_1, s_1), (a_2, s_2))
\]
let bind\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\textit{wm} : \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂})) (\textit{wf} : \textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂} → \textit{W}₂\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{B₁}, \textit{B₂})) = λ\varphi (s₁, s₂). \textit{wm} (λ((\textit{a₁}, s₁), (\textit{a₂}, s₂)). \textit{wf}(\textit{a₁}, \textit{a₂}) \varphi (s₁, s₂))

These operations satisfy equations analogous to the monadic ones and are part of a relative monad structure in the sense of Altenkirch et al. [2015]. The relational specifications for state \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}} are also naturally ordered by \leq\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁} (see (9)) and this ordering is compatible with the relational monad structure, as long as we restrict our attention to monotonic predicate transformers, a condition that we will assume from now on for all monads on predicate transformer. We call such monad-like structure equipped with a compatible ordering a \textit{simple relational specification monad}.

**Definition 1.** A simple relational specification monad consist of

- for each pair of types \((\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂})\), a type \(\textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂})\) equipped with a preorder \(\leq\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}\)
- an operation \(\text{ret}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁} : \textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂} → \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂})\)
- an operation \(\text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁} : \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂}) → (\textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂} → \textit{W}₂\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{B₁}, \textit{B₂})) → \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{B₁}, \textit{B₂})\) monotonic in both arguments
- satisfying the 3 following equations

\[
\text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\text{ret}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\textit{a₁}, \textit{a₂})) \textit{wf} = \textit{wf}(\textit{a₁}, \textit{a₂}) \quad \quad \text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁} \textit{wm} \text{ret}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁} = \textit{wm}
\]

\[
\text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\textit{wm} \textit{wf}) \textit{wg}) = \text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\lambda \textit{x}. \text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{w}₁}(\textit{wf} \textit{x}) \textit{wg})))
\]

for any \(\textit{a₁} : \textit{A₁}, \textit{a₂} : \textit{A₂}, \textit{wf} : \textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂} → \textit{W}₂\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{B₁}, \textit{B₂}), \textit{wm} : \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂}), \textit{wg} : \textit{B₁} × \textit{B₂} → \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{C₁}, \textit{C₂}).

A simple way to produce various examples of simple relational specification monads besides \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}} is to start from a (non-relational) specification monad \textit{W} in the sense of Maillard et al. [2019], that is a monad equipped with a compatible order, and to compose it with the function \((\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂}) → \textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂})\). A result of Altenkirch et al. [2015] (prop. 2.3.(1)) then ensures that \(\textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂}) = \textit{W}(\textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂})\) is a simple relational specification monad. In the following paragraphs, we illustrate this construction with a few concrete instances showing the flexibility of this notion. Depending on the property we want to verify, we can pick simpler or more sophisticated relational specification monads among these. For instance, relational specification monads based on pre-/postconditions make the connection to relational program logics in the literature more evident.

**Backward predicate transformer.** A stateless version of \textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{st}} is the predicate transformer

\[
\textit{W}₁\textsubscript{\textit{pure}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂}) = (\textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂} → \mathbb{P}) → \mathbb{P}
\]

equipped with monadic operations and order derived from the monotonic continuation monad. We call this simple relational specification monad pure because it naturally applies to the relational verification of pure code, however it can also be useful to verify effectful code as we will see for nondeterministic computations in §2.6.

**Pre-/postconditions.** Specifications written in terms of pre-/postconditions are simpler to understand than their predicate transformer equivalents. We show that relational specifications written as pre-/postcondition also from a relational specification monads. The type constructor

\[
\text{Pp}₁\textsubscript{\textit{pure}}(\textit{A₁}, \textit{A₂}) = \mathbb{P} × (\textit{A₁} × \textit{A₂} → \mathbb{P})
\]

models a pair consisting of a precondition in \(\mathbb{P}\) and a postcondition, that is a relation on final values of two computations. There is a natural ordering between such pairs, namely

\[
(\textit{pre}₁, \textit{post}₁) ≺\textsubscript{\textit{pp}₁} (\textit{pre}₂, \textit{post}₂) \iff \textit{pre}₂ → \textit{pre}₁ ∧ ∀(\textit{a₁} : \textit{A₁})(\textit{a₂} : \textit{A₂}). \textit{post}₁(\textit{a₁}, \textit{a₂}) \Rightarrow \textit{post}₂(\textit{a₁}, \textit{a₂}).
\]

The monadic structure is given by

```plaintext
let \text{ret}\textsubscript{\textit{pp}₁}(\textit{a₁}, \textit{a₂}) = (\top, λ(\textit{a₁}', \textit{a₂}'). \textit{a₁} = \textit{a₁}' ∧ \textit{a₂} = \textit{a₂}')
let \text{bind}\textsubscript{\textit{pp}₁}(\textit{pre}, \textit{post}) f =
```
The return operation results in a trivial precondition and a postcondition holding exactly for the
given arguments, whereas $\text{bind}^{\text{pure}}$ strengthens the precondition of its first argument so that the
postcondition of the first computation entails the precondition of the continuation.

**Stateful pre-/postconditions.** Continuing on pre-/postconditions, we consider a stateful vari-

ant of $\text{Pn}_{\text{rel}}$:

$$\text{PP}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) = (S_1 \times S_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}) \times ((S_1 \times A_1 \times S_1) \times (S_2 \times A_2 \times S_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{P})$$

These are pairs, where the first component consists of a precondition on a pair of initial states, one
for each sides, while the second component is a postcondition formed by a relation on triples of an
initial state, a final value and a final state.

The simple relational monadic specification structure is similar to the one of $\text{Pn}_{\text{rel}}$, threading in
the state where necessary, and specifying that the initial state does not change for return:

$$\text{let } \text{ret}_{\text{rel}}(a_1, a_2) = \lambda \phi . \land \rightarrow S_1, \exists s_1, a_1 . \phi(s_1, a_1, s_1') \wedge s_1' = s_1$$

There is a natural embedding of stateful pre-/postconditions $(pre, post) : \text{PP}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$ into stateful
backward predicate transformers $\text{W}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$ given by

$$\lambda \phi . (s_1', s_2'). \pre(pre(s_1', s_2')) \land \exists a_1, a_2, s_1, s_2 . \phi((a_1, s_1'), (a_2, s_2')) : \text{W}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$$

**Errorful backward predicate transformer.** If exceptions turn out to be complex in general,
a coarse approach is still possible using the simple relational monad

$$\text{W}_{\text{rel}}^{\text{Err}}(A_1, A_2) = ((A_1 \times A_2 + \mathbb{1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}.$$  \hfill (11)

This construction represents a predicate transformer that works on either successful computations,
or on an indication that at least one of the computations threw an exception, but losing the
information of which of the two sides raised the exception. We can actually show that, under
mild assumptions, any simple relational specification monad accounting for exceptions cannot
distinguish the three situations where the left, the right, or both programs are raising exceptions.
Intuitively, this is due to the fact that the two programs are supposed to run independently but the
simple relational specification monad impose some amount of synchronization. We return to $\text{W}_{\text{rel}}^{\text{Err}}$ and solve this problem in §3, while previous relational program logics have generally been stuck with weak specification monads in the style of $\text{W}_{\text{rel}}^{\text{Err}}(A_1, A_2)$ above [Barthe et al. 2016].

### 2.3 Relational semantics from effect observations

The relational judgment $\vdash c_1 \sim c_2 \{ w \}$ should assert that monadic computations $c_1 : M_1 A_1$ and $c_2 : M_2 A_2$ satisfy a relational specification $w : \text{W}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$ drawn from a simple relational specification monad. What does satisfaction mean in our monadic framework? Certainly it requires a specific connection between the computational monads $M_1, M_2$ and the simple relational specification monad $\text{W}_{\text{rel}}$. In the non-relational setting, this is accomplished by an effect observation, i.e., a monad morphism from the computational monad to the specification monad [Katsumata 2014; Maillard et al. 2019]. An effect observation accounts for the various choices available when specifying a particular effect, for instance total or partial correctness in the case of errors or recursion, angelic or demonic interpretations of nondeterministic computations, or connecting ghost state with actual state or with past IO events. In the relational setting, we introduce relational effect observations, families of functions respecting the monadic structure, defined here from first principles, but arising as an extension of monad morphisms as we will show in §3.4.
**Definition 2.** A simple relational effect observation $\theta_{\text{rel}}$ from computational monads $M_1, M_2$ to a simple relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}$ is given by

- for each pair of types $A_1, A_2$ a function $\theta_{\text{rel}} : M_1 A_1 \times M_2 A_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$
- such that

\[
\theta_{\text{rel}}(\text{ret}^{M_1} a_1, \text{ret}^{M_2} a_2) = \text{ret}^{W_{\text{rel}}}(a_1, a_2)
\]
\[
\theta_{\text{rel}}(\text{bind}^{M_1} m_1 f_1, \text{bind}^{M_2} m_2 f_2) = \text{bind}^{W_{\text{rel}}}(\theta_{\text{rel}}(m_1, m_2))((\theta_{\text{rel}} \circ (f_1, f_2))
\]

As explained in the introduction, for stateful computations a simple relational effect observation targeting $W_{\text{rel}}^\text{St}$ runs the two computations and passes the results to the postcondition:

\[
\theta_{\text{rel}}^\text{St}(c_1, c_2) = \lambda \phi (s_1, s_2). \varphi(c_1 s_1, c_2 s_2).
\]  

A more interesting situation happens when interpreting nondeterministic computations $(c_1, c_2) : \text{Nd} A_1 \times \text{Nd} A_2$ into the relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}^\text{Pure}(A_1, A_2)$. Two natural simple relational effect observations are given by

\[
\theta_{\text{rel}}^\text{ud}(c_1, c_2) = \lambda \varphi. \forall a_1 \in c_1, a_2 \in c_2. \varphi(a_1, a_2), \quad \theta_{\text{rel}}^\text{du}(c_1, c_2) = \lambda \varphi. \exists a_1 \in c_1, a_2 \in c_2. \varphi(a_1, a_2).
\]

The first one $\theta_{\text{rel}}^\text{ud}$ prescribes that all possible results from the left and right computations have to satisfy the relational specification, corresponding to a demonic interpretation of nondeterminism, whereas the angelic $\theta_{\text{rel}}^\text{du}$ requires at least one final value on each side to satisfy the relation.

These examples are instances of the following theorem, which allows to lift unary effect observations to simple relational effect observations. To state it, we first recall that two computations $c_1 : M_1 A_1$ and $c_2 : M_2 A_2$ commute [Bowler et al. 2013; Führmann 2002] when

\[
\text{bind}^M c_1 \left(\lambda a_1. \text{bind}^M c_2 \left(\lambda a_2. \text{ret}^M(a_1, a_2)\right)\right) = \text{bind}^M c_2 \left(\lambda a_2. \text{bind}^M c_1 \left(\lambda a_1. \text{ret}^M(a_1, a_2)\right)\right).
\]

The intuition is that executing $c_1$ and then $c_2$ is the same as executing $c_2$ and then $c_1$.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\theta_1 : M_1 \rightarrow W$ and $\theta_2 : M_2 \rightarrow W$ be unary effect observations, where $M_1$ and $M_2$ are computational monads and $W$ is a (unary) specification monad. We denote with $W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) = W (A_1 \times A_2)$ the simple relational specification monad derived from $W$ (see §2.2). If for all $c_1 : M_1 A_1$ and $c_2 : M_2 A_2$, we have that $\theta_1(c_1)$ and $\theta_2(c_2)$ commute, then the following function $\theta_{\text{rel}} : M_1 A_1 \times M_2 A_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$ is a simple relational effect observation

\[
\theta_{\text{rel}}(c_1, c_2) = \text{bind}^W \theta_1(c_1) \left(\lambda a_1. \text{bind}^W \theta_2(c_2) \left(\lambda a_2. \text{ret}^W(a_1, a_2)\right)\right).
\]

In general, given a simple relational effect observation $\theta_{\text{rel}} : M_1, M_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}$, we define the semantic relational judgment by

\[
\models_{\text{rel}} c_1 \sim c_2 \{w\} = \theta_{\text{rel}}(c_1, c_2) \leq W_{\text{rel}} w,
\]

where we make use of the preorder given by $W_{\text{rel}}$. The following 3 subsections explain how to derive rules for a relational logic parameterized by the computational monads $M_1, M_2$, the simple relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}$, and the simple relational effect observation $\theta_{\text{rel}}$.

### 2.4 Pure relational rules

We start with rules coming from the ambient dependent type theory. Even though the semantics of the relational judgment depends on the choice of an effect observation, the soundness of basic pure rules introduced in Figure 1 is independent from both the computational monads and effects observation. Indeed, the proof of soundness of these follows from applying the adequate dependent eliminator coming from the type theory.

These rules can then be tailored as explained in the introduction to derive asynchronous (1) or synchronous (2) rules more suited for applications. For some of the derived rules, there is, however, an additional requirement on the simple relational specification monad, so that we can strengthen
The generic monadic rules together with the rules coming from the ambient type theory allow to derive relational judgments for the main structure of the programs. However, these rules are not considered in this paper. We further discuss this in the future work section (§7).

### 2.5 Generic monadic rules

Given any computational monads $M_1, M_2$ and a simple relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}$, we introduce three rules governing the monadic part of a relational program logic (Figure 2). Each of these rules straightforwardly corresponds to a specific aspect of the simple relational specification monad and are all synchronous. As explained in the introduction (5), it is then possible to derive asynchronous variants using the monadic laws of the computational monads.

**Theorem 2 (Soundness of generic monadic rules).** The relational rules in Figure 2 are sound with respect to any relational effect observation $\theta_{\text{rel}}$, that is $\vdash c_1 \sim c_2 \ (w) \Rightarrow \forall\theta_{\text{rel}}, \vdash_{\text{rel}} c_1 \sim c_2 \ (w)$.

**Proof.** For rules **Ret** and **Bind**, we need to prove that $\theta_{\text{rel}}(\text{ret}^{M_1} a_1, \text{ret}^{M_2} a_2) \leq \text{ret}^{W}(a_1, a_2)$ and $\theta_{\text{rel}}(\text{bind}^{M_1} m_1 f_1, \text{bind}^{M_2} m_2 f_2) \leq \text{bind}^{W}(\theta_{\text{rel}} (m_1, m_2)) (\theta_{\text{rel}} o (f_1, f_2))$, which both hold by the relational effect observation laws and reflexivity. For **Weaken**, we need to show that $\theta_{\text{rel}}(c_1, c_2) \leq w'$ under the assumptions that $\theta_{\text{rel}}(c_1, c_2) \leq w$ and $w \leq w'$ so we conclude by transitivity. \[\square\]

We note that the soundness proof would still be valid if we were to weaken the relational effect observation laws to inequalities. A few examples for such lax relational effect observation appears naturally, for instance in order to deal with variants of relational partial correctness, but we will not consider these in this paper. We further discuss this in the future work section (§7).

### 2.6 Effect-specific rules

The generic monadic rules together with the rules coming from the ambient type theory allow to derive relational judgments for the main structure of the programs. However, these rules are

2 Assuming that $W_{\text{rel}}$ contains a top element $\bot$ that entails falsity of the precondition; this is the case for all our examples.
not enough to handle full programs written in the computational monads \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \), as we need rules to reason about the specific effectful operations that these monads provide. The soundness of effect specific relational rules is established with respect to a particular choice of relational effect observation \( \theta_{\text{rel}} : M_1, M_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}} \). Consequently, we make essential use of \( \theta_{\text{rel}} \) to introduce effect specific rules. The recipe was already illustrated for state in the introduction: first pick a pair of effectful algebraic operations (or \( \text{ret} \) for the asynchronous rules), unfold their definition, and then compute a sound-by-design relational specification for this pair by simply applying \( \theta_{\text{rel}} \). By following this recipe, we are decoupling the problem of choosing the computations on which these rules operate (e.g., synchronous vs. asynchronous rules to which we return in §5) from the problem of choosing sensible specifications, which is captured in the choice of \( \theta_{\text{rel}} \).

Non-deterministic computations. The two relational effect observations \( \theta^V_{\text{rel}} \) and \( \theta^3_{\text{rel}} \) provide different relational rules for the operation \( \text{pick} \). As an example of how the recipe works, suppose that we want to come up with an asymmetric rule for non-deterministic computations that works on the left program, and which is sound with respect to \( \theta^V_{\text{rel}} \). This means that the conclusion will be of the form \( \vdash \text{pick} \sim \text{ret} a_2 \{ w \} \) for some \( w : \text{Pl}^\text{Pure} \). To obtain \( w \), we apply the effect observation to the computations involved in the rule

\[
\vdash \text{pick} \sim \text{ret} a_2 \{ \lambda \varphi. \varphi(t, t) \wedge \varphi(ff, a) \}.
\]

obtaining thus a rule which is trivially sound:

\[
\text{DemonicLEFT}
\]

\[
\vdash \text{pick} \sim \text{ret} a_2 \{ \lambda \varphi. \varphi(t, t) \wedge \varphi(ff, a) \}.
\]

Following the same approach, we can come up with an asymmetric rule on the right as well as a symmetric one. For concreteness, we show the symmetric rule for the effect observation \( \theta^3_{\text{rel}} \):

\[
\text{ANGELIC}
\]

\[
\vdash \text{pick} \sim \text{pick} \{ \lambda \varphi. \varphi(t, tt) \vee \varphi(tt, ff) \vee \varphi(ff, tt) \vee \varphi(ff, ff) \}.
\]

Exceptions using \( W_{\text{rel}}^{\text{Err}} \). Taking \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) to be exception monads on exception sets \( E_1 \) and \( E_2 \), and the relational specification monad \( W_{\text{rel}}^{\text{Err}} \) (Equation 11 on page 10), we have an effect observation interpreting any thrown exception as a unique erroneous termination situation, that is

\[
\text{let } \theta^{\text{Err}}((c_1, c_2) : \text{Exc} A_1 \times \text{Exc} A_2) : \text{WrelErr}(A_1, A_2) =
\lambda \varphi. \text{match } c_1, c_2 \text{ with } \mid \text{Inl } a_1, \text{Inl } a_2 \rightarrow \varphi (\text{Inl } (a_1, a_2)) \mid \_ \rightarrow \varphi (\text{Inr }())
\]

Under this interpretation we can show the soundness of the following rules:

\[
\text{THROWL}
\]

\[
\vdash \text{throw} e_1 \sim \text{ret} a_2 \{ \lambda \varphi. \varphi(\text{Inr }()) \}
\]

\[
\text{THROWR}
\]

\[
\vdash \text{ret} a_1 \sim \text{throw} e_2 \{ \lambda \varphi. \varphi(\text{Inr }()) \}
\]

\[
\text{CATCH}
\]

\[
\vdash \text{catch } c_1, c_2 \{ w \} \quad \forall e_1 e_2 \vdash c_1 \ast e_1 e_2 \{ w \ast \} \quad \forall e_1 \vdash c_1 \ast e_1 \sim \text{ret} a_2 \{ w \ast \} \quad \forall e_1 e_2 \sim \text{ret} a_1 \sim c_2 \ast e_2 \{ w \ast \}
\]

The rules THROWL and THROWR can be derived using the recipe above, but the exceptions have to be conflated to the same exceptional result \( \text{Inr } () \), a situation that is forced by the choice of relational effect observation and a weak specification monad. As a consequence, the CATCH rule has to consider three exceptional cases. The specification for CATCH does not follow mechanically from \( \theta^{\text{Err}}_{\text{rel}} \) using our recipe since it is a handler and not an algebraic operation.

Unbounded iteration. Specifications for imperative programs as modeled by the Imp monad come in two flavors in the literature. This is reflected here by two unary effect observations: a first one for total correctness \( \theta^{\text{Tot}}_{\text{rel}} \) ensuring the termination of a program; and a second one for partial correctness \( \theta^{\text{Part}}_{\text{rel}} \) assuming the termination of a program. We explain how this situation extends to
the relational setting, focusing on partial correctness, but the same methodology applies in a total correctness setting. Concretely, we define a simple relational effect observation

\[ \theta_{rel}^{Part} : \text{Imp} A_1 \times \text{Imp} A_2 \rightarrow \text{PP}_{rel}^S(A_1, A_2) \]

by applying Theorem 1 to a unary effect observation \( \theta^{Part} \) defined using the domain structure \( \text{PP}_{rel}^S \) is naturally endowed with. From basic domain theoretic results, \( \text{PP}_{rel}^S \) can be endowed with a least fixpoint combinator \( \text{fix} : (W^S B \rightarrow W^S B) \rightarrow W^S B \), used to define

\[
\text{let } \theta^{Part} (c : \text{Imp} A) : \text{PP}_{rel}^S A = \lambda s. \text{match } c \text{ with } \begin{align*}
\text{| Ret } x & \rightarrow \text{ret}_{PP}^S x s \\
\text{| DoWhile } body \ k & \rightarrow \\
& \text{let } \text{loop} (w : \text{PP}_{rel}^S B) = \text{bind}_{PP}^S (\theta^{Part} \text{ body}) (\lambda b. \text{ if } b \text{ then } w \text{ else } \text{ret}_{PP}^S \text{ ff}) \text{ in } \\
& \text{bind}_{PP}^S (\text{fix } \text{loop}) (\lambda s. \theta^{Part} k s)
\end{align*}
\]

How does \( \theta^{Part} \) work? In the first three cases, it trivially returns in the Ret branch, evaluates a continuation to the current state in the Get branch, and evaluate a continuation with an updated state in the Put branch. The interesting bits are in the DoWhile branch, where the body is repeatedly run using fix as long as the guard returns \( \text{tt} \). We proved by induction on \( c \) that \( \theta^{Part} \) is a monad morphism. Theorem 1 asks for two monad morphisms whose images commute. We provided those morphisms by tweaking a bit the definition of \( \theta^{Part} \). The first \( \theta_1^{Part} : \text{Imp} \rightarrow \text{PP}_{rel}^S (A_1, \text{ff}) \) uses the left state and the second \( \theta_2^{Part} : \text{Imp} \rightarrow \text{PP}_{rel}^S (\text{ff}, A_2) \) uses the right state, finishing the definition of \( \theta_{rel}^{Part} \).

This simple relational effect observation \( \theta_{rel}^{Part} \) stands for partial correctness in the following sense: intuitively, \( \models_{\theta_{rel}^{Part}} \{ \psi \} \ c_1 \sim c_2 \{ \varphi \} \) implies that if \( \psi \) holds on \( s_1, s_2 \) and the two programs \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) terminate on these initial states \( s_1, s_2 \), then the postcondition hold of the final states. On top of this \( \theta_{rel}^{Part} \), we devise a rule for do_ while using an invariant \( \text{inv}_{b_1, b_2 : S \times S \rightarrow \text{ff}} \):

\[
\vdash \{ \text{inv}_{\text{tt}, \text{tt}} \} \text{ body}_1 \sim \text{body}_2 \begin{cases} 
\lambda (_, b_1, s_1) (_, b_2, s_2), b_1 = b_2 \land \text{inv}_{b_1, b_2}(s_1, s_2) \\
\end{cases}
\]

\[
\vdash \{ \text{inv}_{\text{tt}, \text{tt}} \} \text{ do_ while body}_1 \sim \text{do_ while body}_2 \begin{cases} 
\lambda (_, s_1) (_, s_2), \text{inv}_{\text{ff}, \text{ff}}(s_1, s_2) 
\end{cases}
\]

(15)

This rule is synchronous in the sense that the bodies always yield the same boolean values. Consequently the two loops run the same number of steps. The postcondition ensures that if the loop terminates, then the invariant \( \text{inv}_{\text{ff}, \text{ff}} \) holds.

### 2.7 Example: noninterference

As a specific example of the simplified framework, we explore noninterference, a popular relational property for information flow control systems [Antonopoulos et al. 2017; Banerjee et al. 2016; Barthe et al. 2019; Clarkson and Schneider 2010; Nanevski et al. 2013; Sabelfeld and Myers 2003]. The noninterference property dictates that the public outputs of a program cannot depend on its private inputs. Formally, and in its most basic form, we can capture this property by classifying the store’s locations by two security levels: high for private information and low for public information.

By \( s \equiv_L s' \) we express that the two stores \( s \) and \( s' \) are equal for all low locations. We use \( s \not\equiv_P s' \) to denote that the execution of a program \( p \) on a store \( s \) ends in store \( s' \). The noninterference property is then written as

\[
\forall s_1, s'_1, s_0, s'_0. \quad s_1 \equiv_L s'_1 \land s_1 \not\equiv_P s_0 \land s'_1 \not\equiv_P s'_0 \implies s_0 \equiv_L s'_0
\]

A typical solution for enforcing noninterference is to define a static type system which is capable of rejecting obviously interferent programs [Sabelfeld and Myers 2003]. For example, such a type system can rule out interferent programs such as

\[
\text{if } h > 0 \text{ then } l := 1 \text{ else } l := 0
\]
where \(h\) is a high reference and \(l\) is a low one. However, the static nature of these type systems restricts the family of programs that we can show noninterferent. A characteristic example of this limitation is the following noninterferent program:

\[
\text{if } h = 1 \text{ then } l := h \text{ else } l := 1
\]

Relational program logics such as Benton’s [2004] RHL provide a less restrictive framework for proving non-interference, as the proof can rely on information accumulated during the derivation steps. We follow the approach of relational program logics and show how noninterference proofs can be done in our framework. We restrict ourselves to programs with conditionals but without while-loops. In §4.1, we will show a complete embedding of RHL in the extended version of the framework, including iteration. For now though, we assume that we are working with a memory consisting of locations \(L = \{1, h\}\) storing natural numbers, and consider the data in \(h\) to be private and the data in \(1\) to be public. As discussed in §2.1, these stateful computations can be captured using the monad \(St\) where \(S = L \rightarrow N\). The program above can be represented using this monad as follows:

\[
c = \text{let } x = \text{get } h \text{ in if } x = 1 \text{ then put } l \text{ else put } l : 1 : St 1
\]

We instantiate our framework with the computational monad \(St\) on both sides, and use the simple relational specification monad \(W_{rel}\) from §1. The judgment we establish to prove noninterference is

\[
\vdash c \sim c \quad \left\{ \lambda \varphi (s_1^f, s_2^f). s_1^1 1 = s_2^1 1 \land \forall s_1^f \ s_2^f. s_1^1 1 = s_2^1 1 \implies \varphi ((()), ()), ((), ())) \right\}
\]

This weakest precondition transformer comes from taking the pre-/postcondition pair

\[
\lambda(s_1, s_2). s_1 1 = s_2 1 : S \times S \rightarrow P \quad \lambda(s_1^f, s_2^f). (s_1^f, s_2^f). s_1^1 1 = s_2^1 1 : (S \times \mathbb{I} \times S) \times (S \times \mathbb{I} \times S) \rightarrow P
\]

and translating it to its predicate transformer form following the description in §2.2. The proof derivation consists of applying the BND rule after a weakening, and later applying the asymmetric conditional rules (see page 3) for covering the four cases.

An interesting property of our framework is that we can easily adapt the setting to handle more effects. For example, if we are interested in modeling the reading and writing on files, then it is enough to change the monad \(St\) by a monad which additionally supports input-output as in the monad IO described in §2.1, and replace the relational specification monad \(W_{rel}\) by a monad which takes into account the input-output in the specifications.

3 GENERIC FRAMEWORK

While the simple framework works well for a variety of effects, it falls short of providing a convincing treatment of effects with control such as exceptions or non-termination. This limitation is due to the fact that simple relational specification monads merge tightly together the specification of two independent computations. We now explain how to overcome these limitations starting with the example of exceptions, and how it leads to working inside a relational dependent type theory. Informed by the generic constructions on relative monads underlying the simple setting, we derive notions of relational specification monad and relational effect observation in this enriched setting. These relational specification monads require an important amount of operations so we introduce relational specification monad transformers for state and exceptions, simplifying the task of building complex relational specification monad from simpler ones.

3.1 Exceptional control flow in relational reasoning

We explained in §2.6 how to prove relational properties of programs raising exceptions, as long as we give up on the knowledge of which program raised an exception at the level of relational specifications. This restriction prevents us from even stating, natural specifications such as simulations “if the left program raises, so does the right one”.
In order to go beyond this unsatisfying state of affairs, we consider a type of relational specifications allowing to write specifications consisting of predicate transformers mapping a postcondition on pairs of either a value or an exceptional final state to a proposition:

\[ W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) = ((A_1 + E_1) \times (A_2 + E_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}. \]

For instance, the specification above can be stated as \( \lambda \varphi. \forall a \in a_1. (\text{Inr} a) \Rightarrow \text{Inr} a_2 \) \( \varphi(a_1, a_2) : W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) \), where \( \text{Inr} a = \text{match } a \text{ with } \text{Inr } a \rightarrow \top \rightarrow \bot \).

As explained in the introduction, this type does not admit a monadic operation \( \text{bind} \) \( w^m \rightarrow f \) using only a continuation of type \( w^f : A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(B_1, B_2) \) due to the fact that \( w^m \) could result in an intermediate pair consisting of a normal value on one side and an exception on the other side. Our solution is to provide to \( \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} \) the missing information it needs in such cases. To that purpose, we use the unary specification monads \( W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1 + E_1, A_2 + E_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{P} \) and \( W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{P} \) to provide independent specifications of each program. With the addition of these, we can write a function that relies on the unary specifications when the results of the first computations differ (one raise an exception and the other returns).

\begin{align*}
\text{val } \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} & : W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) \rightarrow (A_1 \rightarrow W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(B_1, B_2)) \rightarrow (A_2 \rightarrow W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(B_1, B_2)) \rightarrow \nonumber \\
\text{let } \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} & \; \text{wm} (f_1 : A_1 \rightarrow ((B_1 + E_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) (f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow ((B_2 + E_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) f = \\
\lambda (\varphi : (B_1 + E_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \; \text{wm} (\lambda a : (A_1 + E_1) \times (A_2 + E_2)).
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{match } a \text{ with } & \\
| \text{Inl } a_1, \text{Inl } a_2 \rightarrow f a_1 a_2 \varphi & | \text{Inl } a_1, \text{Inr } e_2 \rightarrow f_1 a_1 (\lambda b \rightarrow \varphi \; \text{be} \; (\text{Inr } e_2)) \\
| \text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inr } e_2 \rightarrow \varphi (\text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inr } e_2) & | \text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inl } a_2 \rightarrow f_2 a_2 (\lambda b \rightarrow \varphi \; \text{be} \; (\text{Inl } e_1, \text{Inl } e_2))
\end{align*}

### 3.2 A problem of context

In order to keep track of these unary specifications drawn from \( W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}} \) and \( W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}} \) in the relational proofs, we extend the relational judgment to

\[ \vdash c_1 \{ w_1 \} \sim c_2 \{ w_2 \} \mid w_{\text{rel}}. \]

Here, \( w_1 : W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1) \) is a unary specification for \( c_1 : \text{Exc}_1 A_1 \), symmetrically \( w_2 : W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_2) \) is a unary specification for \( c_2 : \text{Exc}_2 A_2 \), and \( w_{\text{rel}} : W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) \) specifies the relation between the programs \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \). Using this richer judgment, we would like a rule for sequencing computations as follows, where a bold variable \( w \) stands for the triple \( (w_1, w_2, w_{\text{rel}}) \):

\[ \vdash m_1 \{ w^m_1 \} \sim m_2 \{ w^m_2 \} \mid w^m_{\text{rel}} \quad \forall a_1, a_2 \vdash f_1 a_1 \{ w^f_1 a_1 \} \sim f_2 a_2 \{ w^m_2 a_2 \} \mid w^m_{\text{rel}} a_1 a_2 \\
\vdash \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} m_1 f_1 \{ \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} w^m_{\text{rel}} w^f_1 \} \sim \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} m_2 f_2 \{ \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} w^m_2 w^f_2 \} \mid \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} w^m w^f \]

What would the semantics of such a relational judgment be? A reasonable answer at first sight is to state formally the previous intuition in terms of unary and relational effect observations:

\[ \vdash c_1 \{ w_1 \} \sim c_2 \{ w_2 \} \mid w_{\text{rel}} = \vartheta^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}_1 c_1 \leq w_1 \land \vartheta^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}_2 c_2 \leq w_2 \land \vartheta^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}_1(c_1, c_2) \leq w_{\text{rel}} \]

However, this naive attempt does not validate the rule for sequential composition above. The problem lies in the management of context. To prove the soundness of this rule, we have in particular to show that \( \vartheta^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}(\text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} m_1 f_1) \leq \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} w^m_1 w^f_1 \) under the hypothesis \( \vartheta^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}_1 m_1 \leq w^m_1 \land \ldots \) and \( \forall a_1, a_2, \vartheta^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}(f_1 a_1) \leq w^f_1 a_1 \land \ldots \), in particular the second hypothesis requires an element \( a_2 : A_2 \) that prevents us from concluding by monotonicity of \( \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} \).

\[ \text{In} \text{stead of insisting that } \vdash c_1 \{ w_1 \} \sim c_2 \{ w_2 \} \mid w_{\text{rel}} \text{ proves the correctness of } c_1 \text{ and } c_2 \text{ with respect to } w_1 \text{ and } w_2 \text{ we could try to presuppose it, however this idea does not fare well since it would require a property akin of cancellability with respect to } \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}(\text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} m_1 f_1) \leq \text{bind}^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}} w^m_1 w^f_1 \Rightarrow \vartheta^{W^{\text{Exc}}_{\text{rel}}}_1 m_1 \leq w^m_1 \text{ that has no reason to hold in our examples.} \]
This problematic hypothesis only depends on the part of the context relevant for the left program
and not on the full context, so we introduce structured contexts $\Gamma = (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ in our judgments,
where $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are simple contexts. The judgment $\Gamma \vdash c_1 \{ w_1 \} \sim c_2 \{ w_2 \} \mid w_{\text{rel}}$ now presupposes
that $\Gamma_1 \vdash c_1 : M_1 A_1$, $\Gamma_1 \vdash w_1 : W_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and that $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash w_{\text{rel}} : W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$. The semantics of this judgment is given by
\[
\Gamma \models c_1 \{ w_1 \} \sim c_2 \{ w_2 \} \mid w_{\text{rel}} = \begin{cases} 
\forall \gamma_1 : \Gamma_1, \theta_1(c_1 \gamma_1) \leq w_1 \gamma_1, \\
\forall \gamma_2 : \Gamma_2, \theta_2(c_2 \gamma_2) \leq w_2 \gamma_2, \\
\gamma(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : \Gamma_1 \times \Gamma_2, \theta_{\text{rel}}(c_1 \gamma_1, c_2 \gamma_2) \leq w_{\text{rel}}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)
\end{cases}
\] (16)
A conceptual understanding of this interpretation that will be useful in the following is to consider
$\Gamma$ as a (trivial) relation $\Gamma^r = (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \lambda(\gamma_1 : \Gamma_1)(\gamma_2 : \Gamma_2) \mid \Gamma_1)$ instead of a pair and define the family of relations $\Theta^r(\gamma) = (\Theta_1(\gamma_1), \Theta_2(\gamma_2), \Theta_{\text{rel}} \gamma)$ dependent over $\Gamma^r$:
\[
\Theta_1(\gamma_1 : \Gamma_1) = \theta_1(c_1 \gamma_1) \leq w_1 \gamma_1, \quad \Theta_2(\gamma_2 : \Gamma_2) = \theta_2(c_2 \gamma_2) \leq w_2 \gamma_2,
\]
Then the relational judgment $\Gamma \models c_1 \{ w_1 \} \sim c_2 \{ w_2 \} \mid w_{\text{rel}}$ can be interpreted as a dependent function $(\gamma : \Gamma^r) \rightarrow \Theta^r \gamma$ in an appropriate relational dependent type theory.

### 3.3 A relational dependent type theory

Adding unary specifications in the relational judgment enables a full treatment of exceptions, however the pure rules of section §2.4 do not deal with a structured context $\Gamma^r = (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_{\text{rel}})$. In order to recover rules dealing with such a context, we apply the same recipe internally to a relational dependent type theory as described by Tonelli [2013]. In practice, this type theory is described as a syntactic model in the sense of Boulier et al. [2017], that is a translation from a source type theory to a target type theory that we take to be our ambient type theory, where a type in the source theory is translated to a pair of types and a relation between them. We call the resulting source type theory RDTT and describe part of its construction in Figure 3. A systematic construction of RDTT at the semantic level is obtained by considering families of types and functions indexed by the span $(1 \leftarrow \text{rel} \rightarrow 2)$, a special case of Kapulkin and Lumsdaine [2018].

Moving from our ambient type theory to RDTT informs us on how to define rules coming from the type theory. For instance, generalizing the rule for if-then-else, we can use the motive $P(ab : A^r + B^r) = \Theta^r(ab) : \text{Type}^r$ on the dependent eliminator for sum type
\[
\text{elim}_\text{sum} : (P : (A^r + B^r) \rightarrow \text{Type}^r) \rightarrow (a : A^r \rightarrow P a) \rightarrow (b : B^r \rightarrow P b) \rightarrow (x : A^r + B^r) \rightarrow P x
\]
to obtain a rule for case splitting. This eliminator translates to a large term described in the appendix §A.1 that induces the following relational rule using $w^l = (w_1^l, w_2^l, w_{\text{rel}}^l)$, $w^r = (w_1^r, w_2^r, w_{\text{rel}}^r)$ and the relational specifications of the conclusion – where we abbreviate pattern matching with a case construct – as arguments to the eliminator
\[
\Gamma, a : A^r \vdash c_1 [\text{Inl } a_1 / ab_1] \{ w_1^l \} \sim c_2 [\text{Inl } a_2 / ab_2] \{ w_2^l \} \mid w_{\text{rel}}^l[a_{\text{rel}} / ab_{\text{rel}}]
\]
\[
\Gamma, b : B^r \vdash c_1 [\text{Inr } b_1 / ab_1] \{ w_1^l \} \sim c_2 [\text{Inr } b_2 / ab_2] \{ w_2^l \} \mid w_{\text{rel}}^l[b_{\text{rel}} / ab_{\text{rel}}]
\]
\[
\Gamma^r, ab : A^r + B^r \vdash \begin{cases} 
\text{case } ab_1 [\text{Inl } a_1 / w_1^l] \mid \text{Inr } b_1 / w_1^r] \\
\text{case } ab_2 [\text{Inl } a_2 / w_1^l] \mid \text{Inr } b_2 / w_1^r]
\end{cases}
\]
As in the simple setting, we can then refine this rule to obtain synchronous or asynchronous rules specifying a required shape for the programs $c_1, c_2$. 

3.4 Relative monads and monad morphisms

Before giving the general framework able to derive monadic rules dealing with exceptions, we return to the notions of relative monads and relative monad morphisms, since these will be the common underlying concept relating the simple and generic frameworks.

**Definition 3 (Relative monads [Altenkirch et al. 2015])**. Let $I, C$ be categories and $\mathcal{F} : I \rightarrow C$ a functor between these. A $\mathcal{F}$-relative monad is given by

- for each $A \in I$, an object $\mathcal{T} A \in C$
- for each $A \in I$, a morphism $\text{ret}^\mathcal{T}_A \in C(\mathcal{F} A; \mathcal{T} A)$
- for each $A, B \in I$, a function $(-)^\mathcal{T} : C(\mathcal{F} A; \mathcal{T} B) \rightarrow C(\mathcal{T} A; \mathcal{T} B)$
- satisfying the 3 following equations

$$f^\mathcal{T} \circ \text{ret}^\mathcal{T}_A = f \quad (\text{ret}^\mathcal{T}_A)^{\mathcal{T}} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{T} A} \quad g^\mathcal{T} \circ f^\mathcal{T} = (g^\mathcal{T} \circ f)^\mathcal{T}$$

Noting $\mathcal{Type}$ for the category of types and functions of our ambient type theory, and $\mathcal{Pos}$ for the category of preordered sets and monotonic functions, a simple relational specification monad could be described as a relative monad $W_{\text{rel}} : \mathcal{Type}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Pos}$ over the functor $\text{Disc} \circ \times : \mathcal{Type}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Pos}$ sending a pair of types $(A_1, A_2)$ to their product $A_1 \times A_2$ equipped with a discrete preorder. The monotonicity condition imposed on $\text{bind}^{W_{\text{rel}}}$ amounts to require that all the structure is enriched in $\mathcal{Pos}$ [Kelly 1982]. The general study of enriched relative monads is outside the scope of this paper, but we will use these intuitions to define the general notion of relative specification monads and effect observations in the setting of the relational dependent type theory.

Simple relational effect observations from $M_1, M_2$ to $W_{\text{rel}}$ can also be interpreted as instances of relative monad morphisms. First, a pair of computational monads $M_1, M_2$ yields a monad $M_1 \otimes M_2 : \mathcal{Type}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Type}^2$ acting on pairs of types, that is $M_1 \otimes M_2 (A_1, A_2) = (M_1 A_1, M_2 A_2)$ with monadic structures provided by each sides. Second, by proposition 2.3 of Altenkirch et al. [2015], $M_1 \otimes M_2$
can be seen as a relative monad on the identity functor $\text{Id}_{\text{Type}}$. A simple relational effect observation is a relative monad morphism from $M_1 \otimes M_2$ to $W_{rel}$ over the functor $\text{Disc} \circ \times$.

**Definition 4 (Relative monad morphism).** Let $I, C_1, C_2$ be categories and $\mathcal{F}_1 : I \to C_1, \mathcal{F}_2 : I \to C_2, \mathcal{F} : C_1 \to C_2$ be functors such that $\varphi : \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}_1 \equiv \mathcal{F}_2$. A relative monad morphism from a $\mathcal{F}_1$-relative monad $\mathcal{T}_1 : I \to C_1$ to a $\mathcal{F}_2$-relative monad $\mathcal{T}_2 : I \to C_2$ is

- a natural transformation $\theta : \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{T}_1 \to \mathcal{T}_2$,
- such that

$$\theta \circ \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{T}_2 \circ \varphi \quad \theta \circ \mathcal{F}(f^{\tau_2}) = (\theta \circ \mathcal{F} \circ \varphi^{-1})^{\tau_2} \circ \theta$$

The notion of relative monad morphism defined by Altenkirch et al. [2015] is restricted to relative monads over the same base functor. We recover their definition by taking $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F} = \text{Id}$ and $\varphi = \text{id}$. This generalization should be seen as a relative monad analog to the monad opfunctors of Street [1972].

### 3.5 Relational specification monads, relational effect observations

Motivated by the case of exceptions, we now define the general notion of a relational specification monad. This definition is obtained by instantiating the definitions of an (enriched) relative monad to our relational dependent type theory, ensuring that we obtain a theory uniform with the simple setting, and crucially that we can use the same methodology to introduce relational rules.

**Definition 5.** A relational specification monad consist of

- for each pair of types $(A_1, A_2)$, types $W_1 A_1, W_2 A_2$ and a relation $W_{rel}(A_1, A_2) : W_1 A_1 \to W_2 A_2 \to \text{Type}$ between them, each equipped with a preorder $\leq_W$;
- operations

$$\begin{align*}
\text{ret}^{W_1} : A_1 &\to W_1 A_1 \\
\text{ret}^{W_2} : A_2 &\to W_2 A_2 \\
\text{ret}^{W_{rel}} : (a_1, a_2) : A_1 \times A_2 &\to W_{rel}(A_1, A_2) (\text{ret}^{W_1} a_1) (\text{ret}^{W_2} a_2)
\end{align*}$$

- operations

$$\begin{align*}
\text{bind}^{W_1} : W_1 A_1 &\to (A_1 \to W_1 B_1) \to W_1 B_1 \\
\text{bind}^{W_2} : W_2 A_2 &\to (A_2 \to W_2 B_2) \to W_2 B_2 \\
\text{bind}^{W_{rel}} : w_1 : W_1 A_1 &\to w_2 : W_2 A_2 \to w_{rel} : W_{rel}(A_1, A_2) w_1 w_2 \to w_{\downarrow} : (A_1 \to W_1 B_1) \to w_2 : (A_2 \to W_2 B_2) \\
&\mapsto w'_{\downarrow} : (((a_1, a_2) : A_1 \times A_2) \to W_{rel}(B_1, B_2) (w_{\downarrow} a_1) (w_{\downarrow} a_2)) \\
&\mapsto W_{rel}(B_1, B_2) (\text{bind}^{W_1} w_1 w_1') (\text{bind}^{W_2} w_2 w_2')
\end{align*}$$

monotonic in all arguments
- satisfying equations analogous to the monadic laws
- as well as monotonic operations $\tau_1 : w_1 : W_1 A_1 \to W_{rel}(A_1, \bot) w_1 (\text{ret}^{W_2}())$ and $\tau_2 : w_2 : W_2 A_2 \to W_{rel}(\bot, A_2) (\text{ret}^{W_1}()) w_2$ satisfying certain compatibility with the monadic operations detailed in the appendix §4.2.

If the presence of the operations $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ can seem surprising, they ensure in general that $W_1$ and $W_2$ are indeed unary specification monads, and are useful in practice when building transformers (see §3.6). In most of our examples the relation is constant, simplifying the type of operations to:

$$\begin{align*}
\text{ret}^{W_{rel}} : A_1 \times A_2 &\to W_{rel}(A_1, A_2) \\
\text{bind}^{W_{rel}} : W_1 A_1 &\to W_2 A_2 \to W_{rel}(A_1, A_2) \to
\end{align*}$$
This happens for our leading example of exceptions, but also for any relational specification monad constructed out of a simple relational specification monad. Indeed, we can associate to any simple relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}$ the relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) = (W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, 1), W_{\text{rel}}(1, A_2), \lambda w_1 w_2. W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2))$. The monadic operations just discard the superfluous arguments and $r_1, r_2$ are just identities.

In the general setting a relational effect observation consists of a triple $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_{\text{rel}}) : M_1 \otimes M_2 \rightarrow W$ where $\theta_1 : M_1 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}$, $\theta_2 : M_2 \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}$ are (plain) monad morphisms, and $\theta_{\text{rel}} : ((m_1, m_2) : M_1 A_1 \times M_2 A_2) \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)(\theta_1 m_1)(\theta_2 m_2)$ verify the two equations with respect to the monadic operations

$$\theta_{\text{rel}}(\text{ret}^{M_1} a_1, \text{ret}^{M_2} a_2) = \text{ret}^{W_{\text{rel}}}(a_1, a_2) : W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)(\theta_1 (\text{ret}^{M_1} a_1))(\theta_2 (\text{ret}^{M_2} a_2))$$

$$\theta_{\text{rel}}((\text{bind}^{M_1} m_1 f_1, \text{bind}^{M_2} m_2 f_2)) = \text{bind}^{W_{\text{rel}}}((\theta_1 m_1)(\theta_2 m_2)(\theta_{\text{rel}} m_{\text{rel}}))\theta_1 \circ f_1 \theta_2 \circ f_2 \theta_{\text{rel}} \circ (f_1 \times f_2)$$

Given a relational effect observation $\theta : M_1 \otimes M_2 \rightarrow W$, we can define in full generality the semantics of the relational judgment by the Equation 16. We introduce the generic monadic rules in Figure 4, and similarly to the simple setting obtain the following soundness theorem.

**Theorem 3 (Soundness of monadic rules).** The relational rules in Figure 4 are sound with respect to any relational effect observation $\theta$, that is

$$\Gamma^r \vdash c_1 \{w_1\} \sim c_2 \{w_2\} \mid w_{\text{rel}} \Rightarrow \forall \theta, \Gamma^r \vdash_\theta c_1 \{w_1\} \sim c_2 \{w_2\} \mid w_{\text{rel}}$$

### 3.6 Relational specification monad transformers

Having a category of relational specification monads, we define a relational specification monad transformer to be a pointed endofunctor on this category [Lüth and Ghani 2002]. We show that the usual state and exception transformer lifts to this setting, yielding in each case both a left-variant and a right-variant applying either to the left type $A_1$ or right one $A_2$ of a relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2)$. Since the two variants are symmetric, we only detail the left ones.

**Adding state.** The usual state monad transformer maps a monad $M$ to the monad $\text{StT}(M) A = S \rightarrow M(A \times S)$. The left relational state monad transformer $\text{StT}_{\text{rel}}$ maps a relational specification monad $W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) = (W_1 A_1, W_2 A_2, \lambda w_1 w_2. W_{\text{rel}}(A_1, A_2) w_1 w_2)$ to the relational specification monad with carrier

$$\text{StT}_{\text{rel}}(W)(A_1, A_2) = (\text{StT}(W_1) A_1, W_2 A_2, \lambda w_1 w_2. (s_1 : S_1) \rightarrow W_{\text{rel}}(A_1 \times S_1, A_2)(w_1 s_1) w_2)$$
The monadic operations on \(\mathsf{StT}(W)\) are given by the usual state transformer. The added data resides in the \(\mathsf{ret}\) and \(\mathsf{bind}\) operations responsible for the relational part:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{let } & \mathsf{ret}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{StT}(W)}(a_1, a_2) : (s_1 : S_1) \rightarrow W_{\mathsf{rel}}(A_1 \times S_1 A_2) \mathsf{(ret}_{\mathsf{StT}(W)}(a_1, s_1)) \cdot \mathsf{(ret}_{\mathsf{W}}^{W_2} a_2) = \lambda s_1. \mathsf{ret}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{W}(((a_1, s_1), a_2)) \\
\text{let } & \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{StT}(W)}(m_1 : \mathsf{StT}(W_1) A_1) (m_2 : W_2 A_2) (m_{\mathsf{rel}} : \mathsf{StT}(W))_{\mathsf{rel}}(A_1, A_2) m_1 m_2) \\
& (f_1 : A_1 \rightarrow \mathsf{StT}(W_1) (B_1)) (f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow W_2 B_3) \\
& (f_{\mathsf{rel}} : (a_1, a_2) : A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow \mathsf{StT}(W))_{\mathsf{rel}}(B_1, B_2) (f_1 a_1) (f_2 a_2)) \\
& : \mathsf{StT}(W)_{\mathsf{rel}}(B_1, B_2) (\mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{StT}(W)}^{\mathsf{rel}} m_1 f_1) (\mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{W}}^{\mathsf{W}} m_2 f_2) = \\
& \lambda s_1. \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{W}(m_1 s_1) m_2 (m_{\mathsf{rel}} s_1) (\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{rel}}(a_1, s_1), f_2 a_2) = \lambda s_1. \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{W}(m_1 s_1) m_2 (m_{\mathsf{rel}} s_1) (\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{rel}}(a_1, s_1), f_2 a_2) = \\
& \lambda s_1. \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{W}(m_1 s_1) m_2 (m_{\mathsf{rel}} s_1) (\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{rel}}(a_1, s_1), f_2 a_2) = \lambda s_1. \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{W}(m_1 s_1) m_2 (m_{\mathsf{rel}} s_1) (\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{rel}}(a_1, s_1), f_2 a_2)
\end{align*}
\]

Adding exceptions. In a similar flavor, the exception monad transformer \(\mathsf{ExcT}\) mapping a monad \(\mathsf{M}\) to \(\mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{M})\mathsf{A} = \mathsf{M}(A + E_1)\) gives raise to its relational specification monad counterpart \(\mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W})(A_1, A_2) = (\mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W})_1 A_1, W_2 A_2, \mathsf{rel}(A_1 + E_1, A_2))\). The bind operation is more involved here, and makes full use of the presence of the unary specifications.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{let } & \mathsf{ret}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W})}(a_1, a_2) : W_{\mathsf{rel}}(A_1 + E_1, A_2) \mathsf{(ret}_{\mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W})}^{\mathsf{W}}(a_1)) \cdot \mathsf{(ret}_{\mathsf{W}}^{\mathsf{W}} a_2) = \mathsf{ret}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{W}}(\mathsf{Inl} a_1, a_2)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{let } & \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W})}(m_1 : \mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W}_1) A_1) (m_2 : W_2 A_2) (m_{\mathsf{rel}} : \mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W}))_{\mathsf{rel}}(A_1, A_2) m_1 m_2) \\
& (f_1 : A_1 \rightarrow \mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W}_1) (B_1)) (f_2 : A_2 \rightarrow W_2 B_3) \\
& (f_{\mathsf{rel}} : (a_1, a_2) : A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow \mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W}))_{\mathsf{rel}}(B_1, B_2) (f_1 a_1) (f_2 a_2)) \\
& : \mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W})_{\mathsf{rel}}(B_1, B_2) (\mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{ExcT}(\mathsf{W})}^{\mathsf{rel}} m_1 f_1) (\mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{W}}^{\mathsf{W}} m_2 f_2) = \\
& \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{W}}(m_1, m_2, m_{\mathsf{rel}} \lambda a_{\mathsf{rel}}. \mathsf{match} a_{\mathsf{rel}} \mathsf{with} | \mathsf{Inl} a_1 \rightarrow f_{\mathsf{rel}} a_1 a_2 \\
& | \mathsf{Inr} e_1 \rightarrow \mathsf{bind}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{W}}(\mathsf{\tau}_{\mathsf{rel}} f_{\mathsf{rel}} a_2) (\lambda () . \mathsf{ret}_{\mathsf{rel}}^{\mathsf{W}}(\mathsf{Inr} e_1, b_2)))
\end{align*}
\]

Note the crucial use of the \(\mathsf{\tau}_{\mathsf{rel}} : W_2 A_2 \rightarrow W_{\mathsf{rel}}(\mathsf{Inr} A_2, W_{\mathsf{rel}})^2\) in the last error branch.

Putting these monad transformer to practice, we can finally define the full relational specification monad for exceptions validating the rules in Figure 5 by first lifting the simple relational \(\mathsf{W}_{\mathsf{Pure}}\), and applying the exception transformers on both left and right sides. Further, applications would involve specifications relating state and exceptions with rollback state.

4 EMBEDDING RELATIONAL PROGRAM LOGICS

4.1 Relational Hoare Logic

As explained in the introduction, Benton [2004]’s seminal relational Hoare logic (RHL) is at the origin of many works on relational program logics (see also §6). We present here a syntactic embedding of RHL, showing that our simple framework can host usual program logics.

Concretely, we define a translation from \(\mathsf{WHILE}\)-language to monadic programs using the \(\mathsf{Imp}\) monad, and show that the translation of all Benton [2004]’s rules (with the exception of two partial equivalence specific ones) are admissible in our framework using the effect observation \(\mathbf{\theta}_\mathsf{Part}\).

The translation from direct-style imperative programs to monadic ones follows closely Moggi’s [1989] interpretation of call-by-value in his monadic metalanguage. The \(\mathsf{Imp}\) monad of §2.6 directly interprets \(\mathsf{read}\) and \(\mathsf{write}\), and while loops are translated using the following definable combinator

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{let } & \mathsf{while} (\mathsf{guard} : \mathsf{Imp} B) (\mathsf{body} : \mathsf{Imp} 1) : \mathsf{Imp} 1 = \\
& \mathsf{do}_\mathsf{while} (\mathsf{bind}^{\mathsf{Imp}} \mathsf{guard} (\lambda b . \mathsf{if} b \mathsf{then} \mathsf{bind}^{\mathsf{Imp}} \mathsf{body} (\lambda () . \mathsf{ret}^{\mathsf{Imp}} \mathsf{tt}) \mathsf{else} \mathsf{ret}^{\mathsf{Imp}} \mathsf{ff}))
\end{align*}
\]

The proofs of admissibility for the various rules exhibit a recurrent pattern. We first use weakening to adapt the specification obtained through the translation to an appropriate shape for the rules of
\( w: W_{\text{Exc}} A \) (werr: E \rightarrow W_{\text{Exc}} A): W A = \\
\lambda \varphi. \ w (\lambda a. \text{match } a e \text{ with } | \text{Inl } a \rightarrow \text{ret } W_{\text{Exc}} a \varphi | \text{Inr } e \rightarrow \text{werr } e)

\begin{align*}
\text{let } w_{\text{catch }} \ (w: W_{\text{Exc}} A) (\text{werr: } E \rightarrow W_{\text{Exc}} A): W A = \\
\lambda \varphi. \ w (\lambda (a_1, a_2). \text{match } a_1, a_2 \text{ with } \\
| \text{Inl } a_1, \text{Inl } a_2 \rightarrow \text{ret } W_{\text{ml}} (a_1, a_2) \varphi \\
| \text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inl } a_2 \rightarrow \text{werr} \ e_1 (\lambda a_1 \rightarrow \varphi (a_1, \text{Inl } a_2)) \\
| \text{Inl } a_1, \text{Inr } e_2 \rightarrow \text{werr} \ e_2 (\lambda a_2 \rightarrow \varphi (\text{Inl } a_1, a_2)) \\
| \text{Inr } e_1, \text{Inr } e_2 \rightarrow \text{werr}_{\text{ml}} (e_1, e_2) \varphi)
\end{align*}

Fig. 5. Rules for exceptions

our logic. Then we use the pure and generic monadic rules to decompose the programs on both sides. Finally, effect specific rules together with admissibility of the premises finish the proof.

An easy corollary of our proof is that Benton [2004]'s relational rules are valid for our partial correctness semantics relates two programs whenever one of them diverges, whereas his requires both program to diverge.

4.2 Relational Hoare Type Theory

Nanevski et al. [2013] introduce Relational Hoare Type Theory (RHTT) for the specific goal of proving noninterference properties of programs. RHTT builds upon powerful but specific semantic objects embedded in the type theory of Coq to support specifications relating two runs of a single program. We explain here how we can reconstruct their model with a relational specification monad and an effect observation. This connection between the two frameworks could help extending RHTT to other effects, for instance exceptions.

A model of state and partiality. The effects supported by RHTT are manipulation of a structured heap – a refined version of the simple state monad of §2.1 – and partiality. In order to model these effects, a close variant of the following monad is used

\[ MA = (p : \text{heap} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \times (f : (r : \leq p) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{heap} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \times \text{coherent}(f) \]

where \( \leq p = \{ r : \text{heap} \rightarrow \mathbb{P} \mid \forall h, r h \rightarrow p h \} \) and the predicate \( \text{coherent} \) specifies that \( f \) is defined by its value on singleton predicates consisting of only one heap. Using predicates enables the definition of fixpoint operators, in the same fashion as we did in our interpretation of while loops for the Imp effect in §2.6.

The relational specification used by Nanevski et al. [2013] is a variation on the simple relational monad of stateful pre- and postconditions from §2.2 where the precondition only takes one input
heap corresponding to the fact only one program is considered at a time.

\[ \text{PP}_{rel}(A_1, A_2) = (heap \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \times (heap \times heap \rightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow heap \times heap \rightarrow \mathbb{P}) \]

Taking the same computational monad \( M \) on both sides, that is \( M_1 = M_2 = M \), we define the following simple relational effect observation \( \theta : M, M \rightarrow \text{PP}_{rel} \)

\[ \theta(c_1, c_2) = (\lambda h_0. \ \pi_1 c_1 h_0 \land \pi_1 c_2 h_0, \ \lambda(h_1, h_2)(a_1, a_2)(h'_1, h'_2). \ \pi_1 c_1 h_1 \land \pi_2 c_1 h_1 a_1 h'_1 \land \pi_1 c_2 h_2 \land \pi_2 c_2 h_2 a_2 h'_2) \]

5 PRODUCT PROGRAMS

The product programs methodology is an approach to prove relational properties that can serve as an alternative to relational program logics [Barthe et al. 2011, 2016]. In this section we show how to understand this methodology from the point of view of our framework.

Product programs reduce the problem of verifying relational properties on two programs \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) to the problem of verifying properties on a single product program \( c \) capturing at the same time the behaviors of \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \). To prove a relational property \( w \) on programs \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \), the methodology tells us to proceed as follows. First, we construct a product program \( c \) of \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \). Then, by standard methods, we prove that the program \( c \) satisfies the property \( w \) seen as a non-relational property. Finally, from a general argument of soundness, we can conclude that \( \varphi \) must hold on \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \).

In what follows, we show how these three steps would be understood in our framework if we wanted to prove \( \models_\theta c_1 \sim c_2 \{ w \} \).

First of all, we need a notion of product program. In the setting of monadic programs, we capture a product program of \( c_1 : M_1 A_1 \) and \( c_2 : M_2 A_2 \) as a program \( c : P(A_1, A_2) \), where \( P \) is a relative monad over \( (A_1, A_2) \rightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \) (see §3.4). We can think of \( c : P(A_1, A_2) \) as a single computation that is computing both a value of type \( A_1 \) and a value of type \( A_2 \) at the same time. We expect \( P \) to support the effects from both \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \), mixing them in a controlled way. As a concrete example, we can define products of stateful programs \( - M_1 A_1 = St_{S_1} A_1 \) and \( M_2 A_2 = St_{S_2} A_2 \) - inhabiting the relative monad \( P^{St}(A_1, A_2) = St_{S_1 \times S_2}(A_1 \times A_2) \). To complete the definition of product programs, we also need to explain when a concrete product program \( c : P(A_1, A_2) \) is capturing the behavior of \( c_1 : M_1 A_1 \) and \( c_2 : M_2 A_2 \). We propose to capture this in a relation \( c_1 \times c_2 \sim c \) that exhibits the connection between between pairs of computations and their potential product programs. This relation should be closed under the monadic construction of the effects, that is

\[
\begin{align*}
  a_1 : A_1 & \quad a_2 : A_2 & \quad m_1 \times m_2 \rightarrow m_{rel} \quad \forall a_1, a_2, f_1 a_1 f_2 a_2 \rightarrow f_{rel} (a_1, a_2) \\
  \text{ret}^{M_1} a_1 \times \text{ret}^{M_2} a_2 \rightarrow \text{ret}^P (a_1, a_2) & \quad \text{bind}^{M_1} m_1 f_1 \times \text{bind}^{M_2} m_2 f_2 \rightarrow \text{bind}^P m_{rel} f_{rel}
\end{align*}
\]

but also spells out how particular effects that \( P \) supports correspond to the effects from \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \).

Second, to fully reproduce the product program methodology, we need to explain how specifications relate to product programs. We can use simple relational specification monads (§2.2) for specifying the properties on products programs. The lifting of unary specification monads described there extends to unary effect observations, providing an important source of examples of effect observations for product programs. For example, going back to the example of state, we can specify product programs in \( P(A_1, A_2) = St_{S_1 \times S_2}(A_1 \times A_2) \) with specifications provided by the simple relational specification monad \( W_{rel}^{St} \), and the effect observation \( \zeta : P \rightarrow W_{rel}^{St} \) obtained by lifting the unary effect observation \( \theta^{St} : St \rightarrow W^{St} \) of the introduction, resulting in

\[ \zeta : (f : S_1 \times S_2 \rightarrow (A_1 \times A_2) \rightarrow (S_1 \times S_2)) = \lambda \varphi (s_1, s_2). \ \varphi (f (s_1, s_2)) \]

where \( \sigma : (A_1 \times A_2) \times (S_1 \times S_2) \rightarrow (A_1 \times S_1) \times (A_2 \times S_2) \) simply swaps the arguments. Then, the concrete proof verifying the property \( w \) in this step consists of proving \( \zeta (c) \leq w \) as usual.

Finally, the third step simply relies on (proving and then) applying a soundness theorem for product programs as stated below:
Theorem 4 (Soundness of product programs). If \( c_1 \times c_2 \sim c \) and \( \zeta(c) \leq w \), then \( \models_{\theta_{\text{rel}}} c_1 \sim c_2 \{ w \} \).

For state, this theorem is proved by analyzing the relation \( c_1 \times c_2 \sim c \) and showing in each case that our choice of \( \theta_{\text{rel}} \) and \( \zeta \) agree.

The interpretation of product programs as computations in a relative monad accommodate well the product program methodology. In particular we expect that algebraic presentations of these relative monads used for product programs could shed light on the choice of primitive rules in relational program logics, in a Curry-Howard fashion. We leave this as a stimulating future work.

6 RELATED WORK

Many different relational verification tools have been proposed, making different tradeoffs, especially between automation and expressiveness. This section surveys this prior work, starting with the techniques that are closest related to ours.

Relational program logics. Relational program logics are very expressive and provide a formal foundation for various tools, which have found practical applications in various domains. Benton [2004] introduced Relational Hoare Logic (RHL) as a way to prove the correctness of various static analysis and optimizing transformations for imperative programs. Yang [2007] extended this to the relational verification of pointer-manipulating programs. Barthe et al.’s [2009] introduced pRHL as an extension of RHL to discrete probabilities and showed that pRHL can provide a solid foundation for cryptographic proofs, which inspired further research in this area [Barthe et al. 2014; Basin et al. 2017; Petcher and Morrisett 2015; Unruh 2019] and lead to the creation of semi-automated tools such as EasyCrypt [Barthe et al. 2013a]. Barthe et al. [2013b] also applied variants of pRHL to differential privacy, which led to the discovery of a strong connection [Barthe et al. 2017] between coupling proofs in probability theory and relational program logic proofs, which are in turn connected to product programs even without probabilities [Barthe et al. 2016].

Carbin et al. [2012] introduced a program logic for proving acceptability properties of approximate program transformations. Nanevski et al. [2013] proposed Relational Hoare Type Theory (RHTT), a verification system for proving rich information flow and access control policies about pointer-manipulating programs in dependent type theory. Banerjee et al. [2016] addressed similar problems using a relational program logic with framing and hypotheses. Sousa and Dillig [2016] devised Cartesian Hoare Logic for verifying k-safety hyperproperties and implement it in the DESCARTES tool. Finally, Aguirre et al. [2017] introduced Relational Higher-Order Logic (RHOL) as a way of proving relational properties of pure programs in a simply typed \( \lambda \)-calculus with inductive types and recursive definitions. RHOL was later separately extended to two different monadic effects: cost [Radicke et al. 2018] and continuous probabilities with conditioning [Sato et al. 2019].

Each of these logics is specific to a particular combination of side-effects that is fixed by the programming language and verification framework. We instead introduce a general framework for defining program logics for arbitrary monadic effects. We show that logics such as RHL and HTT can be reconstructed within our framework, and we expect this to be the case for many of the logics above. It would also be interesting to investigate whether RHOL can also be extended to arbitrary monads, but even properly representing arbitrary monads, which is completely straightforward in dependent type theory, is not obvious in less powerful systems such as HOL [Lochbihler 2018].

Relators. Gavazzo [2018] recently proposed a type system for differential privacy that is parameterized by a signature of algebraic effects. The type system is given a relational interpretation in terms of relators, which lift relations on values to relations on monadic computations:

\[ \Gamma : (A_1 \times A_2 \to \mathbb{P}) \to MA_1 \times MA_2 \to \mathbb{P}. \]
Lochbihler [2018] also used relators in a recent library for effect polymorphic definitions and proofs in Isabelle/HOL, based on value-monomorphic monads. There seems to be a strong connection between such relators and the effect observations going into one of the simplest relational specification monads we consider: \((A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P\). Such an effect observation has type 
\[ MA_1 \times MA_2 \rightarrow (A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow P) \rightarrow P,\]
which is isomorphic to the type of the relator \(\Gamma\) above (this is obvious to see by just swapping the two arguments). While further investigating this connection is very interesting, since relators are inherently lax this requires first working out the theory of lax effect observations, for which the relative monad morphism laws hold with \(\leq\) instead of \(=\) (see the end of §2.3). While we expect such an extension to our framework to be possible and generally useful, the technical development is involved even for the simple setting of §2, so we leave it for future work (§7).

**Type systems and static analysis tools.** Various type systems and static analysis tools have been proposed for statically checking relational properties in a sound, automatic, but over-approximate way. The type systems for information flow control generally trade off precision for good automation [Sabelfeld and Myers 2003]. Various specialized type systems and static analysis tools have also been proposed for checking differential privacy [Barthe et al. 2015; Gaboardi et al. 2013; Gavazzo 2018; Winograd-Cort et al. 2017; Zhang and Kifer 2017] or doing relational cost analysis [Çiçek et al. 2017].

**Product program constructions.** Product program constructions and self-composition are techniques aimed at reducing the verification of k-safety properties [Clarkson and Schneider 2010] to the verification of traditional (unary) safety properties of a product program that emulates the behavior of multiple input programs. Multiple such constructions have been proposed [Barthe et al. 2016] targeted for instance at secure IFC [Barthe et al. 2011; Naumann 2006; Terauchi and Aiken 2005; Yasuoka and Terauchi 2014], program equivalence for compiler validation [Zaks and Pnueli 2008], equivalence checking and computing semantic differences [Lahiri et al. 2012], program approximation [He et al. 2018]. Sousa and Dillig’s [2016] DESCARTES tool for k-safety properties also creates k copies of the program, but uses lockstep reasoning to improve performance by more tightly coupling the key invariants across the program copies. Recently Antonopoulos et al. [2017] propose a tool that obtains better scalability by using a new decomposition of programs instead of using self-composition for k-safety problems.

**Logical relations and bisimulations.** Many semantic techniques have been proposed for reasoning about relational properties such as observational equivalence, including techniques based on binary logical relations [Ahmed et al. 2009; Benton et al. 2009, 2013, 2014; Dreyer et al. 2010, 2011, 2012; Mitchell 1986], bisimulations [Dal Lago et al. 2017; Koutavas and Wand 2006; Sangiorgi et al. 2011; Sumii 2009] and combinations thereof [Hur et al. 2012, 2014]. While these powerful techniques are often not directly automated, they can still be used for verification [Timany and Birkedal 2019] and for providing semantic correctness proofs for relational program logics [Dreyer et al. 2010, 2011] and other verification tools [Benton et al. 2016; Gavazzo 2018].

**Other program equivalence techniques.** Beyond the ones already mentioned above, many other techniques targeted at program equivalence have been proposed; we briefly review several recent works: Benton et al. [2009] do manual proofs of correctness of compiler optimizations using partial equivalence relations. Kundu et al. [2009] do automatic translation validation of compiler optimizations by checking equivalence of partially specified programs that can represent multiple concrete programs. Godlin and Strichman [2010] propose proof rules for proving the equivalence of recursive procedures. Lucanu and Rusu [2015] and Ştefan Ciobăcă et al. [2016] generalize this to a set of co-inductive equivalence proof rules that are language-independent. Wang et al. [2018] verify
equivalence between a pair of programs that operate over databases with different schemas using bisimulation invariants over relational algebras with updates. Finally, automatically checking the equivalence of processes in a process calculus is an important building block for security protocol analysis [Blanchet et al. 2008; Chadha et al. 2016].

Reasoning about effectful semantics. Relating monadic expressions is natural and very wide-spread in proof assistants like Coq, Isabelle [Lochbihler 2018], or F* [Grimm et al. 2018], with various degrees of automation. Boulier et al. [2017]; Casinghino et al. [2014]; Pédrot and Tabareau [2018] extend dependent type theory with a few selected primitive effects: partiality, exceptions, reader. The resulting theory allows to some extent to reason directly on pairs of effectful programs, without resorting to a monadic encoding. In another line of work, Barthe et al. [2019] proposed to encode the semantics of imperative programs and their relational properties in an extension of first-order logic that can be automated by Vampire.

7  CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK
This paper introduced a principled framework for building the next 700 relational program logics. Now it’s time to put this framework to the test and discover whether it can deal with more complex effects such as probabilities, continuations, or concurrency, whether it can be in part automated, and whether it can be scaled to realistic relational verification tasks. An interesting research direction, opened by the correspondence with product programs, would be to develop techniques to select which proof rules should be considered as primitive, using proof-theoretical tools like focusing [Zeilberger 2009], but also investigating at the categorical level notions of presentations of relative monads, in connection with the theory of monads with arities [Berger et al. 2012]. Finally, it also remains to be seen whether our notion of relational effect observations can be generalized to turn the laws from equalities to inequalities. The proof of Theorem 2 from §2.5 would be easy to extend, and this extension would allow for more examples, including the ones previously done using relators such as simulations for nondeterminism [Dal Lago et al. 2017], and would also make certain examples such as relational partial correctness easier. Yet the technical development seems more involved, even for the simple setting of §2.
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A  APPENDIX
A.1  Translation from RDTT
In this appendix we give the translation from RDTT to the ambient type theory of the type of the dependent eliminator for sum types:

\[
[\text{elim\_sum}] : (P_1 : A_1 + B_1 \rightarrow \text{Type}) \rightarrow (P_2 : A_2 + B_2 \rightarrow \text{Type}) \rightarrow \\
(P_{\text{ncl}} : \forall (ab_1 : A_1 + B_1) (ab_2 : A_2 + B_2), (A^r + B^r)_{\text{ncl}} ab_1 ab_2 \rightarrow \text{Type}) \rightarrow \\
(\forall (a_1 : A_1), P_1 (\text{Inl} a_1)) \rightarrow (\forall (a_2 : A_2), P_2 (\text{Inl} a_2)) \rightarrow \\
(\forall a_1 a_2 (a_{\text{ncl}} : A^r a_1 a_2), P_{\text{ncl}} (\text{Inl} a_1)(\text{Inl} a_2) a_{\text{ncl}}) \rightarrow \\
(\forall (b_1 : B_1), P_1 (\text{Inr} b_1)) \rightarrow (\forall (b_2 : B_2), P_2 (\text{Inr} b_2)) \rightarrow \\
(\forall b_1 b_2 (b_{\text{ncl}} : B^r b_1 b_2), P_{\text{ncl}} (\text{Inr} b_1)(\text{Inr} b_2) b_{\text{ncl}}) \rightarrow \\
\forall ab_1 ab_2 (ab_{\text{ncl}} : (A^r + B^r)_{\text{ncl}} ab_1 ab_2), P_{\text{ncl}} ab_1 ab_2 ab_{\text{ncl}}
\]
As explained in §3.3 this eliminator can then be used to obtain the rule for sums
\[
\Gamma, a : A^r + c_1 \left[ \text{Inl} \ a_1/ab_1 \right] \{w_1^1\} \sim c_2 \left[ \text{Inl} \ a_2/ab_2 \right] \{w_2^1\} \mid w_{1n}^{\alpha_n/ab_{\alpha_n}} \\
\Gamma, b : B^r + c_1 \left[ \text{Inr} \ b_1/ab_1 \right] \{w_1^2\} \sim c_2 \left[ \text{Inr} \ b_2/ab_2 \right] \{w_2^2\} \mid w_{2n}^{\alpha_n/ab_{\alpha_n}}
\]

\[\Gamma^r, ab : A^r + B^r + \begin{cases}
  c_1 \{ \text{case } ab_1 [\text{Inl} a_1, w_1^1] \mid \text{Inr} b_1, w_1^2] \} & \text{case } ab_1, ab_2 \begin{cases}
    \text{Inl} a_1, \text{Inl} a_2, w_1^1 \mid \text{Inr} b_1, \text{Inr} b_2, w_1^2
  \end{cases} \\
  c_2 \{ \text{case } ab_2 [\text{Inl} a_2, w_2^1] \mid \text{Inr} b_2, w_2^2] \}
\end{cases}\]

A.2 Categorical details on relational specification monads

In this appendix, we explicit the connection between the relative monads of §3.4 and the relational specification monads as presented in §3.5. We start by introducing notations for classical categorical notions.

For \( C \) a category, we write \( \text{Span}(C) \), for the category of spans in \( C \) and morphisms of spans. We usually interpret a span as a relation between two objects in \( C \). There is a functor mapping any type \( A \) to the span \( A \xleftarrow{\text{id}} A \xrightarrow{\text{id}} A \) and we use this together with \( \text{Disc} : \mathcal{Type} \rightarrow \mathcal{Pos} \) – the functor endowing a type with a discrete preorder structure, to consider \( \mathcal{Type}^\mathcal{S} \) as enriched over \( \text{Span}(\mathcal{Pos}) \), that is preordered relations. The function mapping a pair of types \( (A_1, A_2) \) to the span

\[
\text{Disc } A_1 \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \text{Disc } A_1 \times \text{Disc } A_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \text{Disc } A_2
\]

extends to an enriched functor that we name \( \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{R} \). A \textit{pre-relational specification monad} is a \( \text{Span}(\mathcal{Pos}) \)-enriched relative monad over \( \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{R} \). Unfolding this definition, a pre-relational specification monad \( W \) consist of a mapping from pairs of types \( (A_1, A_2) \) to a spans

\[
W_1(A_1, A_2) \leftarrow W_{n_1}(A_1, A_2) \rightarrow W_2(A_1, A_2),
\]

together with return and bind operations satisfying monotonicity conditions.

The potential dependency of \( W_1 \) in \( A_2 \) (respectively \( W_2 \) in \( A_1 \)) is an artifact of the construction that we do not expect of actual relational specification monads, so we require an additional structure on \( W \) that ensures that this dependency is inessential in the form of two operations

\[
\tau_1 : w_1 : W_1(A_1, 1) \rightarrow W_{n_1}(A_1, 1) w_1(\text{ret}_{W_2}(\emptyset)), \\
\tau_2 : w_2 : W_2(1, A_2) \rightarrow W_{n_2}(1, A_2) (\text{ret}_{W_1}(\emptyset)) w_2.
\]

Where do these operations come from and what are they needed for?

From any pre-relational specification monad, we can derive four specification monads – two for each legs of the span – by combining restrictions of the domain and projections:

\[
W_1^1 A = W_1(A, 1) \\
W_1^2 A = W_1(1, A) \\
W_1^\mathcal{S} A = (w : W_1(A, 1)) \times W_{n_1}(A, 1) w (\text{ret}_{W_2}(\emptyset)) \\
W_1^{\mathcal{S}} A = (w : W_2(1, A)) \times W_{n_2}(1, A) (\text{ret}_{W_1}(\emptyset)) w
\]

There is an obvious projection morphism \( \pi^1 : W_1^\mathcal{S} \rightarrow W_1^1 \) (resp. \( \pi^2 : W_1^\mathcal{S} \rightarrow W_1^2 \)) and we require that \( \tau_1 \) (resp. \( \tau_2 \)) is a section of \( \pi_1 \), in particular it needs to be monad morphism.

A relational specification monad is then defined to be a pre-relational specification monad together with monad morphisms \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \) respectively sections of the projections \( \pi^1, \pi^2 \). The reason why we recover the an equivalent definition to §3.5 is because of the following theorem:

**Theorem 5.** The mapping from pre-relational specification monad to pre-relational specification monad sending

\[
W(A_1, A_2) = W_1(A_1, A_2) \leftarrow W_{n_1}(A_1, A_2) \rightarrow W_2(A_1, A_2)
\]

to

\[
\overline{W}(A_1, A_2) = W_1(A_1, 1) \leftarrow W_{n_1}(A_1, A_2) \rightarrow W_2(1, A_2)
\]

extends to an idempotent monad on the category of pre-relational specification monads equipped with structure \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \).
In particular any pre-relational specification monad equipped with $\tau_1, \tau_2$ can be canonically completed to a relational specification monad in the sense of §3.5.
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