

# Semantics for Variational Quantum Programming

XIAODONG JIA, Hunan University, China

ANDRE KORNELL, Tulane University, USA

BERT LINDENHOVIUS, Johannes Kepler Universität, Austria

MICHAEL MISLOVE, Tulane University, USA

VLADIMIR ZAMDZHIEV, Inria, France

We consider a programming language that can manipulate both classical and quantum information. Our language is type-safe and designed for variational quantum programming, which is a hybrid classical-quantum computational paradigm. The classical subsystem of the language is the Probabilistic FixPoint Calculus (PFPC), which is a lambda calculus with mixed-variance recursive types, term recursion and probabilistic choice. The quantum subsystem is a first-order linear type system that can manipulate quantum information. The two subsystems are related by mixed classical/quantum terms that specify how classical probabilistic effects are induced by quantum measurements, and conversely, how classical (probabilistic) programs can influence the quantum dynamics. We also describe a sound and computationally adequate denotational semantics for the language. Classical probabilistic effects are interpreted using a recently-described commutative probabilistic monad on DCPO. Quantum effects and resources are interpreted in a category of von Neumann algebras that we show is enriched over (continuous) domains. This strong sense of enrichment allows us to develop novel semantic methods that we use to interpret the relationship between the quantum and classical probabilistic effects. By doing so we provide the first denotational analysis that relates models of classical probabilistic programming to models of quantum programming.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Quantum Programming, Probabilistic Programming, Semantics

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Variational quantum algorithms [McClean et al. 2016; Peruzzo et al. 2014] are increasingly important in quantum computation. The main idea is to use hybrid classical-quantum algorithms that work in tandem to solve computational problems. The classical part of the computation is executed on a classical processor and the quantum part on a quantum device. During the overall computation, intermediary results produced by the quantum device occur with certain probabilities, and then are passed to the classical processor, which performs computations that are used to tune the parameters of the quantum component of the algorithm, thereby influencing the quantum dynamics.

These kinds of hybrid classical-quantum algorithms pose interesting challenges for the design of suitable programming languages. Clearly, if we wish to understand how to program in such scenarios, we need to devise a type system equipped with an operational semantics that correctly models the manipulation of *quantum resources*. This includes accounting for the fact that quantum measurements induce *probabilistic computational effects* that are inherited by the classical side of the system. Moreover, quantum information behaves very differently from classical information. For instance, quantum information cannot be copied [Wootters and Zurek 1982]. In order to avoid potential runtime errors, a *substructural typing discipline* [Benton 1995; Benton and Wadler 1996; Girard 1987] where contraction is restricted is appropriate for the quantum subsystem. But,

---

Authors' addresses: Xiaodong Jia, School of Mathematics, Hunan University, Changsha, 410082, China; Andre Kornell, Department of Computer Science, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA; Bert Lindenhovius, Department of Knowledge-Based Mathematical Systems, Johannes Kepler Universität, Linz, Austria; Michael Mislove, Department of Computer Science, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA; Vladimir Zamdzhiev, Université de Lorraine, LORIA, Inria, Nancy, F 54000, France.

when manipulating classical information, such restrictions are unnecessary and often inconvenient. Therefore we wish to have a classical (non-linear) subsystem together with a quantum (linear) one that interact nicely with each other. Furthermore, separating the quantum and classical modes of operations has the added benefit that it makes it easier to *extend* existing classical programming languages with the necessary features for type-safe variational quantum programming.

The purpose of the present paper is to address this challenge by describing a type-safe programming language that combines classical (probabilistic) computation with quantum computation. Another one of our goals is to provide a denotational interpretation so that we may establish useful reasoning principles and therefore cement the design of our language.

## 1.1 Our Contributions

We describe a programming language that is suitable for hybrid classical-quantum computation that we call VQPL, the *Variational Quantum Programming Language* (§2). The language has two kinds of judgements: a classical (non-linear) judgement that represents classical programs, and a quantum (linear) judgement that represents quantum programs. Our type system also contains hybrid classical-quantum formation rules that explain how classical probabilistic and quantum computation interact with each other (see Figure 7).

From an operational perspective, VQPL supports both classical probabilistic and quantum effects. The quantum dynamics are modelled via a probabilistic reduction relation on quantum configurations (terms with quantum data embedded within them), where the probabilities of reduction are determined in accordance with the laws of quantum mechanics. The classical dynamics are modelled via a probabilistic reduction relation on terms, where the probabilities of reduction are induced by the quantum dynamics. We show that our system VQPL is type-safe (§2.3).

We also provide a denotational interpretation of our system. We use a recently-described commutative probabilistic monad on the category DCPO [Jia et al. 2021] in order to interpret the classical probabilistic effects (we recall this construction in §3). We interpret quantum effects and resources in the category of hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras (§4), which are mathematical structures used by physicists to study quantum foundations [Takesaki 2000]. We prove that this category is enriched over *continuous domains* (§4.3). This is a very strong sense of enrichment that allows us to develop novel semantic methods that we use to interpret the relationship between the quantum and classical probabilistic effects (§5). In particular, we show that the theory of Kegelspitzen [Keimel and Plotkin 2017] provides a crucial link between the two different ways that probability arises on the classical and quantum sides, respectively. This allows us to systematically present all the relevant mathematical structure within a categorical model (§6) and to use our model to provide a sound and strongly adequate interpretation of VQPL (§7). Our paper is the first to present a mathematical and denotational analysis on the link between models of classical probabilistic programming and quantum programming. We discuss related work and provide concluding remarks in §8.

## 2 VQPL - THE VARIATIONAL QUANTUM PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE

In this section we describe the syntax and operational semantics for VQPL. The classical subsystem is the *Probabilistic FixPoint Calculus* (PFPC), the same language as in [Jia et al. 2021]. PFPC is a call-by-value simply-typed lambda calculus with mixed-variance recursive types, (induced) term recursion and discrete probabilistic choice. The quantum fragment of the language is a first-order linear type system with inductive types and equipped with the usual primitives for manipulating quantum information. This fragment is most similar to [Péchoux et al. 2020], however in the present paper we choose a Church-style syntax in order to more easily relate it to the classical subsystem. The distinguishing feature of our system is the mixed linear/non-linear and quantum/classical

Quantum Type Variables	$X, Y$	Classical Type Variables	$X, Y$
Quantum Type Contexts	$\Theta$	$::=$	$X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$
Classical Type Contexts	$\Theta$	$::=$	$X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$
Quantum Types	$A, B$	$::=$	$X \mid I \mid \mathbf{qbit} \mid A \oplus B \mid A \otimes B \mid \mu X.A$
Classical Types	$P, R$	$::=$	$X \mid 1 \mid P + R \mid P \times R \mid P \rightarrow R \mid Q(A, B) \mid \mu X.P$
Observable Quantum Types	$O$	$::=$	$X \mid I \mid O_1 \oplus O_2 \mid O_1 \otimes O_2 \mid \mu X.O$
Observable Classical Types	$O$	$::=$	$X \mid 1 \mid O_1 + O_2 \mid O_1 \times O_2 \mid \mu X.O$

$\frac{\Theta \vdash}{\Theta \vdash \Theta_i}$	$\frac{\Theta \vdash}{\Theta \vdash I}$	$\frac{\Theta \vdash}{\Theta \vdash \mathbf{qbit}}$	$\frac{\Theta \vdash A \quad \Theta \vdash B}{\Theta \vdash A \star B}$	$\star \in \{\oplus, \otimes\}$	$\frac{\Theta, X \vdash A}{\Theta \vdash \mu X.A}$
$\frac{\Theta \vdash}{\Theta \vdash \Theta_i}$	$\frac{\Theta \vdash}{\Theta \vdash 1}$	$\frac{\Theta \vdash P \quad \Theta \vdash R}{\Theta \vdash P \star R}$	$\star \in \{+, \times, \rightarrow\}$	$\frac{\cdot \vdash A \quad \cdot \vdash B}{\Theta \vdash Q(A, B)}$	$\frac{\Theta, X \vdash P}{\Theta \vdash \mu X.P}$
$ X  \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X$	$ I  \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$	$ O_1 \otimes O_2  \stackrel{\text{def}}{=}  O_1  \times  O_2 $	$ O_1 \oplus O_2  \stackrel{\text{def}}{=}  O_1  +  O_2 $	$ \mu X.O  \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu X. O $	

Fig. 1. Grammars and formation rules for types and translation between observable types.

rules that allow the programmer to switch between the classical and quantum modes of operation. These features make our language suitable for programming variational quantum algorithms, where both classical and quantum computation work in synchrony in order to solve computational problems. Our mixed quantum/classical rules have some similarities with the QWIRE/EWIRE languages [Paykin et al. 2017; Rennela and Staton 2020], but both of these languages have some severe limitations that make them unsuitable for describing variational quantum algorithms, whereas our language does not. This is discussed in more detail in §8.

In order to make the paper easier to read, we use **bold** notation for the quantum types, contexts and terms, so that we can easily distinguish them from the classical primitives.

## 2.1 The Type Structure

We use  $X, Y$  to range over *classical type variables* and we use  $X, Y$  to range over *quantum type variables*. We use  $\Theta$  and  $\Theta$  to range over classical and quantum *type contexts*, respectively. Type variables and type contexts are used for the formation of recursive types, just like in FPC [Abadi and Fiore 1996; Fiore and Plotkin 1994]. We say that a classical type context  $\Theta = X_1, \dots, X_n$  is *well-formed*, written  $\Theta \vdash$ , whenever all type variables within it are distinct, and likewise for a quantum type context. The *classical types* of our language are ranged over by  $P, R$ , and the *quantum types* are ranged over by  $A, B$ . The grammars and formation rules for our types are specified in Figure 1. The notation  $\Theta \vdash P$  indicates that type  $P$  is *well-formed* in type context  $\Theta$ , and likewise for the quantum types. Of course, we are only interested in well-formed types and from now on we only deal with such types. The *closed classical types* are those where  $\cdot \vdash P$  and the *closed quantum types* are those where  $\cdot \vdash A$ . Notice that recursive types may be formed with no restrictions on the admissible logical polarities, just like in FPC.

We now explain how our types should be understood. On the quantum side:  $I$  is the quantum unit type;  $\mathbf{qbit}$  is the type of qubits (quantum bits);  $A \oplus B$  represents quantum sum types;  $A \otimes B$  represents quantum pair types;  $\mu X.A$  is used to form quantum inductive types. All terms of quantum type obey a linear typing discipline and so these types should be viewed as being linear. On the classical side:  $1$  is the classical unit type;  $P + R$  is for classical sum types;  $P \times R$  is for classical pair types;  $P \rightarrow R$  is for classical (higher-order) function types;  $\mu X.P$  is used to form classical recursive types;  $Q(A, B)$  is the type of *first-order* quantum lambda abstractions between quantum types  $A$  and  $B$ . All terms of classical type follow a non-linear typing discipline (no restrictions on weakening and contraction), so they should be understood as being non-linear. Notice that

the type  $Q(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$  is *classical* (non-linear). This is because our quantum lambda abstractions are first-order and therefore they may be used any number of times (including zero). This type would correspond to  $!(\mathbf{A} \multimap \mathbf{B})$  in a call-by-value linear lambda calculus and may be informally thought of in this way.

**Example 2.1.1.** Some important (closed) types are defined as follows: *Booleans* as  $\text{Bool} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 + 1$ ; *Bits* as  $\text{Bit} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{I} \oplus \mathbf{I}$ ; *Natural numbers* as  $\text{Nat} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu X.1 + X$ ; *Linear/Quantum natural numbers* as  $\text{QNat} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu X.\mathbf{I} \oplus X$ ; *Lists of type A* as  $\text{List}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu X.1 + (A \times X)$ ; *Linear/Quantum lists of type A* as  $\text{List}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu X.\mathbf{I} \oplus (A \otimes X)$ ; *Classical Streams of type A* as  $\text{Stream}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu X.1 \rightarrow A \times X$ .

A *subset* of our classical/quantum types are the *observable* classical/quantum types, which are defined in Figure 1. We use  $O$  and  $\mathbf{O}$  to range over the observable classical/quantum types, respectively. These types play an important role for some of the mixed quantum-classical rules that we explain later. The observable quantum types may also be understood from a physical perspective because values of these types correspond to physically observable information. An example of a non-observable quantum type is **qbit**. Indeed, observing a qubit in the physical sense is done via a quantum measurement, which destroys the qubit and produces a bit as output (note that **Bit** is observable in our system). The observable classical types are exactly the *ground types*, i.e., types formed without any use of classical/quantum function space. The observable quantum types are in a 1-1 correspondence with the observable classical types. For each observable quantum type  $\mathbf{O}$ , we write  $|\mathbf{O}|$  to indicate its observable classical counterpart. See Figure 1 for a precise definition of  $|\cdot|$ .

## 2.2 The Term Language

For the formation of terms and term contexts, we implicitly assume that all types within are closed and well-formed. We use  $x, y$  to range over *classical term variables* and  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  to range over *quantum term variables*. Classical term contexts are ranged over by  $\Phi$  and quantum term contexts by  $\Gamma$ . The (well-formed) term contexts are simply lists of (distinct) variables with their types.

The term grammars of VQPL are specified in Figure 2. We write  $\Phi \vdash m : P$  to indicate that a classical term  $m$  is well-formed and has type  $P$  given classical context  $\Phi$ . We write  $\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}$  to indicate that a quantum term  $\mathbf{q}$  is well-formed and has type  $\mathbf{A}$ , given classical context  $\Phi$  and quantum context  $\Gamma$ . A classical term  $m$  of type  $A$  is *closed* when  $\cdot \vdash m : A$  and in this case we also simply write  $m : A$ . Likewise we write  $\mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}$  when  $\cdot; \cdot \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}$ , and then we also say  $\mathbf{q}$  is closed. We use  $v, w$  to range over classical values and  $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$  to range over quantum values (see Figure 2).

**Example 2.2.1.** Important closed values include: the (classical) *false* and *true* values given by  $\text{ff} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{in}_1() : \text{Bool}$  and  $\text{tt} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{in}_2() : \text{Bool}$ ; the false and true bits are defined by  $\text{ff} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{in}_1* : \text{Bit}$  and  $\text{tt} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{in}_2* : \text{Bit}$ ; the *zero natural number*  $\text{zero} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{fold in}_1() : \text{Nat}$  and the *successor function*  $\text{succ} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda n^{\text{Nat}}.\text{fold in}_2 n : \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat}$ ; quantum versions of zero and succ may also be defined.

Execution of (quantum) programs is described by the small-step call-by-value operational semantics in Figures 8–10. If  $m$  and  $n$  are classical terms, we write  $m \xrightarrow{p} n$  to indicate that  $m$  reduces to  $n$  with probability  $p \in [0, 1]$  in exactly one step. Note that the probabilistic behaviour of reduction in the classical subsystem is induced by quantum measurements from the quantum subsystem.

**2.2.1 Quantum Configurations.** Reduction for the quantum fragment is described, as usual, in terms of *quantum configurations*  $[|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$ , which may be seen as terms with embedded quantum information. We describe quantum configurations following [Pagani et al. 2014; Péchoux et al. 2020]. Given  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we write  $\mathbf{qbit}^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{qbit} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{qbit}$  for the  $n$ -fold tensor product of **qbit**.

Quantum Variables	$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$	Classical Variables	$x, y$	Quantum Configurations	$C ::= [ \psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$
Classical Terms	$m, n$	$::= x \mid () \mid (m, n) \mid \pi_1 m \mid \pi_2 m \mid \text{fold } m \mid \text{unfold } m \mid \lambda x.m \mid mn \mid$ $in_1 m \mid in_2 m \mid (\text{case } m \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow n_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow n_2) \mid$ $\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n).q \mid \text{new} \mid \text{meas} \mid U \mid \text{run } C$			
Quantum Terms	$\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}$	$::= \mathbf{x} \mid * \mid \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{q} \otimes \mathbf{r} \mid \text{let } \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r} \mid \text{fold } \mathbf{q} \mid \text{unfold } \mathbf{q} \mid m\mathbf{q} \mid \text{init } m \mid$ $\text{in}_1 \mathbf{q} \mid \text{in}_2 \mathbf{q} \mid (\text{case } \mathbf{q} \text{ of } \text{in}_1 \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_1 \mid \text{in}_2 \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_2) \mid \text{let } x = \text{lift } \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r}$			
Classical Values	$v, w$	$::= x \mid () \mid (v, w) \mid in_1 v \mid in_2 v \mid \text{fold } v \mid \lambda x.m \mid \lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n).q \mid$ $\text{new} \mid \text{meas} \mid U$			
Quantum Values	$\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$	$::= \mathbf{x} \mid * \mid \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{w} \mid \text{in}_1 \mathbf{v} \mid \text{in}_2 \mathbf{v} \mid \text{fold } \mathbf{v}$			

Fig. 2. Grammars for terms, values and quantum configurations.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Phi, x : P \vdash x : P} \quad \frac{}{\Phi \vdash () : 1} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : P \quad \Phi \vdash n : R}{\Phi \vdash (m, n) : P \times R} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : P_1 \times P_2}{\Phi \vdash \pi_i m : P_i} \quad i \in \{1, 2\} \\
\\
\frac{\Phi \vdash m : P}{\Phi \vdash in_1 m : P + R} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : R}{\Phi \vdash in_2 m : P + R} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : P_1 + P_2 \quad \Phi, x : P_1 + n_1 : R \quad \Phi, y : P_2 + n_2 : R}{\Phi \vdash (\text{case } m \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow n_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow n_2) : R} \\
\\
\frac{\Phi, x : P \vdash m : R}{\Phi \vdash \lambda x^P.m : P \rightarrow R} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : P \rightarrow R \quad \Phi \vdash n : P}{\Phi \vdash mn : R} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : P[\mu X.P/X]}{\Phi \vdash \text{fold } m : \mu X.P} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : \mu X.P}{\Phi \vdash \text{unfold } m : P[\mu X.P/X]}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3. Formation rules for terms in the (classical) FPC subsystem.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Phi; \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A} \vdash \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}} \quad \frac{}{\Phi; \cdot \vdash * : \mathbf{I}} \quad \frac{\Phi; \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{I} \quad \Phi; \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A}}{\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A}} \quad \frac{\Phi; \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A} \quad \Phi; \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{B}}{\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{q} \otimes \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Phi; \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \mathbf{A}_2 \quad \Phi; \Gamma_2, \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A}_2 \vdash \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{B}}{\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \text{let } \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{B}} \quad \frac{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}[\mu X.A/X]}{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \text{fold } \mathbf{q} : \mu X.A} \quad \frac{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mu X.A}{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \text{unfold } \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}[\mu X.A/X]} \\
\\
\frac{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}}{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \text{in}_1 \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B}} \quad \frac{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}}{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \text{in}_2 \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Phi; \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}_1 \oplus \mathbf{A}_2 \quad \Phi; \Gamma_2, \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{A}_1 \vdash \mathbf{r}_1 : \mathbf{B} \quad \Phi; \Gamma_2, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A}_2 \vdash \mathbf{r}_2 : \mathbf{B}}{\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash (\text{case } \mathbf{q} \text{ of } \text{in}_1 \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_1 \mid \text{in}_2 \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_2) : \mathbf{B}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 4. Formation rules for terms in the purely linear first-order subsystem.

$$\frac{}{\Phi \vdash \text{new} : Q(\mathbf{bit}, \mathbf{qbit})} \quad \frac{}{\Phi \vdash \text{meas} : Q(\mathbf{qbit}, \mathbf{bit})} \quad \frac{U \text{ is a unitary of arity of } n}{\Phi \vdash U : Q(\mathbf{qbit}^{\otimes n}, \mathbf{qbit}^{\otimes n})} \quad \mathbf{bit} \equiv \mathbf{I} \oplus \mathbf{I}$$

Fig. 5. Formation rules for term constants that manipulate quantum information.

$$\mid * \mid \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} () \quad \mid \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{w} \mid \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (|\mathbf{v}\rangle, |\mathbf{w}\rangle) \quad \mid \text{in}_1 \mathbf{v} \mid \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} in_1 |\mathbf{v}\rangle \quad \mid \text{in}_2 \mathbf{v} \mid \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} in_2 |\mathbf{v}\rangle \quad \mid \text{fold } \mathbf{v} \mid \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{fold } |\mathbf{v}\rangle$$

Fig. 6. Translation between *closed* and observable quantum/classical values.

$$\frac{\Phi; \mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n : \mathbf{A}_n \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}}{\Phi \vdash \lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n).q : Q(\mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_n, \mathbf{B})} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash m : Q(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) \quad \Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}}{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash m\mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash C : \mathbf{O}; \mathbf{qbit}^k}{\Phi \vdash \text{run } C : |\mathbf{O}\rangle} \\
\\
\frac{\Phi \vdash m : |\mathbf{O}\rangle}{\Phi; \cdot \vdash \text{init } m : \mathbf{O}} \quad \frac{\Phi; \Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{O} \quad \Phi, x : |\mathbf{O}\rangle; \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A}}{\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \text{let } x = \text{lift } \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A}}$$

Fig. 7. Formation rules for terms that mediate between the quantum and classical modes of operation.

**Definition 2.2.2** (Quantum Configuration). A *quantum configuration* is a triple  $[|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$ , where:  $|\psi\rangle$  is a *pure quantum state*, i.e., a normalised vector in  $\mathbb{C}^{2^n}$ ;  $\mathbf{q}$  is a quantum term;  $\ell : \text{QFV}(\mathbf{q}) \rightarrow \{1, \dots, \dim(|\psi\rangle)\}$  is a function from the set of free *quantum variables* of  $\mathbf{q}$  into the indicated set, where  $\dim(|\psi\rangle) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n$  is *dimension* of  $|\psi\rangle$ . We refer to  $\ell$  as the *linking function*. A quantum configuration  $[|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$  is *well-formed* in classical context  $\Phi$  with type  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $k$  auxiliary qubits, which we write as  $\Phi \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}] : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$ , whenever the following conditions are satisfied:

- $\Phi; \mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{qbit}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m : \mathbf{qbit} \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}$  is a well-formed quantum term.
- $\dim(|\psi\rangle) = m + k$ .
- The linking function  $\ell : \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, m + k\}$  is injective.

A configuration  $[|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$  is *total* if  $\Phi \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}] : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^0$ , which we abbreviate by  $\Phi \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}] : \mathbf{A}$ . Thus, in a total configuration  $\ell$  defines a 1 - 1 correspondence between the qubits of  $|\psi\rangle$  and the free quantum variables of  $\mathbf{q}$ . A configuration is *closed* if  $\cdot \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}] : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$ , for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We are primarily interested in well-formed configurations that are both total and closed. Nevertheless, the premises of the structural reduction rules in the operational semantics include non-total configurations that have some auxiliary qubits not used by the quantum term, so it is necessary also to consider non-total configurations (see [Pagani et al. 2014; Péchoux et al. 2020] for more details). Otherwise, the configurations in the premises would not be typable, so it is necessary to allow auxiliary qubits as part of the formation conditions. Likewise, the denotational semantics includes configurations that are not closed, because the interpretation of closed terms may be defined using non-closed terms (e.g. lambda abstractions).

The linking function  $\ell$  in a configuration  $[|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$  associates the free variables of  $\mathbf{q}$ , each of type  $\mathbf{qbit}$ , to specific qubits of the quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$ ;  $\ell$  is needed because some of the qubits in  $|\psi\rangle$  may be entangled, in which case  $|\psi\rangle$  cannot be broken down into smaller quantum states.

We use calligraphic letters  $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$  to range over quantum configurations. Given quantum configurations  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  we write  $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{D}$  to indicate that  $\mathcal{C}$  reduces to  $\mathcal{D}$  with probability  $p$  in exactly one step. This is how we model the execution of quantum programs. A *value configuration* is a configuration  $\mathcal{V} = [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{v}]$ , where  $\mathbf{v}$  is a quantum value. Reduction in the quantum subsystem terminates at value configurations, just as reduction in the classical system terminates at values.

**2.2.2 The Subsystem FPC.** We have organised the term formation rules and the associated reduction rules into several subsystems, which we now describe. Figure 3 specifies the formation rules for the classical terms that make up the subsystem FPC (which is well-known [Abadi and Fiore 1996; Fiore and Plotkin 1994; Fiore 1994]). The notation  $P[\mu X.P/X]$  represents type substitution, which is defined as usual. The reduction rules for these terms are standard and are shown in Figure 8.

**2.2.3 The Subsystem QPL.** Figure 4 describes the formation rules for the quantum terms that make up a first-order linear subsystem with inductive types. These terms and their reduction rules are all standard, but they are now described on quantum configurations in Figure 8. For the structural reduction rules involving quantum evaluation contexts, the notation  $\ell \cap \ell_0 = \emptyset$  indicates that the linking functions  $\ell$  and  $\ell_0$  have disjoint domains and the notation  $\ell \cup \ell_0$  indicates the disjoint union of the two linking functions. The terms from Figure 4 do not directly modify the quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$ .

Figure 5 lists the formation rules for the term constants that we use to manipulate quantum information. Note that these constants are values of type  $Q(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$  and therefore are classical/non-linear (and may be used any number of times). The associated reduction rules for quantum function application using these constants are presented in Figure 9. The term  $U(\mathbf{x}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{x}_k)$  applies the



unitary operation  $U$  to the qubits identified by the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  and modifies the quantum state in the configuration accordingly. The term **new ff** (resp. **new tt**) creates a new qubit in state  $|0\rangle$  (resp.  $|1\rangle$ ), creates a fresh new qubit variable that points to it and modifies the quantum configuration accordingly. The term **meas y** measures the qubit identified by variable  $y$  and produces bit **tt** or **ff** with probability given by the Born rule of quantum mechanics. This operation *irreversibly* modifies the quantum state and causes a *probabilistic computational effect*.

The terms in Figures 4 and 5 can be thought of as jointly making up a subsystem that we call QPL (it is roughly equivalent to QPL in [Péchox et al. 2020; Selinger 2004a]), which is a first-order language for quantum programming.

**2.2.4 Mixed Classical/Quantum Terms.** Both subsystems (P)FPC (Figure 3) and QPL have been studied previously (for very different purposes). The main distinguishing feature of VQPL is that it demonstrates how these subsystems can be combined and used simultaneously for variational quantum programming. The terms and formation rules that allow us to achieve this are presented in Figure 7, and we now describe them in greater detail.

The term  $\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n).q$  is a value which represents a *first-order* quantum lambda abstraction. Note that this value is actually classical (non-linear). The term  $m q$  represents *quantum function application*. In our view, this is the most interesting rule in VQPL. This is because its subterm  $m : Q(A, B)$  represents a *probabilistic classical program* that eventually reduces to a quantum lambda abstraction. Because of this, the term  $m q$  combines classical probabilistic computation with quantum computation (represented by the subterm  $q$ ), and this is reflected in the associated reduction rules in Figure 10. Providing a semantic interpretation of this term requires considerable effort and the development of novel semantic methods, as we show later.

The *observable* quantum/classical values are simply quantum/classical values of observable types with observable context. The closed observable quantum values are in 1-1 correspondence with the closed observable classical values, which is made precise by the assignment  $|-|$  from Figure 6. Therefore  $|-|$  may be seen as a translation, not only between the observable types, but also between their closed values, and so we may think of them as carrying the same information. In the sequel, we see that this view extends to our denotational interpretation as well. Observable types and values are important, because they play a special role in the terms we introduce next.

Given any configuration  $C$  of *observable* type, the term “run  $C$ ” reduces the configuration  $C$  to some value configuration  $[|\psi\rangle, \emptyset, v]$ , then extracts the observable quantum value  $v$  from it and produces its *classical counterpart*  $|v|$  as the result of the overall computation. Note that in this situation, the observable value  $v$  does not depend on the quantum data, because it necessarily has an empty quantum context and thus empty linking function, and therefore the remaining quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$  may be safely discarded (this is consistent with affine approaches to quantum programming, see [Clairambault et al. 2019; Péchox et al. 2020; Selinger 2004a]). The term “run  $C$ ” is classical, and it allows us to execute quantum algorithms on a quantum computer and then extract the resulting *observable* information into our classical subsystem for further manipulation. The entire process is probabilistic. It is convenient to introduce some syntactic sugar. Given a closed quantum term  $\cdot; \vdash q : O$  of observable type, we can define  $\text{run } q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{run } [1, \emptyset, q]$ . Users of the programming language are not expected to write the more general terms “run  $C$ ” (which are useful for formalising the operational and denotational semantics), but only the sugarised terms “run  $q$ ”. The term “init  $m$ ” performs the reverse function of that of “run”, i.e., given a classical (probabilistic) process  $m$  of observable type, the term “init  $m$ ” prepares observable quantum information as indicated by the observable value that  $m$  reduces to in the end.

Finally, the “let  $x = \text{lift } q \text{ in } r$ ” term allows us to execute a quantum term  $q$  of observable type and then promote the observable quantum information it produces to the classical world, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1(v, w) &\xrightarrow{1} v & \pi_2(v, w) &\xrightarrow{1} w & \text{unfold fold } v &\xrightarrow{1} v & (\lambda x.m)v &\xrightarrow{1} m[v/x] \\ (\text{case } in_1 v \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow n_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow n_2) &\xrightarrow{1} n_1[v/x] & (\text{case } in_2 v \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow n_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow n_2) &\xrightarrow{1} n_2[v/y] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &[[\psi], \ell, \text{let } x \otimes y = v \otimes w \text{ in } r] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \ell, r[v/x, w/y]] \\ &[[\psi], \ell, \text{case } in_1 v \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow r_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow r_2] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \ell, r_1[v/x]] \\ &[[\psi], \ell, \text{case } in_2 v \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow r_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow r_2] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \ell, r_2[v/y]] \\ &[[\psi], \ell, \text{unfold fold } v] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \ell, v] \\ &[[\psi], \ell, *; r] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \ell, r] & [[\psi], \ell, \text{let } x = \text{lift } v \text{ in } r] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \ell, r[v/x]] \\ E ::= [\cdot] \mid (E, m) \mid (v, E) \mid \pi_i E \mid in_i E \mid (\text{case } E \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow n_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow n_2) \mid Em \mid vE \mid (\text{un})\text{fold } E \\ E ::= [\cdot] \mid E \otimes q \mid v \otimes E \mid \text{let } x \otimes y = E \text{ in } r \mid in_i E \mid (\text{case } E \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow r_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow r_2) \mid E; q \mid (\text{un})\text{fold } E \mid \\ &\text{let } x = \text{lift } E \text{ in } r \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{m \xrightarrow{p} m'}{E[m] \xrightarrow{p} E[m']} \quad \frac{[[\psi], \ell, q] \xrightarrow{p} [[\psi'], \ell', q'] \quad \ell \cap \ell_0 = \emptyset = \ell' \cap \ell_0}{[[\psi], \ell \cup \ell_0, E[q]] \xrightarrow{p} [[\psi'], \ell' \cup \ell_0, E[q']]}$$

Fig. 8. Classical evaluation contexts ( $E$ ), quantum evaluation contexts ( $E$ ) and associated reduction rules.

$$\begin{aligned} &[[\psi], \ell, U(\mathbf{x}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{x}_k)] \xrightarrow{1} [(\sigma \circ (U \otimes \text{id}) \circ \sigma^{-1})|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{x}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{x}_k], \\ &\text{for any permutation } \sigma, \text{ s.t. } \sigma(i) = \ell(\mathbf{x}_i), 1 \leq i \leq k. \\ &[[\psi], \emptyset, \text{new ff}] \xrightarrow{1} [|\psi\rangle \otimes |0\rangle, \{\mathbf{x} \mapsto \dim(|\psi\rangle) + 1\}, \mathbf{x}] \quad [[\psi], \emptyset, \text{new tt}] \xrightarrow{1} [|\psi\rangle \otimes |1\rangle, \{\mathbf{x} \mapsto \dim(|\psi\rangle) + 1\}, \mathbf{x}], \\ &\text{where } \mathbf{x} \text{ is chosen fresh.} \\ &\left[ \alpha \left( \sum_i \alpha_i |b_i\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |b'_i\rangle \right) + \beta \left( \sum_i \beta_i |b_i\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \otimes |b'_i\rangle \right), \{\mathbf{y} \mapsto j\}, \text{meas } \mathbf{y} \right] \xrightarrow{|\alpha|^2} \left[ \sum_i \alpha_i |b_i\rangle \otimes |b'_i\rangle, \emptyset, \text{ff} \right] \\ &\left[ \alpha \left( \sum_i \alpha_i |b_i\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |b'_i\rangle \right) + \beta \left( \sum_i \beta_i |b_i\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \otimes |b'_i\rangle \right), \{\mathbf{y} \mapsto j\}, \text{meas } \mathbf{y} \right] \xrightarrow{|\beta|^2} \left[ \sum_i \beta_i |b_i\rangle \otimes |b'_i\rangle, \emptyset, \text{tt} \right], \\ &\text{where } \dim(|b_i\rangle) = j - 1, \text{ so that the } j\text{-th qubit is measured.} \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 9. Rules for manipulating quantum information.

$$\begin{aligned} &[[\psi], \ell, (\lambda(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n).q)(\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{v}_n)] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \ell, q[\mathbf{v}_1/\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n/\mathbf{x}_n]] \\ &\text{run } [[\psi], \emptyset, \mathbf{v}] \xrightarrow{1} |\mathbf{v}| \quad [[\psi], \emptyset, \text{init } |\mathbf{v}|] \xrightarrow{1} [[\psi], \emptyset, \mathbf{v}] \\ &\frac{m \xrightarrow{p} m'}{[[\psi], \ell, m\mathbf{q}] \xrightarrow{p} [[\psi], \ell, m'\mathbf{q}]} \quad \frac{[[\psi], \ell, \mathbf{q}] \xrightarrow{p} [[\psi'], \ell', \mathbf{q}']}{[[\psi], \ell, v\mathbf{q}] \xrightarrow{p} [[\psi'], \ell', v\mathbf{q}']} \\ &\frac{[[\psi], \ell, \mathbf{q}] \xrightarrow{p} [[\psi'], \ell', \mathbf{q}']}{\text{run } [[\psi], \ell, \mathbf{q}] \xrightarrow{p} \text{run } [[\psi'], \ell', \mathbf{q}']} \quad \frac{m \xrightarrow{p} m'}{[[\psi], \emptyset, \text{init } m] \xrightarrow{p} [[\psi], \emptyset, \text{init } m']} \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 10. Rules for quantum function application and extracting observable (quantum) information.



we may use it any number of times within the continuation  $\mathbf{r}$  (see Figure 8). This term therefore implements what is often called "dynamic lifting" in the quantum programming literature. From a structural perspective, it is the only term that allows us to modify the non-linear context of quantum terms and as such may be compared to the corresponding rules of the LNL calculus [Benton 1995; Benton and Wadler 1996]. In practice, this term is useful for describing quantum processes where we measure a *part of* our quantum state and use the measurement outcome to influence the subsequent quantum dynamics. It is necessary for protocols like quantum teleportation.

### 2.3 Type Safety

The next two propositions show VQPL is type-safe. The first proposition shows type assignment is preserved by reduction, and as a consequence, totality of quantum configurations also is preserved.

**Proposition 2.3.1** (Type Preservation). *If  $\Phi \vdash m : P$  and  $m \xrightarrow{p} n$ , then  $\Phi \vdash n : P$ . Likewise, if  $\Phi \vdash C : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  and  $C \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{D}$ , then  $\Phi \vdash \mathcal{D} : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$ . In both of these situations, if  $p < 1$ , then there exists a term  $n'$  (resp. configuration  $\mathcal{D}'$ ), such that  $m \xrightarrow{1-p} n'$  (resp.  $C \xrightarrow{1-p} \mathcal{D}'$ ).*

**Proposition 2.3.2** (Progress). *If  $\cdot \vdash m : P$ , then either  $m$  is a value or there exists a classical term  $n$ , such that  $m \xrightarrow{p} n$  for some  $p \in (0, 1]$ . Likewise, if  $\cdot \vdash C : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$ , then either  $C$  is a value configuration or there exists a quantum configuration  $\mathcal{D}$ , such that  $C \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{D}$  for some  $p \in (0, 1]$ .*

*Remark 2.3.3.* As usual, Progress holds for all *closed* terms/configurations, whereas Type Preservation holds for all well-formed terms/configurations, including the *open* ones. Here we note that the static semantics is independent of the translation  $|-|$  on values. This translation only matters for three rules in our operational semantics and it is restricted to closed observable values (in Figure 6), because otherwise Type Preservation would fail for *open* terms/configurations.

### 2.4 Recursion and Asymptotic Behaviour of Reduction

It is well-known that type recursion induces term recursion in FPC [Abadi and Fiore 1996; Fiore 1994; Harper 2016], and this also is true for VQPL. The call-by-value fixpoint operator

$$\cdot \vdash \text{fix}_{P \rightarrow R} : ((P \rightarrow R) \rightarrow P \rightarrow R) \rightarrow P \rightarrow R$$

may be *derived* at any function type  $P \rightarrow R$  (see [Abadi and Fiore 1996] and [Fiore 1994, §8] for more details). This fixpoint operator allows us to write recursive functions.

The probability that a term  $m$  reduces to a value  $v$  (in any number of steps) may be determined as in [Pagani et al. 2014]. The *probability weight* of a reduction path  $\pi = (m_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} \dots \xrightarrow{p_n} m_n)$  is  $P(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=1}^n p_i$ . The probability that  $m$  reduces to the value  $v$  in *at most*  $n$  steps is

$$P(m \rightarrow_{\leq n} v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\pi \in \text{Paths}_{\leq n}(m, v)} P(\pi),$$

where  $\text{Paths}_{\leq n}(m, v)$  is the set of all reduction paths from  $m$  to  $v$  whose length is at most  $n$ . The probability that  $m$  reduces to the value  $v$  in *any number* of steps is  $P(m \rightarrow_* v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_i P(m \rightarrow_{\leq i} v)$ . Similarly, the probability that a quantum configuration  $C$  reduces to a value configuration  $\mathcal{V}$  (in any number of steps) is denoted  $P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V})$ ; it is determined in exactly the same way as above by substituting the notion of term with that of configuration. Finally, the overall probability that a term  $m$  or configuration  $C$  *terminates* is given by:

$$\text{Halt}(m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{v \in \text{Val}(m)} P(m \rightarrow_* v) \quad \text{Halt}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{ValC}(C)} P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\text{ValC}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathcal{V} \mid \mathcal{V} \text{ is a value configuration and } P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) > 0\}$  and  $\text{Val}(m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v \mid v \text{ is a value and } P(m \rightarrow_* v) > 0\}$ . Note that both sums may be countably infinite.

## 2.5 Examples

We now illustrate VQPL with some example programs.

**Example 2.5.1.** A fair coin toss can be defined by using some simple quantum resources:  $\text{coin}_{0.5} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{run}(\text{meas}(H(\text{new ff}))) : \text{Bool}$ , where  $H$  represents the Hadamard unitary operation. More generally, by replacing  $H$  with a suitable unitary operation  $U_p$ , a biased coin toss  $\text{coin}_p$  may be defined for  $p \in [0, 1]$  with reduction behaviour  $P(\text{coin}_p \rightarrow_* \text{ff}) = p$  and  $P(\text{coin}_p \rightarrow_* \text{tt}) = 1 - p$ . Notice that  $\text{coin}_p : \text{Bool}$  is a *classical term*. This shows that classical discrete probabilistic choice is *derivable* and therefore the language PFPC [Jia et al. 2021] is a subsystem of VQPL.

**Example 2.5.2.** The fixpoint operator  $\text{fix}$  allows us to write classical recursive functions (as usual), but it also enables us to write quantum recursive functions. The function  $\text{Ts}$  below applies the unitary  $T$  to each qubit in a list. Defining, for brevity,  $\text{Fqs} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q(\text{List}(\mathbf{qbit}), \text{List}(\mathbf{qbit}))$ , let:

$$\text{Ts}' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{fix}_{\mathbf{x}_1 \rightarrow \text{Fqs}} \lambda f^{1 \rightarrow \text{Fqs}}. \lambda x^1. \lambda (\mathbf{qs}). \text{case}(\mathbf{qs}) \text{ of } \text{nil} \Rightarrow \text{nil} \mid \mathbf{q} :: \mathbf{qs}' \Rightarrow T\mathbf{q} :: (fx)\mathbf{qs}') : 1 \rightarrow \text{Fqs},$$

where we used some (hopefully obvious) syntactic sugar for pattern matching of (linear) lists.

The recursive call is performed by the  $fx$  expression, which is of type  $\text{Fqs}$ . Setting  $\text{Ts} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Ts}'()$  :  $Q(\text{List}(\mathbf{qbit}), \text{List}(\mathbf{qbit}))$ , we get the desired function. An example quantum execution is given by  $P([\lvert 111 \rangle, \ell, \text{Ts}(\mathbf{x}_1 :: \mathbf{x}_2 :: \mathbf{x}_3 :: \text{nil})] \rightarrow_* [(T \otimes T \otimes T)\lvert 111 \rangle, \ell, \mathbf{x}_1 :: \mathbf{x}_2 :: \mathbf{x}_3 :: \text{nil}]) = 1$ , where  $\ell$  is the linking function defined by  $\ell(\mathbf{x}_i) = i$ . This shows that classical recursion *induces* recursion on the quantum subsystem and therefore a quantum fixpoint operator is obviously derivable.

## 3 PROBABILISTIC EFFECTS AND (COMMUTATIVE) VALUATIONS MONADS

As we already explained, PFPC is a subsystem of our language. In this section we recall the construction of the commutative monad  $\mathcal{M} : \text{DCPO} \rightarrow \text{DCPO}$  of [Jia et al. 2021], which we also use in our denotational semantics. Our classical judgements are interpreted in the Kleisli category  $\text{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ , which provides a sound and (strongly) adequate model of PFPC [Jia et al. 2021].

### 3.1 Domain-theoretic and Topological Preliminaries

If  $D$  is a partially ordered set (*poset*), a nonempty subset  $A$  of  $D$  is called *directed* if each pair of elements in  $A$  has an upper bound in  $A$ . Then  $D$  is a *directed complete poset* (*dcpo*, for short) if each of its directed subsets has a supremum. For example, the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  is a dcpo in the usual ordering. A *Scott-continuous map*  $f : D \rightarrow E$  between (posets) dcpo's is a function that is monotone and preserves (existing) suprema of directed subsets. *Pointed posets* have least elements, usually denoted by  $\perp_D$  if  $D$  is the ambient poset. A Scott-continuous function  $f : D \rightarrow E$  between pointed dcpo's is *strict* if  $f$  preserves the least element, that is,  $f(\perp_D) = \perp_E$ .

The category  $\text{DCPO}$  of dcpo's and Scott-continuous functions is complete, cocomplete and Cartesian closed [Abramsky and Jung 1994]. The categorical (co)product of the dcpo's  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  is denoted  $A_1 \times A_2$  ( $A_1 + A_2$ ), with  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  ( $\text{in}_1, \text{in}_2$ ) the associated (co)projections. Initial and terminal objects of  $\text{DCPO}$  are denoted by  $\emptyset$  and  $1$ , which are the empty dcpo and the singleton dcpo, respectively. For dcpo's  $A$  and  $B$ , the internal hom of  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\text{DCPO}$  is  $[A \rightarrow B]$ , the space of all Scott-continuous functions  $f : A \rightarrow B$  ordered pointwise.

The category  $\text{DCPO}_{\perp!}$  of *pointed* dcpo's and *strict* Scott-continuous functions is symmetric monoidal closed when equipped with the smash product and strict Scott-continuous function space, and it also is complete and cocomplete [Abramsky and Jung 1994].

The *Scott topology*  $\sigma D$  on a dcpo  $D$  consists of the upper subsets  $U = \uparrow U \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in D \mid (\exists u \in U) u \leq x\}$  that are *inaccessible by directed suprema*: i.e., if  $A \subseteq D$  is directed and  $\sup A \in U$ , then  $A \cap U \neq \emptyset$ . The topological space  $(D, \sigma D)$  is also written as  $\Sigma D$ . Scott-continuous functions between dcpo's  $D$  and  $E$  are exactly the continuous functions between  $\Sigma D$  and  $\Sigma E$  [Gierz et al. 2003, Proposition II-2.1]. We always equip  $[0, 1]$  with the Scott topology unless stated otherwise.

If  $B \subseteq D$  and  $D$  is a dcpo, then  $B$  is a *sub-dcpo* if every directed subset  $A \subseteq B$  satisfies  $\sup_D A \in B$ , where  $\sup_D A$  denotes the supremum of  $A$  in  $D$ . In this case,  $B$  is a dcpo in the induced order from  $D$  and  $\sup_D A = \sup_B A$  for each directed subset  $A$  of  $B$ .

### 3.2 The Monad $\mathcal{M}$

If  $X$  is a topological space, then the open set lattice  $OX$  is a complete lattice in the inclusion order, hence a dcpo. A *subprobability valuation* on  $X$  is a Scott-continuous function  $\nu: OX \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that is strict ( $\nu(\emptyset) = 0$ ) and modular ( $\nu(U) + \nu(V) = \nu(U \cup V) + \nu(U \cap V)$ ). The set  $\mathcal{V}X$  of subprobability valuations on  $X$  is a dcpo in the *stochastic order* defined by:  $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2$  if and only if  $\nu_1(U) \leq \nu_2(U)$  for all  $U \in OX$ , for  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{V}X$ , and the supremum of a directed family of valuations  $\{\nu_i\}_{i \in I}$  is computed pointwise:  $(\sup_{i \in I} \nu_i)(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{i \in I} \nu_i(U)$ , for all  $U \in OX$ . The least element of  $\mathcal{V}X$  is the constantly zero valuation  $0_X$ . The dcpo  $\mathcal{V}X$  also enjoys a convex structure: if  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{V}X$  and  $r_i \geq 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \leq 1$ , then the convex sum  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \nu_i$ , defined by  $(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \nu_i)(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \nu_i(U)$  for  $U \in OX$ , also is in  $\mathcal{V}X$ .

The *Dirac valuations*  $\delta_x$ , for  $x \in X$ , are defined by  $\delta_x(U) = 1$  if  $x \in U$  and  $\delta_x(U) = 0$  otherwise. These are canonical examples of subprobability valuations, as are their convex sums, which we call *simple valuations*: they have form  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \delta_{x_i}$ , where  $x_i \in X$ ,  $r_i \geq 0$ , and  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \leq 1$ . The simple valuations are denoted  $SX$ , and  $SX \subseteq \mathcal{V}X$ , but  $SX$  is not a dcpo in general.

If  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a continuous function and  $\nu \in \mathcal{V}X$ , the *integral of  $f$  against  $\nu$*  is given by the Choquet formula

$$\int_{x \in X} f(x) d\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_0^1 \nu(f^{-1}((t, 1])) dt,$$

where the right side is a Riemann integral of the bounded antitone function  $t \mapsto \nu(f^{-1}((t, 1]))$ . Since  $f$  is continuous, and  $(t, 1] \subseteq [0, 1]$  is Scott open for each  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $f^{-1}((t, 1])$  is open in  $X$ , so  $\nu(f^{-1}((t, 1]))$  is well defined. Thus the integral makes sense. If no confusion can occur, we simply write  $\int_{x \in X} f(x) d\nu$  as  $\int f d\nu$ . Note that if  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is fixed, then the map  $\nu \mapsto \int f d\nu: \mathcal{V}X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is Scott-continuous. Other basic properties of this integral can be found in [Jones 1990].

If  $D$  is a dcpo, then  $\mathcal{V}D \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{V}\Sigma D = \mathcal{V}(D, \sigma(D))$  is well-defined, and [Jones 1990] proved that  $\mathcal{V}$  extends to a monad on DCPO.

**3.2.1 Monad Structure.** The *unit* of  $\mathcal{V}$  at  $D$  is  $\eta_D^{\mathcal{V}}: D \rightarrow \mathcal{V}D :: x \mapsto \delta_x$ . The *Kleisli extension*  $f^\dagger$  of a Scott-continuous map  $f: D \rightarrow \mathcal{V}E$  maps  $\nu \in \mathcal{V}D$  to  $f^\dagger(\nu) \in \mathcal{V}E$ , where for  $U \in \sigma E$ ,  $f^\dagger(\nu)(U) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{x \in D} f(x)(U) d\nu$ . The *multiplication*  $\mu_D^{\mathcal{V}}: \mathcal{V}\mathcal{V}D \rightarrow \mathcal{V}D$  is given by  $\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{id}_{\mathcal{V}D}^\dagger$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{V}$  defines an endofunctor on DCPO that sends a dcpo  $D$  to  $\mathcal{V}D$ , and a Scott-continuous map  $h: D \rightarrow E$  to  $\mathcal{V}(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\eta_E \circ h)^\dagger$ , so  $\mathcal{V}(h)(\nu)(U) = \nu(h^{-1}(U))$  for  $\nu \in \mathcal{V}D$  and  $U \in \sigma E$ . The valuation  $h_*(\nu) = \mathcal{V}(h)(\nu)$  is called the *push forward of  $\nu$  by  $h$* .

In fact,  $\mathcal{V}$  defines a strong monad on DCPO [Jones 1990]: the strength at  $(D, E)$  is

$$\tau_{DE}^{\mathcal{V}}: D \times \mathcal{V}E \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(D \times E) :: (x, \nu) \mapsto \lambda U. \int_{y \in E} \chi_U(x, y) d\nu,$$

where  $\chi_U$  is the characteristic function of  $U \in \sigma(D \times E)$ . However, it is unknown whether  $\mathcal{V}$  is a commutative monad on **DCPO**. This is equivalent to showing the Fubini-style equation

$$\int_{x \in D} \int_{y \in E} \chi_U(x, y) d\xi d\nu = \int_{y \in E} \int_{x \in D} \chi_U(x, y) d\nu d\xi, \quad (3.1)$$

holds for **dcpo**'s  $D$  and  $E$ , where  $U \in \sigma(D \times E)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{V}D$ ,  $\xi \in \mathcal{V}E$  [Jones and Plotkin 1989]. To address this problem, the authors of [Jia et al. 2021] define a subclass of valuations that simultaneously validates (3.1), contains all simple valuations, and forms a **dcpo** in the stochastic order. They prove their construction defines a commutative valuations monad  $\mathcal{M}$  on **DCPO**. We devote the rest of this subsection to describing their construction; for more details, see [Jia et al. 2021].

**Definition 3.2.1.** For a **dcpo**  $D$ ,  $MD$  is the intersection of all sub-**dcpo**'s of  $\mathcal{V}D$  containing  $SD$ .

We call the valuations in  $MD$  the  $\mathcal{M}$ -valuations on  $D$ . In fact,  $MD$  is the smallest sub-**dcpo** of  $\mathcal{V}D$  containing  $SD$ . It follows that the  $\mathcal{M}$ -valuations on  $D$  consist of the simple valuations on  $D$ , directed suprema of simple valuations on  $D$ , directed suprema of directed suprema of simple valuations on  $D$  and so forth, transfinitely. It is straightforward to show that (3.1) holds when  $\xi$  and  $\nu$  are simple valuations, and because the nested integral operations are Scott-continuous in the valuations components, it follows (3.1) holds for  $\mathcal{M}$ -valuations. This is the idea behind the proof of the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.2** ([Jia et al. 2021, Theorem 8]).  $\mathcal{M}$  has the structure of a commutative monad on **DCPO** when equipped with the (co)restricted monad operations of  $\mathcal{V}$ .

Since the inclusions  $MD \subseteq \mathcal{V}D$  form a strong map of monads, we are justified in viewing  $\mathcal{M}$  as a submonad of  $\mathcal{V}$  and we use the same notation for the monad operations of  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$ .

## 4 QUANTUM EFFECTS AND HEREDITARILY ATOMIC VON NEUMANN ALGEBRAS

We now turn our attention to the model for the quantum subsystem of **VQPL**. We begin with a short review of operator algebras, which can be used to study quantum foundations. The standard references are [Blackadar 2006], [Takesaki 2000] and [Kadison and Ringrose 1997]. For quantum computing, it is sufficient to consider a special class of operator algebras that is known as the *hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras*. This class consists of (possibly infinite) products of finite-dimensional matrix algebras. These algebras were studied in [Kornell 2020], where it is shown that the dual category has a concrete description as *quantum sets*. Our main result in this section is to prove that the category of hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras is enriched over continuous domains (§4.3), which is crucial for providing a semantic interpretation of the "mq" term.

### 4.1 Definition of von Neumann algebras

If  $H$  is a Hilbert space, any linear map  $x : H \rightarrow H$  is called an *operator*, and  $x$  is *bounded* if it is continuous with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  induced by the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  on  $H$ . The space  $B(H)$  of all bounded operators on  $H$  forms an algebra over  $\mathbb{C}$  with composition as multiplication. Moreover,  $B(H)$  has an *involution*  $x \mapsto x^*$ , where  $x^*$  is the unique bounded operator satisfying  $\langle x^*k, h \rangle = \langle k, xh \rangle$  for  $h, k \in H$ . A subalgebra  $A \subseteq B(H)$  that is closed under the involution is called a *\*-subalgebra*. If, in addition,  $xy = yx$  for each  $x, y \in A$ , we call  $A$  *commutative*. The *commutant* of a subset  $S \subseteq B(H)$  is  $S' = \{y \in B(H) \mid xy = yx \ (\forall x \in S)\}$ .

**Definition 4.1.1.** Let  $H$  be a Hilbert space. A *von Neumann algebra* on  $H$  is a \*-subalgebra  $M$  of  $B(H)$  such that  $M'' = M$ . If  $K$  is another Hilbert space, and  $N$  is a von Neumann algebra on  $K$ , a

linear map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  that preserves the multiplication and the involution is a *\*-homomorphism*. If, in addition,  $\varphi$  is bijective, it is a *\*-isomorphism*.

The commutant of any non-empty set in  $B(H)$  always contains  $1_H$ , so  $1_H \in M$  for any von Neumann algebra  $M \subseteq B(H)$ . We sometimes write  $1_H$  as  $1_M$  to emphasize it is the unit of  $M$ .

**Example 4.1.2.**  $B(H)$  itself is a von Neumann algebra, and if  $H$  is  $n$ -dimensional, then  $B(H)$  is *\*-isomorphic* to  $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ , the algebra of  $n \times n$ -complex valued matrices. This example plays an important role in the definition of hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras below.

**Example 4.1.3.** If  $X$  is a set, then  $\ell^2(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \sum_{x \in X} |f(x)|^2 < \infty\}$  is a Hilbert space with inner product  $\langle f, g \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x \in X} \overline{f(x)}g(x)$ . The space  $\ell^\infty(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| < \infty\}$  equipped with the norm  $\|f\| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|$  can be embedded isometrically into  $B(\ell^2(X))$  via the maps  $f \mapsto m_f$ , where  $m_f : \ell^2(X) \rightarrow \ell^2(X)$  is the left multiplication  $g \mapsto fg$  [Landsman 2017, Proposition B.73]. Thus, identifying  $\ell^\infty(X)$  with its image in  $B(\ell^2(X))$  shows it is a commutative von Neumann algebra on  $\ell^2(X)$  [Landsman 2017, Proposition B.108].

Given Hilbert spaces  $(H_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ , the sum  $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} H_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(h_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \in \prod_{\alpha \in A} H_\alpha \mid \sum_{\alpha \in A} \|h_\alpha\|^2 < \infty\}$  is a Hilbert space with inner product  $\langle k, h \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle k_\alpha, h_\alpha \rangle$  for  $k = (k_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  and  $h = (h_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ .

**Proposition 4.1.4.** [Takesaki 2000, Proposition II.3.3] Let  $M_\alpha$  be a von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space  $H_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in A$ . Then  $\prod_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \mid \sup_{\alpha \in A} \|x_\alpha\| < \infty\}$  is a von Neumann algebra on  $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} H_\alpha$ , where  $xh \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x_\alpha h_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \in H$  for  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \in \prod_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha$  and  $h = (h_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} \in H$ .

**Definition 4.1.5.** We call a von Neumann algebra  $M$  *hereditarily atomic*, or simply an *HA-algebra*, if  $M$  is isomorphic to  $\prod_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha$ , where each  $M_\alpha$  is *\*-isomorphic* to some matrix algebra.

In order to make the correspondence between HA-algebras and the types of our language clearer, we overload notation and often write  $\bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha$ .

**Example 4.1.6.** All of the following are HA-algebras and we indicate to which type they correspond. The complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$  correspond to type **I**; the algebra  $M_2(\mathbb{C})$  corresponds to type **qbit**; the algebra  $\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}$  corresponds to type **QNat**  $\equiv \mu X. \mathbf{I} \oplus X$ ; the algebra  $\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C})$  corresponds to type **List(qbit)**  $\equiv \mu X. \mathbf{I} \oplus (\mathbf{qbit} \otimes X)$ . Moreover, if  $X$  is a set, then  $\ell^\infty(X) \cong \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathbb{C}$  is an HA-algebra and we will see it corresponds to *observable* quantum types, in general.

## 4.2 Quantum Computation with Hereditarily Atomic von Neumann Algebras

In this subsection, we define the appropriate notion of morphism that is computationally relevant.

If  $M$  is a von Neumann algebra on a Hilbert space  $H$ , we say  $x \in M$  is *self adjoint* if  $x^* = x$ , and *positive* if  $x = y^*y$  for some  $y \in M$ ; equivalently  $\langle h, xh \rangle \geq 0$  for each  $h \in H$  [Kadison and Ringrose 1997]. Given self-adjoint elements  $x$  and  $y$  in  $M$ , we write  $x \leq y$  iff  $y - x$  is positive. The relation  $\leq$  is a partial order on the set  $M_{\text{sa}}$  of self-adjoint elements in  $M$  under which  $M_{\text{sa}}$  is *bounded directed complete*: if  $A$  is directed and  $\alpha \mapsto x_\alpha \in M_{\text{sa}}$  is a monotone ascending net that is bounded (i.e.,  $x_\alpha \leq y \in M_{\text{sa}} \forall \alpha \in A$ ), then  $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  has a supremum  $\sup_{\alpha \in A} x_\alpha = x \in M_{\text{sa}}$ . The partial order  $\leq$  is often called the *Löwner order*.

In fact,  $x$  is the limit of  $(x_\alpha)$  in the *strong operator topology* on  $M$ : i.e.,  $\lim_{\alpha \in A} x_\alpha h = xh$  for each  $h \in H$ ; this also implies convergence with respect to the *weak operator topology* on  $M$ , i.e.,  $\lim_{\alpha \in A} \langle k, x_\alpha h \rangle = \langle k, xh \rangle$  for each  $h, k \in H$  [Blackadar 2006, Proposition I.3.2.5 & Corollary I.3.2.6]. As a consequence, the *unit interval* of  $M$ ,  $[0, 1]_M = \{x \in M_{\text{sa}} \mid 0 \leq x \leq 1_M\}$  is a dcpo.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{tr} : M_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\
\text{tr} :: x \mapsto \sum_i x_{i,i} \\
\text{tr}^* : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{C}) \\
\text{tr}^* :: \alpha \mapsto \alpha 1_{M_n(\mathbb{C})}
\end{array}
\left|
\begin{array}{l}
\text{state}_\rho : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C}) \\
\text{state}_\rho :: \alpha \mapsto \alpha \rho \\
\text{state}_\rho^* : M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\
\text{state}_\rho^* :: x \mapsto \text{tr}(x\rho)
\end{array}
\right|
\begin{array}{l}
\text{meas} : M_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \\
\text{meas} :: \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \mapsto (\alpha \ \delta) \\
\text{meas}^* : \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \rightarrow M_2(\mathbb{C}) \\
\text{meas}^* :: (\alpha \ \delta) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \delta \end{pmatrix}
\end{array}
\left|
\begin{array}{l}
\text{unitary}_U : M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C}) \\
\text{unitary}_U :: x \mapsto UxU^* \\
\text{unitary}_U^* : M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C}) \\
\text{unitary}_U^* :: x \mapsto U^*xU
\end{array}
\right.$$

Fig. 11. Maps in the Schrödinger picture ( $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ ) and their Hermitian adjoints ( $\varphi^* : N \rightarrow M$ ).

A linear function  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  between von Neumann algebras is *unital* if  $\varphi(1_M) = 1_N$ , *subunital* if  $\varphi(1_M) \leq 1_N$ ;  $\varphi$  is *positive* if it preserves positive elements, equivalently, if  $\varphi$  is monotone with respect to  $\leq$ . A positive and subunital  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  restricts to a monotone map  $[0, 1]_M \rightarrow [0, 1]_N$ , which by linearity completely determines  $\varphi$ . We call  $\varphi$  *normal* if it preserves the suprema of bounded increasing nets, i.e., if it is Scott continuous with respect to  $\leq$ .

We denote by  $M_n(M)$  the von Neumann algebra of all  $n \times n$ -matrices with entries in  $M$ . Any linear map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  between von Neumann algebras induces a linear map  $\varphi^{(n)} : M_n(M) \rightarrow M_n(N)$  obtained by applying  $\varphi$  entrywise. We say that  $\varphi$  is *completely positive* if  $\varphi^{(n)}$  is positive for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular, any completely positive map is positive. Finally, we say that a linear map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  is an *NCPSU* map, if  $\varphi$  is normal completely positive and subunital. We note that every normal unital  $*$ -homomorphism is an NCPSU map, but the converse is not true, in general.

**Definition 4.2.1.** We denote the category of von Neumann algebras and NCPSU maps by  $\mathbf{vN}$ . Its full-on-objects subcategory having normal unital  $*$ -homomorphisms as morphisms is denoted by  $\mathbf{vN}_*$ . The category of HA-algebras and NCPSU maps is denoted by  $\mathbf{HA}$  and we denote the full-on-objects subcategory of  $\mathbf{HA}$  with normal unital  $*$ -homomorphisms by  $\mathbf{HA}_*$ . The categories relevant for our semantics are their formal duals given by  $\mathbf{Q} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{HA})^{\text{op}}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{HA}_*)^{\text{op}}$ .

*Remark 4.2.2.* When working with von Neumann algebras, it is customary to adopt the Heisenberg picture of quantum mechanics, rather than the Schrödinger one. This corresponds to working in the category  $\mathbf{Q}$  which is the formal dual of  $\mathbf{HA}$ . In fact, the program of non-commutative geometry is based on dualities between categories of operator algebras and “formal dual” categories. Furthermore, this approach is also established in quantum programming semantics [Cho and Westerbaan 2016; Péchoux et al. 2020] and necessary for the appropriate categorical structure (§6.2).

From now on, all  $*$ -homomorphisms we work with are implicitly assumed to be unital and normal. We interpret quantum values in  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  and quantum terms in  $\mathbf{Q}$ . Next, we describe maps between HA-algebras that are crucial for quantum computation and that we use in our semantics.

The maps in the upper half of Figure 11 describe NCPSU maps between HA-algebras that are well-known in the quantum computing literature. The map “tr” computes the trace of a matrix; the map “state $_\rho$ ” prepares a new (mixed) quantum state that is described by the density matrix  $\rho$ ; the map “meas” performs a destructive quantum measurement on a qubit and returns a bit as outcome; the map “unitary $_U$ ” applies the unitary matrix  $U$  of arity  $n$  to an  $n$ -dimensional quantum state. These are the appropriate maps to take in the Schrödinger picture of quantum mechanics, but as explained above, the Heisenberg picture is more appropriate for our denotational semantics, so it is the Hermitian adjoints of these maps (bottom half of Figure 11) that are relevant to us. By writing  $\varphi^\ddagger \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\varphi^*)^{\text{op}}$  for  $\varphi \in \{\text{tr}, \text{state}_\rho, \text{meas}, \text{unitary}_U\}$ , these maps are then morphisms of  $\mathbf{Q}$ . In particular,  $\text{meas}^\ddagger : M_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$  is the morphism of  $\mathbf{Q}$  which represents quantum measurement.



We also define a morphism  $\text{new}^\ddagger \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{meas}^{\text{op}} \in \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}, M_2(\mathbb{C}))$ . The way to think of this map (in  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) is that given a bit  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , the map would prepare the density matrix  $|i\rangle\langle i|$ . Indeed, notice that (in  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) we have  $\text{meas}^\ddagger \circ \text{new}^\ddagger = (\text{meas} \circ \text{meas}^*)^{\text{op}} = \text{id}_{\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}}$ , as expected.

### 4.3 Continuous Domain Enrichment of $\mathbf{Q}$

The category  $\mathbf{vN}$  is enriched over  $\text{DCPO}_{\perp!}$  [Cho 2016], where  $\varphi \leq \psi$  iff  $\psi - \varphi$  is completely positive, for  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ . The  $\text{DCPO}_{\perp!}$ -enrichment of  $\mathbf{vN}$  immediately implies that of  $\mathbf{HA}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

While  $\text{DCPO}_{\perp!}$ -enrichment is important, it is insufficient for our purposes. In particular, the crucial connection between the semantics of the quantum and classical probabilistic effects in our language requires  $\mathbf{Q}(A, B)$  to be an  $\mathcal{M}$ -algebra for  $A, B$  objects of  $\mathbf{Q}$  (Theorem 5.3.5). We can show this is the case when  $\mathbf{Q}$  is enriched in a much stronger sense, namely, when  $\mathbf{Q}$  is enriched over continuous  $\text{dcpo}$ 's (see Theorem 5.3.3). Explaining all this is our next goal.

We begin with continuous  $\text{dcpo}$ 's. For  $x, y$  in a  $\text{dcpo}$   $D$ ,  $x$  is *way-below*  $y$  (in symbols,  $x \ll y$ ) if and only if for every directed set  $A$  with  $y \leq \sup A$ , there is some  $a \in A$  such that  $x \leq a$ . A  $\text{dcpo}$   $D$  is *continuous*, or simply a *domain*, if every element  $x \in D$  is the supremum of a directed set of elements that are way-below  $x$ . We use  $\text{DOM}$  to denote the category of domains and Scott-continuous maps.

It was noted in [Selinger 2004b, Example 2.7] that the unit interval of  $M(\mathbb{C}^n)$  is a continuous  $\text{dcpo}$ , from which it is easy to show  $[0, 1]_A$  is a domain for every  $\mathbf{HA}$ -algebra  $A$ ; in fact, this is an if-and-only-if [Furber 2019]. We conclude this section with a much stronger result.

**Theorem 4.3.1.** *The category  $\mathbf{Q}$  is enriched over  $\text{DOM}$ .*

**PROOF.** The proof (Appendix A) starts with the fact that  $[0, 1]_A$  is a domain for each  $\mathbf{HA}$ -algebra  $A$  and then makes extensive use of the representation theory of von Neumann algebras.  $\square$

## 5 PROBABILISTIC EFFECTS, QUANTUM EFFECTS AND KEGELSPITZEN

Our language shows that quantum effects induce probabilistic effects on the classical side (via the "run" term) and, vice-versa, probabilistic effects on the classical side can also influence the quantum dynamics (via the "init" and "mq" terms). In this section, we describe the mathematical structure we use to interpret this correspondence.

In particular, we show there is a strong relationship between the Kleisli category  $\text{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  (where we interpret classical programs) and our category  $\mathbf{Q}$  of hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras (where we interpret quantum programs). The link between the two categories is provided by the theory of (continuous) Kegelspitzen [Keimel and Plotkin 2017]. The relationship we identify is crucial for the interpretation of the mixed classical/quantum judgements of Figure 7, and it links the classical theory of valuations monads to the quantum theory of von Neumann algebras.

### 5.1 (Continuous) Kegelspitzen

We begin by recalling the definition of Kegelspitzen [Keimel and Plotkin 2017].

**Definition 5.1.1.** A Kegelspitze is a  $\text{dcpo}$  equipped with a convex structure. More precisely:

- A *barycentric algebra* is a set  $A$  endowed with binary operations  $(a, b) \mapsto a +_r b : A \times A \rightarrow A$  indexed by  $r \in [0, 1]$  such that for all  $a, b, c \in A$  and  $r, p \in [0, 1]$ , the following equations hold:

$$a +_1 b = a; \quad a +_r b = b +_{1-r} a; \quad a +_r a = a; \quad (a +_p b) +_r c = a +_{pr} (b +_{\frac{r-p}{1-pr}} c) \text{ provided } r, p < 1.$$

- A *pointed barycentric algebra* is a barycentric algebra  $A$  with a distinguished element  $\perp$ . For  $a \in A$  and  $r \in [0, 1]$ , we define scalar multiplication  $r \cdot a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a +_r \perp$ . A map  $f : A \rightarrow B$  between pointed barycentric algebras is *linear* if  $f(\perp_A) = \perp_B$  and  $f(a +_r b) = f(a) +_r f(b)$  for all  $a, b \in A, r \in [0, 1]$ .



- A *Kegelspitze* is a pointed barycentric algebra  $K$  equipped with a directed-complete partial order such that scalar multiplication  $(r, a) \mapsto r \cdot a: [0, 1] \times K \rightarrow K$  and the binary operation  $(a, b) \mapsto a +_r b: K \times K \rightarrow K$ , for  $r \in [0, 1]$ , are Scott-continuous (in both arguments). A *continuous Kegelspitze* is a Kegelspitze that is a domain in the equipped order.

**Example 5.1.2.** For each dcpo  $D$ ,  $MD$  is Kegelspitze: for  $v_i \in MD$  and  $r_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \leq 1$ , the convex sum  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i v_i$  is again in  $MD$ . Then, if  $v_1, v_2 \in MD$  and  $r \in [0, 1]$ , we define  $v_1 +_r v_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r v_1 + (1 - r) v_2$ . The zero valuation  $0_D$  is the distinguished least element. If, in addition,  $D$  is a domain, then  $MD = \mathcal{V}D$  is a continuous Kegelspitze [Jia et al. 2021]. For each Scott-continuous map  $f: D \rightarrow E$ , the map  $\mathcal{M}(f): MD \rightarrow ME$  is Scott-continuous and linear.

**Example 5.1.3.** The real unit interval  $[0, 1]$  is obviously a continuous Kegelspitze. More generally, the unit interval  $[0, 1]_A$  of any von Neumann algebra  $A$  is a Kegelspitze. If  $A$  also is hereditarily atomic, then  $[0, 1]_A$  is a continuous Kegelspitze by [Selinger 2004b, Example 2.7]. Moreover, any NCPUSU map  $f: A \rightarrow B$  between von Neumann algebras  $A$  and  $B$ , is Scott-continuous and linear when (co)restricted to the unit intervals of  $A$  and  $B$ .

## 5.2 Correspondence between Observable Quantum/Probabilistic Effects

Our next result describes a bijective correspondence between *observable* quantum/probabilistic effects that allows us to interpret the terms dealing with observable primitives. A semantic observation (which we make precise later) shows that: any quantum observable type  $\mathbf{O}$  is interpreted as a commutative HA-algebra that is  $*$ -isomorphic to  $\ell^\infty(X)$  for some set  $X$ ; its classical observable counterpart  $|\mathbf{O}|$  is interpreted as the *discrete domain* with underlying set  $X$ . Moreover, quantum values correspond to  $*$ -homomorphisms and classical values to Dirac valuations.

**Theorem 5.2.1.** *Let  $X$  be an arbitrary set. Then, there exists an isomorphism of (continuous) Kegelspitzen  $r_X: \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{C}, \ell^\infty(X)) \cong \mathcal{M}(X, \sqsubseteq): r_X^{-1}$ , where  $\sqsubseteq$  is the discrete order on  $X$ . Furthermore, this isomorphism restricts to a 1-1 correspondence between the  $*$ -homomorphisms of  $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{C}, \ell^\infty(X))$  and the Dirac valuations of  $\mathcal{M}(X, \sqsubseteq)$ .*

PROOF. See Appendix B. □

Combined with the above semantic observation, this theorem shows there is a 1-1 correspondence between the quantum and classical probabilistic states of *observable* types, and also a 1-1 correspondence between the interpretations of quantum and classical observable values. This isomorphism is used for the interpretations of the "run" and "init" terms.

Next, we construct an isomorphism that we use for the interpretation of dynamic lifting (the "lift" term). This is similar to a construction first reported in [Rennela and Staton 2020].

**Proposition 5.2.2.** *Given a dcpo  $X$ , HA-algebras  $A, B$ , and a discrete dcpo  $Y$ , there exists a Scott-continuous and linear bijection  $(\widehat{-}): \text{DCPO}(X \times Y, \mathbf{Q}(A, B)) \cong \text{DCPO}(X, \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(Y) \otimes A, B))$ , natural in all components.*

PROOF. See Appendix C. □

## 5.3 Combining Probabilistic and Quantum Effects

In the previous subsection we considered *observable* effects. In the present subsection, we show how to combine *arbitrary* quantum and probabilistic effects *into* quantum ones.

We begin by noting that on any Kegelspitze, the binary operations  $a +_r b$  generalize to convex sums. We then use these convex sums in order to define *barycentre* maps.

**Definition 5.3.1.** In each pointed barycentric algebra  $K$ , given  $a_i \in K, r_i \in [0, 1], i = 1, \dots, n$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \leq 1$ , we inductively define the convex sum by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n r_i a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} a_1 & , \text{ if } r_1 = 1, \\ a_1 +_{r_1} (\sum_{i=2}^n \frac{r_i}{1-r_1} a_i) & , \text{ if } r_1 < 1. \end{cases}$$

This sum is invariant under index-permutation: for  $\pi$  a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n r_{\pi(i)} a_{\pi(i)}$  [Jones 1990, Lemma 5.6]. If  $K$  is a Kegelspitze, then the expression  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i a_i$  is Scott-continuous in each  $r_i$  and  $a_i$ . A *countable* convex sum also can be defined: if  $a_i \in K$  and  $r_i \in [0, 1]$ , for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i \leq 1$ , define  $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} r_i a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{\sum_{j \in J} r_j a_j \mid J \subseteq \mathbb{N} \text{ and } J \text{ is finite}\}$ .

**Definition 5.3.2.** Let  $K$  be a Kegelspitze and  $s = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \delta_{x_i}$  be a simple valuation on  $K$ . The *barycentre* of  $s$  is defined as  $\beta_*(s) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i x_i$ . Furthermore, if  $K$  is a continuous Kegelspitze and  $\nu \in \mathcal{MK}$ , the *barycentre* of  $\nu$  is defined as  $\beta(\nu) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{\beta_*(s) \mid s \in \mathcal{SK} \text{ and } s \ll \nu\}$ .

When  $K$  is a *continuous* Kegelspitze, the barycentre map  $\beta: \mathcal{MK} \rightarrow K :: \nu \mapsto \beta(\nu)$  is well-defined, unique, Scott-continuous and linear [Jia et al. 2021]. We emphasise that *continuity* is crucial for establishing this and it is unclear if this holds otherwise. Moreover, the following also is true.

**Theorem 5.3.3** ([Jia et al. 2021]). *The Eilenberg-Moore category  $\text{DOM}^{\mathcal{M}}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  over  $\text{DOM}$  is isomorphic to the category of continuous Kegelspitzen and Scott-continuous linear maps. In particular:*

- (1) *Each continuous Kegelspitze  $K$  admits a linear barycentre map  $\beta: \mathcal{MK} \rightarrow K$  (as in Definition 5.3.2) for which the pair  $(K, \beta)$  is an Eilenberg-Moore algebra of  $\mathcal{M}$  over  $\text{DOM}$ .*
- (2) *Conversely, on each  $\mathcal{M}$ -algebra  $(K, \beta)$  on  $\text{DOM}$ , define  $a +_r b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta(\delta_a +_r \delta_b)$  for  $a, b \in K$  and  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Then with the operations  $+_r$ ,  $K$  is a continuous Kegelspitze and  $\beta: \mathcal{MK} \rightarrow K$  is linear.*

In §4 we saw that  $\mathcal{Q}$  is enriched over  $\text{DOM}$ . We now further strengthen that result.

**Theorem 5.3.4.** *The category  $\mathcal{Q}$  is enriched over continuous Kegelspitzen in the following sense: for all objects  $A, B$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , the homset  $\mathcal{Q}(A, B)$  is a continuous Kegelspitze, and for any morphism  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  and any object  $C$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , the following maps are Scott-continuous and linear:*

$$\mathcal{Q}(C, \varphi): \mathcal{Q}(C, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(C, B) :: \psi \mapsto \varphi \circ \psi \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}(\varphi, C): \mathcal{Q}(B, C) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(A, C) :: \psi \mapsto \psi \circ \varphi.$$

PROOF. See Appendix A. □

Combining these two theorems gives the main result of this section.

**Theorem 5.3.5.** *For any HA-algebras  $A$  and  $B$ , there exists a (unique) Scott-continuous and linear barycentre map  $\beta: \mathcal{MQ}(A, B) \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(A, B)$  that is also an Eilenberg-Moore algebra of  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

The above properties of  $\beta$  are exactly what is needed to interpret the "mq" term from Figure 7, which allows us to combine classical probabilistic computation with quantum computation.

## 6 CATEGORICAL MODEL

In this section we organise the relevant mathematical data into several categories that we later use to describe our denotational semantics. A diagrammatic summary is provided in Figure 12 (§7).

## 6.1 The Kleisli Category of $\mathcal{M}$

This subsection provides a summary of the development in [Jia et al. 2021] of the Kleisli category of the monad  $\mathcal{M} : \mathbf{DCPO} \rightarrow \mathbf{DCPO}$ , which we denote  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . In order to distinguish between the categorical primitives of  $\mathbf{DCPO}$  and  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , we adopt the notation of [Jia et al. 2021], indicating the morphisms of  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  by  $f : A \rightarrow B$ , and using  $f \circ g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu \circ \mathcal{M}(f) \circ g$  to denote the Kleisli composition of morphisms in  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  (where  $\mu$  is the multiplication of  $\mathcal{M}$ ). We write  $\mathbf{id}_A : A \rightarrow A$  with  $\mathbf{id}_A = \eta_A : A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}A$  for the identity morphisms in  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . The adjunction  $\mathcal{J} \dashv \mathcal{U} : \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbf{DCPO}$  that factorises  $\mathcal{M}$  is determined by the assignments:

$$\mathcal{J}A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A, \quad \mathcal{J}f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \eta \circ f, \quad \mathcal{U}A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{M}A, \quad \mathcal{U}f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu \circ \mathcal{M}f.$$

**6.1.1 Coproducts.**  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  inherits (small) coproducts from  $\mathbf{DCPO}$  in the standard way [Jacobs 2016, pp. 264] and we write  $A_1 \dot{+} A_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A_1 + A_2$  for the induced (binary) coproduct. The induced coprojections are given by  $\mathcal{J}(in_1) : A_1 \rightarrow A_1 \dot{+} A_2$  and  $\mathcal{J}(in_2) : A_2 \rightarrow A_1 \dot{+} A_2$ . Then for  $f : A \rightarrow C$  and  $g : B \rightarrow D$ ,  $f \dot{+} g = [\mathcal{M}(in_C) \circ f, \mathcal{M}(in_D) \circ g]$  and the functor  $\mathcal{J}$  strictly preserves coproducts.

**6.1.2 Symmetric monoidal structure.** Because  $\mathcal{M}$  is *commutative*, it induces a canonical symmetric monoidal structure on  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  making  $\mathcal{J}$  a strict monoidal functor [Power and Robinson 1997]. The induced tensor product is  $A \dot{\times} B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A \times B$  with Kleisli projections  $\mathcal{J}(\pi_A) : A \dot{\times} B \rightarrow A$  and  $\mathcal{J}(\pi_B) : A \dot{\times} B \rightarrow B$ ; but these projections do *not* satisfy the universal property of a product. The tensor product of  $f : A \rightarrow C$  and  $g : B \rightarrow D$  is denoted by  $f \dot{\times} g$  and it is defined as usual. It follows that Kleisli products distribute over Kleisli coproducts and we write  $d_{A,B,C} : A \dot{\times} (B \dot{+} C) \cong (A \dot{\times} B) \dot{+} (A \dot{\times} C)$  for this natural isomorphism.

**6.1.3 Kleisli Exponential.** The adjunction  $\mathcal{J} \dashv \mathcal{U}$  also contains the structure of a *Kleisli-exponential*. Following [Moggi 1991], we use this to interpret higher-order function types.

For each dcpo  $B$ , we use  $[B \rightarrow -] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [B \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(-)] : \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbf{DCPO}$  to denote the right adjoint of the functor  $J(-) \dot{\times} B : \mathbf{DCPO} \rightarrow \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$ . Therefore, on objects,  $[B \rightarrow C] = [B \rightarrow \mathcal{M}C]$ . This determines a family of Scott-continuous bijections  $\lambda : \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{J}A \dot{\times} B, C) \cong \mathbf{DCPO}(A, [B \rightarrow C])$ , natural in  $A$  and  $C$ , often called *currying*. We also denote the counit of these adjunctions by  $\epsilon : \mathcal{J}[B \rightarrow -] \dot{\times} B \Rightarrow \text{Id}$ , which is often called *evaluation*. Since this family of adjunctions is parameterised by objects  $B$  of  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , standard categorical results [Mac Lane 1998, §IV.7] imply the assignment  $[B \rightarrow -] : \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbf{DCPO}$  can be extended uniquely to a bifunctor  $[- \rightarrow -] : \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{op}} \times \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbf{DCPO}$ , such that  $\lambda$  is natural in all three components.

**6.1.4 Enrichment Structure.** The Kleisli category  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  is enriched over  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\perp!}$ : for dcpo's  $A, B$  and  $C$ , the Kleisli exponential  $[A \rightarrow B] = [A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}B] = \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(A, B)$  is a pointed dcpo and the Kleisli composition  $\circ : [A \rightarrow B] \times [B \rightarrow C] \rightarrow [A \rightarrow C]$  is strict and Scott continuous. Furthermore, the adjunction  $\mathcal{J} \dashv \mathcal{U}$  also is  $\mathbf{DCPO}$ -enriched, as are the bifunctors  $(- \dot{\times} -)$ ,  $(- \dot{+} -)$  and  $[- \rightarrow -]$ .

The category  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  also has a convex structure: for each dcpo  $B$ ,  $\mathcal{M}B$  is a Kegelspitze in the stochastic order by Example 5.1.2, from which it follows that  $[A \rightarrow B] = \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(A, B)$  also is a Kegelspitze in the pointwise order. This convex structure is preserved by Kleisli composition  $\circ$ , Kleisli coproduct  $\dot{+}$  and Kleisli product  $\dot{\times}$  [Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 38].

**6.1.5 The Subcategories TD and PD.** We identify two important subcategories of  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$ : one for the interpretation of classical values (TD) and one for solving recursive domain equations (PD).

**Definition 6.1.1.** The subcategory TD of *deterministic total maps* is the full-on-objects subcategory of  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  whose morphisms  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  admit a factorisation  $f = \mathcal{J}(f') = \eta_Y \circ f'$ , for some  $f'$ .

Each map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in **TD** satisfies  $f(x) = \delta_y$  for some  $y \in Y$ , by definition. We call such maps *deterministic* because they carry no interesting convex structure, and they are *total* in that they map all inputs  $x \in X$  to non-zero valuations. **TD** is important because all *classical values* of our language are interpreted in **TD**. In fact,  $\mathbf{DCPO} \cong \mathbf{TD}$  [Jia et al. 2021, Proposition 40].

The canonical copy map at an object  $A$  in our model is given by the map  $\mathcal{J}\langle \text{id}_A, \text{id}_A \rangle : A \rightarrow A \times A$ ; likewise, the canonical discarding map at  $A$  is the map  $\mathcal{J}(1_A) : A \rightarrow 1$ , where  $1_A : A \rightarrow 1$  is the terminal map of **DCPO**. Because maps in **TD** are in the image of  $\mathcal{J}$ , they are compatible with the copy and discard maps, and hence also with weakening and contraction [Benton 1995].

**Definition 6.1.2.** The subcategory of *deterministic partial maps*, denoted **PD**, is the full-on-objects subcategory of  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  each of whose morphisms  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  admits a factorisation  $f = \left( X \xrightarrow{f'} Y_{\perp} \xrightarrow{\phi_Y} \mathcal{M}Y \right)$ , where  $Y_{\perp}$  is the dcpo obtained from  $Y$  by freely adding a least element  $\perp$ , and where  $\phi_Y$  is the map  $\phi_Y : Y_{\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}Y :: y \mapsto \begin{cases} \mathbf{0}_Y & , \text{ if } y = \perp \\ \delta_y & , \text{ if } y \neq \perp \end{cases}$ .

These maps are *partial* because they map some inputs to  $\mathbf{0}$ ; they also are deterministic, because the convex structure is trivial in both cases. This is justified by the fact that  $\mathbf{PD} \cong \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{T}} \cong \mathbf{DCPO}_{\perp}$ , where  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{T}}$  is the Kleisli category of the lift monad  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbf{DCPO} \rightarrow \mathbf{DCPO}$  [Jia et al. 2021].

**6.1.6 Solving Recursive Domain Equations.** The standard method for interpreting recursive types is to construct *parameterised initial algebras* [Fiore and Plotkin 1994; Fiore 1994]. We employ this approach in **PD** using the limit-colimit coincidence theorem [Smyth and Plotkin 1982].

**Definition 6.1.3** (see [Fiore 1994, §6.1]). Given a category  $\mathbf{C}$  and a functor  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbf{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ , a *parameterised initial algebra* for  $\mathcal{T}$  is a pair  $(\mathcal{T}^{\sharp}, \iota^{\mathcal{T}})$ , such that:

- $\mathcal{T}^{\sharp} : \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is a functor;
- $\iota^{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{T} \circ \langle \text{Id}, \mathcal{T}^{\sharp} \rangle \Rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{\sharp} : \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is a natural transformation;
- For every  $\vec{C} \in \text{Ob}(\mathbf{C}^n)$ , the pair  $(\mathcal{T}^{\sharp}\vec{C}, \iota^{\mathcal{T}}_{\vec{C}})$  is an initial  $\mathcal{T}(\vec{C}, -)$ -algebra.

The usual notion of an initial algebra arises in the case that  $n = 1$ .

**Proposition 6.1.4** (see [Lindenhovius et al. 2021, §4.3]). *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a category with an initial object and all  $\omega$ -colimits, and let  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbf{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  be an  $\omega$ -cocontinuous functor. Then  $\mathcal{T}$  has a parameterised initial algebra  $(\mathcal{T}^{\sharp}, \iota^{\mathcal{T}})$  and the functor  $\mathcal{T}^{\sharp} : \mathbf{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  is also  $\omega$ -cocontinuous.*

In fact, the subcategory **PD** has sufficient structure to solve recursive domain equations, because it is *DCPO-algebraically compact* [Jia et al. 2021]. Therefore, every **DCPO**-enriched *covariant* functor on  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  that restricts to **PD** has a parameterised initial algebra (whose inverse is a parameterised final coalgebra). Solving equations involving *mixed-variance* functors (induced by function types) can be done using the limit-colimit coincidence theorem [Smyth and Plotkin 1982]. An important observation made in [Smyth and Plotkin 1982] is that all type expressions (including function spaces) can be interpreted as covariant functors on *subcategories of embeddings*. For more details on this, see [Lindenhovius et al. 2019, 2021]; here we also follow this approach.

**Definition 6.1.5.** If  $\mathbf{C}$  is a **DCPO**-enriched category, a morphism  $e : X \rightarrow Y$  is an *embedding* if there exists a (necessarily unique) *projection*  $e^{\flat} : Y \rightarrow X$ , i.e., a morphism satisfying  $e^{\flat} \circ e = \text{id}_X$  and  $e \circ e^{\flat} \leq \text{id}_Y$ .  $\mathbf{C}_e$  denotes the full-on-objects subcategory of  $\mathbf{C}$  whose morphisms are the embeddings.

**Proposition 6.1.6** ([Jia et al. 2021, Proposition 47]). *The category  $\mathbf{PD}_e$  has an initial object and all  $\omega$ -colimits, and the assignments:*

$\dot{\times}_e : \mathbf{PD}_e \times \mathbf{PD}_e \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$  defined by  $X \dot{\times}_e Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X \times Y$  and  $e_1 \dot{\times}_e e_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_1 \times e_2$

$\dot{+}_e : \mathbf{PD}_e \times \mathbf{PD}_e \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$  defined by  $X \dot{+}_e Y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X + Y$  and  $e_1 \dot{+}_e e_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e_1 + e_2$

$[\rightarrow]_e^{\mathcal{J}} : \mathbf{PD}_e \times \mathbf{PD}_e \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$  defined by  $[X \rightarrow Y]_e^{\mathcal{J}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J}[X \rightarrow Y]$  and  $[e_1 \rightarrow e_2]_e^{\mathcal{J}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J}[e_1^p \rightarrow e_2]$

are covariant  $\omega$ -cocontinuous bifunctors on  $\mathbf{PD}_e$ .

Thus Propositions 6.1.4 and 6.1.6 show we can solve recursive domain equations induced by all well-formed type expressions within  $\mathbf{PD}_e$ , notably with no restrictions on the admissible logical polarities of the types. However, our classical judgements support weakening and contraction, so we have an extra proof obligation: proving each isomorphism that is a solution to a recursive domain equation can be copied and discarded. This is true, because every isomorphism of  $\mathbf{PD}$  (and  $\mathbf{PD}_e$ ) also are isomorphisms of  $\mathbf{TD}$  [Jia et al. 2021, Propoistion 48].

## 6.2 The Quantum Category $\mathbf{Q}$

We now describe the categorical structure of  $\mathbf{Q}$  and its subcategory  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ . We interpret quantum terms in  $\mathbf{Q}$  and quantum values in  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ .

**6.2.1 Coproducts.** Proposition 4.1.4 describes the categorical product on  $\mathbf{vN}_*$ , which restricts to a categorical product on  $\mathbf{HA}_*$  since the product of hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras clearly is hereditarily atomic. Moreover, the product on  $\mathbf{HA}_*$  extends to a product on  $\mathbf{HA}$ . As a consequence,  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  have small coproducts and we write  $A \oplus B$  to denote the coproduct in both categories. We write the coprojections as  $\mathbf{in}_1 : A \rightarrow A \oplus B$  and  $\mathbf{in}_2 : B \rightarrow A \oplus B$ . Note that the initial object  $\mathbf{0}$  of  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ , given by the 1 element  $\mathbf{HA}$ -algebra, is a zero object in  $\mathbf{Q}$  (but not in  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ ).

**6.2.2 Symmetric Monoidal Structure.** Given two von Neumann algebras  $M$  and  $N$  on Hilbert spaces  $H$  and  $K$ , respectively, the algebraic tensor product  $M \otimes N$  acts in a natural way on the Hilbert space tensor product  $H \otimes K$ . The weak operator closure of  $M \otimes N$  in  $B(H \otimes K)$  is a von Neumann algebra, usually denoted  $M \bar{\otimes} N$ , and called the *spatial tensor product* of  $M$  and  $N$ . The construction in [Blackadar 2006, III.2.2.5] shows the spatial tensor product of von Neumann algebras induces a symmetric monoidal product on both  $\mathbf{HA}_*$  and  $\mathbf{HA}$ , hence on  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$ . We write  $A \otimes B$  for the tensor product in both  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  is symmetric monoidal closed [Kornell 2020, Theorem 9.1] and therefore there exists a natural isomorphism  $\mathbf{d}_{A,B,C} : A \otimes (B \oplus C) \cong (A \otimes B) \oplus (A \otimes C)$ .

**6.2.3 Adjunctions.** The subcategory inclusion  $\mathcal{I} : \mathbf{Q}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$  corresponds to an embedding  $\mathbf{HA}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{HA}$  that is shown to have a left adjoint in [Westerbaan 2019, Section 4.3.4]. Therefore  $\mathcal{I}$  has a right adjoint. Moreover, the adjunction between  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  is Kleislian [Westerbaan 2019] and the subcategory inclusion  $\mathcal{I} : \mathbf{Q}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$  is a strict monoidal functor that strictly preserves coproducts.

The assignment  $\ell^\infty(-)$  extends to a functor  $\ell^\infty : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{HA}_*^{\text{op}}$  whose action on functions  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  between sets is a normal  $*$ -homomorphism  $\ell^\infty(f) : \ell^\infty(Y) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(X) :: k \mapsto k \circ f$ . Hence we obtain a functor  $\ell^\infty : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_*$ , which is fully faithful; its essential image is the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  consisting of all commutative hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras.

**6.2.4 Affine Structure.** The monoidal unit  $\mathbb{C}$  is *initial* in  $\mathbf{HA}_*$  and therefore it is *terminal* in  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ , but the same is not true for  $\mathbf{HA}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$ . The terminal map of  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  at  $M_n(\mathbb{C})$  is actually  $\text{tr}^\ddagger$  (see §4.2). This allows us to define suitable discarding maps. The map  $\text{drop}_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (x \mapsto x \otimes 1)^{\text{op}} \in \mathbf{Q}(A \otimes M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C}), A)$  should be thought of (in  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) as discarding  $k$  auxiliary qubits; this map is used for the interpretation




Fig. 12. Overview of the categorical model.

of the "run" term when we execute a non-total quantum configuration that has  $k$  auxiliary qubits (which may be safely discarded at the end of the computation). Indeed, notice that in the category  $\mathbf{Q}$ , we have  $\text{drop}_k^{\ddagger} \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes \text{state}_\rho^{\ddagger}) = \text{id}_A$ , for any density matrix  $\rho$  in  $M_{2^k}(\mathbb{C})$ , as one would expect (for brevity, we implicitly suppress the isomorphism  $A \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong A$ ).

**6.2.5 Solving Recursive Domain Equations.** We now show that the category  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  has sufficient structure to construct parameterised initial algebras for polynomial functors. On the quantum side, this covers all recursive domain equations that have to be solved.

**Proposition 6.2.1.** *The category  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  is cocomplete and the functors  $\otimes: \mathbf{Q}_* \times \mathbf{Q}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_*$  and  $\oplus: \mathbf{Q}_* \times \mathbf{Q}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_*$  are cocontinuous.*

PROOF. Cocompleteness of  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  is shown in [Kornell 2020, Proposition 8.6]; the coproduct bifunctor  $\oplus$  is obviously cocontinuous; the functor  $\otimes$  is cocontinuous because  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  is monoidal closed.  $\square$

## 7 DENOTATIONAL SEMANTICS

We now give the denotational semantics of our language. In Figure 12, we summarise the overall structure of the interpretation. The blue arrows show where the indicated programming primitives can be interpreted. Every such primitive may also be interpreted in a category above it by following the corresponding left adjoint. All depicted categories are symmetric monoidal and so are the adjunctions between them. The left adjoints  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\ell^\infty$  are both fully faithful and this allows us to interpret the *observable* values in the bottom three categories and also to coherently relate these interpretations.

### 7.1 Interpretation of Types

We begin with the interpretation of (open) types, which is described in Figure 13. Open quantum types are interpreted as functors  $\llbracket \Theta \vdash A \rrbracket: \mathbf{Q}_*^{|\Theta|} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_*$  and open classical types are interpreted as functors  $\llbracket \Theta \vdash P \rrbracket: \mathbf{PD}_e^{|\Theta|} \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$ . Given closed types  $\cdot \vdash A$  and  $\cdot \vdash P$ , we write  $\llbracket A \rrbracket \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket \cdot \vdash A \rrbracket(*) \in \text{Ob}(\mathbf{Q}_*) = \text{Ob}(\mathbf{Q})$  and  $\llbracket P \rrbracket \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket \cdot \vdash P \rrbracket(*) \in \text{Ob}(\mathbf{PD}_e) = \text{Ob}(\mathbf{DCPO})$ .

**Proposition 7.1.1.** *The assignments  $\llbracket \Theta \vdash A \rrbracket: \mathbf{Q}_*^{|\Theta|} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_*$  and  $\llbracket \Theta \vdash P \rrbracket: \mathbf{PD}_e^{|\Theta|} \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$  are well-defined  $\omega$ -cocontinuous functors.*

PROOF. By induction using Propositions 6.1.4, 6.1.6 and 6.2.1.  $\square$

$$\begin{aligned}
[\Theta \vdash \mathbf{A}] &: \mathbf{Q}_*^{|\Theta|} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_* \quad [\Theta \vdash \Theta_i] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_i \quad [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{1}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K_C \quad [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{qbit}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K_{M_2(\mathbb{C})} \quad [\Theta \vdash \mu X.A] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\Theta, X \vdash A]^\# \\
[\Theta \vdash \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \oplus \circ \langle [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{A}], [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{B}] \rangle \quad [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \otimes \circ \langle [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{A}], [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{B}] \rangle \\
[\Theta \vdash P] &: \mathbf{PD}_e^{|\Theta|} \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e \quad [\Theta \vdash \Theta_i] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_i \quad [\Theta \vdash \mathbf{1}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K_1 \quad [\Theta \vdash \mu X.P] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\Theta, X \vdash P]^\# \\
[\Theta \vdash P + R] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dot{+}_e \circ \langle [\Theta \vdash P], [\Theta \vdash R] \rangle \quad [\Theta \vdash P \times R] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dot{\times}_e \circ \langle [\Theta \vdash P], [\Theta \vdash R] \rangle \\
[\Theta \vdash P \rightarrow R] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [-\rightarrow]_e^J \circ \langle [\Theta \vdash P], [\Theta \vdash R] \rangle \quad [\Theta \vdash Q(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} K_{Q([\mathbf{A}], [\mathbf{B}])}
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 13. Interpretation of types.  $K_X$  is the constant- $X$ -functor.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{1}] &= \mathbb{C} & [\mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}] &= [\mathbf{A}] \otimes [\mathbf{B}] & [\mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B}] &= [\mathbf{A}] \oplus [\mathbf{B}] & [\mu X.A] &\cong [\mathbf{A}[\mu X.A/X]] \\
[\mathbf{1}] &= 1 & [P \times R] &= [P] \times [R] & [P + R] &= [P] + [R] & [\mu X.P] &\cong [P[\mu X.P/X]] \\
[\mathbf{qbit}] &= M_2(\mathbb{C}) & [P \rightarrow R] &= [P] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}[R] & [Q(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})] &= Q([\mathbf{A}], [\mathbf{B}])
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 14. Derived equations for closed types.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\Phi \vdash m : P] &: [\Phi] \rightarrow [P] \text{ in } \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}} & [\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}] &: [\Phi] \rightarrow Q([\Gamma], [\mathbf{A}]) \text{ in } \mathbf{DCPO} \\
[\Phi, x : P \vdash x : P] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} \pi_2 & [\Phi; y : \mathbf{A} \vdash y : \mathbf{A}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto \text{id}_{[\mathbf{A}]} \\
[\Phi \vdash () : \mathbf{1}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} \mathbf{1} & [\Phi; \cdot \vdash * : \mathbf{1}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto \text{id}_{\mathbb{C}} \\
[\Phi \vdash (m, n) : P \times R] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ([m] \times [n]) \circ \mathcal{J} \langle \text{id}, \text{id} \rangle & [\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto (\cong \circ ([\mathbf{q}]_x \otimes [\mathbf{r}]_x)) \\
[\Phi \vdash \pi_i m : P_i] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} \pi_i \circ [m], \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} & [\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{q} \otimes \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{B}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto [\mathbf{q}]_x \otimes [\mathbf{r}]_x \\
[\Phi \vdash in_i m : P_1 + P_2] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} in_i \circ [m], \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} & [\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \text{let } x \text{ on } y = \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{B}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto [\mathbf{r}]_x \circ (\text{id}_{[\Gamma_2]} \otimes [\mathbf{q}]_x) \circ \text{swap} \\
[\Phi \vdash (\text{case } m \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow n_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow n_2) : R] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [[n_1], [n_2]] \circ d \circ (\text{id} \times [m]) \circ \mathcal{J} \langle \text{id}, \text{id} \rangle & [\Phi; \Gamma \vdash in_i \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{B}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto in_i \circ [\mathbf{q}]_x \\
[\Phi \vdash \lambda x^P. m : P \rightarrow R] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} \lambda([m]) & [\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash (\text{case } \mathbf{q} \text{ of } in_1 x \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_1 \mid in_2 y \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_2) : \mathbf{B}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto [[\mathbf{r}_1]_x, [\mathbf{r}_2]_x] \circ d \circ (\text{id} \otimes [\mathbf{q}]_x) \circ \text{swap} \\
[\Phi \vdash mn : R] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon \circ ([m] \times [n]) \circ \mathcal{J} \langle \text{id}, \text{id} \rangle & [\Phi; \Gamma \vdash m \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto \beta([m]_x) \circ [\mathbf{q}]_x \\
[\Phi \vdash \lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n). \mathbf{q} : Q(\mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_n, \mathbf{B})] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} [\mathbf{q}] & [\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \text{fold } \mathbf{q} : \mu X.A] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto \text{fold} \circ [\mathbf{q}]_x \\
[\Phi \vdash \text{new} : Q(\mathbf{bit}, \mathbf{qbit})] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} (x \mapsto \text{new}^\ddagger) & [\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \text{unfold } \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}[\mu X.A/X]] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto \text{unfold} \circ [\mathbf{q}]_x \\
[\Phi \vdash U : Q(\mathbf{qbit}^{\otimes n}, \mathbf{qbit}^{\otimes n})] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} (x \mapsto \text{unitary}_U^\ddagger) & [\Phi; \cdot \vdash \text{init } m : \mathbf{O}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto r^{-1}([m]_x) \\
[\Phi \vdash \text{meas} : Q(\mathbf{qbit}, \mathbf{bit})] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J} (x \mapsto \text{meas}^\ddagger) & [\Phi; \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \text{let } x = \text{lift } \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A}] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto [\widehat{\mathbf{r}}]_x \circ ([\mathbf{q}]_x \otimes \text{id}_{[\Gamma_2]}) \\
[\Phi \vdash \text{fold } m : \mu X.P] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{fold} \circ [m] & & \\
[\Phi \vdash \text{unfold } m : P[\mu X.P/X]] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{unfold} \circ [m] & & \\
[\Phi \vdash \text{run } C : |\mathbf{O}\rangle] &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x \mapsto r(\text{drop}_k^\ddagger \circ [C]_x) & &
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 15. Interpretation of classical term judgements.

Fig. 16. Interpretation of quantum term judgements.

$$[\Phi \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}] : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k] : [\Phi] \rightarrow Q(\mathbb{C}, [\mathbf{A}] \otimes [\mathbf{qbit}^k]) :: x \mapsto ([\mathbf{q}]_x \otimes \text{id}_{[\mathbf{qbit}^k]}) \circ \sigma_\ell \circ \text{state}_{|\psi\rangle}^\ddagger$$

Fig. 17. Interpretation of quantum configurations.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{fold}_{\mu X.A} : [\mathbf{A}[\mu X.A/X]] &= [\mathbf{X} \vdash \mathbf{A}] [\mu X.A] \cong [\mu X.A] : \text{unfold}_{\mu X.A} \\
\text{fold}_{\mu X.P} : [P[\mu X.P/X]] &= [X \vdash P] [\mu X.P] \cong [\mu X.P] : \text{unfold}_{\mu X.P}
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 18. Definition of the folding/unfolding isomorphisms.



**Lemma 7.1.2** (Substitution). *Given quantum types  $\Theta, X \vdash \mathbf{A}$  and  $\Theta \vdash \mathbf{B}$  and classical types  $\Theta, X \vdash P$  and  $\Theta \vdash R$ , then:*

$$\llbracket \Theta \vdash \mathbf{A}[\mathbf{B}/\mathbf{X}] \rrbracket = \llbracket \Theta, X \vdash \mathbf{A} \rrbracket \circ \langle \text{Id}, \llbracket \Theta \vdash \mathbf{B} \rrbracket \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket \Theta \vdash P[R/\mathbf{X}] \rrbracket = \llbracket \Theta, X \vdash P \rrbracket \circ \langle \text{Id}, \llbracket \Theta \vdash R \rrbracket \rangle.$$

For closed recursive types, the folding/unfolding isomorphisms are defined in Figure 18, where the equalities are from Lemma 7.1.2 and the unnamed isomorphisms are the initial algebras. Note that  $\text{fold}_{\mu X.P}$  and  $\text{fold}_{\mu X.A}$  are isomorphisms in  $\text{TD}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ , respectively. Now, the derived equations in Figure 14 follow immediately.

**7.1.1 Relationship Between Observable Types.** Quantum/classical observable types play a special role in our language and they also satisfy a special denotational relationship that we now describe.

**Proposition 7.1.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{O}$  be a closed quantum observable type with  $|\mathbf{O}|$  its classical counterpart. Then there exists a canonical set  $\langle \mathbf{O} \rangle$ , defined by induction on the derivation of  $\cdot \vdash \mathbf{O}$ , such that: (1)  $\llbracket \mathbf{O} \rrbracket \cong \ell^\infty(\langle \mathbf{O} \rangle)$  in  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ ; and (2)  $\llbracket |\mathbf{O}| \rrbracket = \mathcal{L}(\langle \mathbf{O} \rangle)$ , where  $\mathcal{L} : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{DCPO}$  is the obvious left adjoint functor that equips a set  $X$  with the discrete order.*

**PROOF.** Both of these statements follow as special cases of the abstract categorical semantics in [Lindenhovius et al. 2019, 2021, Section 6], where the source category is  $\text{Set}$  and the target one is  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  and  $\text{TD}$ , respectively (note that  $\text{TD} \cong \text{DCPO}$ , so  $\text{DCPO}$  can also be taken).  $\square$

**Remark 7.1.4.** The coherence conditions outlined in [Lindenhovius et al. 2019, 2021] are very strong and the functor  $\ell^\infty : \text{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_*$  is a fully faithful strong symmetric monoidal left adjoint (just like  $\mathcal{L}$ ). To avoid notational overhead, we treat the  $*$ -isomorphism in (1) above as an equality.

Proposition 7.1.3 shows that the interpretation of any classical observable type is a *discrete domain* and the set  $\langle \mathbf{O} \rangle$  is simply its underlying set. We may safely extend the action of the functor  $\ell^\infty$  to discrete dcpo's and then by the above remark it follows that observable types are related by the following strong relationship:

$$\llbracket \mathbf{O} \rrbracket = \ell^\infty(\llbracket |\mathbf{O}| \rrbracket). \quad (7.1)$$

This shows the interpretation  $\llbracket \mathbf{O} \rrbracket$  of a quantum observable type  $\mathbf{O}$  is a *commutative* HA-algebra.

## 7.2 Interpretation of Terms and Quantum Configurations

A classical context  $\Phi = x_1 : P_1, \dots, x_n : P_n$  is interpreted as the dcpo  $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket P_n \rrbracket$ , and a quantum context  $\Gamma = \mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n : \mathbf{A}_n$  is interpreted as the HA algebra  $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket \mathbf{A}_1 \rrbracket \otimes \dots \otimes \llbracket \mathbf{A}_n \rrbracket$ . The interpretation of classical/quantum term judgements and quantum configurations is defined by mutual induction in Figures 15, 16 and 17. Next, we explain some of the notation used therein.

The interpretation of a classical term judgement  $\Phi \vdash m : P$  is a morphism  $\llbracket \Phi \vdash m : P \rrbracket : \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  in  $\text{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$  that we often abbreviate by writing  $\llbracket m \rrbracket$ . Likewise, a quantum term judgement  $\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}$  is interpreted as a morphism  $\llbracket \Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A} \rrbracket : \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket)$  in  $\text{DCPO}$  that we often abbreviate by writing  $\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket$ . For an element  $x \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket$ , we also write  $\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_x$  and  $\llbracket m \rrbracket_x$  as a shorthand for  $\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket(x)$  and  $\llbracket m \rrbracket(x)$ , respectively. In the special case that  $\Phi = \cdot$ , we can also regard  $\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket$  as a morphism  $\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket$  in  $\mathbf{Q}$ . The unnamed isomorphism in Figure 16 is the left monoidal unitor  $\mathbb{C} \otimes A \cong A$  and "swap" is the monoidal symmetry in  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

The interpretation of a configuration  $\Phi \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}] : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  is given by a morphism in  $\text{DCPO}$  of type  $\llbracket \Phi \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}] : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k \rrbracket : \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{C}, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \mathbf{qbit}^k \rrbracket)$  defined in Figure 17. The notation  $\sigma_\ell$  used there denotes any permutation  $\sigma_\ell : \llbracket \mathbf{qbit}^n \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{qbit}^n \rrbracket$  that maps the  $i$ -th component to  $\ell(x_i)$ , defined in full analogy to  $\sigma$  from Figure 9, and where  $n = \dim(|\psi\rangle)$ . In the special case that  $C = [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$  is total, its interpretation can be seen as a morphism  $\llbracket C \rrbracket : \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow$

$\mathbf{Q}(\mathbb{C}, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket)$  in  $\mathbf{DCPO}$ , given by  $\llbracket C \rrbracket = \left( x \mapsto \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_x \circ \sigma_\ell \circ \text{state}_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}^\ddagger \right)$ . If the linking function  $\ell$  is given by  $\ell(x_i) = i$  (which we may usually assume), then its interpretation is equivalently given by  $\llbracket C \rrbracket = \left( x \mapsto \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_x \circ \text{state}_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|}^\ddagger \right)$ . If, in addition,  $C$  is closed, i.e.,  $\Phi = \cdot$ , then we can regard it as a map  $\llbracket C \rrbracket: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket$  in  $\mathbf{Q}$ , which is just a state in  $\mathbf{Q}$  (and also a state in the operator-algebraic sense).

We now comment on the terms that are of primary interest to us. The interpretation of the "new", "meas" and "U" terms is determined by the constant function on the appropriate  $\mathbf{Q}$ -morphism from §4.2 which is then injected via  $\mathcal{J}$  into  $\mathbf{TD}$ . For quantum lambda abstractions,  $\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket$  is, by construction, a Scott-continuous function  $\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket: \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket)$ , so we may see it as a morphism of  $\mathbf{TD}$  via the  $\mathcal{J}: \mathbf{DCPO} \cong \mathbf{TD}$  isomorphism. For the interpretation of the "run" term, let us consider the special case when  $C$  is total. Then the semantics is equivalently given by the Kleisli morphism  $\llbracket \text{run } C \rrbracket = (x \mapsto r(\llbracket C \rrbracket_x))$ , where  $r$  is the isomorphism from Theorem 5.2.1. When  $C$  is not total, the  $\text{drop}_k^\ddagger$  morphism is used to get rid of the remaining auxiliary qubits in accordance with affine principles. The interpretation of the "init" term is done by simply taking the inverse isomorphism  $r^{-1}$ . Dynamic lifting is interpreted using the natural bijection  $(\overline{\quad})$  from Proposition 5.2.2.

Finally, the interpretation of the "mq" term, representing quantum function application, makes use of the barycentre maps from Theorem 5.3.5. In our view, this is the term of highest interest discussed here and which required the most effort to interpret. Notice that its interpretation is unique in that it *combines* two different Kegelspitzen structures living in two different categories.

### 7.3 Interpretation of (Observable) Values

The interpretation of values in our language enjoys additional structural properties, as usual.

**Proposition 7.3.1.** *For any classical value  $\Phi \vdash v : P$  and quantum value  $\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{A}$ , we have:*

- (1)  $\llbracket v \rrbracket: \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  also is a morphism of  $\mathbf{TD}$ . Equivalently, it is in the image of  $\mathcal{J}$ .
- (2)  $\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket: \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket)$  corestricts to  $\mathbf{Q}_*(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket)$ . That is,  $\forall x \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket. \llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket_x \in \mathbf{Q}_*(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket)$ .

This means that  $\llbracket v \rrbracket_x$  is a Dirac valuation and  $\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket_x$  is a  $*$ -homomorphism, for any  $x \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket$ . Note that the functor  $\mathcal{J}$  restricts to an isomorphism of categories  $\mathcal{J}: \mathbf{DCPO} \cong \mathbf{TD}$  [Jia et al. 2021], so for a classical value  $v$ , we can define  $(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{J}^{-1} \llbracket v \rrbracket: \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  in  $\mathbf{DCPO}$ .

The interpretation of classical/quantum *observable* values enjoys even stronger structural properties and they also are strongly related to each other, as we show next. If  $\Phi \vdash v : P$  is an *observable* value, then  $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  are discrete, so we can safely regard  $(v): \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  as a morphism in  $\mathbf{Set}$ . For the next proposition, we identify  $\mathbb{C}$  with  $\ell^\infty(1)$  (see Remark 7.1.4).

**Proposition 7.3.2.** *Let  $\cdot; \cdot \vdash \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{O}$  be an observable quantum value and let  $\cdot \vdash |\mathbf{v}| : |\mathbf{O}|$  be its classical counterpart. Then  $\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket = \ell^\infty(\llbracket |\mathbf{v}| \rrbracket)$  and  $\llbracket |\mathbf{v}| \rrbracket = \mathcal{J}(\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket)$ . Furthermore,  $r(\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket) = \llbracket |\mathbf{v}| \rrbracket_*$ .*

**PROOF.** By combining Proposition 7.1.3 and [Lindenhovius et al. 2021, Proposition 6.15]. The final statement follows by Theorem 5.2.1 and by construction of the isomorphism  $r$ , which relies on the fact that the functors  $\ell^\infty$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  (and implicitly  $\mathcal{L}$ ) are fully faithful.  $\square$

The above proposition is used for establishing soundness for the "run" and "init" terms. The natural isomorphism  $(\overline{\quad})$  from Proposition 5.2.2 satisfies an additional coherence condition (see Appendix C) w.r.t  $\ell^\infty$ , which, combined with Proposition 7.3.2, is used for the soundness proof of the "lift" term. Also, by Remark 2.3.3, it suffices to establish Proposition 7.3.2 for *closed* observable values, as we have done.

## 7.4 Soundness and Computational Adequacy

Our final contribution is to show our semantic interpretation is sound and (strongly) adequate.

**Lemma 7.4.1** (Substitution). *Let  $\Phi \vdash v : P$  be a classical value and  $\Phi; \Sigma \vdash \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{A}$  a quantum value.*

- (1) *If  $\Phi, x : P \vdash m : R$ , then  $\llbracket m[v/x] \rrbracket = \llbracket m \rrbracket \odot (\text{id}_{\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket} \times \llbracket v \rrbracket) \odot \mathcal{J}\langle \text{id}_{\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket}, \text{id}_{\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket} \rangle$ .*
- (2) *If  $\Phi; \Gamma, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{A} \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}$  and  $x \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket$ , then  $\llbracket \mathbf{q}[v/y] \rrbracket_x = \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_x \circ (\text{id}_{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket} \otimes \llbracket v \rrbracket_x)$ .*
- (3) *If  $\Phi, z : P; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}$  and  $x \in \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket$ , then  $\llbracket \mathbf{q}[v/z] \rrbracket(x) = \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket(x, (v)(x))$ .*

Soundness is the statement that our interpretation is invariant under single-step reduction in a probabilistic sense. In both equations sums of morphisms are defined pointwise using the convex structure of the codomain (which is a Kegelspitze).

**Theorem 7.4.2** (Soundness). *For any classical term  $\Phi \vdash m : P$  and configuration  $\Phi \vdash C : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$ :*

$$\llbracket m \rrbracket = \sum_{m \xrightarrow{p} m'} p \llbracket m' \rrbracket \qquad \llbracket C \rrbracket = \sum_{C \xrightarrow{r} C'} r \llbracket C' \rrbracket$$

*assuming  $m \xrightarrow{p} m'$  and  $C \xrightarrow{r} C'$  for some rules from the operational semantics (§2) and where the convex sums range over all such rules.*

In the above theorem, both sums have at most two summands. Our next theorem is much stronger, because it involves reductions spanning an arbitrary number of steps, and the convex sums can be countably infinite (these can be defined in any Kegelspitze by Definition 5.3.1).

**Theorem 7.4.3** (Strong Adequacy). *Let  $\cdot \vdash m : P$  be a closed classical term and  $\cdot \vdash C : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  a closed quantum configuration. Then:*

$$\llbracket m \rrbracket = \sum_{v \in \text{Val}(m)} P(m \rightarrow_* v) \llbracket v \rrbracket \qquad \llbracket C \rrbracket = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{Val}(C)} P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket.$$

PROOF. See Appendix D. □

*Remark 7.4.4.* As mentioned previously, the *progress* property holds for quantum configurations that are closed (and not necessarily total). The above theorem indeed holds for precisely this class of configurations. Of course, it also holds for closed total configurations as a special case.

**Corollary 7.4.5** (Adequacy). *Let  $\cdot \vdash m : 1$  be a term and  $\cdot \vdash C : \mathbf{I}$  a quantum configuration. Then:*

$$\llbracket m \rrbracket_* (\{*\}) = \text{Halt}(m) \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket C \rrbracket (1) = \text{Halt}(C).$$

PROOF. If  $v : 1$  is a value, then  $v = ()$  and we have  $\llbracket () \rrbracket_* (\{*\}) = 1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Similarly, if  $\cdot \vdash \mathcal{V} : \mathbf{I}$  is a value configuration, then  $\mathcal{V} = [1, \emptyset, *]$  and it follows  $\llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket (1) = 1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The proof then follows immediately by Theorem 7.4.3 and by definition of Halt in (2.1). □

## 8 CONCLUSION AND RELATED WORK

The work closest to ours is QWIRE [Paykin et al. 2017] and EWire [Rennela and Staton 2020]. They are related languages that have a classical and non-linear host language together with a separate small quantum circuit language. However, neither language is suitable for variational quantum programming, because quantum function application is restricted to pure and deterministic (i.e. non-probabilistic) classical programs. Furthermore, both languages have only limited support for recursion and repeat-until-success patterns are not expressible within the host languages. VQPL does not have such restrictions. Furthermore, neither of these papers proves an adequacy result and the only soundness statements that are proven are with respect to strongly-normalising fragments

of the languages. The focus in QWIRE and EWIRE is on quantum *circuits* and not on effectful quantum/probabilistic programming, which is the focus of our paper.

Other related work includes adequate and even fully-abstract semantics for the quantum lambda calculus [Clairambault and de Visme 2020; Clairambault et al. 2019; Pagani et al. 2014]. In this version of the quantum lambda calculus, classical information is represented by types of the form  $!(A \multimap B)$ , but arbitrary types  $!A$  are not allowed. This makes it difficult to understand the connections to classical probabilistic programming. In another version of the quantum lambda calculus [Cho and Westerbaan 2016], the authors allow types of the form  $!A$ , but their model does not support recursion. In all of these papers, there is no denotational analysis that relates the models of the quantum lambda calculus to models of classical probabilistic programming. Indeed, this is the main focus of our paper and we are the first to present such an analysis.

To conclude, we described a mixed linear/non-linear quantum/probabilistic programming language which is suitable for programming hybrid quantum-classical algorithms. Our language, VQPL, is equipped with a type system and a type-safe operational semantics that makes it suitable for variational quantum programming (§2). We showed how to interpret the (induced) classical probabilistic effects using a commutative probabilistic monad on  $\text{dcpo}$ 's (§3). We then showed how to interpret quantum resources and effects in the category of hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras, which we proved is enriched over continuous domains (§4). The relationship between quantum and classical probabilistic effects is modelled via novel semantic methods (§5). Most notably, we use the barycentre maps of our model that are well-behaved under the strong sense of enrichment we established to combine probabilistic and quantum effects (§5.3). Finally, we organised all the relevant mathematical structure in a categorical model (§6), and we described a sound and strongly adequate denotational semantics for VQPL within that model (§7).

A natural question to ask is how to extend VQPL with higher-order quantum lambda abstractions and to find a suitable model. We have shown that our model supports first-order quantum lambda abstractions, but we do not believe it supports higher-order quantum ones. The problem is that there is no known order on the category  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  that makes the adjunction  $\mathbf{Q}_* \overset{\perp}{\rightleftarrows} \mathbf{Q}$  DCPO-enriched. Even though  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  is monoidal closed, the induced Kleisli exponential is not DCPO-enriched, and so it does not behave well under (type) recursion. On the other hand, the category  $\mathbf{Q}$  is enriched in a very strong sense (over domains), which is crucial for establishing the strong correspondence between classical probabilistic and quantum effects that we presented here. Resolving this conundrum is left for future work.

## REFERENCES

- M. Abadi and M. P. Fiore. 1996. Syntactic Considerations on Recursive Types. In *Proceedings 11th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. 242–252. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1996.561324>
- S. Abramsky and A. Jung. 1994. Domain Theory. In *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science (Vol. 3)*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 1–168. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=218742.218744>
- P.N. Benton. 1995. A mixed linear and non-linear logic: Proofs, terms and models. In *Computer Science Logic: 8th Workshop, CSL '94, Selected Papers*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0022251>
- P. N. Benton and P. Wadler. 1996. Linear Logic, Monads and the Lambda Calculus. In *LICS 1996*.
- B. Blackadar. 2006. *Operator Algebras: Theory of  $C^*$ -algebras and von Neumann algebras*. Springer-Verlag.
- K. Cho. 2016. Semantics for a Quantum Programming Language by Operator Algebras. *New Generation Comput.* 34, 1-2 (2016), 25–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00354-016-0204-3>
- Kenta Cho and Abraham Westerbaan. 2016. Von Neumann Algebras form a Model for the Quantum Lambda Calculus. *CoRR abs/1603.02133* (2016). arXiv:1603.02133 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.02133>
- Pierre Clairambault and Marc de Visme. 2020. Full abstraction for the quantum lambda-calculus. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 4, POPL (2020), 63:1–63:28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371131>
- Pierre Clairambault, Marc de Visme, and Glynn Winskel. 2019. Game semantics for quantum programming. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3, POPL (2019), 32:1–32:29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290345>

- Marcelo Fiore and Gordon Plotkin. 1994. An Axiomatization of Computationally Adequate Domain Theoretic Models of FPC. In *LICS*. IEEE Computer Society, 92–102.
- M. P. Fiore. 1994. *Axiomatic domain theory in categories of partial maps*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Edinburgh, UK.
- R. Furber. 2019. Continuous Dcpds in Quantum Computing. *preprint* (2019). <http://people.cs.aau.dk/~furber/papers/contawconf.pdf>
- G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. W. Mislove, and D. S. Scott. 2003. *Continuous Lattices and Domains*. Cambridge University Press.
- J.-Y. Girard. 1987. Linear Logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* 50 (1987), 1 – 101.
- Robert Harper. 2016. *Practical Foundations for Programming Languages (2nd. Ed.)*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~7Erwh/pfpl/index.html>
- Bart Jacobs. 2016. *Introduction to Coalgebra: Towards Mathematics of States and Observation*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. 59. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316823187>
- Xiaodong Jia, Bert Lindenhovius, Michael Mislove, and Vladimir Zamdzhiev. 2021. Commutative Monads for Probabilistic Programming Languages. In *Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2021)*. arXiv:2102.00510 [cs.LO]
- Claire Jones. 1990. *Probabilistic Non-determinism*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Edinburgh, UK. <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/413>
- C. Jones and Gordon D. Plotkin. 1989. A Probabilistic Powerdomain of Evaluations. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '89), Pacific Grove, California, USA, June 5-8, 1989*. IEEE Computer Society, 186–195. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1989.39173>
- R.V. Kadison and J.R. Ringrose. 1997. *Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebra, Volume I: Elementary Theory*. American Mathematical Society.
- Klaus Keimel and Gordon D. Plotkin. 2017. Mixed powerdomains for probability and nondeterminism. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 13, Issue 1 (Jan. 2017). [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13\(1:2\)2017](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13(1:2)2017)
- A. Kornell. 2017. Quantum Collections. *Int. J. Math.* 28, 12 (2017), 1750085. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129167X17500859>
- A. Kornell. 2020. Quantum Sets. *J. Math. Phys.* 61 (2020), 102202. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5054128>
- Klaas Landsman. 2017. *Foundations of Quantum Theory - From Classical Concepts to Operator Algebras*. Springer Open.
- Bert Lindenhovius, Michael Mislove, and Vladimir Zamdzhiev. 2019. Mixed Linear and Non-linear Recursive Types. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3, ICFP, Article 111 (Aug. 2019), 29 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341715>
- Bert Lindenhovius, Michael Mislove, and Vladimir Zamdzhiev. 2021. LNL-FPC: The Linear/Non-linear Fixpoint Calculus. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* Volume 17, Issue 2 (April 2021). <https://lmcs.episciences.org/7390>
- Saunders Mac Lane. 1998. *Categories for the Working Mathematician (2nd ed.)*. Springer.
- Jarrod R McClean, Jonathan Romero, Ryan Babbush, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. 2016. The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms. *New Journal of Physics* 18, 2 (2016), 023023.
- Eugenio Moggi. 1991. Notions of Computation and Monads. *Inf. Comput.* 93, 1 (1991), 55–92. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(91\)90052-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(91)90052-4)
- Michele Pagani, Peter Selinger, and Benoît Valiron. 2014. Applying quantitative semantics to higher-order quantum computing. In *The 41st Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL '14, San Diego, CA, USA, January 20-21, 2014*, Suresh Jagannathan and Peter Sewell (Eds.). ACM, 647–658. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2535838.2535879>
- J. Paykin, R. Rand, and S. Zdancewic. 2017. QWIRE: a core language for quantum circuits. In *POPL*. ACM, 846–858.
- Romain Péchoux, Simon Perdrix, Mathys Rennela, and Vladimir Zamdzhiev. 2020. Quantum Programming with Inductive Datatypes: Causality and Affine Type Theory. In *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 23rd International Conference, FOSSACS 2020 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 12077)*. Springer, 562–581. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45231-5\\_29](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45231-5_29)
- Alberto Peruzzo, Jarrod McClean, Peter Shadbolt, Man-Hong Yung, Xiao-Qi Zhou, Peter J Love, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Jeremy L O'brien. 2014. A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor. *Nature communications* 5, 1 (2014), 1–7.
- John Power and Edmund Robinson. 1997. Premonoidal Categories and Notions of Computation. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* 7, 5 (1997), 453–468. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129597002375>
- Mathys Rennela and Sam Staton. 2020. Classical Control, Quantum Circuits and Linear Logic in Enriched Category Theory. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 16, 1 (2020). [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-16\(1:30\)2020](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-16(1:30)2020)
- P. Selinger. 2004a. Towards a quantum programming language. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 14, 4 (2004), 527–586.
- Peter Selinger. 2004b. Towards a semantics for higher-order quantum computation. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Quantum Programming Languages*, 127–143.
- M.B. Smyth and G.D. Plotkin. 1982. The Category-theoretic Solution of Recursive Domain Equations. *Siam J. Comput.* (1982).

E. Størmer. 2013. *Positive Linear Maps of Operator Algebras*. Springer.

M. Takesaki. 2000. *Theory of Operator Algebra I*. Springer.

Abraham Westerbaan. 2019. *The Category of von Neumann algebras, PhD Thesis*. arXiv:[arxiv:1804.02203](https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.02203)

William K Wootters and Wojciech H Zurek. 1982. A single quantum cannot be cloned. *Nature* 299, 5886 (1982), 802–803.



## A DOMAIN ENRICHMENT OF HEREDITARILY ATOMIC VON NEUMANN ALGEBRAS

In this appendix we prove that the category  $\mathbf{HA}$  (and thus also  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) is enriched over continuous dcpo's. Thus we have to show that  $\mathbf{HA}(M, N)$  is a continuous dcpo for each  $M, N \in \mathbf{HA}$ . We will rely heavily on the following lemma, which follows from [Selinger 2004b, Example 2.7]:

**Lemma A.0.1.** *Let  $M$  be a von Neumann algebra. If  $M$  is hereditarily atomic, then  $[0, 1]_M$  is a continuous dcpo.*

We note that the converse of this lemma is shown in [Furber 2019]. Basically, our proof strategy is to show that all principal downsets in  $\mathbf{HA}(M, N)$  are order isomorphic to  $[0, 1]_R$  for some hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebra. It then follows from the above lemma that  $\mathbf{HA}(M, N)$  is continuous as well.

We will rely on some topologies on von Neumann algebras. We already mentioned the strong and the weak operator topologies on a von Neumann algebra  $M$  on  $H$  in Section 4.2, where the former is the locally convex topology induced by the seminorms  $a \mapsto \|ah\|$  for  $h \in H$ , and the latter is the locally convex topology induced by the seminorms  $a \mapsto |\langle k, ah \rangle|$  for  $h, k \in H$ . We further note that  $M$  has an intrinsic topology, which is known under several names: the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology, the ultraweak operator topology or the weak\*-topology. It is the locally convex topology on  $M$  induced by the seminorms  $a \mapsto \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle k_n, ah_n \rangle \right|$ , where  $(h_n)_n$  and  $(k_n)_n$  are sequences in  $H$  such that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|h_n\|^2 < \infty$  and  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|k_n\|^2 < \infty$ . Any completely positive map between von Neumann algebras is normal if and only if it is continuous with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology [Blackadar 2006, Proposition III.2.2.2]. The  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology is stronger than the weak operator topology, but these topologies coincide on norm-bounded subsets [Blackadar 2006, I.3.1.4]. We note that the bicommutant theorem of von Neumann states that a unital \*-subalgebra of  $B(H)$  is a von Neumann algebra if and only if it is closed with respect to either the weak operator topology, the strong operator topology or the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology (and hence w.r.t. all of them).

Given a von Neumann algebra  $M$  and a Hilbert space  $H$ , any completely positive map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow B(H)$  can be decomposed as  $\varphi(x) = v^* \pi(x) v$ , where  $\pi : M \rightarrow B(K)$  is a representation of  $M$  on some Hilbert space  $K$ , i.e., a unital \*-homomorphism, and  $v : H \rightarrow K$  is a linear map such that  $\|v\|^2 \leq \|\varphi(1)\|$ . We say that  $(\pi, v, K)$  is a Stinespring representation of  $\varphi$ . Moreover,  $K$  can be chosen to be minimal, i.e.,  $\pi[M]vH$  is norm dense in  $K$ ; up to unitary equivalence, the minimal Stinespring decomposition of  $\varphi$  is unique. A proof of the existence of the minimal Stinespring representation is given in [Blackadar 2006, Theorem II.6.9.7] and in [Størmer 2013, Theorem 1.2.7]. In the proof of [Blackadar 2006, Theorem III.2.2.4] it is asserted that  $\pi$  is normal when  $\varphi$  is normal.

**Proposition A.0.2.** *Let  $M$  be a von Neumann algebra, let  $H$  be a Hilbert space, and let  $\varphi : M \rightarrow B(H)$  be a normal completely positive map with minimal Stinespring representation  $(\pi, v, K)$ . Then we have an order isomorphism  $[0, 1]_{\pi[M]'} \rightarrow \downarrow \varphi$ ,  $t \mapsto \varphi_t$ , where  $\varphi_t(x) = v^* t \pi(x) v$  for each  $x \in M$  and where the downset is taken in  $\mathbf{vN}(M, B(H))$ .*

**PROOF.** It follows from [Størmer 2013, Theorem 3.5.3] and the paragraph preceding it that the assignment  $t \mapsto \varphi_t$  is a bijection from  $[0, 1]_{\pi[M]}'$  to the set  $S$  of all completely positive maps  $\psi : M \rightarrow B(H)$  such that  $\varphi - \psi$  is completely positive. We show that  $S = \downarrow \varphi$ . Using the bijection, any  $\psi \in S$  is of the form  $v^* t \pi v$  for some  $t \in [0, 1]_{\pi[M]}'$ . Since  $\varphi$  is normal, so is  $\pi$ , whence also  $\psi = v^* t \pi v$  is normal. Moreover,  $\varphi$  is subunital, and  $\varphi - \psi$  is completely positive, so positive, hence  $\psi(1_M) \leq \varphi(1_M) \leq 1_H$ , so also  $\psi$  is subunital. Thus  $\psi \in \mathbf{vN}(M, B(H))$ . Now by definition of the order  $\leq$  on  $\mathbf{vN}(M, B(H))$  (cf. Section 4.3),  $\varphi - \psi$  is completely positive expresses that  $\psi \leq \varphi$ , so the assignment  $t \mapsto \varphi_t$  is indeed a bijection between  $[0, 1]_{\pi[M]}'$  and  $\downarrow \varphi$ . We have to show that it is an order isomorphism. Let  $t_1 \leq t_2$  in  $[0, 1]_{\pi[M]}'$ . Let  $x \in M$  be positive, so  $x = y^* y$  for some



$y \in M$ . Then for each  $i = 1, 2$ , we have that  $\pi(y^*)$  commutes with  $t_i$  (since the latter is an element of  $\pi[M]'$ , the commutant of  $\pi[M]$  in  $B(K)$ ), whence  $\varphi_{t_i}(x) = v^* t_i \pi(y^*) \pi(y) v = v^* \pi(y)^* t_i \pi(y) v$ . Since for any operator  $b$  the assignment  $t \mapsto b^* t b$  preserves the order (cf. [Kadison and Ringrose 1997, Corollary 4.2.7]), it now follows that  $\varphi_{t_1}(x) \leq \varphi_{t_2}(x)$  in  $B(H)$ , and since  $x$  is an arbitrary positive element of  $M$ , we conclude that hence  $\varphi_{t_1} \leq \varphi_{t_2}$ .

Next assume that  $\varphi_{t_1} \leq \varphi_{t_2}$ . We have to show that  $t_1 \leq t_2$ . Write  $\varphi_i := \varphi_{t_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\varphi_3 := \varphi$ . For each  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , let  $(\pi_i, v_i, K_i)$  be the minimal Stinespring representation of  $\varphi_i$ . For  $i \leq j$  in  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ , [Størmer 2013, Lemma 3.5.2] assures the existence of operators  $s_{ij} : K_j \rightarrow K_i$  with  $\|s_{ij}\| \leq 1$  such that

- (i)  $s_{ij} v_j = v_i$ ;
- (ii)  $s_{ij} \pi_j(x) = \pi_i(x) s_{ij}$  for each  $x \in M$ .

Note that  $\pi_3 = \pi$  for  $\varphi_3 = \varphi$ . As a consequence, for  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$  with  $i \leq j$  and for each  $x \in M$  we have

$$v_j^* s_{ij}^* s_{ij} \pi_j(x) v_j = v_i^* s_{ij} \pi_j(x) v_j = v_i^* \pi_i(x) s_{ij} v_j = v_i^* \pi_i(x) v_i = \varphi_i(x) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and for each  $x \in M$  we have

$$s_{ij}^* s_{ij} \pi_j(x) = s_{ij}^* \pi_i(x) s_{ij} = s_{ij}^* \pi_i(x^*)^* s_{ij} = (\pi_i(x^*) s_{ij})^* s_{ij} = (s_{ij} \pi_j(x^*))^* s_{ij} = \pi_j(x) s_{ij}^* s_{ij} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

so  $s_{ij}^* s_{ij}$  is an element of  $\pi_j[M]'$ , the commutant of  $\pi_j[M]$ . In particular, we find that  $s_{i3}^* s_{i3} \in \pi_3[M]' = \pi[M]'$  such that  $v^* s_{i3}^* s_{i3} \pi v = v^* s_{i3}^* s_{i3} \pi v = \varphi_i$ . Since by the bijection  $t_i$  is the unique element in  $\pi[M]'$  such that  $\varphi_i(x) = v^* t_i \pi(x) v$ , it follows that  $t_i = s_{i3}^* s_{i3}$ . Moreover, for each  $x \in M$  we have

$$v^* s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} \pi(x) v = v^* s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} \pi_3(x) v = v^* s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} \pi_2(x) s_{23} v = v^* s_{12}^* s_{12} \pi_2(x) v = \varphi_1(x),$$

where we used (A.1) in the last equality, and for each  $x \in M$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} \pi_3(x) &= s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} \pi_2(x) s_{23} = s_{23}^* \pi_2(x) s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} = s_{23}^* \pi_2(x^*)^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} = (\pi_2(x^*) s_{23})^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} \\ &= (s_{23} \pi_3(x^*))^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} = \pi_3(x^*)^* s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} = \pi_3(x) s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (A.2) in the second equality. Thus  $s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23}$  is an element of  $\pi_3[M]' = \pi[M]'$  and  $\varphi_1 = v^* s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} \pi v$ , which allows us to conclude that  $t_1 = s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23}$ . Since  $\|s_{ij}\| \leq 1$ , we have  $\|s_{ij}^* s_{ij}\| = \|s_{ij}\|^2 \leq 1$  using the  $C^*$ -identity. It now follows from [Kadison and Ringrose 1997, Proposition 4.2.3(ii)] that  $s_{ij}^* s_{ij} \leq 1$ , so  $1 - s_{ij}^* s_{ij}$  is positive, whence  $s_{23}^* (1 - s_{12}^* s_{12}) s_{23}$  is positive. But

$$s_{23}^* (1 - s_{12}^* s_{12}) s_{23} = s_{23}^* s_{23} - s_{23}^* s_{12}^* s_{12} s_{23} = t_2 - t_1,$$

so also  $t_2 - t_1$  is positive, i.e.,  $t_1 \leq t_2$ .  $\square$

It follows that  $\text{vN}(M, B(H))$  is a continuous dcpo if  $\pi[M]'$  is hereditarily atomic. Thus we have to understand the minimal Stinespring representation  $\pi$  of  $M$  better. In case  $M$  is a product of von Neumann algebras (as in the case of hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras), it turns out we can describe  $\pi$  in terms of the minimal Stinespring representations of the product factors of  $M$  as is shown in the following two lemmas.

**Lemma A.0.3.** *Let  $M = \prod_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha$  be the product of a collection  $(M_\alpha : \alpha \in A)$  of von Neumann algebras, for each  $\alpha \in A$  let  $\pi_\alpha : M_\alpha \rightarrow B(K_\alpha)$  be a representation on some Hilbert space  $K_\alpha$ , and let  $K \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} K_\alpha$  be the sum of the Hilbert spaces  $K_\alpha$ . Then  $\pi : M \rightarrow B(K)$  defined by  $\pi(x)k = (\pi_\alpha(x_\alpha)k_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  for each  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $M$  and each  $k = (k_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $K$  is a representation of  $M$  on  $K$  such there is an injective  $*$ -homomorphism  $\rho : \pi[M] \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in A} B(K_\alpha)$ .*

PROOF. Clearly  $\pi$  is a  $*$ -homomorphism, hence a representation of  $M$  onto  $K$ . For  $\alpha \in A$ , let  $e_\alpha : K_\alpha \rightarrow K$  be the embedding and  $p_\alpha : K \rightarrow K_\alpha$  be the projection, which are easily seen to be bounded with norm at most 1, and to be each other's adjoints: for each  $k \in K$  and each  $h_\alpha \in K_\alpha$ , we have  $\langle p_\alpha k, h_\alpha \rangle = \langle k, e_\alpha h_\alpha \rangle$ . A straightforward application of [Kadison and Ringrose 1997, 2.5.8] gives us that  $\sum_{\alpha \in A} e_\alpha p_\alpha$  converges strongly to  $1_K$ . For each  $y \in B(K)$ , and each  $\alpha, \beta \in A$  let  $y_{\alpha\beta} = p_\beta y e_\alpha : K_\alpha \rightarrow K_\beta$ , so  $y_{\alpha\beta} \in B(K_\alpha, K_\beta)$ . Then  $y$  is completely determined by the  $y_{\alpha\beta}$ . Indeed, if  $z \in B(K)$  and for each  $\alpha, \beta \in A$ , we have  $y_{\alpha\beta} = z_{\alpha\beta}$ , then we have  $e_\beta p_\beta y e_\alpha p_\alpha = e_\beta p_\beta z e_\alpha p_\alpha$ , and since multiplication with a fixed operator is strongly continuous (cf. [Kadison and Ringrose 1997, Remark 2.5.10]), and  $\sum_{\alpha \in A} e_\alpha p_\alpha$  converges strongly to 1, we obtain  $y = z$ .

For  $y, z \in B(K)$  and  $\beta, \gamma \in A$ , multiplication can be described in a way similar to matrix multiplication:  $(yz)_{\beta\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha \in A} y_{\beta\alpha} z_{\alpha\gamma}$ . Moreover, for  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $M$ ,  $\beta, \gamma \in A$  and each  $a \in K_\gamma$  we have

$$(\pi(x))_{\beta\gamma} a = p_\gamma \pi(x) e_\beta(a) = p_\gamma \pi(x) (\delta_{\alpha\beta} a)_{\alpha \in A} = p_\gamma (\pi_\alpha(x_\alpha) \delta_{\alpha\beta} a)_{\alpha \in A} = \pi_\gamma(x_\gamma) (\delta_\gamma \beta a) = \delta_{\beta\gamma} \pi_\gamma(x_\gamma) a,$$

hence

$$\pi(x)_{\beta\gamma} = \delta_{\beta\gamma} \pi_\gamma(x_\gamma). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Let  $D = \{y \in B(K) : y_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \text{ for each } \alpha \neq \beta \text{ in } A\}$ . We define a map  $\rho : D \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in A} B(K_\alpha)$  by  $y \mapsto (y_{\alpha\alpha})_{\alpha \in A}$ . In order to show that  $\rho$  is well defined, let  $y \in D$ . Since for each  $\alpha \in A$ , we have  $\|y_{\alpha\alpha}\| = \|p_\alpha y e_\alpha\| \leq \|p_\alpha\| \|y\| \|e_\alpha\| \leq \|y\|$ , because  $\|p_\alpha\|, \|e_\alpha\| \leq 1$ , it follows that  $\sup_{\alpha \in A} \|y_{\alpha\alpha}\| \leq \|y\| < \infty$ , which shows that  $\rho(y)$  is a well-defined element of  $\prod_{\alpha \in A} B(K_\alpha)$ . Clearly  $\rho$  is a  $*$ -homomorphism (where preservation of the involution  $(-)^*$  follows since  $p_\alpha$  and  $e_\alpha$  are each other's adjoints). It is injective, because each  $y \in B(K)$  is determined by  $y_{\beta\gamma}$  for  $\beta, \gamma \in A$ , and by definition of  $D$ , we have  $y_{\beta\gamma} = 0$  for each  $\beta \neq \gamma$ .

Let  $y \in \pi[M]'$ , i.e.,  $y \in B(K)$  such that  $\pi(x)y = y\pi(x)$  for each  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $M$ . Let  $\beta \neq \gamma$  in  $A$ , so in particular  $x_\gamma = 0$ . Let  $x_\beta = 1_{M_\beta}$  and let  $x_\alpha = 0$  for each  $\alpha \neq \beta$ . Then  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  is an element of  $M$  and since  $y \in \pi[M]'$ , we find:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\beta\gamma} &= \pi_\beta(1_{M_\beta}) y_{\beta\gamma} = \pi_\beta(x_\beta) y_{\beta\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \delta_{\beta\alpha} \pi_\alpha(x_\alpha) y_{\alpha\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \pi(x)_{\beta\alpha} y_{\alpha\gamma} = (\pi(x)y)_{\beta\gamma} \\ &= (y\pi(x))_{\beta\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha \in A} y_{\beta\alpha} \pi(x)_{\alpha\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha \in A} y_{\beta\alpha} \delta_{\alpha\gamma} \pi_\gamma(x_\gamma) = y_{\beta\gamma} \pi_\gamma(x_\gamma) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (A.3) in the fourth and eighth equality. Hence  $y \in D$ , from which follows that  $\rho$  restricts to an injective  $*$ -homomorphism  $\pi[M]' \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in A} B(K_\alpha)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.0.4.** *Let  $(M_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  be a collection of von Neumann algebras, and let  $M = \prod_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha$ , and for  $\beta \in A$ , denote the embedding  $M_\beta \rightarrow M$  by  $\iota_\beta$ . Let  $H$  be a Hilbert space, and let  $\varphi : M \rightarrow B(H)$  be a normal completely positive subunitary map. Then for each  $\alpha \in A$ , the map  $\varphi_\alpha := \varphi \circ \iota_\alpha$  is a completely positive map  $M_\alpha \rightarrow B(H)$ , and if  $(\pi_\alpha, v_\alpha, K_\alpha)$  denotes the minimal Stinespring representation corresponding to  $\varphi_\alpha$ , then the representation  $(\pi, v, K)$  constructed in Lemma A.0.3 from the representations  $(\pi_\alpha, v_\alpha, K_\alpha)$  is the minimal Stinespring representation corresponding to  $\varphi$ .*

PROOF. Let  $\alpha \in A$ . Then  $\iota_\alpha$  is a (non-unital)  $*$ -homomorphism, hence completely positive, whence  $\varphi_\alpha$  is completely positive. The identity element in  $M_\alpha$  corresponds to a projection  $r_\alpha$  in  $M$ , and  $\sum_{\alpha \in A} r_\alpha = 1_M$ , where the convergence is with respect to the strong operator topology. Since multiplication with a fixed element is continuous with respect to the strong operator topology, it follows that  $x = \sum_{\alpha \in A} x r_\alpha$  for each  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $M$ . It is easy to see that  $x r_\alpha = \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha)$ : if  $\bar{x}_\alpha$  denotes the element in  $M$  whose  $\alpha$ -component is  $x_\alpha$  and with all other components vanishing, then clearly  $\bar{x}_\alpha = \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha)$  and  $x r_\alpha = \bar{x}_\alpha r_\alpha$ , hence  $x r_\alpha = \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha) \iota_\alpha(1_{M_\alpha}) = \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha 1_{M_\alpha}) = \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha)$ . Since convergence with respect to the strong operator topology implies convergence with respect to the

weak operator topology, and the latter topology coincides with the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology on the unit ball of an operator algebra [Takesaki 2000, Lemma II.2.5], it follows that  $x = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha)$ , where the sum converges with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology.

Since  $\varphi$  is normal, so continuous with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology, and since we previously found that  $x = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha)$  for each  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $M$ , where the sum converges with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology, we obtain

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi\left(\sum_{\alpha \in A} \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha)\right) = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \varphi \circ \iota_\alpha(x_\alpha) = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \varphi_\alpha(x_\alpha).$$

For each  $\alpha \in A$ , let  $(\pi_\alpha, v_\alpha, K_\alpha)$  be the minimal Stinespring representation of  $\varphi_\alpha$ , so  $v_\alpha : H \rightarrow K_\alpha$  satisfies  $\|v_\alpha\|^2 \leq \|\varphi_\alpha(1_{M_\alpha})\|$  and  $\varphi_\alpha(x) = v_\alpha^* \pi_\alpha(x) v_\alpha$  for each  $x \in M_\alpha$ , and  $\overline{\pi_\alpha[M_\alpha]v_\alpha H} = K_\alpha$ . Let  $K = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} K_\alpha$ . We want to define  $v : H \rightarrow K$  by  $vh = (v_\alpha h)_{\alpha \in A}$ , but we have to show that each  $vh$  is indeed an element of  $K$ , i.e., we have to show that  $\sum_{\alpha \in A} \|v_\alpha h\|^2 < \infty$ . Since each Stinespring representation  $\pi_\alpha$  is unital, and since  $\varphi$  is subunital, we obtain

$$1_H \geq \varphi(1_M) = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \varphi_\alpha(1_{M_\alpha}) = \sum_{\alpha \in A} v_\alpha^* \pi_\alpha(1_{M_\alpha}) v_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha \in A} v_\alpha^* v_\alpha.$$

Hence for each  $h \in H$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{\alpha \in A} \|v_\alpha h\|^2 = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle v_\alpha h, v_\alpha h \rangle = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle h, v_\alpha^* v_\alpha h \rangle = \left\langle h, \left( \sum_{\alpha \in A} v_\alpha^* v_\alpha \right) h \right\rangle \leq \langle h, h \rangle = \|h\|^2,$$

where the third equality is due to the fact convergence with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology implies convergence with respect to the weak operator topology. Thus  $v : H \rightarrow K$  given by  $vh = (v_\alpha h)_{\alpha \in A}$  is indeed a well defined operator.

Then for  $h, k \in H$ , and  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $M$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle k, v^* \pi(x) v h \rangle_H &= \langle vk, \pi(x) v h \rangle_K = \langle (v_\alpha k)_{\alpha \in A}, (\pi_\alpha(x_\alpha) v_\alpha h)_{\alpha \in A} \rangle_K \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle v_\alpha k, \pi_\alpha(x_\alpha) v_\alpha h \rangle_{K_\alpha} = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle h, v_\alpha^* \pi_\alpha(x_\alpha) v_\alpha h \rangle_H \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle k, \varphi_\alpha(x_\alpha) h \rangle_H = \left\langle k, \sum_{\alpha \in A} \varphi_\alpha(x_\alpha) h \right\rangle \\ &= \langle k, \varphi(x) h \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate equality is because  $\sum_{\alpha} \varphi_\alpha(x_\alpha)$  converges to  $\varphi(x)$  in the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology, hence also in the weak operator topology. Since we can take  $h$  and  $k$  in  $H$  arbitrary, it follows that  $v^* \pi(x) v = \varphi(x)$ .

Finally, we show that  $K = \overline{\pi[M]vH}$ . Let  $e_\alpha : K_\alpha \rightarrow K$  denote the embedding and denote by  $G_\alpha$  its image in  $K$ . Let  $k = (k_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  be an element of  $K$ . Then for each  $\alpha \in A$  it follows that  $k_\alpha \in K_\alpha = \overline{\pi_\alpha[M_\alpha]v_\alpha H}$ .

Let  $\alpha \in A$ ,  $x \in M_\alpha$  and  $h \in H$ . Then  $\iota_\alpha(x)_\beta = \delta_{\alpha\beta} x$  for each  $\beta \in A$ , hence

$$(\pi(\iota_\alpha(x))v(h))_\beta = \pi_\beta(\iota_\alpha(x)_\beta)(v(h))_\beta = \pi_\beta(\delta_{\alpha\beta} x)v_\beta h = \delta_{\alpha\beta} \pi_\alpha(x)v_\alpha h = (e_\alpha \pi_\alpha(x)v_\alpha h)_\beta,$$

so  $\pi(\iota_\alpha(x))v(h) = e_\alpha \pi_\alpha(x)v_\alpha(h)$ , where we recall that  $e_\alpha : K_\alpha \rightarrow K$  is the embedding, whose image is  $G_\alpha \subseteq K$ . As a consequence, we have for each  $\alpha \in A$ :

$$G_\alpha = e_\alpha[K_\alpha] = e_\alpha[\overline{\pi_\alpha[M_\alpha]v_\alpha H}] \subseteq \overline{e_\alpha[\pi_\alpha[M_\alpha]v_\alpha H]} = \overline{\pi[\iota_\alpha[M_\alpha]]vH} \subseteq \overline{\pi[M]vH},$$

where we used that  $e_\alpha$  is bounded, so continuous in the first inclusion. Since clearly  $\bigvee_{\alpha \in A} G_\alpha = K$  in the lattice of closed subspaces of  $K$ , it follows that  $K \subseteq \overline{\pi[M]vH}$ , which implies  $K = \overline{\pi[M]vH}$ . We conclude that  $\pi$  is the minimal Stinespring representation corresponding to  $\varphi$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.0.5.** *Let  $M$  be a von Neumann algebra, and let  $(N_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  be a collection of von Neumann algebras. Let  $N = \prod_{\alpha \in A} N_\alpha$ , and let  $\pi_\alpha : N \rightarrow N_\alpha$  be the projection on the  $\alpha$ -th coordinate. Then  $\iota : \mathbf{vN}(M, N) \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in A} \mathbf{vN}(M, N_\alpha)$ ,  $\varphi \mapsto (\pi_\alpha \circ \varphi)_{\alpha \in A}$  is an order isomorphism.*

**PROOF.** Firstly,  $\pi_\alpha$  is a unital  $*$ -homomorphism, so certainly completely positive and subunital. Let  $H_\alpha$  be the Hilbert space such that  $N_\alpha$  is a von Neumann algebra on  $H_\alpha$ , hence  $N$  is a von Neumann algebra on  $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} H_\alpha$ . Let  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  be an element of  $N$ . Then  $x$  is positive if and only if for each  $h = (h_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $H$  we have  $0 \leq \langle h, xh \rangle$ , i.e., if and only if  $0 \leq \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle h_\alpha, x_\alpha h_\alpha \rangle$ , from which it is clear that the positivity of each  $x_\alpha$  is sufficient for  $x$  to be positive. Since for fixed  $\beta \in A$ , we can choose  $h$  in such a way that  $h_\alpha = 0$  for each  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , it follows that  $x$  positive implies that  $\langle h_\beta, x_\beta h_\beta \rangle \geq 0$ , so it is also necessary for  $x$  to be positive that each  $x_\beta$  is positive. Thus  $x$  is positive if and only if each  $x_\alpha$  is positive. As a consequence, if  $(x^d)_{d \in D}$  is a monotonically ascending net in  $N_{\text{sa}}$  with supremum  $x$ , and if we write  $x^d = (x_\alpha^d)_{\alpha \in A}$  and  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$ , we have  $x_\alpha = \sup_{d \in D} x_\alpha^d$ , whence  $\pi_\alpha(x) = \sup_{d \in D} \pi_\alpha(x^d)$ , so  $\pi_\alpha$  is normal.

As a consequence,  $\iota$  is well defined, and if  $\theta : M \rightarrow N$  is a normal completely positive subunital map, then for each  $\alpha \in A$ , the map  $\pi_\alpha \circ \theta$  is normal, completely positive, and subunital. Moreover, since we found that  $x = (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  is positive if and only if each  $x_\alpha$  is positive, it follows that the product  $\prod$  on  $\mathbf{vN}_*$  extends to a product on  $\mathbf{vN}_+$ , the category of von Neumann algebras and normal positive maps.

Now assume that  $\theta : M \rightarrow N$  is a map such that  $\pi_\alpha \circ \theta$  is a normal completely positive subunital map for each  $\alpha \in A$ . Clearly it follows that  $\theta$  is a normal positive subunital map. We assert it is also completely positive, so we need to show that for fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\theta^{(n)}$  is positive. In order to see this, we first mention that from [Takesaki 2000, Proposition IV.1.6] it follows  $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes (-) : \mathbf{vN}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}_*$  is natural isomorphic to the functor  $M_n(-) : \mathbf{vN}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}_*$ , which acts on morphisms via  $\rho \mapsto \rho^{(n)}$ . Moreover, since  $(\mathbf{vN}_*)^{\text{op}}$  is monoidal closed [Kornell 2017, Theorem 9.5], it follows that its monoidal product preserves coproducts, hence  $M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes (-)$  preserves products in  $\mathbf{vN}_*$  (see also [Kornell 2017, Corollary 9.6]). As a consequence, we have a  $*$ -isomorphism  $\kappa : M_n(N) \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in A} M_n(N_\alpha)$ . Since  $\pi_\alpha \circ \theta$  is completely positive, it follows that  $(\pi_\alpha \circ \theta)^{(n)} : M_n(M) \rightarrow M_n(N_\alpha)$  is positive, and since  $\prod$  is the product in  $\mathbf{vN}_+$ , it follows that  $((\pi_\alpha \circ \theta)^{(n)})_{\alpha \in A} : M_n(M) \rightarrow \prod_{\alpha \in A} M_n(N_\alpha)$  is positive. Now,  $\mathbf{vN}_*$  and  $\mathbf{vN}_+$  share the same isomorphisms, so  $\kappa$  is also an isomorphism in  $\mathbf{vN}_+$ . Since both  $M_n(N)$  and  $\prod_{\alpha \in A} M_n(N_\alpha)$  are the product of the  $M_n(N_\alpha)$  in  $\mathbf{vN}_+$ , it follows that  $\kappa \circ \theta^{(n)} = ((\pi_\alpha \circ \theta)^{(n)})_{\alpha \in A}$ , so  $\theta^{(n)} = \kappa^{-1} \circ ((\pi_\alpha \circ \theta)^{(n)})_{\alpha \in A}$  is the composition of two positive functions, hence positive. We conclude that  $\theta$  is completely positive if and only if  $\pi_\alpha \circ \theta$  is completely positive for each  $\alpha \in A$ .

It now follows that  $\varphi \leq \psi$  in  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  if and only if  $\theta := \psi - \varphi$  is completely positive,

if and only if  $\pi_\alpha \circ \theta = \pi_\alpha \circ \psi - \pi_\alpha \circ \varphi$  is completely positive for each  $\alpha \in A$ ,

if and only if  $\pi_\alpha \circ \varphi \leq \pi_\alpha \circ \psi$  in  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N_\alpha)$  for each  $\alpha \in A$ ,

if and only if  $\iota(\varphi) = (\pi_\alpha \circ \varphi)_{\alpha \in A} \leq (\pi_\alpha \circ \psi)_{\alpha \in A} = \iota(\psi)$  in  $\prod_{\alpha \in A} \mathbf{vN}(M, N_\alpha)$ .

Thus  $\iota$  is an order embedding. The map  $\iota$  also is surjective: If  $\psi \in \prod_{\alpha \in A} \mathbf{vN}(M, N_\alpha)$ , then  $\psi = (\psi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  for some completely positive maps  $\psi_\alpha : M \rightarrow N_\alpha$ . Then the properties of the categorical product,  $N = \prod_{\alpha \in A} N_\alpha$ , imply there is a map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  with  $\pi_\alpha \circ \varphi = \psi_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in A$ , i.e.,  $\iota(\varphi) = (\pi_\alpha \circ \varphi)_{\alpha \in A} = (\psi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A} = \psi$ .  $\square$

**PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3.1.** Let  $M$  and  $N$  be hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras. We show that the pointed dcpo  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is continuous. We first assume that  $N = B(H)$  for some finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $H$ . Since  $M$  is hereditarily atomic, we can write  $M = \prod_{\alpha \in A} M_\alpha$ , where  $M_\alpha$  is a matrix algebra. Let  $\varphi \in \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ . It follows from combining Lemmas A.0.3 and A.0.4 that the minimal Stinespring representation  $(\pi, v, K)$  of  $\varphi$  can be obtained from the minimal Stinespring representations  $(\pi_\alpha, v_\alpha, K_\alpha)$  of  $\varphi_\alpha := \varphi \circ \iota_\alpha$ , and that  $\pi[M]'$  embeds into  $\prod_{\alpha \in A} B(K_\alpha)$ . Since  $(\pi_\alpha, v_\alpha, K_\alpha)$  is minimal,  $\pi_\alpha[M_\alpha]v_\alpha H$  is dense in  $K_\alpha$ . Since both  $M_\alpha$  and  $H$  are finite-dimensional, it follows that  $K_\alpha$  is finite-dimensional, too, so  $\prod_{\alpha \in A} B(K_\alpha)$  is hereditarily atomic. Since  $\pi[M]'$  embeds in this algebra, it is a hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebra, too, hence its unit interval  $[0, 1]_{\pi[M]'}$  is a continuous dcpo by Lemma A.0.1. It now follows from Proposition A.0.2 that  $\downarrow \varphi$  is a continuous dcpo. Thus all principal downsets in  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  are continuous, so  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is continuous by [Abramsky and Jung 1994, Proposition 2.2.17].

If  $N$  is an arbitrary hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebra, then  $N = \prod_{\beta \in B} B(H_\beta)$  for some finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces  $H_\beta$ . By Lemma A.0.5 we have an order isomorphism  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N) \cong \prod_{\beta \in B} \mathbf{vN}(M, B(H_\beta))$ , and since the product of pointed continuous dcpos is continuous [Gierz et al. 2003, Exercise I-2.18], it follows that  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is continuous. Hence  $\mathbf{vN}$  is enriched over continuous dcpos, so its dual  $\mathbf{Q}$  also is enriched over continuous dcpos.  $\square$

Recall the definition of a Kegelspitze in Section 5.1. We denote the category of Kegelspitzen and Scott continuous linear maps by  $\mathbf{KS}$ . We proceed by showing that  $\mathbf{vN}$  is enriched over  $\mathbf{KS}$ , whence  $\mathbf{HA}$  and  $\mathbf{Q}$  are also enriched over  $\mathbf{KS}$ .

**Lemma A.0.6.** *Let  $M$  and  $N$  be von Neumann algebras. Then  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is a barycentric algebra if we define  $\varphi +_r \psi := r\varphi + (1-r)\psi$  for each  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  and each  $r \in [0, 1]$ .*

**PROOF.** Clearly  $\varphi +_r \psi$  is normal. We show that it is completely positive. First assume that  $R$  is a von Neumann algebra and  $x, y \in R$  are positive. By [Kadison and Ringrose 1997, Theorem 4.2.2]  $x+y$  is positive, and  $rx$  is positive for each  $r \in [0, \infty)$ . Hence if  $r \in [0, 1]$  it follows that  $rx + (1-r)y$  is a positive element of  $R$ . Now let  $\varphi, \psi : M \rightarrow N$  be positive maps. So  $\varphi(x)$  and  $\psi(x)$  are positive for each positive  $x \in M$ , hence for  $r \in [0, 1]$ , we also have that  $(r\varphi + (1-r)\psi)(x) = r\varphi(x) + (1-r)\psi(x)$  is positive, so  $r\varphi + (1-r)\psi$  is a positive map.

Recall that if  $\omega : M \rightarrow N$  is a map and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\omega^{(n)} : M_n(M) \rightarrow M_n(N)$  is the map  $[x_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n \mapsto [\omega(x_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n$ , and that  $\omega$  is completely positive if and only if  $\omega^{(n)}$  is positive for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then for each  $r, s \in \mathbb{C}$  and each  $[x_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n$  in  $M_n(M)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (r\varphi + s\psi)^{(n)}([x_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n) &= [(r\varphi + s\psi)(x_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n = [r\varphi(x_{ij}) + s\psi(x_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n \\ &= r[\varphi(x_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n + s[\psi(x_{ij})]_{i,j=1}^n = r\varphi^{(n)}([x_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n) + s\psi^{(n)}([x_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n) \\ &= (r\varphi^{(n)} + s\psi^{(n)})([x_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n), \end{aligned}$$

hence  $(r\varphi + s\psi)^{(n)} = r\varphi^{(n)} + s\psi^{(n)}$ . Assume that  $\varphi, \psi : M \rightarrow N$  are normal completely positive subunital maps. Then  $\varphi^{(n)}$  and  $\psi^{(n)}$  are positive, hence  $r\varphi^{(n)} + (1-r)\psi^{(n)}$  is positive, which equals  $(r\varphi + (1-r)\psi)^{(n)}$ , and since  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is arbitrary, we conclude that  $r\varphi + (1-r)\psi$  is completely positive. Moreover, since both  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are subunital, we have

$$(r\varphi + (1-r)\psi)(1_M) = r\varphi(1_M) + (1-r)\psi(1_M) \leq r1_N + (1-r)1_N = 1_N,$$

so  $r\varphi + (1-r)\psi$  is subunital. Finally,  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are normal, so continuous with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology, hence so is their convex combination  $r\varphi + (1-r)\psi$ . Thus  $+_r$  defined by  $\varphi +_r \psi := r\varphi + (1-r)\psi$  for each  $r \in [0, 1]$  is a well-defined binary operation on  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ . We

now have  $\varphi +_1 \psi = 1\varphi + (1-1)\psi = \varphi$ ,  $\varphi +_r \varphi = r\varphi + (1-r)\varphi = \varphi$ , and  $\varphi +_r \psi = r\varphi + (1-r)\psi = (1-r)\psi + (1-(1-r))\varphi = \psi +_{1-r} \varphi$ . Let  $\omega \in \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  and  $p, r \in [0, 1)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi +_p \psi) +_r \omega &= r(\varphi +_p \psi) + (1-r)\omega = r(p\varphi + (1-p)\psi) + (1-r)\omega \\ &= rp\varphi + r(1-p)\psi + (1-r)\omega = rp\varphi + (1-rp)\left(\frac{r-rp}{1-rp}\psi + \frac{1-r}{1-rp}\omega\right) \\ &= \varphi +_{rp} \left(\frac{r-rp}{1-rp}\psi + \frac{1-r}{1-rp}\omega\right) = \varphi +_{rp} \left(\frac{r-rp}{1-rp}\psi + \frac{1-rp-(r-rp)}{1-rp}\omega\right) \\ &= \varphi +_{rp} \left(\frac{r-rp}{1-rp}\psi + \left(1 - \frac{r-rp}{1-rp}\right)\omega\right) = \varphi_{rp} + \left(\psi +_{\frac{r-rp}{1-rp}} \omega\right). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is indeed a barycentric algebra.  $\square$

Given von Neumann algebras  $M$  and  $N$ , the map  $0 : M \rightarrow N$  defined  $x \mapsto 0$  is normal, completely positive and subunital, hence we can take it as the distinguished element of  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ .

**Lemma A.0.7.** *Let  $M, N$  and  $R$  be von Neumann algebras and let  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  be a normal completely positive subunital map. Then*

$$\mathbf{vN}(R, \varphi) : \mathbf{vN}(R, M) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(R, N), \quad \psi \mapsto \varphi \circ \psi$$

and

$$\mathbf{vN}(\varphi, R) : \mathbf{vN}(N, R) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(M, R), \quad \psi \mapsto \psi \circ \varphi$$

are linear maps between barycentric algebras.

PROOF. Since  $\varphi$  is linear in the sense of linear algebra and  $\varphi(0) = 0$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{vN}(R, \varphi)$  is linear.

Write  $f = \mathbf{vN}(\varphi, R)$ . Then for  $\psi, \omega \in \mathbf{vN}(N, R)$ , we have

$$f(\psi +_r \omega) = (\psi +_r \omega) \circ \varphi,$$

hence for each  $x \in M$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\psi +_r \omega)(x) &= ((\psi +_r \omega) \circ \varphi)(x) = ((r\psi + (1-r)\omega) \circ \varphi)(x) = (r\psi + (1-r)\omega)(\varphi(x)) \\ &= r\psi(\varphi(x)) + (1-r)\omega(\varphi(x)) = (r\psi \circ \varphi)(x) + ((1-r)\omega \circ \varphi)(x) \\ &= (r\psi \circ \varphi + (1-r)\omega \circ \varphi)(x) = (\psi \circ \varphi +_r \omega \circ \varphi)(x) = (f(\psi) +_r f(\omega))(x) \end{aligned}$$

hence  $f(\psi +_r \omega) = f(\psi) +_r f(\omega)$ , so  $f$  is linear. Furthermore, we have for each  $x \in M$ :  $f(0)(x) = (0 \circ \omega)(x) = 0(\omega(x)) = 0$ , so  $f(0) = 0$ , expressing that  $f$  is linear.  $\square$

**Proposition A.0.8.** *Let  $M$  and  $N$  be von Neumann algebras. Then  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is a Kegelspitze.*

PROOF. Upon inspecting the proof of [Cho 2016, Proposition 5.2] that shows that  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is a pointed dcpo, the supremum  $\varphi$  of any directed set  $(\varphi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  in  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is calculated pointwise:  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$  is the normal completely positive subunital map such that  $\varphi(x) = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} \varphi_\alpha(x)$  for each  $x \in M$ , where the supremum of the  $\varphi_\alpha(x)$  is calculated in  $N_{\text{sa}}$ , the  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space of all self-adjoint elements in  $N$  and where this supremum is the limit of the  $\varphi_\alpha(x)$  with respect to the strong operator topology on  $N$  [Kadison and Ringrose 1997, Lemma 5.1.4]. This means that if  $H$  is a Hilbert space such that  $N$  is a von Neumann algebra on  $B(H)$ , we have that  $\|\varphi_\alpha(x)h - \varphi(x)h\|$  converges to 0 for each  $h \in H$ .

We proceed by showing that  $+_r$  is Scott continuous for each  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Fix  $\psi \in \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ . We start by showing that  $(-)+_r\psi$  is monotone for each  $\psi \in \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ , i.e., if  $\varphi \leq \omega$  in  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ , then  $\varphi +_r \psi \leq \omega +_r \psi$ . Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $\varphi \leq \omega$  implies that  $\omega - \varphi$  is completely positive, so  $(\omega - \varphi)^{(n)}$  is positive. Then also  $((\omega +_r \psi) - (\varphi +_r \psi))^{(n)} = (r\omega + (1-r)\psi - (r\varphi + (1-r)\psi))^{(n)} = (r\omega - r\varphi)^{(n)} =$

$r(\omega - \varphi)^{(n)}$  is positive, so  $(\omega +_r \psi) - (\varphi +_r \psi)$  is completely positive since  $n$  is arbitrary. Hence indeed  $\varphi +_r \psi \leq \omega +_r \psi$ .

Let  $(\varphi_\alpha)_{\alpha \in A}$  be a directed set in  $\mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  with supremum  $\varphi$ . For each  $h \in H$ , we have

$$\|(r\varphi_\alpha + (1-r)\psi)(x)h - (r\varphi + (1-r)\psi)(x)h\| = \|r\varphi_\alpha(x)h - r\varphi(x)h\| = |r|\|\varphi_\alpha(x)h - \varphi(x)h\|,$$

which clearly converges to 0, hence  $\bigvee_{\alpha \in A} (r\varphi_\alpha(x) + (1-r)\psi(x)) = r\varphi(x) + (1-r)\psi(x)$ , whence  $\bigvee_{\alpha \in A} (\varphi_\alpha +_r \psi) = \varphi +_r \psi$ . We conclude that  $+_r : \mathbf{vN}(M, N) \times \mathbf{vN}(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$  is Scott continuous in the first variable, and since  $\varphi +_r \psi = \psi +_{1-r}\varphi$ , it also follows that  $+_r$  is Scott continuous in the second variable, hence Scott continuous overall.

Since  $r \cdot \varphi = \varphi +_r 0$ , it follows that scalar multiplication is Scott continuous in  $\varphi$ , so we only have to check that it is Scott continuous in  $r$ . So fix  $\varphi \in \mathbf{vN}(M, N)$ , and let  $D \subseteq [0, 1]$  be a directed set with supremum  $s$ . We need to show that  $\bigvee_{d \in D} d\varphi = s\varphi$ , hence for each  $x \in M$ , we need to show that  $(d\varphi(x))_{d \in D}$  converges to  $s\varphi(x)$  in the strong operator topology. Thus we need to show for each  $x \in M$  and each  $h \in H$  that  $\|d\varphi(x)h - s\varphi(x)h\|$  converges to zero. But  $\|d\varphi(x) - s\varphi(x)\| = |d - s|\|\varphi(x)\|$  and obviously  $|d - s|$  converges to 0 since  $s$  is the supremum of  $D$  in  $[0, 1]$ , which show that scalar multiplication is also Scott continuous in both variables, hence Scott continuous overall.  $\square$

**Theorem A.0.9.** *The category  $\mathbf{vN}$  is enriched over  $\mathbf{KS}$ .*

PROOF. By Proposition A.0.8, any homset in  $\mathbf{vN}$  is a Kegelspitze. We have to verify that for any von Neumann algebras  $M, N$ , and  $R$ , and any normal completely positive subunital map  $\varphi : M \rightarrow N$ , the maps

$$\mathbf{vN}(R, \varphi) : \mathbf{vN}(R, M) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(R, N), \quad \psi \mapsto \varphi \circ \psi$$

and

$$\mathbf{vN}(\varphi, R) : \mathbf{vN}(N, R) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(M, R), \quad \psi \mapsto \psi \circ \varphi$$

are morphisms in  $\mathbf{KS}$ . It follows from [Cho 2016, Theorem 5.3] that  $\mathbf{vN}$  is enriched over  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\perp 1}$ , hence the morphisms above are Scott continuous. By Lemma A.0.7, the maps are linear, hence indeed morphisms in  $\mathbf{KS}$ .  $\square$



## B THE ISOMORPHISM $r_X$

**Definition B.0.1.** Let  $\mathcal{L} : \text{Set} \rightarrow \text{DCPO}$  be the functor defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}X &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (X, \sqsubseteq), \text{ where } \sqsubseteq \text{ is the discrete order on } X \\ \mathcal{L}f &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f\end{aligned}$$

**Definition B.0.2.** A complex Banach algebra  $A$  is called a  $*$ -algebra if it equipped with an idempotent conjugate-linear map  $*$  :  $A \rightarrow A$  such that  $(ab)^* = b^*a^*$  for each  $a, b \in A$ . If, in addition,  $\|a^*a\| = \|a\|^2$  for each  $a \in A$ , we call  $A$  a  $C^*$ -algebra.

In particular any von Neumann algebra is a  $C^*$ -algebra. More generally, for each Hilbert space  $H$ , every norm-closed  $*$ -subalgebra of  $B(H)$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra. The converse holds as well: if  $A$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra, any  $*$ -homomorphism  $\pi : A \rightarrow B(H)$  for some Hilbert space  $H$  is called a *representation*. The Gelfand-Naimark Representation Theorem [Blackadar 2006, Corollary II.6.4.10] states that any  $C^*$ -algebra has a faithful representation.

**Definition B.0.3.** Any  $C^*$ -algebra that is  $*$ -isomorphic to a von Neumann algebra is called a  $W^*$ -algebra.

Let  $V$  be a Banach space. The space of all continuous linear maps  $V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is denoted by  $V^*$ .

The following theorem gives an alternative characterization of  $W^*$ -algebras:

**Theorem B.0.4.** [Blackadar 2006, III.2.1.8, Theorems III.2.4.1 & III.2.4.2] *Let  $A$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra. Then  $A$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra if and only if there is a Banach space  $F$  such that  $A$  is isometrically isomorphic to the dual  $F^*$  of  $F$ . Under the isometric embedding of  $F$  into  $F^{**}$ , and by the isometric isomorphism  $A^* \cong F^{**}$ ,  $F$  is isometrically isomorphic to  $A_*$ , the subspace of  $A^*$  consisting of all normal functionals on  $A$ .*

Hence if  $M$  is a  $W^*$ -algebra, then up to isometric isomorphism  $M_*$  is the unique Banach space whose dual is isometrically isomorphic to  $M$ . We call  $M_*$  the *predual* of  $M$ .

Let  $X$  be a set. From Example 4.1.3 we already know that  $\ell^\infty(X)$  is a von Neumann algebra. Its predual is the Banach space of all functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\sum_{x \in X} |f(x)| < \infty$ , which we denote by  $\ell^1(X)$ , see for instance Table B.1, p. 547 of [Landsman 2017]. By the same table, we have a *separating* pairing  $\langle -, - \rangle : \ell^1(X) \times \ell^\infty(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,  $(f, g) \mapsto \sum_{x \in X} f(x)g(x)$ , i.e., for each different  $f, f' \in \ell^1(X)$  there exists a  $g \in \ell^\infty(X)$  such that  $\langle f, g \rangle \neq \langle f', g \rangle$ , and for each different  $g, g' \in \ell^\infty(X)$  there is an  $f \in \ell^1(X)$  such that  $\langle f, g \rangle \neq \langle f, g' \rangle$ . Using [Landsman 2017, Theorem B.47], this pairing induces an isomorphism of vector spaces  $\ell^1(X) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(X)_*$ , which is isometric as one can see as follows. Let  $g \in \ell^1(X)$ , so  $\|g\| = \sum_{x \in X} |g(x)| < \infty$ . Let  $f \in \ell^\infty(X)$  such that  $\|f\| = 1$ , i.e.,  $\sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| = 1$ . Then

$$\|g\| = \|f\| \|g\| = \sup_{x \in X} \sum_{x' \in X} |f(x)| |g(x')| \geq \sum_{x \in X} |f(x)| |g(x)| \geq \left| \sum_{x \in X} f(x)g(x) \right| = |\zeta(g)(f)|,$$

hence  $\|\zeta(g)\| = \sup\{|\zeta(g)(f)| : f \in \ell^\infty(X), \|f\| = 1\} \leq \|g\|$ . On the other hand, for each  $x \in X$ , we can write  $g(x) = |g(x)|e^{i \arg(g(x))}$ . Let  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be given by  $f(x) = e^{-i \arg(g(x))}$ . Then  $|f(x)| = 1$  for each  $x \in X$ , hence  $f \in \ell^\infty(X)$  with  $\|f\| = 1$ . Then we have

$$\|\zeta(g)\| \geq |\zeta(g)(f)| = \left| \sum_{x \in X} f(x)g(x) \right| = \left| \sum_{x \in X} |g(x)| \right| = \|g\|,$$

so  $\|\zeta(g)\| = \|g\|$ , showing that  $\zeta$  is an isometry. We conclude:

**Lemma B.0.5.** *We have an isometric isomorphism  $\zeta : \ell^1(X) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(X)_*$  defined by*

$$\zeta(g)(f) = \sum_{x \in X} f(x)g(x)$$

for each  $g \in \ell^1(X)$  and each  $f \in \ell^\infty(X)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  be the set of all  $g \in \ell^1(X)$  such that  $g(x) \geq 0$  for each  $x \in X$  and  $\sum_{x \in X} g(x) \leq 1$ . We order  $\mathcal{D}(X)$  by  $g \leq g'$  if and only if  $g(x) \leq g'(x)$  for each  $x \in X$ .

**Proposition B.0.6.** *The isometric isomorphism  $\zeta : \ell^1(X) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(X)_*$  restricts to an isomorphism of Kegelspitzen  $\mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(\ell^\infty(X), \mathbb{C})$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $g \in \ell^1(X)$ . Then  $\zeta(g) \in \ell^\infty(X)_*$  is positive if and only if  $\zeta(g)(f)$  is positive for each positive  $f \in \ell^\infty(X)$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{x \in X} f(x)g(x) \geq 0$  for each positive  $f \in \ell^\infty(X)$ . Since  $f$  is positive if and only if  $f(x) \geq 0$  for each  $x \in x$ , and for each  $y \in X$  the function  $e_y : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined by  $e_y(x) = \delta_{x,y}$  for each  $x \in X$  is an element of  $\ell^\infty(X)$  that clearly is positive, it follows that  $\zeta(g)(f)$  is positive if and only if  $g(x) \geq 0$  for each  $x \in X$ . It also follows that if  $g' \in \ell^1(X)$  is another element such that  $\zeta(g')$  is positive, then  $\zeta(g) \leq \zeta(g')$  if and only if  $\zeta(g' - g)$  is positive if and only if  $g(x) \leq g'(x)$  for each  $x \in X$ .

By [Blackadar 2006, Proposition II.6.2.5], any positive  $\omega \in \ell^\infty(X)_*$  is bounded with norm  $\|\omega\| = \omega(1)$ . Thus  $\omega$  is subunital if and only if  $\|\omega\| \leq 1$ . Hence, if  $\zeta(g)$  positive, it is bounded with norm  $\|\zeta(g)\| = \zeta(g)(1)$ , so  $\|\zeta(g)\| = \sum_{x \in X} g(x)$ . Thus  $\zeta(g)$  is positive and subunital if and only if  $\|g\| = \|\zeta(g)\| = \sum_{x \in X} g(x) \leq 1$ , where we used that  $\zeta$  is an isometry. It follows that  $\zeta$  restricts to an isometric isomorphism between  $\mathbf{vN}(\ell^\infty(X), \mathbb{C})$  and  $\mathcal{D}(X)$ , which is also an order isomorphism. Since  $\zeta$  is an isomorphisms of vector spaces, it in particular preserve the convex structure, whence its restriction is a Kegelspitze isomorphism.  $\square$

**Proposition B.0.7.** *For any set  $X$ , there exists an isomorphism of Kegelspitzen  $r_X : \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(1), \ell^\infty(X)) \cong \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \mathcal{L}X) : r_X^{-1}$ . Moreover,  $r_X$  restricts to an isomorphism of sets  $r_X : \mathbf{Q}_*(\ell^\infty(1), \ell^\infty(X)) \cong \mathbf{TD}(1, \mathcal{L}X) : r_X^{-1}$ .*

**PROOF.** Firstly, we have an isomorphism

$$\alpha : \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \mathcal{L}X) = \mathbf{DCPO}(1, \mathcal{M}\mathcal{L}X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\mathcal{L}(X) = \mathcal{D}(X), \quad f \mapsto f(1).$$

Furthermore, we have an isomorphism  $i : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \ell^\infty(1)$  that to each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  assigns the function  $c_\lambda \in \ell^\infty(1)$  defined by  $c_\lambda(*) = \lambda$ . This isomorphism induces an isomorphism

$$\iota : \mathbf{vN}(\ell^\infty(X), \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(\ell^\infty(X), \ell^\infty(1)) = \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(1), \ell^\infty(X)), \quad f \mapsto i \circ f.$$

It follows that the required isomorphism  $r_X^{-1} : \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \mathcal{L}X) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(1), \ell^\infty(X))$  is given by  $\iota \circ \zeta \circ \alpha$ , where  $\zeta : \mathcal{D}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{vN}(\ell^\infty(X), \mathbb{C})$  is the isomorphism from Proposition B.0.7.

Recall that  $\ell^\infty : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_*$  is a functor if for each function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  between sets, we define  $\ell^\infty(f) : \ell^\infty(Y) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(X)$  by  $g \mapsto g \circ f$ . By [Kornell 2020, Theorem 7.4], this functor is fully faithful. Now consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{Q}_*(\ell^\infty(1), \ell^\infty(X)) & \hookrightarrow & \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(1), \ell^\infty(X)) & \xrightarrow{r_X} & \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \mathcal{L}X) \\ \uparrow \ell^\infty & & & & \uparrow \\ \mathbf{Set}(1, X) & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathbf{DCPO}(1, \mathcal{L}X) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{J}} & \mathbf{TD}(1, \mathcal{L}X) \end{array}$$

Since it consists only of isomorphisms and two injective functors (note that  $\mathcal{J}$ , which was introduced in Section 6.1, is fully faithful by construction of **TD** in Definition 6.1.1), commutativity of the diagram implies that  $r_X$  restricts to an isomorphism  $\mathbf{Q}_*(\ell^\infty(1), \ell^\infty(X)) \rightarrow \mathbf{TD}(1, \mathcal{L}X)$ . In order to show that the diagram indeed is commutative, let  $f \in \mathbf{Set}(1, X)$ . We will write  $f(*) = x$ . Then  $\ell^\infty(f) \in \mathbf{Q}_*(\ell^1(X), \ell^\infty(X)) = \mathbf{HA}_*(\ell^\infty(X), \ell^\infty(1))$  is given by  $\ell^\infty(f)(g) = g \circ f$ , i.e.  $(\ell^\infty(f)(g))(*) = (g \circ f)(*) = g(x)$ , hence  $\ell^\infty(f)(g) = c_{g(x)}$ .

In the other direction, we have  $\mathcal{J}(f)(*) = (\eta_{\mathcal{L}X} \circ f)(*) = \eta_{\mathcal{L}X}(x) = \delta_x$ , hence

$$(r_X^{-1} \circ \mathcal{J}(f)) = (\iota \circ \zeta \circ \alpha)(\mathcal{J}(f)) = (\iota \circ \zeta)(\mathcal{J}(f)(*)) = (\iota \circ \zeta)(\delta_x),$$

which is a function  $\ell^\infty(X) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(1)$ , hence for  $g \in \ell^\infty(X)$ , we have

$$(r_X^{-1} \circ \mathcal{J}(f))(g) = (\iota \circ \zeta)(\delta_x)(g) = \iota \left( \sum_{y \in X} \delta_x(y) g(y) \right) = \iota(g(x)) = i(g(x)) = c_{g(x)}.$$

Thus  $(r_X^{-1} \circ \mathcal{J}(f))(g) = c_{g(x)} = \ell^\infty(f)(g)$ , so  $\mathcal{J}(f) = r_X \circ \ell^\infty(f)$ , which shows that the diagram indeed commutes.  $\square$

Theorem 5.2.1 now follows immediately, because  $\mathcal{M}(X, \sqsubseteq) \cong \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \mathcal{L}X)$  and  $\mathbf{TD}(1, \mathcal{L}X)$  consists precisely of the Dirac valuations of  $\mathcal{M}(X, \sqsubseteq)$ .

## C CONSTRUCTION OF THE LIFT ISOMORPHISM

We start by proving a general proposition whose second statement is a coherence property used in the proof of soundness/adequacy.

**Proposition C.0.1.** *Given a dcpo  $X$ , hereditarily atomic von Neumann algebras  $A, B$ , and a discrete dcpo  $Y$  (equivalently, a set), there exists a natural Scott-continuous and linear bijection*

$$\widehat{(-)} : \mathbf{DCPO}(X \times Y, \mathbf{Q}(A, B)) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbf{DCPO}(X, \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(Y) \otimes A, B)).$$

Furthermore, if  $f \in \mathbf{DCPO}(X \times Y, \mathbf{Q}(A, B))$  and  $g : X \rightarrow [1 \rightarrow Y]$  is a Scott-continuous function, then

$$\forall x \in X. \widehat{f}(x) \circ (\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A) = (f(x, g(x)(*)) \circ \cong) : \ell^\infty(1) \otimes A \rightarrow B,$$

as morphisms in  $\mathbf{Q}$ , where the unnamed  $*$ -isomorphism is  $\ell^\infty(1) \otimes A \cong A$ .

PROOF. This is established via the following sequence of Scott-continuous bijections:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{DCPO}(X \times Y, \mathbf{Q}(A, B)) \\ \hline \mathbf{DCPO}(X, [Y \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(A, B)]) \quad (\text{currying}) \\ \hline \mathbf{DCPO}(X, \prod_{|Y|} \mathbf{Q}(A, B)) \quad (Y \text{ is discrete}) \\ \hline \mathbf{DCPO}(X, \mathbf{Q}(\prod_{|Y|} A, B)) \quad (\mathbf{Q} \text{ has DCPO-enriched coproducts}) \\ \hline \mathbf{DCPO}(X, \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(Y) \otimes A, B)) \end{array}$$

where  $|Y|$  indicates the cardinality of  $Y$ . Here the last isomorphism is induced by an isomorphism  $\ell^\infty(Y) \otimes A \rightarrow \prod_{|Y|} A$  in  $\mathbf{Q}$  (and in  $\mathbf{Q}_*$ , which has the same isomorphisms as  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) as follows. From Proposition 4.1.4 recall that in  $\mathbf{HA}_*$  the  $|Y|$ -fold product of  $A$  is given by  $\prod_{|Y|} A = \{(a_y)_{y \in Y} : \sup_{y \in Y} \|a_y\| < \infty\}$ , from which it easily follows that  $\prod_{|Y|} \mathbb{C} = \ell^\infty(Y)$ . Since  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  is monoidal closed, coproducts commute with the monoidal product  $\otimes$ , hence in  $\mathbf{HA}_*$  products commute with the spatial tensor product  $\otimes$ , i.e.,

$$\prod_{|Y|} A \cong \prod_{|Y|} (\mathbb{C} \bar{\otimes} A) \cong \left( \prod_{|Y|} \mathbb{C} \right) \bar{\otimes} A = \ell^\infty(Y) \bar{\otimes} A.$$

The resulting  $*$ -isomorphism  $\theta : \ell^\infty(Y) \bar{\otimes} A \rightarrow \prod_{|Y|} A$  is given explicitly by  $\theta(a) = \sum_{y \in Y} e_y \otimes a_y$  for each  $a = (a_y)_{y \in Y}$  in  $\prod_{|Y|} A$ , where  $e_y \in \ell^\infty(Y)$  is the function  $Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  whose  $y$ -component is 1, while all other components vanish. The sum converges in the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology. Let  $f \in \mathbf{DCPO}(X \times Y, \mathbf{Q}(A, B))$ , so  $f$  is a Scott continuous function  $X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbf{HA}(B, A)$ . We can now construct  $\widehat{f}$  as follows. Fix  $x \in X$ . Then we obtain a function  $f(x, -) : Y \rightarrow \mathbf{HA}(B, A)$ , hence for  $b \in B$ , we have  $f(x, -)(b) : Y \rightarrow A$ . This corresponds with an element  $(f(x, y)(b))_{y \in Y}$  in  $\prod_{|Y|} A$ , hence using  $\theta$ , to an element  $\sum_{y \in Y} e_y \otimes f(x, y)(b)$  in  $\ell^\infty(Y) \bar{\otimes} A$ . Thus  $\widehat{f}(x)(b) = \sum_{y \in Y} e_y \otimes f(x, y)(b)$ .

Now let  $g \in \mathbf{DCPO}(X, [1 \rightarrow Y])$ . Then  $g(x)$  is a function  $1 \rightarrow Y$ , hence  $\ell^\infty(g(x))$  is a morphism  $\ell^\infty(1) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(Y)$  in  $\mathbf{Q}$ , corresponding to the  $*$ -homomorphism  $\ell^\infty(Y) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(1)$ ,  $k \mapsto k \circ (g(x))$  in  $\mathbf{HA}_*$ . Thus we obtain a morphism

$$\mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A, B) : \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(Y) \otimes A, B) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(\ell^\infty(1) \otimes A, B), \quad h \mapsto h \circ (\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A).$$

In particular, it follows from choosing  $h = \widehat{f}(x)$  that  $\widehat{f}(x) \circ (\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A)$  is a morphism  $\ell^\infty(1) \otimes A \rightarrow B$  in  $\mathbf{Q}$ , which in the opposite category  $\mathbf{HA}$  corresponds to the map

$$(\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \widehat{f}(x) : B \rightarrow \ell^\infty(1) \otimes A.$$

For fixed  $b \in B$ , we then have

$$(\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \widehat{f}(x)(b) = (\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \sum_{y \in Y} e_y \otimes f(x, y)(b) = \sum_{y \in Y} e_y(g(x)) \otimes f(x, y)(b),$$

where we used that  $\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A$  is continuous with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology. Now, the inverse of the isomorphism  $\cong: \ell^\infty(1) \otimes A \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathbf{Q}$  corresponds to the  $*$ -isomorphism  $\zeta: \ell^\infty(1) \bar{\otimes} A \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathbf{HA}$ , which acts on elementary tensors by  $k \otimes a \mapsto k(*)a$ . By continuity of  $\zeta$  with respect to the  $\sigma$ -weak operator topology, we obtain

$$\zeta \circ (\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \widehat{f}(x)(b) = \sum_{y \in Y} e_y(g(x)(*)) f(x, y)(b) = \sum_{y \in Y} \delta_{y, g(x)(*)} f(x, y)(b) = f(x, g(x)(*)) (b).$$

Thus  $(\ell^\infty(g(x)) \otimes \text{id}_A) \circ \widehat{f}(x) = \zeta^{-1} \circ f(x, g(x)(*))$  in  $\mathbf{HA}$ , whence the expression in the statement holds in the opposite category  $\mathbf{Q}$ .  $\square$

## D PROOF OF STRONG ADEQUACY

In this appendix we provide a proof of Theorem 7.4.3. We begin by stating a corollary for the soundness theorem.

**Corollary D.0.1.** *Let  $\cdot \vdash m : P$  be a closed classical term and  $\cdot \vdash C : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  a closed quantum configuration. Then:*

$$\llbracket m \rrbracket \geq \sum_{v \in \text{Val}(m)} P(m \rightarrow_* v) \llbracket v \rrbracket \quad \llbracket C \rrbracket \geq \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{ValC}(C)} P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket.$$

PROOF. The classical statement is identical to [Jia et al. 2021, Corollary 67] and the quantum statement is fully analogous.  $\square$

The remainder of the appendix is dedicated to showing the converse inequalities, which are much more difficult to prove.

### D.1 Overview of the Proof Strategy

Our proof strategy uses logical relations to establish strong adequacy. Our logical relations are described in Theorem D.8.1 and their design follows that of [Jia et al. 2021] which is in turn based on the logical relations of Claire Jones in her thesis [Jones 1990]. We establish some useful closure properties for these relations in Subsection D.9 and this allows us to prove the Fundamental Lemma (Lemma D.10.3). Once the Fundamental Lemma is proved, strong adequacy follows easily.

A large part of the effort in proving Strong Adequacy lies in the proof of Theorem D.8.1. The classical logical relations there are defined via non-well-founded induction. The proof of the existence of these relations is not obvious. We use methods from [Jia et al. 2021; Lindenhovius et al. 2019, 2021] (which are in turn based on ideas from [Fiore 1994]) to show the existence of these logical relations.

The quantum logical relations are actually easier to define and we do this first (Subsection D.3). The reason for this is that the quantum subsystem is *first-order* and all the *quantum values* depend only on themselves and not on classical terms or quantum terms. This is not the case for the classical values, because they may depend on terms that are not values (e.g. lambda abstractions). Existence of the quantum logical relations is clear and immediate from their definition.

The main idea for the proof of existence of the classical relations is the following. For every type  $P$ , we define a category  $\mathbf{R}(P)$  of logical relations with a suitable notion of morphism. We show that every such category has sufficient structure to construct parameterised initial algebras (Proposition D.6.5). It follows that we may define functors on these categories (Proposition D.6.11) which construct logical relations as they are needed in Theorem D.8.1. All of these functors are  $\omega$ -cocontinuous (Proposition D.6.12) and therefore we may form (parameterised) initial algebras using them. This, in turn, allows us to define *augmented interpretation of types* on the categories  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ . These interpretations satisfy important coherence conditions with respect to the standard interpretation of types (Corollary D.7.6). These coherence conditions are important, because they show that every augmented interpretation  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  of a type  $P$  contains the standard interpretation  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ , together with the logical relation that we need for the proof, as shown in Theorem D.8.1.

The proof strategy that we use to define the classical logical relations and their existence is heavily based on [Jia et al. 2021], so we use the same notation as there.

### D.2 Notation for Reduction Paths

Before we may define our logical relations, we have to introduce some auxiliary definitions for reduction paths.



*Assumption D.2.1.* Throughout this appendix, we assume that all types are closed, unless otherwise noted.

**Definition D.2.2.** For each classical type  $P$  and quantum type  $A$  we write:

- $\text{Val}(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{V \mid V \text{ is a classical value and } \cdot \vdash V : P\}$ .
- $\text{Prog}(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{M \mid M \text{ is a classical term and } \cdot \vdash M : P\}$ .
- $\text{ValC}(A; \mathbf{qbit}^k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathcal{V} \mid \mathcal{V} \text{ is a value configuration and } \cdot \vdash \mathcal{V} : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k\}$ .
- $\text{C}(A; \mathbf{qbit}^k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{C \mid C \text{ is a configuration and } \cdot \vdash C : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k\}$ .

**Definition D.2.3.** Let  $M : P$  and  $N : P$  be closed classical terms of the same type. We define

$$\text{Paths}(M, N) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \pi \mid \pi = \left( M = M_0 \xrightarrow{p_0} M_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} M_2 \xrightarrow{p_2} \dots \xrightarrow{p_n} M_n = N \right) \text{ is a reduction path} \right\}.$$

In other words,  $\text{Paths}(M, N)$  is the set of all reduction paths from  $M$  to  $N$ . The *probability weight* of a path  $\pi \in \text{Paths}(M, N)$  is  $P(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=0}^n p_i$ , i.e., it is simply the product of all the probabilities of single-step reductions within the path. The *set of terminal reduction paths of  $M$*  is

$$\text{TPaths}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{V \in \text{Val}(P)} \text{Paths}(M, V).$$

Thus the endpoint of any path  $\pi \in \text{TPaths}(M)$  is a value. If  $\pi \in \text{Paths}(M, W)$ , where  $W$  is a value, then we shall write  $V_\pi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} W$ . That is, for a path  $\pi \in \text{TPaths}(M)$ , the notation  $V_\pi$  indicates the endpoint of the path  $\pi$  which is indeed a value.

Reduction paths for quantum configurations are defined in the same way.

**Definition D.2.4.** Let  $\cdot \vdash C : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  and  $\cdot \vdash \mathcal{D} : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  be closed quantum configurations of the same type. We define

$$\text{Paths}(C, \mathcal{D}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \pi \mid \pi = \left( C = C_0 \xrightarrow{p_0} C_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} C_2 \xrightarrow{p_2} \dots \xrightarrow{p_n} C_n = \mathcal{D} \right) \text{ is a reduction path} \right\}.$$

In other words,  $\text{Paths}(C, \mathcal{D})$  is the set of all reduction paths from  $C$  to  $\mathcal{D}$ . The *probability weight* of a path  $\pi \in \text{Paths}(C, \mathcal{D})$  is  $P(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=0}^n p_i$ . The *set of terminal reduction paths of  $C$*  is

$$\text{TPaths}(C) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{ValC}(A; \mathbf{qbit}^k)} \text{Paths}(C, \mathcal{V}).$$

Thus the endpoint of any path  $\pi \in \text{TPaths}(C)$  is a value configuration. If  $\pi \in \text{Paths}(C, \mathcal{W})$ , where  $\mathcal{W}$  is a value configuration, then we shall write  $\mathcal{V}_\pi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{W}$ . That is, for a path  $\pi \in \text{TPaths}(C)$ , the notation  $\mathcal{V}_\pi$  indicates the endpoint of the path  $\pi$  which is indeed a value configuration.

*Remark D.2.5.* We also note that for each closed classical term  $M$  and each closed quantum configuration  $C$  the sets  $\text{TPaths}(M)$  and  $\text{TPaths}(C)$  are both countable.

### D.3 The Quantum Logical Relation

Next, we define a logical relation between quantum configurations and their semantic domain.

**Definition D.3.1.** For each closed quantum type  $A$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define a *logical relation*

$$\begin{aligned} \blacktriangleleft_A^k &\subseteq \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{C}, \llbracket A \otimes \mathbf{qbit}^k \rrbracket) \times \mathcal{C}(A; \mathbf{qbit}^k) \quad \text{by} \\ c \blacktriangleleft_A^k C &\text{ iff } c \in \mathcal{S}(\blacktriangleleft_A^k; C), \text{ where } \mathcal{S}(\blacktriangleleft_A^k; C) \text{ is the Scott-closure in } \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{C}, \llbracket A \otimes \mathbf{qbit}^k \rrbracket) \text{ of the set} \\ \mathcal{S}_0(\blacktriangleleft_A^k; C) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \sum_{\pi \in F} P(\pi) \llbracket \mathcal{V}_\pi \rrbracket \mid F \subseteq \text{TPaths}(C), F \text{ is finite} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma D.3.2.** *If  $\cdot \vdash \mathcal{V} : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  is a value configuration, then  $\llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket \blacktriangleleft_A^k \mathcal{V}$ .*

PROOF. This is immediate by Definition D.3.1.  $\square$

#### D.4 Classical Logical Relations

*Assumption D.4.1.* In this section and the next two, all types are assumed to be classical, unless otherwise noted.

We define sets of relations that are parameterised by dcpo's  $X$  from our semantic category, types  $P$  from our language and partial deterministic embeddings  $e_X : X \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  which show how  $X$  approximates  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ . We shall write relation membership in infix notation, that is, for a binary relation  $\triangleleft$ , we write  $v \triangleleft V$  to indicate  $(v, V) \in \triangleleft$ .

**Definition D.4.2.** For any dcpo  $X$ , type  $P$  and morphism  $e : X \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  in  $\mathbf{PD}_e$ , let:

$$\text{ValRel}(X, P, e) = \{ \triangleleft_{X,P}^e \subseteq \mathbf{TD}(1, X) \times \text{Val}(P) \mid \forall V \in \text{Val}(P). (-) \triangleleft_{X,P}^e V \text{ is a Scott closed subset of } \mathbf{TD}(1, X) \text{ and } \forall V \in \text{Val}(P). v \triangleleft_{X,P}^e V \Rightarrow e \circ v \leq \llbracket V \rrbracket \}.$$

*Remark D.4.3.* In the above definition, relations  $\triangleleft_{X,P}^e \in \text{ValRel}(X, P, e)$  can be seen as ternary relations  $\triangleleft_{X,P}^e \subseteq \mathbf{TD}(1, X) \times \text{Val}(P) \times \{e\}$ . However, since there is no choice for the third component, we prefer to see them as binary relations that are parameterised by the embeddings  $e$ . Indeed, this leads to a much nicer notation. We shall also sometimes indicate the parameters  $X, P$  and  $e$  of the relation in order to avoid confusion as to which set  $\text{ValRel}(X, P, e)$  it belongs to.

The relations we need for the adequacy proof inhabit the sets  $\text{ValRel}(\llbracket P \rrbracket, P, \mathbf{id}_{\llbracket P \rrbracket})$ . In the remainder of the appendix, we will show how to choose exactly one relation (the one we need) from each of those sets.

The next definition we introduce is crucial for the proof of strong adequacy.

**Definition D.4.4.** Given a relation  $\triangleleft_{X,P}^e \in \text{ValRel}(X, P, e)$  and a term  $\cdot \vdash M : P$ , let  $\mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X,P}^e; M)$  be the Scott-closure in  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, X)$  of the set

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\triangleleft_{X,P}^e; M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \sum_{\pi \in F} P(\pi) v_\pi \mid F \subseteq \text{TPaths}(M), F \text{ is finite and } v_\pi \triangleleft_{X,P}^e V_\pi \text{ for each } \pi \in F \right\}. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

In other words,  $\mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X,P}^e; M)$  is the smallest Scott-closed subset of  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, X)$  which contains all morphisms of the form in (D.1). For a subset  $U \subseteq \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, X)$ , we write  $\overline{U}$  to indicate its Scott-closure in  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, X)$ .

**Lemma D.4.5.** *For any value  $V$ , we have  $\mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X,P}^e; V) = \overline{\{v \mid v \triangleleft_{X,P}^e V\}} \cup \{0\} = \overline{\{v \mid v \triangleleft_{X,P}^e V\}} \cup \{0\}$ .*

PROOF. This is because all of the sums in (D.1) are singleton sums or the empty sum.  $\square$

**Lemma D.4.6** ([Jones 1990, Lemma 8.4]). *Let  $Y$  be a dcpo and let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in F}$  be a finite collection of dcpo's. Let  $f : \prod_i X_i \rightarrow Y$  be a Scott-continuous function. Let  $C_Y$  be a Scott-closed subset of  $Y$ .*

Let  $U_i \subseteq X_i$  be arbitrary subsets, such that  $f(\prod_i U_i) \subseteq C_Y$ . Then  $f(\prod_i \overline{U_i}) \subseteq C_Y$ , where  $\overline{U_i}$  is the Scott-closure of  $U_i$  in  $X_i$ .

**Lemma D.4.7** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 77]). Let  $\triangleleft_{X_1, P}^{e_1}$  and  $\triangleleft_{X_2, P}^{e_2}$  be two logical relations and  $\cdot \vdash M : P$  a term. Assume that  $g : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  is a morphism, such that  $v \triangleleft_{X_1, P}^{e_1} V$  implies  $g \circ v \in \mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X_2, P}^{e_2}; V)$ , for any  $V \in \text{Val}(M)$ . If  $m \in \mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X_1, P}^{e_1}; M)$ , then  $g \circ m \in \mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X_2, P}^{e_2}; M)$ .

Next, we define important *closure relations* which we use for terms.

**Definition D.4.8.** If  $\triangleleft_{X, P}^e \in \text{ValRel}(X, P, e)$ , let  $\overline{\triangleleft_{X, P}^e} \subseteq \text{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, X) \times \text{Prog}(P)$  be the relation defined by

$$m \overline{\triangleleft_{X, P}^e} M \text{ iff } m \in \mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X, P}^e; M).$$

**Lemma D.4.9.** For any term  $\cdot \vdash M : P$  and  $\triangleleft_{X, P}^e \in \text{ValRel}(X, P, e)$ , the set  $(-) \overline{\triangleleft_{X, P}^e} M$  is a Scott-closed subset of  $\text{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, X)$ .

PROOF. This follows immediately by definition, because  $\mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{X, P}^e; M)$  is Scott-closed.  $\square$

**Lemma D.4.10** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 80]). Let  $C$  be a Scott-closed subset of a dcpo  $X$ . Let  $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\delta_x \mid x \in C\} \subseteq MX$  and let  $\overline{W}$  be the Scott-closure of  $W$  in  $MX$ . Then,  $\delta_y \in \overline{W}$  iff  $y \in C$ .

**Lemma D.4.11** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 81]). Let  $X$  be a dcpo, let  $v \in \text{TD}(1, X)$  and let  $V$  be a value. Then  $v \triangleleft_{X, P}^e V$  iff  $v \overline{\triangleleft_{X, P}^e} V$ .

**Lemma D.4.12** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 82]). For any value  $\cdot \vdash V : P$  and  $\triangleleft_{X, P}^e \in \text{ValRel}(X, P, e)$ , if  $m \overline{\triangleleft_{X, P}^e} V$  then  $e \circ m \leq \llbracket V \rrbracket$ .

## D.5 Logical Relations for types 1 and $Q(A, B)$

The unit type 1 and the type of quantum functions  $Q(A, B)$  have simple type structures, because they do not depend on any other classical types. As a result, it is easy to define the required logical relations at those types and we do so now.

**Definition D.5.1.** We define a logical relation  $\triangleleft_1 \in \text{ValRel}(\llbracket 1 \rrbracket, 1, \text{id}_{\llbracket 1 \rrbracket})$  by:

$$f \triangleleft_1 () \text{ iff } f = \text{id}_{\llbracket 1 \rrbracket}.$$

**Definition D.5.2.** For every two closed quantum types  $A$  and  $B$ , we define a logical relation  $\triangleleft_{Q(A, B)} \in \text{ValRel}(\llbracket Q(A, B) \rrbracket, Q(A, B), \text{id}_{\llbracket Q(A, B) \rrbracket})$  by:

$$f \triangleleft_{Q(A, B)} \mathbf{f} \text{ iff } f \leq \llbracket \mathbf{f} \rrbracket \text{ and } \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \forall (\cdot \vdash [\psi], \ell, \mathbf{v}] : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k). \\ (\beta(f(\ast)) \otimes \text{id}) \circ \llbracket [\psi], \ell, \mathbf{v}] \rrbracket \triangleleft_B^k \llbracket [\psi], \ell, \mathbf{fv}] \rrbracket,$$

where the second quantifier ranges over well-formed *value configurations* of the indicated type.

It is easy to see that both logical relations are well-defined. Furthermore, notice that the second family of logical relations is defined via the quantum logical relations on configurations.

## D.6 Categories of Logical Relations

**Definition D.6.1.** For any type  $P$ , we define a category  $\mathbf{R}(P)$  where:

- Each object is a triple  $(X, e_X, \triangleleft_X)$ , where  $X$  is a dcpo,  $e_X : X \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  is a morphism in  $\text{PD}_e$  and  $\triangleleft_X \in \text{ValRel}(X, P, e_X)$ .
- A morphism  $f : (X, e_X, \triangleleft_X) \rightarrow (Y, e_Y, \triangleleft_Y)$  is a morphism  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\text{PD}_e$ , which satisfies the three additional conditions:

- If  $v \triangleleft_X V$ , then  $f \circ v \triangleleft_Y V$ .
- If  $v \triangleleft_Y V$ , then  $f^p \circ v \triangleleft_X V$ .
- $e_X = e_Y \circ f$ .

- Composition and identities coincide with those in  $\mathbf{PD}_e$ .

**Lemma D.6.2** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 84]). *For every type  $P$ , the category  $\mathbf{R}(P)$  is indeed well-defined.*

**Lemma D.6.3.** *Let  $\cdot \vdash M : P$  be a term and let  $g : (X, e_X, \triangleleft_X) \rightarrow (Y, e_Y, \triangleleft_Y)$  be a morphism in  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ . If  $m \triangleleft_X M$  then  $g \circ m \triangleleft_Y M$ . Moreover, if  $n \triangleleft_Y N$ , then  $g^p \circ n \triangleleft_X N$ .*

PROOF. This follows immediately by Lemma D.4.7.  $\square$

**Definition D.6.4.** For every type  $P$ , we define the obvious forgetful functor  $U^P : \mathbf{R}(P) \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$  by

$$U^P(X, e, \triangleleft) = X$$

$$U^P(f) = f.$$

**Proposition D.6.5** ([Jia et al. 2021, Proposition 87]). *For each type  $P$ , the category  $\mathbf{R}(P)$  has an initial object and all  $\omega$ -colimits. Furthermore, the forgetful functor  $U^P : \mathbf{R}(P) \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$  preserves and reflects  $\omega$ -colimits (and also the initial objects).*

Next, we introduce important relation constructors and some new notation.

**Notation D.6.6.** Given morphisms  $m_i : 1 \rightarrow X_i$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we define

$$\langle\langle m_1, \dots, m_n \rangle\rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (m_1 \times \dots \times m_n) \circ \mathcal{J}\langle \text{id}_1, \dots, \text{id}_1 \rangle : 1 \rightarrow X_1 \times \dots \times X_n.$$

**Notation D.6.7.** Given morphisms  $x : 1 \rightarrow X$  and  $f : 1 \rightarrow [X \rightarrow Y]$  in  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}$ , let  $f[x] : 1 \rightarrow Y$  be the morphism defined by

$$f[x] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon \circ (f \times x) \circ \mathcal{J}\langle \text{id}_1, \text{id}_1 \rangle.$$

**Definition D.6.8** (Relation Constructions). We define relation constructors:

- If  $\triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_1, P_1, e_1)$  and  $\triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2} \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_2, P_2, e_2)$ , define

$$(\triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} + \triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2}) \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_1 + X_2, P_1 + P_2, e_1 \dot{+} e_2) \text{ by:}$$

$$\mathcal{J} \text{ini} \circ v \langle \triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} + \triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2} \rangle \text{ in}_i V \text{ iff } v \triangleleft_{X_i, P_i}^{e_i} V \quad (\text{for } i \in \{1, 2\}).$$

- If  $\triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_1, P_1, e_1)$  and  $\triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2} \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_2, P_2, e_2)$ , define

$$(\triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} \times \triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2}) \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_1 \times X_2, P_1 \times P_2, e_1 \times e_2) \text{ by:}$$

$$\langle\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle\rangle \langle \triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} \times \triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2} \rangle (V_1, V_2) \text{ iff } v_1 \triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} V_1 \text{ and } v_2 \triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2} V_2.$$

- If  $\triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_1, P_1, e_1)$  and  $\triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2} \in \mathbf{ValRel}(X_2, P_2, e_2)$ , define

$$(\triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} \rightarrow \triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2}) \in \mathbf{ValRel}([X_1 \rightarrow X_2], P_1 \rightarrow P_2, \mathcal{J}[e_1^p \rightarrow e_2]) \text{ by:}$$

$$f \langle \triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} \rightarrow \triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2} \rangle \lambda x.M \text{ iff } \mathcal{J}[e_1^p \rightarrow e_2] \circ f \leq \llbracket \lambda x.M \rrbracket \text{ and } \forall (v \triangleleft_{X_1, P_1}^{e_1} V). f[v] \overline{\triangleleft_{X_2, P_2}^{e_2}} (\lambda x.M)V.$$

**Lemma D.6.9** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 91]). *The assignments in Definition D.6.8 are indeed well-defined.*

**Notation D.6.10.** Throughout the rest of the paper we shall write  $(- \rightarrow_e -) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [- \rightarrow -]_e^{\mathcal{J}} : \mathbf{PD}_e \times \mathbf{PD}_e \rightarrow \mathbf{PD}_e$ . That is, we just introduce a more concise notation for the functor  $[- \rightarrow -]_e^{\mathcal{J}}$  from Proposition 6.1.6.

The next definition is crucial. Given two logical relations, it is used to define the product, co-product and function space logical relations. Moreover, this is done in a functorial sense on the categories  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ .

**Proposition D.6.11** ([Jia et al. 2021, Proposition 95]). *Let  $P$  and  $R$  be types. The following assignments (recall Definition D.6.8):*

(1)  $\times^{P,R}: \mathbf{R}(P) \times \mathbf{R}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(P \times R)$  by

$$(X, e_X, \triangleleft_X) \times^{P,R} (Y, e_Y, \triangleleft_Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (X \times Y, e_X \times_e e_Y, \triangleleft_X \times \triangleleft_Y)$$

$$f \times^{P,R} g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f \times_e g$$

(2)  $+^{P,R}: \mathbf{R}(P) \times \mathbf{R}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(P + R)$  by

$$(X, e_X, \triangleleft_X) +^{P,R} (Y, e_Y, \triangleleft_Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (X + Y, e_X \dot{+}_e e_Y, \triangleleft_X + \triangleleft_Y)$$

$$f +^{P,R} g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f \dot{+}_e g$$

(3)  $\rightarrow^{P,R}: \mathbf{R}(P) \times \mathbf{R}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(P \rightarrow R)$  by

$$(X, e_X, \triangleleft_X) \rightarrow^{P,R} (Y, e_Y, \triangleleft_Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ([X \twoheadrightarrow Y], e_X \dot{\rightarrow}_e e_Y, \triangleleft_X \rightarrow \triangleleft_Y)$$

$$f \rightarrow^{P,R} g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f \dot{\rightarrow}_e g$$

define covariant functors with the indicated types.

Observe that Proposition D.6.11 lifts the functors that we use to interpret our types in the category  $\mathbf{DCPO}_M$  to the categories  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ . Next, we show that the functors we just defined are also suitable for forming (parameterised) initial algebras.

**Proposition D.6.12** ([Jia et al. 2021, Proposition 96]). *For  $\star \in \{\times, +, \rightarrow\}$ , for all types  $P$  and  $R$ , the functor  $\star^{P,R}: \mathbf{R}(P) \times \mathbf{R}(R) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(P \star R)$  is  $\omega$ -cocontinuous and the following diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{R}(P) \times \mathbf{R}(R) & \xrightarrow{\star^{P,R}} & \mathbf{R}(P \star R) \\ U^P \times U^R \downarrow & & \downarrow U^{P \star R} \\ \mathbf{PD}_e \times \mathbf{PD}_e & \xrightarrow{\star_e} & \mathbf{PD}_e \end{array}$$

commutes.

Next, we establish an isomorphism between the categories  $\mathbf{R}(\mu X.P)$  and  $\mathbf{R}(P[\mu X.P/X])$ .

**Definition D.6.13.** We define constructors for folding and unfolding logical relations as follows:

- If  $\triangleleft_{X,P[\mu Y.P/Y]}^e \in \text{ValRel}(X, P[\mu Y.P/Y], e)$ , define

$$(\mathbb{I}^{\mu Y.P} \triangleleft_{X,P[\mu Y.P/Y]}^e) \in \text{ValRel}(X, \mu Y.P, \text{fold} \circ e) \text{ by:}$$

$$v (\mathbb{I}^{\mu Y.P} \triangleleft_{X,P[\mu Y.P/Y]}^e) \text{ fold } V \text{ iff } v \triangleleft_{X,P[\mu Y.P/Y]}^e V.$$

- If  $\triangleleft_{X,\mu Y.P}^e \in \text{ValRel}(X, \mu Y.P, e)$ , define

$$(\mathbb{E}^{\mu Y.P} \triangleleft_{X,\mu Y.P}^e) \in \text{ValRel}(X, P[\mu Y.P/Y], \text{unfold} \circ e) \text{ by:}$$

$$v (\mathbb{E}^{\mu Y.P} \triangleleft_{X,\mu Y.P}^e) V \text{ iff } v \triangleleft_{X,\mu Y.P}^e \text{ fold } V.$$

**Proposition D.6.14** ([Jia et al. 2021, Proposition 99]). *For every type  $\cdot \vdash \mu X.P$ , we have an isomorphism of categories*

$$\mathbb{I}^{\mu X.P} : \mathbf{R}(P[\mu X.P/X]) \cong \mathbf{R}(\mu X.P) : \mathbb{E}^{\mu X.P},$$

where the functors are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}^{\mu X.P} : \mathbf{R}(P[\mu X.P/X]) &\rightarrow \mathbf{R}(\mu X.P) & \mathbb{E}^{\mu X.P} : \mathbf{R}(\mu X.P) &\rightarrow \mathbf{R}(P[\mu X.P/X]) \\ \mathbb{I}^{\mu X.P}(Y, e, \triangleleft) &= (Y, \text{fold} \circ e, \mathbb{I}^{\mu X.P} \triangleleft) & \mathbb{E}^{\mu X.P}(Y, e, \triangleleft) &= (Y, \text{unfold} \circ e, \mathbb{E}^{\mu X.P} \triangleleft) \\ \mathbb{I}^{\mu X.P}(f) &= f & \mathbb{E}^{\mu X.P}(f) &= f. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the categorical development of the categories  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ .

## D.7 Augmented Interpretation of Types

We have now established sufficient categorical structure in order to construct parameterised initial algebras in the categories  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ . Furthermore, we have sufficient structure to also define an *augmented* interpretation of types in these categories. The main idea behind providing the augmented interpretation is to show how to pick out the logical relations we need from all those that exist in the categories  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ .

**Notation D.7.1.** Given any type context  $\Theta = X_1, \dots, X_n$  and closed types  $\cdot \vdash C_i$  with  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we shall write  $\vec{C}$  for  $C_1, \dots, C_n$  and we also write  $[\vec{C}/\Theta]$  for  $[C_1/X_1, \dots, C_n/X_n]$ .

**Definition D.7.2.** For any type  $\Theta \vdash P$  and closed types  $\vec{C}$ , we define their *augmented interpretation* to be the functor

$$\|\Theta \vdash P\|^{\vec{C}} : \mathbf{R}(C_1) \times \dots \times \mathbf{R}(C_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}(P[\vec{C}/\Theta])$$

defined by induction on the derivation of  $\Theta \vdash P$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Theta \vdash \Theta_i\|^{\vec{C}} &:= \Pi_i \\ \|\Theta \vdash 1\|^{\vec{C}} &:= K_{([\mathbb{1}], \text{id}_{[\mathbb{1}]}, \triangleleft_1)} \\ \|\Theta \vdash Q(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})\|^{\vec{C}} &:= K_{([\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})], \text{id}_{[\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})]}, \triangleleft_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})})} \\ \|\Theta \vdash P \star R\|^{\vec{C}} &:= \star^{P[\vec{C}/\Theta], R[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \circ \langle \|\Theta \vdash P\|^{\vec{C}}, \|\Theta \vdash R\|^{\vec{C}} \rangle \quad (\text{for } \star \in \{+, \times, \rightarrow\}) \\ \|\Theta \vdash \mu X.P\|^{\vec{C}} &:= \left( \mathbb{I}^{\mu X.P[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \circ \|\Theta, X \vdash P\|^{\vec{C}, \mu X.P[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \right)^{\sharp}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $K_Y$  is the constant functor on  $Y$  and the  $(-)^{\sharp}$  operation is from Definition 6.1.3.

**Proposition D.7.3.** *Each functor  $\|\Theta \vdash P\|^{\vec{C}}$  is well-defined and  $\omega$ -cocontinuous. Moreover, the following diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{R}(C_1) \times \dots \times \mathbf{R}(C_n) & \xrightarrow{\|\Theta \vdash P\|^{\vec{C}}} & \mathbf{R}(P[\vec{C}/\Theta]) \\ \downarrow U^{C_1} \times \dots \times U^{C_n} & & \downarrow U^{P[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \\ \mathbf{PD}_e \times \dots \times \mathbf{PD}_e & \xrightarrow{[\|\Theta \vdash P\|]} & \mathbf{PD}_e \end{array}$$

commutes.



PROOF. The proof is essentially the same as [Lindenhovius et al. 2021, Proposition 7.26].  $\square$

Next, a corollary which shows that parameterised initial algebras for our type expressions are constructed in the same way in both categories.

**Corollary D.7.4.** *The 2-categorical diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{R}^{\mu X.P[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \circ \llbracket \Theta, X \vdash P \rrbracket^{\vec{C}, \mu X.P[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \circ \langle \text{Id}, \llbracket \Theta \vdash \mu X.P \rrbracket^{\vec{C}} \rangle & & \\
 \mathbb{R}(C_1) \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R}(C_n) & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & \mathbb{R}(P[\vec{C}/\Theta]) \\
 \downarrow U^{C_1} \times \cdots \times U^{C_n} & \begin{array}{c} \Downarrow \iota \\ \llbracket \Theta \vdash \mu X.P \rrbracket^{\vec{C}} \end{array} & \downarrow U^{P[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \\
 \mathbb{P}D_e \times \cdots \times \mathbb{P}D_e & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & \mathbb{P}D_e \\
 & \begin{array}{c} \Downarrow \iota \\ \llbracket \Theta \vdash \mu X.P \rrbracket \end{array} & 
 \end{array}$$

commutes, where  $\iota$  is the parameterised initial algebra isomorphism (see Definition 6.1.3).

PROOF. The proof is the same as [Lindenhovius et al. 2021, Corollary 7.27].  $\square$

Proposition D.7.3 shows that the first component of the augmented interpretation coincides with the standard interpretation. This is true for all types, including open ones. In the special case for closed types, let  $\llbracket P \rrbracket \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket \cdot \vdash P \rrbracket^{\cdot} (*)$ , where  $*$  is the unique object of the terminal category  $\mathbf{1} = \mathbb{R}(P)^0$ . Proposition D.7.3 therefore shows that  $U\llbracket P \rrbracket = \llbracket P \rrbracket$ , which means that  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  has the form  $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (\llbracket P \rrbracket, e, \triangleleft)$ , where  $e : \llbracket P \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket P \rrbracket$  is some embedding. Next, we show that  $e = \text{id}$ . In order to do this, we prove a stronger proposition first. We show that the action of the functor  $\llbracket \Theta \vdash P \rrbracket^{\vec{C}}$  on the embedding component is also completely determined by the action of  $\llbracket \Theta \vdash P \rrbracket$  on embeddings.

**Proposition D.7.5.** *For every functor  $\llbracket \Theta \vdash P \rrbracket^{\vec{C}}$  and objects  $(X_i, e_i, \triangleleft_i)$  with  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have:*

$$\pi_e \left( \llbracket \Theta \vdash P \rrbracket^{\vec{C}} ((X_1, e_1, \triangleleft_1), \dots, (X_n, e_n, \triangleleft_n)) \right) = \llbracket \Theta \vdash P \rrbracket (e_1, \dots, e_n),$$

where for an object  $(Z, e_Z, \triangleleft_Z)$  in any category  $\mathbb{R}(R)$ , we define  $\pi_e(Z, e_Z, \triangleleft_Z) = e_Z$ .

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of  $\Theta \vdash P$ .

**Case  $P = 1$ .** The functors on both sides are constant ones, so this is a trivial verification.

**Case  $P = Q(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ .** The functors on both sides are constant ones, so this is a trivial verification.

The remaining cases follow using exactly the same arguments as in [Jia et al. 2021, Proposition 104].  $\square$

**Corollary D.7.6.** *For every closed classical type  $P$ , we have  $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (\llbracket P \rrbracket, \mathbf{id}_{\llbracket P \rrbracket}, \triangleleft_P)$  for some logical relation  $\triangleleft_P$ .*

PROOF. We already know that the first component is  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$ . For the second component, the previous proposition shows that  $\pi_e \llbracket P \rrbracket = \pi_e \llbracket \cdot \vdash P \rrbracket^{\cdot} (*) = \llbracket \cdot \vdash P \rrbracket (\text{id}_*) = \mathbf{id}_{\llbracket P \rrbracket}$ , where  $*$  denotes the empty tuple of objects and  $\text{id}_*$  the empty tuple of embeddings.  $\square$

Finally, we want to show that the third component of  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  is the logical relation that we need to carry out the adequacy proof. For this, we have to prove a substitution lemma first.

**Lemma D.7.7** (Substitution). *For any classical types  $\Theta, X \vdash P$  and  $\Theta \vdash R$  and closed types  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ , we have:*

$$\llbracket \Theta \vdash P[R/X] \rrbracket^{\vec{C}} = \llbracket \Theta, X \vdash P \rrbracket^{\vec{C}, R[\vec{C}/\Theta]} \circ \langle \text{Id}, \llbracket \Theta \vdash R \rrbracket^{\vec{C}} \rangle.$$

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of  $\Theta, X \vdash P$ . The cases for the types 1 and  $Q(A, B)$  are trivial, because they involve constant functors. The remaining cases can be proven in the same way as [Lindenhovius et al. 2021, Lemma 7.30].  $\square$

For each type  $P$ , we have now provided an augmented interpretation  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  of  $P$  in the category  $\mathbf{R}(P)$ . The interpretation  $\llbracket - \rrbracket$  satisfies all the fundamental properties of  $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ , as we have now shown. It should now be clear that this augmented interpretation is true to its name, because it carries strictly more information compared to the standard interpretation of types. The additional information that  $\llbracket P \rrbracket$  carries is precisely the logical relation that we need at type  $P$ , as we show in the next subsection.

## D.8 Existence of the Logical Relations

We can now show that the logical relations we need for the adequacy proof exist.

**Theorem D.8.1.** *For each closed classical type  $P$ , there exist formal approximation relations:*

$$\begin{aligned} \triangleleft_P &\subseteq \mathbf{TD}(1, \llbracket P \rrbracket) \times \text{Val}(P) \\ \overline{\triangleleft}_P &\subseteq \mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \llbracket P \rrbracket) \times \text{Prog}(P) \end{aligned}$$

which satisfy the following properties:

- (A0)  $v \triangleleft_1 ()$  iff  $v = \mathbf{id}_1$ .
- (A1)  $\mathcal{J} \text{in}_i \circ v \triangleleft_{P_1+P_2} \text{in}_i V$  iff  $v \triangleleft_{P_i} V$ , where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .
- (A2)  $\langle\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle\rangle \triangleleft_{P_1 \times P_2} (V_1, V_2)$  iff  $v_1 \triangleleft_{P_1} V_1$  and  $v_2 \triangleleft_{P_2} V_2$ .
- (A3)  $f \triangleleft_{P \rightarrow R} \lambda x. M$  iff  $f \leq \llbracket \lambda x. M \rrbracket$  and  $\forall (v \triangleleft_P V). f[v] \overline{\triangleleft}_R (\lambda x. M)V$ .
- (A4)  $v \triangleleft_{\mu X. P} \text{fold } V$  iff  $\text{unfold} \circ v \triangleleft_{P[\mu X. P/X]} V$ .
- (A5)  $f \triangleleft_{Q(A, B)} \mathbf{f}$  iff  $f \leq \llbracket \mathbf{f} \rrbracket$  and  $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \forall (\cdot \vdash \llbracket \psi \rrbracket, \ell, \mathbf{v} \rrbracket : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k)$ .

$$(\beta(f(*)) \otimes \text{id}) \circ \llbracket \llbracket \psi \rrbracket, \ell, \mathbf{v} \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{B}}^k \llbracket \llbracket \psi \rrbracket, \ell, \mathbf{fv} \rrbracket.$$

- (R)  $m \overline{\triangleleft}_P M$  iff  $m \in \mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_P; M)$ , where  $\mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_P; M)$  is the Scott-closure in  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \llbracket P \rrbracket)$  of the set

$$\mathcal{S}_0(\triangleleft_P; M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \sum_{\pi \in F} P(\pi)v_\pi \mid F \subseteq \text{TPaths}(M) \text{ is finite and } v_\pi \triangleleft_P V_\pi \text{ for each } \pi \in F \right\} \text{ (see Definition D.2.3).}$$

- (C1) If  $v \triangleleft_P V$ , then  $v \leq \llbracket V \rrbracket$ .
- (C2)  $(- \triangleleft_P V)$  is a Scott-closed subset of  $\mathbf{TD}(1, \llbracket P \rrbracket)$ .
- (C3) If  $m \overline{\triangleleft}_P M$ , then  $m \leq \llbracket M \rrbracket$ .
- (C4)  $(- \overline{\triangleleft}_P M)$  is a Scott-closed subset of  $\mathbf{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(1, \llbracket P \rrbracket)$ .
- (C5) If  $v \in \mathbf{TD}(1, \llbracket P \rrbracket)$  and  $V$  is a value, then  $v \triangleleft_P V$  iff  $v \overline{\triangleleft}_P V$ .

PROOF. Consider the object  $\llbracket P \rrbracket \in \mathbf{R}(P)$ . We have already shown that  $\llbracket P \rrbracket = (\llbracket P \rrbracket, \mathbf{id}_{\llbracket P \rrbracket}, \triangleleft_P)$  for some logical relation  $\triangleleft_P \in \text{ValRel}(\llbracket P \rrbracket, P, \mathbf{id}_{\llbracket P \rrbracket})$ . We now show that  $\triangleleft_P$  satisfies the required properties. Notice that the embedding components are just identities.

Properties (A0) and (A5) are satisfied by construction. To show the remaining properties are satisfied we simply use the same arguments as in [Jia et al. 2021, Theorem 107].  $\square$

## D.9 Closure Properties of the Logical Relations

Here we establish some important closure properties of our logical relations.

**Lemma D.9.1** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 108]). *Let  $m \cdot \vdash M : P$  be a term and let  $F$  be some finite index set. Assume that we are given morphisms  $m_i$  and terms  $M_i$  such that  $m_i \overleftarrow{<P} M_i$  for  $i \in F$ . Assume further that for each  $i \in F$ , we are given a reduction path  $\pi_i \in \text{Paths}(M, M_i)$ , such that all paths  $\pi_i$  are distinct. Then*

$$\sum_{i \in F} P(\pi_i) m_i \overleftarrow{<P} M.$$

**Lemma D.9.2** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 109]). *If  $m \overleftarrow{<P} M$  and  $n \overleftarrow{<P} N$ , then  $p \cdot m + (1-p) \cdot n \overleftarrow{<P} M \text{ or }_p N$ .*

**Lemma D.9.3** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 110]). *For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ : if  $m \overleftarrow{<P_i} M$ , then  $\mathcal{J} \text{ in}_i \circ m \overleftarrow{<P_1+P_2} \text{ in}_i M$ .*

**Lemma D.9.4** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 111]). *Let  $m \overleftarrow{<P_1+P_2} M$ . Next, assume that for  $k \in \{1, 2\}$  we have terms  $x_k : P_k \vdash N_k : R$  and morphisms  $n_k : \llbracket P_k \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket R \rrbracket$ , such that for every  $v_k \overleftarrow{<P_k} V_k$ , it is the case that  $n_k \circ v_k \overleftarrow{<R} N_k[V_k/x_k]$ . Then*

$$[n_1, n_2] \circ m \overleftarrow{<R} \text{ case } M \text{ of } \text{in}_1 x_1 \Rightarrow N_1 \mid \text{in}_2 x_2 \Rightarrow N_2.$$

**Lemma D.9.5** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 112]). *If  $m_1 \overleftarrow{<P_1} M_1$  and  $m_2 \overleftarrow{<P_2} M_2$  then  $\langle\langle m_1, m_2 \rangle\rangle \overleftarrow{<P_1 \times P_2} (M_1, M_2)$ .*

**Lemma D.9.6** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 113]). *If  $m \overleftarrow{<P_1 \times P_2} M$  then  $\mathcal{J} \pi_i \circ m \overleftarrow{<P_i} \pi_i M$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ .*

**Lemma D.9.7** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 114]). *If  $m \overleftarrow{<_{\mu X.P}} M$  then  $\text{unfold} \circ m \overleftarrow{<_{P[\mu X.P/X]}} \text{unfold } M$ .*

**Lemma D.9.8** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 115]). *If  $m \overleftarrow{<_{P[\mu X.P/X]}} M$  then  $\text{fold} \circ m \overleftarrow{<_{\mu X.P}} \text{fold } M$ .*

**Lemma D.9.9** ([Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 116]). *If  $m \overleftarrow{<_{P \rightarrow R}} M$  and  $n \overleftarrow{<P} N$ , then  $m[n] \overleftarrow{<R} MN$ .*

It is also helpful to state some closure lemmas for the quantum logical relations. However, instead of stating this for the logical relations on configurations, it is more convenient to extend those relations to *quantum terms* and establish the closure properties for them.

**Notation D.9.10.** Given a quantum term  $\Phi; \mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n : \mathbf{A}_n \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}$  and a value configuration  $\Phi \vdash \mathcal{V} : \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_n; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  where  $\mathcal{V} = [\lvert\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_n]$ , we shall write  $[\mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathcal{V}] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\lvert\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}[\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n/\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]]$  for the configuration obtained by performing the indicated substitution. Then  $\Phi \vdash [\mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathcal{V}] : \mathbf{B}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$ .

**Definition D.9.11.** For each closed quantum type  $\mathbf{B}$  and quantum context  $\Gamma = \mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n : \mathbf{A}_n$ , we define a *logical relation*

$$\begin{aligned} \leftarrow_{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{B} \rrbracket) \times \{\mathbf{q} \mid \vdash; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}\} \quad \text{by} \\ \mathbf{q} \leftarrow_{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{B}} \mathbf{q} \text{ iff } \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \forall \left( \cdot \vdash \mathcal{V} : \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_n; \mathbf{qbit}^k \right). (\mathbf{q} \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbf{qbit}^k}) \circ \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket \leftarrow_{\mathbf{B}}^k [\mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathcal{V}], \end{aligned}$$

where the second quantifier ranges over well-formed *value configurations* of the indicated type.

**Lemma D.9.12.** *For any quantum value  $\vdash; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{B}$ , we have that  $\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket \leftarrow_{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{B}} \mathbf{v}$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $\Gamma = \mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n : \mathbf{A}_n$  and let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\cdot \vdash \mathcal{V} : \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_n; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  be arbitrary. By the Substitution Lemma 7.4.1, it follows that  $\llbracket [\mathbf{v} \leftarrow \mathcal{V}] \rrbracket = (\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbf{qbit}^k}) \circ \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket$ . Then the proof follows by Lemma D.3.2.  $\square$

Before we may prove the necessary lemmas for terms dealing with observable primitives, the following lemma is useful.

**Lemma D.9.13.** *Let  $\cdot \vdash v : O$  be an observable value. Then  $\llbracket v \rrbracket \triangleleft_O v$ . Furthermore, if  $f \triangleleft_O v$ , then  $f = \llbracket v \rrbracket$ .*

PROOF. Observable values have a very simple structure, because they do not involve any use of function space. The lemma follows by straightforward induction on the derivation of  $v$  using Theorem D.8.1.  $\square$

**Lemma D.9.14.** *Let  $\cdot \vdash C : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  be a configuration and let  $F$  be some finite index set. Assume that we are given morphisms  $c_i \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathbb{C}, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \mathbf{qbit}^k \rrbracket)$  and configurations  $\cdot \vdash C_i : A; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  such that  $c_i \triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k C_i$  for  $i \in F$ . Assume further that for each  $i \in F$ , we are given a reduction path  $\pi_i \in \text{Paths}(C, C_i)$ , such that all paths  $\pi_i$  are distinct. Then*

$$\sum_{i \in F} P(\pi_i) c_i \triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k C.$$

PROOF. Fully analogous to Lemma D.9.1.  $\square$

**Lemma D.9.15.** *If  $q_1 \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1+B_1} \mathbf{q}_1$  and  $q_2 \triangleleft_{\Gamma_2+B_2} \mathbf{q}_2$ , then  $q_1 \otimes q_2 \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2+B_1 \otimes B_2} \mathbf{q}_1 \otimes \mathbf{q}_2$ .*

**Lemma D.9.16.** *If  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1+A_1 \otimes A_2} \mathbf{q}$  and  $r \triangleleft_{\Gamma_2, x:A_1, y:A_2+B} \mathbf{r}$ , then*

$$r \circ (\text{id} \otimes q) \circ \text{swap} \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2+B} \text{let } \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r}.$$

**Lemma D.9.17.** *For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , if  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+A} \mathbf{q}$  then  $\text{in}_i \circ q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+A \oplus B} \text{in}_i \mathbf{q}$ .*

**Lemma D.9.18.** *If  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1+A_1 \oplus A_2} \mathbf{q}$  and  $r_1 \triangleleft_{\Gamma_2, x:A_1+B} \mathbf{r}_1$  and  $r_2 \triangleleft_{\Gamma_2, y:A_2+B} \mathbf{r}_2$ , then*

$$\llbracket r_1, r_2 \rrbracket \circ d \circ (\text{id} \otimes q) \circ \text{swap} \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2+B} (\text{case } \mathbf{q} \text{ of } \text{in}_1 \mathbf{x} \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_1 \mid \text{in}_2 \mathbf{y} \Rightarrow \mathbf{r}_2).$$

**Lemma D.9.19.** *If  $m \triangleleft_{\mathcal{Q}(A, B)} M$  and  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+A} \mathbf{q}$ , then  $\beta(m(*)) \circ q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+B} Mq$ .*

**Lemma D.9.20.** *If  $c \triangleleft_{\mathbf{O}}^k C$ , then  $(* \mapsto r_{\mathbf{O}}(\text{drop}_k \circ c)) \triangleleft_{|\mathbf{O}|} \text{run } C$ .*

**Lemma D.9.21.** *If  $m \triangleleft_{|\mathbf{O}|} M$ , then  $r_{\mathbf{O}}^{-1}(m_*) \triangleleft_{+\mathbf{O}} \text{init } M$ .*

**Lemma D.9.22.** *Let  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+\mathbf{O}} \mathbf{q}$ . Let  $x : |\mathbf{O}|; \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{r} : \mathbf{A}$  be a term and  $r : \llbracket |\mathbf{O}| \rrbracket \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}(\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{A} \rrbracket)$  a Scott-continuous function such that for any observable value  $\cdot \vdash V : |\mathbf{O}|$  we have that  $r[\llbracket V \rrbracket] \triangleleft_{\Gamma_2+A} \mathbf{r}[V/x]$ . Then  $\widehat{r}_* \circ (q \otimes \text{id}) \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2+A} \text{let } \mathbf{x} = \text{lift } \mathbf{q} \text{ in } \mathbf{r}$ .*

**Lemma D.9.23.** *If  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+P[\mu X.P/X]} \mathbf{q}$  then  $\text{fold} \circ q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+\mu X.P} \text{fold } \mathbf{q}$ .*

**Lemma D.9.24.** *If  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+\mu X.P} \mathbf{q}$  then  $\text{unfold} \circ q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+P[\mu X.P/X]} \text{unfold } \mathbf{q}$ .*

**Lemma D.9.25.** *If  $q \triangleleft_{\Gamma+I} \mathbf{q}$  and  $r \triangleleft_{\Gamma_2+A} \mathbf{r}$  then  $\cong \circ (q \otimes r) \triangleleft_{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2+A} \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{r}$ .*

## D.10 Fundamental Lemma and Strong Adequacy

We extend the definition of the logical relations to cover *all terms*, including those whose non-linear context may be non-empty.

**Definition D.10.1.** For any classical term  $x_1 : P_1, \dots, x_n : P_n \vdash M : R$ , and morphism  $m \in \text{DCPO}_{\mathcal{M}}(\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket P_n \rrbracket, \llbracket R \rrbracket)$  we shall write  $m \triangleleft_{x_1:P_1, \dots, x_n:P_n+R} M$  iff  $\forall (v_1 \triangleleft_{P_1} V_1), \dots, (v_n \triangleleft_{P_n} V_n)$  we have that  $m \circ \langle \vec{v} \rangle \triangleleft_R M[\vec{V}/\vec{x}]$ .

**Definition D.10.2.** For any quantum term  $x_1 : P_1, \dots, x_n : P_n; y_1 : A_1, \dots, y_m : A_m \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}$  and morphism  $q \in \text{DCPO}(\llbracket P_1 \rrbracket \times \dots \times \llbracket P_n \rrbracket, \mathcal{Q}(\llbracket A_1 \rrbracket \otimes \dots \otimes \llbracket A_m \rrbracket, \llbracket B \rrbracket))$  we shall write  $q \triangleleft_{x_1:P_1, \dots, x_n:P_n; y_1:A_1, \dots, y_m:A_m+B} \mathbf{q}$  iff  $\forall (v_1 \triangleleft_{P_1} V_1), \dots, (v_n \triangleleft_{P_n} V_n)$  we have that  $q_{\vec{v}} \triangleleft_{y_1:A_1, \dots, y_m:A_m+B} \mathbf{q}[\vec{V}/\vec{x}]$ .

We may now prove the Fundamental Lemma which then easily implies our adequacy result.

**Lemma D.10.3** (Fundamental). *For any classical term  $\Phi \vdash M : R$  and any quantum term  $\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}$  we have that*

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\Phi \vdash R} M \quad \text{and} \quad \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\Phi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{B} \mathbf{q}}$$

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of the term.

**Classical Lambda Abstractions.** The case for classical lambda abstractions follows using exactly the same arguments as [Jia et al. 2021, Lemma 117].

**Quantum Lambda Abstractions.** The case for quantum lambda abstractions follows using similar arguments which we now present.

Let us assume that the term of the induction hypothesis is

$$x_1 : P_1, \dots, x_n : P_n; y_1 : \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, y_m : \mathbf{A}_m \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{B}.$$

Let  $(v_1 \triangleleft_{P_1} V_1), \dots, (v_n \triangleleft_{P_n} V_n)$  be arbitrary. Let us write  $l \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \llbracket \lambda \vec{y}. \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \circ \langle \langle \vec{v} \rangle \rangle$  and  $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda \vec{y}. \mathbf{q}[\vec{V}/\vec{x}]$ . Observe that  $l \in \text{TD}$  and therefore by Theorem D.8.1 (C5), we may equivalently show that

$$l \triangleleft_{Q(\mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_m, \mathbf{B})} R.$$

By Theorem D.8.1 (A5), this is in turn equivalent to showing that

$$l \leq \llbracket R \rrbracket \text{ and } \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \forall (\cdot \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m] : \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_m; \mathbf{qbit}^k). \\ (\beta(l(*)) \otimes \text{id}) \circ \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m] \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{B}}^k \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, R(\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m)] \rrbracket$$

The inequality is satisfied, because

$$l = \llbracket \lambda \vec{y}. \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \circ \langle \langle \vec{v} \rangle \rangle \\ \leq \llbracket \lambda \vec{y}. \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \circ \langle \langle \vec{V} \rangle \rangle \quad (\text{Theorem D.8.1 (C1)}) \\ = \llbracket R \rrbracket. \quad (\text{Lemma 7.4.1})$$

For the other requirement, we reason as follows

$$\beta(l(*)) = \beta(\llbracket \lambda \vec{y}. \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_{\vec{v}}) \quad (\text{Definition}) \\ = \beta(\mathcal{J}[\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket]_{\vec{v}}) \\ = \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_{\vec{v}} \\ \triangleleft_{y_1 : \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, y_m : \mathbf{A}_m \vdash \mathbf{B} \mathbf{q}[\vec{V}/\vec{x}]} \quad (\text{Induction Hypothesis})$$

It now follows (by definition) that for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $\cdot \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m] : \mathbf{A}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_m; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  we have that

$$(\beta(l(*)) \otimes \text{id}) \circ \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m] \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{B}}^k \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}[\vec{v}/\vec{y}, \vec{V}/\vec{x}]] \rrbracket.$$

Finally, observe that  $\llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, R(\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m)] \rrbracket \xrightarrow{1} \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}[\vec{v}/\vec{y}, \vec{V}/\vec{x}]] \rrbracket$  and then by Lemma D.9.14 it follows that

$$(\beta(l(*)) \otimes \text{id}) \circ \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m] \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{B}}^k \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, R(\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{v}_m)] \rrbracket,$$

as required.

The cases for terms whose formation rules do not have a premise follow by straightforward verification. All other cases follow by induction using the relevant closure lemma from Section D.9.  $\square$

**Corollary D.10.4.** *For any closed quantum configuration  $\cdot \vdash C : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$ , we have that  $\llbracket C \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k C$ .*

PROOF. Let  $C = [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{q}]$ . It follows that for  $n = \dim(|\psi\rangle) - k$  we have  $\mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{qbit}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n : \mathbf{qbit} \vdash \mathbf{q} : \mathbf{A}$  and then by the Fundamental Lemma we know that

$$\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{x}_1 : \mathbf{qbit}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n : \mathbf{qbit} \vdash \mathbf{A}} \mathbf{q}.$$

By definition it now follows that for  $\cdot \vdash [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{x}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{x}_n] : \mathbf{qbit} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{qbit}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  we have

$$(\llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket \otimes \text{id}_{\mathbf{qbit}^k}) \circ \llbracket [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{x}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{x}_n] \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k [\mathbf{q} \leftarrow [|\psi\rangle, \ell, \mathbf{x}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{x}_n]].$$

The LHS is precisely  $\llbracket C \rrbracket$  and the RHS is exactly  $C$  which completes the proof.  $\square$

Adequacy now follows as a consequence of the Fundamental Lemma.

**Theorem D.10.5** (Strong Adequacy). *Let  $\cdot \vdash m : P$  be a closed classical term and  $\cdot \vdash C : \mathbf{A}; \mathbf{qbit}^k$  a closed quantum configuration. Then:*

$$\llbracket m \rrbracket = \sum_{v \in \text{Val}(m)} P(m \rightarrow_* v) \llbracket v \rrbracket \qquad \llbracket C \rrbracket = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{ValC}(C)} P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket.$$

PROOF. The equation for classical terms may be established using exactly the same arguments as [Jia et al. 2021, Theorem 118]. The equation for quantum configurations also follows using the same arguments which we repeat now. Let

$$u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{ValC}(C)} P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket.$$

From Corollary D.0.1, we know that  $\llbracket C \rrbracket \geq u$ . It remains to show the converse inequality. Towards this end, observe that  $\mathcal{S}_0(\triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k; C) \subseteq \downarrow u$ . To establish this, we reason as follows. Taking an arbitrary element of  $\mathcal{S}_0(\triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k; C)$  as in Definition D.3.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\pi \in F} P(\pi) \llbracket \mathcal{V}_\pi \rrbracket &= \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \cup \{ \mathcal{V}_\pi \mid \pi \in F \}} \left( \sum_{\substack{\pi \in F \\ \mathcal{V}_\pi = \mathcal{V}}} P(\pi) \right) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \cup \{ \mathcal{V}_\pi \mid \pi \in F \}} \left( \sum_{\pi \in \text{Paths}(C, \mathcal{V})} P(\pi) \right) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \cup \{ \mathcal{V}_\pi \mid \pi \in F \}} P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{ValC}(C)} P(C \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $\downarrow u$  is Scott-closed and therefore  $\mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k; C) \subseteq \downarrow u$ . By Corollary D.10.4, we know that  $\llbracket C \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k C$ . By definition of  $\triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k$  it follows  $\llbracket C \rrbracket \in \mathcal{S}(\triangleleft_{\mathbf{A}}^k; C)$  and therefore  $\llbracket C \rrbracket \leq u$ , thus finishing the proof.  $\square$