

# An Order Theory Framework of Recurrence Equations for Static Cost Analysis – Dynamic Inference of Non-Linear Inequality Invariants

Louis Rustenholz<sup>1,3</sup>✉, Pedro López-García<sup>2,3</sup>, José F. Morales<sup>1,3</sup>, and Manuel V. Hermenegildo<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (UPM), Spain

<sup>2</sup> Spanish Council for Scientific Research (CSIC), Spain  
pedro.lopez@csic.es

<sup>3</sup> IMDEA Software Institute, Spain

{louis.rustenholz, josef.morales, manuel.hermenegildo}@imdea.org

**Abstract.** Recurrence equations have played a central role in static cost analysis, where they can be viewed as abstractions of programs and used to infer resource usage information without actually running the programs with concrete data. Such information is typically represented as functions of input data sizes. More generally, recurrence equations have been increasingly used to automatically obtain *non-linear* numerical invariants. However, state-of-the-art recurrence solvers and cost analysers suffer from serious limitations when dealing with the (complex) features of recurrences arising from cost analyses. We address this challenge by developing a novel order-theoretical framework where recurrences are viewed as operators and their solutions as fixpoints, which allows leveraging powerful pre/postfixpoint search techniques. We prove useful properties and provide principles and insights that enable us to develop techniques and combine them to design new solvers. We have also implemented and experimentally evaluated an optimisation-based instantiation of the proposed approach. The results are quite promising: our prototype outperforms state-of-the-art cost analysers and recurrence solvers, and can infer tight non-linear lower/upper bounds, in a reasonable time, for complex recurrences representing diverse program behaviours.

**Keywords:** Static Cost Analysis · Resource Usage Analysis · Static Analysis · Recurrence Equations.

## 1 Introduction

Recurrence equations have played a central role in static cost analysis and verification for decades, having been used in many automated tools [15, 14, 16, 59, 32, 1, 71, 51, 23, 50, 48] ever since Wegbreit’s seminal work in 1975 [80]. The goal of static cost analysis is to infer information about the resources used by programs (e.g. *execution time*, *memory*, *energy consumption*) without actually running them with concrete data. Since program resource consumption generally depends on input data values, the inferred resource usage information is typically presented as functions of some abstraction of the program input (e.g. size) and possibly other (environmental) parameters. The resulting cost

functions are generally desired to be correct everywhere (in the sense of safe approximations, i.e. lower/upper bounds). This is a requirement in some applications, such as verification of resource-related specifications [50], automated parallelisation with guarantees [15, 81], security (e.g. detection of side channel attacks), and blockchain (e.g. smart-contract gas analysis) [64, 3]. Moreover, in these and other applications, such as automatic program optimisation, asymptotic approximations (i.e. just complexity orders) are insufficient, as the techniques employed need functions that yield concrete, accurately approximated values. Recent works in cost analysis have come to the realisation that, more deeply, *recurrences can be viewed as an abstraction of programs*, stripped from information irrelevant to cost, or simply as programs themselves. Recurrences can be executed, and we are interested in overapproximating their semantics, i.e. in finding bounds on their solutions. Various properties of programs can be understood by focusing on their recurrence representations.

In a broader program analysis sense, recurrence equations have been increasingly used in the last few years to automatically obtain *non-linear* numerical invariants [42, 34, 40, 48, 78]. Indeed, recurrence solving allows deducing highly non-linear (global) invariants from simple (local) relations on program variables.

The challenge we address in this paper originates from the limitations of state-of-the-art recurrence solving and cost analysis approaches. First, general-purpose techniques are insufficient. Since the numerical properties relevant to static cost analysis are highly non-linear, we cannot simply use a general-purpose abstract domain such as polyhedra, which would not directly support programs with even only quadratic complexity. Similarly, Computer Algebra Systems (CAS) typically focus on univariate *difference* equations [37] with very simple recursive calls but complex coefficients, whereas the opposite occurs in cost analysis, where coefficients are generally simple but we are faced with multivariate equations, complex recursive calls, conditional/non-linear/non-deterministic behaviour, etc. Second, despite significant progress on specialised solvers, they too do not support the breadth of behaviours arising from programs. As reported in [70], tools such as RaML, CiaoPP, PUBS, Cofloco, KoAT/LoAT, Loopus, or Duet [33, 32, 1, 23, 25, 24, 72, 40] all present important limitations and are each unable to infer tight bounds for some classes of programs, that exhibit, e.g. non-linear recursive, amortised, non-monotonic and/or multiphase behaviour, even when a simple closed-form solution exists. Recently, approaches in the spirit of dynamic invariant generation have been proposed to circumvent the difficulties of the equation itself and focus instead on its solution [70] (syntax versus semantics), but are currently limited to solutions that can be expressed *exactly* using some templates, and are not able to obtain (safe) bounds for equations that do not admit an exact solution easily expressed in closed form.

Motivated by these limitations, we introduce a novel approach to recurrence solving, which leverages classical results of order theory, and makes it possible to infer tight non-linear bounds for complex recurrence equations arising from programs that exhibit diverse behaviour (e.g. divide-and-conquer, multiphase, hardware-related noise, non-monotone resources), that do not admit simple so-

lutions. More specifically, our contributions are as follows: first, we introduce a novel order-theoretical viewpoint on recurrence solving, that allows us to leverage powerful pre/postfixpoint search techniques. Indeed, we introduce a simple but powerful proof principle: for *monotone* equations, pre/postfixpoints provide lower/upper bounds on the solution respectively. Thanks to the theoretical framework we develop, we prove properties and obtain a new understanding of the bound search problem in recurrence solving. We witness underlying algebraic and geometric structures that can be utilised to design novel, more accurate solving methods. In particular, we investigate the completeness of our proof principle. This unveils cones of postfixpoints, with rays related to ranking functions for the equation, that provide strategies to repair and fine-tune candidate bounds.

These theoretical contributions enable the development of new and accurate algorithms. We propose several instantiations of our approach, and implement one of them as a proof-of-concept, that uses dynamic invariant generation and constrained optimisation techniques. Using a machine-learning vocabulary, its results suggest that, when searching for models, enforcing “local verifiability” beyond local correctness can improve accuracy. This paper extends previous work in several directions. In particular, it improves the methods presented in [70] with the ability to infer *safe* approximations, i.e. bounds of the solution of difficult equations. We perform an experimental evaluation on recurrences arising from programs displaying diverse properties, and show that our proof-of-concept solver performs better than the state-of-the-art on various categories of benchmarks.

Finally, additional results are presented to facilitate and foster discussion. The “recurrences as (abstractions of) programs” approach to cost analysis is described in a more order-theoretical language than classical in the literature, and Galois connections between abstract domains of functions relevant to our viewpoint on recurrences are introduced, so that they may be extended to new, non-discrete applications.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. Sections 2–4 introduce the setting with an illustrative example (Section 2), background information and notations (Section 3), as well as motivation and context from cost analysis presented in an order-theoretical language (Section 4). The main theoretical contributions are then described: Section 5 introduces the equations as operators viewpoint and our proof principle, Section 6 presents a syntax of equations and inductively proves properties on them, after which Section 7 investigates robustness and extensions of our proof principle, unveiling algebraic and geometrical structures. We then move on to algorithmic contributions: candidate generation (Section 8) and repair (Section 9) strategies are introduced. In particular, Section 8.1 describes a constrained optimisation-based approach, whose implementation and experimental evaluation are presented in Section 10. Finally, Section 11 discusses related work, and Section 12 summarises conclusions and lines for future work. Additionally, Appendix B sketches a relevant abstract domain framework with the aim to encourage discussion.

## 2 Illustrative Example

Consider a program with quadratic time complexity, performing a linear time action at each step, and additionally interacting with a buffer, slowly filled over time and flushed when it is full, so that rare but costly events can occur. For example, imagine a program processing a list of initial length  $n$ , along with a buffer containing  $c$  elements and of maximal allowed size 100. At each step, until the list is empty, it goes through all of it (cost  $n$ ), selects the largest element, pops it, and pushes it to a buffer. When the buffer is full, it flushes it and prints it to screen (cost 300), a rare but costly event. Finally, when the list is empty, all unprinted elements are freed from the buffer (cost  $c$ ). Such a program, independently of the programming language it originates from, can be represented as the following equation.

$$f(n, c) = \begin{cases} f(n-1, 0) + n + 300 & \text{if } n > 0 \text{ and } c \geq 100, \\ f(n-1, c+1) + n & \text{if } n > 0 \text{ and } c < 100, \\ c & \text{if } n = 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We denote its solution by  $f_{sol}$ . If the buffer is initially empty, the total cost as a function of  $n$  is  $f_0(n) := f_{sol}(n, 0)$ . While the quadratic cost component is simply  $\sum_{k \leq n} k = n(n+1)/2$ , the noisy behaviour introduced by the buffer interaction leads to an exact solution that is difficult to express with a simple closed-form expression. Current tools do not obtain tight bounds for this example but coarse overapproximations. For example, `RaML` [33] only infers that  $\forall n, \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{1}{2}n \leq f_0(n) \leq \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{1}{2}n + 300n$ , i.e. it overapproximates by triggering the bad event at either every or no iteration. `Cofloco` [23] obtains even coarser overapproximations: for the recursive case  $n \geq 1$ ,  $n \leq f_0(n) \leq 2n^2 + 300n + 100$ . Similar or more serious difficulties can be observed with cost analysers such as `PUBS`, `KoAT/LoAT`, `CiaoPP`'s builtin solver, `Loopus` and `Duet`. CAS such as `Sympy`, `PURRS` or `Mathematica` simply do not handle such equations. The method of [70], purely based on regression applied to input-output samples, produces intermediate approximations such as  $f_0(n) \approx 0.5n^2 + 3.435n + 210.3$  for  $n \geq 1$ , and hence witnesses that bad events are expected to occur around once every 101 steps ( $(3.435 - 0.5)/300 \approx 102.2$ ), but cannot prove this result, since this is not an exact solution. Thus, it does not obtain any *safe* approximation.

Our novel method views (1) as the following operator.

$$\Phi : (\mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$$

$$f \mapsto (n, c) \mapsto \begin{cases} f(n-1, 0) + n + 300 & \text{if } n > 0 \text{ and } c \geq 100, \\ f(n-1, c+1) + n & \text{if } n > 0 \text{ and } c < 100, \\ c & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$$

With this viewpoint, Theorem 2 and monotonicity of  $\Phi$  in  $f$  make it possible to deduce lower and upper bounds on  $f_{sol}$  from pre- and postfixpoints of  $\Phi$ , which can be obtained by leveraging a variety of classical techniques. For example, we could discover a simple candidate upper bound  $\hat{f}$ , given by  $\hat{f}(n, c) = c$  if  $n = 0$ ,  $n(n+1)/2 + 3n + 3c$  if  $n \neq 0$  and  $c < 100$ ; and  $n(n+1)/2 + 3n + 297$  otherwise. Then, check with a CAS that  $\Phi \hat{f} \leq \hat{f}$ , which guarantees that  $f_{sol} \leq \hat{f}$ . In

fact, besides other algorithmic ideas and theoretical framework, we present in this paper a prototype that implements a simple approach based on constrained optimisation, which obtains the following bounds for all  $n \geq 1$ .

$$\frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{300}{101}n + 100 \leq f_0(n) \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{300}{101}n + 100 \cdot \frac{300}{101}$$

This models cost precisely, in its quadratic and linear terms, without simply assuming that the bad event always happens. In fact, those are the best possible polynomial bounds on the exact solution  $\frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n + 299 + 199 \lfloor \frac{n-1}{101} \rfloor$ . More complete information is available in Table 3 of Appendix A.

Beyond this simple example, exact solutions can become even harder to express with simple closed-form expressions, but we can still hope to obtain *bounds* on the solution, without losing too much accuracy. Our approach allows us to do so. Similarly to [70], it has few restrictions on equation syntax, focusing instead on its solution, but unlike [70], it is not limited to guessing exact solutions, and can search through the full space of (inductive) bounds, which is much larger.

While our approach supports more difficult benchmarks, and is not limited to polynomial bounds (in fact, any user-defined template can be used), this example shows that tight bounds not discovered by the state-of-the-art methods can be found, even for benchmarks restricted to linear arithmetic.

An additional motivation for this example is that, in future work, we plan to use these techniques to improve interaction between cost/size abstract domains, and abstract domains for low-level properties such as cache [52], that allow obtaining partial information on such “rare bad events” relevant to cost properties. We believe this is a promising direction to bridge the gap between two families of automated cost analysis techniques: those that support general programs but typically use very coarse-grained cost models, with those common in WCET communities that support fine-grained models but only limited programming patterns, often requiring user annotations to handle loops and recursion.

### 3 Preliminaries

#### 3.1 Notation

Boldface characters represent vectors. Depending on the context,  $\mathbf{0}$  is a zero finite-dimensional vector, a zero matrix, or the constant function  $\mathbf{n} \mapsto 0$ . Given two sets  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $B^A$  and  $A \rightarrow B$  both refer to the set of functions from  $A$  to  $B$ , the former insisting on its natural vector space structure.  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{R}_+$  both include 0. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, functions are ordered pointwise and vectors are ordered elementwise.  $f$  and  $\hat{f}$  both refer to arbitrary functions, but the latter is used to convey that it is thought of as a candidate bound.  $f_{sol}$  denotes an exact solution. Operators on functions are usually denoted by  $\Phi$  when they are interpreted as recurrence equations, and by  $\Psi$  otherwise. The function  $\text{ite}$  is defined by  $\text{ite}(\top, x, y) = x$  and  $\text{ite}(\perp, x, y) = y$ . Given  $f : A \rightarrow B$  and  $A' \subseteq A$ ,  $f|_{A'} : A' \rightarrow B$  is the restriction of  $f$  to  $A'$ .

### 3.2 Order Theory, Prefixpoints and Postfixpoints Conventions

We recall some classical definitions of order-theory in cases where it may be helpful to disambiguate. We refer the reader to [13, 12] for more background.

**Definition 1.** *We say that a function  $f : (X, \sqsubseteq) \rightarrow (Y, \leq)$  is monotone whenever  $\forall x, y \in X, x \sqsubseteq y \implies f(x) \leq f(y)$ , and that it is antimonotone when  $\forall x, y \in X, x \sqsubseteq y \implies f(x) \geq f(y)$ .*

We adopt the following convention.

**Definition 2 (Prefixpoints and postfixpoints).**

*Given a function  $f : (X, \sqsubseteq) \rightarrow (X, \sqsubseteq)$  and  $x \in X$ , we say that*

- $x$  is a fixpoint of  $f$  whenever  $f(x) = x$ ,
- $x$  is a prefixpoint of  $f$  whenever  $x \sqsubseteq f(x)$ ,
- $x$  is a postfixpoint of  $f$  whenever  $f(x) \sqsubseteq x$ .

*The sets of fixpoints, prefixpoints, and postfixpoints of  $f$  are respectively written as  $\text{Fix}(f)$ ,  $\text{Prefp}(f)$ , and  $\text{Postfp}(f)$ .*

Note that the opposite convention can be found, reversing prefixpoints and postfixpoints [73, 13]. The convention we choose is more common in abstract interpretation literature [11] because of its interpretation in the context of ascending/descending Kleene sequences.

**Definition 3.** *The minimum element of  $\text{Fix}(f)$ , if it exists, is called the least fixpoint (lfp) of  $f$ , written  $\text{lfp } f$ . Similarly, the maximum element of  $\text{Fix}(f)$ , if it exists, is called the greatest fixpoint (gfp) of  $f$ , written  $\text{gfp } f$ .*

We will make use of the following classical result.

**Theorem 1 (Knaster-Tarski, [41, 76]).**

*Let  $(L, \sqsubseteq)$  be a complete lattice and  $f : L \rightarrow L$  be monotone.*

- $\text{Fix}(f)$  is a complete lattice. In particular, it is not empty.
- $\text{lfp } f = \bigsqcap \text{Postfp}(f)$ . In particular,  $\forall x \in X, f(x) \sqsubseteq x \implies \text{lfp } f \sqsubseteq x$ .
- $\text{gfp } f = \bigsqcup \text{Prefp}(f)$ . In particular,  $\forall x \in X, x \sqsubseteq f(x) \implies x \sqsubseteq \text{gfp } f$ .

### 3.3 Function Comparison

The approach presented in this paper reduces the problem of checking whether a candidate function is a bound of the (unknown) solution to a (monotone) equation to the problem of comparing two functions. This can be formulated as follows: given two functions  $f, g : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ , we want to decide the universally quantified formula  $\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}, f(\mathbf{n}) \leq^{(?) } g(\mathbf{n})$ .

This is a much simpler, but still non-trivial problem, whose difficulty obviously depends on the class of functions under comparison. In general, it is an undecidable problem, remaining undecidable even when restricting ourselves to global multivariate polynomial functions with integer domains [54]. Nevertheless, complete algorithms exist for comparing piecewise multivariate polynomials with real number domains, providing a decidable sufficient condition for the comparison of polynomials on integers.

The related work on function comparison in the context of cost analysis [50, 49, 2] provides sufficient conditions and techniques for dealing with large classes of functions, including polynomials and expressions with exponentials, logarithms, summations, max/min, etc. These methods perform well in practice, despite being incomplete in general.

If we are only concerned with whether the global inequality  $f \leq g$  holds, the techniques employed by the work cited above are also provided by contemporary general-purpose CAS. Since the function comparison problem is beyond the scope of this paper, to facilitate the implementation of our prototype, we chose to simply use `Mathematica` [53], for which we obtained the best results compared to other off-the-shelf tools. Further discussion is included in a longer version of the paper.<sup>4</sup>

### 3.4 Quadratic Programming, Sparse Constrained Linear Regression

Quadratic Programming [74] (QP) refers to the process of solving optimisation problems with quadratic objective functions and linear constraints on the variables and is a generalisation of Linear Programming (LP). QP problems, with  $n$  variables and  $m$  constraints, can be formulated as the optimisation problem  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \mathbf{x}^T P \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x}$  under the constraint  $G \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{h}$ , where  $P$  is a  $n \times n$  *symmetric* matrix,  $\mathbf{q}$  is an  $n$ -dimensional vector,  $G$  is  $m \times n$ , and  $\mathbf{h}$  is an  $m$ -dimensional, all over  $\mathbb{R}$ . In other words, the quadratic objective function  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x}^T P \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{q}^T \mathbf{x}$  is optimised over the convex polyhedra  $\{\mathbf{x} \mid G \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{h}\}$ . In many applications, including this paper, we are mostly interested in the case where  $P$  is positive definite (or at least semidefinite). In this case, the problem is convex, efficient<sup>5</sup> algorithms and tools are available, and the problem is equivalent to *constrained least square*. Hence, QP is the natural framework for (linearly) *constrained* linear regression. We refer the reader to [30, 31] for more background on linear regression.

As described in [70], (sparse) linear regression can be used to obtain non-linear invariants, by searching for models  $\hat{f}$  of *functions*  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in an affine model space spanned by base functions  $f_i : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , using a set of observations  $\{(\langle \dots, f_i(\mathbf{n}), \dots \rangle, f(\mathbf{n}) \mid \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I})\}$  which are produced from finite samples  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ , but the linear relationship is searched between the  $f_i$ 's and  $f$ . In this context, lasso regularisation can be described as a way to perform feature selection, so that base functions  $f_i$  most relevant to model  $f$  are selected. With this viewpoint, regression may first be performed with lasso to select a subset of relevant functions, and then without lasso but with only the selected features to achieve better precision. However, constrained linear regression has not been used before in this context. In this work (Section 8.1), we describe how we use it to generate candidate *bounds* on solutions to recurrence equations, as well as candidate *inductive bounds*.

<sup>4</sup> Reference to the technical report skipped to respect lightweight double-blind process.

<sup>5</sup> In particular when iterative or `float`-based. Exact methods for rational inputs exist, but do not scale as well, similarly to the case of Linear Programming.

## 4 Context and Motivation

As mentioned earlier, an important motivation for the work presented in this paper stems from automated static cost analysis and verification of programs.

In this context, classical operational semantics are decorated using some cost model, provided by the user or inferred, which may be either very generic or contain detailed low-level architectural information. For such applications it may be *a priori* necessary and relevant to consider very fine-grained set of states  $\Sigma$  and semantics, in order to take into account low-level information, such as cache behaviour, which can be very impactful on cost properties. We represent this as  $\Sigma = \mathcal{L} \times \mathbf{Env} \times \mathbf{Mem}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the set of control states (program points, etc.),  $\mathbf{Mem} = \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{Data}$  is the set of memory states (where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the set of program variables, and  $\mathbf{Data}$  is the set of possible values, e.g. integers, data structures or Herbrand terms), and  $\mathbf{Env}$  is the set of states for the rest of the environment.

Cost models may be seen as a way to add weights<sup>6</sup> to transitions  $\Sigma \times \Sigma$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{CostModel} : \Sigma \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , or non-deterministically  $\mathbf{CostModel} : \Sigma \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ . Usual concrete trace semantics  $\llbracket \mathbf{Prog} \rrbracket \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ , where  $\mathcal{T} = \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$  are (finite or infinite) traces  $\sigma_0 \rightarrow \sigma_1 \rightarrow \dots$ , are extended into concrete trace semantics with costs  $\llbracket \mathbf{Prog} \rrbracket_c \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}^c)$  where elements of  $\mathcal{T}^c$  are “weighted traces” of the form  $\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots$ , with  $\sigma_i \in \Sigma$  and  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ . For simplicity, we will only consider finite weighted traces  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{fin}}^c$  with costs in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and their *total cost*,<sup>7</sup> i.e. the function  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{fin}}^c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $(\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_n} \sigma_n) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n c_i$ . We use this function to abstract concrete trace semantics (with cost) into input-output semantics (with cost), via

$$\alpha_{ioc} : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{fin}}^c) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Sigma \times \mathbb{R} \times \Sigma)$$

$$T \mapsto \left\{ \left( \sigma_0, \sum_{i=1}^n c_i, \sigma_n \right) \mid (\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{c_1} \sigma_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} \dots \xrightarrow{c_n} \sigma_n) \in T \right\},$$

which can be abstracted further into  $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma \times \Sigma)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\Sigma \times \mathbb{R})$  by dropping the cost and output components respectively.

After having defined this low-level cost semantics in a language most appropriate to describe concrete execution (e.g. “on bare metal” – the low level language is chosen for the precision of the corresponding cost model), the recurrence-based approach to cost analysis then suggests translating the program into an intermediate language more appropriate for analysis. This can be done for example by a translation into *Horn clauses*, while preserving/encoding the low level cost semantics presented above (which may be done automatically, c.f. [50, 47, 46, 58, 55]). This intermediate representation as Horn clauses (HC IR) may be viewed as a simple language with *pure* functions operating on symbolic terms, so that the main challenge of program analyses, recursion, can be dealt with

<sup>6</sup> Typically taken from  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{N}$ , but generalisations are possible.

<sup>7</sup> We could also consider the *maximal footprint*  $\max_{k \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^k c_i$ , e.g. in the case of analysis of memory usage, or to more complex aggregations of weights, e.g. when analysing non-deterministic logic programs with tree semantics, or searching for cost hotspots when analysing parallel programs.



uniformly, as recursive function calls become the core control structure. Recurrence equations then arise naturally as a representation of numerical recursive programs, or, more generally, of programs abstracted to numerical programs via *size* abstractions, as explained below.

In this new setting, the “concrete” denotational semantics, decorated with cost, of a function  $\mathbf{p}$  with input and output variables  $\mathcal{V}_i$  and  $\mathcal{V}_o$ , is an element

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_{ioc} &\in \mathcal{P}((\mathcal{V}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{Data}) \times \mathbb{R} \times (\mathcal{V}_o \rightarrow \mathbf{Data})) \\ &\simeq (\mathcal{V}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{Data}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R} \times (\mathcal{V}_o \rightarrow \mathbf{Data})) \\ &= \mathbf{Data}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbf{Data}^{\mathcal{V}_o}), \end{aligned}$$

where the equivalence is just curryfication ( $A \times B \rightarrow 2 \simeq (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow 2))$ ), and functions are (naturally) ordered pointwise. Dropping the cost and output components respectively, we then obtain  $\llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_{io} : \mathbf{Data}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Data}^{\mathcal{V}_o})$  and  $\llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_{ic} : \mathbf{Data}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ , which may be seen as the concrete *data* semantics and concrete *cost* semantics of function  $\mathbf{p}$  respectively. Notice that to obtain a compositional framework, it is necessary to take data semantics into account, even if we are only interested in cost: in order to compute the cost semantics of a composition  $\mathbf{p} \circ \mathbf{q}$ , we need to know the cost semantics of the outer function, *and the data semantics* of inner functions, i.e. we expect to have  $\llbracket \mathbf{p} \circ \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_{ic} = \llbracket \mathbf{p} \rrbracket_{ic} \circ \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_{io} + \llbracket \mathbf{q} \rrbracket_{ic}$  (where functions  $A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$  are implicitly extended into  $\mathcal{P}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B)$  in the natural way).

To move into the realm of computability and finitely-representable objects, more abstractions are introduced. This is achieved by using *size measures*, which are functions  $m : \mathbf{Data} \rightarrow \mathbf{Size}$  that transform concrete data elements in  $\mathbf{Data}$  into data *sizes* in  $\mathbf{Size}$  (representing properties like length of lists, number of nodes of trees, value of integers, etc.). Typically  $\mathbf{Size} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  as in [14, 15], but more general and refined approaches exist, e.g. extracting tuples of natural numbers using sized types [71], where  $\mathbf{Size} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$ . Any *size measure* naturally provides Galois connections  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Data}) \Leftarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Size})$ ,  $(\mathbf{Data} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})) \Leftarrow (\mathbf{Size} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$  and  $(\mathbf{Data} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Data})) \Leftarrow (\mathbf{Size} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{Size}))$ , where the last two connections allow for abstraction of cost and data semantics, respectively.

Note that  $\mathbf{Data} \rightarrow \mathbf{Size}$  allows viewing programs operating on  $\mathbf{Data}$ , after size abstractions, as purely numerical programs. Ideally, size abstractions would be defined, for a particular program, via some quotient of the semantics with observational (cost) equivalence, so that as little information on the cost semantics is lost, but behaviour irrelevant to cost is abstracted away. In practice, current size analyses use type analyses, heuristics and user annotations to transform data structures into numerical summaries that appear relevant to cost properties. We refer the reader to [14, 71] for more details.

Hence, at this point, we are left with non-deterministic numerical programs operating on sizes, which may be viewed as abstractions of the original program. Any such recursive numerical program defined with pure functions may also be viewed directly as a *system of (non-deterministic) recurrence equations*.

However, non-deterministic systems of recurrence equations on cost functions  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  and size functions  $\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{V}_o})$ , arising from the diversity of nu-

merical programs are far beyond what can be effectively analysed by recurrence solving methods. The recurrence equations corresponding to programs via size abstractions therefore need to be simplified to be handled.

A first natural step is to focus on obtaining parametric *bounds* on the cost of functions: numerical sets of sizes and costs (in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ ) are abstracted using intervals (or generalised Kaucher intervals [38] – we omit these details for the sake of conciseness). The problem is further simplified by abstracting away output-output relations in data semantics, i.e. by looking at each output independently. We are left with the following interval-valued functions, which abstract data and cost semantics via size abstraction, and may equivalently be viewed as *intervals whose endpoints are functions*.

$$\mathbf{Size}_p^{(k)} : \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{N}) \text{ for each } k \in \mathcal{V}_o, \quad \mathbf{Cost}_p : \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R})$$


Separating lower and upper bounds of the intervals, we obtain functions  $\mathbf{Size}_{p,lb}^{(k)}$ ,  $\mathbf{Size}_{p,ub}^{(k)}$ ,  $\mathbf{Cost}_{p,lb}$  and  $\mathbf{Cost}_{p,ub}$ , all of which may be viewed as elements of  $\mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , for each function  $p$  (of arity  $d$ ) defined in the source program.<sup>8</sup> We can then extract (ideal) *deterministic* recurrence equations on such  $\mathbf{Size}$  and  $\mathbf{Cost}$  bound functions, abstracting the non-deterministic equations above. Solving these equations or finding bounds on their solutions, finally allows us to obtain overapproximations of the cost semantics  $\llbracket p \rrbracket_{ic} : \mathbf{Data}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  via

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma : (\mathbf{Size}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}) \times (\mathbf{Size}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}) &\rightarrow (\mathbf{Data}^{\mathcal{V}_i} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})) \\ (\mathbf{Cost}_{lb}, \mathbf{Cost}_{ub}) &\mapsto (\mathbf{x} \mapsto [\mathbf{Cost}_{lb}(m(\mathbf{x})), \mathbf{Cost}_{ub}(m(\mathbf{x}))]), \end{aligned}$$

where the order  $\geq \times \leq$ , with  $\geq$  and  $\leq$  pointwise, is used on the left hand side. In practice, cost/size analysers such as [14, 15, 71] do not necessarily obtain ideal recurrence equations on  $\mathbf{Size}$  and  $\mathbf{Cost}$  bound functions, but instead focus their effort on setting up safely simplified equations assumed to be supported by recurrence solvers.

Without loss of generality, in the rest of the paper, we will only refer to equations on a single function  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with discrete domain  $\mathcal{D}$ , instead of *systems* of equations. Note that any system of equations on  $\{f_i : \mathcal{D}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$  may always be translated into an equivalent system on  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathcal{D} = \sqcup \mathcal{D}_i$ . This allows us to simplify the presentation of our novel approach for recurrence solving, by applying it to a recurrence equation on a single unknown  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We will describe how to obtain (good) bounds on its solution, even if this exact solution cannot be computed.

<sup>8</sup> In general,  $d$  can be different from the arity of  $p$ ; for example, when using more refined size measures such as sized types [71], which can represent sizes of structures and substructures at any position and depth by using tuples of natural numbers. Additionally, some sizes can be inferred to be irrelevant and thus removed. However, in this section, we use simpler concepts for the sake of presentation.



**Fig. 1. Candidate and operator dynamics.** The operator  $\Phi$  of a program computing the `gcd` interacts with a candidate upper bound  $\hat{f}(x, y) = x + y$ . Plots represent the solution  $f_{sol}$  (black),  $\hat{f}$  (blue left),  $\Phi\hat{f}$  (red left, blue right), and  $\Phi^2\hat{f}$  (red right). We observe that  $\Phi\hat{f} \leq \hat{f}$ , which is enough to prove that  $\hat{f}$  is an upper bound on  $f_{sol}$ . Iterates  $\Phi^k\hat{f}$  progressively get closer to  $f_{sol}$ , but have more complex expressions.

## 5 The Equations as Operators Viewpoint

A simple but effective insight enabling the techniques presented in this paper is that recurrence equations may be viewed as higher-order operators. In our setting, a *recurrence equation* is simply an equation on a function  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , that can be written as:

$$\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}, f(\mathbf{n}) = \Phi(f)(\mathbf{n}),$$

where the higher-order operator  $\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$  is used to define  $f(\mathbf{n})$  in terms of other values of  $f$ .

We say that  $\Phi$  is *the operator corresponding to such a functional equation*. Additionally, the operator may be viewed as a *definition* of the equation. A function  $f$  is then a *solution* to the equation if and only if it is a *fixpoint* of the  $\Phi$  operator. A key observation of this paper is that, for a large class of recurrence equations, the bound search problem can be reduced to the search of pre/post-fixpoints for a *monotone* operator  $\Phi$  corresponding to an equation. This section is devoted to this result, proved as Theorem 2. We also discuss the intuition behind the equation monotonicity assumption in Section 5.3 – importantly, this does not require the solutions themselves to be monotone. Fig. 1 illustrates Theorem 2 and operator dynamics: a linear upper bound candidate  $\hat{f}$  is compared against a non-trivial program computing the greatest common divisor, and the “blanket”  $\hat{f}$  slowly falls onto the *a priori* unknown solution.

### 5.1 Equations as Operators

The equations that arise in static cost analysis typically correspond to *monotone* operators for the pointwise order, hence allowing the use of all insights and techniques coming from order theory to study these equations and obtain bounds

on their solutions. *Solutions* to equations naturally correspond to *fixpoints* on operators, and the idea of the “equation-as-operator viewpoint” is that we can take this operator seriously: we can study the values taken by the operator *outside* of its fixpoints, and obtain information on the solutions without having to compute them explicitly, which may be impossible or impractical. The equations we consider are typically defined piecewise as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \\ f \mapsto \mathbf{n} &\mapsto \begin{cases} \dots \\ e_i(f, \mathbf{n}) & \text{if } \varphi_i(f, \mathbf{n}), \\ \dots \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

as was illustrated in Section 2. In our context, we usually take the domain  $\mathcal{D}$  to be discrete, e.g.  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$  or  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$  with  $d \geq 1$ . In many cases, we will further suppose that the conditions  $\varphi_i$  are independent of  $f$  to simplify the problem. However, we plan to take more general  $\varphi_i$  into account in future work.

We bring order theory into the picture by equipping the set of functions  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the *pointwise order* derived from the usual order on  $\mathbb{R}$ : given two functions  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $g : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $f \leq_{\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} g$  if and only if for all inputs  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}$  we have  $f(\mathbf{n}) \leq_{\mathbb{R}} g(\mathbf{n})$ . This provides the expected definition of upper and lower bounds: if  $f \leq_{\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}} g$ , we say that  $g$  is an upper bound of  $f$  (or equivalently, that  $f$  is a lower bound of  $g$ ). In order to work with complete lattices, we extend  $\mathbb{R}$  with a top and a bottom element, obtaining  $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ , where  $\leq_{\overline{\mathbb{R}}}$  is defined as expected.  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  equipped with the pointwise order is then also a complete lattice, with meet and join defined pointwise.

The rest of this paper focuses on the following class of recurrence equations.

**Definition 4 (Monotone equation).** *A monotone recurrence equation, or simply monotone equation, is a monotone function*

$$\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \leq) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \leq)$$

*We say that a function  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is a solution to the equation whenever  $f$  is a fixpoint of  $\Phi$ . We respectively call  $\text{lfp } f$  and  $\text{gfp } f$  the least and greatest solutions to the equation. If  $\text{lfp } f = \text{gfp } f$ , the unique fixpoint of  $\Phi$  is simply called the solution to the equation.*

We argue that monotone equations are common in cost analysis applications. Large classes of examples are given in Section 6, e.g. Example 1. We also refer the reader to our benchmarks in Table 2 of Appendix A, all of which are monotone, including some operating on non-monotone resources such as memory.

**Proposition 1.** *A monotone equation always admits a solution in  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ .*

*Proof.* This is a direct corollary of Theorem 1.

The following observation, also a direct corollary of Theorem 1, enables us to reformulate our bound search problem as a question of pre/post-fixpoints of monotone operators.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\Phi : \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathcal{D}}$  be a monotone equation. For any  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ,*

- if  $\Phi f \leq f$ , i.e. if  $f$  is a postfixpoint of  $\Phi$ , then  $\text{lfp } \Phi \leq f$ , i.e.  $f$  is an upper bound on the least solution to the equation,*
- if  $f \leq \Phi f$ , i.e. if  $f$  is a prefixpoint of  $\Phi$ , then  $f \leq \text{gfp } \Phi$ , i.e.  $f$  is a lower bound on the greatest solution to the equation.*

*Remark 1.* In particular, notice that if  $\Phi$  admits a unique solution  $f_{sol}$ , then any postfixpoint is an upper bound on  $f_{sol}$ , and any prefixpoint is a lower bound on  $f_{sol}$ . This is always the case when the equation is *well-defined*, in the sense that it terminates everywhere as a program, as will be explained in Section 5.2.

With this insight, we introduce the following synonyms.

**Definition 5 (Inductive bounds).** *Let  $\Phi$  be a monotone equation. We say that  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is an inductive upper bound (resp. inductive lower bound) whenever it is a postfixpoint (resp. prefixpoint) of  $\Phi$ . Additionally, we simply say that  $f$  is an inductive bound whenever it is either a prefixpoint or a postfixpoint.*

We compare below these notions with classical proofs by induction of upper/lower bounds. When the restriction  $\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}})$  is well-defined, i.e. when infinities are unnecessary, we can also introduce the following concept.

**Definition 6 (Inductivity measure).** *For any monotone equation  $\Phi$  and  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , we call the function  $\Phi f - f$  the (local) inductivity measure of  $f$ , to reflect the intuition that local information on  $\Phi f - f$  gives partial information on whether  $f$  is an inductive bound. Indeed,  $f$  is an inductive upper (resp. lower) bound whenever  $\text{sgn}(\Phi f - f)$  is  $(-)$  (resp.  $(+)$ ) everywhere.*

This local viewpoint is leveraged in our algorithms, e.g. to exploit dynamic invariant generation techniques. We also later explain that quantitative information on “offending” values of the function  $\Phi f - f$  may be used to *repair* candidates  $f$ , i.e. transform them into actual inductive bounds with constant-sign inductivity measure, in accordance with our motto of *taking the operator seriously*.

## 5.2 Termination of Equations

The exposition of multiple results and proofs in this paper can be simplified if we assume that the equations we deal with always terminate, in the viewpoint where equations are simply programs that can be executed, with solution given by their semantics. This is directly related to termination of derivations in the operational semantics expressed in [70]. In particular, this will allow us to simply use the vector space structure of  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  without extra technical care for infinities, and to simply identify pre/postfixpoints with lower/upper bounds on *the* solution without having to distinguish between  $\text{lfp}$  and  $\text{gfp}$ .

Termination of equations is defined at the level of syntactical representations. This can be done by introducing a boolean domain  $\mathbb{B} = \{\perp, \top\}$ , (corresponding to “undefined”, “defined”). We can then abstract each operation in the syntax of expressions by  $\llbracket - \rrbracket^b(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \top \iff \forall i, x_i = \top$  (in particular, constants

are abstracted to  $\top$ , and this generalises trivially to infinite arities). It is then easy to abstract  $\Phi$  into  $\Phi^b : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{B})$  (again, note that we are abusing notation: this depends *a priori* on the syntax of the definition of  $\Phi$ , and not only on its intensive properties  $(\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$ ). The domain of termination of  $\Phi$  simply appears as  $(\text{lfp}_{\leq_b} \Phi^b)^{-1}\{\top\} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ .

**Definition 7 (Termination).** *We say that an equation terminates everywhere unconditionally whenever  $(\text{lfp}_{\leq_b} \Phi^b)^{-1}\{\top\} = \mathcal{D}$  for the above abstraction. For simplicity, we also require that  $\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}})$  restricts to  $\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$ . When the context is clear, we will equivalently simply say that  $\Phi$  terminates, or even just that  $\Phi$  is a well-defined equation.*

*Note that in the general case, the required number  $\beta$  of iterations so that the execution  $\Phi^\beta(\perp)(\mathbf{n})$  converges to  $(\text{lfp} \Phi)(\mathbf{n})$  may be transfinite.*

*In this case,  $\Phi$  admits a single solution  $\text{lfp} \Phi = \text{gfp} \Phi = f_{\text{sol}} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*

Note that unconditional termination is implied by the existence of a *ranking function for the equation* (Definition 15 later in the paper). In the rest of this paper, unless explicitly said otherwise, we will always assume that this is the case (reducing  $\mathcal{D}$  if required) for the sake of simplicity and presentation.

### 5.3 Discussion and Interpretation

**Relation with classical proof by induction.** Proofs by Theorem 2 may be seen as easy-to-automate generalisations of proofs by induction, which motivates the vocabulary introduced in Definition 5. For example, a proof by induction of a candidate upper bound  $\hat{f}$  for `exp2` of Table 2 would start by noticing that  $f_{\text{sol}}(0) = 3 \leq \hat{f}(0)$ , and then observe that, for  $n \geq 1$ ,  $f_{\text{sol}}(n) = 2f_{\text{sol}}(n-1) + 1 \leq 2\hat{f}(n-1) + 1 \leq \hat{f}(n)$ . The direct connection with monotonicity of  $\Phi$  is apparent. However, automatically setting up and performing inductive proofs for benchmarks such as `mphase` or `sum-osc` is not easy, as it requires selecting an appropriate “induction path”. This difficulty is circumvented by Theorem 2.

**Interpretation of equation monotonicity.** We informally discuss intuition to better visualise the main hypothesis of Theorem 2, which does *not* imply limitations to monotone  $f_{\text{sol}}$  or monotone resources (e.g. excluding memory that can be freed during execution), as shown by our benchmarks.

Given an equation, we can picture its *control-flow* by organising  $\mathcal{D}$  as a graph, with arrows going from callers to callees for each recursive call. In fact, for cost properties, a better visualisation is to consider the *opposite* orientation, from callees to possible callers, hence making base cases *sources* (as opposite to *sinks*), from which cost *flows*, and *accumulates* towards further recursive cases. This orientation, with logical content, coincides with that of *derivation trees* from logic programming, when viewing equations as Horn clauses.

With this image, monotonicity can be interpreted dynamically, and simply means that, if a cost value is increased *upstream* (e.g. an initial condition), then all values *downstream* also increase. This does *not* imply monotonicity of  $\text{lfp} \Phi$ .

regarding an underlying order of  $\mathcal{D}$ , as it may not coincide with the direction of recursive calls (consider `incr1` in Table 2). This also does *not* mean that values downstream are higher than upstream: flow can be withdrawn along the stream without affecting the monotonic response of values downstream – this allows to handle “non-monotonic” resources such as memory.

However, non-monotone equations do exist, as discussed in Remark 3 below. Examples outside of pure program analysis appear in biochemical systems, where an increase of population at some point in time may actually have a negative impact on the population downstream. We can see that monotonicity of  $\Phi$  is connected with the possibility to compute worst/best cases for an input size from worst/best cases of the recursive calls.

## 6 Grammars and Classes of Equations

We may break apart equations into simpler building blocks, introducing grammar of operators. This allows us to easily define classes of equations, and inductively prove properties on them. Additionally, this viewpoint provides us with syntax of supported inputs for Sections 8-10 and enables the “abstract equations” viewpoint sketched in Section 8.2.

### 6.1 Intrinsic definitions and properties

We start by defining classes of equations through their properties. Constructive subsets of these classes are obtained in 6.3 through grammar of equations.

The approach presented in this paper focuses on *monotone equations*, but other properties will be useful. We define them here.

**Definition 8 (Linear equation).** *We say that an equation  $\Phi_{\text{lin}} : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$  is linear whenever it restricts to a linear operator on the vector space  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , i.e. whenever  $\forall f, g : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}(f + g) = \Phi_{\text{lin}}(f) + \Phi_{\text{lin}}(g)$  and  $\forall f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}(\alpha f) = \alpha \cdot \Phi_{\text{lin}}(f)$ . In particular, in this case,  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ .*

**Definition 9 (Affine equation).** *Similarly, we say that  $\Phi$  is affine whenever it restricts to an affine operator on  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}}$ , i.e. whenever there exists a linear  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}$  such that  $\forall f \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}}$ ,  $\Phi(f) = \Phi(\mathbf{0}) + \Phi_{\text{lin}}(f)$ . In this case, we call  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}$  the linearisation of  $\Phi$ , and we can observe that  $\forall f, g \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}}$ ,  $\Phi(f - g) = \Phi(f) - \Phi(g)$ .*

While our approach is only limited to monotone *operators*, without restrictions on candidates, the special case of *monotone candidates* is interesting. Unless specified, we give  $\mathcal{D}$  the order induced by the product of the usual order on  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition 10 (Monotone candidate).** *We call monotone candidate any function  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  that is monotone, i.e. order-preserving.*

**Proposition 2.** *The set of monotone candidates is a complete sublattice of the set of functions  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  ordered pointwise.*

**Definition 11.** We say that an equation  $\Phi$  preserves candidate monotonicity whenever  $\Phi f$  is monotone for all monotone  $f$ .

**Proposition 3.** If  $\Phi$  is a monotone equation that preserves candidate monotonicity, then it admits a solution that is monotone. In particular, if  $\Phi$  admits a unique solution  $f_{sol}$ , e.g. if  $\Phi$  terminates unconditionally, then  $f_{sol}$  is monotone.

More generally, if a monotone equation  $\Phi$  preserves a sublattice of  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  defined by a property, then it admits solutions that have this property.

## 6.2 Order

We continue our algebraic treatment of equations as first-class objects, by introducing an order on monotone equations themselves. This higher-order order structure interacts well with the semantics of equations (with their solutions), and can be used to simplify them, i.e. to safely approximate them. It is also useful for proofs, such as that of Proposition 23 on hybrid verification.

**Definition 12 (Order of equations).** We define the order  $\sqsubseteq$  on equations by lifting pointwise (once more) the pointwise order of  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ .

In other words,  $\Phi_1 \sqsubseteq \Phi_2 \iff \forall f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}, \Phi_1(f)(\mathbf{n}) \leq \Phi_2(f)(\mathbf{n})$ . This gives  $((\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}), \sqsubseteq)$  the structure of a complete lattice, of which the set of monotone equations is a complete sublattice.

**Proposition 4 (Fixpoint transfer).** Solution extraction is  $\sqsubseteq$ -monotone.

More precisely, if  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2$  are two monotone equations with  $\Phi_1 \sqsubseteq \Phi_2$ , then  $\text{lfp } \Phi_1 \leq \text{lfp } \Phi_2$  and  $\text{gfp } \Phi_1 \leq \text{gfp } \Phi_2$ . In particular, when  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  terminate everywhere and thus admit a single solution, we can write  $f_{sol,1} \leq f_{sol,2}$ .

*Remark 2.* Over- and underapproximations of equations for the  $\sqsubseteq$  order can be easily performed at the syntactical level, by using over- and underapproximations of the expressions used in the definition of the equation. For example, if  $\Phi(f)(\mathbf{n}) := \text{ite}(\varphi(\mathbf{n}), y_0, \Phi_1(f)(\mathbf{n}))$  and  $\Phi'(f)(\mathbf{n}) := \text{ite}(\varphi(\mathbf{n}), \overline{y_0}, \Phi_1(f)(\mathbf{n}))$  with  $y_0 \leq \overline{y_0}$  (overapproximation of initial conditions), then  $\text{lfp } \Phi \leq \text{lfp } \Phi'$ . Similarly, when setting up an equation by a max in a branch, this can be (coarsely but safely) overapproximated by a sum, i.e. schematically  $\max(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) \sqsubseteq (\Phi_1 + \Phi_2)$ . Negligible or complex terms can also be simplified, e.g. to attempt to recover simple equations handled by CAS solvers. For example,  $\Phi \sqsubseteq \tilde{\Phi}$  for  $\Phi(f)(n) = \text{ite}(n = 0, 0, 2f(n-1) + n^2 + 3n + \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor + 4 + \frac{1}{n})$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}(f)(n) = \text{ite}(n = 0, 0, 2f(n-1) + 11n^2)$ . While these transformations may appear to be trivial and natural, our formalisation provides guarantees for them, and highlights an important hypothesis: *equations  $\Phi$  must be **monotone** in their unknown*. Multiple counter-examples can be produced if this hypothesis is violated.

## 6.3 Inductive definitions and grammars

We finally explicitly introduce large classes of equations supported by our approach, thanks to their monotonicity and other good properties. These are the



equations that we analyse in our experiments and in Section 10. Note that we only prove that our implementation is correct for such equations, and we assume that all inputs belong to this syntax so as to make them monotone.

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $Eqs$  denote the set of all monotone equations  $\mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ . Then,  $Eqs$  is stable by all operations presented in the grammar of Fig. 2.*

*Remark 3 (Warning).*  $f \mapsto -f$  is not a monotone operation, i.e. positivity on  $a$  in (Scale) is necessary. More subtly, (Choice) also requires  $\varphi$  to depend only on  $\mathbf{n}$  (and not on  $f$ ). Non-monotone equations can be constructed with piecewise definitions whose conditions depend on the result of recursive calls (e.g. the `prs23_1` benchmark in [70, 78]). The order theory of such equations is interesting but subtle, and requires a lot of care in handling  $\varphi$  – this is left for future work.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{P : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}}{(f \mapsto \mathbf{n} \mapsto P(\mathbf{n})) : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Base-Case)} \quad \frac{\phi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}}{(f \mapsto f \circ \phi) : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Rec-Call)} \\
 \frac{\Phi_1 : \mathbf{Eqs}, \Phi_2 : \mathbf{Eqs}}{(f \mapsto \Phi_1(f) + \Phi_2(f)) : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Sum)} \quad \frac{\Phi : \mathbf{Eqs}, a : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+}{(f \mapsto \mathbf{n} \mapsto a(\mathbf{n}) \cdot \Phi(f)(\mathbf{n})) : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Scale)} \\
 \frac{\Phi_1 : \mathbf{Eqs}, \Phi_2 : \mathbf{Eqs}, \varphi : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}}{(f \mapsto \mathbf{n} \mapsto \text{ite}(\varphi(\mathbf{n}), \Phi_1(f)(\mathbf{n}), \Phi_2(f)(\mathbf{n}))) : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Choice)} \quad \frac{\Phi_1 : \mathbf{Eqs}, \Phi_2 : \mathbf{Eqs}}{\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1 : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Comp)} \\
 \frac{\Phi_1 : \mathbf{Eqs}, \Phi_2 : \mathbf{Eqs}}{(f \mapsto \max(\Phi_1(f), \Phi_2(f))) : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Max)} \quad \frac{\Phi_1 : \mathbf{Eqs}, \Phi_2 : \mathbf{Eqs}}{(f \mapsto \min(\Phi_1(f), \Phi_2(f))) : \mathbf{Eqs}} \text{ (Min)}
 \end{array}$$

**Fig. 2.** A grammar of operators to construct equations. All constructors presented here preserve monotonicity of equations. Note that no assumptions are made on  $P$  and  $\phi$  in (Base-Case) and (Rec-Call), which form the base cases for structural induction. (Sum) and (Scale) allow analysing programs with non-linear recursion. (Choice) corresponds to (restricted) conditional choice, and enables piecewise definitions. (Comp) is convenient for combining equations. Finally, (Max) and (Min) give simple ways to analyse worst- and best-cases in branching programs.

**Definition 13.** *We call  $EqsM$  the set of equations generated by all constructors in Fig. 2, i.e. the corresponding least fixed point in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D)$ .*

*Remark 4.* For implementation, we also need to define the syntax of functions  $P$ ,  $a$ ,  $\phi$  and  $\varphi$  that can appear in Fig. 2, even if we have no restriction in principle. In the artifact attached to this paper, we circumvent this technicality by using an embedded language, i.e. using syntax of numerical expressions naturally available in languages such as `Python` and `Wolfram`, and we allow users to extend it via a bank of custom functions (e.g. `log2`, `ceiling`, `factorial`, etc.).

All proofs of this section are easy, by induction on the syntax.

**Proposition 6.** *All equations in  $EqsM$  are monotone.*

**Definition 14.** We call  $\mathit{EqsA}$  the subset of  $\mathit{EqsM}$  containing all equations generated by the constructors in Fig. 2, ( $\mathit{Max}$ ) and ( $\mathit{Min}$ ) excluded.

**Proposition 7.** All equations in  $\mathit{EqsA}$  are both monotone and affine.

*Example 1.* All equations of the following form belong to  $\mathit{EqsA}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) &\rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \\ f \mapsto \mathbf{n} &\mapsto \begin{cases} \dots \\ \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) \cdot f(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}))) + b_i(\mathbf{n}) & \text{if } \varphi_i(\mathbf{n}), \\ \dots \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where all the  $a_{i,j}$  are positive, and  $\phi_{i,j} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ ,  $b_i : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are arbitrary.

This class contains many examples. In fact, we can prove the following.

**Proposition 8.** All elements of  $\mathit{EqsA}$  are of the shape (3).

**Corollary 1.** Elements of  $\mathit{EqsM}$  can be understood as equations of shape (3), interleaved with nested min and max operators.

**Proposition 9.** Candidate monotonicity is preserved by ( $\mathit{Sum}$ ), ( $\mathit{Comp}$ ), ( $\mathit{Max}$ ), ( $\mathit{Min}$ ). It is preserved by ( $\mathit{Base-Case}$ ), ( $\mathit{Rec-Call}$ ) and ( $\mathit{Scale}$ ) whenever  $P$  (resp.  $\varphi$ , resp.  $a$ ) are monotone. It is not preserved in general by ( $\mathit{Choice}$ ), but sufficient conditions can be obtained to deal with special cases (e.g. initial conditions).

The grammar of Fig. 2 can be extended to wider types of equations, featuring nested calls (self-composition), and other very nonlinear behaviours, on the condition of being a bit more careful about the lattice we work in. For the sake of presentation, we do not include these constructors in our grammar, as they would require precise hypotheses, and only give the following few results.

**Proposition 10 (Self-composition).** The operation  $(f, g) \mapsto f \circ g$  is monotone in both variables for  $f, g$  in the sublattice of monotone candidates, when this operation is well-defined, i.e. when  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ ,  $g(\mathbb{N}) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ . Generalisations can be obtained. Note that this allows us to deal with the **nested** benchmark in Table 2.

**Proposition 11 (Monotone post-composition).** Operations ( $\mathit{Sum}$ ), ( $\mathit{Scale}$ ), ( $\mathit{Max}$ ), ( $\mathit{Min}$ ) can be unified by noting that for all monotone  $P : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the equation  $f \mapsto P(\Phi_1(f), \dots, \Phi_k(f))$  is monotone for all monotone  $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_k$ . For example,  $f \mapsto n \mapsto \text{ite}(n = 0, 1, f(n-1)^2 + 1)$  is monotone on positive candidates.

**Proposition 12 (Unbounded optimisation).** Operations ( $\mathit{Max}$ ), ( $\mathit{Min}$ ) can be immediately extended to all finite arity max and min by iterating them. More generally, even unbounded max and min operations are monotone. This allows, e.g., dealing with explicit non-deterministic divide-and-conquer equations.

#### 6.4 Application to inductivity measure

The compositional and axiomatic viewpoint presented in this section allows us to easily obtain and combine results on the inductivity measure  $\Phi f - f$  of Definition 6. For example, it admits a simple expression for affine equations applied to affine combinations of base functions. This will be useful to enforce inductivity of candidates in our optimisation-based approach of Section 8.1, as it will be possible to enforce inductivity locally using only linear constraints in the  $\alpha_i$ .

**Proposition 13.** *Let  $\Phi$  be an affine equation, and  $f = (\sum_i \alpha_i f_i) + b$  be an affine combination of functions. Then,  $\Phi f = (\sum_i \alpha_i \cdot \Phi_{\text{lin}} f_i) + \Phi(b)$ , where  $\Phi_{\text{lin}} := f \mapsto \Phi(f) - \Phi(\mathbf{0})$  is the linear component of  $\Phi$ , i.e. the linearisation of  $\Phi$ . In other words, the behaviour of affine equations on affine candidates is easy to express explicitly. In particular, the inductivity measure can be expressed as  $\Phi f - f = (\sum_i \alpha_i \cdot (\Phi_{\text{lin}} f_i - f_i)) + (\Phi(b) - b)$ .*

In Section 7, we are even more explicit, and give expressions of  $(\Phi f - f)$  that provide, for basic building blocks of equations, simple sufficient conditions for a bound to be inductive. For now, we focus on how such results can be combined through the constructors of our grammar. In other words, taking a deductive approach, inductivity  $(\Phi f - f)$  of candidates can be analysed by induction on the structure of the equation – such results could be expressed as type rules. For example, it is preserved by (full) conditional choice and convex combinations of equations (which may be viewed as a restricted form of probabilistic choice).

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2$  be two monotone equations. Then, for all  $f$ , if  $\text{sgn}(\Phi_1(f) - f)$  and  $\text{sgn}(\Phi_2(f) - f)$  are equal and globally constant,  $\text{sgn}(\Phi(f) - f)$  is identical, in both of the following cases: when  $\Phi(f)(\mathbf{n})$  is defined piecewise via  $\varphi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$  as  $\text{ite}(\varphi(f, \mathbf{n}), \Phi_1(f)(\mathbf{n}), \Phi_2(f)(\mathbf{n}))$  and is monotone; and when  $\Phi = \lambda \Phi_1 + \mu \Phi_2$  for  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\lambda + \mu = 1$ . In other words, to check that  $f$  is inductive for  $\Phi$ , it is sufficient to do so for  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$ .*

We may also observe that for affine equations, inductivity conditions can be obtained from conditions for linear equations, by relativisation.

**Proposition 15.** *For all affine  $\Phi$  and all  $f$ ,  $\Phi f - f = \Phi_{\text{lin}}(f - f_{\text{sol}}) - (f - f_{\text{sol}})$ .*

For example, conditions in Section 7 on the growth of  $f$  will be translated into conditions on the growth of the difference  $f - f_{\text{sol}}$  with the (unknown) solution. Similarly, sufficient conditions for inductivity of bounds can be obtained for max / min of operators or for composition, and should be easily obtained by the interested reader, but we do not describe them here for brevity.

Just as inductivity  $(\Phi f - f)$  of candidates can be analysed by induction on the structure of the equation, the same is true of *variation* of inductivity measures under a transformation  $\Psi$  of expressions, i.e. of  $(\Phi \Psi f - \Psi f) - (\Phi f - f)$ . This is relevant for candidate *repair*, i.e. to build inductive bounds from candidate bounds only “nearly inductive”, which is quickly sketched in Section 9.

## 7 Structure of sets of pre- and postfixpoints – Robustness and Extensions of the proof principle

We now investigate the *converse* of the proof principle introduced in Section 5, i.e. we question the *completeness* of the approach: when are bounds inductive?

The results of our exploration are summarised as a rather explicit description of  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi)$  and  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi)$  in terms of convex cones (Theorem 3 for affine equations, partially extended to the full grammar in Proposition 17). The conditions we obtain can be interpreted as conditions on the relative growth of candidates with respect to the solution, *in the direction of the recursive calls*, as exemplified at the end of Section 7.1. They fully explain the nature of our counter-examples, and suggest ways to repair them (as sketched in Section 9). This view is further empowered by additional algebraic structure of these cones (Proposition 18) and by relationship with (quasi-)ranking functions for the equation.

Additionally, Section 7.2 proposes tools to extend our proof principle, so as to handle some of the non-inductive bounds and simplify the proof process, via *hybrid verification* and introduction of *subdomain-wise* reasoning enabling control-flow analysis and refinement (CFA/CFR) for equations.

### 7.1 Structure of the set of postfixpoints

**Proposition 16 (Structure of  $\text{Postfp}/\text{Prefp}$  for affine equations).** *Let  $\Phi$  be a (monotone) affine equation. Then, the sets  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi)$  and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi)$  are affine convex cones described by  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi) = \text{lfp } \Phi + C$  and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi) = \text{gfp } \Phi - C$ , where  $C$  is a linear convex cone. Moreover, the linear cone  $C$  is equal to  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ , where  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}$  is the linearisation of  $\Phi$ .*

*Proof.* For simplicity, we only present the case of  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , without infinities. Recall that for all  $h, h'$ ,  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}(h - h') = \Phi(h) - \Phi(h')$ , so that for any  $f : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Phi f - f = (\Phi f - \Phi(\text{lfp } \Phi)) - (f - \text{lfp } \Phi) = \Phi_{\text{lin}}(f - \text{lfp } \Phi) - (f - \text{lfp } \Phi)$ , hence  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi) = \text{lfp } \Phi + \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ . We could actually show that  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi) = \text{Fix}(\Phi) + \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ , but we choose the former for its geometrical interpretation. We now prove that  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$  is a linear convex cone. Let  $f, g \in \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . We need to show that  $\alpha f + \beta g \in \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ , which follows from linearity:  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}(\alpha f + \beta g) - (\alpha f + \beta g) = \alpha \cdot (\Phi_{\text{lin}} f - f) + \beta \cdot (\Phi_{\text{lin}} g - g) \leq \mathbf{0}$ .

Finally, we need to prove that  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi) = \text{gfp } \Phi - \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ , showing that it is also an affine convex cone, and that its corresponding linear cone is the same as that of  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi)$  up to a sign reversal. This follows directly from the fact that, for all  $f$ ,  $\Phi_{\text{lin}}(\text{gfp } \Phi - f) - (\text{gfp } \Phi - f) = (\Phi(\text{gfp } \Phi) - \Phi f) - (\text{gfp } \Phi - f) = f - \Phi f$ , hence  $f \in \text{Prefp}(\Phi) \iff \text{gfp } \Phi - f \in \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}}) \iff f \in \text{gfp } \Phi - \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ .

The next lemma aids interpretation and to later unveil multiplicative structure.

**Lemma 1 (Cone positivity).** *Assume that  $\Phi$  is a “well-defined equation”, i.e. that it terminates everywhere unconditionally (c.f. Definition 7). Then, with the assumptions of Proposition 16, all  $f \in C = \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$  are such that  $f \geq \mathbf{0}$ .*

*Proof (Sketch).* By transfinite induction on the height of derivations.

We finally give an explicit description of the cones for the affine equations we work with, by unfolding the definition of  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ . It can be interpreted both externally, as relative growth conditions, and internally via rays akin to “quasi-ranking functions”.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\Phi$  be a (monotone) affine equation written as in Example 1, i.e.  $\Phi : f \mapsto \mathbf{n} \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} (a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) \cdot f(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}))) + b_i(\mathbf{n})$  if  $\varphi_i(\mathbf{n})$ , with  $a_{i,j} \geq \mathbf{0}$ . As usual, we write  $\mathcal{D} = \sqcup_i \mathcal{D}_i$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_i = \{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D} \mid \varphi_i(\mathbf{n})\}$ .*

*Then  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi) = \text{lfp } \Phi + C$  and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi) = \text{gfp } \Phi - C$ , where*

$$C = \left\{ g : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}} \mid \forall i, \forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}_i, g(\mathbf{n}) \geq \sum_j a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) \cdot g(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n})) \right\}.$$

*In other words,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Postfp}(\Phi) &= \left\{ f \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathcal{D}} \mid \forall i \forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}_i (f - \text{lfp } \Phi)(\mathbf{n}) \geq \sum_j a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) \cdot (f - \text{lfp } \Phi)(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n})) \right\}, \\ \text{Prefp}(\Phi) &= \left\{ f \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathcal{D}} \mid \forall i \forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}_i (\text{gfp } \Phi - f)(\mathbf{n}) \geq \sum_j a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) \cdot (\text{gfp } \Phi - f)(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n})) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The results above can be extended to the full grammar of Fig. 2 (with  $\min / \max$ ) using the following proposition, with the caveat of replacing equalities with inclusions, hence obtaining sufficient but not necessary conditions for inductiveness.

**Proposition 17.** *If  $\Phi = \max(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ , then  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi) = \text{Postfp}(\Phi_1) \cap \text{Postfp}(\Phi_2)$ , and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi) \supseteq \text{Prefp}(\Phi_1) \cap \text{Prefp}(\Phi_2)$ . Similarly, if  $\Phi = \min(\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$ , then  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi) \supseteq \text{Postfp}(\Phi_1) \cap \text{Postfp}(\Phi_2)$ , and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi) = \text{Prefp}(\Phi_1) \cap \text{Prefp}(\Phi_2)$ .*

*As the intersection of two affine convex cones is an affine convex cone, this implies that for all equations  $\Phi$  in the family defined in Fig. 2, their sets  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi)$  and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi)$  also contain affine convex cones. Moreover,  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi)$  and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi)$  are stable by addition from the corresponding linear convex cones.*

*Remark 5.* An intuitive way to visualise sets stable by additions from cones is as “icebergs”, with sharp points at minimal elements for the induced cone preorder.

Under mild assumptions, these cones have additional algebraic structure.

**Proposition 18 (Stability by multiplication).** *Consider an affine equation given explicitly with the same notation as above. Assume that it terminates everywhere so that Lemma 1 can be applied, and that all  $a_{i,j}$  are such that  $\forall \mathbf{n}, a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n})^2 \geq a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n})$ , i.e.  $a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) = 0$  or  $a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) \geq 1$ .*

*Then, the linear cone  $C = \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ , appearing in the affine convex cones  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi) = \text{lfp } \Phi + C$  and  $\text{Prefp}(\Phi) = \text{gfp } \Phi - C$ , is stable by (pointwise) multiplication, i.e.  $\forall f, g \in C, (\mathbf{n} \mapsto f(\mathbf{n}) \cdot g(\mathbf{n})) \in C$ .*

This makes it possible to build fast-growing rays (e.g. polynomials) from simpler elements, e.g. as obtained below with ranking functions.

This is useful to have in mind when considering a final intuition related to the cone structure presented in this section: “if we degrade the precision of a

candidate long enough, we will eventually reach an inductive bound”. Indeed, intuitively, the presence of such cones guarantee that inductive bounds are “reasonably common” in the space of all bounds, and not only isolated points.<sup>9</sup> This suggests that inductive upper bounds could be searched simply by “going up and eventually encountering the cone”. Three issues have to be considered to make this idea concrete: the codimension of the cone to stay in an appropriate subspace, the use of *interior rays* to get closer to the cone, and the necessity to produce fast-growing rays to eventually reach it (indeed, unlike in finite dimensions  $\forall \mathbf{n} \exists N, N \cdot f(\mathbf{n}) \geq g(\mathbf{n}) \not\equiv \exists N, N \cdot f \geq g$ ).

**(Quasi)-ranking functions for rays.** We now observe that elements of  $C$  can be constructed from ranking functions for the equation, either directly or through an exponential transformation. In particular, we are comforted that  $C$  is not reduced to  $\mathbf{0}$ : inductive bounds other than the exact solution exist. Additionally, this observation is useful to explore candidate repair, making it possible to leverage prior work on ranking function inference.

**Definition 15 (Ranking function for an equation).** *A ranking function for a monotone equation  $\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$  is simply a function  $r : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  (or more generally to a well-ordered set) such that  $r$  decreases strictly along recursive calls, i.e. such that for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ , the function  $f \mapsto \Phi(f)(\mathbf{x})$  depends only on the values of  $f(\mathbf{y})$  for  $r(\mathbf{y}) < r(\mathbf{x})$ .*

Since we focus on  $\Phi$  that terminate, we will consider that such functions exist. For linear-recursive  $\Phi$ , they directly provide elements and hence rays of  $C$ .

**Definition 16.** *We say that an affine equation is linear-recursive when, given explicitly with the same notation as in Theorem 3, there is a single recursive call in each subdomain ( $\forall i, k_i = 1$ ) with  $a_{i,1} = 1$ .*

**Proposition 19.** *For all affine linear-recursive  $\Phi$ , ranking functions  $r : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  belong to the linear cone  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ .*

*Proof.* Simply observe the expression of  $C$  in Theorem 3 for linear-recursive  $\Phi$ . The ranking function definition corresponds to  $r(\mathbf{n}) \geq 0$  in base cases and  $r(\mathbf{n}) \geq r(\phi_i(\mathbf{n})) + 1$  in recursive cases, which implies  $r(\mathbf{n}) \geq r(\phi_i(\mathbf{n}))$ .

For affine  $\Phi$ , ranking functions can be simply described as postfixpoints of a modified equation.

**Proposition 20.** *Consider a monotone affine equation  $\Phi$  given explicitly as in Theorem 3, and assume that  $\Phi$  is terminating. Then, a function  $r : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a ranking function for  $\Phi$  if and only if it verifies the following inequation.*

$$\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}, r(\mathbf{n}) \geq \begin{cases} 1 + \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_i} r(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n})) & \text{if } \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}_i \text{ with } \mathcal{D}_i \text{ recursive} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}_i \text{ with } \mathcal{D}_i \text{ non-recursive} \end{cases}$$

<sup>9</sup> This is not the case anymore, e.g., for the `nested` benchmark of Table 2.

Not all elements of  $C$  are ranking functions. We can describe more of them with the following generalisation, where we allow real codomain and non-strict decrease. Such quasi-ranking functions do not provide termination guarantees.

**Definition 17 (Quasi-ranking function).** *For a monotone  $\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$ , we call quasi-ranking function any (non-negative) function  $r : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $r$  decreases along recursive calls, i.e. so that for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{D}$ , the function  $f \mapsto \Phi(f)(\mathbf{x})$  depends only on the values of  $f(\mathbf{y})$  for  $r(\mathbf{y}) \leq r(\mathbf{x})$ .*

**Proposition 21.** *For all affine linear-recursive  $\Phi$ , quasi-ranking functions  $r : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  belong to the linear cone  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ .*

*Remark 6.* Constants are trivial quasi-ranking functions. Hence, for linear-recursive  $\Phi$ , inductive upper and lower bounds can always be degraded by a constant.

This is not true anymore for non-linear-recursive equations, as seen with `(exp2)`. However, we can still build elements in the linear cone  $C = \text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$  of general affine equations by using their ranking functions.

**Proposition 22.** *Let  $\Phi$  be a terminating affine equation, explicitly described as in Proposition 20 and Equation (3). If all  $a_{i,j}$  are bounded above by a constant  $a$ , and the  $k_i$  are bounded above by a constant  $k$ , then for all ranking functions  $r$  of  $\Phi$ , the function  $g : \mathbf{n} \mapsto (ka)^{r(\mathbf{n})}$  belongs to the linear cone  $\text{Postfp}(\Phi_{\text{lin}})$ .*

*Proof.* This comes directly by observing that for  $\mathbf{n}$  in a recursive subdomain  $\mathcal{D}_i$ ,  $g(\mathbf{n}) = (ka)^{r(\mathbf{n})} \geq ka \cdot \max_{1 \leq j \leq k_i} (ka)^{r(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}))} \geq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k_i} a_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}) \cdot g(\phi_{i,j}(\mathbf{n}))$ .

By being a bit more careful, we could generalise this to more kinds of equations (e.g. unbounded  $a$ , max/min), and obtain  $g$  that are more precise by avoiding the use of the exponential  $a$  in subdomains with a single recursive call.

**Examples.** As mentioned before, the results above provide inductivity conditions that can be interpreted as relative growth conditions *in the direction of recursive calls*, which may be visualised in light of the discussion of Section 5.3. Space considerations lead us to only present simple illustrations in this section, leaving a unified description for a longer version of the paper (it can be phrased through operator algebra, discussing attractivity of modified discrete derivatives). Additional examples, e.g. for equations with min/max, can easily be created.

For linear recursive equations, relative growth is identical to absolute growth, and the only relative condition is that inductive bounds must be bounds.

*Example 2.* Consider the equation given by  $f(n) = f(n - 1) + n$  if  $n > 0$  and  $f(0) = 3$ . The results above tell us that an upper bound  $g \geq f_{\text{sol}}$  is checkable with our proof principle whenever  $\forall n > 0, g(n) \geq g(n - 1)$ , i.e. whenever  $g$  is an upper bound and has increasing discrete derivative.

*Example 3.* Consider equation `sum-osc` in Table 2. An upper bound  $g \geq f_{\text{sol}}$  is inductive whenever  $\forall x, y > 0, g(x, y) \geq g(x - 1, y)$  and  $\forall y > 0, g(0, y) \geq g(1, y)$ , i.e. whenever it has increasing derivative “in the direction of recursive calls”.

For non-linear recursion, simple growth is insufficient: it must be exponential.

*Example 4.* Consider once again the `exp2` equation,  $f(n) = 2f(n-1) + 1$  if  $n > 0$  and  $f(0) = 3$ , with solution  $f_{sol}(n) = 4 \cdot 2^n - 1$ , which gives an example of non-inductive upper bound  $\hat{f}(n) = 4 \cdot 2^n$ . From the results above, an upper bound  $g \geq f_{sol}$ , is inductive whenever  $\forall n > 0, (g(n) - f_{sol}(n)) \geq 2(g(n-1) - f_{sol}(n-1))$ .

This explains the non-checkability of  $\hat{f}$ : while the candidate itself grows exponentially, its difference with  $f_{sol}$  is constant, which is insufficient to permit an inductive proof. However, this also suggests ways to “repair” the candidate: if we replace  $\hat{f}$  by  $\hat{f} \circ (n \mapsto 1.2n) = n \mapsto 4 \cdot 2^{1.2n}$ , we get a new candidate that grows fast enough, and is an inductive bound. We come back to this idea in Section 9.

## 7.2 Extensions of the proof principle

The space of checkable candidates can be expanded beyond the cones mentioned above.

**Hybrid verification.** Inductive proofs may be safely mixed with proofs obtained by other means, in the following sense. For example, if inductivity fails only on a finite subdomain, but the candidate still seems to be a correct bound, it is safe to simply check it by concrete execution on this subdomain.

**Proposition 23 (Hybrid verification).** *Let  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{D}_2$ . If  $f_{sol} \leq f$  in  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , and  $\Phi f \leq f$  in  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , then  $f_{sol} \leq f$  everywhere. The dual is true for lower bounds.*

**Lemma 2 (For hybrid verification).** *Let  $\Phi : (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}})$ ,  $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{D}_2$ , and suppose that  $g : \mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is such that  $g \geq \text{lfp } \Phi$  (in  $\mathcal{D}_1$ ). Consider*

$$\tilde{\Phi} := f \mapsto n \mapsto \begin{cases} \min(\Phi(f)(n), g(n)) & \text{if } n \in \mathcal{D}_1, \\ \Phi(f)(n) & \text{if } n \in \mathcal{D}_2. \end{cases}$$

*Then,  $\text{lfp } \tilde{\Phi} = \text{lfp } \Phi$ . The dual result holds for `gfp`, `max`, and  $g \leq \text{gfp } \Phi$  in  $\mathcal{D}_1$ .*

*Proof (Sketch).* First,  $\tilde{\Phi} \sqsubseteq \Phi$ , hence  $\text{lfp } \tilde{\Phi} \leq \text{lfp } \Phi$ . Then, observe that  $\text{lfp } \Phi$  is also fixpoint of  $\tilde{\Phi}$  and that there are no strictly smaller fixpoints (by contradiction).

*Remark 7.* This proves Proposition 23 by noticing that, for a candidate solution  $g$  of equation  $\Phi$ , if  $\text{lfp } \Phi \leq g$  in  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\Phi g \leq g$  in  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , then  $\tilde{\Phi}(g) \leq g$  (with the notations of the lemma), so that  $g \geq \text{lfp } \tilde{\Phi} = \text{lfp } \Phi$  (everywhere).


Such proof principle may be used for interactive bound search approaches, mixed with local repair as sketched in Section 8.2. Additionally, it provides safety guarantees for substitution of partial bounds or solutions (known to be valid only in a subdomain), which is particularly useful to define a compositional approach to solving systems of equations.

### Subdomain-wise reasoning, CFR and CFA for equations.

It can be useful to consider control-flow graphs for equations, and follow the topological order when searching candidates for subdomains, generalising classical approaches used for systems of equations [14].



*Example 5.* Consider equation `mphase` of Table 2, with subdomains  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3$  corresponding to  $i \geq n, i < n \wedge r > 0$  and  $i < n \wedge r = 0$  respectively. The following dependency graph is obtained by asking, for each  $\mathbf{n}$ , what are the values  $\mathbf{n}'$  such that  $\Phi(f)(\mathbf{n})$  may depend on  $f(\mathbf{n}')$ . Up to orientation reversal, this is just the control flow of the program from which this equation originates (Fig 1.12, [23]).



In the interpretation of Section 8.2, cost flows from  $\mathcal{D}_1$  to  $\mathcal{D}_3$  to  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , and we may thus perform our bound search in this order. For example, take the candidate  $g : (i, n, r) \mapsto \max(0, n + r - i + 1)$ . We have

$$\Phi g = (i, n, r) \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}_1 \\ n + r + 1 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}_2 \\ n - i + 1 & \text{in } \mathcal{D}_3, \end{cases}$$

hence  $\Phi g \leq g$  in  $\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_3$ , but  $\Phi g \geq g$  in  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , we thus cannot apply our proof principle directly. However, since there are no recursive calls to  $\mathcal{D}_2$  coming from  $(\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_3)$ , we can restrict our attention to  $\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_3$ , and the observation above proves that  $f_{sol} \leq g$  on  $\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_3$ . To go further, we may thus later search another candidate upper bound only in  $\mathcal{D}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , using the bound  $g|_{\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_3}$  in recursive calls. (In this particular example, admittedly a bit contrived, we can also realise that if we had searched a bit further, we would have obtained a global bound directly, since  $\Phi \Phi g \leq \Phi g$  everywhere, hence  $f_{sol} \leq \Phi g$  on the whole domain.)

Subdomain-wise reasoning also suggests to take particular attention to *interfaces*, where inductive proofs are most likely to fail if we are not careful. As this intuition is particularly useful to define good heuristics (e.g. for input sample generation in the approach of Section 8.1), we define this notion here.

**Definition 18 (Subdomain interface).** Let  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}}$  be an equation, and  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  two disjoint subdomains. We say that a value  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}_1$  is at the interface between  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  whenever there exists two functions  $f_1, f_2 : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , identical outside of  $\mathcal{D}_2$ , such that  $\Phi(f_1)(\mathbf{n}) \neq \Phi(f_2)(\mathbf{n})$ .

## 8 Candidate Generation

The order “equation-as-operator” viewpoint and the theoretical framework developed in this paper lead to many avenues for development of new recurrence solving algorithms, especially in the form of “guess, check, and repair/refine” loops (including abstract interpretation approaches).

For brevity, we focus on a particular instance, that has been implemented as a proof-of-concept. It is an effective although simple approach based on dynamic invariant generation and constrained optimisation, presented in Section 8.1. We also sketch other possible approaches in Section 8.2 (which we believe offer other advantages, particularly in terms of generalisability), and discuss them further in the longer version of the paper.

### 8.1 Dynamic optimisation-based approach

While we do not *a priori* have access to a closed-form for the solution  $f_{sol} = \text{lfp } \Phi$  to our equation, we can always observe its projection on finite-dimensional subspaces of the form  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$  with  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  finite. Indeed, we can take advantage of the fact that we are working in a *discrete* setting where  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ , with equations that terminate in finite time, to obtain the values of  $f_{sol}$  on each  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I}$  by evaluating  $\Phi$  as a program ( $f_{sol}(\mathbf{n}) = \Phi^\beta(\perp)$  for some  $\beta < \omega$ ). Note that this would not be immediate in non-discrete settings, e.g. for differential equations.

This observation allows us to draw upon techniques developed in the line of work on *dynamic invariant analysis*, e.g. [61, 62, 35, 63, 70], which proposes to identify likely invariants from a sample of program traces, before attempting to prove them. Note that we apply these techniques to *recurrences viewed as programs*, i.e. executable abstractions of programs, instead of programs directly.

Thus, we generate a *training set*  $\mathcal{T} = \{(\mathbf{n}, f_{sol}(\mathbf{n})) \mid \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I}\}$ , by executing  $\Phi$ .

We generalise the approach of [70], which uses regression techniques on  $\mathcal{T}$  to search for  $f_{sol}$  among various model spaces, including finite-dimensional affine subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}}$  generated by *base functions* taken from a finite set  $\mathcal{F}$  hoped to be representative of common size/cost functions. Our generalisation allows the *guess* stage to search through the space of all *bounds* on  $f_{sol}$ , which are a priori easier to guess in general, and thus makes it possible to obtain bounds where [70] only obtains unsafe approximations.

We do so by leveraging the order-theoretical framework developed in the rest of this paper, and perform dynamic invariant generation on the set of observations  $\mathcal{T}$  using *constrained* optimisation methods, that enforce *accuracy*, *parsimony*, *safety* and local *inductivity*. Generalisations of the approach can easily be imagined, but for simplicity, efficiency, and to obtain a first prototype, we present an instantiation based on quadratic programming (QP), using affine model spaces (made of affine combinations of base functions). The full version presented here is a priori limited to *affine* equations, but can be generalised to the full grammar of Fig. 2, or directly applied without *inductivity* constraints for simplicity. For the sake of exposition, the method is presented for upper bounds; the case of lower bounds is symmetrical.

We first present our objectives in a general setting, before presenting the instantiation with QP, affine equations and affine template spaces, which can be efficiently handled in practice.

We want the optimisation-based method to search for “good” candidate bounds  $\hat{f}$  of  $f_{sol} = \text{lfp } \Phi$ , inside some tractable model space  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$ , ideally such that they can be checked by our method, i.e. such that they are *inductive*:  $\Phi \hat{f} \leq \hat{f}$ . We formalise these requirements in the following way.

1. **Accuracy** on the training set. We want to minimise the  $\ell_2$  norm of  $\hat{f} - f_{sol}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ , i.e. minimise  $\|(\hat{f} - f_{sol})|_{\mathcal{I}}\|_2^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I}} (\hat{f}(\mathbf{n}) - f_{sol}(\mathbf{n}))^2$ .
2. **Parsimony**. In order to avoid overfitting, we need to penalise model complexity, i.e. minimise some measure of complexity of  $\hat{f}$ .
3. **Safety**. We search for functions that are bounds on all of  $\mathcal{D}$ , so candidates should at least be bounds on  $\mathcal{I}$ , and we impose  $\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I}, f_{sol}(\mathbf{n}) \leq \hat{f}(\mathbf{n})$ .
4. **Local Inductivity**. Ideally, we search for bounds that we will be able to prove, i.e. such that  $\Phi \hat{f} \leq \hat{f}$ . To extract a finite number of constraints from this, we can at least require that this inequality holds on the training set:  $\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I}, \Phi(\hat{f})(\mathbf{n}) \leq \hat{f}(\mathbf{n})$ .

These goals can be achieved efficiently if we restrict ourselves to model spaces and candidates that can be handled by QP methods. Generalisations to larger template spaces are possible with other optimisation methods, at the cost of efficiency and theoretical guarantees.

We choose a finite number  $p$  of *base functions*  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}}$  (intended to represent common complexity orders), we impose  $(\mathbf{n} \mapsto 1) \in \mathcal{F}$  to handle biases uniformly, and we set  $\mathcal{M} = \text{Vec}(\mathcal{F}) = \{ \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i f_i \mid \forall i, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}, f_i \in \mathcal{F} \}$ . For simplicity, for a generic candidate  $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{M}$  of the form  $f_{\alpha} := \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i f_i$ , we refer to the vector of coefficients  $\alpha$  as “the candidate” itself, although a single function may admit multiple representations as a linear combination of elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

To simplify the notation, let  $\mathbf{y}_{sol}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_i$  respectively denote the projection on  $\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of  $f_{sol}$  and each  $f_i \in \mathcal{F}$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{y}_{sol} = (f_{sol}(\mathbf{n}))_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I}}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_i = (f_i(\mathbf{n}))_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{I}}$ . Similarly we write  $\mathbf{y}_{\alpha}$ , or simply  $\mathbf{y}$ , to represent the projection  $f_{\alpha}$ , so that  $\mathbf{y} = \sum_i \alpha_i \mathbf{y}_i$ . This can be rewritten as the matrix multiplication  $\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{Y}\alpha$ , where  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a  $n \times p$  matrix whose columns are the  $\mathbf{y}_i$ , with  $n = \text{Card}(\mathcal{I})$ .

Once this is done, the goals presented above can be handled as follows. **Accuracy** corresponds to minimisation of the Euclidean norm  $\|\mathbf{y}_{sol} - \mathcal{Y}\alpha\|_2^2$ . To achieve **parsimony**, we can use lasso regularisation, i.e. add a penalisation of the  $\ell_1$  norm  $\|\alpha\|_1 := \sum_i |\alpha_i|$ , which can serve as an approximation of the  $\ell_0$  pseudo-norm  $\|\alpha\|_0 := \text{Card}\{i \mid \alpha_i \neq 0\}$ , as described in [31]. Local **safety** is simply represented as a linear inequality  $\mathbf{y}_{sol} \leq \mathcal{Y}\alpha$ . Local **inductivity** corresponds to  $\Phi(f_{\alpha})|_{\mathcal{I}} \leq (f_{\alpha})|_{\mathcal{I}}$ , which is a bit more complicated as it is not in general a conjunction of affine inequalities on  $\alpha$ . The situation simplifies if we additionally assume that  $\Phi$  is *affine*, in which case we use Proposition 13. Calling  $\mathbf{y}'_i$  the projections of  $\Phi_{\text{lin}} f_i$  on  $\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}'$  the  $n \times p$  matrix whose columns are the  $\mathbf{y}'_i$ , and  $\mathbf{b}'$  the projection of the bias  $\Phi(\mathbf{0})$ , we obtain  $\Phi(f_{\alpha})|_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{Y}'\alpha + \mathbf{b}'$ , so that the inequality above can be rewritten as the polyhedron  $\mathcal{Y}'\alpha + \mathbf{b}' \leq \mathcal{Y}\alpha$ . Putting all of this together, and calling  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$  the hyperparameter associated to lasso regularisation, we obtain the following constrained optimisation problem.

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\mathbf{y}_{sol} - \mathcal{Y}\alpha\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\alpha\|_1 \tag{4}$$

under the constraints  $\mathbf{y}_{sol} \leq \mathcal{Y}\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{Y}'\alpha + \mathbf{b}' \leq \mathcal{Y}\alpha$ .

This can be transformed into a QP problem. We give the full version directly for completeness, but it can be simplified if we ignore terms enforcing parsimony, safety and/or local inductivity.

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^p \\ G\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{h}}} \mathbf{x}^T P \mathbf{x} + q^T \mathbf{x}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{pmatrix}, \quad P = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{Y}^T \mathcal{Y} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & I_p \end{pmatrix}, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathcal{Y}^T \mathbf{y}_{sol} \\ \lambda \mathbf{1}_p \end{pmatrix}, \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathcal{Y} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathcal{Y}' - \mathcal{Y} & \mathbf{0} \\ -I_p & -I_p \\ I_p & -I_p \end{pmatrix}, \quad h = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{sol} \\ -\mathbf{b}' \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As mentioned in Section 3.4, to our knowledge, the use of such bounds and inductivity constraints is novel in this context, but the rest of the setup is classical. The terms  $\mathcal{Y}^T \mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}^T \mathbf{y}_{sol}$  correspond to the classical QP representation of linear regression problems. The first two lines of  $G$  and  $h$  correspond respectively to bound constraints and local inductivity constraints. Finally,  $\mathbf{u}$  are auxiliary variables used to obtain a QP-encoding of the  $\ell_1$  minimisation term.

Note that in practice, to gain precision and as in [70], we use a modified model space composed of piecewise functions, with subdomains extracted from the definition of  $\Phi$ . More precisely, for  $\Phi$  defined piecewise as in Equation 2 with  $\mathcal{D}_i = \{\mathbf{n} \mid \varphi_i(\mathbf{n})\}$ , we classify the subdomains into non-recursive (if  $e_i(f, \mathbf{n})$  does not depend on  $f$ ) and recursive (otherwise or if nothing can be proven), and use

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = f_{base} + \bigoplus_{\mathcal{D}_i \text{ recursive subdomain}} \text{Vec}\left(\left\{\mathbf{n} \mapsto f(\mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_i}(\mathbf{n}) \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\right\}\right),$$

where  $f_{base}(\mathbf{n}) = \Phi(\mathbf{0})(\mathbf{n})$  if  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}_i$  for  $\mathcal{D}_i$  non-recursive, and  $f_{base}(\mathbf{n}) = 0$  otherwise, and  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_i} : \mathbf{n} \mapsto \text{ite}(\varphi_i(\mathbf{n}), 1, 0)$  is the characteristic function of  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . In other words,  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is simply composed of functions which are piecewise combinations of the base functions from  $\mathcal{F}$  in the recursive subdomains, and which are equal to the solution  $f_{sol}$  on the non-recursive domains, in which this solution is explicitly available as a base case.  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  is then an affine vector space of dimension  $r_{\text{rec}} \times \text{Card}(\mathcal{F})$ , where  $r_{\text{rec}}$  is the number of recursive subdomains.  $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$  can also simply be viewed as a shifted version (by  $f_{base}$ ) of a model space  $\text{Vec}(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}})$  with a modified set of base functions  $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$  containing all the restrictions to each recursive subdomain of each base function in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The expressions presented above generalise easily to this case by adding a bias term  $\mathbf{b}$  so that  $\mathbf{y} = \mathcal{Y}\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \mathbf{b}$ , and reflecting this in the definition of  $\mathbf{b}'$  as well as  $q$  and  $h$ . Such strategy, that improves precision by using piecewise templates on selected subdomains, can easily be improved by using more refined strategies for subdomain selection than the purely syntactic method mentioned here, e.g. CFA/CFR techniques from [17].

At this point, a QP problem is set up. It is handed to a QP solver, which performs candidate generation, outputting an  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  which corresponds to a candidate  $\hat{f} = f_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ . Depending on QP solver used, the resulting  $\hat{f}$  may be expressed on floating points rather than rational numbers, which hinders verification. Strategies to handle this issue are discussed along with our implementation in Section 10.

## 8.2 Alternative approaches

**Interactive and dichotomy-like approach.** A first simple idea is to view Theorem 2 and its extensions as “a proof principle/system for humans”. Indeed, it leads to very short proofs for both introductory and non-trivial examples, such as

$\Phi(f)(n) = \text{ite}(n \leq 1, 0, n + \max_{0 \leq k \leq n-1}(f(k) + f(n-1-k)))$ , i.e. worst-case non-deterministic quicksort, where the max over  $k$  presents unique challenges. Using Theorem 2, it is immediate to prove that  $n^2$  is an upper bound, since for  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\Phi(n \mapsto n^2)(n) = n + \max_{0 \leq k \leq n-1}(k^2 + (n-1-k)^2) = n + (n-1)^2 \leq n^2$ . Large parts of such proofs can be mechanised. This leads to an interactive proof system, where the user iteratively proposes candidate bounds, and the system either proves them or provides information to improve the guess. Hybrid verification and local repairs are particularly valuable here. To automate manual exploration strategies, further research of the structure of candidate (sub)lattices is required.

**Quantifier elimination: a partial result on completeness.** As mentioned in Section 3.3, the first-order theory of reals (as an ordered field) is decidable, and effective algorithms such as CAD are available to perform quantifier elimination. This provides partial results on completeness, in the sense that we can obtain all *inductive* (piecewise) polynomial bounds (locally of shape  $f_\alpha(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_i \alpha_i \prod_j n_j^{e_{i,j}}$ ), for equations that preserve the set of piecewise polynomials, after integer-to-real relaxation. Indeed, the formula  $\exists \alpha \forall \mathbf{n} \Phi(f_\alpha)(\mathbf{n}) \leq f_\alpha(\mathbf{n})$  can be fully handled on the reals, and CAD produces a logical formula on  $\alpha$  that can be viewed as the representation of an element of the domain of (sets) of polynomial bounds, as described in Appendix B. A heuristic to temper the loss of precision from integer-to-real relaxation is to use a finite number of disjunctions to enforce integrality close to the origin and to interfaces between the  $\mathcal{D}_i$ , where most spurious counterexamples are found (e.g.  $1/2$  for  $n \leq n^2$ ).

As CAD does not scale well, this approach is mainly valuable for the understanding it provides, but it can be applied practically when the number of template parameters is moderate. For example, using CAD through `Mathematica`'s `Resolve`, we obtain the exact solution to `sum-osc` in 20 seconds, and recover the ideal solution of Table 3 when fixing the leading term for our running example.


**Abstraction-based approach, Abstract Iteration.** We conclude this section with an idea, included here to enable discussion, and as a foundation for future work, that we believe opens interesting research avenues. Since recurrence equations can be viewed as programs and thus as operators  $\Phi : \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$  on a concrete domain  $\mathfrak{D} = \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , whose semantics/solution is  $\text{lfp } \Phi$ , it is very tempting to design *abstract domains*  $\mathfrak{D}^\sharp$  of abstract functions and obtain sound  $\Phi^\sharp : \mathfrak{D}^\sharp \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}^\sharp$  via *abstract transfer functions*, computed on simpler operators used to syntactically construct  $\Phi$ . From this, upper bounds on solutions, can be obtained thanks to fixpoint transfer theorems, as limits of a Kleene sequence  $(\Phi^\sharp)^\beta(\perp^\sharp)$  – possibly using widenings. Such computation may be called *abstract iteration* to reflect the intuition of executing an abstract recurrence equation.

Preliminary versions on these ideas have been described in the technical report [69], using domains  $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds presented in Appendix B, and can be extended to various template spaces. However, a complete description of the abstractions and transfer functions designed as extension of this line of work is outside the scope of this paper, and will be reported upon in future work.

Abstract iteration is illustrated in Fig. 3, on a small example difficult to handle deductively. The analysis in this example simply uses affine bounds, and

could thus be performed with polyhedra,<sup>10</sup> but the value of the “ $\mathfrak{B}$ -bound abstract domain” viewpoint lies in the fact that it can be extended beyond affine relationships, hence beyond programs limited to linear complexity. Our intuition and experience is that transfer functions are easier to design in this context than for general numerical domains, thanks to the “relational-to-functional constraint abstraction” mentioned in Proposition 25.

In comparison with the approach chosen for our proof-of-concept implementation, clear advantages of abstraction interpretation methods are liveness guarantees, lower sensibility to numerical errors, and absence of need for sampling. However, they appeared to require extra implementation effort, for the design of transfer functions and widenings adapted to each family of templates, although this might be simplified by integrating transfer function synthesis methods (on basic operators and small compositions of them).



**Fig. 3.** Abstract iteration with sets of affine bounds on benchmark `nested`. Candidate upper bounds (light blue) are progressively removed by abstract iterations. It is sufficient to apply  $\Phi^\sharp$  on extremal bounds (dark blue). Between  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ ,  $(n \mapsto n)$  is fixed, which shows that it is a correct upper bound on  $f_{sol}$ . When the fixpoint  $U_\omega$  is reached, only correct upper bounds are left. In this case, the ideal solution is obtained.

## 9 On Candidate Repair


Consider a candidate (e.g. upper) bound  $\hat{f}$  on the solution to  $\Phi$ . When the inductivity check fails, i.e.  $\Phi\hat{f} \not\leq \hat{f}$ , but the candidate  $\hat{f}$  seems “close to be correct” (e.g. if  $f_{sol}(n) \leq \hat{f}(n)$  on a large sample, or if  $\Phi\hat{f} - \hat{f}$  stays close to zero when it is positive), it would be useful to “repair” this candidate by applying small transformations to  $\hat{f}$ . This is particularly relevant for the optimisation-based approach presented in Section 8.1, where numerical errors may make a candidate uncheckable even though it is extremely close to a tight inductive upper bound. More generally, we could imagine using these repair strategies on candidates obtained by other means (e.g. interactive loops of Section 8.2), and integrate them in “guess, check, and repair/refine” bound inference loops.

To reformulate our question more precisely, can we find a transformation  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{D}}$ , such that  $(\Phi\Psi\hat{f} - \Psi\hat{f}) \leq \mathbf{0}$ ? Can this  $\Psi$  be obtained by combining simple transformation rules  $\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_k$ , or can we at least obtain safety conditions to ensure that such  $\Psi_j$  will not degrade checkability, although they may degrade precision? The concepts introduced in this paper are useful tools to investigate these questions, through the analysis of variations  $(\Phi\Psi\hat{f} - \Psi\hat{f}) - (\Phi\hat{f} - \hat{f})$

<sup>10</sup> This (interprocedural abstract interpretation by polyhedra+disjunctions to obtain affine bounds, if possible, on solutions of equations represented as programs) can be considered “folklore”, but we are not aware of full descriptions in the literature.

of inductivity measures – a transformation *helps* (for upper bounds) when this quantity is negative. Three important families of transformations are (briefly) introduced below.

**Local repair** –  $\Psi : f \mapsto \text{ite}(\varphi, g, f)$ . Consider a candidate upper bound  $\hat{f}$  such  $\Phi\hat{f} \not\leq \hat{f}$  only on a finite subdomain  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , i.e. such that the inductivity proof *succeeds* on a cofinite set  $\mathcal{D}_2 := \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_1$ , e.g. “at infinity”. We can then attempt to *repair*  $\hat{f}$  by computing a correct upper bound  $g$  on  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , (by executing  $\Phi$  on the finite sample  $\mathcal{D}_1$ ), and by replacing the value of  $\hat{f}$  by that of  $g$  in  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , i.e.  $\Psi : f \mapsto \text{ite}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{D}_1}, g, f)$ . Using Section 7.2, we can show that to check the inductiveness of such a repair, it is sufficient to check the result  $(\Phi\Psi\hat{f} \leq \Psi\hat{f}$  or  $f_{sol} \leq \Psi\hat{f})$  on the *interface* of  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$ . This empowers interactive guess/repair loops presented in Section 8.2. An illustration is given in Fig. 4.



**Fig. 4.** Local repair of candidate lower bound  $\hat{f} : n \mapsto n^{1.25} + 10$  on the solution to the equation  $\Phi(f)(n) = \text{ite}(n = 0, 1, 2f(\lfloor n/3 \rfloor) + 5f(\lfloor n/6 \rfloor) + n)$ . Plots represent  $f_{sol}$  (black),  $\hat{f}$  (blue, left),  $\Phi\hat{f}$  (red, left),  $\Psi\hat{f}$  (blue, right), and  $\Phi\Psi\hat{f}$  (red, right).  $\hat{f}$  fails the inductivity check in 0. Sample evaluation of  $f_{sol} - \hat{f}$  allows to guess that  $\hat{f}$  is a correct lower bound for  $n \geq 25$ . This suggests a fix such as  $\Psi\hat{f} : n \mapsto \text{ite}(n < 25, n, \hat{f}(n))$ .  $\Psi\hat{f}$  is a correct lower bound to  $f_{sol}$ . To check this, we verify that  $\Psi\hat{f}(n) \leq f_{sol}(n)$  on the *interface*  $[25, 149]$ , and that  $\Phi\hat{f} \geq \hat{f}$  for  $n \geq 150$  (left).

**Additive repair** –  $\Psi : f \mapsto f + g$ . Additive transformations interact particularly well with affine equations  $\Phi$ , where  $(\Phi(f+g) - (f+g)) - (\Phi f - f) = \Phi_{lin}g - g$  for all for  $f, g$ . In other words, to repair a candidate upper bound, it suffices to choose a  $g$  that corrects the defect of inductivity of  $f$ , i.e. such that  $g - \Phi_{lin}g \geq \max(\mathbf{0}, \Phi f - f)$ . This is directly connected to our discussion on the geometry of Postfp and Prefp in Section 7, and to the description of their cones via (generalised) ranking functions for  $\Phi$ . Indeed, elements  $g$  such that  $\Phi_{lin}g - g \leq 0$  can be constructed from such generalised ranking functions, and we typically have a very good understanding of the values taken by  $g - \Phi_{lin}g$ . This suggests that we can attempt to choose such  $g$  appropriately, to fix  $\hat{f}$  “just enough”, i.e. to repair the offending positive values in  $(\Phi\hat{f} - \hat{f})$  without degrading too much the precision of the new candidate. Such choice of repair obtained by precise accounting of the offending numerical values in  $(\Phi\hat{f} - \hat{f})$  may be called a “quantitative repair strategy”.

The interested reader can ponder (precise) repair of the following candidate in the simple case of our running example, obtained numerically, and incorrect because of an unfortunate rounding.

$$\hat{f}(n, c) = \begin{cases} 0.5*n**2 + 3.47*n + 297.02 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ 0.5*n**2 + 3.47*n + 2.97*c & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0, \end{cases}$$

For the prospect of future implementation, we note that in our manual experiments, it was particularly useful to have access to both *piecewise*  $g$  (e.g. provided by [77] but not [7]) to localise the fix, and to have access to large *sets* of  $g$  (e.g. as in [7] but not [77]) to be able to choose and combine them. Automated inference and combination of such  $g$  is an interesting direction for future work.

**Repair by precompositions: shift and rescale** –  $\Psi : f \mapsto f \circ \phi$ . A final convenient repair strategy is to simply shift or rescale the graph of the candidate  $\hat{f}$ , i.e. to apply a precomposition  $\Psi : f \mapsto f \circ \phi$ . Compared to additive repair, this allows to more naturally conserve and use the shape of the candidate expression  $\hat{f}$ . Moreover, compared to local repair, which can be difficult to apply to some multivariate cases if  $\hat{f}$  is verified in an infinite but not cofinite set, repair by precomposition can often eliminate this issue. Relevant examples of shifts can be observed in two dimensions for `open-zip`, and for non-linear recursion, with speedups, as already presented on `exp2`.

To give a feeling of the kind of safety conditions that can be computed for such  $\Psi$ , consider the example of a linear-recursive program with a single variable, i.e. an equation  $\Phi := f \mapsto f \circ \varphi + P$  (we allow partial functions  $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , with default value 0 for  $f \circ \varphi$ ). Then, for  $\Psi = - \circ \phi$ , when both sign in the following tuple are identical, then  $(\Phi\Psi f - \Psi f) - (\Phi f - f)$  has the same sign.

$$(\text{sgn}(\Delta^2 f) \cdot \text{sgn}(\text{id} - \varphi) \cdot \text{sgn}(\text{id} - \phi), \text{sgn}(\Delta f) \cdot \text{sgn}(\text{id} - \varphi) \cdot \text{sgn}(\Delta(\text{id} - \phi)))$$

Such results can be conveniently obtained via computations of discrete calculus and operator algebra, focusing on commutators ( $[a, b] := ab - ba$ ) for basic operators built on discrete derivatives, pre/postcomposition and products.

## 10 Implementation (of the optimisation-based approach) and Experimental Evaluation

As a proof-of-concept of the potential of our order-theory viewpoint on recurrence equations for cost analysis, we have implemented the instantiation described in Section 8.1, which is submitted as the artifact for the paper. We have performed an experimental comparison with state-of-the-art cost analysers and recurrence solvers, which demonstrates that inductive bounds more precise than the bounds obtained by other tools exist and can be efficiently discovered.

**Prototype.** The full pipeline of our prototype is described in Fig. 5. Inputs and outputs are given as Python code, decorated with comments for the verification results, as illustrated in Fig. 6.






Fig. 5. Architecture of our optimisation-based recurrence solver.

```

def f(n,c):
    if n>0 and c>=100:
        return f(n-1, 0) + n + 300
    if n>0 and c<100:
        return f(n-1, c+1) + n
    return c

def f_ub(n, c):
    if ((n > 0) and (c >= 100)):
        return 1/2*n*n + 701/202*n + 30000/101*1
    elif ((n > 0) and (c < 100)):
        return 1/2*n*n + 701/202*n + 300/101*c
    else:
        return c

# =====
# Result: {}.
# Candidate checked (no counter-examples).
# =====

def f_lb(n, c):
    if ((n > 0) and (c >= 100)):
        return 1/2*n*n + 701/202*n + 100*1
    elif ((n > 0) and (c < 100)):
        return 1/2*n*n + 701/202*n + 300/101*c \
            + -19900/101*1
    else:
        return c

# =====
# Result: {}.
# Candidate checked (no counter-examples).
# =====
    
```

Fig. 6. Input recurrence (left) corresponding to Equation 1, Section 2, and output (right), including closed-form bound functions, of our prototype using `lden` rounding strategy (based on continued fractions) and training sample  $\mathcal{I} = [0, 300] \times [0, 300]$ .

Equation evaluation is sped up by memoisation decorators. Operators are constructed by AST manipulations. Inputs and outputs are executable and can be connected with other analyses.

We use the `cvxopt` [5] library for (float-based, iterative) QP solving, and the `Mathematica` CAS solver [53] to decide function inequality. The verification step can be turned off if `Mathematica` is not available on the user’s machine, or can be performed separately on candidates obtained by other means for further experimentation. We augment these off-the-shelf tools with simple heuristics, e.g. we allow the CAS to discover extra simplification opportunities for divide-and-conquer benchmarks by hinting towards case reasoning on the value on inputs modulo a small product of primes.

In the “guess” stage, several rounds of feature selection are performed, which restrict the set of base functions to the most relevant ones, using only a portion of the training sample to accelerate the process. This diminishes the dimension of the problem, which tempers numerical errors and speeds up the final guess, where we allow more QP iterations to improve precision.

Additionally, to recover candidates represented with exact rational coefficients from floating-point versions of them, we allow the user to choose among several heuristics that we call *rounding strategies*, including a version of the `fractions.limit_denominator` function in Python’s standard library, modified so as to obtain best lower and upper rational bounds (of bounded denominator) of any floating-point number, using continued fraction expansions [39, 43]. Note that, in principle, we could apply a more complete method by using approaches such as [6, 57], which recover rational solutions to an LP problem from an approximate float solution, and applying them to obtain a feasible solution of our QP problem close to the initially suggested candidate, without including the quadratic objective function.

**Benchmarks.** We evaluate our prototype and other tools on 21 benchmarks organised into five categories that we believe are representative of the challenging features exhibited by recurrences arising from cost analysis, capturing the essence of a much larger set of benchmarks. For brevity, we provide a high-level overview of them in this section and encourage the reader to interpret them through the lens of the equation–program correspondence, as discussed in Section 2, since each equation can be viewed as the size/cost abstraction of multiple programs. Nevertheless, a full description of these benchmarks, in equation format, is given in Appendix A, Table 2.

For comparison with external tools, benchmarks have been manually translated into a suitable input format using a strategy similar to [70] to avoid accuracy loss from automated translation and to better understand actual tool capabilities. The full translations can be found in our artifact.

Category `with_noise` contains benchmarks with programs whose cost function is difficult to express exactly, because of underlying noise that can be interpreted as rare cost events coming from interaction with hardware or data structures. This includes variations of our running example and a “fill and free” loop monitoring its memory usage. Category `nonmonot` contains benchmarks with

non-monotone solutions, which can typically arise from the particular control-flow of imperative programs, but is less common in declarative code. Several are inspired from [23], and we also encode a program with a memory leak caused by an incorrect boundary condition. Category `div_and_conq` presents equations that exactly encode some divide-and-conquer programs. For them too, simple and exact closed-form solutions are not typically available, although asymptotic behaviours can be obtained at the expense of safe bounds and initial values. They present recursive calls with divisions and floor/ceil that are particularly hard for classical CAS if not helped by abstractions. Category `superpoly` presents simple equations with fast-growing solutions, typically better supported by CAS than by cost analysers. The remaining examples are in category `misc`, including a simple one for sanity check, and harder benchmarks testing diverse features, such as oscillating subdomain paths, arithmetic computations, nested calls, max expressions in equation or ideal solution, and amortised cost in non-deterministic programs.

***Experimental Setup and Hyperparameters.*** Experiments are performed with the following hyperparameters. Tuning them can affect performance and precision. We assume here that  $f_{sol}$  has domain  $\mathbb{N}^d$ .

For input sample generation,  $\mathcal{I}$  is by default the union of two sets, the hypercube  $[0, \text{Bb}]^d$  with  $\text{Bb}$  chosen so that it contains around  $\text{Nb}$  elements, and a random sample of  $\text{Nrs}$  elements in  $[0, \text{Brs}]^d$ , with  $\text{Nb} = 5 \cdot 10^4$ ,  $\text{Brs} = 2 \cdot 10^3$  and  $\text{Nrs} = 2 \cdot 10^4$ . If this leads to overflows in evaluation (if the solution is fast-growing), we retry with small inputs  $\text{Bb} = \text{Brs} = 15$ . We use the model space of piecewise affine combination of base functions presented in Section 8.1. For simplicity (and unlike [70]), we select simple sets of base functions, which can be customised. Experiments are performed twice, first with all multivariate polynomials of small bounded degree (defaults to 2), then adding all products of them with  $\log_2$  in one variable. If overflows are encountered in input generation, we use instead polynomials, small products of exponentials (at most 2 variables, base at most 3), and factorials. By default, memoisation is enabled, lasso parameter is  $\lambda = 10$ , and half of the training set is sampled for feature selection, done in 2 rounds. For each call to the QP solver, 100 KKT steps are performed, and we tolerate less error in feasibility (with `cvxopt` conventions,  $10^{-15}$  tolerance, close to `float` maximal precision) than in optimality ( $10^{-10}$  absolute and  $10^{-9}$  relative tolerance). `Mathematica` verification tasks timeout at `1min`. The default max denominator in the rounding strategy by continued fractions is  $10^5$ .

We perform extra experiments to account for non-affine benchmarks, disabling inductivity constraints and enforcing positivity of the coefficients (which enforces monotonicity of the candidate for our templates). Finally, we use benchmark `noisy3` to show the value of additional training data, improving QP convergence and precision, but also to suggest that implementation of repair strategies (e.g. via ranking functions) could avoid this time-consuming step. With default values, we obtain reasonable but imperfect candidates. We rerun the experiment with more training data ( $\text{Nrs} = 10^6$  and  $\text{Brs} = 300$ ), obtaining the ideal, tightest polynomial bounds for this benchmark, although it takes  $20\times$  more time.

Bench	Prototype	LinReg only	RaML	Cofloco	Mathematica
with_noise	1 Tight in all coeffs., but $O(1)$ . [ $\sim, \sim$ ]	$\times$ In $\frac{1}{2}n^2 + O(n)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$	[ $\sim, O$ ] lb: $0.5n^2 + 0.5n$ ub: $0.5n^2 + 300.5n + c$	[ $\Omega, \Theta$ ] lb: $n$ ub: $2n^2 + O(n)$	None
	2 Tight in all coeffs., but $O(1)$ . [ $\sim, \sim$ ]	$\times$ In $\Theta(n^2)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$	[ $\Theta, \text{None}$ ] lb: $\Theta(n^2)$	[ $\Omega, \Theta$ ] lb: $n$ ub: $302n^2 + O(n)$	None
	3 [ $f_{sol} - \Theta(1), f_{sol} + \Theta(1)$ ] [ $0, 0$ ] ( $n = 0$ ) [ $-c, 99 - c$ ] ( $n > 0$ )	$\times$ ( $\approx cst - \alpha \cdot c$ )	[None, $O$ ] ub: $n$	[ $\times, O$ ] lb: $-n$ ub: $n$	None
	4 Tight in all coeffs., but $O(1)$ . [ $\sim, \sim$ ]	$\times$ In $\frac{1}{2}n^2 + O(n)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$	[None, None]	[None, None]	None
nonmonot	5 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\times$ In $\Theta(1)$	[ $\Theta, \text{None}$ ] lb: 1	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	None
	6 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[None, $\sim$ ] ub: $n$	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\sim/\times$ “ $\exists c, f_{sol}(n) = n + c$ ”
	7 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[None, None]	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	None
	8 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[None, None]	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	None
div_and_conq	9 lb: $\approx \frac{2}{3} \log_2(n)$	$\times$ $\approx \log_2(n)$	[None, $O$ ] ub: $\Theta(n)$	[None, None]	None without help [ $\sim, \sim$ ] with help
	10 [ $\approx, \sim$ ]	$\times$ $\approx 1.2n \log_2(n)$	[None, $O$ ] ub: $\Theta(n^2)$	[None, None]	None without help [ $\sim, \sim$ ] with strong help
	11 lb: $\approx 2n \log_2(n)$ ub: $\approx 1.2n^2$	$\times$ $\approx 20n \log_2(n)$	[ $\Omega, O$ ] lb: $\Theta(n)$ ub: $\Theta(n^2)$	[None, None]	None
superpoly	12 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[ $\Omega, \text{None}$ ] lb: $\Theta(n^d)$ (Poly lb in selected degree)	[None, None]	$\checkmark$
	13 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[ $\Omega, \text{None}$ ] lb: $\Theta(n^d)$ (Poly lb in selected degree)	[None, None]	$\checkmark$
	14 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[ $\Omega, \text{None}$ ] lb: $\Theta(n^d)$ (Poly lb in selected degree)	None $\times$ for $n \geq 2$	$\checkmark$
misc	15 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ] [ $\times, O$ ]	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$
	16 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	lb: $\frac{1}{2}y^2 + \frac{3}{2}y + 1$ ( $\times$ in $x = 0$ ) ub: $\frac{1}{2}y^2 + \frac{3}{2}y + x + 1$ ( $O$ in $y = 0$ )	[ $\times, O$ ] lb: $\Theta(1)$ , $\times$ in $(0, 1)$ ub: $2y^2 + xy + O(y)$	None
	17 [ $\Omega, O$ ] lb: $\Theta(1)$ ub: $\max(x - y + 1, 0)$	$\times$ For $x \geq y \geq 1$ , $\approx 0.015x - 0.025y + O(1)$	[None, None]	[None, $O$ ] ub: $\max(x - y + 1, 0)$	None None without help “x/y” (no int) with help
	18 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	[None, None]	None
	19 Exact for $x = 0 \vee y = 0$ For $x > 0 \wedge y > 0$ , lb: $\approx \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}y$ ub: $\approx 0.99x + 0.99y + O(1)$	$\times$ Exact for $x = 0 \vee y = 0$ For $x > 0 \wedge y > 0$ , $\approx 0.6x + 0.6y + O(1)$	[ $\Omega, \Theta$ ] lb: $y$ ub: $x + y$	[ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	None
	20 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	[None, $\sim$ ] ub: $x + y$	[ $\Omega, \checkmark$ ] lb: $\min(x, y)$ (lb(bc) instead of lb(wc))	None
	21 [ $\checkmark, \checkmark$ ]	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	[ $\Theta, \checkmark$ ] lb: $i$ (lb(bc) instead of lb(wc))	None

Table 1. Experimental evaluation and comparison.

**Legend.** The results of our experimental evaluation and comparison are presented in Table 1. For the sake of simplicity, and for space reasons, output accuracy is reported with only a few symbols defined below. This is non-trivial, and information is necessarily lost in the process, as outputs are often incomparable. Asymptotic order of scales ( $\Theta$ ) are too coarse-grained for the applications we are interested in (e.g. granularity control), and are difficult to define well for multivariate outputs (e.g. `termCOMP` [26] compresses reports on  $\mathbf{x}$  into reports for a single input  $\sum_i |x_i|$ ). At the opposite end of the spectrum, numerical accuracy scores (e.g.  $\ell_2$  error on a sample) are not robust, and do not allow evaluation of qualitative properties (e.g. tightness of a bound). For these reasons, we use the following list of symbols, first defined for single variable functions  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , then extended for multivariate functions, illustrated with an example in the context of evaluating an upper bound on  $f_{sol}(n) = n^2 - 2n - 3$ .

Symbol	Meaning	Example
✓	exact solution	$n^2 - 2n - 3$
✓̃	exact solution, with small numerical errors on coefficients	$1.001n^2 - 1.998n - 2.997$
~	classical asymptotic equivalence $f \sim g \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} f(n)/g(n) = 1$	$n^2$
≈	as above, with small numerical errors, ratio tends to a number very close to 1	$1.0001n^2$
Θ	usual big theta, bounded ratio, not very close to 1	$4n^2$
Ω/O	non-trivial lower/upper bound, but incorrect asymptotic order	$n^3$
None	trivial bound or no output	$+\infty$
×	not a bound (unsound or does not claim to be a bound)	$\frac{1}{2}n^2$

Numerical errors that cause unsoundness are reported with  $\times$ . There are several options to compress multivariate functions. We choose to use the best symbol that holds “in all directions”, i.e.  $f \mathcal{R} g$  whenever  $(f \circ u) \mathcal{R} (g \circ u)$  holds for all sequences  $u : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\|u_n\|$  tends to infinity (i.e. at least one component tends to infinity). For example,  $\max(x, y) \in \Theta(x + y)$ , but  $(x, y) \mapsto x + y - 1$  is only  $O$  for the `merge` benchmark (consider  $u_n = (n, 0)$ , where  $f_{sol} \circ u = \mathbf{0}$ ).

For each tool reporting both lower and upper bounds, we report its result as an interval of symbols. Some additional information is often helpful to interpret the results, and is then included below this interval in each cell.

For further details, we refer the reader to Table 3 in Appendix A to interpret full outputs in the case of our running example, and to our artifact otherwise.

**Evaluation and Discussion.** Overall, the experimental results are quite promising, showing that our approach is accurate, discovers bounds not obtained by other tools, and is reasonably efficient. More specifically, these results are compared in Table 1 with further analysers from different paradigms and one CAS. The features of related tools can be found in [70], which provides additional motivation for the choice of tools presented here. Compared to (`LinReg only`), i.e. [70] with hyperparameters similar to our prototype, we infer bounds in cases where it does not obtain any safe approximation (e.g. categories `with_noise` and

`div_and_conq`). `Mathematica`'s results support our claim that CAS are not appropriate for the problems we tackle. Compared to `RaML`, we obtain better bounds in multiple cases. While `RaML` consistently obtains reasonable bounds for the features it is designed for, and handles some difficult benchmarks (e.g. `nested`), it is hindered by its limitation to global polynomial templates. Furthermore, it does not support integer comparisons, and list encodings are not enough to make it succeed consistently on categories such as `with_noise` and `div_and_conq`. We also obtain overall better results than `Cofloco` on our benchmarks, in part because of the coarse overapproximations it performs (e.g. in `with_noise` or `misc`) and its limited support for non-linear recursion (`div_and_conq`, `superpoly`).

Our prototype is also reasonably efficient. Runtimes depend on the amount of training data, but we can report the time taken for the candidates of Table 1, with experiments run on a small Linux laptop (1.1GHz Intel Celeron N4500 CPU, 4 GB, 2933 MHz DDR4 memory). All of them (both bounds combined, timeouts excluded) can be obtained and checked in 9.047s to 47.475s, around half of which is taken by verification, at the exception of `noisy3` for which ideal tight bounds are only obtained with extra training data requiring 22min, although reasonable candidates are obtained in less than 1min.

However, it must be noted that, unlike `RaML` and `Cofloco`, the optimisation-based approach implemented here is susceptible to numerical errors and sensible to hyperparameter choice, so that it can require extra analyses or domain knowledge for fine-tuning. Because of this, `Cofloco` outperforms our prototype in category `nonmonot`, where it obtains exact solutions in cases where our prototype only infer (accurate) approximations. For example, in the memory leak benchmark, we only find bounds  $[\frac{4589}{4599}, \frac{4609}{4599}]$  for  $s = 0$  instead of  $[1, 1]$ , and in the `open_zip` benchmark, a counter-example caused by numerical errors is found for our candidate upper bound. We may note that approaches mentioned in Section 8.2 and 9, not implemented in this prototype, could alleviate this limitation. A full implementation and evaluation of these techniques is left for future work.

Overall, we can conclude that our approach performs quite well. Most importantly, it demonstrates the existence of bounds that are inductive in the sense of this paper, which cannot be discovered by current methods, as well as the feasibility of finding them, showing the potential of the order-theoretical viewpoint introduced in this paper.

## 11 Related Work

**Exact Recurrence Solvers.** Centuries of work have created a large body of knowledge, with classical results including closed forms of *C-recursive sequences* [66], or more recently for hypergeometric solutions of *P-recursive sequences* [65]. Several algorithms have been implemented in CAS, based on mathematical frameworks such as *Difference Algebra* [37, 45], *Finite Calculus* [29] or *Generating Functions* [22] mixed with template-based methods. However, as explained in the introduction, these techniques have a different focus than ours.

**Cost Analysis via (Generalised) Recurrence Equations.** Since the seminal work of Wegbreit [80], implemented in METRIC, multiple authors have tackled the problem of cost analysis of programs (either logic, functional, or imperative) by automatically setting up and solving recurrence equations. This includes early work such as [44, 68] and the Ciao line of work (c.f. references in introduction), as well as tools such as PUBS [1] and Cofloco [23], which emphasise the shortcomings of using too simple recurrence equations. They introduce the vocabulary of *cost relations* to focus on properties such as non-determinism, inequations, non-monotonic solutions and complex control flow. Additionally, recent work in KoAT also uses recurrence solving [48].

**Recurrence Solving for Invariant Synthesis and Verification.** In other areas of program analysis, important lines of work use recurrences as key ingredients in generation of invariants, with applications such as loop summarisation. This is well illustrated by the work initiated in [42], with a recommended overview available in [4]. This is also key to compositional recurrence analysis [40], which has a stronger focus on abstraction-based techniques (e.g., the *wedge* abstract domain). We can also note that *size* analysis can sometimes be seen as a form of numerical invariant synthesis, as illustrated by [48].

**Other Approaches to Static Cost Analysis.** Automatic static cost analysis of programs is an active field of research, and approaches with different abstractions than recurrence equations have been proposed. We will simply mention here the potential method implemented in RaML [33], which utilises polynomial templates in the binomial basis, and refer the reader to [70] for more references.

**Dynamic Inference of Invariants/Recurrences.** The instantiation of our approach implemented in our prototype generalises [70], by using inductivity constraints to obtain bounds, and is directly related to dynamic invariant analysis [19, 18, 61, 62, 63]. A key difference between these works and ours, beyond different technical solutions and underlying theory, is the setting: we do not sample program traces but instead abstract semantics of recurrence equations that are intermediate abstractions of programs, obtained via size abstractions.

**Fixpoints and/or Order for Equations and Sequences.** To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to use both a fixpoint and an order-theoretical viewpoint to infer bounds on the solutions to recurrence equations on their whole domain, in a way that enables support for a large class of templates. Nevertheless, we would like to mention other work, that we believe is related.

First, while the equations-as-operators viewpoint, for the most general sense of equation, is established in abstract interpretation for handling *semantic equations* [10], it is much less common in more explicit numerical settings, where the goal is to solve concrete recurrence or differential equations. In our context (cost analysis in particular, but more generally for numerical equations considered globally), we believe that our framework is unique.

Concepts introduced in this paper are related to the *flowpipes* developed for differential equations [27, 28]. This work also exploits a fixpoint semantics of equations viewed as operators, but this fixpoint is fundamentally *topological*, rather than *order-theoretical*, using the Picard-Lindelöf/Cauchy-Lipschitz the-

orem instead of Tarski’s – it is difficult to naturally view the Picard operator as monotone in a global sense. Flowpipe-based approaches do recover under and overapproximations, building on the “classical interval Picard-Lindelöf approach” developed by Nedialkov [60], but the inclusion proofs for intervals are non-obvious, and can require restriction of the time horizon, so that only *local* bounds (with respect to time) are obtained, as opposed to the *global* bounds we discuss in this paper.

In a different context, probabilistic program analysis, techniques introduced by Karp [36] have been later understood in light of pre/postfixpoints, which enabled the approach of [79]. However, such an approach is less general than ours, and only obtains bounds (here on probabilities) at explicit values, rather than fully parametric, functional bounds. This order approach appears to not have been further pursued, as recent work on probabilistic recurrence equations [75] reverts to more classical tail-bound concentration techniques (e.g. Markov inequality).

Finally, other work has considered the idea of abstract domains of discrete functions, in particular [21] for (one-dimensional) algebraic-geometric sequences, applied to filter analysis. More generally, several abstract interpretation works explore numerical abstract domains for non-linear invariants [20, 67]. However, they cannot be applied directly in our context, as transfer functions for key operators on functions are not included, and their design can require overcoming serious theoretical difficulties.

## 12 Conclusions and Future Work

We have introduced a novel approach to recurrence solving in the context of cost analysis: equations are viewed as monotone operators, which allows leveraging classical order-theoretical results and techniques, and obtaining safe and tight lower/upper bounds on the solutions to complex recurrences as pre/postfixpoints.

The novel order-theoretical framework we have developed under this viewpoint has not only provided new insights on the properties of recurrences, by unveiling underlying algebraic and geometric structures, but has also laid the groundwork for more accurate and robust methods in cost analysis: the properties and principles we have proved allow us to develop techniques that can be combined for designing new solvers that infer safe overapproximations.

Indeed, as a proof-of-concept, we have implemented a prototype instantiation of the proposed approach that uses constrained optimisation techniques. Our experimental evaluation showed quite promising results: it infers tight non-linear lower/upper bounds for complex recurrences not supported by the state-of-the-art recurrence solvers and cost analysers. It is particularly effective for programs with complex control flow and for equations obtained while incorporating fine-grained cost models, which result in multivariate solutions with non-monotonic properties, complex recursive calls and disjunctive multiphase behaviours. Indeed, these equations present complex features that make them hard to anal-



yse directly, but also do not admit simple closed-form exact solutions, so that template-based methods have to be extended to support inequalities while accommodating complex piecewise and non-linear templates.

Finally, our work opens new avenues for future research. We have presented multiple directions for designing new algorithms to explore spaces of bounds and integrate information available locally to generate candidate bounds, check their correctness, evaluate their accuracy, and improve or repair them.

Additionally, while our proof-of-concept prototype is focused on dynamic invariant generation techniques, using sample inputs conveniently available in discrete settings, we have proposed abstraction-based strategies that do not require such data. Therefore, an exciting direction for future work is to apply our viewpoint on functional equations beyond domains of integers and codomains of reals. This would open exploration of new application areas, e.g. cyberphysical systems, biochemical networks, and probabilistic settings. To fully enter these new territories, we would need to consider support for non-monotonic equations, e.g. by introducing abstract codomains such as intervals, and find ways to handle continuous domains and differential operators, e.g. via non-standard analysis. More concretely, another promising and interesting line for future work is to integrate and implement our algorithms inside existing cost analysis pipelines, while developing new size abstractions, able to interact with fine-grained cost models to generate complex equations, closely modelling cost properties and making the most of our new recurrence solving methods.

**Acknowledgments.** This work has been partially supported by MICINN projects PID2019-108528RB-C21 *ProCode*, TED2021-132464B-I00 *PRODIGY*, and FJC2021-047102-I, and the Tezos foundation.

**Disclosure of Interests.** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

## References

1. Albert, E., Arenas, P., Genaim, S., Puebla, G.: Closed-Form Upper Bounds in Static Cost Analysis. *Journal of Automated Reasoning* **46**(2), 161–203 (2011)
2. Albert, E., Arenas, P., Genaim, S., Puebla, G.: A Practical Comparator of Cost Functions and its Applications. *Science of Computer Programming* **111**, 483–504 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2014.12.001>, special Issue on Foundational and Practical Aspects of Resource Analysis (FOPARA 2009)
3. Albert, E., Correas, J., Gordillo, P., Román-Díez, G., Rubio, A.: GASOL: gas analysis and optimization for ethereum smart contracts. In: *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, TACAS 2020*. LNCS, vol. 12079, pp. 118–125. Springer (2020). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45237-7\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45237-7_7)
4. Amrollahi, D., Bartocci, E., Kenison, G., Kovács, L., Moosbrugger, M., Stankovič, M.: (Un)Solvable Loop Analysis. *arXiv* **2306.01597** (2023)
5. Andersen, M.S., Dahl, J., Vandenberghe, L.: CVXOPT: A Python package for convex optimization, version 1.3.2 (2023), available at <https://cvxopt.org/>

6. Applegate, D.L., Cook, W., Dash, S., Espinoza, D.G.: Exact solutions to linear programming problems. *Operations Research Letters* **35**(6), 693–699 (2007)
7. Bagnara, R., Mesnard, F., Pescetti, A., Zaffanella, E.: The automatic synthesis of linear ranking functions: The complete unabridged version. *Quaderno 498*, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Parma, Italy (2010), available at <http://www.cs.unipr.it/Publications/>
8. Bagnara, R., Pescetti, A., Zaccagnini, A., Zaffanella, E.: PURRS: Towards Computer Algebra Support for Fully Automatic Worst-Case Complexity Analysis. Tech. rep. (2005), [arXiv:cs/0512056](https://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0512056)
9. Bagnara, R., Zaccagnini, A.: Checking and Bounding the Solutions of Some Recurrence Relations. *Quaderno 344*, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Parma, Italy (2004), available at <http://www.cs.unipr.it/Publications/>
10. Bourdoncle, F.: Efficient chaotic iteration strategies with widenings. In: *Formal Methods in Programming and Their Applications*. pp. 128–141 (1993)
11. Cousot, P., Cousot, R.: Systematic Design of Program Analysis Frameworks. In: *Sixth ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. pp. 269–282. San Antonio, Texas (1979)
12. Cousot, P.: *Principles of Abstract Interpretation*. MIT Press (Sep 2021)
13. Davey, B.A., Priestley, H.A.: *Introduction to Lattices and Order*. Cambridge University Press, second edn. (2002)
14. Debray, S.K., Lin, N.W.: Cost Analysis of Logic Programs. *ACM TOPLAS* **15**(5), 826–875 (November 1993). <https://doi.org/10.1145/161468.161472>
15. Debray, S.K., Lin, N.W., Hermenegildo, M.V.: Task Granularity Analysis in Logic Programs. In: *Proc. PLDI’90*. pp. 174–188. ACM (June 1990)
16. Debray, S.K., Lopez-Garcia, P., Hermenegildo, M.V., Lin, N.W.: Lower Bound Cost Estimation for Logic Programs. In: *ILPS’97*. pp. 291–305. MIT Press (1997)
17. Doménech, J.J., Gallagher, J.P., Genaim, S.: Control-flow refinement by partial evaluation, and its application to termination and cost analysis. *TPLP* **19**(5-6), 990–1005 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068419000310>
18. Ernst, M., Cockrell, J., Griswold, W., Notkin, D.: Dynamically discovering likely program invariants to support program evolution. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* **27**(2), 99–123 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1109/32.908957>
19. Ernst, M.D.: *Dynamically Discovering Likely Program Invariants*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Washington, USA (2000), <https://homes.cs.washington.edu/~mernst/pubs/invariants-ernst-phdthesis.pdf>, advisor: Notkin, David
20. Feret, J.: Static Analysis of Digital Filters. In: Schmidt, D. (ed.) *Programming Languages and Systems*. pp. 33–48. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2004)
21. Feret, J.: The Arithmetic-Geometric Progression Abstract Domain. *VMCAI* (2005)
22. Flajolet, P., Sedgewick, R.: *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press (2009), also available from <https://algo.inria.fr/flajolet/Publications/book.pdf>
23. Flores-Montoya, A.: *Cost Analysis of Programs Based on the Refinement of Cost Relations*. Ph.D. thesis, Technische Universität, Darmstadt (August 2017), <http://tuprints.ulb.tu-darmstadt.de/6746/>, advisor: Reiner Hähnle
24. Frohn, F., Giesl, J.: Proving Non-Termination and Lower Runtime Bounds with LoAT (system description). In: *Automated Reasoning*. pp. 712–722. Springer (2022)
25. Giesl, J., Lommen, N., Hark, M., Meyer, F.: Improving Automatic Complexity Analysis of Integer Programs. In: *The Logic of Software. A Tasting Menu of Formal Methods*. LNCS, vol. 13360, pp. 193–228. Springer (2022)
26. Giesl, J., Rubio, A., Sternagel, C., Waldmann, J., Yamada, A.: The Termination and Complexity Competition. In: *TACAS*. pp. 156–166 (2019)

27. Goubault, E., Putot, S.: Forward Inner-Approximated Reachability of Non-Linear Continuous Systems. In: Proceedings of HSCC'17. p. 1–10. ACM (2017)
28. Goubault, E., Putot, S., Sahlmann, L.: Inner and Outer Approximating Flowpipes for Delay Differential Equations. In: Chockler, H., Weissenbacher, G. (eds.) Computer Aided Verification. pp. 523–541. Springer, Cham (2018)
29. Graham, R.L., Knuth, D.E., Patashnik, O.: Concrete Mathematics. Addison-Wesley (1989)
30. Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J.: The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference and Prediction. Springer New York, NY, second edn. (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-84858-7>
31. Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Wainwright, M.: Statistical Learning with Sparsity: The Lasso and Generalizations. Chapman & Hall/CRC (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1201/b18401>
32. Hermenegildo, M., Puebla, G., Bueno, F., Lopez-Garcia, P.: Integrated Program Debugging, Verification, and Optimization Using Abstract Interpretation (and The Ciao System Preprocessor). *Science of Comp. Progr.* **58**(1–2) (2005)
33. Hoffmann, J., Aehlig, K., Hofmann, M.: Multivariate Amortized Resource Analysis. *ACM TOPLAS* **34**(3), 14:1–14:62 (2012)
34. Humenberger, A., Jaroschek, M., Kovács, L.: Automated Generation of Non-Linear Loop Invariants Utilizing Hypergeometric Sequences. p. 221–228. ISSAC '17 (2017)
35. Ishimwe, D., Nguyen, K., Nguyen, T.: Dynaplex: Analyzing Program Complexity using Dynamically Inferred Recurrence Relations. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **5**(OOPSLA), 1–23 (October 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485515>
36. Karp, R.M.: Probabilistic Recurrence Relations. *Journal of the ACM* **41**(6), 1136–1150 (Nov 1994)
37. Karr, M.: Summation in finite terms. *J. ACM* **28**(2), 305–350 (apr 1981). <https://doi.org/10.1145/322248.322255>
38. Kaucher, E.: Interval Analysis in the Extended Interval Space IR, pp. 33–49. Springer Vienna (1980)
39. Kimberling, C.: Best Lower and Upper Approximates to Irrational Numbers. *Elemente der Mathematik* **52**(3), 122–126 (Aug 1997)
40. Kincaid, Z., Cyphert, J., Breck, J., Reps, T.W.: Non-linear reasoning for invariant synthesis. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **2**(POPL), 54:1–54:33 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158142>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158142>
41. Knaster, B.: Un théorème sur les fonctions d'ensembles. *Ann. Soc. Polon. Math.* **6**, 133 – 134 (1928), with A. Tarski
42. Kovács, L.: Automated Invariant Generation by Algebraic Techniques for Imperative Program Verification in Theorema. Ph.D. thesis, RISC, Johannes Kepler University Linz (October 2007), advisors: Tudor Jebelean and Andrei Voronkov
43. Lang, S.: Introduction to Diophantine Approximations, Second Edition. Springer New York (1995)
44. Le Metayer, D.: ACE: An Automatic Complexity Evaluator. *ACM TOPLAS* **10**(2) (1988)
45. Levin, A.: Difference Algebra. Algebra and Applications, Springer, NY (Apr 2008)
46. Liqat, U., Georgiou, K., Kerrison, S., Lopez-Garcia, P., Hermenegildo, M.V., Gallagher, J.P., Eder, K.: Inferring Parametric Energy Consumption Functions at Different Software Levels: ISA vs. LLVM IR. In: Proc. of FOPARA. LNCS, vol. 9964, pp. 81–100. Springer (2016). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46559-3\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46559-3_5)
47. Liqat, U., Kerrison, S., Serrano, A., Georgiou, K., Lopez-Garcia, P., Grech, N., Hermenegildo, M.V., Eder, K.: Energy Consumption Analysis of Programs based

- on XMOS ISA-level Models. In: Proceedings of LOPSTR'13. LNCS, vol. 8901, pp. 72–90. Springer (2014). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14125-1\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14125-1_5)
48. Lommen, N., Giesl, J.: Targeting completeness: Using closed forms for size bounds of integer programs. In: Frontiers of Combining Systems (FroCos). pp. 3–22. Springer (2023)
  49. Lopez-Garcia, P., Darmawan, L., Bueno, F., Hermenegildo, M.V.: Interval-Based Resource Usage Verification: Formalization and Prototype. In: Proc. of FOPARA, LNCS, vol. 7177, pp. 54–71. Springer-Verlag (2012)
  50. Lopez-Garcia, P., Darmawan, L., Klemen, M., Liqat, U., Bueno, F., Hermenegildo, M.V.: Interval-based Resource Usage Verification by Translation into Horn Clauses and an Application to Energy Consumption. TPLP **18**(2), 167–223 (March 2018)
  51. Lopez-Garcia, P., Klemen, M., Liqat, U., Hermenegildo, M.V.: A General Framework for Static Profiling of Parametric Resource Usage. TPLP (ICLP'16 Special Issue) **16**(5-6), 849–865 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068416000442>
  52. Lv, M., N.Guan, Reineke, J., Wilhelm, R., Yi, W.: A survey on static cache analysis for real-time systems. LITES **3**(1), 05:1–05:48 (2016)
  53. Wolfram Mathematica (v13.2): the World's Definitive System for Modern Technical Computing. <https://www.wolfram.com/mathematica> (2023), accessed: May 25, 2023
  54. Matijasevič, J.V.: Enumerable sets are diophantine **191**, 279–282 (1970), english translation in *Soviet Mathematics—Doklady*, 11 (1970), 354–357
  55. Méndez-Lojo, M., Navas, J., Hermenegildo, M.: A Flexible (C)LP-Based Approach to the Analysis of Object-Oriented Programs. In: LOPSTR. LNCS, vol. 4915, pp. 154–168. Springer-Verlag (August 2007). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78769-3\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78769-3_11)
  56. Milanese, M., Miné, A.: Generation of Violation Witnesses by Under-Approximating Abstract Interpretation. In: Dimitrova, R., Lahav, O., Wolff, S. (eds.) VMCAI. pp. 50–73. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham (2024)
  57. Monniaux, D.: On using floating-point computations to help an exact linear arithmetic decision procedure. In: Computer-aided verification (CAV). pp. 570–583. No. 5643 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer Verlag (2009)
  58. Navas, J., Méndez-Lojo, M., Hermenegildo, M.V.: User-Definable Resource Usage Bounds Analysis for Java Bytecode. In: BYTECODE'09. ENTCS, vol. 253, pp. 6–86. Elsevier (March 2009)
  59. Navas, J., Mera, E., Lopez-Garcia, P., Hermenegildo, M.: User-Definable Resource Bounds Analysis for Logic Programs. In: Proc. of ICLP'07. LNCS, vol. 4670, pp. 348–363. Springer (2007). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74610-2\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74610-2_24)
  60. Nediakov, N., Jackson, K., Corliss, G.: Validated Solutions of Initial Value Problems for Ordinary Differential Equations. Applied Mathematics and Computation **105**(1), 21–68 (1999)
  61. Nguyen, T., Kapur, D., Weimer, W., Forrest, S.: Using Dynamic Analysis to Discover Polynomial and Array Invariants. In: ICSE (2012)
  62. Nguyen, T., Kapur, D., Weimer, W., Forrest, S.: Using Dynamic Analysis to Generate Disjunctive Invariants. In: ICSE (2014)
  63. Nguyen, T., Nguyen, K., Dwyer, M.B.: Using Symbolic States to Infer Numerical Invariants. IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering **48**(10), 3877–3899 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2021.3106964>
  64. Perez-Carrasco, V., Klemen, M., Lopez-Garcia, P., Morales, J., Hermenegildo, M.V.: Cost Analysis of Smart Contracts via Parametric Resource Analysis. In: Static Analysis Symposium (SAS'20). LNCS, vol. 12389, pp. 7–31. Springer (2020). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65474-0\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65474-0_2)

65. Petkovšek, M.: Hypergeometric solutions of linear recurrences with polynomial coefficients. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **14**(2), 243–264 (1992)
66. Petkovšek, M., Zakrajšek, H.: Solving linear recurrence equations with polynomial coefficients. In: *Computer Algebra in Quantum Field Theory: Integration, Summation and Special Functions*, pp. 259–284. Springer (2013), preprint at <https://users.fmf.uni-lj.si/petkovsek/PetZakPreprint.pdf>
67. Rodríguez-Carbonell, E., Kapur, D.: Automatic generation of polynomial invariants of bounded degree using abstract interpretation. *Science of Computer Programming* **64**(1), 54–75 (2007), special issue on the 11th Static Analysis Symposium - SAS 2004
68. Rosendahl, M.: Automatic Complexity Analysis. In: *4th ACM Conference on Functional Programming Languages and Computer Architecture (FPCA'89)*. pp. 144–156. ACM Press (1989). <https://doi.org/10.1145/99370.99381>
69. Rustenholz, L.: Automated Approximate Recurrence Solving applied to Static Analysis of Energy Consumption. Tech. rep., CLIP Lab, IMDEA Software Institute (August 2022), <https://cliplab.org/papers/rustenholz-aars-msc.pdf>, master internship report. Supervised by M.V. Hermenegildo, P. Lopez-Garcia, and J. F. Morales.
70. Rustenholz, L., Klemen, M., Ángel Carreira-Perpiñán, M., López-García, P.: A Machine Learning-based Approach for Solving Recurrence Relations and its use in Cost Analysis of Logic Programs (2024), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.06972>, under consideration for publication in TPLP.
71. Serrano, A., Lopez-Garcia, P., Hermenegildo, M.V.: Resource Usage Analysis of Logic Programs via Abstract Interpretation Using Sized Types. *TPLP, ICLP'14 Special Issue* **14**(4-5), 739–754 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S147106841400057X>
72. Sinn, M., Zuleger, F., Veith, H.: Complexity and resource bound analysis of imperative programs using difference constraints. *J. Autom. Reason.* **59**(1), 3–45 (2017)
73. Smyth, M.B., Plotkin, G.D.: The category-theoretic solution of recursive domain equations. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **11**(4), 761–783 (Nov 1982)
74. Sra, S., Nowozin, S., Wright, S.J. (eds.): *Optimization for Machine Learning*. The MIT Press (September 2011)
75. Sun, Y., Fu, H., Chatterjee, K., Goharshady, A.K.: Automated Tail Bound Analysis for Probabilistic Recurrence Relations. In: Enea, C., Lal, A. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification*. pp. 16–39. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham (2023)
76. Tarski, A.: A lattice-theoretical fixpoint theorem and its applications. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **5**(2), 285 – 309 (1955)
77. Urban, C.: *Static Analysis by Abstract Interpretation of Functional Temporal Properties of Programs*. Ph.D. thesis, École Normale Supérieure, Paris, France (2015), advisors: Radhia Cousot and Antoine Miné
78. Wang, C., Lin, F.: Solving Conditional Linear Recurrences for Program Verification: The Periodic Case. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **7**(OOPSLA1), 28–55 (2023)
79. Wang, J., Sun, Y., Fu, H., Chatterjee, K., Goharshady, A.K.: Quantitative Analysis of Assertion Violations in Probabilistic Programs. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. p. 1171–1186. PLDI 2021, ACM (2021)
80. Wegbreit, B.: Mechanical Program Analysis. *Communications of the ACM* **18**(9), 528–539 (September 1975). <https://doi.org/10.1145/361002.361016>
81. Westrick, S., Fluet, M., Rainey, M., Acar, U.A.: Automatic parallelism management. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **8**(POPL), 1118–1149 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3632880>

## A Tables of Experimental Data

Table 2: Benchmarks

Bench		Equation	Solution
with_noise	runn_ex 1	$f(n, c) = \begin{cases} f(n-1, 0) + n + 300 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ f(n-1, c+1) + n & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n + 299 + 199 \lfloor \frac{n-1}{101} \rfloor & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n + c + 199 \lfloor \frac{n+c}{101} \rfloor & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$
	noisy2 2	$f(n, c) = \begin{cases} f(n-1, 0) + n + 300n & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ f(n-1, c+1) + n & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	Hard to express exactly, but for $c \geq 100$ , and $n \rightarrow \infty$ , $= \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{300}{101} \frac{n(n+101)}{2} + O(1)$
	ffree 3	$f(n, c) = \begin{cases} f(n-1, 0) - c & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 99 \\ f(n-1, c+1) + 1 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 99 \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} (n-1)\%100 - c & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 99 \\ (n+c)\%100 - c & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 99 \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$
	noisy3 4	$f(n, c_1, c_2) = \begin{cases} f(n-1, 0, 0) + n + 300 + 20 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c_1 \geq 100 \wedge c_2 \geq 77 \\ f(n-1, 0, c_2+1) + n + 300 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c_1 \geq 100 \wedge c_2 < 77 \\ f(n-1, c_1+1, 0) + n + 20 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c_1 < 100 \wedge c_2 \geq 77 \\ f(n-1, c_1+1, c_2+1) + n & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c_1 < 100 \wedge c_2 < 77 \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	Long to express exactly, but for $c_1 \geq 100$ , $c_2 \geq 77$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$ , $= \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (\frac{300}{101} + \frac{20}{78})n + O(1)$
nonmonot	incr1 5	$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + f(x+1) & \text{if } x < 10 \\ 1 & \text{if } x \geq 10 \end{cases}$	$\max(1, 11 - x)$
	noisy1 6	$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \vee x = 20 \\ 1 + f(x-1) & \text{if } x \neq 0 \wedge x \neq 20 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} x & \text{if } x < 20 \\ x - 20 & \text{if } x \geq 20 \end{cases}$
	memory 7	$f(i, n, s) = \begin{cases} n + f(0, n, 1) & \text{if } s = 0 \\ 1 + f(i+1, n, s) & \text{if } s > 0 \wedge i \leq n \\ -2n & \text{if } s > 0 \wedge i > n \end{cases}$	Encodes simple loop with memory leak. Sol: $\begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = 0 \\ -i - n + 1 & \text{if } s > 0 \wedge i \leq n \\ -2n & \text{if } s > 0 \wedge i > n \end{cases}$
	mphase 8	$f(i, n, r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \geq n \\ 1 + f(0, n, r-1) & \text{if } i < n \wedge r > 0 \\ 1 + f(i+1, n, r) & \text{if } i < n \wedge r = 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \geq n \\ n + r & \text{if } i < n \wedge r > 0 \\ n - i & \text{if } i < n \wedge r = 0 \end{cases}$
div_and_conq	b_search 9	$f(n) = \begin{cases} f(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) + 1 & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ 1 + \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor & \text{if } n > 0 \end{cases}$
	qsort1 10	$f(n) = \begin{cases} f(\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor) + f(\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor) + n & \text{if } n > 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } n \leq 1 \end{cases}$	Hard to express exactly, but $\sim n \log_2(n)$
	divcon_m 11	$f(n) = \begin{cases} 2f(\lfloor \frac{n}{3} \rfloor) + 5f(\lfloor \frac{n}{6} \rfloor) + n & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	Hard to express exactly, but $n^{1.2764\dots}$
superpoly	exp1 12	$f(n) = \begin{cases} 2f(n-1) & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 3 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$3 \times 2^n$
	exp2 13	$f(n) = \begin{cases} 2f(n-1) + 1 & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 3 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$4 \times 2^n - 1$
	fact 14	$f(n) = \begin{cases} nf(n-1) & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$n!$

Table 2: Benchmarks (continued)

	Bench	Equation	Solution
misc	basic1	15 $f(n) = \begin{cases} f(n-1) + 1 & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$n$
	sum-osc	16 $f(x, y) = \begin{cases} f(x-1, y) + 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \wedge y > 0 \\ f(x+1, y-1) + y & \text{if } x = 0 \wedge y > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } y = 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}y^2 + \frac{3}{2}y + x & \text{if } y > 0 \end{cases}$
	div	17 $f(x, y) = \begin{cases} f(x-y, y) + 1 & \text{if } x \geq y \wedge y > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x < y \wedge y > 0 \end{cases}$	$\lfloor \frac{x}{y} \rfloor$
	nested	18 $f(n) = \begin{cases} f(f(n-1)) + 1 & \text{if } n > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$n$
	open-zip	19 $f(x, y) = \begin{cases} f(x-1, y-1) + 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \wedge y > 0 \\ f(x, y-1) + 1 & \text{if } x = 0 \wedge y > 0 \\ f(x-1, y) + 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \wedge y = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \wedge y = 0 \end{cases}$	$\max(x, y)$
	merge	20 $f(x, y) = \begin{cases} \max(f(x-1, y), f(x, y-1)) + 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \wedge y > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \vee y = 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} x + y - 1 & \text{if } x > 0 \wedge y > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \vee y = 0 \end{cases}$
loopus_t	21 $f(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ 1 + \max(f(i-1, j+1), 1 + f(i-1, j+2)) & \text{if } i > 0 \end{cases}$	Inlined single-function encoding of tarjan benchmark from [72, 70] $2i$ (worst-case)	

Prototype	RaML	Cofloco
Upper bound: $\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{701}{202}n + \frac{30000}{101} & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{701}{202}n + \frac{300}{101}c & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$ Lower bound: $\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{701}{202}n + 100 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{701}{202}n + \frac{300}{101}c - \frac{19900}{101} & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	Upper bound: $\frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{601}{2}n + c$  Lower bound: $\frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{1}{2}n$	Upper bound: $\begin{cases} 2n^2 + 300n + 100 & \text{if } n \geq 1 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$  Lower bound: $\begin{cases} n & \text{if } n \geq 1 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$
LinReg only	SymbReg only [70]	Mathematica
$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{17747}{5166}n + \frac{1874420}{8911} & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{12169}{3503}n + \frac{7429}{2576}c - \frac{112277}{1182} & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 0.49929*n**2 + 3.4857*n + 222.34 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c \geq 100 \\ 0.49960*n**2 + 3.6287*n + 2*c - 66.422 & \text{if } n > 0 \wedge c < 100 \\ c & \text{if } n = 0 \end{cases}$	None

**Table 3.** Full results obtained by each tool for the running example. Results for the symbolic regression presented in [70] is included for completeness: it does not manage to discover the exact solution either, even if floor and division nodes are allowed.

## B Domains of $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds

In this appendix, we introduce an abstract domain framework, which proposes to obtain abstractions, i.e. safe approximations, of general functions in  $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by “simple” functions from a selected set  $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  that we call *boundary functions*. This concept can be motivated from at least three points of view.

1. Simplification of analysis output, to report it to the user in an interpretable format. This is explored in technical report [9] as part of the PURRS project [8], but has not been pursued to the best of the authors’ knowledge.
2. Simplification of analysis output, to be usable by further analyses. In our context, this is particularly relevant to decide inequality of functions, e.g. to reduce functions to classes supported by CAS. This would provide a unified framework to works such as [2, 50].
3. Finally, this can be considered more literally, and used directly to abstract lattices of (templates of) candidates to improve the search of pre/postfix-points, e.g. by abstract iteration as mentioned in Section 8.2.

To achieve these goals, we may try to use elements of  $\mathfrak{B}$  to *under and over-approximate* general functions, in an intuition similar to *flowpipes* used for differential equations [27, 28]. Intuitively, we would thus obtain abstract elements in  $(\mathfrak{B} \times \mathfrak{B}, \geq \times \leq) \simeq \mathfrak{B}^{op} \times \mathfrak{B}$ , which would abstract abstract “intervals whose endpoints are function” (which appear concretely in cost analysis as described Section 4), with “concretisation”

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{B} \times \mathfrak{B} &\rightarrow (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R})) \\ (f_{lb}^\#, f_{ub}^\#) &\mapsto (\mathbf{n} \mapsto [f_{lb}^\#(\mathbf{n}), f_{ub}^\#(\mathbf{n})]). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$


Unfortunately, in general, this cannot be turned into a Galois connection, and  $\mathfrak{B}^{op} \times \mathfrak{B}$  is not a complete lattice. This simply comes from the fact that, in general, for  $b_1, b_2 \in \mathfrak{B}$ , there is no best approximation in  $\mathfrak{B}$  of  $\max(b_1, b_2)$  and  $\min(b_1, b_2)$ , as illustrated in Fig. 7 for  $\mathfrak{B}$  the set of affine functions in  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . We *do* however recover a Galois connection if we apply a power lifting and instead consider abstractions by *sets* of (conjunctions of)  $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds: the concretisation  $\gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}$  below admits a left adjoint  $\alpha_{\mathfrak{B}}$ , which extracts the set of *all*  $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds of a function.

**Proposition 24 ( $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds abstraction).** *The following is a Galois connection. Abstract elements can be interpreted as conjunctions of  $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds.*

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R}), \dot{\subseteq}_{\mathcal{I}}) &\xleftrightarrow[\alpha_{\mathfrak{B}}]{\gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}} (\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B}), \supseteq) \times (\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B}), \supseteq) \\ \left( \mathbf{n} \mapsto \left[ \max_{f_{lb}^\# \in F_{lb}^\#} f_{lb}^\#(\mathbf{n}), \min_{f_{ub}^\# \in F_{ub}^\#} f_{ub}^\#(\mathbf{n}) \right] \right) &\longleftarrow (F_{lb}^\#, F_{ub}^\#) \\ (f_{lb}, f_{ub}) &\longmapsto \left( \left\{ f_{lb}^\# \in \mathfrak{B} \mid \forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}, f_{lb}^\#(\mathbf{n}) \leq f_{lb}(\mathbf{n}) \right\}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left\{ f_{ub}^\# \in \mathfrak{B} \mid \forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{D}, f_{ub}^\#(\mathbf{n}) \geq f_{ub}(\mathbf{n}) \right\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

With the concretisation above in mind, we call  $(\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B}), \supseteq) \times (\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B}), \supseteq)$  the *domain of  $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds*. We talk about the *domain of  $\mathfrak{B}$ -lbs* and *domain of  $\mathfrak{B}$ -ubs*






**Fig. 7.** (Left)  $\min(n, 1)$  has no best affine upper bound, but is fully represented by a conjunction of two bounds. (Right)  $\max(n, 1)$  cannot be represented exactly as a conjunction of affine upper bounds.

when extracting the first or second component of the tuple respectively. In a way, the discussion above shows that the *ideal* solution to the problem of finding the best  $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds is to simply consider *all*  $\mathfrak{B}$ -bounds, or more efficiently an antichain generating them. In other words, while we cannot optimally abstract an interval whose endpoints are general functions by intervals whose endpoints are in  $\mathfrak{B}$ , it can be done for intervals whose endpoints are *piecewise* in  $\mathfrak{B}$ , or more precisely maxima and minima of elements in  $\mathfrak{B}$ .

Indeed, it is sufficient to focus our attention on elements in the image of the closure  $\gamma_{\mathfrak{B}} \circ \alpha_{\mathfrak{B}}$ . All of these elements are upsets and downsets, and can in many cases be represented by their extremal elements. In favourable cases, extremal elements are even in finite number, which allows to finitely represent elements of this abstract domain.

*Remark 8.* Upsets and downs are sets closed by taking upper and lower bounds respectively. We write  $\uparrow : S \mapsto \cup_{s \in S} \{f \in \mathfrak{B} \mid s \leq f\}$  the ( $\mathcal{P}$ -)upper closure operator, and similarly for  $\downarrow$ . For an upset  $\uparrow U \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B})$  (or symmetrically for downsets), we say that  $U$  is a set of *extremal* constraints when it minimal among all  $U'$  such that  $\uparrow U = \uparrow U'$ , which is the case if and only if  $U$  is an antichain. Extremal constraints are represented in dark blue in Fig. 7. The Galois connection of Proposition 24 may equivalently be rephrased as a connection between  $(\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}(\mathbb{R}), \sqsubseteq_{\mathcal{I}})$  and  $(\mathcal{P}_{\downarrow}(\mathfrak{B}), \supseteq) \times (\mathcal{P}_{\uparrow}(\mathfrak{B}), \supseteq)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_{\downarrow}(\mathfrak{B})$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{\uparrow}(\mathfrak{B})$  respectively refer to the sets of downsets and upsets.

With this finite representation in mind, we can conveniently compute *sound* (but non-optimal) transfer functions for operators on functions, by focusing computing the transfer  $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\uparrow}(\mathfrak{B})$  for each extremal element, and passing to the union. We can introduce normalisation operations to keep small the number of generators in a representation of each upsets. To make this practical, we can force representations to stay bounded, by discarding some generators if necessary (this is a sound overapproximation, similar to heuristics used for operating on sets of polyhedra in [56]). Choosing to work with only one bound at a time then appears as the coarsest instance of this (non-optimal) abstraction, using singletons (i.e. principal upsets  $\uparrow \{f\}$ ).



**Fig. 8.** (Left) An illustration of the precision loss when representing a polyhedron with online (affine) upper bounds. (Right) Schematic representation of the factorisation of this abstraction ( $\rightsquigarrow$ ) through that ( $\vec{\alpha}$ ) of Proposition 25.

A very simple instantiation of these ideas is to work with  $\mathfrak{B}$  being a set of affine bounds. In this case, the domain is subsumed by polyhedra, and is an abstraction of it, as illustrated in Fig. 8. However, the approach can be extended beyond affine relationship, e.g. to piecewise polynomials or arithmetico-geometric relationships. This leads to interesting questions for computing joins, meets, and transfer functions in this context (connecting, among others, with [77]). We note that, in our intuition and experience, these computations appear easier to perform for such domains of (functional) bounds than for classical (relational) numerical domains. We interpret this observation as the consequence of a generic Galois connection between such domains. We illustrate this connection in the example of polyhedra and affine upper bounds, whose abstraction factorises through the following, which may be viewed as an abstraction from *arbitrary* relations to only relations defined by (functional) upper bounds.

**Proposition 25 (Relational to functional constraint abstractions – ub).** *Let  $X$  be any set,  $(Y, \leq)$  be a lattice, and  $X \rightarrow Y$  be equipped with the pointwise order. The following is a Galois connection.*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\mathcal{P}(X \times Y), \subseteq) &\xleftrightarrow[\vec{\alpha}]{\vec{\gamma}} (\mathcal{P}_{\uparrow}(X \rightarrow Y), \supseteq) \\
 S &\mapsto \left\{ f \mid \forall x \in X, f(x) \geq \sup_{(x,y) \in S} y \right\} \\
 \left\{ (x, y) \mid \forall y \in A, y \leq f(x) \right\} &\longleftarrow A
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can mention that, to realise the first two points discussed at the the beginning of this section, we can consider computing explicitly sound abstractions  $(\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\uparrow}(\mathfrak{B})$  themselves, rather than simply transfer functions, at least for input functions given in a selected expression syntax. This is well studied problems for particular  $\mathfrak{B}$  (i.e. linearisation of expressions, best abstractions by polynomials, etc.), but is more difficulty to handle uniformly in general.

We could consider to *compute such abstraction by rewriting*, using rewriting rules of the form used in [2, 50] or more generally in CAS. We can note that more precise rewriting rules can be designed if we allow them to require hypotheses to be triggered, e.g. (anti)monotonicity of a subexpression. For this, an interesting direction could be to design simple abstract domains operating on numerical expressions, e.g. to infer (piecewise) (anti)monotonicity.