

# *A Transformational Approach to Resource Analysis with Typed-norms Inference\**

Elvira Albert, Samir Genaim

Dep. Sistemas Informáticos y Computación, Universidad Complutense de Madrid  
C/ Prof. José García Santesmases 9, 28040 Madrid, Spain  
(*e-mail*: [elvira@fdi.ucm.es](mailto:elvira@fdi.ucm.es), [samir.genaim@fdi.ucm.es](mailto:samir.genaim@fdi.ucm.es))

Raúl Gutiérrez

Dep. Sistemes Informàtics i Computació, Universitat Politècnica de València  
Camino de Vera S/N, 46022 València, Spain  
(*e-mail*: [rgutierrez@dsic.upv.es](mailto:rgutierrez@dsic.upv.es))

Enrique Martin-Martin

Dep. Sistemas Informáticos y Computación, Universidad Complutense de Madrid  
C/ Prof. José García Santesmases 9, 28040 Madrid, Spain  
(*e-mail*: [emartinm@ucm.es](mailto:emartinm@ucm.es))

*submitted 1 January 2003; revised 1 January 2003; accepted 1 January 2003*

---

## Abstract

In order to automatically infer the resource consumption of programs, analyzers track how *data sizes* change along program's execution. Typically, analyzers measure the sizes of data by applying *norms* which are mappings from data to natural numbers that represent the sizes of the corresponding data. When norms are defined by taking type information into account, they are named *typed-norms*. This article presents a transformational approach to resource analysis with typed-norms that are inferred by a data-flow analysis. The analysis is based on a transformation of the program into an *intermediate abstract program* in which each variable is abstracted with respect to all considered norms which are valid for its type. We also present the data-flow analysis to automatically infer the required, useful, typed-norms from programs. Our analysis is formalized on a simple rule-based representation to which programs written in different programming paradigms (e.g., functional, logic, imperative) can be automatically translated. Experimental results on standard benchmarks used by other type-based analyzers show that our approach is both efficient and accurate in practice.

*Under consideration in Theory and Practice of Logic Programming (TPLP).*

**KEYWORDS:** resource analysis, typed-norms, data-flow analysis, program transformation

---

\* This work was funded partially by the Spanish MICINN/FEDER, UE projects RTI2018-094403-B-C31 and RTI2018-094403-B-C32, MINECO projects TIN2015-69175-C4-2-R and TIN2015-69175-C4-1-R, by the CM project S2018/TCS-4314, the GV project PROMETEO/2019/098, and the UPV project SP20180225. Raúl Gutiérrez was also supported by INCIBE program “Ayudas para la excelencia de los equipos de investigación avanzada en ciberseguridad”.

## 1 Introduction

Automated resource analysis (Wegbreit 1975) needs to infer how the sizes of data are modified along program’s execution. Size is measured using so-called norms (Bossi et al. 1991) which define how the size of a term is computed. Examples of norms are *list-length* which counts the number of elements of a list, *tree-depth* which counts the depth of a tree, *term-size* which counts the number of constructors, etc. Basically, in order to infer the resource consumption of executing a loop that traverses a data-structure, the analyzer tries to infer how the size of such data-structure decreases at each iteration w.r.t. the chosen norm. Given a tree  $t$ , using a term-size norm, we infer that a loop like “while ( $t \neq \text{leaf}$ )  $t = t.\text{right}$ ,” performs at most  $\text{nodes}(t)$  iterations, where function  $\text{nodes}$  returns the number of nodes in the tree. This is because size analysis infers that at each iteration the instruction  $t = t.\text{right}$  decreases  $\text{nodes}(t)$ . However, by using the tree-depth norm, we will infer that  $\text{depth}(t)$  is an upper bound on the number of iterations. The latter is obviously more precise than the former bound as  $\text{depth}(t) \leq \text{nodes}(t)$ .

The last two decades have witnessed a wealth of research on using norms in termination analysis, especially in the context of logic programming (Bossi et al. 1991; Bruynooghe et al. 2007; Genaim et al. 2002). Early work pointed out that the choice of norm affects the precision such that the analyzer may only succeed to prove termination if a certain norm is used, while it cannot prove it with others. Later on, there has been further investigation on applying multiple norms, i.e., using two or more norms by applying them simultaneously (Bossi et al. 1991). This means that the same data in the original program is replaced by two or more abstract data each one specifying its size information w.r.t. the corresponding norm. Even a further step has been taken on using *typed-norms* which allow defining norms based on type information (namely on recursive types) (Bruynooghe et al. 2007). Inferring norms from type information makes sense as recursive types represent recursive data-structures and thus, in termination analysis, they identify some potential sources of infinite recursion and, in resource analysis, they might influence the number of iterations that the loops perform. Besides, typed-norms allow that the same term can be measured differently depending on its type. As pointed out in (Genaim et al. 2002), this is particularly useful when the same function symbol may occur in different type contexts.

In the context of resource analysis, we found early work that already pointed out that the combination of norms affects the precision of lower-bound time analysis (King et al. 1997). Sized-types provide a way to consider more than one norm for each type. They have been used in the context of functional (Pedro Vasconcelos 2008; Vasconcelos and Hammond 2003) and recently in logic programming (Serrano et al. 2013; Serrano et al. 2014). In the former case, they are inferred by a type analysis and in the latter via abstract interpretation. In contrast, we propose a transformational approach which provides a simple and accurate way to use multiple typed-norms in resource analysis as follows: (1) we first transform the program into an *intermediate abstract program* in which each variable is abstracted with respect to all considered norms valid for its type, (2) such intermediate program is then transformed into upper and lower resource bounds automatically. As regards the first phase, we formalize the transformation assuming that the input programs are given in a simple rule-based representation. The rule-based representation contains program rules, pattern matching and assignment using a compact syntax. Programs written in first-

order functional or imperative programming languages can be represented by means of this representation in a straightforward way (since this representation can model control-flow graphs with procedure calls). Logic programs can be represented as well by replacing matching (and assignment) by unification, without any further change in our analysis. As regards the second phase, note that we are interested in relying on existing techniques and using them as a black-box without modifying them. This is important since they receive abstract programs that come from different sources, and we do not want to make any change that is particular to our transformation that might break the functionality of other parts. Thus, formalizing our framework focuses only on the first step.

While allowing multiple norms might lead to more accurate bounds than adopting one norm, the efficiency of the analysis can be degraded considerably. This is because the process of finding resource bounds from abstractions that have more arguments (due to the use of multiple norms) is more costly. Thus, an essential aspect for the practical applicability of our method is to obtain the smallest sets for the relevant typed-norms, i.e., eliminate those abstractions that will not lead to further precision. For this purpose, we present a new algorithm for the inference of typed-norms which, by inspecting the program, can detect which norms are useful to later infer the resource consumption, and discard norms that are useless for this purpose. Our inference is formalized as a data-flow analysis which is applied as a pre-process, such that once the relevant norms are inferred, the transformation into the abstract program is carried out w.r.t. the inferred norms.

### **1.1 Summary of Contributions**

The main contributions of this article can be summarized as follows:

1. We introduce a transformation from the rule-based representation to an abstract representation in which each variable is abstracted with respect to all considered norms valid for its type, and prove soundness of the process.
2. We present to the best of our knowledge the first algorithm for the inference of typed-norms that are relevant to infer the resource consumption, and prove soundness of the type inference step.
3. We extend our approach to handle polymorphic types and context-sensitive norms.
4. We perform an experimental evaluation and compare the results with those obtained using other systems (Hoffmann et al. 2012; Serrano et al. 2014).

This article is an extended and revised version of a conference paper that was published in the proceedings of LOPSTR 2013 (Albert et al. 2014). The main extensions w.r.t. the conference paper affect all points above. As regards (1), we now provide a semantics for the rule-based representation and for the abstract representation and prove soundness of the transformation process, while (Albert et al. 2014) did not have soundness results. (2) The formalization of the algorithm for the inference of typed-norms and its soundness are new contributions of this article. In (Albert et al. 2014) the inference algorithm was informally presented without any theoretical result, but in this extended revised version we present a completely formalized data-flow algorithm for inferring typed-norms, prove its termination and also prove that the detected typed-norms cover those that may affect the program executions, i.e., the inference algorithm is correct. (3) Also, in (Albert et al. 2014), we had considered only monomorphic types. (4) The experiments

of (Albert et al. 2014) have also been improved to deal with the same benchmarks as in related work (Hoffmann et al. 2012; Serrano et al. 2014) and a comparison with these systems has been included. We also have analyzed an industrial case study to show the performance of our approach when handling larger programs.

### 1.2 Organization of the Article

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the syntax and the semantics of the rule-based representation. Section 3 presents our transformational approach to resource analysis with typed-norms. We start by reviewing the concept of typed-norm in Section 3.1. It is then extended to symbolic typed-norm and used to define the program abstraction in Section 3.2. Soundness of the transformation is proven in Section 3.3. Section 4 presents a typed-norms inference algorithm that is essential for the scalability of our approach. It infers the smallest sets for the typed-norms that are relevant for the inference of upper bounds. Section 4.1 formalizes the inference process and Section 4.2 proves its soundness. In Section 5.1 we describe the extension of our approach to handle polymorphic types. Section 6 contains our experimental evaluation, Section 7 compares our approach to related work, and Section 8 concludes. Finally, Appendix A contains the proofs of the theoretical results.

## 2 A Rule-based Language

To simplify the presentation, we formalize our approach on a compact program syntax called *rule-based representation* (RBR) that contains program rules, pattern matching, and assignment. It already incorporates *static single assignment* (Cytron et al. 1991) (each variable is assigned exactly once). *Recursion* is the only iterative mechanism and *rule guards* are the only conditional constructions in the RBR. Although simple, the RBR syntax can represent programs from different programming languages by means of an intermediate translation. For example, the RBR can be obtained from Java programs (Albert et al. 2012), from the functional part of *Abstract Behavioral Specification* (Johnsen et al. 2012) (ABS) programs (Albert et al. 2015), and from the imperative part of ABS (Albert et al. 2015). This RBR can handle core-Prolog programs as well simply by interpreting the pattern matching as unification. Interestingly this does not require any further change in our size abstraction since our abstract programs are actually constraint logic programs. However, we note that analyzing abstract programs that originate from logic programs for cost should be done by an analyzer that takes failure into account (Serrano et al. 2014).

### 2.1 Syntax of the rule-based language

In order to present typed-norms and its impact on termination and resource analyses in a clear way, for now we will consider only *monomorphic types*, although in Section 5.1 we will present the extension to *polymorphic types*.

*Definition 1 (Monomorphic types)*

A *monomorphic type*  $T$  can be a built-in data type as `Int` or an algebraic data type  $D$  defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} Dd & ::= \text{data } D = \text{Alt } [\overline{\text{Alt}}] \\ \text{Alt} & ::= \text{Co}[\overline{T}] \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{Co}$  represents a data constructor and the notation  $\overline{X}$  represents an *optional* sequence of elements  $X$ . For simplicity, we assume that recursive types are in *direct recursive form*, otherwise, we could consider mutually recursive types to be the same type.

*Example 1 (List of integer numbers)*

Using the syntax presented in Def. 1 we can define the data type of integer lists (`IntList`) as follows:

$$\text{data IntList} = \text{Nil} \mid \text{Cons}(\text{Int}, \text{IntList})$$

In this case, the type of the nullary data constructor `Nil` is `IntList`, and the type of the binary data constructor `Cons` is `Int × IntList → IntList`.

We define programs in *rule-based representation* (RBR programs in the sequel) as a set of data declarations followed by typed procedures:

*Definition 2 (RBR syntax)*

$$\begin{aligned} P & ::= [\overline{Dd}] \overline{Proc} \\ Proc & ::= p :: T_1 \times \cdots \times T_k \bar{r} \\ r & ::= p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leftarrow g, b_1, \dots, b_n \\ b & ::= x := t \mid p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \\ g & ::= \text{true} \mid g \wedge g \mid e > e \mid e = e \mid e \geq e \mid \text{match}(x, p) \mid \text{nonmatch}(x, p) \\ p & ::= \text{Co}(\bar{x}) \\ t & ::= e \mid \text{Co}(\bar{t}) \\ e & ::= x \mid n \mid e + e \mid e - e \end{aligned}$$

RBR programs  $P$  are formed by an optional set of data declarations ( $Dd$ ) followed by a set of typed procedures ( $Proc$ ). A *typed procedure* begins with a type declaration  $p :: T_1 \times \cdots \times T_n \times T_{n+1} \times \cdots \times T_{n+m}$  stating the types  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  of its  $n$  input arguments  $\bar{x}$  ( $n \geq 0$ ) and the types  $T_{n+1}, \dots, T_{n+m}$  of its  $m$  output arguments  $\bar{y}$  ( $m \geq 0$ ). After the type declarations there is a set of *guarded rules* ( $r$ ), where  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  is the *head* of the rule, the guard  $g$  specifies the conditions for the rule to be applicable and  $b_1, \dots, b_n$  are the statements in the rule's *body*. For clarity, we sometimes enclose input and output arguments with angles “ $\langle \rangle$ ” and “ $\langle \rangle$ ”, i.e.,  $p :: \langle T_1 \times \cdots \times T_n \rangle \times \langle T_{n+1} \times \cdots \times T_{n+m} \rangle$  and  $p(\langle \bar{x} \rangle, \langle \bar{y} \rangle)$ . If a program  $P$  has  $n$  rules, we say that  $|P| = n$  and  $P^i$  represents the  $i$ -th rule of  $P$ . Guards  $\text{match}(x, p)$  and  $\text{nonmatch}(x, p)$ , where  $x \notin \text{vars}(p)$  and  $x$  and  $p$  are of the same type, check if the value stored in variable  $x$  matches with pattern  $p$ . Patterns ( $p$ ) are data constructors  $\text{Co}$  applied to variables. Terms ( $t$ ) can be expressions (variables, integer numbers or arithmetic operations over expressions) or data constructors  $\text{Co}$  applied to properly typed terms (e.g.,  $\text{Cons}(6, y)$ , where  $6$  has type `Int` and  $y$  has type `IntList`). Terms not containing variables are called *closed terms* (a.k.a. *ground terms*). We assume that RBR programs are well-typed, i.e., every term and subterm in the program (including variables) have a type assigned that is coherent with procedure type declarations and data constructor types, considering a standard monomorphic type system (Pierce 2002).

```

1 data IntList = Nil | Cons(Int, IntList)
2
3 fact :: ⟨Int⟩ × ⟨Int⟩
① 4 fact(⟨n⟩, ⟨prod'⟩) ← true,
5   prod := 1,
6   while_0(⟨n, prod⟩, ⟨prod'⟩)
7
8 while_0 :: ⟨Int × Int⟩ × ⟨Int⟩
② 9 while_0(⟨n, prod⟩, ⟨prod'⟩) ← 0 >= n
10  prod' := prod
③ 11 while_0(⟨n, prod⟩, ⟨prod'⟩) ← 0 < n,
12  prod1 := prod * n,
13  n1 := n - 1,
14  while_0(⟨n1, prod1⟩, ⟨prod'⟩)
15
16 factSum :: ⟨IntList⟩ × ⟨Int⟩
④ 17 factSum(⟨l⟩, ⟨sum'⟩) ← true,
18   sum := 0,
19   while_1(⟨l, sum⟩, ⟨sum'⟩)
20
21 while_1 :: ⟨IntList × Int⟩ × ⟨Int⟩
⑤ 22 while_1(⟨l, sum⟩, ⟨sum'⟩) ←
23   match(l, Nil),
24   sum' := sum
⑥ 25 while_1(⟨l, sum⟩, ⟨sum'⟩) ←
26   match(l, Cons(e,l1)),
27   fact(⟨e⟩, ⟨prod'⟩),
28   sum1 := sum + prod,
29   while_1(⟨l1, sum1⟩, ⟨sum'⟩)
30
31 main :: ⟨⟩ × ⟨Int⟩
⑦ 32 main(⟨⟩ × ⟨r'⟩) ← true,
33   l := Cons(2, Nil),
34   factSum(⟨l⟩, ⟨r'⟩)

```

Fig. 1. RBR program.

$$\begin{array}{l}
(1) \quad \frac{b \equiv x := t \quad eval_t(t, lw) = v}{\langle p, b \cdot bs, lw \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow \langle p, bs, lw[x \mapsto v] \rangle \cdot C} \\
(2) \quad \frac{\begin{array}{l} b \equiv m(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad m(\bar{x}', \bar{y}') \leftarrow g, b_1 \cdots b_k \in P \text{ fresh} \\ lw_1 \equiv \overline{[x' \mapsto lw(x)]} \quad eval_g(g, lw_1) = lw_2 \end{array}}{\langle p, b \cdot bs, lw \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow \langle m, b_1 \cdots b_k, lw_1 \uplus lw_2 \rangle \cdot \overline{\langle p[y' \sim y], bs, lw \rangle} \cdot C} \\
(3) \quad \frac{}{\langle m, \epsilon, lw_1 \rangle \cdot \overline{\langle p[y' \sim y] \rangle}, bs, lw \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow \langle p, bs, lw[y \mapsto lw_1(y')] \rangle \cdot C}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 2. Operational semantics of rule-based programs

*Example 2 (RBR program)*

Figure 1 contains the RBR of a program with three principal procedures: `fact` computes the factorial of an integer number, `factSum` traverses a list of integer numbers and adds the factorial value for each element, and `main` is the entry point of the program that invokes `factSum` with the unitary list `Cons(2, Nil)`. Both `fact` and `factSum` have only one rule each, which establishes the value of the accumulator and invokes `while_n`. Each loop is a procedure with two rules: one for finishing the loop and other for computing one iteration. For example, the first rule of `while_0` has the guard  $0 \geq n$  (Line 9) to check that the loop has finished, therefore returning the input accumulator as output value. On the other hand, the second rule of `while_0` (lines 11–14) contains the guard  $0 < n$  that checks that the loop has not finished yet. In that case, updated values of `prod` and `n` are stored in `prod1` and `n1` (recall the use of *static single assignment*) and those values are used in the recursive call. Finally, `main` is a procedure with one rule that simply invokes `factSum`.

## 2.2 Semantics of the rule-based language

The rule-based language is evaluated using an operational semantics based on *variable mappings* and *configurations*, which are defined as:

*Definition 3 (Variable mappings)*

A *variable mapping*  $lv \in \mathcal{LV}$  is a mapping  $[\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{v}]$  that associates values  $\bar{v}$  (namely integer numbers or ground constructed terms) to variables  $\bar{x}$ . We use the symbol  $\epsilon$  for empty mappings and  $lv_1 \uplus lv_2$  for the union of variable mappings with disjoint domain. The notation  $lv[\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{v}]$  represents the extension of  $lv$  with the new mappings  $[\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{v}]$  (this operation redefines the previous mappings for variables  $\bar{x}$  if they appear in the domain of  $lv$ ). The application  $lv(x)$  returns the value  $v$  associated to variable  $x$ , and  $lv(t)$  returns the term resulting of replacing every variable in  $t$  by its value in  $lv$  (similarly for patterns  $p$ ).

*Example 3 (Variable mappings)*

Consider two variable mappings  $lv_1 \equiv [x \mapsto 3, y \mapsto \text{Nil}]$  and  $lv_2 \equiv [z \mapsto \text{Cons}(3, \text{Nil})]$ . Since  $lv_1$  and  $lv_2$  have disjoint domains its union  $lv_1 \uplus lv_2$  is defined, with result  $[x \mapsto 3, y \mapsto \text{Nil}, z \mapsto \text{Cons}(3, \text{Nil})]$ . On the other hand,  $lv_1[x \mapsto \text{Nil}, z \mapsto 0] = [y \mapsto \text{Nil}, x \mapsto \text{Nil}, z \mapsto 0]$  because the mapping  $x \mapsto 3$  has been redefined in the extension of  $lv_1$ .

*Definition 4 (Configurations)*

A *configuration* (or *call stack*), denoted as  $C$ , is a sequence of *activation records*. An activation record is a triple of the form  $\langle p, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle$  where  $p$  is a procedure name,<sup>1</sup>  $b$  is the next statement to execute,  $bs$  is the sequence of statements after  $b$ , and  $lv$  is the variable mapping that stores the values of the procedure parameters and local variables. Elements in sequences are separated by dots, where the last element of the sequence can represent the rest of the sequence (for example  $b_1 \cdot b_2 \cdot bs$  or  $\langle p, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C$ ), and we overload the symbol  $\epsilon$  to denote empty sequences.

Figure 2 shows the rules of the operational semantics ( $\rightsquigarrow$ ) that evaluates RBR programs. We consider a function  $eval_t(t, lv)$  that evaluates a term  $t$  under a variable mapping  $lv$ , returning a value  $v$ , and a function  $eval_g(g, lv)$  that checks if a guard  $g$  is satisfied under a variable mapping  $lv$ , returning a new (possibly empty) mapping that performs pattern matching.<sup>2</sup> Figure 2 contains 3 rules. Rule (1) evaluates activation records where the next statement is an assignment. In that case the value obtained from the right-hand side is introduced in the variable mapping of the activation record. Rule (2) evaluates an activation record where the next statement is a procedure call  $m(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ . The first step is to obtain a *fresh* version of a rule of  $m$  with all its variables renamed to avoid any collision. Then a variable mapping  $lv_1$  is created for parameter passing and this mapping is used to evaluate the rule guard  $g$ . If the guard is evaluated to *true*, a new activation record with the rule body and the variable mapping<sup>3</sup>  $lv_1 \uplus lv_2$  (where  $lv_2$  is generated

<sup>1</sup> While procedure names are not really needed in the operational semantics, they increase clarity and simplify the proofs in Appendix A.

<sup>2</sup> The straightforward definition of these functions can be found in Appendix A.

<sup>3</sup> *Static single assignment* guarantees that  $x$  does not appears in  $lv_1$ , so we could use mapping union instead of extension.

during the evaluation of the guard) is inserted in front of the configuration. Note that the activation record of the caller stores the relation  $\overline{y' \sim y}$  between the output values of the rule and the output parameters of the call. Finally, rule (3) handles empty activation records, which are removed after the output values of the callee are stored in the variable mapping of the caller.

When needed, we decorate steps with two values  $\rightsquigarrow^{a \cdot b}$ : the semantic rule  $a$  applied—(1), (2) or (3)—and the program rule number  $b$  used, considering the whole program. If the step is not a procedure call i.e., it uses semantic rules (1) or (3), the program rule number is set to  $\epsilon$ . Examples of these decorations can be seen in the next example:

*Example 4 (Evaluation of an RBR program)*

The evaluation of the main procedure in Figure 1 proceeds as shown below. For simplicity, when obtaining fresh names for variables—rule (2) in Figure 2—we simply use subscripts  $(n)$  with the same number as the current configuration  $C_n$ , we have underlined the statement that controls each step, and we write  $\rightsquigarrow^*$  for several  $\rightsquigarrow$ -steps. Note that the program rule of `factSum` is the 4<sup>th</sup> rule in the program, and the second rule of `while_1` is the 6<sup>th</sup> rule in the program.

$$\begin{aligned}
C_0 &\equiv \langle \text{main}, \underline{l_0 := \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})} \cdot \text{factSum}(\langle l_0, \langle r'_0 \rangle \rangle), \epsilon \rangle \rightsquigarrow^{(1) \cdot \epsilon} \\
C_1 &\equiv \langle \text{main}, \underline{\text{factSum}(\langle l_0, \langle r'_0 \rangle \rangle)}, [l_0 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})] \rangle \rightsquigarrow^{(2) \cdot 4} \\
C_2 &\equiv \langle \text{factSum}, \underline{\text{sum}_2 := 0} \cdot \text{while}_1(\langle l_2, \text{sum}_2 \rangle, \langle \text{sum}'_2 \rangle), [l_2 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})] \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad \langle \text{main}[\text{sum}'_2 \sim r'_0], \epsilon, [l_0 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})] \rangle \rightsquigarrow^{(1) \cdot \epsilon} \\
C_3 &\equiv \langle \text{factSum}, \underline{\text{while}_1(\langle l_2, \text{sum}_2 \rangle, \langle \text{sum}'_2 \rangle)}, [l_2 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil}), \text{sum}_2 \mapsto 0] \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad \langle \text{main}[\text{sum}'_2 \sim r'_0], \epsilon, [l_0 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})] \rangle \rightsquigarrow^{(2) \cdot 6} \\
C_4 &\equiv \langle \text{while}_1, \underline{\text{fact}(\langle e_4 \rangle, \langle \text{prod}_4 \rangle)} \cdot \dots \cdot \text{while}_1(\langle l_{14}, \text{sum}_4 \rangle, \langle \text{sum}'_4 \rangle), [l_4 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil}), \\
&\quad \text{sum}_4 \mapsto 0, e_4 \mapsto 2, l_{14} \mapsto \text{Nil}] \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad \langle \text{factSum}[\text{sum}'_4 \sim \text{sum}'_2], \epsilon, [l_2 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil}), \text{sum}_2 \mapsto 0] \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad \langle \text{main}[\text{sum}'_2 \sim r'_0], \epsilon, [l_0 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})] \rangle \rightsquigarrow^* \\
C_5 &\equiv \langle \text{while}_1, \underline{\epsilon}, [l_4 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil}), \text{sum}_4 \mapsto 0, e_4 \mapsto 2, l_{14} \mapsto \text{Nil}, \text{sum}'_4 \mapsto 2] \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad \langle \text{factSum}[\text{sum}'_4 \sim \text{sum}'_2], \epsilon, [l_2 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil}), \text{sum}_2 \mapsto 0] \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad \langle \text{main}[\text{sum}'_2 \sim r'_0], \epsilon, [l_0 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})] \rangle \rightsquigarrow^{(3) \cdot \epsilon} \\
C_6 &\equiv \langle \text{factSum}, \underline{\epsilon}, [l_2 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil}), \text{sum}_2 \mapsto 0, \text{sum}'_2 \mapsto 2] \rangle \cdot \\
&\quad \langle \text{main}[\text{sum}'_2 \sim r'_0], \epsilon, [l_0 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil})] \rangle \rightsquigarrow^{(3) \cdot \epsilon} \\
C_7 &\equiv \langle \text{main}, \epsilon, [l_0 \mapsto \text{Cons}(2, \text{Nil}), r'_0 \mapsto 2] \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

*Definition 5 (Traces and sequences of steps)*

A trace  $\mathcal{T} = C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} C_n$  is a sequence of  $\rightsquigarrow$ -steps from an initial configuration  $C_0$ . Given a trace  $\mathcal{T}$ , its *steps* are defined as  $\text{steps}(\mathcal{T}) = \langle r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n \rangle$ , i.e., the sequence of step decorations of the  $\rightsquigarrow$ -steps in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Finally, the set of *trace steps* combines the steps of all the possible traces starting from a given configuration. Formally,  $\text{Tr}(C_0) = \{ \text{steps}(C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} C_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \}$ . These notions will play an important role when defining the soundness of the abstraction (Section 3.3) and the soundness of the typed-norms inference in Section 4.2.

Let us informally discuss how the operational semantics is typically instrumented to account for cost of traces. We first assume that our language includes a special instruction `tick( $n$ )`, where  $n$  is a number, which is used to simulate a consumption of  $n$  resources.



Note that  $n$  can be negative to simulate release of resources as well. In practice, we also allow the use any arithmetic expression instead of  $n$ , but for simplicity we assume it is a constant. Next, we instrument activation records with a *global* resource consumption counter called `cost`, and add a corresponding semantic rule for `tick( $n$ )` that simply sets `cost` to `cost -  $n$` . A trace  $\mathcal{T}$  is said to be valid if `cost` never takes negative values, i.e., `cost` is initialized with an amount of resources that is enough to carry out this particular execution. The cost of a trace is the minimal initial value for `cost` that makes it valid. Finally, a function  $f$  that maps initial configurations to nonnegative values is called an upper bound on the worst-case cost if, for any initial configuration  $C_\theta$ , setting the initial value of `cost` to  $f(C_\theta)$  guarantees generating valid traces only. It is called a lower bound on the best-case cost if, for any initial configuration  $C_\theta$ , setting the initial value of `cost` to a value smaller than  $f(C_\theta)$  generates an invalid trace.

### 3 Size Abstraction Using Typed-Norms

The resource analysis framework we rely on (Albert et al. 2007; Albert et al. 2015) performs two phases: (1) the program is transformed into an abstract representation where data are replaced by their sizes, and (2) such intermediate program is then analyzed to obtain upper/lower bounds on the resource consumption. In this section we will present how to abstract the size of program data using typed-norms and we will show that this abstraction is sound wrt. the original semantics of RBR programs. The second phase, performed by cost relation solvers like PUBS (Albert et al. 2013), CoFloCo (Flores-Montoya and Hähnle 2014; Flores-Montoya 2016) or the solver in CiaoPP (Serrano et al. 2014), is independent of the technique applied to abstract data sizes and therefore will not be covered in this paper.

#### 3.1 Preliminaries on Typed-Norms

In order to obtain the abstract representation of a program, we first replace data with numbers representing their sizes and then transform each instruction to linear constraints that reflect how these sizes change. The mapping from data structures to sizes is done by means of size functions (usually called *norms*). The most well-known norm used in the literature is *term-size* (Bossi et al. 1991; Bruynooghe et al. 2007), which counts the number of constructors in a given data structure:

*Definition 6 (Term-size norm)*

The size of a term  $t$  using the term-size norm is defined as:  $\|Co(t_1, \dots, t_n)\|_{ts} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_{ts}$ .

Notice that term-size is defined for terms containing only data constructors and cannot handle integer numbers.

*Example 5 (Term-size norm)*

Consider the following program that uses binary trees (BT), list of binary trees (BTL), and lists of lists of binary trees (BTLL).

```

1 data BT = E | B(BT, BT)           10 n' := 1 + nt
2 data BTL = N | C(BT, BTL)         11
3 data BTLL = NL | CL(BTL,BTLL)     12 sumtrees :: ⟨BTLL⟩ × ⟨Int⟩
4                                     13 sumtrees(⟨l⟩, ⟨n'⟩) ← match(l, NL),
5 trees :: ⟨BTL⟩ × ⟨Int⟩            14 n' := 0
6 trees(⟨l⟩, ⟨n'⟩) ← match(l, N),   15 sumtrees(⟨l⟩, ⟨n'⟩) ← match(l, CL(h,t)),
7 n' := 0                            16 trees(⟨h⟩, ⟨nh⟩),
8 trees(⟨l⟩, ⟨n'⟩) ← match(l, C(h,t), 17 sumtrees(⟨t⟩, ⟨nt⟩),
9 trees(⟨t⟩, ⟨nt⟩),                 18 n' := nh + nt

```

The `trees` function counts the number of binary trees in a list of type `BTL`, and `sumtrees` counts the number of binary trees in all the lists inside a list of type `BTLL`. Using the term-size norm, an empty list `N` or `NL` has size 1 (one data constructor), whereas the list `C(E,C(E,N))` has size 5 (three list constructors plus two empty binary tree constructors). The function `sumtrees` traverses every element of the list for computing its number of trees. Using the term-size norm, a static analysis obtains a complexity of  $O(n^2)$  for the function `sumtrees`, where  $n$  is the total size of the original list (i.e., the number of list, list of lists, and binary tree constructors). The size of each inner `BTL` list is bounded by  $n$ , so each call to `trees` will contribute  $O(n)$  to the overall complexity. This is an example where term-size is not very precise, as it does not keep separate the information about the length of the `BTLL` list ( $l$ ), the length of the inner `BTL` lists ( $s$ ), and the size of the binary trees ( $b$ ) to obtain a more accurate complexity of  $O(l \times s)$ . Note that the size of the binary trees does not play any role in the actual complexity of `sumtrees` because the binary trees are not traversed.

In order to overcome the mentioned imprecision we use typed-norms, which distinguish data constructors according to their types. Using this kind of norms we can measure the length of a list and the size of its elements separately, similarly to what has been done in the context of termination analysis of logic programs (Bruynooghe et al. 2007). Before introducing typed-norms, we present some notation about types that will be used throughout the paper:

*Definition 7*

Given two types  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , we say that  $T_2$  depends on  $T_1$ , written  $T_1 \preceq T_2$ , if the definition of type  $T_2$  uses (either directly or transitively) type  $T_1$ . Relying on this notion, we define the *set of constituent types of  $T$*  as  $Constituents(T) = \{T' \mid T' \preceq T\} \cup \{T\}$ , i.e., all the types involved in the definition of  $T$  including  $T$  itself. If  $T \preceq T$  we say that  $T$  is a *recursive type*. We use  $type_i(t)$  to refer to the type of a term  $t$  in the  $i$ -th rule of the program, or simply  $type(t)$  if the rule is clear from the context (note that the same variable can have different types in different rules). As the program is well-typed then every term  $t$  has a monomorphic type assigned, so  $type_i(t)$  simply returns that type.

By definition of `IntList`—Line 1) in Figure 1—we have that `Int`  $\preceq$  `IntList` and `IntList`  $\preceq$  `IntList`, therefore `IntList` is a recursive type and  $Constituents(\text{IntList}) = \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}$ .

*Definition 8 (Typed-norms for closed terms)*

We consider two typed-norms for computing the size of a closed term  $t$  regarding a type  $T$ :  $\|t\|_T^+$  and  $\|t\|_T$ . We will not contemplate integer values for the first norm but non-negative integer numbers (denoted as  $\mathbf{Int}^+$ ) as we explain later.

$$\|t\|_T^+ = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } T = \mathbf{Int}^+ \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) = \mathbf{Int}^+ \\ 0 & \text{if } T \neq \mathbf{Int}^+ \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) = \mathbf{Int}^+ \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_T^+ & \text{if } t = \mathit{Co}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) = T \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_T^+ & \text{if } t = \mathit{Co}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) \neq T \end{cases}$$

$$\|t\|_T = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } T = \mathbf{Int} \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) = \mathbf{Int} \\ 0 & \text{if } T \neq \mathbf{Int} \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) = \mathbf{Int} \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_T & \text{if } t = \mathit{Co}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) = T \\ \max_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_T & \text{if } t = \mathit{Co}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } \mathit{type}(t) \neq T \end{cases}$$

Note that, in the last case of the definition of  $\|t\|_T$ , the  $\max$  of an empty set is  $-\infty$  if  $T$  is  $\mathbf{Int}$ , and 0 otherwise. In principle, this depends on the domain of the elements whose  $\max$  we are taking. The intuition behind these typed-norms is to count the number of data constructors of type  $T$  that appear in term  $t$ . For integer numbers they simply return their value, whereas for constructed terms they check whether the term has type  $T$  or not in order to count the constructor in the head. The difference is how to handle those nested subterms of type  $T$  that occur in a bigger term of type different from  $T$ :  $\|t\|_T^+$  sums the sizes of those subterms, whereas  $\|t\|_T$  just keeps the size of the maximal subterm. The reason to constrain  $\|t\|_T^+$  to  $\mathbf{Int}^+$  instead of  $\mathbf{Int}$  is that adding the integers inside a data structure provides a size that is not sound when negative values are involved. For example,  $\|\mathbf{Cons}(3, \mathbf{Cons}(-3, \mathbf{Nil}))\|_{\mathbf{Int}}^+$  would be 0. On the other hand,  $\|\mathbf{Cons}(3, \mathbf{Cons}(-3, \mathbf{Nil}))\|_{\mathbf{Int}} = 3$ , so we know that any integer inside the list is smaller than or equal to 3. We claim that  $\|t\|_T$  suits better in the static analysis framework we consider, as we explain in Example 6.

In our rule-based language we only consider the basic type of integer numbers, so the rest of values are constructed using data constructors  $\mathit{Co}$ . However, typed-norms could be easily extended to support more basic types by providing a suitable case in the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_T^+$  and  $\|\cdot\|_T$ . For example, if  $\mathbf{String}$  were a basic type, we could define the size of strings as their length:  $\|\cdot\|_T^+ = \mathit{length}(t)$  if  $T = \mathbf{String}$  and  $\mathit{type}(t) = \mathbf{String}$  (similarly for  $\|\cdot\|_T$ ).

*Example 6 (Typed-norms for closed terms)*

Consider the program involving lists of binary trees shown in Example 5. The program does not contain integer values but only constructed data, so in this case both typed-norms  $\|\cdot\|_T$  and  $\|\cdot\|_T^+$  are sound. Regarding the list types  $\mathbf{BTL}$  and  $\mathbf{BTLL}$ , both typed-norms obtain the same values:  $\|\mathbf{N}\|_{\mathbf{BTL}}^+ = \|\mathbf{N}\|_{\mathbf{BTL}} = 1$  and  $\|\mathbf{NL}\|_{\mathbf{BTLL}}^+ = \|\mathbf{NL}\|_{\mathbf{BTLL}} = 1$  because they contain exactly one list constructor. They also coincide in the list of type  $\mathbf{BTLL}$  with two elements  $t \equiv \mathbf{CL}(\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{N})), \mathbf{CL}(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{NL}))$  regarding the type  $\mathbf{BTLL}$ — $\|t\|_{\mathbf{BTLL}}^+ = \|t\|_{\mathbf{BTLL}} = 3$ —as both count the number of list constructors: two constructors  $\mathbf{CL}$  and one  $\mathbf{NL}$ . However, the two norms differ wrt. type  $\mathbf{BTL}$ :  $\|t\|_{\mathbf{BTL}}^+ = 4$  because it is the sum of all the  $\mathbf{BTL}$  constructors in the list, 3 in the first element and one in the second element, but  $\|t\|_{\mathbf{BTL}} = 3$  as it is the maximum number of  $\mathbf{BTL}$  constructors that appear

in some element of the list. This difference has an impact on the concrete upper bounds obtained by static analysis. For example, the function `sumtrees` defined in Example 5 has an asymptotic complexity of  $O(l \times s)$  in both cases, where  $l$  is the size of the list of lists BTLL and  $s$  is the size of its inner lists BTL. The size of any list  $l$  is the same using both typed-norms ( $\|l\|_{\text{BTLL}}^+ = \|l\|_{\text{BTLL}}$ ), however, the size of its elements of type BTL will differ ( $\|l\|_{\text{BTL}}^+ \geq \|l\|_{\text{BTL}}$ ). Since the static analysis framework we are considering is compositional and assumes worst-case scenarios for each iteration, the upper bound obtained using  $\|\cdot\|_T$  will in general be tighter.

As a final comment, note that we could also define a typed-norm analogous to  $\|\cdot\|_T$  that estimates the minimum value, by replacing “max” with “min”. This would be useful in situations where the upper bounds depend on the minimum value that an inner element of type  $T$  can take, for example in recursive definitions where the value increments in every invocation. Similarly, if we replace the sum in the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_T$  by “max”, then we estimate the depth of terms instead of the number of their constructs. This is useful in cases like the example in Section 1. Note that all these norms can be used at the same time, so the size of some elements could be measured using minimum, maximum, depth, etc., if these values are relevant for the cost.

### 3.2 Our Transformational Approach

Next we describe how to use typed-norms to translate RBR programs to abstract programs that only contain procedure calls and constraints between sizes. From this information the resource analysis framework can produce cost relations (Albert et al. 2011) to obtain the desired bounds. The main feature of our approach is that we allow the use of several abstractions for the same variable at the same time, as in (Bruynooghe et al. 2007). Thus, we can estimate the size of a term using different measures, and even relations between sizes of different measures which might be crucial for precision as claimed in (Bruynooghe et al. 2007).

This is important since two different parts of the program might traverse two different parts of the same data structure, so having both measures allows us to provide tighter bounds. Since rules will usually contain variables, we need *symbolic* versions of typed-norms. These versions extend the typed-norms presented in Definition 8 with new cases for handling variables. In the following definition we only show the symbolic typed-norm  $\|\cdot\|_T$ , but it is analogous for  $\|\cdot\|_T^+$ . Notice that we use the same notation to represent typed-norms for closed terms and their symbolic counterparts because the version used is clear from the context.

*Definition 9 (Symbolic typed-norms)*

The symbolic typed-norm to compute the size of a term  $t$  (possibly with variables) regarding a type  $T$  is defined as:

$$\|t\|_T = \begin{cases} X_T & \text{if } t \equiv x \text{ and } T \in \text{Constituents}(\text{type}(x)) \\ -\infty & \text{if } t \equiv x, T = \text{Int} \text{ and } \text{Int} \notin \text{Constituents}(\text{type}(x)) \\ n & \text{if } t \equiv n \text{ and } T = \text{Int} \\ \|e_1\|_T \pm \|e_2\|_T & \text{if } t \equiv e_1 \pm e_2 \text{ and } T = \text{Int} \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_T & \text{if } t = \text{Co}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } \text{type}(t) = T \\ \max_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_T & \text{if } t = \text{Co}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } \text{type}(t) \neq T \\ 0 & \text{in other case} \end{cases}$$

Note that, as in the closed case, the max of an empty set is  $-\infty$  if  $T = \text{Int}$ , and 0 otherwise. When a variable  $x$  is abstracted using a type  $T \in \text{Constituents}(\text{type}(x))$ , it generates a variable  $X_T$ . On the other hand, abstracting variables not related to  $\text{Int}$  using the type  $T = \text{Int}$  generates the size  $-\infty$ . This special case is useful to obtain precise sizes in terms containing integer numbers and variables like pairs  $(\text{Int}, \text{Seq})$ . For example, we get  $\|\text{Pair}(-5, x)\|_{\text{Int}} = \max(\|-5\|_{\text{Int}}, \|x\|_{\text{Int}}) = \max(-5, -\infty) = -5$  because  $\text{Int} \notin \text{Constituents}(\text{type}(x)) = \{\text{Seq}\}$ , which is more precise than a size of 0 obtained if  $\|x\|_{\text{Int}} = 0$ . Integer numbers are abstracted to themselves if  $T$  is  $\text{Int}$ , and in integer expressions with  $T = \text{Int}$  both subexpressions are abstracted recursively. The cases for data constructors are similar to Definition 8. Finally, if the type  $T \neq \text{Int}$  is not valid wrt. the type of  $t$ , i.e.,  $t$  cannot include any subterm of type  $T$ , then the symbolic typed-norm simply returns 0. Notice that the symbolic version is equivalent to the typed-norm defined in Definition 8 for closed terms.

As an example, consider the term  $3 + x$  where both 3 and  $x$  have type  $\text{Int}$ . The abstractions wrt.  $\text{Int}$  and  $\text{IntList}$  are  $\|3 + x\|_{\text{Int}} = 3 + X_{\text{Int}}$  and  $\|3 + x\|_{\text{IntList}} = 0$ . If we consider a more complex term like  $t \equiv \text{Cons}(z, \text{Cons}(5, \text{Nil}))$  we have that  $\|t\|_{\text{Int}} = \max(Z_{\text{Int}}, \max(5, 0))$  and  $\|t\|_{\text{IntList}} = 1 + 1 + 1 = 3$ .

In some cases it is inevitable to measure the size of a variable  $x$  wrt. all its dependent types— $\text{Constituents}(\text{type}(x))$ —to bound the resource consumption of a program. However, often many types do not play any role for termination or resource consumption and therefore can be safely ignored. In order to consider only those important types we use the notion of *relevant types*. For every variable  $x$  and rule  $i$  in the program, we write  $\text{rtypes}_i(x)$  to refer to the set of types wrt. which we want to measure the size of that variable. In Section 4 we explain how to automatically infer these types. If the rule is clear from the context, we usually omit the subscript. Note that the set  $\text{rtypes}(x)$  must be a subset of all dependent types of a variable  $x$  in a program rule, i.e.,  $\text{rtypes}_i(x) \subseteq \text{Constituents}(\text{type}_i(x))$ .

Using the above symbolic typed-norms and the notion of relevant type-norms we can define our transformation of RBR programs. Figure 3 contains the definition of the function  $\cdot^\alpha$  that abstracts guards, statements, rules, and procedures into procedure calls and conjunctions of arithmetic constraints between sizes<sup>4</sup>. In all these cases we assume

<sup>4</sup> Relations ( $=, >, \geq$ ) between linear expressions containing integer variables representing sizes.

Guard ( $g$ )	Guard abstraction ( $g^\alpha$ )
<code>true</code>	$\top$
$g_1 \wedge g_2$	$g_1^\alpha \wedge g_2^\alpha$
$e_1 \text{ op } e_2$	$(e_1 \text{ op } e_2)[\overline{y \mapsto Y_{\text{Int}}}]$ , where $\text{op} \in \{>, =, \geq\}$ and $\{\overline{y}\} = \text{vars}(e_1 \text{ op } e_2)$
$\text{match}(x, p)$	$\bigwedge \{X_T = \ p\ _T \mid T \in \text{rtypes}(x)\}$
$\text{nonmatch}(x, p)$	$\top$
Statement ( $b$ )	Statement abstraction ( $b^\alpha$ )
$p(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$	$p(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$
$x := t$	$\bigwedge \{X_T = \ t\ _T \mid T \in \text{rtypes}(x)\}$
Rule ( $r$ )	Rule abstraction ( $r^\alpha$ )
$p(\overline{x}, \overline{y}) \leftarrow g, b_1, \dots, b_n$	$p(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) \leftarrow g^\alpha \wedge \text{non\_neg}(S), b_1^\alpha, \dots, b_n^\alpha$ where $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \text{vars}(b_i) \cup \text{vars}(g) \cup \{\overline{y}\} \cup \{\overline{x}\}$
Procedure ( $Proc$ )	Procedure abstraction ( $Proc^\alpha$ )
$p :: T_1 \times \dots \times T_k \ r_1 \dots r_m$	$r_1^\alpha \dots r_m^\alpha$

Fig. 3. Size abstraction for guards, statements, rules, and procedures

that given a type  $T \in \text{rtypes}(x)$  the variable  $X_T$  is an integer valued variable representing the size of (the value of)  $x$  w.r.t. the typed-norm  $\|\cdot\|_T$ . If  $T \neq \text{Int}$ , then we implicitly assume  $X_T \geq 0$ , as constructed terms cannot have negative size. For a sequence of variables  $\overline{x}$ , we consider  $\overline{X}$  is a sequence that results from replacing each variable  $x_i$  by  $X_{T_1}^i, \dots, X_{T_n}^i$ , where  $\text{rtypes}(x_i) = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ .

As shown in Figure 3, the trivial guard **true** is transformed into the truth value  $\top$ , the identity element of conjunction. Conjunction of guards ( $g_1 \wedge g_2$ ) is abstracted into the conjunction of their size abstractions. Arithmetic guards are abstracted by replacing their variables  $y$  with  $Y_{\text{Int}}$ . For example, the expression 5 is directly abstracted as 5, whereas  $x + y + 8$  is abstracted as  $X_{\text{Int}} + Y_{\text{Int}} + 8$ . Match guards— $\text{match}(x, t)$ —generate a conjunction with as many elements as types in  $\text{rtypes}(x)$ . Each element in the conjunction will be an equality between the variable  $X_T$  (the size of  $x$  wrt.  $T$ ) and  $\|t\|_T$  (the size of the term  $t$  wrt.  $T$ , computed using the symbolic typed-norm). For example, if  $\text{rtypes}(z) = \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}$ , the abstraction of  $\text{match}(z, \text{Cons}(6, \text{Nil}))$  will be the conjunction  $Z_{\text{Int}} = \text{max}(6, 0) \wedge Z_{\text{IntList}} = 2$ . On the other hand, the  $\text{nonmatch}(x, t)$  guard is abstracted to the truth value  $\top$ , as it does not provide any information relating the sizes of  $x$  and  $t$ . Regarding statements, the abstraction of a procedure call  $p(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$  simply replaces each variable with variables related to its different sizes<sup>5</sup> (for example,  $p(x, y)$  is abstracted to  $p(X_{\text{Int}}, X_{\text{IntList}}, Y_{\text{Int}})$  considering  $\text{rtypes}(x) = \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}$  and  $\text{rtypes}(y) = \{\text{Int}\}$ ). Likewise, an assignment  $x := t$  is abstracted by generating a conjunction of equalities between the different variables  $X_T$  and their sizes. The abstraction of a rule  $p(\overline{x}, \overline{y}) \leftarrow g, b_1, \dots, b_n$  proceeds compositionally by abstracting its head, the guard and all the

<sup>5</sup> When needed, we use angles “ $\langle$ ” and “ $\rangle$ ” to enclose input and output variables, as we do in Section 2.

statements. As mentioned before, non-integer variables in a rule are assumed to be non-negative. The abstraction inserts these constraints explicitly using function  $non\_neg(S)$ , where  $S$  is the set of variables occurring in the rule. The definition of  $non\_neg(S)$  is the following:

$$non\_neg(S) = \bigwedge \{X_T \geq 0 \mid x \in S, T \in rtypes(x), T \neq \mathbf{Int}\}$$

Finally, the abstraction of a procedure is the abstraction of all its rules.

*Definition 10 (Program abstraction)*

Given a program  $P \equiv \overline{[Dd]} Proc$ , its size abstraction  $P^\alpha$  is obtained by abstracting each procedure, i.e.,  $P^\alpha \equiv \overline{Proc^\alpha}$ .

Figure 4 shows the abstraction for a fragment of the running example given in Figure 1. When using the typed-norm  $\|\cdot\|_T$  in Definition 9,  $P^\alpha$  might include constraints of the form  $X_T = E$  where  $E$  is an arithmetic expression that involves “max”. If the second phase of the resource analysis framework does not support this kind of constraints, they can be approximated using linear constraints as follows: (1) replace the sub-expression  $\max(B_1, \dots, B_n)$  by a new auxiliary variable  $A$ , (2) add the constraints  $A \geq B_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A \geq B_n$ ; and (3) if  $B_i \geq 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , then add the constraint  $B_1 + \dots + B_n \geq A$  as well. This process might be applied repeatedly in case of nested or multiple occurrences of max. In the case of nested “max” expression, we try to flatten them first. Notice that this approximation is not the only approach to handle max constraints, as they could also be approximated as in (Alonso-Blas et al. 2011). Moreover, in practice, the constant  $-\infty$  (that we used in the definition of norms) can safely be replaced by any other constant — replacing it by the minimum value that *syntactically* appears in the program (or by 0) works well in practice.

*Example 7 (Program abstraction)*

Figure 4 shows the abstraction using the typed-norm  $\|\cdot\|_T$  of the procedures `factSum`, `while_1` and `main` from Figure 1. Each line contains a comment indicating if it involves non-negativity constraints or is the abstraction of a particular line of the original RBR program. We assume that list variables ( $x \in \{l, l1\}$ ) have  $rtypes(x) = \{\mathbf{Int}, \mathbf{IntList}\}$ , whereas integer variables ( $x \in \{\text{sum}, \text{sum}', e, \text{prod}, \text{sum1}, r'\}$ ) have  $rtypes(x) = \{\mathbf{Int}\}$ . The abstraction proceeds rule by rule, abstracting rule heads, guards, and statements; so rule numbers (gray circles in the left margin) does not change from the concrete program. Notice that the constraints from the guard are combined with the non-negativity of all the non-integer variables of each rule. The most interesting part is the abstraction of the guard `match(l, Cons(e,l1))` in the second rule of `while_1`. For the type `Int`, the guard generates  $L_{\mathbf{Int}} = \max(E_{\mathbf{Int}}, L1_{\mathbf{Int}})$ —which could be approximated by linear constraints—and for the type `IntList` the guard generates the constraint  $L_{\mathbf{IntList}} = 1 + L1_{\mathbf{IntList}}$ , stating that the new list `l1` is one constructor smaller than `l`.

Note that deterministic programs can be abstracted to non-deterministic programs if different terms of the same type have the same size. For example, consider the simple data type `data Dir = Up | Down`, and the following `price :: ⟨Dir⟩ × ⟨Int⟩` procedure:

```
price(⟨x⟩,⟨y⟩) ← match(x, Up), y := 10      price(⟨x⟩,⟨y⟩) ← match(x, Down), y := 0
```

Since  $rtypes(x) = \mathbf{Dir}$  and  $rtypes(y) = \mathbf{Int}$  in both rules, and  $\|\mathbf{Up}\|_{\mathbf{Dir}} = \|\mathbf{Down}\|_{\mathbf{Dir}} = 1$ , the program abstraction results in the nondeterministic version:

```

④ 1 factSum( $\langle L_{\text{Int}}, L_{\text{IntList}} \rangle, \langle \text{Sum}'_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ )  $\leftarrow$  T // RBR line 17
   2  $\wedge L_{\text{IntList}} \geq 0$ , // non-negativity constraints
   3  $\text{Sum}_{\text{Int}} = 0$ , // RBR line 18
   4 while_1( $\langle L_{\text{Int}}, L_{\text{IntList}}, \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}} \rangle, \langle \text{Sum}'_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ ) // RBR line 19
   5
⑤ 6 while_1( $\langle L_{\text{Int}}, L_{\text{IntList}}, \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}} \rangle, \langle \text{Sum}'_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ )  $\leftarrow$  // RBR line 22
   7  $L_{\text{Int}} = -\infty \wedge L_{\text{IntList}} = 1$  // RBR line 23
   8  $\wedge L_{\text{IntList}} \geq 0$ , // non-negativity constraints
   9  $\text{Sum}'_{\text{Int}} = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}$  // RBR line 24
  10
⑥ 11 while_1( $\langle L_{\text{Int}}, L_{\text{IntList}}, \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}} \rangle, \langle \text{Sum}'_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ )  $\leftarrow$  // RBR line 25
   12  $L_{\text{Int}} = \max(E_{\text{Int}}, L1_{\text{Int}}) \wedge L_{\text{IntList}} = 1 + L1_{\text{IntList}}$  // RBR line 26
   13  $\wedge L_{\text{IntList}} \geq 0 \wedge L1_{\text{IntList}} \geq 0$ , // non-negativity constraints
   14 fact( $\langle E_{\text{Int}} \rangle, \langle \text{Prod}_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ ), // RBR line 27
   15  $\text{Sum}1_{\text{Int}} = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}} + \text{Prod}_{\text{Int}}$ , // RBR line 28
   16 while_1( $\langle L1_{\text{Int}}, L1_{\text{IntList}}, \text{Sum}1_{\text{Int}} \rangle, \langle \text{Sum}'_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ ) // RBR line 29
   17
⑦ 18 main( $\langle \rangle, \langle R'_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ )  $\leftarrow$  T // RBR line 32
   19  $\wedge L_{\text{IntList}} \geq 0$ , // non-negativity constraints
   20  $L_{\text{Int}} = 2 \wedge L_{\text{IntList}} = 2$ , // RBR line 33
   21 factSum( $\langle L_{\text{Int}}, L_{\text{IntList}} \rangle, \langle R'_{\text{Int}} \rangle$ ) // RBR line 34

```

Fig. 4. Abstraction of a fragment of the RBR program from Figure 1.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{price}(\langle X_{\text{Dir}}, Y_{\text{Int}} \rangle) \leftarrow & \text{price}(\langle X_{\text{Dir}}, Y_{\text{Int}} \rangle) \leftarrow \\ X_{\text{Dir}} = 1, Y_{\text{Int}} = 10 & X_{\text{Dir}} = 1, Y_{\text{Int}} = 0 \end{array}$$

However, the possible nondeterminism introduced by the abstraction is not a problem from the point of view of soundness, as any trace in the deterministic program can be performed in the nondeterministic abstraction. This result is presented in the next section.

### 3.3 Soundness

The abstraction presented in the previous section transforms RBR programs into abstract programs, which the resource analysis framework can take as input for computing bounds. Therefore, we ensure that the size of variables that are observed in  $\rightsquigarrow$  traces of RBR programs can be observed in traces of their abstractions. In order to prove this soundness result, we need an abstract operational semantics for abstract programs, which is an adaptation of the operational semantics for RBR programs in Figure 2. This abstract operational semantics evaluates *abstract configurations* step by step:

*Definition 11 (Abstract configurations)*

An *abstract configuration*, denoted as  $AC \equiv ar^\alpha | \psi$ , is a sequence  $ar^\alpha$  of *abstract activation records* followed by a conjunction  $\psi$  of constraints. Similarly, an abstract activation record, denoted as  $\langle bs^\alpha \rangle$ , is a sequence of constraint conjunctions and abstract procedure calls  $p(\bar{X}, \bar{Y})$ . We use Greek letters ( $\psi, \varphi, \dots$ ) to denote constraint conjunctions,  $b^\alpha$  to denote one constraint conjunction or one abstract procedure call, and  $bs^\alpha$  to denote a sequence  $b_1^\alpha \dots b_n^\alpha$ .



$$\begin{array}{c}
(1) \quad \frac{\psi \wedge \varphi \not\equiv \text{false}}{\langle \varphi \cdot bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi \rightsquigarrow_\alpha \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi \wedge \varphi} \\
(2) \quad \frac{p(\bar{X}', \bar{Y}') \leftarrow \varphi, b_1^\alpha, \dots, b_n^\alpha \in P^\alpha \text{ fresh} \quad \overline{X = X' \wedge \varphi \wedge \psi} \not\equiv \text{false}}{\langle p(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \cdot bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi \rightsquigarrow_\alpha \langle b_1^\alpha \dots b_n^\alpha \rangle^{Y=Y'} \cdot \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \overline{X = X'} \wedge \varphi \wedge \psi} \\
(3) \quad \frac{\psi \wedge \overline{Y = Y'} \not\equiv \text{false}}{\langle \epsilon \rangle^{Y=Y'} \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi \rightsquigarrow_\alpha ar^\alpha | \psi \wedge \overline{Y = Y'}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5. Operational semantics of abstract rule-based programs

Figure 5 contains the operational semantics  $\rightsquigarrow_\alpha$  that evaluates abstract configurations regarding an abstract program  $P^\alpha$ . Rule (1) handles abstracted assignments, which are translated into conjunctive constraints  $\varphi$ . If  $\varphi$  is consistent wrt. the global set of constraints ( $\psi \wedge \varphi \not\equiv \text{false}$ ) then it is added to the global constraints and the evaluation continues with the next element of the abstract activation record. Rule (2) handles procedure invocation. First, we obtain a fresh rule from the abstract program  $P^\alpha$ . Then, if the parameter passing, the guard and the global constraints are consistent ( $\overline{X = X'} \wedge \varphi \wedge \psi \not\equiv \text{false}$ ),<sup>6</sup> a new abstract activation record containing the body of the procedure is inserted in the abstract configuration.

Similarly to the  $\rightsquigarrow$  semantics, the relation  $\overline{Y = Y'}$  between the output variables and the parameters is stored as a mark. Finally, rule (3) removes an empty abstract activation record if the output variables are consistent with the global constraints. Notice that global constraints accumulate variables from all the abstract activation records, even those whose execution has finished and therefore have been removed. Similarly to  $\rightsquigarrow$ , we use the notion of *abstract trace*  $\mathcal{T}^\alpha = AC_0 \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{r_1} AC_1 \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{r_n} AC_n$  where its *steps* are defined as  $steps(\mathcal{T}^\alpha) = \langle r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n \rangle$ , and the set of *abstract trace steps* as the combination of the steps of all the possible abstract traces starting from a given configuration ( $Tr(AC_0) = \{steps(AC_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} AC_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} AC_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ).

*Example 8 (Evaluation of an abstract program)*

The abstract evaluation of the main procedure in Figure 1 proceeds similarly to Example 4. When obtaining fresh names for variables—rule (2) in Figure 5—we use superscripts with the same number as the current abstract configuration  $AC_n$ . For simplicity, the statement or constraint that controls each step is underlined, the constraints in each abstract configuration  $AC_i$  are denoted as  $\psi_i$  and  $\top$  is omitted. Each step  $\rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{a,b}$  is decorated with the semantic rule  $a$  and abstract program rule  $b$  used, and  $\rightsquigarrow_\alpha^*$  refers to many  $\rightsquigarrow_\alpha$ -steps.

<sup>6</sup> We use the notation  $\overline{X = X'}$  to denote the conjunction of constraints  $\bigwedge \overline{X = X'}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
AC_0 &\equiv \langle \underline{L_{\text{Int}}^0 = 2 \wedge L_{\text{IntList}}^0 = 2 \cdot \text{factSum}(\langle L_{\text{Int}}^0, L_{\text{IntList}}^0 \rangle, \langle R_{\text{Int}}^0 \rangle)} \mid L_{\text{IntList}}^0 \geq 0 \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{(1) \cdot \epsilon} \rangle \\
AC_1 &\equiv \langle \underline{\text{factSum}(\langle L_{\text{Int}}^0, L_{\text{IntList}}^0 \rangle, \langle R_{\text{Int}}^0 \rangle)} \mid L_{\text{IntList}}^0 \geq 0 \wedge L_{\text{Int}}^0 = 2 \wedge L_{\text{IntList}}^0 = 2 \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{(2) \cdot 4} \rangle \\
AC_2 &\equiv \langle \underline{\text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^2 = 0 \cdot \text{while\_1}(\langle L_{\text{Int}}^2, L_{\text{IntList}}^2, \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^2 \rangle, \langle \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2} \rangle)} \rangle_{R_{\text{Int}}^0 = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2}} . \\
&\quad \langle \epsilon \rangle \mid \psi_1 \wedge L_{\text{Int}}^0 = L_{\text{Int}}^2 \wedge L_{\text{IntList}}^0 = L_{\text{IntList}}^2 \wedge L_{\text{IntList}}^2 \geq 0 \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{(1) \cdot \epsilon} \rangle \\
AC_3 &\equiv \langle \underline{\text{while\_1}(\langle L_{\text{Int}}^2, L_{\text{IntList}}^2, \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^2 \rangle, \langle \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2} \rangle)} \rangle_{R_{\text{Int}}^0 = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2}} . \\
&\quad \langle \epsilon \rangle \mid \psi_2 \wedge \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^2 = 0 \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{(2) \cdot 6} \rangle \\
AC_4 &\equiv \langle \underline{\text{fact}(\langle E_{\text{Int}}^4, \langle \text{Prod}_{\text{Int}}^4 \rangle) \dots)} \rangle_{\text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2} = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 4}} . \\
&\quad \langle \epsilon \rangle_{R_{\text{Int}}^0 = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2}} . \\
&\quad \langle \epsilon \rangle \mid \psi_3 \wedge L_{\text{Int}}^2 = L_{\text{Int}}^4 \wedge L_{\text{IntList}}^2 = L_{\text{IntList}}^4 \wedge \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^2 = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^4 \wedge \\
&\quad L_{\text{Int}}^4 = \max(E_{\text{Int}}^4, L1_{\text{Int}}^4) \wedge L_{\text{IntList}}^4 = 1 + L1_{\text{IntList}}^4 \wedge \\
&\quad L_{\text{IntList}}^4 \geq 0 \wedge L1_{\text{IntList}}^4 \geq 0 \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^* \rangle \\
AC_5 &\equiv \langle \underline{\epsilon} \rangle_{\text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2} = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 4}} . \\
&\quad \langle \epsilon \rangle_{R_{\text{Int}}^0 = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2}} . \\
&\quad \langle \epsilon \rangle \mid \psi_5 \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{(3) \cdot \epsilon} \rangle \\
AC_6 &\equiv \langle \underline{\epsilon} \rangle_{R_{\text{Int}}^0 = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2}} . \\
&\quad \langle \epsilon \rangle \mid \psi_5 \wedge \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2} = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 4} \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{(3) \cdot \epsilon} \rangle \\
AC_7 &\equiv \langle \epsilon \rangle \mid \psi_6 \wedge R_{\text{Int}}^0 = \text{Sum}_{\text{Int}}^{\prime 2} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

In  $AC_3$  the first program rule of `while_1` (Line 6 in Figure 4) cannot be used to evaluate the call because the guard is not compatible with the global set of constraints, namely:  $L_{\text{IntList}}^2 = L_{\text{IntList}}^4 \wedge L_{\text{Int}}^4 = 1 \wedge L_{\text{IntList}}^0 = L_{\text{IntList}}^2 \wedge L_{\text{Int}}^0 = 2 \models \text{false}$ . Therefore, the evaluation can only proceed with the second rule of `while_1` (Rule 6, Line 11 in Figure 4).

The soundness result relates  $\rightsquigarrow$ -traces starting from a configuration  $C$  with abstract  $\rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}$ -traces starting from the abstraction of  $C$ . The following definitions present the abstraction of configurations, which is based on  $\|\cdot\|_T$  and the abstraction of statements defined in Figure 3.

*Definition 12 (Variable mapping abstraction)*

The abstraction of a variable mapping  $lv$  is defined as  $lv^{\alpha} = \bigwedge \{X_T = \|lv(x)\|_T \mid x \in \text{dom}(lv), T \in \text{rtypes}(x)\}$ . Notice that  $lv^{\alpha}$  is a conjunction of equalities between distinct  $X_T$  variables and integer values, since  $lv(x)$  are concrete values and therefore  $\|lv(x)\|_T$  generates integer numbers.

*Definition 13 (Configuration abstraction)*

Let  $C = \langle p_1, bs_1, lv_1 \rangle \dots \langle p_n, bs_n, lv_n \rangle$  be a configuration. Its abstraction is defined as:  $C^{\alpha} = \langle bs_1^{\alpha} \rangle \dots \langle bs_n^{\alpha} \rangle \mid \psi$  where  $\psi = lv_1^{\alpha} \wedge \dots \wedge lv_n^{\alpha}$ . Notice that  $\psi$  is a conjunction of equalities between distinct  $X_T$  variables and integer values, since every activation record uses fresh variables and  $\psi$  is the conjunction of abstracted variable mappings.

The following theorem establishes the soundness of our translation using typed-norms: for any trace  $C_0 \rightsquigarrow^* C_n$  it is possible to create an abstract trace  $C_0^{\alpha} \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^* ar^{\alpha} \mid \psi$  with the same steps.

*Theorem 1 (Soundness)*

If  $\mathcal{T} \equiv C_0 \rightsquigarrow^* C_n$  then there is an abstract trace  $\mathcal{T}^\alpha \equiv C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^* ar^\alpha | \psi$  such that  $steps(\mathcal{T}) = steps(\mathcal{T}^\alpha)$ ,  $C_n^\alpha = ar^\alpha | \tilde{\psi}$  and  $\psi \wedge \tilde{\psi} \not\models false$ .

Intuitively, the above theorem states that the sizes of the variables of the concrete configuration  $C_n$ , w.r.t. the corresponding norm, define a model of the abstract state configuration.

Let us now informally explain how abstract programs preserve cost. The idea is to simulate the same process that we have described at the end of Section 2. First, during the abstraction phase the instruction  $tick(n)$  is kept in the abstract program. Next, we instrument abstract activation records with a cost counter  $\mathbf{cost}^\alpha$ , and add a corresponding abstract semantic rule for  $tick(n)$  that simply sets  $\mathbf{cost}^\alpha$  to  $\mathbf{cost}^\alpha - n$ . An abstract trace  $\mathcal{T}^\alpha$  is said to be valid if  $\mathbf{cost}^\alpha$  never takes negative values, i.e.,  $\mathbf{cost}$  is initialized with an amount of resources that is enough to carry out this particular abstract execution. Finally, a function  $f^\alpha$  that maps initial abstract configurations to nonnegative values is called an upper bound on the (abstract) worst-case cost if, for and  $AC_0$ , setting the initial value of  $\mathbf{cost}^\alpha$  to  $f^\alpha(AC_0)$  guarantees generating valid abstract traces only. It is called a lower bound on the best-case cost if, for any  $AC_0$ , setting the initial value of  $\mathbf{cost}^\alpha$  to a value smaller than  $f^\alpha(AC_0)$  generates an invalid abstract trace. The function  $f^\alpha$  is typically given in terms of the input abstract variables, i.e., in terms of the sizes of the corresponding data. The black-box component that infer the cost of the abstract program, infers such functions.

Given the statement of Theorem 1, it is easy to see that if  $f^\alpha$  is an upper (resp. lower) bound on the abstract worst-case (resp. best-case) cost, then it is also an upper (resp. lower) bound on the concrete cost (up to rewriting it in terms of typed-norms instead of corresponding abstract variables).

As a final remark, let us mention that although the paper and the experiments focus on upper bounds inference, our transformation is valid also to infer lower bounds as it ensures that the cost of every trace is preserved by the transformed program.

## 4 Inference of Relevant Types

As explained in the previous section, in order to abstract the size of a variable  $x$  in the rule number  $i$  we consider a set  $rtypes_i(x)$  containing its *relevant types*. It is safe to assume that  $rtypes_i(x)$  contains all the constituent types of  $x$ . However, the complexity of the solving phase that obtains bounds grows exponentially with the number of variables involved, so it is very important to obtain the smallest sets for the relevant typed-norms. In this section we will present the inference algorithm for relevant types as well as its soundness result.

As it was observed in (Albert et al. 2008), variables that do not affect the cost can be removed from the abstract program and the bounds obtained do not change. In our setting, the cost of a program depends primarily on the number of recursive calls performed, which is affected by the guards in the rules. Therefore, any variable that does not affect directly or indirectly the value of a guard can be ignored. We push this idea further and detect, from each variable, those types that do not affect a guard evaluation directly or indirectly. These types are useless from the point of view of resource analysis, so they should be discarded from the set of relevant types of the variable.

The main intuition behind the algorithm for inferring relevant types is detecting those constituent types of a guard variable that are involved in the guard evaluation. For example, in `match(l, Cons(x,xs))` we say that the type `IntList` of variable `l` is involved in the guard evaluation because the pattern matched is of type `IntList`. On the other hand, the type `Int` of the same variable is not involved in the guard evaluation because it can succeed or fail regardless of the possible `Int` values stored in `l`. Once we have this information from the guards, we propagate it backwards to include those relevant types in the rest of variables that can affect the value of the guard variable. Relevant types will be propagated to the rules formal parameters, where they will be combined with the relevant types from the rest of rules of the same procedure. Similarly, when invoking a procedure, the relevant types of the formal parameters will be included in the variables of the actual arguments.

*Example 9 (Intuition of relevant types inference)*

Consider the RBR program in Figure 1. From Line 9 (Rule ②) we discover that `Int` is involved in the arithmetic guard `0 >= n` for procedure `while_0`, so  $\text{Int} \in \text{rtypes}_2(n)$ . The procedure `while_0` is invoked in Line 6 of Rule ①, so that this relevant type is propagated to the `fact` rule, i.e.,  $\text{Int} \in \text{rtypes}_1(n)$ . Similarly, `fact` is invoked in Line 27 of the Rule ⑥ corresponding to the `while_1` predicate, so `Int` will be a relevant type for variable `e`. That rule contains a guard `match(l, Cons(e,l))` in Line 26, so `Int` will be propagated from variable `e` to `l`, i.e.,  $\text{Int} \in \text{rtypes}_6(l)$ . After another step of propagation in Rule ④ (procedure `factSum`) we will obtain that  $\text{Int} \in \text{rtypes}_4(l)$ . In summary, the relevant type `Int` detected in Rule ② has been propagated to Rule ④ following the path ② → ① → ⑥ → ④. A similar but shorter process would produce that `IntList`  $\in \text{rtypes}_4(l)$  by propagating it in the path ⑤ → ④. In this case all the constituent types of `IntList` are relevant types for the parameter `l` in `factSum` (Rule ④), as the resource usage depends both in the length of the list and its stored numbers.

#### 4.1 Formalization of relevant type inference

We formalize the relevant types inference algorithms as a data-flow analysis that constructs a mapping for the complete program. This mapping relates a set of relevant types to every variable in the program, and is defined as follows:

*Definition 14 (Rule and program mappings)*

A *rule mapping*  $M \ni \mu = [x \mapsto P(\overline{\text{Types}})]$  maps variables  $\bar{x}$  in a rule to sets of types. The domain of  $\mu$  is denoted as  $\text{dom}(\mu) = \{\bar{x}\}$ , and  $\mu(x)$  returns the set of relevant types related to variable  $x$ . We use  $\epsilon$  to denote an empty rule mapping.

A *program mapping*  $\Sigma^P \ni \sigma = \langle \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n \rangle$  aggregates the mappings of all the rules of a program  $P$ , considering that  $P$  has  $n$  rules. We use the notation  $\sigma(i) = \mu_i$  to refer to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  rule mapping in  $\sigma$ , and  $\sigma(i)(x)$  to refer to the set of relevant types of variable  $x$  in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  rule.

Rule and program mappings support the following set of standard operations (extension, ordering, combination, restriction and renaming) that we use in the formalization of the inference algorithm.

*Definition 15 (Operations on rule and program mappings)*

A rule mapping can be *extended* to a program mapping by assigning it to the  $i^{\text{th}}$  rule and considering the empty mapping for the rest of rules. The extension of a rule mapping is denoted as  $\langle \mu \rangle_i^n = \langle \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{i-1}, \mu, \epsilon_{i+1}, \dots, \epsilon_n \rangle$ .

We consider the natural order of rule mappings based on subset inclusion. We say that  $\mu \sqsubseteq \mu'$  iff.  $\forall x \in \text{dom}(\mu). \mu(x) \subseteq \mu'(x)$ . This order is extended to program mappings as follows:  $\sigma \sqsubseteq \sigma'$  iff.  $\sigma(i) \sqsubseteq \sigma'(i)$  for all rule  $i$ .

Rule mappings can be combined using the commutative and associative operator  $\oplus$ , defined as:

$$(\mu \oplus \mu')(x) = \begin{cases} \mu(x) \cup \mu'(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{dom}(\mu) \cap \text{dom}(\mu') \\ \mu(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{dom}(\mu) \setminus \text{dom}(\mu') \\ \mu'(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{dom}(\mu') \setminus \text{dom}(\mu) \\ \text{undefined} & \text{i.o.c.} \end{cases}$$

If a variable  $x$  appears in both rule mappings, its typed-norms are combined, otherwise it takes the typed-norms from the mapping where it appears. Notice that variables not appearing in  $\text{dom}(\mu_1)$  nor  $\text{dom}(\mu_2)$  are undefined in  $\mu_1 \oplus \mu_2$ . We also consider the combination of program mappings of the same length by proceeding element-wise. We overload the symbol  $\oplus$ :

$$\langle \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \rangle \oplus \langle \mu'_1, \dots, \mu'_n \rangle = \langle \mu_1 \oplus \mu'_1, \dots, \mu_n \oplus \mu'_n \rangle$$

When combining sequences of mappings we use the notation  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mu_i = \mu_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mu_n$ , and  $\bigoplus_{\sigma \in C} \sigma = \sigma_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \sigma_n$  for combining sets  $C = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$  of program mappings.

Rule mappings can be restricted to a set of variables  $C$ , formally:

$$(\mu|_C)(x) = \begin{cases} \mu(x) & \text{if } x \in C \\ \text{undefined} & \text{i.o.c.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, we use  $\mu_{\bar{x} \sim \bar{y}}$  to denote the renaming of a rule mapping  $\mu$ , where the variables  $\bar{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$  are renamed to  $\bar{y} = y_1, \dots, y_n$  (we consider that  $\{\bar{x}\} \subseteq \text{dom}(\mu)$  and  $\{\bar{y}\} \cap \text{dom}(\mu) = \emptyset$ ):

$$(\mu_{\bar{x} \sim \bar{y}})(z) = \begin{cases} \mu(x_i) & \text{if } z = y_i \\ \mu(z) & \text{if } z \in \text{dom}(\mu) \setminus \{\bar{x}\} \\ \text{undefined} & \text{i.o.c.} \end{cases}$$

*Example 10 (Operations on rule and program mappings)*

Consider the following rule mappings:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1 &= [x \mapsto \{\text{Int}\}, y \mapsto \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}] \\ \mu_2 &= [y \mapsto \{\text{IntList}\}] \\ \mu_3 &= [y \mapsto \{\text{Int}\}] \end{aligned}$$

We have that  $\mu_2 \sqsubseteq \mu_1$  ( $\{\text{IntList}\} \subseteq \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}$  for variable  $y$ ) and  $\mu_3 \sqsubseteq \mu_1$  ( $\{\text{Int}\} \subseteq \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}$  for variable  $y$ ) but  $\mu_1 \not\sqsubseteq \mu_2$  ( $x \notin \text{dom}(\mu_2)$ ) and  $\mu_2 \not\sqsubseteq \mu_3$  ( $\{\text{IntList}\} \not\subseteq \{\text{Int}\}$  for variable  $y$ ). Regarding combination, we have that  $\mu_2 \oplus \mu_3 = [y \mapsto \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}]$  and  $\mu_1 \oplus \mu_2 = \mu_1 \oplus \mu_3 = \mu_1$ . The restriction of rule mappings simply reduces the domain, so  $\mu_1|_{\{x\}} = [x \mapsto \{\text{Int}\}]$  and  $\mu_1|_{\{y\}} = [y \mapsto \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}]$ . Finally, the renaming changes the variables in the domain, for example  $\mu_{1, x, y \sim a, b} = [a \mapsto \{\text{Int}\}, b \mapsto \{\text{Int}, \text{IntList}\}]$  because  $x$  is renamed by  $a$  and  $y$  is renamed by  $b$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
gen^P & : \Sigma^P \mapsto \Sigma^P \\
gen^P(\sigma) & = \sigma \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^n gen_i^P(\sigma) \\
\\
gen_i^P & : \Sigma^P \mapsto \Sigma^P \\
gen_i^P(\sigma) & = \langle genG_i^P(g, \sigma) \rangle_i^n \oplus genS_i^P(\{\bar{b}\}, \sigma) \oplus \langle \mu_i \rangle_i^n, \text{ where} \\
& P^i = p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leftarrow g, \bar{b}, \quad \mu_i = \bigoplus_{\mu \in S_i} \mu \text{ and} \\
& S_i = \{(\sigma(j)|_{\bar{w}\bar{z}})_{\bar{w}\bar{z} \sim \bar{x}\bar{y}} \mid j \in [1..n], P^j = p(\bar{w}, \bar{z}) \leftarrow g', \bar{b}'\} \\
\\
genG_i^P & : \text{Guard} \times \Sigma^P \mapsto M \\
genG_i^P(true, \sigma) & = \epsilon \\
genG_i^P(g_1 \wedge g_2, \sigma) & = genG_i^P(g_1, \sigma) \oplus genG_i^P(g_2, \sigma) \\
genG_i^P(e_1 \text{ op } e_2, \sigma) & = [x \mapsto \{\mathbf{Int}\} \mid x \in \text{vars}(e_1) \cup \text{vars}(e_2)] \\
genG_i^P(\text{match}(x, p), \sigma) & = [x \mapsto \{T\} \mid T = \text{type}_i(x), T \text{ is recursive}] \oplus \\
& [x \mapsto \{T \mid y \in \text{vars}(p), T \in \sigma(i)(y)\}] \\
genG_i^P(\text{nonmatch}(x, p), \sigma) & = [x \mapsto \{T \mid y \in \text{vars}(p), T \in \sigma(i)(y)\}] \\
\\
genS_i^P & : P(\text{Statement}) \times \Sigma^P \mapsto \Sigma^P \\
genS_i^P(\{\bar{b}\}, \sigma) & = \bigoplus_{b \in \{\bar{b}\}} genS_i^P(b, \sigma) \\
\\
genS_i^P & : \text{Statement} \times \Sigma^P \mapsto \Sigma^P \\
genS_i^P(x := t, \sigma) & = \langle [y \mapsto T_{x,y,i} \mid y \in \text{vars}(t)] \rangle_i^n, \text{ where} \\
& T_{x,y,i} = \{T \mid T \in \sigma(i)(x) \cap \text{Constituents}(\text{type}_i(y))\} \\
genS_i^P(p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}), \sigma) & = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in A \cup B} \sigma, \text{ where} \\
& A = \{(\sigma(j)|_{\bar{w}})_{\bar{w} \sim \bar{x}} \rangle_j^n \mid j \in [1..n], P^j = p(\bar{w}, \bar{z}) \leftarrow g, \bar{b}\} \\
& B = \{(\sigma(i)|_{\bar{y}})_{\bar{y} \sim \bar{z}} \rangle_j^n \mid j \in [1..n], P^j = p(\bar{w}, \bar{z}) \leftarrow g, \bar{b}\}
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 6. Functions for inferring typed-norms.

Next we explain the inference algorithm, which is based on the definition of  $gen^P$  that is given in Figure 6. Let  $P$  be a program with  $n$  rules ( $|P| = n$ ). Then the relevant types inferred for the program is the least fixed point of the function  $gen^P$ , i.e.,  $lfp(gen^P) \in \Sigma^P$ . Note that  $gen^P$  is a monotone function and  $\Sigma^P$  is a finite complete lattice, so the least fixed point can be computed exactly. Considering this fixed point, the notation  $rtypes_i(x)$  is defined as  $lfp(gen^P)(i)(x)$ . The function  $gen^P$  takes a program mapping  $\sigma$  and extends it with the new information from the different rules of the program. For each program rule, it computes  $gen_i^P(\sigma)$  and combines them with the current program mapping.

The function  $gen_i^P$  takes the current program mapping and extends it using the information in rule number  $i$ . This function processes a rule  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leftarrow g, \bar{b}$  by combining the information from the guard ( $genG_i^P$ ), the body ( $genS_i^P$ ) and also collecting the relevant types from the parameters of all the rules of the same procedure (mapping  $\mu_i$ ). This last step, which requires a renaming of the parameters  $\bar{w}\bar{z}$  to  $\bar{x}\bar{y}$ , forces rules of the same predicate to have the same relevant types and therefore be abstracted to rules with the same name and number of abstracted parameters.

The function  $genG_i^P$  takes a guard  $g$  and a program mapping  $\sigma$  and generates new relevant types in a rule mapping. This function proceeds by combining the new relevant types obtained in every fragment of the guard. A *true* guard always succeeds, so it does not impose any relevant type. Arithmetic guards  $e_1 \text{ op } e_2$  requires *Int* as a relevant

type for any variable in the expression. If there is a  $\text{match}(x, p)$  guard and  $x$  has a recursive type  $T$  then this type is included as a relevant type for  $x$ . Non-recursive types are ignored because they cannot directly affect the number of recursions. However, if it contains an inner recursive type it will be detected and propagated when computing the fixed point. Finally, in  $\text{match}(x, p)$  and  $\text{nonmatch}(x, p)$  guards all relevant types already detected in the variables of the pattern  $p$  are propagated to the matching variable  $x$ . Note that in  $\text{match}(x, p)$  guards, the recursive type  $T$  of  $x$  will be only relevant if the procedure is recursive, otherwise it will not affect the execution. Therefore, in practice we can infer relevant types for recursive procedures and then transfer that information to non-recursive ones.

The function  $\text{genS}_i^P$  is overloaded. When it takes a set of statements  $\{\bar{b}\}$  and a program mapping  $\sigma$  then it traverses all the statements, invoking  $\text{genS}_i^P$  for each one and combining the results. When  $\text{genS}_i^P$  is invoked with only one statement  $b$  then it propagates the information from  $\sigma$  according to the statement processed. If  $b \equiv x := t$  then all the relevant types detected for  $x$  that are constituents of the type of some variable  $y$  of the right-hand side  $t$  (set  $T_{x,y,i}$ ) are propagated to that variable  $y$ . Finally, if the statement is a procedure call  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  then the function propagates the relevant types of the parameters. The set  $A$  propagates all the relevant types for the input parameters  $\bar{w}$  of the rules  $j$  for the same procedure to the input parameters  $\bar{x}$  of the current rule  $i$ . Similarly, the set  $B$  propagates the relevant types of the output parameters  $\bar{y}$  of the current rule  $i$  to the output parameters  $\bar{z}$  of the rules  $j$  of the same predicate. Sets  $A$  and  $B$  contain program mappings that are combined.

The result of the relevant types inference always exists, and it can be effectively computed by iterating  $\text{gen}^P$  starting from the empty program typed-norms mapping, as we state below.

*Theorem 2*

Consider a program  $P$  such that  $|P| = n$ . Then  $\text{lfp}(\text{gen}^P)$  exists and is the supremum of the ascending Kleene chain starting from  $\langle \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \rangle$ .

*Example 11 (Relevant types inference)*

Here we explain how the functions in Figure 6 produce the result intuitively explained in Example 9. We consider  $P$  as the RBR program in Figure 1. The process starts with an empty program mapping  $\sigma_0 = \langle \epsilon, \epsilon, \epsilon, \epsilon, \epsilon, \epsilon, \epsilon \rangle$ . In the first iteration  $\sigma_1 = \text{gen}^P(\sigma_0)$ , when processing Rule ② we obtain that  $\text{Int} \in \sigma_1(2)(n)$  because of the call  $\text{genG}_2^P(0 \geq n, \sigma_0)$ . In the next iteration,  $\sigma_2 = \text{gen}^P(\sigma_1)$ , so that information is propagated to Rule ①, i.e.,  $\text{Int} \in \sigma_2(1)(n)$ , thanks to the invocation  $\text{genS}_1^P(\text{while}_0(\langle n, \text{prod} \rangle, \langle \text{prod}' \rangle), \sigma_1)$ . This information is collected in the set  $A$  from Rule ②. Similarly, that information is propagated to  $\text{Int} \in \sigma_3(6)(e)$  from the procedure call  $\text{fact}(\langle e \rangle, \langle \text{prod} \rangle)$  in Line 27 by invoking  $\text{genS}_6^P(\text{fact}(\langle e \rangle, \langle \text{prod} \rangle), \sigma_2)$ . In the next step, the relevant type of  $e$  is propagated to  $\text{Int} \in \sigma_4(6)(l)$ —when processing the guard with  $\text{genG}_6^P(\text{match}(l, \text{Cons}(e, l)), \sigma_3)$ . Finally, the relevant type in the input parameter  $l$  of Rule ⑥ is propagated to Rule ④ when processing the procedure call with  $\text{genS}_4^P(\text{while}_1(\langle l, \text{sum} \rangle, \langle \text{sum}' \rangle), \sigma_4)$ , so  $\text{Int} \in \sigma_5(4)(l)$ . As the function  $\text{gen}^P$  is monotone, all this information will be kept in the least fixed point.

## 4.2 Soundness of relevant types inference

The inference of relevant types previously presented obtains a set of *interesting* types for every variable in every rule in the program. In order to state that those inferred types are enough to guide the traces, we need to introduce a new notion: *value variation*.

*Definition 16 (Value variation)*

We say that  $v'$  is a *variation* of  $v$  wrt. a type  $T$  (written  $v \triangleright^T v'$ ) if  $v'$  results from replacing some components of  $v$  with type  $T$  for other components of the same type. For example,  $\text{Cons}(1, \text{Nil}) \triangleright^{\text{Int}} \text{Cons}(4, \text{Nil})$ —replacing 1 by 4—and  $\text{Cons}(0, \text{Cons}(1, \text{Nil})) \triangleright^{\text{IntList}} \text{Cons}(1, \text{Nil})$ —replacing the list completely.

Using the notion of variation, we can define when a type is *useful* for a variable:  $T$  will be useful for a variable  $x$  in the  $i$ -th rule of a program if changing the value of that variable changes the set of trace steps starting from a configuration of rule  $i$ . Formally:

*Definition 17 (Useful type)*

We say that a type  $T$  is *useful* for variable  $x$  in the  $i$ -th rule of a program  $P$ —written  $\text{useful}_i^T(x)$ —if there are configurations  $C_0$  and  $C'_0$  such that:

1.  $C_0 = \langle p, b \cdot bs, lw \rangle \cdot C_1$ , where  $b \cdot bs$  are statements from the  $i$ -th rule of  $P$
2.  $x \in \text{dom}(lw)$
3.  $C'_0 = \langle p, b \cdot bs, lw' \rangle \cdot C_1$  with  $lw' = lw[x \mapsto v]$  and  $lw(x) \triangleright^T v$
4.  $\text{Tr}(C_0) \neq \text{Tr}(C'_0)$

Finally, we can state the soundness result of the inference of relevant types: if changing some components of type  $T$  of a variable  $x$  in rule  $i$  affects the possible trace steps—i.e.  $\text{useful}_i^T(x)$ —then that type  $T$  will be inferred by our process—i.e.  $T \in \text{rtypes}_i(x)$ .

*Theorem 3 (Soundness)*

If  $\text{useful}_i^T(x)$  then  $T \in \text{rtypes}_i(x)$ .

## 5 Extensions

The purpose of this section is to propose two extensions, which are very useful in practice, to the previous analysis. This, moreover, demonstrates that extending our framework is very easy.

### 5.1 Extension to Polymorphic Types

Let us now describe the extension of our approach to handle polymorphic types. First, we extend the data type definition in Section 2 by adding *polymorphic types*.

*Definition 18 (Polymorphic types)*

Given a countable set of type variables  $V_T$ , a *polymorphic type*  $T(V_T)$  can be either a monomorphic type  $T$ , a type variable  $\alpha \in V_T$ , or an algebraic data type  $D(\Gamma)$  defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} pDd &::= \text{data } D(\Gamma) = pAlt \ [\overline{pAlt}] \\ pAlt &::= Co[\overline{(T(\Gamma))}] \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Gamma \subseteq V_T$  is a finite subset of variables and any type variable in the right-hand side of a data type definition must be in the finite subset of variables in the left-hand side.



```

12 factSum :: <List(Int)> × <Int>
③ 13 factSum(<l>, <sum'>) ← true,
14   sum := 0,
15   while_1(<l, sum>, <sum'>)
16
17 while_1 :: <List(Int) × Int> × <Int>
④ 18 while_1(<l, sum>, <sum'>) ← match(l, Nil)
19   sum' := sum
⑤ 20 while_1(<l, sum>, <sum'>) ←
21   nonmatch(l, Nil),
22   head(<l>, <e>),
23   fact(<e>, <prod>),
24   sum1 := sum + prod,
25   tail(<l>, <l1>),
26   while_1(<l1, sum1>, <sum'>)
1 data List(A) =
2   Nil
3   | Cons(A, List(A))
4
5 head(A) :: <List(A)> × <A>
① 6 head(<l>, <e>) ←
7   match(l, Cons(e, l'))
8
9 tail(A) :: <List(A)> × <List(A)>
② 10 tail(<l>, <l'>) ←
11   match(l, Cons(e, l'))

```

Fig. 7. RBR program with polymorphic types.

*Example 12 (Polymorphic list)*

Using the syntax presented in Definition 18 we can define the data type of a polymorphic list ( $\text{List}(A)$ ) as follows:

$$\text{data List}(A) = \text{Nil} \mid \text{Cons}(A, \text{List}(A))$$

The type  $\text{IntList}$  in Definition 1 can be represented by the type  $\text{List}(\text{Int})$ , where the parametric type  $A$  is instantiated to  $\text{Int}$ .

The RBR program syntax in Definition 2 can also be extended by adding *polymorphic typed procedures* in the following way:

$$\text{Proc} ::= p(\Gamma) :: T(\Gamma) \times \cdots \times T(\Gamma) \bar{r}$$

In this context, properly typed terms must be understood as the natural extension to polymorphic types. Figure 7 contains a RBR program with polymorphic types. In order to avoid confusion with the angles used to represent polymorphic types, in the examples of this section we use  $<$  and  $>$  to separate input and output arguments.

Analyzing RBR programs with polymorphic types can be done by transforming them into equivalent programs with monomorphic types only. This basically creates monomorphic versions of procedures (and types) for every use of the polymorphic types. Note that all possible uses (or instantiations) of the polymorphic types can be inferred using standard type inference algorithms. The following list of steps describes how such a transformation can be carried out:

- For every polymorphic type definition  $D(\Gamma)$  and every needed instantiation of the polymorphic type, we replace the polymorphic type definition by new copies using fresh monomorphic types and constructors.
- For every polymorphic procedure  $p(\Gamma)$  and every needed instantiation of its polymorphic type declarations, we replace the polymorphic procedure by new copies using fresh monomorphic types. Calls to procedures are also replaced by their properly typed monomorphic translations.

Note that, in addition, in some situations the user might be interested in analyzing a polymorphic procedure without providing any calling context, i.e., the polymorphic type cannot be instantiated to a monomorphic one in such cases. To handle these cases, for every type variable  $A$  in the program, we create a corresponding *fresh* monomorphic type  $A$  together with a fresh constant  $a$ , and then use those types to instantiate the corresponding procedures.

*Example 13*

Consider the RBR program in Figure 7. We can analyze the program and extract that `head` and `tail` are called in the body of `while_1` with the type  $A$  instantiated to `Int`. Therefore, we obtain the transformed program presented in Figure 8 and its abstraction in Figure 9. Note also that we have instantiated procedures `head` and `tail` with respect to the auxiliary monomorphic type  $A$ . This allows analyzing these procedures directly without considering the calling context of `while_1`.

```

1 data A = a
2
3 data ListA =
4   NilA
5   | ConsA(A, ListA)
6
7 data ListInt =
8   NilInt
9   | ConsInt(Int, ListInt)
10
11 headA :: <ListA> × <A>
① 12 headA(<l>, <e>) ←
13   match(l, ConsA(e, l'))
14
15 headInt :: <ListInt> × <Int>
② 16 headInt(<l>, <e>) ←
17   match(l, ConsInt(e, l'))
18
19 tailA :: <ListA> × <ListA>
③ 20 tailA(<l>, <l'>) ←
21   match(l, ConsA(e, l'))
22   tailInt :: <ListInt> × <ListInt>
④ 23 tailInt(<l>, <l'>) ←
24   match(l, ConsInt(e, l'))
25
26 factSum :: <ListInt> × <Int>
③ 27 factSum(<l>, <sum'>) ← true,
28   sum := 0,
29   while_1(<l>, sum, <sum'>)
30
31 while_1 :: <ListInt × Int> × <Int>
⑤ 32 while_1(<l>, sum, <sum'>) ← match(l, NilInt)
33   sum' := sum
⑥ 34 while_1(<l>, sum, <sum'>) ←
35   nonmatch(l, NilInt),
36   headInt(<l>, <e>),
37   fact(<e>, <prod>),
38   sum1 := sum + prod,
39   tailInt(<l>, <l1>),
40   while_1(<l1>, sum1, <sum'>)

```

Fig. 8. Transformed RBR program.

Notice that, in this example, the number of arguments of `head` and `tail` procedures in the different instantiated versions of Figure 9 are the same, but they can differ depending on the instantiations of the type variables. In this way, we can keep the size relations between input and output instantiated abstractions (this is not possible if we have only one version of `head` and `tail` and a fixed number of arguments).

It is easy to check that any evaluation step given in the original RBR program is translated into an evaluation step in the transformed RBR program. The rest of the analysis follows from previous sections.

Another possibility for handling polymorphism could be to analyze every method once and instantiate that information in every particular method invocation. However, this is

```

1  headA(<LListA, LA>, <EA>) ←
2  LListA = L'ListA + 1
3  ∧ L'ListA ≥ 0 ∧ LA = max(EA, L'A)
4  ∧ EA ≥ 0 ∧ L'A ≥ 0,
5
6  headInt(<LListInt, LInt>, <EInt>) ←
7  LListInt = L'ListInt + 1
8  ∧ L'ListInt ≥ 0
9  ∧ LInt = max(EInt, L'Int),
10
11 tailA(<LListA, LA>, <L'ListA, L'A>) ←
12 LListA = L'ListA + 1
13 ∧ L'ListA ≥ 0 ∧ LA = max(EA, L'A)
14 ∧ EA ≥ 0 ∧ L'A ≥ 0,
15
16 tailInt(<LListInt, LInt>, <L'ListInt, L'Int>)
17 ← LListInt = L'ListInt + 1
18 ∧ L'ListInt ≥ 0
19 ∧ LInt = max(EInt, L'Int),
20 factSum(<LListInt, LInt>, <Sum'Int>) ←
21 ⊤ ∧ LListInt ≥ 0 ∧ L'ListInt ≥ 0,
22 SumInt = 0,
23 while_1(<LListInt, LInt, SumInt>,
24         <Sum'Int>)
25
26 while_1(<LListInt, LInt, SumInt>,
27         <Sum'Int>) ←
28 LInt = -∞ ∧ LListInt = 1
29 ∧ LListInt ≥ 0
30 Sum'Int = SumInt
31
32 while_1(<LListInt, LInt, SumInt>,
33         <Sum'Int>) ← ⊤,
34 headInt(<LListInt, LInt>, <EInt>),
35 fact(<EInt>, <ProdInt>),
36 Sum1Int = SumInt + ProdInt,
37 tailInt(<LListInt, LInt>, <L1ListInt, L1Int>),
38 while_1(<L1ListInt, L1Int, Sum1Int>,
39         <Sum'Int>)
40

```

Fig. 9. Abstraction of the polymorphic RBR program.

not an straightforward approach because different uses of the same polymorphic method can involve a different number of norms whose sizes must be related. Our approach is not completely modular and cannot be applied in every scenario (for example, polymorphic recursion cannot be handled), but provides a simple and effective way of supporting standard parametric polymorphism in our setting.

## 5.2 Context-Sensitive Norms


In this section, we propose a way to improve the precision of typed-norms using annotations. When we define a data type, we can use the same type in different positions and for different purposes. In such cases, if the type is not part of the recursive data structure, we can distinguish the different uses of the same type. The corresponding upper bounds are typically more precise and provide insights on the complexity of processing each part of the data. Technically, to achieve this, we need to annotate non-recursive types with their positions in the data type structures.

*Definition 19 (Annotated Monomorphic types)*

An annotated monomorphic type  $T$  can be a built-in data type as  $\text{Int}$  or an algebraic data type  $D$  defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Dd & ::= \text{data } D = \text{Alt}_D \left[ \overline{Alt}_D \right] \\
 \text{Alt}_D & ::= \text{Co}[(T_{D,Co,1}, \dots, T_{D,Co,n})] \\
 T_{D,Co,i} & ::= \begin{cases} T & \text{if } T \text{ is recursive in } D \\ T_{Co,i} & \text{if } T \text{ is non-recursive in } D \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

By unrolling annotated type definitions as trees we can extend  $\text{Constituents}(T)$  to

Fig. 10. Unrolled type definition tree view of type `IntListList`

consider the annotations in the path from the root to the types. Figure 10 shows the type definition `IntListPair = Pair(IntList, IntList)` as a tree. From these annotations we obtain  $Constituents(IntListPair) = \{(IntListPair, \Lambda), (IntList, (Pair, 1)), (Int, (Pair, 1) \cdot (Cons, 1)), (IntList, (Pair, 2)), (Int, (Pair, 2) \cdot (Cons, 1))\}$ , where each element of the set is formed by a pair (type, chain of positions) that represents its annotations in the tree, and the empty chain is represented by  $\Lambda$ . Notice that, if we do not have duplicated non-recursive types, we obtain the same number of norms (but annotated).

Symbolic typed norms are extended to deal with annotated types. The intuition in  $\|t\|_{(T,A)}$  is that we traverse the annotated data structure using  $A$  and when the annotation is empty ( $\Lambda$ ), we have reached the type-norm we want to compute and we can use a definition similar to Definition 9.

*Definition 20 (Symbolic annotated typed-norms)*

The symbolic typed-norm to compute the size of a term  $t$  (possibly with variables) regarding a type  $T$  is defined as  $\|t\|_{(T,A)} = \|t\|_{(T,A)}^\Lambda$  where:

$$\|t\|_{(T,A)}^\Lambda = \begin{cases} X_{(T,A)} & \text{if } t \equiv x \text{ and } (T, A) \in Constituents(type(x)) \\ -\infty & \text{if } t \equiv x, T = \text{Int} \text{ and } (\text{Int}, A) \notin Constituents(type(x)) \\ n & \text{if } t \equiv n \text{ and } T = \text{Int} \\ \|e_1\|_{(T,A)}^\Lambda \pm \|e_2\|_{(T,A)}^\Lambda & \text{if } t \equiv e_1 \pm e_2 \text{ and } T = \text{Int} \\ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_{(T,A)}^\Lambda & \text{if } t = Co(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } type(t) = T \\ \max_{i=1}^n \|t_i\|_{(T,A)}^\Lambda & \text{if } t = Co(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } type(t) \neq T \\ 0 & \text{in other case} \end{cases}$$

$$\|t\|_{(T,A)}^{(Co,i) \cdot rest} = \begin{cases} \|t_i\|_{(T,A)}^{rest} & \text{if } t = Co(t_1, \dots, t_n) \\ -\infty & \text{if } t \neq Co(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ and } T = \text{Int} \\ 0 & \text{in other case} \end{cases}$$

By using  $\|t\|_{(T,A)}$ , we obtain a sound abstraction in the sense of Theorem 1, and the relevant type inference presented in Section 4 could be easily adapted to consider annotated type-norms. In the following, we present an example that shows how this technique is applied in practice.

*Example 14*

Consider the program in Figure 11 (left) where the rule `lengthP` takes a non-recursive `IntListPair` structure and computes the length of the second list if the first list is empty; otherwise, returns the length of the first list. Since both lists are of the same type (`IntList`), we are interested in considering their norms separately to obtain a better upper bound.

<pre> 1 data IntListPair = Pair(IntList, IntList) 2 3 lengthP :: IntListPair × Int ① 4 lengthP(p, res) ← 5   match(p, Pair(Nil, l2)), 6   length(l2, res) ② 7 lengthP(p, res) ← 8   nomatch(p, Pair(Nil, l2)), 9   match(p, Pair(l1, l2)), 10  length(l1, res) </pre>	<pre> 11 lengthP(&lt;P<sub>IntListPair</sub>, P<sub>IntList<sub>1</sub></sub>, P<sub>IntList<sub>2</sub></sub>, P<sub>Int<sub>1</sub></sub>     , P<sub>Int<sub>2</sub></sub>&gt;, &lt;Res<sub>Int</sub>&gt;) ← 12   P<sub>IntList<sub>1</sub></sub> = 1 13   ∧ P<sub>IntList<sub>1</sub></sub> ≥ 0 14   ∧ P<sub>IntList<sub>2</sub></sub> ≥ 0, 15   length(&lt;P<sub>IntList<sub>2</sub></sub>, P<sub>Int<sub>2</sub></sub>&gt;, &lt;Res<sub>Int</sub>&gt;) 16 17 lengthP(&lt;P<sub>IntListPair</sub>, P<sub>IntList<sub>1</sub></sub>, P<sub>IntList<sub>2</sub></sub>, P<sub>Int<sub>1</sub></sub>     , P<sub>Int<sub>2</sub></sub>&gt;, &lt;Res<sub>Int</sub>&gt;) ← 18   P<sub>IntList<sub>1</sub></sub> &gt; 1 19   ∧ P<sub>IntList<sub>1</sub></sub> ≥ 0 20   ∧ P<sub>IntList<sub>2</sub></sub> ≥ 0, 21   length(&lt;P<sub>IntList<sub>1</sub></sub>, P<sub>Int<sub>1</sub></sub>&gt;, &lt;Res<sub>Int</sub>&gt;) </pre>
---	--

Fig. 11. Abstraction of RBR program with context-sensitive norms.

Figure 11 (right) shows this abstraction<sup>7</sup>. It basically distinguishes the uses of `IntList` by their position in the definition of `IntListPair`—note the use of `IntList1` and `IntList2`. Using this improvement, we can obtain the upper bound  $1 + \max(6 + 6 * P_{\text{IntList}_1}, 5 + 6 * P_{\text{IntList}_2})$  for the function `lengthP(<PIntListPair, PIntList1, PIntList2, PInt1, PInt2>, <ResInt>)` instead of  $7 + 6 * P_{\text{IntList}}$  `lengthP(<PIntListPair, PIntList, PInt>, <ResInt>)`. Note that in this case  $P_{\text{IntList}} = P_{\text{IntList}_1} + P_{\text{IntList}_2}$ .

The proposed approach using annotated types to handle context-sensitive norms generates abstract programs without any type information where every parameter represents an integer value. Therefore, these abstract programs can be solved automatically to upper and lower resource bounds using the existing techniques with no additional adaptations.

## 6 Experiments

We have implemented our approach in the SACO system (Albert et al. 2011; Albert et al. 2014). SACO is a Static Analyzer for Concurrent Objects that in addition to the resource analyzer also includes a deadlock analyzer. Although in this paper we have focused on sequential programs, concurrent objects (Agha and Callsen 1993) provide a formalism to model concurrent and distributed systems using the ABS language mentioned in Section 2. SACO carries out the transformation of ABS programs into the intermediate representation defined in Section 2 so that new extensions and analyses can be integrated in SACO at this point in the implementation. The whole system is implemented in Prolog and can be used from an online web interface at <https://costa.fdi.ucm.es/saco/web/>, where in addition to the examples that will be described in this section, the user can type her own programs and run the available analyses.

In this section we perform an experimental comparison of the different norms to evaluate both the precision of the obtained upper bounds and the time needed by our resource analysis framework to obtain them. In order to create a set of benchmarks as complete as possible, we have collected tests from different sources. First, we have taken some

<sup>7</sup> For simplicity, we use `IntList1` and `IntList2` instead of `IntList(Pair,1)` and `IntList(Pair,2)`, and `Int1` and `Int2` instead of `Int(Pair,1).(Cons,1)` and `Int(Pair,2).(Cons,1)`.

Method	TS	TN sum		TN max	
		Inference	w/o Inference	Inference	w/o Inference
append	121	32	32	32	32
appendAll2	41809	535	451	3189	3189
coupled	92	84	84	84	84
dyade	3601.5	273	273	273	273
eratos	6424	387	387	387	387
factSum	573	–	–	63	63
fib	627	467	467	467	467
isort	3912.5	285	285	285	285
isortlist	2100497	7214.5	3999.5	14444	14444
listfact	573	–	–	63	63
listnum	48	44.5	44.5	44.5	44.5
minSort	6485.5	835	835	457	457
nub	1454705	3492	3571.5	–	–
partition	247.5	65	65	65	65
traverse1	1243	83	83	–	–
traverse2	1234	83	83	–	–
zip3	291	81	87	81	90

Fig. 12. Median number of steps when evaluating the upper bounds for the list manipulation examples using 10 random input parameters.

Method	TS	TN sum		TN max	
		Inference	w/o Inference	Inference	w/o Inference
ButtonImpl.press	725	217	217	217	217
Button-Impl.registerListener	113	40	40	40	40
ClientGUI-Impl.init2	146	73	73	73	73
ClientImpl.getGUI	167	94	94	94	94
ClientImpl.receive	154	64	64	64	124
Main.main	17831	4687	4372	4687	3859
ServerImpl.connect	170	80	80	80	116
Server-Impl.sessionClosed	134	44	44	44	44
SessionImpl.close	138	48	48	48	48
SessionImpl.init2	159	69	69	69	105
UserImpl.use	750	242	242	242	242

Fig. 13. Median number of steps when evaluating the upper bounds for Chat methods using 10 random input parameters.

examples from the Resource Aware ML (Hoffmann et al. 2017; Hoffmann et al. 2012; Hofmann and Jost 2003) (RAML) set of examples, which are also used in the resource usage analysis using sized types presented in (Serrano et al. 2014). These examples are mainly focused on list manipulation, and include:

- *append* and *appendAll2* for appending lists and compound lists,
- *coupled*, a pair of mutually recursive functions that generate lists of a given size,
- *dyade* for combining and multiplying two lists,

Method	TS	TN sum		TN max	
		Inference	w/o Inference	Inference	w/o Inference
Solver.bestSolution	2	2	2	2	2
Solver.contains	840.5	118.5	118.5	118.5	118.5
Solver.randomMap	23873.5	515	515	515	515
Solver.utility	95160	1250	6076	1250	<i>timeout</i>

Fig. 14. Median number of steps when evaluating the upper bounds for ETICS methods using 10 random input parameters.

- *eratos* for detecting prime numbers in a range using the *sieve of Eratosthenes*,
- *fib* for computing the  $n^{\text{th}}$  number of the Fibonacci sequence,
- *isort*, *isortlist* and *minSort*, for sorting integer lists and lists of integer lists,
- *listnum*, that creates a list of decreasing integer numbers,
- *nub* for removing duplicates in a list of lists,
- *partition* for splitting a list given a pivot element, and
- *zip3* for combining 3 lists in a list of triples.

Additionally, we have included in this first set of list manipulation examples the *factSum* method presented in Figure 1, the *listfact* running example used in (Serrano et al. 2014) for adding all the factorial numbers in a list, and two extra methods *traverse1* and *traverse2* for traversing lists of lists.

As the second set of examples we have used 11 different methods of the *Chat* program, a well-known distributed ABS (Johnsen et al. 2012) program used for testing and evaluating static analyses. This program provides a chat server that allows different clients to exchange messages. Finally, we have also considered a third set of 4 methods from the industrial case study ETICS<sup>8</sup>. This case study models in ABS the process of exploiting on-demand virtual machines to satisfy service requests trying to maximize the profit considering cost and penalty terms specified in service level agreements (SLAs). The complete code of all the examples used in this section can be found in <https://costa.fdi.ucm.es/saco/web/> inside the “*Typed-Norms*” folder.

Figures 12–14 contain upper bounds on the number of steps obtained by our resource analysis framework with different norms and enabling/disabling the relevant types inference algorithm presented in Section 4. The resource analysis framework obtains upper bounds as arithmetic expressions on the input parameters of the methods, which are difficult to compare (when possible). In order to easily compare the upper bounds obtained for the different norms, we have evaluated them using 10 sets of random input parameters.<sup>9</sup> This approach generates 10 different numeric values for each method and norm, so in the Figures 12–14 we have included the median of those numbers.<sup>10</sup> If the framework is not able to obtain an upper bound for a method using a particular norm we mark it with the symbol “-”, and if the framework requires more than 2 hours to obtain the upper bound we use the term “*timeout*”. These figures contain a row for each method,

<sup>8</sup> [http://envisage-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/D4\\_4\\_1r.pdf](http://envisage-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/D4_4_1r.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> Note that we evaluate the obtained upper bounds, so in this comparison we are considering the worst case of every method for different random sizes of its parameters.

<sup>10</sup> We have used the median value instead of the average to avoid any influence of extreme outliers. These values may appear, as we are evaluating upper bounds using random input parameters.

whose upper bounds have been computed using the different norms presented in Definitions 6 and 8: term-size norm  $\|\cdot\|_{ts}$  (**TS** in the figures), typed-norm  $\|\cdot\|_T^+$  (**TN sum** in the figures), and typed-norm  $\|\cdot\|_T$  (**TN max** in the figures). In the case of typed-norms, the upper bound has been computed inferring the useful types (column *Inference*) and without inferring that information (column *w/o Inference*).

The main result extracted from Figures 12–14 is that, for all methods, the resource analysis framework obtains more precise results using typed-norms ( $\|\cdot\|_T^+$  or  $\|\cdot\|_T$ ) than using term-size ( $\|\cdot\|_{ts}$ ). Concretely, for the list manipulation examples in Figure 12 we observe that the ratio  $\frac{\text{steps typed-norm}}{\text{steps term-size}}$  ranges from 0.002 (*isortlist*, *nub*) to 0.93 (*listnum*), although the vast majority of the examples show a very small ratio: considering the 17 methods, the 53% have a ratio smaller than 0.1 and 82% have a ratio smaller than 0.3. As shown in Figure 13, the examples of the *Chat* program obtain more precise upper bounds than using term-size, but the gain is not as relevant as in the list manipulation examples. For these methods, the ratio ranges between 0.22 for *Main.main* and 0.80 for *ClientImpl.receive*. Finally, Figure 14 shows improved upper bounds with ratio 0.01 for *Solver.utility*, 0.02 for *Solver.randomMap* and 0.14 for *Solver.contains*. In the case of *Solver.bestSolution*, there is no improvement because the method has a constant cost which does not involve traversing any data structure, so in this case the chosen norm is not relevant for the upper bound.

Another important result extracted from Figures 12–14 is that, for the majority of the methods, the upper bounds obtained using  $\|\cdot\|_T^+$  and  $\|\cdot\|_T$  are equal. There are cases where one typed-norm definition allows obtaining an upper bound, whereas the other definition cannot (namely in *factSum*, *listfact*, *nub*, *traverse1*, and *traverse2* from Figure 12). This is not a surprising result, as depending on the manipulation performed on a data structure one typed-norm can detect a decreasing of the size whereas the other cannot, which has a dramatic impact on the obtained upper bound. However, this cannot be seen as a practical limitation because our resource analysis framework can support term-size norm and both types of typed-norms, so the user can choose at any moment which norm to use.

A surprising result observed in Figures 12–14 is that, in some cases like *appendAll2*, *isortlist*, *nub*, *zip3*, *ClientImpl.receive*, *Main.main*, or *Solver.utility*, the upper bound obtained for a typed-norm is different with or without the inference enabled. From the theoretical point of view both versions have the same upper bounds, but the actual implementation of the cost relation solver can produce different upper bounds. Concretely, we use CoFloCo (Flores-Montoya and Hähnle 2014; Flores-Montoya 2016), a compositional solver for programs with complex execution flow and multi-dimensional ranking functions. This solver can find different ranking functions for recurrences (loops), and in those cases it selects one of them to generate the final upper bound. For this selection step, it takes into account which ranking functions can be maximized in terms of the input parameters, and it uses some heuristics in case of ties. When we remove some variables thanks to the inference of typed-norms, the set of ranking functions found by CoFloCo for a given recurrence can be different, altering the selected ranking function and therefore the final upper bound.

Another dimension we have measured in our benchmarks is the time needed by our resource analysis framework to obtain upper bounds using the different norms. Figures 15–17 show these results for the 3 sets of examples, measuring time in milliseconds



Method	TS	TN sum		TN max	
		Inference	w/o Inference	Inference	w/o Inference
append	31.0	32.0	62.0	46.0	31.0
appendAll2	125.0	282.0	281.0	172.0	187.0
coupled	47.0	47.0	62.0	16.0	47.0
dyade	110.0	62.0	110.0	63.0	110.0
eratos	125.0	109.0	140.0	93.0	141.0
factSum	140.0	–	–	47.0	159.0
fib	31.0	31.0	31.0	16.0	31.0
isort	94.0	94.0	125.0	110.0	94.0
isortlist	375.0	937.0	797.0	359.0	375.0
listfact	46.0	–	–	62.0	109.0
listnum	32.0	31.0	47.0	31.0	46.0
minSort	109.0	109.0	140.0	125.0	172.0
nub	594.0	531.0	647.0	–	–
partition	78.0	78.0	110.0	93.0	125.0
traverse1	62.0	63.0	62.0	–	–
traverse2	31.0	47.0	47.0	–	–
zip3	94.0	78.0	141.0	62.0	125.0

Fig. 15. Time (milliseconds) to obtain upper bounds for the list manipulation examples

Method	TS	TN sum		TN max	
		Inference	w/o Inference	Inference	w/o Inference
ButtonImpl.press	63.0	63.0	157.0	63.0	172.0
Button-Impl.registerListener	31.0	47.0	63.0	31.0	125.0
ClientGUI-Impl.init2	62.0	47.0	109.0	47.0	141.0
ClientImpl.getGUI	62.0	62.0	140.0	78.0	157.0
ClientImpl.receive	63.0	94.0	109.0	78.0	140.0
Main.main	765.0	375.0	875.0	484.0	750.0
ServerImpl.connect	141.0	47.0	141.0	63.0	188.0
Server-Impl.sessionClosed	109.0	47.0	94.0	63.0	125.0
SessionImpl.close	47.0	32.0	110.0	63.0	94.0
SessionImpl.init2	94.0	63.0	125.0	63.0	109.0
UserImpl.use	78.0	62.0	172.0	78.0	156.0

Fig. 16. Time (milliseconds) to obtain upper bounds for Chat methods

in a CPU Intel<sup>®</sup> i5-7300U CPU with 8 GB of memory. As before, we use “–” to denote that the framework is not able to obtain the upper bound and “*timeout*” if the framework does not finish in 2 hours. In general, obtaining upper bounds using typed-norms requires more time than using the term-size norm. This fact was expected because of two causes: the additional stage for inferring typed-norms and the increment in variables when using typed-norms. Although the data-flow analysis is not very expensive, for small programs where solving is very fast the inference can require a similar amount of time, therefore significantly increasing the overall time. However, independently of the typed-norm inference stage, using typed-norms implies that one data-structure can be measured using

Method	TS	TN sum		TN max	
		Inference	w/o Inference	Inference	w/o Inference
Solver.bestSolution	47.0	30.0	31.0	31.0	31.0
Solver.contains	360.0	265.0	469.0	234.0	500.0
Solver.randomMap	359.0	328.0	2000.0	312.0	2063.0
Solver.utility	3719.0	4125.0	444109.0	3937.0	<i>timeout</i>

Fig. 17. Time (milliseconds) to obtain upper bounds for ETICS methods. Executions were aborted after 2 hours.

different sizes, which results in more than one variable per structure in the set of cost relations that the solver processes. The time needed by the solver is proportional to the complexity of the cost relations (i.e., the number of relations and the amount of variables), so using typed-norms usually increases the overall time of the analysis. As shown in Figures 15–17, the increase of time wrt. term-size norms is not very pronounced and this extra time greatly compensates the gain in precision. However, there are also some situations (for example in *coupled*, *eratos*, *zip3*, *ClientGUIImpl.init2*, *ServerImpl.connect*, *ServerImpl.sessionClosed*, and *Solver.contains*, among others) where the time required to obtain upper bounds using typed-norms with inference is faster than using term-size. The explanation of this behavior is that the type-norm inference can detect that a parameter has not relevant types (i.e., its value is not involved in any recurrence), so that parameter disappears from the cost relations, reducing the number of variables. As explained before, the resulting set of cost relations will be simpler and the solver will require less time to obtain the upper bound. Similarly, we also notice that using the typed-norm inference in general produces better times than avoiding this step. Although this requires an extra analysis, the reduction on the complexity (number of variables) of the resulting cost relations makes the resolution stage faster, producing smaller overall times. An extreme example of this situation is the method *Solver.utility*, where not applying inference is 120 times slower (for  $\|\cdot\|_T^+$ ) or reaches the time limit of 2 hours (for  $\|\cdot\|_T$ ).

### 6.1 Comparison to RAML and Sized Types

To conclude this section we will compare the results obtained by RAML (Hoffmann et al. 2017; Hoffmann et al. 2012; Hofmann and Jost 2003), sized types (Serrano et al. 2014) and our approach using the set of list manipulation examples. To that end, we will use Table 1 from (Serrano et al. 2014) extended with a new column containing the upper bounds obtained by our resource analysis framework using the best typed-norm definition for each program. We will also consider a new example *hanoi* that computes a list of movements needed to solve the Tower of Hanoi puzzle, as it is included in the comparison of (Serrano et al. 2014). The results can be found in Figure 18, where we show the complexity order of the upper bounds instead of the concrete expression obtained. Parameters L, L1, L2, and L3 are lists of different types, and parameters N, A, B, C, and E are integer numbers. We represent the integer type as “i”, lists of integers as “il”, lists of lists of integers as “ill”, and lists of lists of lists of integers as “illl”.

As shown in Figure 18, the three approaches obtain the same results for the majority of the methods and they differ in a small number of cases. RAML cannot handle *factSum*,

Method	RAML	Sized Types	Typed-norms
append(L1,L2)	$L_{i1}$	$L_{i1}$	$L_{i1}$
appendAll2(L)	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i111}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i111}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i111}$
coupled(N)	$N_i$	$N_i$	$N_i$
dyade(L1,L2)	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{2i}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{2i}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{2i}$
eratos(L)	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$
factSum(L)	infeasible	$L_{i1} \cdot L_i$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_i$
fib(N)	infeasible	$\varphi^{N_i}$	$2^{N_i}$
hanoi(N,A,B,C)	infeasible	$2^{N_i}$	unknown
isort(L)	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$
isortlist(L)	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$
listfact(L)	unknown	$L_{i1} \cdot L_i$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_i$
listnum(N)	unknown	$N_i$	$N_i$
minSort(L)	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i1} \cdot L_{i1}$
nub(L)	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$
partition(E,L)	$L_{i1}$	$L_{i1}$	$L_{i1}$
traverse1(L)	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$	unknown	$L_{i1}$
traverse2(L)	$L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$	$L_{i1}$	$L_{i1}$
zip3(L1,L2,L3)	$L_{3i1}$	$\min(L_{1i1}, L_{2i1}, L_{3i1})$	$L_{3i1}$

Fig. 18. Complexity order of the upper bounds obtained by RAML (Hoffmann et al. 2017), sized types (Serrano et al. 2014), and typed-norms.

fib, listfact, and listnum, but both sized types and typed-norms obtain a similar upper bound. In the case of fib both approaches obtain an exponential upper bound but sized types obtain a slightly more precise bound of  $\varphi^N$ , where  $\varphi \approx 1.62$  is the golden ratio, whereas our approach obtains the upper bound  $2^N$ . Both RAML and typed-norms obtain upper bounds for traverse1 and traverse2, but the upper bounds  $L_{i1}$  computed by typed-norms are more precise than the ones from RAML ( $L_{i11} \cdot L_{i1}$ ). On the other hand, sized types cannot handle traverse1 but generate the same upper bound  $L_{i1}$  for traverse2. In zip3 both RAML and typed-norms obtain the same upper bound  $L_{3i1}$  (the length of the third list), but the upper bound  $\min(L_{1i1}, L_{2i1}, L_{3i1})$  generated by sized types is more precise, as it represents the minimum length of any of the lists. Finally, RAML cannot handle the hanoi method whereas sized types obtain an upper bound of  $2^N$ . Note that the fact that SACO cannot obtain an upper bound for this example is not related to typed-norms abstraction. This program creates a data-structure of exponential size in the input parameter  $N$  and then traverses it. SACO is able to infer that the cost of generating the data-structure is  $2^N$ , and that the cost of traversing it is linear in the size of the data-structure. However, the underlying cost analysis techniques of SACO cannot track exponential input-output dependencies, and thus it fails to conclude that the cost of traversing the data-structure is actually exponential in  $N$ .

## 7 Related Work

Our work is inspired by (Genaim et al. 2002) where the authors introduce the notion of typed-based norm in the context of termination analysis, and show how types can be very useful for finding suitable norms even for untyped languages like Prolog. They

also illustrate that typed-based norms sometimes must be combined to get a termination proof.

Resource Aware ML (Hoffmann et al. 2017; Hoffmann et al. 2012; Hofmann and Jost 2003) uses automatic amortized resource analysis, where the main idea is to consider potential functions that depend on data structures. For every step the available potential must be sufficient for the cost of the evaluation and the potential of the next state. The information about the potential functions (combinations of a set of base polynomials) are annotated in the types, and the type system collects the relations among the different types, which are finally solved by linear programming. On the other hand, our transformational approach is based on Wegbreit’s (Wegbreit 1975): (1) generation of an abstract representation and (2) resolution of cost relations. Although originally presented for Lisp programs, this approach has been applied to other functional languages (Sands 1990; Grobauer 2001), imperative languages like Java bytecode (Albert et al. 2007) or actor systems (Albert et al. 2015).

Sized types (Hughes et al. 1996; Hughes and Pareto 1999; Chin and Khoo 2001) are type expressions that incorporates annotations representing lower/upper bounds of the size of the different components of a type. They were originally proposed for guaranteeing various basic properties of reactive systems like productivity, memory leaks, or termination. In (Pedro Vasconcelos 2008), Vasconcelos proposed to use sized types to track the different sizes involved in a data structure and use them to perform resource analysis. Unlike our approach, in this approach one can handle multiple typed-norms on variables only by having parametric data-structures. The techniques of Vasconcelos have been extended to the context of logic programs (Serrano et al. 2013) and applied to resource usage analysis (Serrano et al. 2014) inside the PLAI abstract interpretation framework (Muthukumar and Hermenegildo 1992; Puebla and Hermenegildo 1996) of CiaoPP (Hermenegildo et al. 2012).

Our approach and the one presented in (Serrano et al. 2013; Serrano et al. 2014) use the sizes of different inner parts of a data structure in order to obtain more precise bounds, but differ in the destination resource analysis framework: the analysis in (Serrano et al. 2013; Serrano et al. 2014) must fit in the abstract interpretation framework used by CiaoPP, whereas our analysis must fit in a transformational framework based on Wegbreit’s approach (Wegbreit 1975). From this point of view, the presented approach in this paper is simpler to define and to implement because we do not need to update the abstract interpretation theory (defining specific concretization, abstraction functions, etc.). Instead, we have to add explicit arguments for the sizes of data structures and define a size abstraction which is rather straightforward. The implementation simply requires a pre-process to add the arguments and properly abstract them. Then, standard size analysis works on the transformed program. As regards accuracy, the resource analysis in (Serrano et al. 2014) is closer to logic programming and takes into account some features like backtracking or failure to obtain more precise upper and lower bounds. The sized types used in (Serrano et al. 2014) can track separately the size of different components of a clause, but the only data type they use are lists of elements. Using lists and procedures, our approach could provide a similar level of precision. Finally, the approach used in (Serrano et al. 2014) detects relevant Prolog variables and generates constraints between them. Once a variable is detected as relevant, its complete sized type is used to generate constraints, although some of them may not have any impact in the resource

analysis. As explained in Section 4, we define an additional step to infer the relevant typed-norms of any variable, which is an extension of the results in (Albert et al. 2011) to deal with typed-norms in addition to useless arguments. Using this analysis, irrelevant variables will have an empty set of relevant typed-norms, and will therefore be ignored in the resolution phase. Moreover, for relevant variables only those relevant typed-norms will be kept in the next phase. As explained in the experiments in Section 6, removing useless typed-norms is an optimization in the resolution phase with a great impact in the overall time when obtaining upper bounds, so this analysis is essential to be scalable in practice. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, it is the first time that it is applied on norms.

## 8 Conclusions and Future Work

We have presented a transformational approach to resource analysis with typed-norms which has the advantage that its formalization can be done by only adapting the first phase of cost analysis in which the program is transformed into an intermediate abstract program. Besides its simple formal development, the implementation easily integrates into the previous system as a pre-phase to the existing analysis. Additionally, we have presented, to the best of our knowledge, the first algorithm to automatically infer typed-norms from programs. Our analysis is formalized on a simple rule-based language and it is therefore not tied to any particular programming language. Translating from the standard programming languages to the rule-based form is rather straightforward (see e.g. (Albert et al. 2015; Albert et al. 2012)). Finally, we have carried out a thorough experimental evaluation of our proposal and integrated it within the SACO system (Albert et al. 2011). In future work we plan to extend our work to a concurrent setting for which the inference of typed-norms will be more contrived.

## References

- AGHA, G. AND CALLSEN, C. J. 1993. Actorspace: An open distributed programming paradigm. In *Proceedings 4th ACM Conference on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, ACM SIGPLAN Notices. 23–32.
- ALBERT, E., ARENAS, P., CORREAS, J., GENAIM, S., GÓMEZ-ZAMALLOA, M., AND AN D GUILLERMO ROMÁN-DÍEZ, G. P. 2015. Object-Sensitive Cost Analysis for Concurrent Objects. *Software Testing, Verification and Reliability* 25, 3, 218–271.
- ALBERT, E., ARENAS, P., FLORES-MONTOYA, A., GENAIM, S., GÓMEZ-ZAMALLOA, M., MARTIN-MARTIN, E., PUEBLA, G., AND ROMÁN-DÍEZ, G. 2014. SACO: Static Analyzer for Concurrent Objects. In *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems - 20th International Conference, TACAS 2014*, E. Ábrahám and K. Havelund, Eds. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8413. Springer, 562–567.
- ALBERT, E., ARENAS, P., GENAIM, S., GÓMEZ-ZAMALLOA, M., AND PUEBLA, G. 2011. Cost Analysis of Concurrent OO programs. In *Programming Languages and Systems - 9th Asian Symposium, APLAS 2011*, Kenting, Taiwan, December 5-7, 2011. *Proceedings*, H. Yang, Ed. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7078. Springer, 238–254.
- ALBERT, E., ARENAS, P., GENAIM, S., AND PUEBLA, G. 2011. Closed-Form Upper Bounds in Static Cost Analysis. *Journal of Automated Reasoning* 46, 2, 161–203.
- ALBERT, E., ARENAS, P., GENAIM, S., PUEBLA, G., AND ZANARDINI, D. 2007. Cost Analysis of Java Bytecode. In *Programming Languages and Systems, 16th European Symposium on*

- Programming, ESOP 2007, Held as Part of the Joint European Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2007, Braga, Portugal, March 24 - April 1, 2007, Proceedings, R. D. Nicola, Ed. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4421. Springer-Verlag, 157–172.
- ALBERT, E., ARENAS, P., GENAIM, S., PUEBLA, G., AND ZANARDINI, D. 2008. Removing Useless Variables in Cost Analysis of Java Bytecode. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC)*, Fortaleza, Ceara, Brazil, March 16-20, 2008, R. L. Wainwright and H. Haddad, Eds. ACM, 368–375.
- ALBERT, E., ARENAS, P., GENAIM, S., PUEBLA, G., AND ZANARDINI, D. 2012. Cost Analysis of Object-Oriented Bytecode Programs. *Theoretical Computer Science (Special Issue on Quantitative Aspects of Programming Languages)* 413, 1, 142–159.
- ALBERT, E., GENAIM, S., AND GUTIÉRREZ, R. 2014. A Transformational Approach to Resource Analysis with Typed-Norms. In *Proc. of the 23rd International Symposium on Logic-based Program Synthesis and Transformation (LOPSTR'13)*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8901. Springer, 38–53.
- ALBERT, E., GENAIM, S., AND MASUD, A. N. 2013. On the Inference of Resource Usage Upper and Lower Bounds. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 14, 3, 22:1–22:35.
- ALONSO-BLAS, D. E., ARENAS, P., AND GENAIM, S. 2011. Handling Non-linear Operations in the Value Analysis of COSTA. In *Proceedings of the Bytecode 2011 workshop, the Sixth Workshop on Bytecode Semantics, Verification, Analysis and Transformation (Bytecode)*. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 279 Issue 1. Elsevier, 3–17.
- BOSSI, A., COCCO, N., AND FABRIS, M. 1991. Proving Termination of Logic Programs by Exploiting Term Properties. In *APSOFT'91: Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Theory and Practice of Software Development*, Brighton, UK, April 8-12, 1991, Volume 2: Advances in Distributed Computing (ADC) and Colloquium on Combining Paradigms for Software Development (CCPSD), S. Abramsky and T. S. E. Maibaum, Eds. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 494. Springer, 153–180.
- BRUYNNOGHE, M., CODISH, M., J. P. GALLAGHER, GENAIM, S., AND VANHOOF, W. 2007. Termination analysis of logic programs through combination of type-based norms. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 29, 2.
- CHIN, W.-N. AND KHOO, S.-C. 2001. Calculating sized types. *Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation* 14, 2 (Sep), 261–300.
- CYTRON, R., FERRANTE, J., ROSEN, B. K., WEGMAN, M. N., AND ZADECK, F. K. 1991. Efficiently Computing Static Single Assignment Form and the Control Dependence Graph. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 13, 4, 451–490.
- FLORES-MONTOYA, A. 2016. Upper and lower amortized cost bounds of programs expressed as cost relations. In *FM 2016: Formal Methods - 21st International Symposium*, Limassol, Cyprus, November 9-11, 2016, Proceedings, J. S. Fitzgerald, C. L. Heitmeyer, S. Gnesi, and A. Philippou, Eds. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9995. Springer, 254–273.
- FLORES-MONTOYA, A. AND HÄHNLE, R. 2014. Resource analysis of complex programs with cost equations. In *Programming Languages and Systems - 12th Asian Symposium, APLAS 2014*, Singapore, November 17-19, 2014, Proceedings. LNCS, vol. 8858. Springer, 275–295.
- GENAIM, S., CODISH, M., GALLAGHER, J., AND LAGOON, V. 2002. Combining Norms to Prove Termination. In *3rd International Workshop on Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation (VMCAI'02)*, G. Goos, J. Hartmanis, and J. van Leeuwen, Eds. LNCS, vol. 2294. Springer, 123–138.
- GROBAUER, B. 2001. Cost recurrences for DML programs. In *International Conference on Functional Programming*. 253–264.
- HERMENEGILDO, M. V., BUENO, F., CARRO, M., LÓPEZ, P., MERA, E., MORALES, J., AND PUEBLA, G. 2012. An Overview of Ciao and its Design Philosophy. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 12, 1–2 (January), 219–252. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.5497>.
- HOFFMANN, J., AEHLIG, K., AND HOFMANN, M. 2012. Resource Aware ML. In *24rd Inter-*

- national Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV'12)*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7358. Springer, 781–786.
- HOFFMANN, J., DAS, A., AND WENG, S.-C. 2017. Towards automatic resource bound analysis for ocaml. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*. POPL 2017. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 359–373.
- HOFMANN, M. AND JOST, S. 2003. Static Prediction of Heap Space Usage for First-Order Functional Programs. In *30th Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL'03)*. ACM Press.
- HUGHES, J. AND PARETO, L. 1999. Recursion and Dynamic Data-structures in Bounded Space: Towards Embedded ML Programming. In *Proc. of ICFP'99*. ACM Press, 70–81.
- HUGHES, J., PARETO, L., AND SABRY, A. 1996. Proving the correctness of reactive systems using sized types. In *POPL*. 410–423.
- JOHNSEN, E. B., HÄHNLE, R., SCHÄFER, J., SCHLATTE, R., AND STEFFEN, M. 2012. ABS: A Core Language for Abstract Behavioral Specification. In *Formal Methods for Components and Objects - 9th International Symposium, FMCO 2010, Graz, Austria, November 29 - December 1, 2010. Revised Papers*, B. K. Aichernig, F. S. de Boer, and M. M. Bonsangue, Eds. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6957. Springer, 142–164.
- KING, A., SHEN, K., AND BENOY, F. 1997. Lower-bound Time-complexity Analysis of Logic Programs. In *1997 International Logic Programming Symposium*, J. Maluszyński, Ed. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 261–275.
- MUTHUKUMAR, K. AND HERMENEGILDO, M. 1992. Compile-time Derivation of Variable Dependency Using Abstract Interpretation. *Journal of Logic Programming* 13, 2/3 (July), 315–347.
- NIELSON, F., NIELSON, H. R., AND HANKIN, C. 1999. *Principles of Program Analysis*. Springer.
- PEDRO VASCONCELOS. 2008. Space cost analysis using sized types. Ph.D. thesis, School of Computer Science, University of St Andrews.
- PIERCE, B. C. 2002. *Types and Programming Languages*. MIT Press.
- PUEBLA, G. AND HERMENEGILDO, M. 1996. Optimized Algorithms for the Incremental Analysis of Logic Programs. In *International Static Analysis Symposium (SAS 1996)*. Number 1145 in LNCS. Springer-Verlag, 270–284.
- SANDS, D. 1990. Calculi for time analysis of functional programs. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computing, Imperial College London.
- SERRANO, A., LÓPEZ-GARCÍA, P., BUENO, F., AND HERMENEGILDO, M. V. 2013. Sized Type Analysis for Logic Programs. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 13, 4-5-Online-Supplement (August).
- SERRANO, A., LÓPEZ-GARCÍA, P., AND HERMENEGILDO, M. V. 2014. Resource usage analysis of logic programs via abstract interpretation using sized types. *TPLP* 14, 4-5, 739–754.
- TARSKI, A. 1955. A lattice-theoretical fixpoint theorem and its applications. *Pacific journal of Mathematics* 5, 2, 285–309.
- VASCONCELOS, P. AND HAMMOND, K. 2003. Inferring Cost Equations for Recursive, Polymorphic and Higher-Order Functional Programs. In *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Implementation of Functional Languages*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3145. Springer-Verlag, 86–101.
- WEGBREIT, B. 1975. Mechanical Program Analysis. *Communications ACM* 18, 9, 528–539.

## Appendix A Proofs

*Definition 21 (eval<sub>t</sub> function for terms)*

The function  $eval_t : Terms \times \mathcal{LV} \hookrightarrow Terms$  evaluates a term  $t$  based on a variable mapping  $lv$ :

$$eval_t(t, lv) = \begin{cases} lv(x) & \text{if } t \equiv x, x \in dom(lv) \\ n & \text{if } t \equiv n \\ eval_t(e_1, lv) + eval_t(e_2, lv) & \text{if } t \equiv e_1 + e_2 \\ eval_t(e_1, lv) - eval_t(e_2, lv) & \text{if } t \equiv e_1 - e_2 \\ Co(\overline{eval_t(t_n, lv)}) & \text{if } t \equiv Co(\overline{t_n}) \\ \text{undefined} & \text{i.o.c} \end{cases}$$

*Definition 22 (eval<sub>g</sub> function for guards)*

The function  $eval_g : Guards \times \mathcal{LV} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{LV}$  checks if a guard  $g$  is satisfied w.r.t. a variable mapping  $lv$ , returning the variable mapping that instantiates the variables in the guard:

$$eval_g(g, lv) = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{if } g \equiv true \\ lv_1 \uplus lv_2 & \text{if } g \equiv g_1 \wedge g_2, eval_g(g_1, lv) = lv_1, \\ & \quad eval_g(g_2, lv \uplus lv_1) = lv_2 \\ \epsilon & \text{if } g \equiv e_1 \text{ op } e_2, \text{ op} \in \{>, =, \geq\}, \\ & \quad eval_t(e_1, lv) = n_1, eval_t(e_2, lv) = n_2, n_1 \text{ op } n_2 \\ lv' & \text{if } t \equiv match(x, p), \exists lv' \in \mathcal{LV} \text{ s.t. } lv'(p) = lv(x), \\ & \quad dom(lv') = vars(p) \\ \epsilon & \text{if } t \equiv nonmatch(x, p), \nexists lv' \in \mathcal{LV} \text{ s.t. } lv'(p) = lv(x), \\ & \quad dom(lv') = vars(p) \\ \text{undefined} & \text{i.o.c} \end{cases}$$

*Proposition 1*

Let  $\{\bar{x}\}$  be those variables occurring in the patterns  $p$  of a guard  $g$ . If  $eval_g(g, lv) = lv'$  and  $dom(lv) \cap \{\bar{x}\} = \emptyset$  then  $dom(lv) \cap dom(lv') = \emptyset$ .

*Proof*

By induction on the structure of the guard  $g$ .  $\square$

### A.1 Results in Section 3

*Proposition 2*

Consider a configuration  $C$  and its abstraction  $C^\alpha = ar^\alpha | \psi$ . Then  $\psi \not\equiv false$ .

*Proof*

$\psi$  is a conjunction of equalities between distinct  $X_T$  variables, so there is a trivial model.

$\square$



*Proposition 3*

If  $\varphi \wedge \psi \not\equiv \text{false}$  then  $\varphi \not\equiv \text{false}$ .

*Proof*

$\varphi \wedge \psi$  have at least one solution  $S$ , and it is also a valid solution to  $\varphi$ .  $\square$

In the rest of the appendix we will use the notation  $\overline{X_n = z_n}$  to denote the conjunction of constraints  $X_1 = z_1 \wedge X_2 = z_2 \wedge \dots \wedge X_n = z_n$ , where  $z_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Similarly, the notation  $\overline{X_n = z_n} \in \varphi$  expresses that the conjunction of constraints  $\varphi$  syntactically contains the constraints  $\overline{X_n = z_n}$ .

*Proposition 4*

If  $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 \not\equiv \text{false}$  and  $\overline{X_i = z_i} \in \psi_2$ , where  $z_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $\psi_1 \wedge \overline{X'_i = X_i} \wedge \psi_2 \wedge \overline{X'_i = z_i} \not\equiv \text{false}$ .

*Proof*

Every solution  $S$  to the original set of constraints  $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$  can be extended  $S \cup \overline{X'_i = z_i}$  and it is also a solution of  $\psi_1 \wedge \overline{X'_i = X_i} \wedge \psi_2 \wedge \overline{X'_i = z_i}$ .  $\square$

In order to prove the soundness of the translation using typed-norms, we first need to prove that the definition of typed-norms is *consistent* with the evaluation of terms and guards. The next two lemmas prove that consistency with respect the definition of  $\|t\|_T$  in Def. 8 and Def. 9, but the proof will be similar for  $\|t\|_T^\perp$ . Moreover, any definition of typed-norms satisfying the following Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 will produce a sound translation.

*Lemma 1*

If  $x := t \in P$ ,  $\text{eval}_t(t, lv) = v$  and  $\psi \wedge lv^\alpha \not\equiv \text{false}$  then  $X_T = \|t\|_T \wedge X_T = \|v\|_T \wedge \psi \wedge lv^\alpha \not\equiv \text{false}$  for any type  $T \in \text{rtypes}(x)$ .

*Proof*

By induction on the structure of the term  $t$ . It is important to notice that  $\text{eval}_t(t, lv) = v$  implies that  $y \in \text{dom}(lv)$  for every variable  $y \in \text{vars}(t)$ , so  $lv^\alpha$  will contain equalities  $Y_T = \|lv(y)\|_T$  that are consistent with  $\psi$ . Therefore,  $X_T = \|v\|_T$  will assign a concrete value to  $X_T$  that is consistent with the constraint  $X_T = \|t\|_T$  that involves those variables  $Y_T$ .  $\square$

*Lemma 2*

Let  $g$  a guard in a program  $P$ . If  $\text{eval}_g(g, lv) = lv_g$  and  $\psi \wedge lv^\alpha \not\equiv \text{false}$  then  $\psi \wedge g^\alpha \wedge lv^\alpha \wedge lv_g^\alpha \not\equiv \text{false}$

*Proof*

By induction on the structure of the guard  $g$ . The most interesting cases are  $\text{match}(x, p)$  and  $g_1 \wedge g_2$ :

- $g \equiv \text{match}(x, p)$ , where  $p \equiv \text{Co}(y^1, \dots, y^k)$  and  $y^i$  do not appear in  $\text{dom}(lv)$ . In this case  $g^\alpha$  is  $\bigwedge\{X_T = \|p\|_T \mid T \in \text{rtypes}(x)\}$ . Consider only a type  $T' \in \text{rtypes}(x)$  such that  $T' = \text{type}(x)$ , then  $X_{T'} = 1 + Y_{T'}^1 \dots + Y_{T'}^k$ . On the other hand,  $X_{T'} = z$  appears in  $lv^\alpha$  and  $lv_g^\alpha$  contains some constraints  $Y_{T'}^i = z_i$  such that  $1 + z_1 \dots + z_k = z$  (by definition of  $\text{eval}_g$ ). Therefore,  $\psi \wedge X_{T'} = 1 + Y_{T'}^1 \dots + Y_{T'}^k \wedge \overline{Y_{T'}^i = z_i} \wedge lv_g^\alpha \not\models \text{false}$ . The case is the same if  $T' \neq \text{type}(x)$ , and it can be repeated for every  $T' \in \text{rtypes}(x)$ , so  $\psi \wedge g^\alpha \wedge lv^\alpha \wedge lv_g^\alpha \not\models \text{false}$ .
- $g \equiv g_1 \wedge g_2$ . By definition of guard abstraction (Fig. 3)  $g^\alpha = g_1^\alpha \wedge g_2^\alpha$ , and by definition of  $\text{eval}_g$  we have that (A)  $\text{eval}_g(g_1, lv) = lv_1$  and (B)  $\text{eval}_g(g_2, lv \uplus lv_1) = lv_2$ . From (A) and the premises, by IH we obtain that  $\psi \wedge g_1^\alpha \wedge lv^\alpha \wedge lv_1^\alpha \not\models \text{false}$ . By Prop. 1 we know that  $\text{dom}(lv) \cap \text{dom}(lv_1) = \emptyset$ , so  $lv^\alpha \wedge lv_1^\alpha = (lv \uplus lv_1)^\alpha$ . Then, again, by IH and using (B) we have that  $\psi \wedge g_1^\alpha \wedge g_2^\alpha \wedge lv^\alpha \wedge (lv \uplus lv_1)^\alpha \wedge lv_2^\alpha \not\models \text{false}$ . Finally, as by Prop. 1 the domains of the generated variable mappings are disjoint then  $(lv \uplus lv_1)^\alpha \wedge lv_2^\alpha = lv^\alpha \wedge lv_1^\alpha \wedge lv_2^\alpha = lv^\alpha \wedge (lv_1 \uplus lv_2)^\alpha$  and therefore  $\psi \wedge g_1^\alpha \wedge g_2^\alpha \wedge lv^\alpha \wedge (lv_1 \uplus lv_2)^\alpha \not\models \text{false}$ .

□

**Theorem 1 (Soundness).** If  $\mathcal{T} \equiv C_0 \rightsquigarrow^* C_n$  then there is an abstract trace  $\mathcal{T}^\alpha \equiv C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^* ar^\alpha | \psi$  such that  $\text{steps}(\mathcal{T}) = \text{steps}(\mathcal{T}^\alpha)$ ,  $C_n^\alpha = ar^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi}$  and  $\psi \wedge \widetilde{\psi} \not\models \text{false}$ .

*Proof*

By induction on the length of the  $C_0 \rightsquigarrow^n C_n$  derivation.

Base Case:  $n = 0$

We have  $\mathcal{T} \equiv C_0 \rightsquigarrow^0 C_n$  and the trivial derivation  $\mathcal{T}^\alpha \equiv C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^0 C_0^\alpha$ , where  $C_0^\alpha \equiv ar^\alpha | \psi$  and therefore  $\psi = \widetilde{\psi}$  in this case. By Prop. 2  $\psi \not\models \text{false}$ , so  $\psi \wedge \psi \not\models \text{false}$ . Additionally, the sequences of steps in both traces are empty:  $\text{steps}(\mathcal{T}) = \langle \rangle = \text{steps}(\mathcal{T}^\alpha)$ .

Inductive Step:  $n > 0$

We have a derivation  $C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{n-1} C_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow C_n$ . By Induction Hypothesis we have that if  $C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{n-1} C_{n-1}$  then  $C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{n-1} ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi}_{n-1}$  such that  $C_{n-1}^\alpha = ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi}_{n-1}$ ,  $\psi_{n-1} \wedge \widetilde{\psi}_{n-1} \not\models \text{false}$ , and  $\text{steps}(C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{n-1} C_{n-1}) = \text{steps}(C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{n-1} ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi}_{n-1})$ . Depending on  $C_{n-1}$  we can perform the last step using the 3 different rules:

- $C_{n-1} \equiv \langle p, x := t \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C$ . Then we can only apply rule (1):

$$(1) \frac{b \equiv x := t \quad \text{eval}_t(t, lv) = v}{C_{n-1} \equiv \langle p, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow^{(1) \cdot \epsilon} \langle p, bs, lv[x \mapsto v] \rangle \cdot C \equiv C_n}$$

By definition of configuration abstraction (Def. 13)  $C_{n-1}^\alpha = ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi}_{n-1}$ , where  $ar_{n-1}^\alpha = \langle \varphi_1 \cdot bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha$  and  $\varphi_1 = \bigwedge\{X_T = \|t\|_T \mid T \in \text{rtypes}(x)\}$ . Then we can perform the following abstract step from  $ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi}_{n-1}$ :

$$(1) \frac{\varphi_1 \wedge \psi_{n-1} \not\models \text{false}}{\langle \varphi_1 \cdot bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow_{\alpha}^{(1) \cdot \epsilon} \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \varphi_1 \wedge \psi_{n-1}}$$

We define  $\varphi_2 = \bigwedge\{X_T = \|lv(x)\|_T \mid T \in \text{rtypes}(x)\}$  as the constraints added by the mapping extension  $lv[x \mapsto v]$ , and  $lv_1, \dots, lv_k$  the variable mappings in the activation records in  $C$ . By IH we have  $\psi_{n-1} \wedge \widetilde{\psi}_{n-1} \not\models \text{false}$ , where  $\widetilde{\psi}_{n-1} = lv^\alpha \wedge lv_1^\alpha \wedge \dots \wedge lv_k^\alpha$  by definition. By the repeated application of Lemma 1 using all the variable mappings

$lv \uplus lv_1 \uplus \dots \uplus lv_k$  (their domains are disjoint because variables in every activation record are fresh), we obtain that  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}} \not\models \text{false}$ . Therefore the abstract (1) step is correct— $\varphi_1 \wedge \psi_{n-1} \not\models \text{false}$  by Prop. 3—and  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}} = (\varphi_1 \wedge \psi_{n-1}) \wedge (\varphi_2 \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}}) = \psi_n \wedge \widetilde{\psi_n} \not\models \text{false}$ . Finally, since  $\text{steps}(C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{n-1} C_{n-1}) = \text{steps}(C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{n-1} ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \psi_{n-1})$  then it is clear that  $\text{steps}(C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{n-1} C_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow^{(1)\cdot\epsilon} C_n) = \text{steps}(C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{n-1} ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{(1)\cdot\epsilon} (bs^\alpha) \cdot ar^\alpha | \varphi_1 \wedge \psi_{n-1})$ .

- $C_{n-1} \equiv \langle p, m(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C$ . Then we can only apply rule (2):

$$(2) \frac{\begin{array}{l} b \equiv m(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad m(\bar{x}', \bar{y}') \leftarrow g, b_1 \cdot \dots \cdot b_k \in P \text{ fresh} \\ lv_1 \equiv [\bar{x}' \mapsto lv(x)] \quad \text{eval}_g(g, lv_1) = lv_2 \end{array}}{C_{n-1} \equiv \langle p, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow^{(2)\cdot rn} \langle m, b_1 \cdot \dots \cdot b_k, lv_1 \uplus lv_2 \rangle \cdot \langle p[\bar{y}' \sim \bar{y}], bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \equiv C_n}$$

We assume that the fresh program rule  $m(\bar{x}', \bar{y}') \leftarrow g, b_1 \cdot \dots \cdot b_k$  used in the step is the number  $rn$ . By definition of configuration abstraction (Def. 13)  $C_{n-1}^\alpha = ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}}$ , where  $ar_{n-1}^\alpha = \langle p(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \cdot bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha$ . Then we can perform the following abstract step from  $ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \psi_{n-1}$  using the abstract semantic rule (2) and a fresh instance of the abstract program rule number  $rn$ :

$$(2) \frac{\begin{array}{l} m(\bar{X}', \bar{Y}') \leftarrow g^\alpha \mid b_1^\alpha, \dots, b_k^\alpha \in P^\alpha \text{ fresh} \quad \overline{X = X'} \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge g^\alpha \not\models \text{false} \\ \langle m(\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) \cdot bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{(2)\cdot rn} \\ \langle b_1^\alpha \cdot \dots \cdot b_k^\alpha \rangle^{\bar{Y}=\bar{Y}'} \cdot \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \overline{X = X'} \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge g^\alpha \end{array}}{}{}$$

We need to prove that:

1.  $\overline{X = X'} \wedge g^\alpha \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge (lv_1^\alpha \wedge lv_2^\alpha \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}}) = \psi_n \wedge \widetilde{\psi_n} \not\models \text{false}$ , from the soundness theorem.
2.  $\overline{X = X'} \wedge g^\alpha \wedge \psi_{n-1} \not\models \text{false}$ , i.e., the abstract step is valid.

We will focus only on the first statement as it implies the second one by Prop. 3. By Prop. 4 we have that  $\overline{X = X'} \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge (lv_1^\alpha \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}}) \not\models \text{false}$ , because:

- $\bigwedge_{x \in \bar{x}, T \in rtypes(x)} \{X_T = \|lv(x)\|_T\} \in \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}}$ , with  $\|lv(x)\|_T \in \mathbb{Z}$ , by definition of configuration transformation, and
- $lv_1^\alpha = [\bar{x}' \mapsto lv(x)]^\alpha = \bigwedge_{x' \in \bar{x}', T \in rtypes(x')} \{X'_T = \|lv(x)\|_T\}$
- $rtypes(x) = rtypes(x')$

Then by the guard evaluation  $\text{eval}_g(g, lv_1) = lv_2$  and Lemma 2 we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{X = X'} \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}} \wedge g^\alpha \wedge lv_1^\alpha \wedge lv_2^\alpha \not\models \text{false} \\ &= \overline{X = X'} \wedge g^\alpha \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge (lv_1^\alpha \wedge lv_2^\alpha \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}}) \not\models \text{false} \\ &= \psi_n \wedge \widetilde{\psi_n} \not\models \text{false} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to the previous case  $\text{steps}(C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{n-1} C_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow^{(2)\cdot rn} C_n) = \text{steps}(C_0^\alpha \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{n-1} ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{(2)\cdot rn} \langle b_1^\alpha \cdot \dots \cdot b_m^\alpha \rangle^{\bar{Y}=\bar{Y}'} \cdot \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \overline{X = X'} \wedge \psi_{n-1} \wedge g^\alpha)$ .

- $C_{n-1} \equiv \langle m, \epsilon, lv_1 \rangle \cdot \langle p[\bar{y}' \sim \bar{y}], bs, lv \rangle \cdot C$ . Then we can only apply rule (3):

$$(3) \frac{}{C_{n-1} \equiv \langle m, \epsilon, lv_0 \rangle \cdot \langle p[\bar{y}' \sim \bar{y}], bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow^{(3)\cdot\epsilon} \langle p, bs, lv[y \mapsto lv_0(y')] \rangle \cdot C \equiv C_n}$$

By definition of configuration abstraction (Def. 13)  $C_{n-1}^\alpha = ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}}$ , where  $ar_{n-1}^\alpha =$

$\langle \epsilon \rangle^{\overline{Y=Y'}} \cdot \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha$ . Then we can perform the following abstract step from  $ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \psi_{n-1}$ :

$$(3) \frac{\psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y=Y'} \not\equiv false}{\langle \epsilon \rangle^{\overline{Y=Y'}} \cdot \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{(3) \cdot \epsilon} \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y=Y'}}$$

Let  $lw_1, lw_2, \dots, lw_k$  the variable mappings in the activation records in  $C$ . The constraints  $lw_0^\alpha$  contains  $\overline{Y_i' = z_i}$  for some  $z_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , therefore by definition of configuration abstraction (Def. 13) we have that  $\widetilde{\psi_{n-1}} \equiv lw_0^\alpha \wedge lw_1^\alpha \wedge lw_2^\alpha \wedge \dots \wedge lw_k^\alpha$  and  $\widetilde{\psi_n} \equiv lw^\alpha \wedge \overline{Y_i = z_i} \wedge lw_1^\alpha \wedge lw_2^\alpha \wedge \dots \wedge lw_k^\alpha$ . As before, we need to prove that:

1.  $\psi_n \wedge \widetilde{\psi_n} = (\psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y=Y'}) \wedge (lw^\alpha \wedge \overline{Y_i = z_i} \wedge lw_1^\alpha \wedge lw_2^\alpha \wedge \dots \wedge lw_k^\alpha) \not\equiv false$ , from the soundness theorem.
2.  $\psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y=Y'} \not\equiv false$ , i.e., the abstract step is valid.

The first statement implies the second one by Prop. 3, so we focus only on the first one. By IH we have  $\psi_{n-1} \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}} \not\equiv false$ , so we can apply Prop. 4 and obtain that  $\psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y_i = Y_i'} \wedge \widetilde{\psi_{n-1}} \wedge \overline{Y_i = z_i} \not\equiv false$ , i.e.,  $\psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y_i = Y_i'} \wedge lw_0^\alpha \wedge lw_1^\alpha \wedge lw_2^\alpha \wedge \dots \wedge lw_k^\alpha \wedge \overline{Y_i = z_i} \not\equiv false$ . By Prop. 3 we can remove the constraints  $lw_0^\alpha$  and the set remains satisfiable, therefore  $(\psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y=Y'}) \wedge (lw^\alpha \wedge \overline{Y_i = z_i} \wedge lw_1^\alpha \wedge lw_2^\alpha \wedge \dots \wedge lw_k^\alpha) \not\equiv false$ . As before  $steps(C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{n-1} C_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow^{(3) \cdot \epsilon} C_n) = steps(C_0 \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{n-1} ar_{n-1}^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \rightsquigarrow_\alpha^{(3) \cdot \epsilon} \langle bs^\alpha \rangle \cdot ar^\alpha | \psi_{n-1} \wedge \overline{Y=Y'})$ .

□

## A.2 Results in Section 4.1

*Lemma 3*

$(\Sigma^P, \sqsubseteq)$  is a partially ordered set.

*Proof*

- reflexivity:  $\sigma \sqsubseteq \sigma$  because  $\sigma(i) \sqsubseteq \sigma(i)$  for every rule  $i$ , since for all  $x \in dom(\sigma(i))$  we have that  $\sigma(i)(x) \subseteq \sigma(i)(x)$ .
- transitivity: if  $\sigma_1 \sqsubseteq \sigma_2$  then for all rule  $i$  and  $x \in dom(\sigma_1(i))$ ,  $\sigma_1(i)(x) \subseteq \sigma_2(i)(x)$ . Similarly, if  $\sigma_2 \sqsubseteq \sigma_3$  then for all rule  $i$  and  $x \in dom(\sigma_2(i))$ ,  $\sigma_2(i)(x) \subseteq \sigma_3(i)(x)$ . Therefore, for every rule  $i$  and  $x \in dom(\sigma_1(i))$ ,  $\sigma_1(i)(x) \subseteq \sigma_2(i)(x) \subseteq \sigma_3(i)(x)$ , so  $\sigma_1 \sqsubseteq \sigma_3$ .
- anti-symmetry: if  $\sigma_1 \sqsubseteq \sigma_2$  then for all rule  $i$  and  $x \in dom(\sigma_1(i))$ ,  $\sigma_1(i)(x) \subseteq \sigma_2(i)(x)$ . Similarly, if  $\sigma_2 \sqsubseteq \sigma_1$  then for all rule  $i$  and  $x \in dom(\sigma_2(i))$ ,  $\sigma_2(i)(x) \subseteq \sigma_1(i)(x)$ . Therefore for all rule  $i$   $dom(\sigma_1(i)) = dom(\sigma_2(i))$  and  $\sigma_1(i)(x) = \sigma_2(i)(x)$  for every variable, so  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ .

□

*Lemma 4*

In the partially ordered set  $(\Sigma^P, \sqsubseteq)$  every subset  $C \subseteq \Sigma^P$  has a least upper bound  $\sigma' = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in C} \sigma$ .

*Proof*

We consider that  $|P| = n$  and  $C = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k\}$ , where  $\sigma_i = \langle \mu_i^1, \mu_i^2, \dots, \mu_i^n \rangle$ . By definition of  $\bigoplus$  we have  $\sigma' = \langle \mu_1^1 \oplus \mu_2^1 \dots \oplus \mu_k^1, \mu_1^2 \oplus \mu_2^2 \dots \oplus \mu_k^2, \dots, \mu_1^n \oplus \mu_2^n \dots \oplus \mu_k^n \rangle$ .

We proceed by reduction to the absurd: suppose  $\sigma''$  is a least upper bound of  $C$  but  $\sigma' \not\sqsubseteq \sigma''$ , then for some rule  $i$  and variable  $x$  we have  $\sigma'(i)(x) \not\sqsubseteq \sigma''(i)(x)$ . If  $x \notin \text{dom}(\sigma''(i))$  then  $\sigma''$  cannot be an upper bound of  $C$ , because  $\text{dom}(\sigma'(i)) = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \text{dom}(\mu_j^i)$  so for some  $\mu_j^i$  we will have that  $\mu_j^i(x) \not\sqsubseteq \sigma'(i)$ . On the other hand, if  $x \in \text{dom}(\sigma''(i))$  then  $\sigma'(i)(x) \not\sqsubseteq \sigma''(i)(x)$  because  $T \in \sigma'(i)(x)$  but  $T \notin \sigma''(i)(x)$  for some type  $T$ . By definition of  $\bigoplus$  we have that  $\sigma'(i)(x) = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mu_j^i(x)$ , so  $T \in \mu_j^i(x)$  for some  $\mu_j^i(x)$ . Therefore  $\sigma''$  cannot be an upper bound of  $C$  because  $\sigma''(i)(x) \not\sqsubseteq \mu_j^i(x)$ , so  $\sigma'' \not\sqsubseteq \sigma_j$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** Consider a program  $P$  such that  $|P| = n$ . Then  $\text{lfp}(\text{gen}^P)$  exists and is the supremum of the ascending Kleene chain starting from  $\perp_P = \langle \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \rangle$ .

*Proof*

$(\Sigma^P, \sqsubseteq)$  is a partially ordered set because by Lemma 3  $\sqsubseteq$  is reflexive, transitive, and anti-symmetric. By Lemma 4 every subset of  $\Sigma^P$  has a least upper bound (obtained by  $\bigoplus$ ) so  $(\Sigma^P, \sqsubseteq)$  is also a complete lattice by Lemma A.2 (Nielson et al. 1999).  $\Sigma^P$  satisfies the Ascending Chain condition trivially because it is finite, and  $\text{gen}^P$  is monotone as by definition (Fig. 6) it extends the program mapping  $\sigma$  passed as argument. Then  $\text{lfp}(\text{gen}^P) = \text{gen}^{P(n)}(\perp_P)$  for some  $n \geq 0$  (Nielson et al. 1999; Tarski 1955).  $\square$

### A.3 Results in Section 4.2

In this section we need to track the concrete program rule associated to each activation record. Therefore we will assume that activation records contain in their first element the rule number used to create them. For example  $\langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle$  is an activation record generated by a call to procedure  $p$  using the  $i$ -th rule of the program.

We will also use the notion of a variable  $z$  being dependent on a variable  $x$  w.r.t. a type  $T$  in a step  $C \rightsquigarrow C'$ —written  $x \Rightarrow_T z$ . This relation tracks the dependence between variables in a step, so that a change in a component of type  $T$  in the value of  $x$  in the original configuration will have an impact on the components of type  $T$  of variable  $z$  in the destination configuration. Formally:

*Definition 23 (Dependent variables in a  $\rightsquigarrow$ -step)*

Consider a step  $\langle p^i, bs, lv \rangle \cdot C'_0 \rightsquigarrow \langle q^j, bs', lv' \rangle \cdot C'_1$ . The set  $D$  of dependent variables w.r.t.  $T$  is defined as:

- If the step evaluates an assignment  $x := t$  using rule (1) of Fig. 2 then  $D = \{y \Rightarrow_T x \mid y \in \text{vars}(t), T \preceq \text{type}(y)\}$ , i.e.,  $x$  is dependent on all the variables  $y \in \text{vars}(t)$ .
- If the step evaluates a procedure call  $m(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ —rule (2) of Fig. 2—using the program rule  $m(\bar{x}', \bar{y}') \leftarrow g, b_1 \cdot \dots \cdot b_k \in P$  then  $D = \text{dep}^T(D_0, g)$  where  $D_0 = \{x_k \Rightarrow_T x'_k \mid T \preceq \text{type}(x_k)\}$  and

$$\text{dep}^T(D, g) = \begin{cases} \text{dep}^T(\text{dep}^T(D, g_1), g_2) & \text{if } g = g_1 \wedge g_2 \\ D \cup \{x \Rightarrow_T y \mid y \in \text{vars}(p), T \preceq \text{type}(y)\} \cup \\ \quad \{z \Rightarrow_T y \mid z \Rightarrow_T x \in D, y \in \text{vars}(p), T \preceq \text{type}(y)\} & \text{if } g = \text{match}(x, p) \\ D & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that, in the case of  $\text{match}(x, p)$  guards, the variables  $y \in \text{vars}(p)$ —which are

fresh—are dependent on the variable  $x$ . Recursively, if  $x$  depends on any variable  $z$ , then any variable  $y \in \text{vars}(p)$  is also dependent on  $z$ .

- Finally, if the step uses rule (3) of Fig. 2 to evaluate  $\langle p^i, \epsilon, lw_1 \rangle \cdot \langle q^j \overline{[y' \sim y]}, bs, lw \rangle \cdot C$  then we have  $D = \{y'_k \Rightarrow_T y_k \mid y'_k, T \preceq \text{type}(y'_k)\}$ , i.e., the output arguments of a call ( $y_k$ ) are dependent on the output variables of the fresh instance ( $y'_k$ ) used to evaluate a call.

We use the notation  $x \Rightarrow_{*T} y$  in a trace  $\mathcal{T} = C_0 \rightsquigarrow C_1 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow C_n$  to refer to a chain of  $k \leq n$  dependences between ordered (but not necessarily consecutive) steps. Formally, we have a sequence of  $k$  positions  $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_{k-1} < p_k$  such that  $0 \leq p_i < n$  and a chain of  $k$  dependencies:

1.  $x \Rightarrow_T x_1$  in some step  $C_{p_1} \rightsquigarrow C_{p_1+1}$ ,
2.  $x_1 \Rightarrow_T x_2$  in some subsequent step  $C_{p_2} \rightsquigarrow C_{p_2+1}$ ,
- ⋮
- (k-1).  $x_{k-2} \Rightarrow_T x_{k-1}$  in some subsequent step  $C_{p_{k-1}} \rightsquigarrow C_{p_{k-1}+1}$ ,
- k.  $x_{k-1} \Rightarrow_T y$  in step  $C_{p_k} \rightsquigarrow C_{p_k+1}$  with  $p_k > p_{k-1}$

Finally, we will use an extended notion of *value variations* for variable mappings and configurations. We will say that  $lw'$  is a *variation* of  $lw$ , written  $lw \triangleright^T lw'$ , if  $lw' = lw[x_i \mapsto v'_i]$  for some variables  $x_i \in \text{dom}(lw)$  and  $lw(x_i) \triangleright^T v'_i$ . This notion can be extended to configurations, written  $C \triangleright^T C'$ , if  $C'$  results from  $C$  by replacing some of its variable mappings  $lw$  by  $lw'$  such that  $lw \triangleright^T lw'$ .

*Lemma 5*

Let  $\sigma$  be the result of the typed-norms inference of a program  $P$ . If  $\langle p^i, bs, lw \rangle \cdot C_0 \rightsquigarrow \langle q^j, bs', lw' \rangle \cdot C'_0$ ,  $T \in \sigma(j)(z)$  and  $x \Rightarrow_T z$ , then  $T \in \sigma(i)(x)$ .

*Proof*

By case distinction on the semantic rule from Fig. 2 used to perform the step:

- If the step evaluates an assignment using rule (1) we have:

$$(1) \quad \frac{b \equiv x := t \quad \text{eval}_t(t, lw) = v}{\langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lw \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow \langle p^i, bs, lw[x \mapsto v] \rangle \cdot C}$$

In this case the step is in the same activation record of  $p^i$ , and the only dependent variable is  $x$ , which depends on every  $y \in \text{vars}(t)$ :  $y \Rightarrow_T x$ . Then by the first equation of  $\text{gen}S_i^P$  any typed-norm of  $x \dashv T \in \sigma(i)(x)$ —will be a typed-norm of  $y \dashv T \in \sigma(i)(y)$ .

- When using rule (2) we have:

$$(2) \quad \frac{\begin{array}{l} b \equiv m(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad m(\bar{x}', \bar{y}') \leftarrow g, b_1 \cdots b_k \in P \text{ fresh} \\ lw_1 \equiv [x' \mapsto lw(x)] \quad \text{eval}_g(g, lw_1) = lw_2 \end{array}}{\langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lw \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow \langle m^j, b_1 \cdots b_k, lw_1 \uplus lw_2 \rangle \cdot \langle p^i \overline{[y' \sim y]}, bs, lw \rangle \cdot C}$$

In this case the dependence between variables is more complex: there are dependences from the parameter passing ( $x_k \Rightarrow_T x'_k$ ) and also from the sequence of guards ( $x_k \Rightarrow_T z_m$  for those variables  $z_m$  appearing in the right-hand side of *match* guards).

1. For the parameter passing, we have  $T \in \sigma(i)(x_k)$  directly by the second equation of  $genS_i^P$  (set  $A$ ). The typed-norms of any input variable for any rule of  $m$  (including rule number  $j$ ) will be propagated to the arguments  $\bar{x}_k$  of the call  $m(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  in rule  $i$ .
2. Assume a variable  $z_m$  in some guard such that  $x_k \Rightarrow_T z_m$  and  $T \in \sigma(i)(z_m)$ . Thus there is a sequence of *match* guards

$$match(x'_k, p_1) \wedge match(z_1, p_2) \wedge \dots \wedge match(z_{m-1}, p_m)$$

such that  $z_i \in vars(p_i)$ —note that we can safely ignore  $e_1$  *op*  $e_2$  as they do not define new variables. Then by definition of  $genG_i^P$  ( $2^{nd}$  and  $4^{th}$  rules) we know that  $T \in \sigma(i)(z_{m-1})$ ,  $T \in \sigma(i)(z_{m-2})$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $T \in \sigma(i)(z_2)$ ,  $T \in \sigma(i)(z_1)$ ,  $T \in \sigma(i)(x'_k)$ . Therefore  $T \in \sigma(i)(x_k)$  using the same reasoning as in case 1.

- Finally, if we use rule (3):

$$(3) \frac{}{\langle p^i, \epsilon, lv_1 \rangle \cdot \langle q^j [y' \sim y], bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow \langle q^j, bs, lv[y \mapsto lv_1(y')] \rangle \cdot C}$$

In this case we have that  $y'_k \Rightarrow_T y_k$ , so if  $T \in \sigma(j)(y_k)$  then  $T \in \sigma(i)(y'_k)$  because of the second equation of  $genS_i^P$ : rule  $q^j$  will contain a call  $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , so using the set  $B$  the typed-norm  $T$  will be propagated to any output variable of any rule of procedure  $q$ , in particular those  $y'_k \in rvars(i)$  such that  $y'_k \Rightarrow_T y_k$ . Therefore  $\sigma(i)(y'_k)$ .

□

**Theorem 3 (Soundness).** If  $useful_i^T(x)$  then  $T \in rtypes_i(x)$ .

*Proof*

Let  $\sigma$  be the result of the typed-norms inference of the program. By definition of  $useful_i^T(x)$  there are two configurations such that:

1.  $C_0 = \langle p, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C'$  containing statements from the  $i$ -th rule of  $P$
2.  $x \in dom(lv)$
3.  $C'_0 = \langle p, b \cdot bs, lv' \rangle \cdot C'$  with  $lv' = lv[x \mapsto v]$  and  $lv(x) \triangleright^T v$
4.  $Tr(C_0) \neq Tr(C'_0)$

From point 4 we know that  $Tr(C_0) \not\subseteq Tr(C'_0)$  or  $Tr(C_0) \not\supseteq Tr(C'_0)$ . We will focus only on the first case, as the second one is similar. Since  $Tr(C_0) \not\subseteq Tr(C'_0)$  we know that there is a trace  $\mathcal{T} \in Tr(C_0)$  such that  $\mathcal{T} \notin Tr(C'_0)$ . However,  $Tr(C'_0)$  will contain a trace  $\mathcal{T}'$  which starts with a (possibly empty) prefix of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} C_n \rightsquigarrow^{r_{n+1}} C_{n+1} \\ \mathcal{T}' &= C'_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C'_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} C'_n \end{aligned}$$

but  $C'_n \rightsquigarrow^{r_{n+1}} C'_*$ . Furthermore, from point 3 we have that  $C_0 \triangleright^T C'_0$ . Assuming  $C_n = \langle q^j, bs', lv_n \rangle \cdot C'_n$  then by Lemma 6 we know that there is a variable  $z \in dom(lv_n)$  such that

1.  $useful_j^T(z)$
2.  $x \Rightarrow_{*T} z$
3.  $T \in \sigma(j)(z)$

Therefore by Lemma 7 we have that  $T \in \sigma(i)(x)$ . □

*Lemma 6*

Consider a configuration  $C_0 = \langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C$  containing statements from the  $i$ -th rule of  $P$ , and a variant configuration  $C_0 \equiv \langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \triangleright^T \langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lv' \rangle \cdot C' \equiv C'_0$ . Let  $\{\bar{x}\} \subseteq \text{dom}(lv)$  be those variables whose value has changed from  $C_0$  to  $C'_0$ , and  $\sigma$  be the result of the typed-norms inference of the program. If there are traces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} C_n \\ \mathcal{T}' &= C'_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C'_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} C'_n \end{aligned}$$

such that  $C_n \rightsquigarrow^{r_{n+1}} C_{n+1}$  but  $C'_n \not\rightsquigarrow^{r_{n+1}} C'_*$ , where  $C_n = \langle q^j, \_ , lv_n \rangle \cdot C''_n$ , then  $C_n \triangleright^T C'_n$  and there is a variable  $z \in \text{dom}(lv_n)$  such that:

1.  $useful_j^T(z)$
2.  $x_k \Rightarrow_{*T} z$  for some  $x_k \in \{\bar{x}\}$
3.  $T \in \sigma(j)(z)$

*Proof*

By induction on the length  $n$  of the traces.

• Base Case:  $n = 0$ 

In this case  $C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C_1$  but  $C'_0 \not\rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C'_1$ , where  $lv \triangleright^T lv'$ . According to the rules in Fig. 2 the only rule that can prevent such a step is (2):

$$(2) \frac{b \equiv m(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \quad m(\bar{x}', \bar{y}') \leftarrow g, b_1 \dots b_k \in P \text{ fresh} \quad \begin{array}{l} lv_1 \equiv [x' \mapsto lv(x)] \quad eval_g(g, lv_1) = lv_2 \\ \langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \rightsquigarrow \langle m^j, b_1 \dots b_k, lv_1 \uplus lv_2 \rangle \cdot \langle p^i [y' \sim y], bs, lv \rangle \cdot C \end{array}}{\quad}$$

$C'_0$  cannot be reduced because  $eval_g(g, [x' \mapsto lv'(x)])$  is undefined, but on the other hand  $eval_g(g, [x' \mapsto lv(x)])$  returns a variable mapping. Then it is clear that the value of some variable  $z \in \{\bar{x}'\}$  must differ from  $lv$  to  $lv'$ . If there is only differences in one variable  $z$  then  $useful_i^T(z)$  (in this case  $i = j$ ) because clearly  $Tr(\langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lv \rangle \cdot C) \neq Tr(\langle p^i, b \cdot bs, lv' \rangle \cdot C)$ . If there are several variables  $\bar{z} \subseteq \text{dom}(lv)$  such that  $lv(z) \triangleright^T lv'(z)$  then it is clear that we can revert the values of all of them but one, which would prevent the guard evaluation, so again  $useful_i^T(z)$ . In this case  $z \Rightarrow_{*T} z$  trivially, because there is no step involved. Finally, by definition of  $genG_i^P$  and  $genS_i^P$  (2<sup>nd</sup> rule, set A) the typed-norm  $T$  will be propagated from the guard to the input variable, and then to  $z$ , therefore  $T \in \sigma(j)(z)$ . Note that  $C_0 \triangleright^T C'_0$  holds trivially in this case.

• Inductive Step:  $n > 0$ 

We know that the traces from  $C_1$  and  $C'_1$  are different, so  $C_1 \neq C'_1$  and by Prop. 5 we have that  $C_1 \triangleright^T C'_1$  with  $C_1 = \langle q^k, \_ , lv_1 \rangle \cdot C$  and  $C'_1 = \langle q^k, \_ , lv'_1 \rangle \cdot C'$ . Then by IH we know  $C_n \triangleright^T C'_n$  and (1)  $useful_j^T(z)$ , (2)  $y \Rightarrow_{*T} z$  for some  $y \in \text{dom}(lv_1)$  and (3)  $T \in \sigma(j)(z)$ .

If  $y \in \text{dom}(lv)$  then  $lv(y) \triangleright^T lv'(y)$  and the proof is finished. Otherwise, consider the set of variables  $\{\bar{x}\} \subseteq \text{dom}(lv)$  whose value has changed from  $C_0$  to  $C'_0$ , i.e.,  $lv(x_k) \triangleright^T lv'(x_k)$ . Then by a case distinction on the definition of dependent variables (Def. 23) we have that there is at least one variable  $x_k \in \text{dom}(lv)$  such that  $x_k \Rightarrow_T y$ , therefore  $x_k \Rightarrow_{*T} z$ .

□



*Lemma 7*

Let  $\sigma$  be the result of the typed-norms inference of the program. Consider configurations  $C_0 = \langle p^i, bs, lv \rangle \cdot C'$  and  $C_n = \langle q^j, bs', lv_n \rangle \cdot C''$ . If  $C_0 \rightsquigarrow^{r_1} C_1 \rightsquigarrow^{r_2} \dots \rightsquigarrow^{r_n} C_n$ ,  $x \Rightarrow_{*T} z$  for some  $x \in \text{dom}(lv)$ , and  $T \in \sigma(j)(z)$ , then  $T \in \sigma(i)(x)$ .

*Proof*

By induction on the length  $n$  of the trace:

• Base Case:  $n = 0$

In this case  $C_0 = C_n$ ,  $q^j = p^i$ , and  $x \Rightarrow_{*T} x$ . Therefore  $T \in \sigma(i)(x) = \sigma(j)(x)$ .

• Inductive Step  $n > 0$

We assume that  $C_1 = \langle r^k, bs'', lv'' \rangle \cdot C''$ . The dependence  $x \Rightarrow_{*T} z$  appears in the complete trace, so there are two cases:

- $x \in \text{dom}(lv'')$ . Then by the Induction Hypothesis we have that  $T \in \sigma(k)(x)$ . If  $x \in \text{dom}(lv'')$  and  $x \in \text{dom}(lv)$  then  $p^i$  and  $r^k$  are the same activation record, so  $T \in \sigma(i)(x)$ .
- $x \notin \text{dom}(lv'')$ , so  $x \Rightarrow_T z'$  in the first step and  $z' \Rightarrow_{*T} z$  in the rest of the trace, for some  $z' \in \text{dom}(lv'')$ . Then by the Induction Hypothesis we have that  $T \in \sigma(k)(z')$ . From  $T \in \sigma(k)(z')$ ,  $x \Rightarrow_T z'$  and Lemma 5, we obtain directly that  $T \in \sigma(i)(x)$ .

□

*Proposition 5*

If  $C_0 \rightsquigarrow^r C_1$ ,  $C'_0 \rightsquigarrow^r C'_1$ ,  $C_0 \triangleright^T C'_1$ , and  $C'_0 \neq C'_1$  then  $C_1 \triangleright^T C'_1$ .

*Proof*

By case distinction on the rule of Fig. 2 used. Note the importance of the premise  $C'_0 \neq C'_1$ , as rule (3) of Fig. 2 drops an activation record from the configuration and could remove those variables storing variations, therefore making  $C'_0$  equal to  $C'_1$ . □