

Resource Analysis: Problem Set 5

Jan Hoffmann
Carnegie Mellon University

February 22, 2016

Due before 1:30pm on Monday, February 29

5.1 (8 Points) Resource Monoid

Recall the definition of the resource monoid $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}, \cdot)$ where

$$(q, q') \cdot (p, p') = \begin{cases} (q + p - q', p') & \text{if } q' \leq p \\ (q, p' + q' - p) & \text{if } q' > p \end{cases}$$

Let $(q, q') = (r, r') \cdot (s, s')$. Prove the following statements.

1. $q \geq r$ and $q - q' = r - r' + s - s'$
2. If $(p, p') = (\bar{r}, r') \cdot (s, s')$ and $\bar{r} \geq r$ then $p \geq q$ and $p' = q'$
3. If $(p, p') = (r, r') \cdot (\bar{s}, s')$ and $\bar{s} \geq s$ then $p \geq q$ and $p' \leq q'$
4. $(r, r') \cdot ((s, s') \cdot (t, t')) = ((r, r') \cdot (s, s')) \cdot (t, t')$

5.2 (12 Points) Reasoning with the Cost Semantics

Consider the metric M_{app} that counts the number of function applications, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{app}}(\text{app}) &= 1 \\ M_{\text{app}}(K) &= 0 \quad \text{if } K \neq \text{app} \end{aligned}$$

Consider the function $\text{omega}: (X \rightarrow X) \rightarrow Y$ that is defined as follows.

`let rec omega = fun x → omega x in omega (fun x → x)`

Let e_{omega} be the above expression.

- a) Prove that $\cdot; H_M \vdash e_{\text{omega}} \Downarrow \circ \mid (n, 0)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every heap H .
- b) Prove that $\cdot; H_M \not\vdash e_{\text{omega}} \Downarrow (\ell, H')$ for any ℓ and H' .

5.3 (18 Points) Resource-Based Type Safety

We will now use our effect-based cost semantics to show that *well-typed programs don't go wrong*: In a well-formed environment, a well-typed expression will either evaluate to a value of the right type or can make an infinite number of steps.

First, recall the definition of a *well-typed* environment. We write $H \models \ell : A$ to indicate that there exists a, necessarily unique, semantic value $a \in [A]$ so that $H \models v \mapsto a : A$. An environment V and a heap H are *well-formed* with respect to a context Γ if $H \models V(x) : \Gamma(x)$ holds for every $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$. We then write $H \models V : \Gamma$.

The judgement $H \models v \mapsto a : A$ is defined by the following rules. Recall that the rules have to be interpreted coinductively.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{X \in \mathcal{X} \quad \ell \in \text{dom}(H)}{H \models \ell \mapsto \ell : X} \text{ (V:TVAR)} \qquad \frac{}{H \models \text{Null} \mapsto [] : \text{L}(T)} \text{ (V:NIL)} \\
\\
\frac{H(\ell) = (\ell_1, \ell_2) \quad H \models \ell_1 \mapsto a_1 \quad H \models \ell_2 \mapsto (a_2, \dots, a_n) : \text{L}(T)}{H \models \ell \mapsto [a_1, \dots, a_n] : \text{L}(T)} \text{ (V:CONS)} \\
\\
\frac{H(\ell) = (\lambda x. e, V) \quad \exists \Gamma. H \models V : \Gamma \wedge \Gamma \vdash \lambda x. e \vdash^m T_1 \rightarrow T_2}{H \models \ell \mapsto (\lambda x. e, V) : \Sigma \rightarrow T} \text{ (V:FUN)}
\end{array}$$

In this problem assume that M_E is the *steps metric*, which counts the number of evaluation steps. We then have $M_E^K = 1$ for all constants K .

Prove the following theorem. It is sufficient if you prove the theorem for expressions of the form

$$\begin{array}{ll}
e ::= & x \\
& \text{lam}(x.e) \\
& \text{app}(e_1, e_2) \\
& \text{let}(e_1, x.e_2) \\
& \text{rec}((f, x).e_f, f.e)
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{l}
x \\
\text{fun } x \rightarrow e \\
e_1 \ e_2 \\
\text{let } x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \\
\text{let rec } f x = e_f \text{ in } e
\end{array}$$

Theorem 1 (Type Safety). *Let $H \models V : \Gamma$, $\Gamma \vdash^m e : T$, and let M_E be the steps metric. Then*

- *there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $V; H_{M_E} \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (n, 0)$, $H' \models V : \Gamma$, and $H' \models \ell : T$*
- *or $V; H_{M_E} \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid (m, 0)$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$*

A consequence of the theorem is that resource bounds on the number of evaluation steps prove termination.

Hint: The following lemma can be proved by induction on n .

Lemma 1. *Let $H \models V : \Gamma$ and $\Gamma \vdash^m e : T$. If $V; H_{M_E} \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid (n, 0)$ then $V; H_{M_E} \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid (n+1, 0)$ or $V; H_{M_E} \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (n+1, 0)$ for a location ℓ and an heap H' .*

$V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q, q')$ In environment V and heap H , expression e evaluates to (ℓ, H') , the watermark resource usage is q and q' resources are available afterwards.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{V; H_M \vdash x \Downarrow (\ell, H) \mid M^{\text{var}}} \text{(EE:VAR)} \qquad \frac{H' = H, \ell \mapsto (\lambda x. e, V)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{lam}(x. e) \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid M^{\text{abs}}} \text{(EE:ABS)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad H(\ell_1) = (\lambda x. e, V') \quad V; H_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow (\ell_2, H_2) \mid (q_2, q_3) \quad V'[x \mapsto \ell_2]; H_2 \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q_3, q_4)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{app}(e_1, e_2) \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid M^{\text{app}} \cdot (q_0, q_1) \cdot (q_2, q_3) \cdot (q_3, q_4)} \text{(EE:APP)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad V[x \mapsto \ell_1], H_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{let}(e_1, x. e_2) \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid M^{\text{let}} \cdot (q_0, q_1) \cdot (q_2, q_3)} \text{(EE:LET)} \\
\\
\frac{H' = H, \ell \mapsto \text{Null}}{V; H_M \vdash \text{nil} \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid M^{\text{nil}}} \text{(EE:NIL)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad V; H_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow (\ell_2, H_2) \mid (q_2, q_3) \quad H' = H_2, \ell \mapsto (\ell_1, \ell_2)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{cons}(e_1, e_2) \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid M^{\text{cons}} \cdot (q_0, q_1) \cdot (q_2, q_3)} \text{(EE:CONS)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad H'(\ell) = \text{Null} \quad V; H' \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{matL}(e, e_1, (x_1, x_2). e_2) \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid M_1^{\text{matL}} \cdot (q_0, q_1) \cdot (q_2, q_3)} \text{(EE:MATL1)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad H'(\ell) = (\ell_1, \ell_2) \quad V[x_1 \mapsto \ell_1, x_2 \mapsto \ell_2]; H' \vdash e_2 \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{matL}(e, e_1, (x_1, x_2). e_2) \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid M_2^{\text{matL}} \cdot (q_0, q_1) \cdot (q_2, q_3)} \text{(EE:MATL2)} \\
\\
\frac{V' = V[f \mapsto \ell_f] \quad H' = H, \ell_f \mapsto (\lambda x. e_f, V') \quad V'; H' \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell', H'') \mid (q, q')}{V; H_M \vdash \text{rec}((f, x). e_f, f. e) \Downarrow (\ell', H'') \mid M^{\text{rec}} \cdot (q, q')} \text{(EE:REC)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: Rules of the effect-based cost semantics.

$V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid (q, q')$	After evaluating expression e in environment V and heap H for several steps, the watermark resource usage is q and q' resources are available.
---	--

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid 0} \text{(EP:ABORT)} \qquad \frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_0, q_1)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{app}(e_1, e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{app}}.(q_0, q_1)} \text{(EP:APP1)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad V; H_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{app}(e_1, e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{app}}.(q_0, q_1).(q_2, q_3)} \text{(EP:APP2)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad H(\ell_1) = (\lambda x. e, V') \quad V; H_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow (\ell_2, H_2) \mid (q_2, q_3) \quad V'[x \mapsto \ell_2]; H_2 \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_3, q_4)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{app}(e_1, e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{app}}.(q_0, q_1).(q_2, q_3).(q_3, q_4)} \text{(EP:APP3)} \\
\\
\frac{V, H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_0, q_1)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{let}(e_1, x. e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{let}}.(q_0, q_1)} \text{(EP:LET1)} \\
\\
\frac{V, H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad V[x \mapsto \ell_1], H_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{let}(e_1, x. e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{let}}.(q_0, q_1).(q_2, q_3)} \text{(EP:LET2)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_0, q_1)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{cons}(e_1, e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{cons}}.(q_0, q_1)} \text{(EP:CONS1)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e_1 \Downarrow (\ell_1, H_1) \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad V; H_1 \vdash e_2 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{cons}(e_1, e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{cons}}.(q_0, q_1).(q_2, q_3)} \text{(EP:CONS2)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_0, q_1)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{matL}(e, e_1, (x_1, x_2). e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M_1^{\text{matL}}.(q_0, q_1)} \text{(EP:MATL0)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad H'(\ell) = \text{Null} \quad V; H' \vdash e_1 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{matL}(e, e_1, (x_1, x_2). e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M_1^{\text{matL}}.(q_0, q_1).(q_2, q_3)} \text{(EP:MATL1)} \\
\\
\frac{V; H_M \vdash e \Downarrow (\ell, H') \mid (q_0, q_1) \quad H'(\ell) = (\ell_1, \ell_2) \quad V[x_1 \mapsto \ell_1, x_2 \mapsto \ell_2]; H' \vdash e_2 \Downarrow \circ \mid (q_2, q_3)}{V; H_M \vdash \text{matL}(e, e_1, (x_1, x_2). e_2) \Downarrow \circ \mid M_2^{\text{matL}}.(q_0, q_1).(q_2, q_3)} \text{(EP:MATL2)} \\
\\
\frac{V' = V[f \mapsto \ell_f] \quad H' = H, \ell_f \mapsto (\lambda x. e_f, V') \quad V'; H' \vdash e \Downarrow \circ \mid (q, q')}{V; H_M \vdash \text{rec}((f, x). e_f, f. e) \Downarrow \circ \mid M^{\text{rec}}.(q, q')} \text{(EP:REC)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2: Rules of the partial effect-based cost semantics.