#### All About That Base

Qualitative to Quantitative Denotational Models

Jim Laird University of Bath, UK

September 2, 2016

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

# Aims

- Give a categorical model of higher-order computation with quantities.
- A general way of moving from existing, qualitative models, to quantitative ones ...
- ... which captures existing examples (non-deterministic games [Harmer and McCusker], probabilistic games [Danos and Harmer], slot games [Ghica]).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

We may represent the two level structure we want to capture (computation, quantities) using *enriched categories*: Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a monoidal category (the *base*).Recall that a  $\mathcal{V}$ -category  $\mathcal{C}$  is given by:

- ► A set *Obj<sub>C</sub>*
- A  $\mathcal{V}$ -object  $\mathcal{C}(A, B)$  for each  $A, B \in Obj_{\mathcal{C}}$ .
- *V*-morphisms id<sub>A</sub> : *I* → *C*(*A*, *A*) and *comp*<sub>A,B,C</sub> : *C*(*A*, *B*) ⊗ *C*(*B*, *C*) → *C*(*A*, *C*) satisfying the relevant diagrams.

# Constructing Differential Categories, Deconstructing Games

[L., McCusker Manzonetto, I&C '13] Start with any symmetric monoidal category, C:

- Freely enrich over sup-lattices (i.e. morphisms are sets of C-morphisms), to get a commutative-monoid-enriched category.
- 2. Complete with countable, distributive biproducts
- 3. Take the *Karoubi envelope* (free idempotent splitting) giving *symmetric tensor powers* by splitting the idempotents

We can then construct the *cofree commutative comonoid* by Lafont's construction, giving a differential closed category.

A blueprint for constructing quantitative models?

- Starting with C as the category with one-object and one morphism, we get the category of relations, with the multiset exponential.
- Starting with C as a simple category of games (essentially, the free SMCC over 1 object), we get a HO-style, fully complete model of "differential PCF".

Can we generalize this? The problematic step is free sup-lattice enrichment:

- Applying this to e.g. history sensitive strategies does not give us non-deterministic strategies.
- How do we enrich over other kinds of quantities e.g. natural numbers, probabilities, dioids?

# R-weighted Relations

[L., Manzonetto,McCusker,Pagani - LICS '13] For any continuous semiring  $\mathcal{R}$ :

- Construction of a Lafont category (model of ILL with free exponential) in which objects are sets and morphisms from A to B are A × B matrices.
- ▶ Models of PCF with a sum operator and weights from *R*.
- Key property: Computational Adequacy denotation of a program given by the weighted sum of its reduction paths. Not fully abstract.
- Can we generalize this?
  - To models with richer structure (e.g. games) interpret computational effects, prove full abstraction.
  - To complete semirings (can't enrich over continuous monoids, and some interesting examples are not continuous).

# Lafont Categories With Biproducts

[L. LICS'16] A categorical semantics for quantitative higher-order computation: *Lafont categories with biproducts* — in which we define:

- 1. a parameterised uniform fixed point operator, using principles of axiomatic domain theory.
- 2. a computationally adequate semantics of PCF<sup>+</sup> with weights from the *internal semiring* proved using a resource  $\lambda$ -calculus with *nested finite multiset* resources.

### Biproducts

A category C has (finite) biproducts if it has (finite) products and coproducts, and these are naturally isomorphic:

- ► The category of sets and functions does not have biproducts.
- ► The category of F-vector spaces always has finite biproducts (the direct sum) but never has infinite biproducts.
- The category of sets and relations has all biproducts (disjoint unions).

Note that biproducts in a symmetric monoidal closed category are distributive:  $A \otimes \bigoplus_{i \in I} B_i \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} (A \otimes B_i)$ .

# From Biproducts to Complete Monoid Enrichment

In a category with biproducts we may define the sum of a family of morphisms  $\{f_i : A \to B\}_{i \in I}$ :

 $\Sigma_{i \in I} f_i = \langle f_i \mid i \in I \rangle; [\mathsf{id}_B \mid i \in I] = \langle \mathsf{id}_A \mid i \in I \rangle; [f_i \mid i \in I]$ 

This is a complete monoid — an indexed sum  $\Sigma$  such that:

▶ If *I* is partitioned into  $\{I_j \mid j \in J\}$  then  $\sum_{i \in I} a_i = \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{i \in I_i} a_i$ .

• If 
$$I = \{j\}$$
 then  $\sum_{i \in I} a_i = a_j$ .

 $\ensuremath{\mathcal{C}}$  is enriched over the category of complete monoids.

Symmetric Monoidal Categories and Complete Semirings

In any (symmetric) monoidal category (C, ⊗, I) we may define "scalar multiplication" of g : A → B by f : I → I

$$f \cdot g : A \cong I \otimes A \xrightarrow{f \otimes g} I \otimes B \cong B$$

If C (and ⊗) is complete-monoid-enriched, scalar multiplication distributes over the sum, so C(I, I) is a (commutative) complete semiring — the "internal semiring"
R<sub>C</sub> = (C(I, I), Σ, ·, id<sub>I</sub>).

• C is enriched over the category of  $\mathcal{R}_C$ -modules.

# From Complete Monoid Enrichment to Biproducts

For  ${\mathcal C}$  complete monoid enriched, the biproduct completion  ${\mathcal C}^{\Pi}$  has:

- Objects indexed families of objects of C.
- ▶ Morphisms from {A<sub>i</sub>}<sub>i∈I</sub> to {B<sub>j</sub>}<sub>j∈J</sub> I × J "matrices" of morphisms; {f<sub>ij</sub> : A<sub>i</sub> → B<sub>j</sub>}<sub>ij∈I×J</sub>

Composition is by "matrix multiplication":

$$\{f_{ij}\}_{ij\in I\times J}; \{g_{jk}\}_{jk\in J\times K} = \{\sum_{j\in J} f_{ij}; g_{jk}\}_{ik\in I\times K}$$

Since any complete, commutative semiring  ${\cal R}$  is a one-object complete-monoid-enriched SMCC,  ${\cal R}^\Pi$  is a SMCC with biproducts — a.k.a.

- ► The category of sets and *R*-weighted relations.
- ► The category of free *R*-modules and their homomorphisms.

# Lafont Categories

A SMCC with (bi)products C is a Lafont Category if the forgetful functor into C from its category of commutative comonoids has a right adjoint.

In other words, for every object A in C there is:

- ► A commutative comonoid  $(!A, \delta_A : !A \rightarrow !A \otimes !A, \epsilon_A : !A \rightarrow I)$
- which is "cofree": there is a morphism der<sub>A</sub> :!A → A giving a natural isomorphism between morphisms into A and comonoid morphisms into !A.

Resolving this (monoidal) adjunction gives a (monoidal) comonad  $!:\mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{C}$ , and thus a (cartesian closed) co-Kleisli category  $\mathcal{C}_{!}$ .

**Proposition**  $\mathcal{R}^{\Pi}$  is a Lafont category.

For any set S, !S is the set  $\mathcal{M}_*(S)$  of finite multisets over S, with:

- $\delta_{XYZ} = 1$  if  $X = Y \uplus Z$  and 0 otherwise.
- $\epsilon_{X*} = 1$  if X = [-] and 0 otherwise.
- der<sub>XY</sub> = 1 if X = [Y] and 0 otherwise.

For any  $f : !S \to T$ , define the comonoid morphism  $f_{X,[y_1,...,y_n]}^{\dagger} : !S \to !T = \Sigma \{ f_{X_1,y_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot f_{X_n,y_n} \mid X = X_1 + \ldots + X_n \}$ 

(日) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

#### **Fixed Point Operators**

To interpret recursively defined functions we require a fixed point operator for  $C_1$  — a map sending  $f : !A \to A$  to fix $(f) : !1 \to A$  such that fix $(f) = \text{fix}(f)^{\dagger}$ ; f. It is uniform in ! if f; h = !h; g implies fix(g) = fix(f); h.

## **Fixed Point Operators**

To interpret recursively defined functions we require a fixed point operator for  $C_1$  — a map sending  $f : !A \to A$  to fix $(f) : !1 \to A$  such that fix $(f) = \text{fix}(f)^{\dagger}$ ; f. It is uniform in ! if f; h = !h; g implies fix(g) = fix(f); h. How can we obtain such a fixed point?

- CPO enrichment of C? Only definable if the internal semiring is continuous.
- Trace operator on C? Only uniform (and adequate) if the internal semiring is idempotent.

A Bifree Algebra for the exponential ?

#### Fixed Points from Bifree Algebras

A bifree algebra for  $!: C \to C$  is an object A with an isomorphism  $\alpha : !A \cong A$  such that:

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- $\alpha : !A \to A$  is an initial algebra for !.
- $\alpha^{-1}: A \rightarrow !A$  is a final coalgebra for !.

## Fixed Points from Bifree Algebras

**Proposition**[After Freyd (1990) and Simpson and Plotkin (200)] If  $!: C \to C$  has a bifree algebra  $\Psi$  then  $C_!$  has a unique uniform fixed point operator.

- ►  $\operatorname{id}_{!1}^{\dagger}:!1 \rightarrow !!1$  has a unique anamorphism  $\infty:!1 \rightarrow \Psi$  such that  $\infty; \psi^{-1} = \operatorname{id}_{!1}^{\dagger}; !\infty = \infty^{\dagger}.$
- Any f :!A → A has a unique catamorphism ([f]) : Ψ → A such that ψ; ([f]) =!([f]); f. Let fix(f) :!1 → A = ∞; ([f])

- ►  $fix(f)^{\dagger}; f = (\infty; ([f]))^{\dagger}; f = \infty^{\dagger}; !([f]); f = \infty; \psi^{-1}; \psi; ([f]) = \infty; ([f]) = fix(f).$
- Uniformity and uniqueness follow from uniqueness of catamorphisms and anamorphisms.

# The Bifree Algebra of Nested Finite Multisets

**Theorem** If C is a Lafont category with biproducts then  $C_1$  has a uniform fixed point operator.

Observe that the functor from  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{C}}^{\Pi}$  to  $\mathcal{C}$  sending S to  $\bigoplus_{a \in S} I$  preserves cofree exponentials — i.e.  $! \bigoplus_{a \in S} I \cong \bigoplus_{a \in \mathcal{M}_*(S)} I$ 

- ▶ Let  $\mathbb{M}$  be the set of finite nested multisets i.e.  $\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{M}_i$ , where  $\mathbb{M}_0 = \emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{M}_{i+1} = \mathcal{M}_*(\mathbb{M}_i)$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}_*(\mathbb{M}) = \mathbb{M}$ .
- ► Hence  $\Psi = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{M}} I = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{M}_*(\mathbb{M})} I$  and so  $!\Psi \cong \Psi$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

We show that this isomorphism is a bifree algebra for  $!:\mathcal{C}\rightarrow\mathcal{C}.$ 

#### Extend an applied $\lambda$ -calculus (PCF) with:

Erratic choice:

# $\frac{\Gamma \vdash M: \texttt{nat} \quad \Gamma \vdash N: \texttt{nat}}{\Gamma \vdash M \text{ or } N: \texttt{nat}}$

• "Scalar Weights" from a complete semiring  $\mathcal{R}$ :

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M: \mathtt{nat}}{\Gamma \vdash \underline{a}. M: \mathtt{nat}} a \in \mathcal{R}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

#### **Operational Semantics**

Define a labelled transition system in which

- states are programs of PCF<sup>R</sup> (closed terms of ground type).
- labels are elements of  $\{I, r\}^* \times |\mathcal{R}|$ .
- actions are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} E[M \text{ or } N] & \xrightarrow{l,1} & E[M] & & E[M \text{ or } N] & \xrightarrow{r,1} & E[N] \\ E[\underline{a}.M] & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon,a} & E[M] & & E[M] & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon,1} & E[M'] \end{array}$$

where  $M \longrightarrow M'$  is a PCF reduction.

# Path Weights

For closed terms M, N and a path  $s \in \{l, r\}^*$ , define a weight in  $\mathcal{R}$ :

- $w_s(M, N) = a_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot a_n$  if there exists a reduction  $M \xrightarrow{u_1, a_1} \ldots \xrightarrow{u_n, a_n} N$  such that  $s = u_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot u_n$ .
- $w_s(M, N) = 0$ , otherwise.

We evaluate M at n by taking the sum in  $\mathcal{R}$  of path-weights:  $W(M, n) = \sum_{s \in \{l, r\}^*} w_s(M, n).$ 

Note that if M is strongly convergent (has no infinite reduction paths) this is a finite sum by König's Lemma.

Example



There are many computationally interesting examples of complete semirings e.g.:

- complete lattices (security),
- ▶ positive reals,  $(\mathcal{R}_+ \cup \infty, \Sigma, \times, 1)$  (probability)
- ▶ tropical semirings —e.g.( $\mathbb{N} \cup \infty, \max, +, 0$ ) (longest path).

The above are continuous semirings — they can be ordered so that sum and product are continuous.

# Non-continuous Semirings

Let  $(|\mathcal{R}|, +, \cdot, 1)$  be any commutative semiring without (necessarily) additive identity. Define a complete semiring  $\mathcal{R}_0^{\infty} = (|\mathcal{R}| \uplus \{0, \infty\}, \Sigma, \cdot, 1)$ , where:

► 
$$\Sigma_{i \in I} a_i = 0$$
 if  $I_0^C \triangleq \{i \in I \mid a_i \neq 0\} = \emptyset$ 

► 
$$\Sigma_{i \in I} a_i = \Sigma_{i \in I_0^C} a_i$$
, if  $0 < |I_0^C| < \infty$  and  $\{i \in I \mid a_i = \infty\} = \emptyset$ .

• 
$$\sum_{i \in I} a_i = \infty$$
, otherwise.

and  $a.\infty = \infty.a = 0$  if a = 0;  $a.\infty = \infty.a = \infty$ , otherwise. This is not continuous in general — e.g. if  $\mathcal{R}$  is finite.

# Nested multiset approximants

To prove computational adequacy, we represent fixed points as sums of approximants, indexed over  $\mathbb{M}$ :

• We show that  $\infty: I \to \Psi = \sum_{X \in \mathbb{M}^l X}$  (where  $\iota_X: I \to \bigoplus_{X \in \mathbb{M}} I$  is the Xth injection.

• Let 
$$f^X : I \to !A = \iota_X; ([f]).$$

Then fix $(f) = \sum_{X \in \mathbb{M}} f^X$ 

Each  $X \in \mathbb{M}$  represents a unique forest of nested calls to f — i.e.  $f^{[X_1,...,X_k]}$  corresponds to k recursive calls to f at top level, which make nested calls to f with call-patterns  $X_1, \ldots, X_k$  and so on.

Computational Adequacy for  $PCF^{R}$ 

**Theorem** If C is a Lafont category with biproducts with  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{C}$ , then for any program M

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (W(M, \mathbf{n}) \cdot \llbracket \mathbf{n} \rrbracket)$$

Usual proof techniques (logical relations) depend on continuity.

- We use a translation into an equivalent operational semantics which nondeterministically assigns an explicit multiplicity to each variable — either a natural number or a nested multiset (for recursively defined variables). — cf. the resource λ-calculus.
- We define the denotational semantics of this system using our semantic approximants to the fixed point.

## Qualitative to Quantitative Models: Change of Base

Suppose  $F : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{U}$  is a *monoidal functor*, with  $m_{A,B} : FA \otimes FB \to F(A \otimes B)$  and  $m_I : I \to FI$ . Then for any  $\mathcal{V}$ -enriched category  $\mathcal{C}$ , F induces a  $\mathcal{U}$ -enriched category  $F\mathcal{C}$  by *change of base*:

- $Obj_{FC} = Obj_C$
- $\blacktriangleright FC(A,B) = F(C(A,B))$

The identity and composition morphisms are m<sub>I</sub>; (Fid<sub>A</sub>) : I → FC(A, B) and m<sub>C(A,B),C(B,C)</sub>; comp<sub>A,B,C</sub> : FC(A, B) ⊗ FC(B, C) → C(A, C).

Example — for any  $\mathcal{V}$ , the functor  $\mathcal{V}(I, _{-}) : \mathcal{V} \to Set$  is monoidal — for any  $\mathcal{V}$ -category  $\mathcal{C}$ , change of base along this functor gives the *underlying category*  $\mathcal{C}_0$ .

Observe that F acts as a functor from  $C_0$  to  $(FC)_0$ .

Consider the (strict monoidal) "forgetful" functor  $\Phi_R$  from the category of coherence spaces and stable, linear maps (cliques of  $A \multimap B$ ) to  $R^{\Pi}$ :

• 
$$\Phi_R(|A|, \bigcirc) = |A|$$

For f : A → B, Φ<sub>R</sub>(f) : |A| × |B| → R is the characteristic function of R − Φ<sub>R</sub>(f)(a, b) = 1 if (a, b) ∈ R, 0 otherwise.

Note that stability is crucial for functoriality.

## **Coherence Enriched Categories**

Many categories (hypercoherences, event structures, sequential algorithms...) bear a natural enrichment over coherence spaces. For example, games and history-free strategies (used by Abramsky and McCusker to interpret *Idealized Algol*):

- Objects are games.
- ▶  $\mathcal{G}(A, B)$  is the set  $L_{A \multimap B}$  of complete (legal) sequences on  $A \multimap B$ , with  $s \sub t$  if  $s \sqcap t$  is even-length.
- $comp_{A,B,C}$  is the set of  $((r,s),t) \in L_{A \multimap B} \times L_{B \multimap C} \times L_{B \multimap C}$ such that there exists u with  $u \upharpoonright A \multimap B = r$ ,  $u \upharpoonright B \multimap C = s$  and  $u \upharpoonright A \multimap C = t$ ,

Stability of composition is the Zipping Lemma.

#### *R*-weighted strategies

The underlying category  $\Phi_R \mathcal{G}$  has games as objects, maps from A to B are maps from  $L_{A \multimap B}$  to R.

- If *R* is the Boolean semiring ({⊤, ⊥}, ∨, ⊤, ∧) then Φ<sub>R</sub>*G* is the category of games and nondeterministic strategies
- If *R* is the probability semiring (*R*<sup>∞</sup><sub>+</sub>, Σ, 1, ×) then Φ<sub>R</sub>*G* is the category of probabilistic games and pre-strategies (Danos and Harmer).
- If R is the tropical semiring (N<sup>∞</sup>, V, 0, +) then Φ<sub>R</sub>G is the category of slot games (Ghica).

# $\mathcal{R}$ -weighted Idealized Algol

- ► So we get a sound model of *IA<sup>R</sup>*, with meaning-preserving functor from the qualitative model : computational adequacy proved as for PCF<sup>R</sup>.
- Full abstraction follows easily from definability of the basis in Idealized Algol, proved by Abramsky and McCusker.