

---

# SIMPLIFYING EXPLICIT SUBTYPING COERCIONS IN A POLYMORPHIC CALCULUS WITH EFFECTS

FILIP KOPRIVEC <sup>a,b</sup> AND MATIJA PRETNAR <sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Jadranska 19, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

<sup>b</sup> Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, Jadranska 19, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia  
*e-mail address:* filip.koprivec@fmf.uni-lj.si  
*e-mail address:* matija.pretnar@fmf.uni-lj.si

---

**ABSTRACT.** Algebraic effect handlers are becoming increasingly popular way of structuring and reasoning about effectful computations, and their performance is often a concern. One of the proposed approaches towards efficient compilation is tracking effect information through explicit subtyping coercions. However, in the presence of polymorphism, these coercions are compiled to additional arguments of compiled functions, incurring significant overhead.

In this paper, we present a polymorphic effectful calculus, identify simplification phases needed to reduce the number of unnecessary constraints, and prove they preserve the semantics. In addition, we implement the simplification algorithm in the `EFF` language, and evaluate its performance on a number of benchmarks. Though we do not prove optimality of presented simplifications, the results show that the algorithm eliminates all the coercions, resulting in a code as efficient as manually monomorphised one.

## INTRODUCTION

Recent years have seen an increase in the number of programming languages that support algebraic effect handlers [PP03, PP13]. With a widespread usage, the need for performance is becoming ever more important. And there are two main ways for achieving it: an efficient runtime [DWS<sup>+</sup>15, SDW<sup>+</sup>21], or an optimising compiler [SBO20, XL21, KKPS21], which we focus on in this paper.

Our recent work [KKPS21] has shown how an optimising compiler can take code written using the full flexibility of handlers, infer precise information about which parts of it use effects and which are pure, and produce code that matches conventional handcrafted one. However, the approach tracks effect information through explicit subtyping coercions [KPS<sup>+</sup>20], and for polymorphic functions, these need to be passed around as additional parameters. Since

---

*Key words and phrases:* Computational effects, Optimizing compilation, Algebraic effects, Polymorphic compilation, Subtyping, Denotational semantics.

This material is based upon work supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under awards number FA9550-17-1-0326 and FA9550-21-1-0024.

subtyping coercions are inferred automatically, their number grows with the size of the program, which drastically reduces the performance. To avoid this, all polymorphic functions need to be annotated with particular types, or monomorphised by the compiler, neither of which is a satisfactory solution.

In this paper, we propose an algorithm that soundly reduces (and often completely eliminates) redundant coercion parameters, leading to a performance comparable to monomorphic code. We start with an overview of the approach (Section 1) and continue with a specification of our working language (Section 2). Afterwards, we turn to our contributions, which are:

- Identifying requirements for a simplification algorithm phase to be correct with respect to typing (Sections 3 and 4).
- A number of progressive phases for simplification of constraints (Section 5).
- A proof that the all presented simplifications preserve the denotational semantics (Section 6).
- An implementation of the algorithm in a prototype language `EFF` and an evaluation of the impact it has on the code size and runtime (Section 7).

We conclude by discussing related and future work.

## 1. OVERVIEW

**1.1. Explicit polymorphism.** Our work builds on an existing optimizing compiler, which compiles `EFF` [BP15], an ML-like language with native support for algebraic effects and handlers, into pure OCAML code without handlers. From the latest version onwards, OCAML also offers native support for handlers, but unlike `EFF`, restricts them to continuations that may be resumed at most once. Ignoring effect annotations for a bit, let us consider a polymorphic function that applies a given function to its argument only if a given predicate is satisfied. In `EFF`, one would write it as:

```
let apply_if p f x = if p x then f x else x
```

The above function is first translated to `EFF`'s core language `COREEFF`, which is a fine-grain call-by-value language [LPT03b], meaning it distinguishes values and computations. For example, since `p x` is a computation, and a conditional statement expects a boolean value, we must explicitly sequence the two computations and get:

```
fun p ↦ return (fun f ↦ return (fun x ↦ (
  do b ← p x;
  if b then f x else return x
))))
```

Next, the inference algorithm infers the most general type and makes it explicit by annotating variables with types and certain terms with type coercions (highlighted in *gray*):

```

fun (p :  $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \text{bool}$ )  $\mapsto$  return (
  fun (f :  $\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_3$ )  $\mapsto$  return (
    fun (x :  $\alpha_4$ )  $\mapsto$  (
      do b  $\leftarrow$  p (x  $\triangleright$   $\omega_1$ );
      if b then
        (f (x  $\triangleright$   $\omega_2$ ))  $\triangleright$   $\omega_3$ 
      else
        return (x  $\triangleright$   $\omega_4$ )
    ))
  ))


```

In general, the type  $\alpha_4$  of  $x$  does not have to be the same as the argument type  $\alpha_1$  of  $p$ , it only needs to be its subtype, thus it needs to be cast by some type coercion  $\omega_1 : \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_1$ . A similar situation occurs with  $f$  and  $\omega_2 : \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_2$ . Finally, the result of  $f$  needs to be coerced to a supertype it shares with the other branch. As before, we express this by introducing a new type variable  $\alpha_5$  for the output and coercions  $\omega_3 : \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_5$  and  $\omega_4 : \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_5$ .

The inferred type of the function `apply_if` is then:

$$(\alpha_1 \rightarrow \text{bool}) \rightarrow (\alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_3) \rightarrow (\alpha_4 \rightarrow \alpha_5)$$

under the constraints described above. These are most easily expressed with a graph where nodes correspond to type parameters, while edges correspond to coercions between them:



When translating EFF computations to OCAML, we target a monadic type `'a comp`, which represents effectful computations that return values of type `'a`, and could be implemented using the free monad or a continuation-passing style. Due to a monadic embedding, one would expect the translation:

```

let apply_if p f x =
  p x >>= fun b -> if b then f x else x

```

where `(>>=) : 'a comp -> ('a -> 'b comp) -> ('b comp)` is the monadic bind. However, we do not have to consider only monads, but explicit coercions as well. We translate coercions into OCaml functions and casts into applications, for which we use the reverse application operator `(|>) : 'a -> ('a -> 'b) -> 'b`. Any coercion parameters need to be passed in as function arguments, so the translation is actually:

```


let apply_if w1 w2 w3 w4 p f x =
  p (x |> w1) >>= fun b ->
    if b then (f (x |> w2)) |> coer_comp w3
    else return (x |> w4)

```

where `coer_comp` : (`'a`  $\rightarrow$  `'b`)  $\rightarrow$  (`'a comp`  $\rightarrow$  `'b comp`) lifts value coercions to computations, and `return` : `'a`  $\rightarrow$  `'a comp` is the unit of the monad.


Each additional argument not only increases the function size, but significantly impacts the runtime, especially as it soon prevents the OCAML compiler from passing function arguments in processor registers. In fact, the situation is even worse, as the above example was simplified for the presentation, while the actual inference algorithm uses additional intermediate type variables leading to further arguments. A quick analysis of the EFF standard library shows that the number of explicit constraints produced by the current algorithm is overwhelming. Standard `unzip` function needs 23 explicit coercions, while a straightforward implementation of the quicksort algorithm produces OCAML code with just under 200 explicit coercion parameters.

**1.2. Type constraint simplification.** Explicit type coercions are relevant during compilation, optimization and during execution, and therefore cannot be simply discarded, but it is obvious we want to reduce them to a minimum. One simple case of a simplification is when the coercions form a cycle in the graph and which often happens with recursive functions. For example, if we have three coercions:



all the variables must be the same, and we can replace them with a single variable  $\alpha$ . Similarly, we can replace all coercions with the reflexive coercion  $\langle \alpha \rangle : \alpha \leq \alpha$ , essentially removing any casts in which they appear.

In a more general case, we have to be more cautious, though we can achieve similar results. To see how constraints impact the type of the program, let us first annotate type parameters with a *polarity*. We label a parameter as *positive* if it appears covariantly in the type, and as *negative* if it appears contravariantly. The running example above annotated with polarities is:



Like in the running example, it is often the case (but not true in general!) that each parameter is either positive or negative and that constraints are of the form  $X^- \leq Y^+$  (we are going to omit writing the coercion if we shall be interested only in the subtyping relation between the types).

It is easy to see that if  $\alpha^+$  is positive with regards to a type  $A$ , and if  $A_1 \leq A_2$ , then  $A[A_1/\alpha^+] \leq A[A_2/\alpha^+]$ . For that reason, we lose no generality if we replace all positive parameters with their unique lower bounds, if they exist. The exact opposite holds for negative type parameters.

As a simple example, consider a polymorphic term (e.g. one defining a function)  $v : A$  where  $A$  features type parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$ , and a single coercion parameter  $\omega : \alpha \leq \alpha'$ . If


$\alpha'$  occurs positively in  $A$ , we can replace  $v$  with a simplified term  $v' = v[\alpha/\alpha', \langle \alpha \rangle/\omega]$  of type  $A[\alpha/\alpha']$ . Next, any instantiation  $v[A'/\alpha, A''/\alpha', \gamma/\omega]$  of  $v$  can be replaced with a coerced instantiation  $(v'[A'/\alpha]) \triangleright \gamma'$  of  $v'$  (we shall prove that this preserves semantics). Here,  $\gamma'$  is a coercion witnessing

$$(A[\alpha/\alpha'])[A'/\alpha] = A[A'/\alpha, A''/\alpha'] \leq A[A'/\alpha, A''/\alpha']$$

which exists (we are going to construct it later on), because  $\gamma$  witnesses  $A' \leq A''$  and  $\alpha'$  occurs positively in  $A$ . One could say that we have introduced an additional coercion, but this can often be optimized away, and even if it cannot, we have reduced the number of coercion parameters, which has a much more significant impact on performance.

In our running example, we can simplify the type and constraints by replacing  $\alpha_1^+$  and  $\alpha_2^+$  with  $\alpha_4^-$  (which now gains both positive and negative polarity),  $\alpha_3^-$  with  $\alpha_5^+$

$$(\alpha_4^\pm \rightarrow \mathbf{bool}) \rightarrow (\alpha_4^\pm \rightarrow \alpha_5^\pm) \rightarrow (\alpha_4^\pm \rightarrow \alpha_5^\pm)$$



We cannot reduce the constraints any further because  $\alpha_4$  is positive and  $\alpha_5$  is negative. This now compiles to the OCAML function:

```
let apply_if w p f x =
  p x >>= fun b -> if b then f x else return (x |> w)
```

which still has one remaining coercion parameter, however this is in practice more an exception than a rule. The quicksort algorithm compiles without any of the hundreds of additional parameters, as does the standard library of EFF, which contains around 50 of the most frequently used polymorphic functions.

**1.3. Effect annotations.** As mentioned above, effect information is crucial for optimizations, as it allows the compiler to identify pure parts of the code.

To this extent, COREEFF computations are assigned types of the form  $A ! \Delta$ , where  $A$  is the type of returned values, while a *dirt*  $\Delta$  captures the set of effects that the computation may perform. With this additional information, the annotated version of the running example

becomes:

```

fun (p :  $\alpha_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} \text{bool}$ )  $\mapsto$  return (
  fun (f :  $\alpha_2 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \alpha_3$ )  $\mapsto$  return (
    fun (x :  $\alpha_4$ )  $\mapsto$  (
      do b  $\leftarrow$  (p (x  $\triangleright$   $\omega_1$ ))  $\triangleright$   $\langle \text{bool} \rangle ! \varpi_1$ ;
      if b then
        (f (x  $\triangleright$   $\omega_2$ ))  $\triangleright$   $\omega_3 ! \varpi_2$ 
      else
        (return x)  $\triangleright$   $\omega_4 ! \emptyset_{\delta_3}$ 
    )
  )
)

```

where  $A \xrightarrow{\Delta} B$  is an abbreviation for a function type  $A \rightarrow B ! \Delta$ . Dirt parameters  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  capture sets of effects performed by  $p$  and  $f$ , respectively. We do not need the effects of  $p$  and  $f$  to be the same, we just need the effect of the whole computation to cover both. For that reason, we extend subtyping to dirt and capture the above by introducing a third dirt variable  $\delta_3$  and two coercions  $\varpi_1 : \delta_1 \leq \delta_3$  and  $\varpi_2 : \delta_2 \leq \delta_3$


Similarly to the twofold structure of computation types, computation coercions are of the form

$$(\gamma_v ! \gamma_d) : (A_1 ! \Delta_1) \leq (A_2 ! \Delta_2)$$

where  $\gamma_v : A_1 \leq A_2$  coerces values and  $\gamma_d : \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_2$  coerces the dirt.

In the example above, the first coercion casts the application of  $p$  to  $x$ . In it, we use  $\varpi_1$  to cast the dirt, while for the type `bool` of boolean values, the only option is the reflexive coercion  $\langle \text{bool} \rangle : \text{bool} \leq \text{bool}$ . Next, we cast the application of  $f$  to  $x$  by extending the value coercion  $\omega_3$  from before with the dirt coercion  $\varpi_2$ . Finally, in the last cast, returned values cause no effects, so we need to cast the empty dirt to the common dirt  $\delta_3$ , which we do using the empty coercion  $\emptyset_{\delta_3} : \emptyset \leq \delta_3$ .

Even though dirt coercions only inform the monadic structure and get erased when translating to OCAML, they are still present in the intermediate representation and other potential compilation targets, so we want to simplify them. This proceeds similarly as for type coercions. Incoming dirt parameters  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  receive negative polarity and outgoing dirt  $\delta_3$  receives the positive one. Thus, the constraint graph is of the form:



which we can simplify by replacing both  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  with  $\delta_3$  and both  $\varpi_1$  and  $\varpi_2$  with the reflexive coercion  $\langle \delta_3 \rangle$ .

With some renaming and writing  $A \xrightarrow{\emptyset} B$  as  $A \rightarrow B$ , the final simplified type of `apply_if` is thus:

$$(\alpha \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathbf{bool}) \rightarrow (\alpha \xrightarrow{\delta} \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \xrightarrow{\delta} \beta$$

under the constraint  $\alpha \leq \beta$ .

**1.4. Operations.** The COREFF language also features explicit *operations*. The operations are used to model both external effects such as state, input/output or randomness, and user-defined effects such as exceptions, non-determinism, or multi-threading. As an example, assume an operation `Random : bool` that produces random boolean values each time when triggered.

Operations are tracked in the aforementioned dirt, which is a set  $\{op_1, \dots, op_n\}$  that overapproximates the effects a program can perform. To account for effects coming from elsewhere, the general form of a dirt is  $\mathcal{O} \cup \delta$ , where  $\mathcal{O}$  is a set of that may occur, and  $\delta$  is a *row* variable capturing all other unlisted operations, for example the ones coming from an argument of a higher-order function.

In EFF, operations are triggered through the `perform` keyword. For example, here is a program that applies a given function to its argument with some probability:

```
let apply_randomly f x =
  if (perform Random) then f x else x
```

Simplification of type constraints removes all of them and the type of `apply_randomly` is:

$$(\alpha_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} \alpha_2) \rightarrow \alpha_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \alpha_2$$

under the constraints  $\delta_1 \leq \delta_2$  and  $\{Random\} \leq \delta_2$ . The latter constraint shows that  $\delta_2$  needs to contain `Random`, so we replace it with  $\{Random\} \cup \delta_3$  for some fresh dirt variable  $\delta_3$ , ending up with a single constraint of the form

$$\delta_1 \leq \{Random\} \cup \delta_3$$

Again,  $\delta_1$  is a negative parameter which may be safely increased to  $\{Random\} \cup \delta_3$ , and the final simplified type of `apply_randomly` is

$$(\alpha \xrightarrow{\{Random\} \cup \delta} \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \xrightarrow{\{Random\} \cup \delta} \beta$$

Note that the given function does not have to perform the `Random` operation, so the dirt  $\delta$  is preserved.

While adding handlers provides additional flexibility to the programmer, it does not change the effect system significantly [BP14]. To incorporate first-class handlers, we introduce a new type constructor  $A_1 ! \Delta_1 \Rightarrow A_2 ! \Delta_2$ , which handles a computation of type  $A_1 ! \Delta_1$  into one of type  $A_2 ! \Delta_2$ . For example, a handler that resolves all `Random` operations to `true` and counts the number of `Random` operations performed can be written as:

```
handler
| val x -> (x, 0)
| perform Random k -> let (res, cnt) = k true in (res, cnt + 1)
```

The type of this handler is

$$\alpha ! (\{Random\} \cup \delta) \Rightarrow (\alpha \times \mathbf{int}) ! \delta$$

So, it takes a probabilistic computation potentially performing *Random* and some other effects  $\delta$  and producing values of type  $\alpha$ , and handles it into a computation that performs only  $\delta$ , and returns an integer in addition to the original result.

All of the above is more or less orthogonal to the rest of the work, so we will not go into further details.

## 2. LANGUAGE

Let us now turn to a formal development of the above ideas. As our working language, we take COREEFF, a simple fine-grain call-by-value [LPT03a] calculus with effects and explicit coercions. In contrast to our previous work [KPS<sup>+</sup>20], which used impredicative polymorphism, we use predicative polymorphism as it is simpler and sufficient for our use, especially as EFF generalizes only top-level let bindings [VJS10].

**2.1. Types.** As we are working with a fine-grain call-by-value calculus, we distinguish between value and computation types, defined as:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{dirt} & \Delta ::= \delta \mid \emptyset \mid \{op\} \cup \Delta \\ \\ \text{value type} & A, B ::= \alpha \mid \mathbf{Unit} \mid A \rightarrow \underline{C} \\ \text{computation type} & \underline{C} ::= A ! \Delta \\ \\ \text{skeleton} & S ::= \varsigma \mid \mathbf{Unit} \mid S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \end{array}$$

Dirt is, as before, a sequence of operations followed by either a row dirt variable or the empty dirt. Note that the same set of operations can be represented in multiple ways, all of which differ only in the ordering of operations. In this paper, we consider all such representations equivalent and treat dirt as being of the form  $\mathcal{O} \cup \emptyset = \mathcal{O}$  or  $\mathcal{O} \cup \delta$  for some set of operations  $\mathcal{O}$ . The prototype implementation indeed represents dirt with a set instead of a list of operations, joined with an optional dirt variable.

For simplicity, value types are limited to type parameters, the unit type, and function types, which consist of an argument (value) type and a return (computation) type. Since functions take value arguments and perform computations, their type consists of a value type domain and a computation type codomain.

Computation types are a combination of a type of returned values with an associated dirt representing the operations that may be called. Importantly, the dirt conservatively over-approximates the set of operations that may be called.

In addition to types, we also introduce *skeletons* [KPS<sup>+</sup>20], which capture the structure of types, if we ignore all effect information. For that reason, their syntax mimics the one of the value types, except that for functions, both the domain and codomain are skeletons. Importantly, our subtyping is structural, and one type can be a subtype of another only if their skeletons are equal.

For the rest of the paper, we assume a global signature

$$\Sigma = \{op_1 : A_1 \rightarrow B_1, op_2 : A_2 \rightarrow B_2, \dots, op_n : A_n \rightarrow B_n\}$$

which assigns monomorphic types  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  to each operation  $op_i$ . Note that the arrow  $\rightarrow$  in the operation signature is just the traditional syntax separating two value types, and should not be confused with a function type where the right-hand side is a computation type.



For technical reasons (see Section 6.3), we assume the result type  $B_i$  to be ground, i.e. not a function type.

Due to the presence of parameters, we check well-formedness (Figure 1) in *parameter contexts* given by the following grammar:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{skeleton parameter context } \Xi_s ::= \varepsilon \mid \Xi_s, \tau \\ \text{dirt parameter context } \Xi_d ::= \varepsilon \mid \Xi_d, \delta \\ \text{type parameter context } \Xi_t ::= \varepsilon \mid \Xi_t, (\alpha : S) \end{array}$$

$\vdash_s \Xi_s \text{ ctx}$  and  $\vdash_d \Xi_d \text{ ctx}$

$$\frac{}{\vdash_s \varepsilon \text{ ctx}} \quad \frac{\vdash_s \Xi_s \text{ ctx}}{\vdash_s \Xi_s, \tau \text{ ctx}} \quad \frac{}{\vdash_d \varepsilon \text{ ctx}} \quad \frac{\vdash_d \Xi_d \text{ ctx}}{\vdash_d \Xi_d, \delta \text{ ctx}}$$

$\Xi_s \vdash S \text{ skel}$  assuming  $\vdash_s \Xi_s \text{ ctx}$

$$\frac{\varsigma \in \Xi_s}{\Xi_s \vdash \varsigma \text{ skel}} \quad \frac{}{\Xi_s \vdash \text{Unit} \text{ skel}} \quad \frac{\Xi_s \vdash S_1 \text{ skel} \quad \Xi_s \vdash S_2 \text{ skel}}{\Xi_s \vdash S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \text{ skel}}$$

$\Xi_d \vdash \Delta \text{ dirt}$  assuming  $\vdash_d \Xi_d \text{ ctx}$

$$\frac{\delta \in \Xi_d}{\Xi_d \vdash \delta \text{ dirt}} \quad \frac{}{\Xi_d \vdash \emptyset \text{ dirt}} \quad \frac{(op : A_1 \rightarrow A_2) \in \Sigma \quad \Xi_d \vdash \Delta \text{ dirt}}{\Xi_d \vdash \{op\} \cup \Delta \text{ dirt}}$$

$\Xi_s \vdash_t \Xi_t \text{ ctx}$

$$\Xi_s \vdash_t \varepsilon \text{ ctx} \quad \frac{\Xi_s \vdash_t \Xi_t \text{ ctx} \quad \Xi_s \vdash S \text{ skel}}{\Xi_s \vdash_t \Xi_t, (\alpha : S) \text{ ctx}}$$

$\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A : S$  assuming  $\vdash_s \Xi_s \text{ ctx}$  and  $\Xi_s \vdash S \text{ skel}$

$$\frac{(\alpha : S) \in \Xi_t}{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash \alpha : S} \quad \frac{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A : S_1 \quad \Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash \underline{C} : S_2}{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A \rightarrow \underline{C} : S_1 \rightarrow S_2} \quad \frac{}{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash \text{unit} : \text{Unit}}$$

$\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash \underline{C} : S$  assuming  $\vdash_s \Xi_s \text{ ctx}$  and  $\Xi_s \vdash S \text{ skel}$

$$\frac{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A : S \quad \Xi_d \vdash \Delta \text{ dirt}}{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A ! \Delta : S}$$

FIGURE 1. Well-formedness rules for skeletons, dirt, types, and their contexts

2.2. **Coercions.** Coercions, denoted by  $\gamma$  are explicit witnesses for the subtyping relation. Similarly to types, coercions are split into ones for dirt, values, and computations.

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{dirt coercion} \quad \gamma_d ::= \varpi \mid \gamma_d^2 \circ \gamma_d^1 \mid \langle \delta \rangle \mid \langle \emptyset \rangle \mid \emptyset_\delta \mid \{op\} \cup \gamma_d \mid \{op\} \cup^+ \gamma_d \\ \text{value coercion} \quad \gamma_v ::= \omega \mid \gamma_v^2 \circ \gamma_v^1 \mid \langle \alpha \rangle \mid \langle \mathbf{Unit} \rangle \mid \gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c \\ \text{computation coercion} \quad \gamma_c ::= \gamma_v ! \gamma_d \end{array}$$

Dirt coercions can be either parameters, compositions, reflexive coercions for an arbitrary dirt parameter, reflexive empty dirt set coercion, coercion asserting that empty set is below any dirt parameter, or two extensions of coercions with operations. First one asserts that the same operation can be added on both sides, while the second one asserts that the right hand side can be safely increased. Similarly to dirt, dirt coercions can be given with differing order of operations, which we do not distinguish.

Next, value coercions are again parameters, compositions, reflexive coercions for type parameters and the unit type, and function coercions  $\gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c$ , which use  $\gamma_v$  to cast the argument and  $\gamma_c$  to cast the result. Computation coercions are just a combination of value coercion and dirt coercion.

Coercions require us to introduce two additional kinds of parameter contexts:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{dirt coercion parameter context} \quad \Xi_{dc} ::= \varepsilon \mid \Xi_{dc}, (\varpi : \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_2) \\ \text{type coercion parameter context} \quad \Xi_{tc} ::= \varepsilon \mid \Xi_{tc}, (\omega : A_1 \leq A_2) \end{array}$$

which are well-formed according to rules in Figure 2.

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{\Xi_d \vdash_{dc} \Xi_{dc} \text{ ctx assuming } \vdash_d \Xi_d \text{ ctx}} \\ \\ \frac{\Xi_d \vdash_{dc} \Xi_{dc} \text{ ctx} \quad \Xi_d \vdash \Delta \text{ dirt} \quad \Xi_d \vdash \Delta' \text{ dirt}}{\Xi_d \vdash_{dc} \Xi_{dc}, (\varpi : \Delta \leq \Delta') \text{ ctx}} \\ \\ \boxed{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash_{tc} \Xi_{tc} \text{ ctx assuming } \vdash_t \Xi_t \text{ ctx } \vdash_d \Xi_d \text{ ctx and } \Xi_s \vdash_d \Xi_d \text{ ctx}} \\ \\ \frac{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash_{tc} \Xi_{tc} \text{ ctx} \quad \Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A : S \quad \Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A' : S}{\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash_{tc} \Xi_{tc}, (\omega : A \leq A') \text{ ctx}} \end{array}$$

FIGURE 2. Well-formedness rules for coercion contexts

For readability, we shall write the quintuple  $(\Xi_s, \Xi_d, \Xi_t, \Xi_{dc}, \Xi_{tc})$  as a single, flat *parameter context*  $\Xi$ , formed as:

$$\frac{\vdash_s \Xi_s \text{ ctx} \quad \vdash_d \Xi_d \text{ ctx} \quad \Xi_s \vdash_t \Xi_t \text{ ctx} \quad \Xi_d \vdash_{dc} \Xi_{dc} \text{ ctx} \quad \Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash_{tc} \Xi_{tc} \text{ ctx}}{\vdash (\Xi_s, \Xi_d, \Xi_t, \Xi_{dc}, \Xi_{tc}) \text{ ctx}}$$

We shall use the joint context even in judgements that require only particular subcontexts. For example, we shall write  $\Xi \vdash A : S$  instead of the more verbose  $\Xi_s; \Xi_d; \Xi_t \vdash A : S$  when  $\Xi = (\Xi_s, \Xi_d, \Xi_t, \Xi_{dc}, \Xi_{tc})$ .

Using the joint contexts, the well-formedness rules for coercions are given in Figure 3. Note that the subtyping on value and computation types is structural, i.e. if both sides need to have the same skeleton.

$\Xi \vdash \gamma_d : \Delta \leq \Delta'$  assuming  $\vdash \Xi$  **ctx** and  $\Xi \vdash \Delta$  **dirt** and  $\Xi \vdash \Delta'$  **dirt**

$$\frac{(\varpi : \Delta \leq \Delta') \in \Xi}{\Xi \vdash \varpi : \Delta \leq \Delta'}$$

$$\frac{\Xi \vdash \gamma_d^1 : \Delta \leq \Delta' \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_d^2 : \Delta' \leq \Delta''}{\Xi \vdash \gamma_d^2 \circ \gamma_d^1 : \Delta \leq \Delta''}$$

$$\frac{\Xi \vdash \delta \text{ dirt}}{\Xi \vdash \langle \delta \rangle : \delta \leq \delta}$$

$$\frac{}{\Xi \vdash \langle \emptyset \rangle : \emptyset \leq \emptyset}$$

$$\frac{}{\Xi \vdash \emptyset_\delta : \emptyset \leq \delta}$$

$$\frac{op \in \Sigma \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_d : \Delta \leq \Delta'}{\Xi \vdash \{op\} \cup \gamma_d : \{op\} \cup \Delta \leq \{op\} \cup \Delta'}$$

$$\frac{op \in \Sigma \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_d : \Delta \leq \Delta'}{\Xi \vdash \{op\} \cup^+ \gamma_d : \Delta \leq \{op\} \cup \Delta'}$$

$\Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A \leq A'$  assuming  $\vdash \Xi$  **ctx** and  $\Xi \vdash S$  **skel** and  $\Xi \vdash A : S$  and  $\Xi \vdash A' : S$

$$\frac{(\omega : A \leq A') \in \Xi}{\Xi \vdash \omega : A \leq A'}$$

$$\frac{\Xi \vdash \gamma_v^1 : A \leq A' \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_v^2 : A' \leq A''}{\Xi \vdash \gamma_v^2 \circ \gamma_v^1 : A \leq A''}$$

$$\frac{\Xi \vdash \alpha : S}{\Xi \vdash \langle \alpha \rangle : \alpha \leq \alpha}$$

$$\frac{}{\Xi \vdash \langle \text{Unit} \rangle : \text{Unit} \leq \text{Unit}}$$

$$\frac{\Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A \leq A' \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_c : \underline{C} \leq \underline{C}'}{\Xi \vdash \gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c : (A \rightarrow \underline{C}') \leq (A' \rightarrow \underline{C})}$$

$\Xi \vdash \gamma_c : \underline{C} \leq \underline{C}'$  assuming  $\vdash \Xi$  **ctx** and  $\Xi \vdash S$  **skel** and  $\Xi \vdash \underline{C} : S$  and  $\Xi \vdash \underline{C}' : S$

$$\frac{\Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A \leq A' \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_d : \Delta \leq \Delta'}{\Xi \vdash \gamma_v ! \gamma_d : (A ! \Delta) \leq (A' ! \Delta')}$$

FIGURE 3. Coercion well-formedness rules

Even though we assume empty coercions only for the empty dirt and dirt parameters, they are admissible for any well-formed  $\Xi \vdash \Delta$  **dirt**. For those, we can define the empty coercion  $\Xi \vdash \emptyset_\Delta : \emptyset \leq \Delta$  by

$$\emptyset_\emptyset = \langle \emptyset \rangle \quad \emptyset_{\{op\} \cup \Delta} = \{op\} \cup \emptyset_\Delta$$

Similarly, we reflexive coercions are admissible for an arbitrary dirt  $\Xi \vdash \langle \Delta \rangle : \Delta \leq \Delta$  by:

$$\langle \{op\} \cup \Delta \rangle = \{op\} \cup \langle \Delta \rangle$$

and for an arbitrary value or computation type by:

$$\langle A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rangle = \langle A \rangle \rightarrow \langle \underline{C} \rangle \quad \langle A ! \Delta \rangle = \langle A \rangle ! \langle \Delta \rangle$$

Due to composition, we have multiple (semantically equivalent) coercions between two types, for example we can always compose a coercion with the reflexive one. In our previous work [KPS<sup>+</sup>20], we preferred to keep the calculus minimal, but Proposition 4.7 requires compositions of arbitrary coercions, including parametric ones, therefore we add composition as an additional construct.

**2.3. Terms.** Last, and in fact least, we define the terms of the language. It turns out that it does not matter what terms we choose as long as typing judgements are preserved by substitutions (Theorem 3.4) and their denotational semantics respects subtyping (Theorem 6.2). The values are usual: variable, unit, function and also an explicit cast of a value. Computations are: return that lifts a value to a computation, operation calls, sequencing, application, and explicit casts of computations.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{typing context } \Gamma &::= \varepsilon \mid \Gamma, (x : A) \\ \text{value } v &::= x \mid \mathbf{unit} \mid \mathbf{fun} (x : A) \mapsto c \mid v \triangleright \gamma_v \\ \text{computation } c &::= \mathbf{return} v \mid \mathbf{op} v (y : A.c) \mid \mathbf{do} x \leftarrow c_1; c_2 \mid v_1 v_2 \mid c \triangleright \gamma_c \end{aligned}$$

Typing contexts are well-formed in a parameter context according to rules in Figure 4, while terms are typed according to rules in Figure 5. As typing contexts are secondary in our development, we shall always use their full name, and simply use *context* to talk about parameter contexts  $\Xi$ .

$\Xi \vdash \Gamma \text{ tyCtx assuming } \vdash \Xi \text{ ctx}$

$$\frac{}{\Xi \vdash \varepsilon \text{ tyCtx}} \qquad \frac{\Xi \vdash \Gamma \text{ tyCtx} \quad \Xi \vdash A : S}{\Xi \vdash \Gamma, (x : A) \text{ tyCtx}}$$

FIGURE 4. Typing context well-formedness

### 3. SUBSTITUTIONS

Most of our work focuses on translating types and terms in a given context into ones in a simpler context. With that purpose, we define *substitutions*  $\sigma$ , defined as:

$$\text{substitution } \sigma ::= \emptyset \mid \sigma, (\varsigma \mapsto S) \mid \sigma, (\delta \mapsto \Delta) \mid \sigma, (\alpha \mapsto A) \mid \sigma, (\omega \mapsto \gamma_v) \mid \sigma, (\varpi \mapsto \gamma_d)$$

that maps skeleton parameters to skeletons, dirt parameters to dirt, and so on. We assume that each parameter is assigned at most one counterpart, so we can interpret each substitution as a function. When easier, we will use the function like notation  $\sigma(x) = z$  to denote the action of the substitution on the parameter  $x$ . We shall also use  $\sigma \setminus x$  to denote the substitution  $\sigma$  with the mapping that maps the variable  $x$  removed.

**3.1. Valid substitutions.** A *valid substitution*  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  takes each parameter from a well-formed parameter context  $\Xi$  into its counterpart, which is well-formed in context  $\Xi'$ , as given by rules presented in the Figure 6.

Note that validity rules ensure that substitutions are defined on all parameter in the source context, even if they map back to themselves. To prevent unnecessary clutter, we will omit these trivial mappings.

$\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A$  assuming  $\Xi \vdash \Gamma$  **tyCtx** and  $\Xi \vdash A : S$

$$\frac{x : A \in \Gamma}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash x : A} \quad \frac{}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{unit} : \mathbf{Unit}} \quad \frac{\Xi; \Gamma, x : A \vdash c : \underline{C}}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{fun} (x : A) \mapsto c : A \rightarrow \underline{C}}$$

$$\frac{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A \leq A'}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v \triangleright \gamma_v : A'}$$

$\Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C}$  assuming  $\Xi \vdash \Gamma$  **tyCtx** and  $\Xi \vdash \underline{C} : S$

$$\frac{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{return} v : A ! \emptyset} \quad \frac{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash c_1 : A ! \Delta \quad \Xi; \Gamma, x : A ! \Delta \vdash c_2 : A' ! \Delta}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{do} x \leftarrow c_1; c_2 : A' ! \Delta}$$

$$\frac{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v_1 : A \rightarrow \underline{C} \quad \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v_2 : A}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v_1 v_2 : \underline{C}} \quad \frac{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A \quad \Xi; \Gamma, x : A \vdash c : \underline{C}}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{let} x = v \mathbf{in} c : \underline{C}}$$

$$\frac{op : A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \in \Sigma \quad \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A_1 \quad \Xi; \Gamma, y : A_2 \vdash c : A ! \Delta \quad op \in \Delta}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash op v (y : A_2.c) : A ! \Delta}$$

$$\frac{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C} \quad \Xi \vdash \gamma_c : \underline{C} \leq \underline{C}'}{\Xi; \Gamma \vdash c \triangleright \gamma_c : \underline{C}'}$$

FIGURE 5. COREEFF typing rules

$\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  assuming  $\vdash \Xi$  **ctx** and  $\vdash \Xi'$  **ctx**

$$\frac{}{\vdash \emptyset : \varepsilon \Rightarrow \Xi'} \quad \frac{\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi' \quad \Xi' \vdash S \mathbf{skel}}{\vdash (\sigma, \varsigma \mapsto S) : (\Xi, \varsigma) \Rightarrow \Xi'} \quad \frac{\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi' \quad \Xi' \vdash \Delta \mathbf{dirt}}{\vdash (\sigma, \delta \mapsto \Delta) : (\Xi, \delta) \Rightarrow \Xi'}$$

$$\frac{\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi' \quad \Xi' \vdash A : \sigma(S)}{\vdash (\sigma, \alpha \mapsto A) : (\Xi, (\alpha : S)) \Rightarrow \Xi'} \quad \frac{\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi' \quad \Xi' \vdash \gamma_v : \sigma(A_1) \leq \sigma(A_2)}{\vdash (\sigma, \omega \mapsto \gamma_v) : (\Xi, (\omega : A_1 \leq A_2)) \Rightarrow \Xi'}$$

$$\frac{\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi' \quad \Xi' \vdash \gamma_a : \sigma(\Delta_1) \leq \sigma(\Delta_2)}{\vdash (\sigma, \varpi \mapsto \gamma_a) : (\Xi, (\varpi : \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_2)) \Rightarrow \Xi'}$$

FIGURE 6. Substitution validity rules

We will mostly be interested in substitutions  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  where  $\Xi'$  is a subset of  $\Xi$ , and  $\sigma$  preserves all their common parameters. In such cases, we shall call  $\sigma$  a *strengthening* of  $\Xi$  and denote  $\Xi'$  as  $\sigma(\Xi)$ . For example

$$\{\varsigma' \mapsto \mathbf{Unit}, \delta' \mapsto \delta, \alpha \mapsto \mathbf{Unit}\}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\sigma(\mathbf{Unit}) = \mathbf{Unit} & \sigma(S_1 \rightarrow S_2) = \sigma(S_1) \rightarrow \sigma(S_2) \\
\sigma(\emptyset) = \emptyset & \sigma(\{op\} \cup \Delta) = \sigma(\{op\}) \cup \sigma(\Delta) \\
\sigma(\mathbf{Unit}) = \mathbf{Unit} & \sigma(A \rightarrow \underline{C}) = \sigma(A) \rightarrow \sigma(\underline{C}) \\
\sigma(A ! \underline{C}) = \sigma(A) ! \sigma(\underline{C}) &
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 7. Substitution action on skeletons, dirt, and types

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\sigma(\langle \delta \rangle) = \langle \sigma(\delta) \rangle & \sigma(\langle \emptyset \rangle) = \langle \emptyset \rangle \\
\sigma(\emptyset_\delta) = \emptyset_{\sigma(\delta)} & \sigma(\{op\} \cup^\dagger \gamma_a) = \{op\} \cup^\dagger \sigma(\gamma_a) \\
\sigma(\{op\} \cup \gamma_a) = \{op\} \cup \sigma(\gamma_a) & \\
\sigma(\langle \mathbf{Unit} \rangle) = \langle \mathbf{Unit} \rangle & \sigma(\langle \alpha \rangle) = \langle \sigma(\alpha) \rangle \\
\sigma(\gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c) = \sigma(\gamma_v) \rightarrow \sigma(\gamma_c) & \sigma(\gamma_v ! \gamma_a) = \sigma(\gamma_v) ! \sigma(\gamma_a)
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 8. Substitution action on dirt and type coercions

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\sigma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon & \sigma(\Gamma, x : A) = \sigma(\Gamma), x : \sigma(A) \\
\sigma(x) = x & \sigma(\mathbf{unit}) = \mathbf{unit} \\
\sigma(\mathbf{fun } x : T \mapsto c) = \mathbf{fun } x : \sigma(T) \mapsto \sigma(c) & \sigma(v \triangleright \gamma_v) = \sigma(v) \triangleright \sigma(\gamma_v) \\
\sigma(\mathbf{return } v) = \mathbf{return } \sigma(v) & \sigma(\mathbf{do } v \leftarrow x; c) = \mathbf{do } \sigma(v) \leftarrow x; \sigma(c) \\
\sigma(v_1 v_2) = \sigma(v) \sigma(w) & \sigma(v \triangleright \gamma_c) = \sigma(v) \triangleright \sigma(\gamma_c) \\
\sigma(\mathbf{let } x = v \mathbf{ in } c) = \mathbf{let } x = \sigma(v) \mathbf{ in } \sigma(c) & \sigma(\mathbf{op } v (y : A.c)) = \mathbf{op } \sigma(v) (y : A.\sigma(c))
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 9. Substitution action on typing contexts and terms

(where we omit  $\varsigma \mapsto \varsigma, \delta \mapsto \delta$ ), strengthens  $\Xi = \varsigma, \varsigma', \delta, \delta', (\alpha : \varsigma')$  to  $\Xi' = \varsigma, \delta$ .

As expected, valid substitutions preserve well-formedness and typing judgements, where the action of a substitution is extended from parameters to arbitrary types in Figure 7, arbitrary coercions in Figure 8, and arbitrary typing contexts and terms in Figure 9.

**Proposition 3.1.** *For an arbitrary valid substitution  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , the following holds:*

- if  $\Xi \vdash S \text{ skel}$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash \sigma(S) \text{ skel}$ ,
- if  $\Xi \vdash \Delta \text{ dirt}$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash \sigma(\Delta) \text{ dirt}$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *For an arbitrary valid substitution  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , the following holds:*

- if  $\Xi \vdash A : S$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash \sigma(A) : \sigma(S)$ ,

- if  $\Xi \vdash \underline{C} : S$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash \sigma(\underline{C}) : \sigma(S)$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *For an arbitrary valid substitution  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , the following holds:*

- if  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A_1 \leq A_2$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash \sigma(\gamma_v) : \sigma(A_1) \leq \sigma(A_2)$ ,
- if  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_c : \underline{C}_1 \leq \underline{C}_2$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash \sigma(\gamma_c) : \sigma(\underline{C}_1) \leq \sigma(\underline{C}_2)$ ,
- if  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_d : \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_2$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash \sigma(\gamma_d) : \sigma(\Delta_1) \leq \sigma(\Delta_2)$ .

**Theorem 3.4.** *For an arbitrary valid substitution  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , the following holds:*

- if  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A$ , then  $\Xi'; \sigma(\Gamma) \vdash \sigma(v) : \sigma(A)$ ,
- if  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C}$ , then  $\Xi'; \sigma(\Gamma) \vdash \sigma(c) : \sigma(\underline{C})$ .

For substitutions  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ , we can define their *composition* as:

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma' \circ \sigma)(\varsigma) &= \sigma'(\sigma(\varsigma)) & (\sigma' \circ \sigma)(\alpha) &= \sigma'(\sigma(\alpha)) \\ (\sigma' \circ \sigma)(\delta) &= \sigma'(\sigma(\delta)) & (\sigma' \circ \sigma)(\omega) &= \sigma'(\sigma(\omega)) \\ (\sigma' \circ \sigma)(\varpi) &= \sigma'(\sigma(\varpi)) \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  and  $\vdash \sigma' : \Xi' \Rightarrow \Xi''$  be valid substitutions. Then the composition of the two substitutions is a valid substitution  $\vdash \sigma' \circ \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi''$ .*

**3.2. Reducing parameter types.** To ease further analysis, we first reduce parameter types to a canonical form, following similar ideas as our previous unification algorithms [Pre14, SKPS18, KPS<sup>+</sup>20]. Recall that parameter contexts are of the form  $(\Xi_s, \Xi_d, \Xi_t, \Xi_{dc}, \Xi_{tc})$ , where:

- $\Xi_s$  lists skeleton parameters  $\varsigma$ ,
- $\Xi_d$  lists dirt parameters  $\delta$ ,
- $\Xi_t$  lists type parameters and their skeletons  $\alpha : S$ ,
- $\Xi_{dc}$  lists dirt coercion parameters  $\varpi : \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_2$ , and
- $\Xi_{tc}$  lists type coercion parameters  $\omega : A_1 \leq A_2$ .

There is nothing to do with the lists  $\Xi_s$  and  $\Xi_d$ , but due to structural subtyping, the type parameters  $\Xi_t$  can be reduced to ones of the form  $\alpha : \varsigma$ , so with only parameter skeletons. For example, we can instantiate  $\alpha : \mathbf{Unit}$  only to  $\mathbf{Unit}$ , the only closed type with skeleton  $\mathbf{Unit}$ .

With that in mind, we define an auxiliary function  $\varphi_t(\Xi_t; \Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \sigma)$  that processes a context  $\Xi_t$  one parameter at a time and accumulates canonical type parameters  $\Xi'_t$ , additionally generated dirt parameters  $\Xi'_d$ , and a reducing substitution  $\sigma$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_t(\varepsilon; \Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \sigma) &:= (\Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \sigma) \\ \varphi_t((\Xi_t, \alpha : \varsigma); \Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \sigma) &:= \varphi_t(\Xi_t; (\Xi'_t, \alpha : \varsigma), \Xi'_d, \sigma) \\ \varphi_t((\Xi_t, \alpha : \mathbf{Unit}); \Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \sigma) &:= \varphi_t(\Xi_t; \Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \{\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{Unit}\} \circ \sigma) \\ \varphi_t((\Xi_t, \alpha : S_1 \rightarrow S_2); \Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \sigma) &:= \varphi_t((\Xi_t, \alpha_1 : S_1, \alpha_2 : S_2); \Xi'_t, (\Xi'_d, \delta), \{\alpha \mapsto \alpha_1 \xrightarrow{\delta} \alpha_2\} \circ \sigma) \\ &\quad (\delta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \text{ fresh}) \end{aligned}$$

Note that even though  $\Xi_t$  increases in length in the last case, the total size of unprocessed skeletons decreases.

After reducing type parameters, we turn to type constraints, as reducing those may introduce further dirt constraints. Using a similar approach as for types, we reduce type

constraints to ones witnessing  $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ , so only inequalities between type parameters. Like before, we define a function  $\varphi_{tc}(\Xi_{tc}; \Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma)$  that processes  $\Xi_{tc}$  and accumulates reduced type constraints  $\Xi'_{tc}$ , additionally generated dirt constraints  $\Xi'_{dc}$ , and a substitution  $\sigma$  like before:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{tc}(\varepsilon; \Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma) &:= (\Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma) \\ \varphi_{tc}((\Xi_{tc}, \omega : \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2); \Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma) &:= \varphi_{tc}(\Xi_{tc}; (\Xi'_{tc}, \omega : \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2), \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma) \\ \varphi_{tc}((\Xi_{tc}, \omega : \mathbf{Unit} \leq \mathbf{Unit}); \Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma) &:= \varphi_{tc}(\Xi_{tc}; \Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \{\omega \mapsto \langle \mathbf{Unit} \rangle\} \circ \sigma) \\ \varphi_{tc}((\Xi_{tc}, \omega : A_1 \xrightarrow{\Delta} A_2 \leq A'_1 \xrightarrow{\Delta'} A'_2); \Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma) &:= \\ \varphi_{tc}((\Xi_{tc}, \omega_1 : A'_1 \leq A_1, \omega_2 : A_2 \leq A'_2); \Xi'_{tc}, (\Xi'_{dc}, \varpi : \Delta \leq \Delta'), \{\omega \mapsto (\omega_1 \xrightarrow{\varpi} \omega_2)\} \circ \sigma) & \\ \text{where } \omega_1, \omega_2, \varpi \text{ fresh} & \end{aligned}$$

Since well-formedness rules ensure that both sides of type inequalities share the same skeleton, and since the previous stage removed all type parameters with non-parameter skeletons, these four clauses cover all possible cases.


We can visualise reduced contexts with directed graphs. First, we have a graph representing type coercions. Its nodes are type parameters, and its edges are type coercion parameters between them. As we can compare only types with the same skeleton, the graph has multiple connected components, each corresponding to a single skeleton parameter.

Similarly, we shall reduce dirt coercions. Unlike type coercions, we can reduce only the left-hand sides [KPS<sup>+</sup>20], ending up with inequalities of the form  $\delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}$  and  $\delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O} \cup \delta_2$ . Still, we end up with a graph that has dirt parameters as nodes and dirt coercion parameters as edges between them. Additionally, each edge is annotated with an operation set to account for the right-hand side of dirt inequalities, and we need an additional sink node to account for coercions with no parameter on the right. In Section 5.1, we shall explain why we can put operations on edges rather than add additional nodes for each combination  $\mathcal{O} \cup \delta$ .

For example, the reduced context

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_1, \varsigma_2, \delta_1, \delta_2, (\alpha_1 : \varsigma_1), (\alpha'_1 : \varsigma_1), (\alpha''_1 : \varsigma_1), (\alpha_2 : \varsigma_2), (\alpha'_2 : \varsigma_2), (\alpha''_2 : \varsigma_2) \\ (\omega_1 : \alpha_1 \leq \alpha''_1), (\omega_2 : \alpha'_1 \leq \alpha''_1), (\omega_3 : \alpha_2 \leq \alpha'_2), (\varpi_1 : \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \delta_2), (\varpi_2 : \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2) \end{aligned}$$

can be concisely captured with the graph



We reduce dirt coercion contexts using a function  $\varphi_{dc}(\Xi_{dc}; \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma)$  like before. Recall that each dirt is either of the form  $\mathcal{O}$  or  $\mathcal{O} \cup \delta$ , so in addition to the terminal one, we need



to consider four cases, each split into two further subcases:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_{dc}(\varepsilon; \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := (\Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \\
& \quad \varphi_{dc}(\Xi_{dc}; \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \{\varpi \mapsto \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \emptyset_{\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_1}\} \circ \sigma) \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \text{fail} \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \\
& \quad \varphi_{dc}(\Xi_{dc}; (\Xi'_{dc}, \varpi' : \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2), \Xi'_d, \{\varpi \mapsto \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \varpi'\} \circ \sigma) \\
& \quad \text{where } \varpi' \text{ fresh} \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \text{fail} \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \cup \delta_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \varphi_{dc}(\Xi_{dc}; \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \cup \delta_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \\
& \quad \varphi_{dc}(\sigma'(\Xi_{dc}, \Xi'_{dc}); \varepsilon, (\Xi'_d \setminus \delta_2, \delta'_2), \sigma' \circ \sigma) \\
& \quad \text{where } \delta'_2 \text{ fresh, } \sigma' = \{\delta_2 \mapsto (\mathcal{O}_1 \setminus \mathcal{O}_2) \cup \delta'_2\} \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \cup \delta_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \\
& \quad \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}; (\Xi'_{dc}, \varpi' : \delta_1 \leq (\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_1) \cup \delta'_2); \Xi'_d, \{\varpi \mapsto \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \varpi'\} \circ \sigma) \\
& \quad \text{where } \varpi' \text{ fresh} \\
& \varphi_{dc}((\Xi_{dc}, \varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2 \cup \delta_2 \text{ for } \mathcal{O}_1 \not\subseteq \mathcal{O}_2); \Xi'_{dc}, \Xi'_d, \sigma) := \\
& \quad \varphi_{dc}((\sigma'(\Xi_{dc}, \Xi'_{dc})); (\varpi' : \delta_1 \leq (\mathcal{O}_2 \setminus \mathcal{O}_1) \cup \delta'_2), (\Xi'_d \setminus \delta_2, \delta'_2), \{\varpi \mapsto \mathcal{O}_1 \cup \varpi'\} \circ \sigma' \circ \sigma) \\
& \quad \text{where } \delta'_2, \varpi' \text{ fresh, } \sigma' = \{\delta_2 \mapsto (\mathcal{O}_1 \setminus \mathcal{O}_2) \cup \delta'_2\}
\end{aligned}$$

In the first two cases, we have only  $\mathcal{O}_2$  on the right-hand side, so  $\mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_2$  must hold for an instantiation to exist. If it holds, we can factor out  $\mathcal{O}_1$  from both sides of the coercion  $\varpi$ , however note that for flexibility we keep the less restrictive coercion  $\varpi' : \delta \leq \mathcal{O}_2$  in  $\Xi'_{dc}$  in the second case.

In the third and fourth case, the dirt variable  $\delta_2$  can absorb the difference  $\mathcal{O}_1 \setminus \mathcal{O}_2$  if necessary, so we replace it with  $\delta_2 \mapsto (\mathcal{O}_1 \setminus \mathcal{O}_2) \cup \delta'_2$ . As  $\delta_2$  could have appeared in already reduced coercions  $\Xi'_{dc}$ , we need to reintroduce them back in the unreduced context and start afresh. Even though in this case, the reducing context  $\Xi_{dc}$  increases in size, the set of operations that parameters in  $\Xi_d$  can absorb in the future gets smaller, ensuring termination.

Finally, we can merge all three stages into a single substitution:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi_{\text{red}}(\Xi_s, \Xi_d, \Xi_t, \Xi_{dc}, \Xi_{tc}) = \\
& \quad \text{let } (\Xi'_t, \Xi'_d, \sigma_t) = \varphi_t(\Xi_t; \varepsilon, \Xi_d, \emptyset) \\
& \quad \text{let } (\Xi'_{tc}, \Xi'_{dc}, \sigma_{tc}) = \varphi_{tc}(\sigma_t(\Xi_{tc}); \varepsilon, \Xi_{dc}, \sigma_t) \\
& \quad \text{let } (\Xi''_{dc}, \Xi''_d, \sigma_{dc}) = \varphi_{dc}(\Xi'_{dc}; \varepsilon, \Xi'_d, \sigma_{tc}) \\
& \quad ((\Xi_s, \Xi''_d, \Xi'_t, \Xi''_{dc}, \Xi'_{tc}), \sigma_{dc})
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sigma_t$  maps only type parameters, we need to apply it only to  $\Xi_{tc}$ , while dirt constraints  $\Xi_{dc}$  can be left as is. Next, type coercion parameters do not appear anywhere else, so there is no need to apply  $\sigma_{tc}$ , only pass it to the next stage. Finally, even though  $\sigma_{dc}$  maps dirt

parameters, we can assume that  $\Xi'_t$  and  $\Xi'_{tc}$  are in canonical form, so there is no need to substitute them.

**Proposition 3.6.** *If we have  $\Phi_{\text{red}}(\Xi) = (\Xi', \sigma)$ , then  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ .*

#### 4. POLARITY

As shown in Section 1.2, constraint simplification will not necessarily replace types with equivalent, but with compatible ones. Instead of checking the compatibility of whole types, it is enough to check the compatibility of their free parameters. Whether a parameter can be safely increased or decreased depends on its *polarity*, which captures their impact on the whole type.

##### 4.1. Free parameters.

**Definition 4.1.** We define a set of free type and dirt parameters  $F$  as a pair of sets  $(p, n)$  for types, dirts and typing contexts as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{fp}(\alpha) &= (\{\alpha\}, \emptyset) & \mathbf{fp}(\text{Unit}) &= (\emptyset, \emptyset) & \mathbf{fp}(A \rightarrow \underline{C}) &= \overline{\mathbf{fp}(A)} \cup \mathbf{fp}(\underline{C}) \\ \mathbf{fp}(\delta) &= (\{\delta\}, \emptyset) & \mathbf{fp}(\emptyset) &= (\emptyset, \emptyset) & \mathbf{fp}(\{op\} \cup \Delta) &= \mathbf{fp}(\Delta) \\ \mathbf{fp}(A ! \Delta) &= \mathbf{fp}(A) \cup \mathbf{fp}(\Delta) \\ \mathbf{fp}(\varepsilon) &= (\emptyset, \emptyset) & \mathbf{fp}(\Gamma, x : T) &= \mathbf{fp}(\Gamma) \cup \mathbf{fp}(T) \end{aligned}$$

where all set operations (union, difference, subset, ...) on pairs are defined component-wise, while  $\overline{(p, n)} = (n, p)$  denotes the swap of the components.

We can extract the components of a set  $F = (p, n)$  as  $F^+ = p$  and  $F^- = n$ . If a parameter is not present in neither  $F^+$  nor in  $F^-$ , we call it *neutral*. If it is present in both  $F^+$  and in  $F^-$ , we call it *bipolar*.

For example, for

$$F = \mathbf{fp}((\text{bool} \xrightarrow{\delta} \alpha) \xrightarrow{\delta'} \alpha)$$

we have  $F^+ = \{\alpha, \delta'\}$  and  $F^- = \{\alpha, \delta\}$ .

Applying a substitution to a type changes its sets of positive and negative parameters, and the new sets can be computed directly from the original ones as

$$\sigma(F) = \bigcup_{p \in F^+} \mathbf{fp}(\sigma(p)) \cup \overline{\bigcup_{n \in F^-} \mathbf{fp}(\sigma(n))}$$

**Proposition 4.2.** *For an arbitrary valid substitution  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , the following holds:*

- if  $\Xi \vdash \Gamma \text{ tyCtx}$ , then  $\mathbf{fp}(\sigma(\Gamma)) = \sigma(\mathbf{fp}(\Gamma))$ ,
- if  $\Xi \vdash \Gamma : A$ , then  $\mathbf{fp}(\sigma(A)) = \sigma(\mathbf{fp}(A))$ ,
- if  $\Xi \vdash \Gamma : \underline{C}$ , then  $\mathbf{fp}(\sigma(\underline{C})) = \sigma(\mathbf{fp}(\underline{C}))$ .

**4.2. Coercion families.** As discussed in Section 1.3, positive parameters can be safely replaced with their subtypes, and negative parameters can be replaced with their supertypes. We consolidate this subtyping information in a *coercion family*  $Y = \{a \mapsto \gamma\}_{a \in F}$  assigning a type coercion to each type parameter  $\alpha \in F$ , and a dirt coercion to each dirt parameter  $\delta \in F$ .

**Definition 4.3.** Take substitutions  $\vdash \sigma_1 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_2 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , a set of free parameters  $F$ . Then, a family  $Y = \{a \mapsto \gamma\}_{a \in F}$  as described above is a *coercion between  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  relative to  $F$* , written as:

$$\Xi' \vdash Y : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_2$$

if:

- for all  $\alpha \in F^+$ , we have  $\Xi' \vdash Y(\alpha) : \sigma_1(\alpha) \leq \sigma_2(\alpha)$
- for all  $\alpha \in F^-$ , we have  $\Xi' \vdash Y(\alpha) : \sigma_2(\alpha) \leq \sigma_1(\alpha)$
- for all  $\delta \in F^+$ , we have  $\Xi' \vdash Y(\delta) : \sigma_1(\delta) \leq \sigma_2(\delta)$
- for all  $\delta \in F^-$ , we have  $\Xi' \vdash Y(\delta) : \sigma_2(\delta) \leq \sigma_1(\delta)$

For example, for  $F = (\{\alpha, \delta'\}, \{\alpha, \delta\})$  as above, and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 &= \{\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{int}, \delta \mapsto \{\mathit{op}\}, \delta' \mapsto \emptyset\} \\ \sigma_2 &= \{\alpha \mapsto \mathbf{int}, \delta \mapsto \{\mathit{op}\}, \delta' \mapsto \{\mathit{op}'\}\} \\ Y &= \{\alpha \mapsto \langle \mathbf{int} \rangle, \delta \mapsto \langle \{\mathit{op}\} \rangle, \delta' \mapsto \emptyset_{\{\mathit{op}'\}}\} \end{aligned}$$

we have  $\varepsilon \vdash Y : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_2$ . Note that  $\alpha$  is bipolar, thus it can be assigned only reflexive coercions.

Given a coercion family  $Y$ , we can extend dirt coercions  $Y(\Delta)$  to arbitrary dirt  $\Delta$  as long as  $\mathbf{fp}(\Delta) \subseteq F$  by:

$$Y(\emptyset) = \langle \emptyset \rangle \qquad Y(\{\mathit{op}\} \cup \Delta) = \{\mathit{op}\} \cup Y(\Delta)$$

Similarly, we can define a value coercion  $Y(A)$  and a computation coercion  $Y(\underline{C})$  for arbitrary  $A, \underline{C}$  such that  $\mathbf{fp}(A) \subseteq F$  or  $\mathbf{fp}(\underline{C}) \subseteq F$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Y(\mathbf{Unit}) &= \langle \mathbf{Unit} \rangle & Y(\alpha) &= \gamma_v^\alpha \\ Y(A \rightarrow \underline{C}) &= Y(A) \rightarrow Y(\underline{C}) & Y(A ! \Delta) &= Y(A) ! Y(\Delta) \end{aligned}$$

For example, for  $Y = \{\alpha \mapsto \langle \mathbf{int} \rangle, \delta \mapsto \langle \{\mathit{op}\} \rangle, \delta' \mapsto \emptyset_{\{\mathit{op}'\}}\}$  as above, we have

$$Y((\mathbf{bool} \xrightarrow{\delta} \alpha) \xrightarrow{\delta'} \alpha) = (\langle \mathbf{bool} \rangle \xrightarrow{\langle \{\mathit{op}\} \rangle} \langle \mathbf{int} \rangle) \xrightarrow{\emptyset_{\{\mathit{op}'\}}} \langle \mathbf{int} \rangle$$

which witnesses a subtyping

$$(\mathbf{bool} \xrightarrow{\{\mathit{op}\}} \mathbf{int}) \rightarrow \mathbf{int} \leq (\mathbf{bool} \xrightarrow{\{\mathit{op}\}} \mathbf{int}) \xrightarrow{\{\mathit{op}'\}} \mathbf{int}$$

As expected, this property holds in general.

**Proposition 4.4.** For any valid substitutions  $\vdash \sigma_1 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_2 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , such that  $\Xi' \vdash Y : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_2$ , and an arbitrary dirt  $\Xi \vdash \Delta$  dirt such that  $\mathbf{fp}(\Delta) \subseteq F$ , we have

$$\Xi' \vdash Y(\Delta) : \sigma_1(\Delta) \leq \sigma_2(\Delta)$$

**Proposition 4.5.** *For any valid substitutions  $\vdash \sigma_1 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_2 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , such that  $\Xi' \vdash Y : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_2$ , for an arbitrary value type  $\Xi \vdash A : S$  such that  $\mathbf{fp}(A) \subseteq F$ , and for an arbitrary computation type  $\Xi \vdash \underline{C} : S$  such that  $\mathbf{fp}(\underline{C}) \subseteq F$ , we have*

$$\Xi' \vdash Y(A) : \sigma_1(A) \leq \sigma_2(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi' \vdash Y(\underline{C}) : \sigma_1(\underline{C}) \leq \sigma_2(\underline{C})$$

In addition, coercion families satisfy a number of meta-theoretical properties that will prove useful when establishing soundness of simplifications.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\vdash \sigma_1 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_2 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  be valid substitutions and  $F$  a set of free parameters such that  $\Xi' \vdash Y : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_2$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash Y : \sigma_2 \leq_{\overline{F}} \sigma_1$ .*

**Proposition 4.7.** *Take substitutions  $\vdash \sigma_1 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_2 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_3 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , and coercion families  $\Xi' \vdash Y_1 : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_2$  and  $\Xi' \vdash Y_2 : \sigma_2 \leq_F \sigma_3$ . Then  $\Xi' \vdash (Y_2 \circ Y_1) : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_3$ , where  $Y_2 \circ Y_1 := \{a \mapsto Y_2(a) \circ Y_1(a)\}$ .*

*Proof.* Take an arbitrary positive type parameter  $\alpha \in F^+$ . We immediately get coercions  $\Xi' \vdash Y_1(\alpha) : \sigma_1(\alpha) \leq \sigma_2(\alpha)$  and  $\Xi' \vdash Y_2(\alpha) : \sigma_2(\alpha) \leq \sigma_3(\alpha)$ , thus  $\Xi' \vdash Y_2(\alpha) \circ Y_1(\alpha) : \sigma_1(\alpha) \leq \sigma_3(\alpha)$  as required. The proof for positive dirt parameters, and for negative type and dirt parameters is analogous.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8.** *Take substitutions  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi_1 \Rightarrow \Xi_2$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_1 : \Xi_2 \Rightarrow \Xi'$ ,  $\vdash \sigma_2 : \Xi_2 \Rightarrow \Xi'$ , and a coercion family  $\Xi' \vdash Y : \sigma_1 \leq_{\sigma(F)} \sigma_2$ , then  $\Xi' \vdash Y \circ \sigma : (\sigma_1 \circ \sigma) \leq_F (\sigma_2 \circ \sigma)$ , where  $Y \circ \sigma := \{a \mapsto Y(\sigma(a))\}$ .*

*Proof.* Take a positive type parameter  $\alpha \in F^+$ . By definition of  $\sigma(F)$ , we have  $\mathbf{fp}(\sigma(\alpha)) \subseteq \sigma(F)$ , thus from Proposition 4.5, we get  $\Xi' \vdash Y(\sigma(\alpha)) : \sigma_1(\sigma(\alpha)) \leq_F \sigma_2(\sigma(\alpha))$  or equivalently  $\Xi' \vdash Y(\sigma(\alpha)) : (\sigma_1 \circ \sigma)(\alpha) \leq_F (\sigma_2 \circ \sigma)(\alpha)$ . The proof for other kinds of parameters is analogous.  $\square$

**4.3. Simplification phases.** Each *phase*  $\Phi$  takes as inputs a parameter context  $\Xi$  and a set of free parameters  $F$ , denoting the polarity of parameters in the type being simplified, and produces a simplified parameter context  $\Xi'$  together with a substitution  $\vdash \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  that can be used to replace the removed parameters.

We shall compare contexts in terms of all their possible *instantiations* in some other context, say  $\Xi_{\text{use}}$ , which we fix throughout the rest of the paper. Take a polymorphic value  $v$  with parameters in context  $\Xi$ . Whenever this value is used in  $\Xi_{\text{use}}$ , we need to instantiate all its parameters to their counterparts (types, coercions, etc.) that need to be valid in  $\Xi_{\text{use}}$ . Instantiating a polymorphic value thus amounts to a substitution  $\vdash \eta : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$ , which we shall label with  $\eta$  to highlight its role.

From Proposition 3.5, it immediately follows that any instantiation  $\vdash \eta' : \Xi' \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  of the simplified context also produces an instantiation  $\vdash \eta' \circ \sigma : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  of the original context. The converse does not hold: not every instantiation of the original context can be reconstructed from one of the simplified context. This is for the simple reason that simplifications remove parameters and hence decrease the degrees of freedom. However, we can recover the lost freedom using subtyping.

**Definition 4.9.** Phase  $\Phi$  is *complete* if for any  $\Phi(\Xi, F) = (\Xi', \sigma)$  and any instantiation  $\vdash \eta : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$ , there exists an instantiation  $\vdash \eta' : \Xi' \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  and a coercion family  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y_\eta : (\eta' \circ \sigma) \leq_F \eta$ .

**Definition 4.10.** Let  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  be two phases. The *composition of phases*  $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1$  is defined as follows:

$$(\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1)(\Xi, F) = (\Xi'', \sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1) \text{ where } \Phi_1(\Xi, F) = (\Xi', \sigma_1) \text{ and } \Phi_2(\Xi', \sigma_1(F)) = (\Xi'', \sigma_2)$$

Proposition 3.5 implies that the composition of two phases is also a phase.

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  be two phases. If  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  are complete, then  $\Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1$  is also complete.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Phi_1$  and  $\Phi_2$  be two complete phases and  $\vdash \eta : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  be a valid instantiation. We need to show that there exists  $\vdash \eta'' : \Xi'' \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  and a coercion family  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y : (\eta'' \circ \sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1) \leq_F \eta$ .

Since  $\Phi_1$  is complete, there exists  $\vdash \eta' : \Xi' \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  and  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y_{\eta'} : (\eta' \circ \sigma_1) \leq_F \eta$ . Furthermore, by completeness of  $\Phi_2$ , there exists  $\vdash \eta'' : \Xi'' \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  and  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y_{\eta''} : (\eta'' \circ \sigma_2) \leq_{\sigma_1(F)} \eta'$ . Proposition 4.8 implies that  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y_{\eta''} \circ \sigma_1 : (\eta'' \circ \sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1) \leq_F (\eta' \circ \sigma_1)$ . Finally, Proposition 4.7 implies that  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash (Y_{\eta''} \circ \sigma_1 \circ Y_{\eta'}) : (\eta'' \circ \sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1) \leq_F \eta$ .  $\square$

## 5. SIMPLIFICATION PHASES

Finally, we have all the ingredients required for our constraint simplification algorithm. We split the algorithm into multiple independent phases focusing on specific patterns often present in the inferred constraints.

**5.1. Removing loops and parallel edges.** An observant reader might have noticed that our graphs might have loops if the context contains coercion parameters of the form  $\omega : \alpha \leq \alpha$  or  $\varpi : \delta \leq \mathcal{O} \cup \delta$ . However, these are easily disposed by a strengthening

$$\sigma_l = \{\omega \mapsto \langle \alpha \rangle \mid (\omega : \alpha \leq \alpha) \in \Xi\} \circ \{\varpi \mapsto \langle \delta \rangle \cup^+ \mathcal{O} \mid (\varpi : \delta \leq \mathcal{O} \cup \delta) \in \Xi\}$$

Note that the sink node cannot have loops as coercions  $\varpi : \mathcal{O}_1 \leq \mathcal{O}_2$  are already removed during context reduction.

Furthermore, our graph may have multiple parallel edges. Let us first consider type coercions. If we already have  $\omega : \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ , an additional parameter  $\omega' : \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$  between the same two nodes offers no additional flexibility, so we can simply replace it with  $\omega$ . In general, we define a strengthening

$$\sigma_t = \{\omega_{ijk} \mapsto \omega_{ij0} \mid (\omega_{ijk} : \alpha_i \leq \alpha_j) \in \Xi\}$$

where  $\omega_{ij0}$  is the chosen representative of all coercions between  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_j$ .

For dirt coercions, the situation is more interesting due to the presence of operation sets. Still, if we have both  $\varpi : \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O} \cup \delta_2$  and  $\varpi' : \delta_1 \leq \mathcal{O}' \cup \delta_2$ , then the upper bound for  $\delta_1$  can be refined to  $(\mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{O}') \cup \delta_2$ , and  $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{O}'$  can be factored out of both coercions. Again, for a general context, we define

$$\sigma_d = \{\varpi_{ijk} \mapsto (\mathcal{O}_{ijk} \setminus \bigcap_l \mathcal{O}_{ijl}) \cup^+ \varpi_{ij} \mid (\varpi_{ijk} : \delta_i \leq \mathcal{O}_{ijk} \cup \delta_j) \in \Xi\}$$

for some fresh  $\varpi_{ij} : \delta_i \leq (\bigcap_l \mathcal{O}_{ijl}) \cup \delta_j$  replacing all coercions between  $\delta_i$  and  $\delta_j$ . We can apply a similar approach for the sink node and define

$$\sigma_s = \{\varpi_{ij} \mapsto (\mathcal{O}_{ij} \setminus \bigcap_k \mathcal{O}_{ik}) \cup^+ \varpi_i \mid (\varpi_{ij} : \delta_i \leq \mathcal{O}_{ij}) \in \Xi\}$$

coalescing all edges  $\varpi_{ij} : \delta_i \leq \mathcal{O}_{ij}$  between  $\delta_i$  and the sink node into a fresh  $\varpi_i : \delta_i \leq \bigcap_k \mathcal{O}_{ik}$ .

Even though  $\sigma_d$  and  $\sigma_s$  are not a strengthenings due to the introduction of additional dirt coercions, it is easy to check that

$$\Phi_{\text{loopPar}}(\Xi, \_) = ((\sigma_s \circ \sigma_d \circ \sigma_t \circ \sigma_l)(\Xi), (\sigma_s \circ \sigma_d \circ \sigma_t \circ \sigma_l))$$

is a valid and complete simplification phase.

**5.2. Contracting strongly connected components.** Having obtained a simple directed graph, we can simplify it even further.

Firstly, we can easily see that any strongly connected component (which in practice occurs for recursive functions) in a graph requires all the type parameters to be equal. In terms of coercions, if  $\Xi$  contains type coercions

$$\omega_1 : \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2, \omega_2 : \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_3, \dots, \omega_n : \alpha_n \leq \alpha_1$$

we can unify all type parameters with a substitution  $\{\alpha_i \mapsto \alpha_1\}_{i=2}^k$ . If we wish, we can also replace all  $\omega_i$  with  $\langle \alpha_1 \rangle$ , or we can simply weed them out by re-running  $\Phi_{\text{loopPar}}$ .

The same can be done for cycles in dirt coercions in case no additional operations  $\mathcal{O}$  are present, which is often the case in higher-order functions.

We skip writing out the formal definition of the substitution  $\sigma$  as it would offer way more verbosity than insight. Still,  $\sigma$  is a strengthening, and we can again define a complete phase  $\Phi_{\text{scc}}(\Xi, \_) = (\sigma(\Xi), \sigma)$ , after which we end with a directed acyclic graph (DAG).

**5.3. Compressing bridges.** Secondly, intermediate type parameters  $\omega : \alpha \leq \alpha'$  can be merged if no other type parameters are dependent on their specific relationship, in particular if the edge is a *bridge*, i.e. the only incoming edge of  $\alpha'$ , or the only outgoing edge of  $\alpha$  (Figure 10).




FIGURE 10. Two cases for type parameter contraction

First, consider the case when  $\omega : \alpha \leq \alpha'$  is the only incoming edge of  $\alpha'$ . In that case, we can safely replace  $\alpha'$  with  $\alpha$  as the only affected constraints are ones of the form  $\alpha' \leq \alpha''_i$ ,

which continue to hold in the new form  $\alpha \leq \alpha'_i$  due to transitivity. To ensure completeness, we must furthermore ensure that  $\alpha'$  is not negative.

Formally, if  $\alpha'$  has only one incoming edge and  $\alpha' \notin F^-$ , we can apply the phase

$$\Phi_{\text{bridgeIn}}(\Xi, F) = (\sigma(\Xi), \sigma) \text{ where } \sigma = \{\alpha' \mapsto \alpha\}$$

Conversely, if  $\alpha$  has only outgoing edge and  $\alpha \notin F^+$ , we can apply the phase

$$\Phi_{\text{bridgeOut}}(\Xi, F) = (\sigma(\Xi), \sigma) \text{ where } \sigma = \{\alpha \mapsto \alpha'\}$$

In both cases, the substitution  $\sigma$  is a strengthening, thus we get valid simplification phases.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Simplification phases  $\Phi_{\text{bridgeIn}}$  and  $\Phi_{\text{bridgeOut}}$  are complete.*

*Proof.* Since the cases are symmetric, we can consider only  $\Phi_{\text{bridgeIn}}$ . Take an arbitrary  $\vdash \eta : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  and let us define  $\vdash \eta' : \sigma(\Xi) \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$

Since  $\sigma$  affects only type and type coercion parameters, we define  $\eta'(\varsigma) = \eta(\varsigma)$  for all skeleton parameters  $\varsigma$ , and similar for dirt parameters  $\delta$  and dirt coercion parameters  $\varpi$ . For all type parameters  $\alpha'' \neq \alpha'$  (including  $\alpha$ ) we similarly define  $\eta'(\alpha'') = \eta(\alpha'')$ , while on  $\alpha'$ , we leave  $\eta'$  undefined.

Finally, the only affected type coercion parameters are ones that contained  $\alpha'$ . By assumption, there is only one where  $\alpha'$  appears on the right-hand side:  $\omega : \alpha \leq \alpha'$ , and this maps to  $(\omega : \alpha \leq \alpha) \in \sigma(\Xi)$ , which we satisfy by defining  $\eta'(\omega) = \langle \eta'(\alpha) \rangle$ . All other coercion parameters have  $\alpha'$  on the left, so are of the form  $\omega'_i : \alpha' \leq \alpha''_i$  for some  $\alpha''_i$ , and map to  $(\omega'_i : \alpha \leq \alpha''_i) \in \sigma(\Xi)$ . For those, we define  $\eta'(\omega'_i) = \eta(\omega'_i) \circ \eta(\omega)$ . As we had  $\vdash \eta(\omega) : \eta(\alpha) \leq \eta(\alpha')$  and  $\vdash \eta(\omega'_i) : \eta(\alpha') \leq \eta(\alpha''_i)$ , and as  $\eta'(\alpha) = \eta(\alpha)$  and  $\eta'(\alpha''_i) = \eta(\alpha''_i)$ , we indeed have  $\vdash \eta'(\omega'_i) : \eta'(\alpha) \leq \eta'(\alpha''_i)$ .

Having checked that  $\vdash \eta' : \sigma(\Xi) \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  let us find a coercion family  $Y$  such that  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y : (\eta' \circ \sigma) \leq_F \eta$ . The only parameter we need to check is  $\alpha'$ , as on all others, instantiations  $\eta' \circ \sigma$  and  $\eta$  are the same. By assumption, we have  $\alpha' \notin F^-$ , so we only need to consider the case  $\alpha' \in F^+$ . However,  $\eta'(\sigma(\alpha')) = \eta'(\alpha) = \eta(\alpha)$ , thus  $\vdash \eta(\omega) : \eta(\alpha) \leq \eta(\alpha')$  is the required coercion  $\vdash Y(\alpha') : \eta'(\sigma(\alpha')) \leq \eta(\alpha')$ .  $\square$

If there are multiple bridges, we can repeat the process, though we must make keep in mind that the polarity of the remaining parameter is the union of both polarities, so the polarity condition has to be re-evaluated after each compression. As before, the same compression can be done for bridges in dirt coercions as long as the edge has no additional operations  $\mathcal{O}$  on the right-hand side.

**5.4. Minimizing operation sets.** Recall that dirt constraint parameters in a typing context  $\Xi$  are of the form  $\varpi : \delta \leq \delta' \cup \mathcal{O}$  or  $\varpi : \delta \leq \mathcal{O}$ . We have already seen that we can apply  $\Phi_{\text{scc}}$ ,  $\Phi_{\text{bridgeIn}}$ , and  $\Phi_{\text{bridgeOut}}$  in case the sets of operations  $\mathcal{O}$  are empty, for example with higher-order functions that are effectful without mentioning any particular operation  $op$ .

In contrast to types, dirs has the least element  $\emptyset$ , which is often desirable as it signifies lack of effects, leading to efficient compilation [KKPS21]. Furthermore, any dirt parameter appearing only on the left-hand side of dirt inequalities can be safely set to  $\emptyset$ , as long as it is not negative. Since setting  $\delta \mapsto \emptyset$  trivializes inequalities of the form  $\varpi : \delta \leq \delta' \cup \mathcal{O}$  where  $\delta'$  appeared on the right-hand side, this can cause a chain-reaction of further removals.

More generally, we can simultaneously remove any set of non-negative dirt parameters  $\mathcal{D} = \{\delta \mid \delta \in \Xi, \delta \notin F^-\}$  with no incoming edges, i.e. no coercion parameters  $\varpi : \delta' \leq \delta \cup \mathcal{O}$  with  $\delta \notin \mathcal{D}$ . For such a set  $\mathcal{D}$ , we define a substitution  $\sigma$  by  $\sigma(\delta) = \emptyset$  for each  $\delta \in \Xi$ , and by

$\sigma(\varpi) = \emptyset_{\sigma(\Delta)}$  for each  $(\varpi : \delta \leq \Delta) \in \Xi$  where  $\delta \in \mathcal{D}$ . As  $\sigma$  is a strengthening, we can define a simplification phase

$$\Phi_{\text{emptyDirt}}(\Xi, F) = (\sigma(\Xi), \sigma)$$

**Proposition 5.2.**  $\Phi_{\text{emptyDirt}}$  is complete.

*Proof.* Take an arbitrary  $\vdash \eta : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$ . The required  $\vdash \eta' : \sigma(\Xi) \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  is thus

$$\eta' = (\eta \setminus \mathcal{D}) \setminus \{\varpi : \delta \leq \Delta \mid \delta \in \mathcal{D}\}$$

As by assumption, parameters from  $\mathcal{D}$  did not appear on right-hand sides of dirt coercions, no other parameters apart from the removed ones have been impacted by the substitution. Thus, to obtain  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y : (\eta' \circ \sigma) \leq_F \eta$ , we only need to check how  $Y$  is defined on  $\delta \in \mathcal{D}$ . By assumption,  $\delta \notin F^-$ , so we only need to consider the case  $\delta \in F^+$ . But since  $(\eta' \circ \sigma)(\delta) = \eta'(\sigma(\delta)) = \emptyset$ , we can define  $Y(\delta)$  to be the empty coercion  $\emptyset_{\eta(\delta)}$ .  $\square$

Like  $\Phi_{\text{bridgein}}$  and  $\Phi_{\text{bridgeout}}$ , the phase  $\Phi_{\text{dirtEmpty}}$  can be repeated iteratively until there is no set satisfying the requirements. In practice, this can be done efficiently by traversing the quotient graph of strongly connected components in topological ordering. Dually, there is a greatest dirt  $\Sigma$ , and we can apply a dual phase  $\Phi_{\text{fullDirt}}$  for sets of non-positive dirt parameters with no incoming edges. However, as discussed in Section 7, this does not bring significant practical benefits, so we refrain from doing it in the implementation.

## 6. DENOTATIONAL SEMANTICS

To show that simplification phases preserve the semantics of terms, we turn to denotational semantics.

**6.1. Free monad.** As it is standard in the setting of algebraic effects, we are going to interpret effectful computations with the help of a *free monad*. For any assignment  $\mathcal{S} = \{op_i : U_i \rightarrow V_i\}_i$ , that maps an operation  $op_i$  to sets  $U_i$  and  $V_i$ , we can define a monad  $T_{\mathcal{S}}$  that takes a set  $X$  to the set  $T_{\mathcal{S}}X$ , defined inductively as the smallest set, containing:

- $\text{in}_{\text{return}}(a)$  for each  $a \in X$ ,
- $\text{in}_{op}(u; \kappa)$  for each  $op_i : U_i \rightarrow V_i \in \mathcal{S}$ , each  $u \in U_i$ , and each  $\kappa \in V_i \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{S}}X$

The inclusion  $\text{in}_{\text{return}}$  acts as the unit of the monad, while for a map  $f : X \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{S}}Y$ , its lifting  $f^\dagger : T_{\mathcal{S}}X \rightarrow T_{\mathcal{S}}Y$  is defined recursively as

$$\begin{aligned} f^\dagger(\text{in}_{\text{return}}(a)) &= f(a) \\ f^\dagger(\text{in}_{op}(u; \kappa)) &= \text{in}_{op}(u; f^\dagger \circ \kappa) \end{aligned}$$



**6.2. Skeletal semantics.** Since the presented simplifications preserve types only up to subtyping, we first introduce a *skeletal* semantics, which disregards effect information, giving us a unified platform on which to compare such changes.

For a parameter context  $\Xi$ , we shall take its interpretation  $\llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$  to be a set of all valid assignments  $\xi$  that map parameters to their interpretations. Due to dependencies between parameters, we shall expose  $\xi$  in turn, starting with skeleton parameters  $\tau \in \Xi$ , which are mapped to arbitrary sets  $\xi(\tau)$ .

Then, for any  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$ , we can interpret each skeleton  $\Xi \vdash S$  **ske1** with a set  $\llbracket S \rrbracket_\xi$ , defined as:

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket_\xi = \xi(\tau) \quad \llbracket \mathbf{Unit} \rrbracket_\xi = \{\star\} \quad \llbracket S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket S_1 \rrbracket_\xi \rightarrow T_{[\Sigma]}(\llbracket S_2 \rrbracket_\xi)$$

where for a global signature  $\Sigma = \{op_i : A_i \rightarrow B_i\}_i$ , we define  $\llbracket \Sigma \rrbracket = \{op : \llbracket S_i \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket S'_i \rrbracket\}_i$ , where  $\vdash A_i : S_i$  and  $\vdash B_i : S'_i$  are monomorphic, thus  $\xi$  does not play a role in their interpretation.

Next, for each  $\Xi \vdash A : S$ , we define its *skeletal semantics*  $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket S \rrbracket_\xi$  and similarly  $\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket S \rrbracket_\xi$  for  $\Xi \vdash \underline{C} : S$ . Since interpretations of types ignore all effect information, types with matching skeletons have the same interpretation. For this reason, we also do not define any skeletal interpretations of coercions.

Given an assignment  $\xi$ , skeletal denotational semantics of well-typed terms are defined as maps from interpretations of typing contexts to interpretations of types:

$$\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \quad \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi \rightarrow \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi$$

where interpretation of typing contexts  $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi$  is defined component wise:

$$\llbracket x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n \rrbracket_\xi := \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket_\xi \times \dots \times \llbracket A_n \rrbracket_\xi$$

Interpretations are given in the standard way [BP14]. For a tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \vec{a} \in \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi$  interpretations of values are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash x_i : A_i \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= a_i \\ \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{unit} : \mathbf{Unit} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= \star \\ \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{fun} (x : A) \mapsto c : A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= a' \in \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \mapsto \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma, x : A \vdash c : \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}, a') \\ \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v \triangleright \gamma_v : A_1 \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A_2 \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, observe that  $\llbracket A_1 \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket A_2 \rrbracket_\xi$ , so we can safely discard  $\gamma_v$ . Similarly, interpretations of computations are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{return} v : T ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= \mathbf{in}_{\mathbf{return}}(\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : T \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a})) \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash op v (y : A_{op}.c) : \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= \mathbf{in}_{op}(\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A_{op} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}); \\ &\quad b \in \llbracket B_{op} \rrbracket_\xi \mapsto \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma, y : B_{op} \vdash c : \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}, b)) \\ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{do} x \leftarrow c_1; c_2 : A_2 ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= (a' \in \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket_\xi \mapsto \llbracket \Gamma, x : A_1 \vdash c_2 : A_2 ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}, a'))^\dagger \\ &\quad (\llbracket \Gamma \vdash c_1 : A_1 ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a})) \\ \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v_1 v_2 : \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= (\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v_1 : A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}))(\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v_2 : A \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a})) \\ \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash c \triangleright \gamma_c : \underline{C}_1 \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) &= \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C}_2 \rrbracket_\xi(\vec{a}) \end{aligned}$$

where again in the last line, we discard the coercion since  $\llbracket \underline{C}_1 \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \underline{C}_2 \rrbracket_\xi$ .

**6.3. Effectful semantics.** We refine the skeletal semantics into a more precise *effectful* semantics, which also reflects the operations, tracked by the effect system.

To do so, an assignment  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$  maps each dirt parameter  $\delta \in \Xi$  to some set of operations  $\xi(\delta)$ , all of which must appear in the global signature  $\Sigma$ . Then, each dirt  $\Xi \vdash \Delta$  **dirt** can similarly be interpreted with a set of operations  $\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket_\xi$ , given by:

$$\llbracket \delta \rrbracket_\xi = \xi(\delta) \qquad \llbracket \emptyset \rrbracket_\xi = \emptyset \qquad \llbracket \{op\} \cup \Delta \rrbracket_\xi = \{op\} \cup \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket_\xi$$

Interpreting dirt allows us to also interpret value and computation types. For each value type  $\Xi \vdash A : S$  and each computation type  $\Xi \vdash \underline{C} : S$  we define sets  $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi$  and  $\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi$  together with injections  $\iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} : \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \langle A \rangle_\xi$  and  $\iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} : \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \langle \underline{C} \rangle_\xi$ . To interpret types, any assignment  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$  must map each  $(\alpha : S) \in \Xi$  to some set  $\xi(\alpha)$  together with an injection  $\iota_{\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket_\xi} : \xi(\alpha) \hookrightarrow \llbracket S \rrbracket_\xi$ . Then, interpretations are extended to arbitrary value and computation types by:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbf{Unit} \rrbracket_\xi &= \{\star\} \\ \llbracket A ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi &= T_{\llbracket \Sigma \rrbracket | \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket_\xi}(\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi) \\ \llbracket A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi &= \left\{ (f, f') : (\langle A \rangle_\xi \rightarrow \langle \underline{C} \rangle_\xi) \times (\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \rightarrow \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi) \mid f \circ \iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} = \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} \circ f' \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\llbracket \Sigma \rrbracket | \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket_\xi$  is the restriction of  $\llbracket \Sigma \rrbracket$  to operations from  $\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket_\xi$ , and the injections  $\iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi}$  and are defined recursively by:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{\llbracket \mathbf{Unit} \rrbracket_\xi}(\star) &= \star \\ \iota_{\llbracket A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi}(f, f') &= f \\ \iota_{\llbracket A ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi}(\mathbf{in}_{\mathbf{return}}(a)) &= \mathbf{in}_{\mathbf{return}}(a) \\ \iota_{\llbracket A ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi}(\mathbf{in}_{op}(u; \kappa)) &= \mathbf{in}_{op}(\iota_{\llbracket A_i \rrbracket_\xi}(u); \iota_{\llbracket A ! \Delta \rrbracket_\xi} \circ \kappa) \end{aligned}$$

where we crucially use the fact that  $B_i$  is ground, and so  $\langle B_i \rangle_\xi = \llbracket B_i \rrbracket_\xi$ .

More interestingly, functions are interpreted with pairs of functions, the first acting on skeletal and the second on effectful semantics. Interpreting values of  $A \rightarrow \underline{C}$  with functions  $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \rightarrow \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi$  is not sufficient because there is no simple way to extend their domain from  $\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi$  to  $\langle A \rangle_\xi$  in order to include them in  $\langle A \rangle_\xi \rightarrow \langle \underline{C} \rangle_\xi$ . Even though  $\iota_{\llbracket A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi}$  projects on the first component, it is still injective. Indeed, if  $\iota_{\llbracket A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi}(f_1, f'_1) = \iota_{\llbracket A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi}(f_2, f'_2)$ , we first get  $f_1 = f_2$  and furthermore  $\iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} \circ f'_1 = \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} \circ f'_2$  which implies  $f'_1 = f'_2$  since  $\iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi}$  is injective.

Next, we turn to previously ignored coercions. As dirt is interpreted with sets of operations, dirt coercions are interpreted as injections between them. Thus, an assignment  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$  maps each dirt coercion parameter  $(\varpi : \Delta \leq \Delta') \in \Xi$  to an injection  $\xi(\varpi) : \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \llbracket \Delta' \rrbracket_\xi$ . Then, a dirt coercion  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_d : \Delta \leq \Delta'$ , can be interpreted with an injection  $\llbracket \gamma_d \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \llbracket \Delta' \rrbracket_\xi$ , defined recursively in the expected way.

Similarly, we use injections to interpret value and computation type coercions. For the fifth and final kind of parameters, an assignment  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$  maps type coercion parameters  $(\omega : A \leq A') \in \Xi$  to injections  $\xi(\omega) : \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi$ . In addition, we require these injections to commute with injections into the shared skeletal semantics:

$$\iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} = \iota_{\llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi} \circ \xi(\omega)$$

which can be summed up with the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi & \xrightarrow{\xi(\omega)} & \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi \\
 & \searrow \iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} & \swarrow \iota_{\llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi} \\
 & & \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi
 \end{array}$$

Then, we can interpret arbitrary value and computation type coercions with injections

$$\llbracket \Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A \leq A' \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi \quad \llbracket \Xi \vdash \gamma_c : \underline{C} \leq \underline{C}' \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \llbracket \underline{C}' \rrbracket_\xi$$

that again commute with injections into the skeletal semantics:

$$\iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} = \iota_{\llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi} \circ \llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi \quad \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} = \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C}' \rrbracket_\xi} \circ \llbracket \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi$$

The interpretations are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket \langle \mathbf{Unit} \rangle \rrbracket_\xi(\star) &= \star \\
 \llbracket \gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi((f, f')) &= (f, \llbracket \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi \circ f' \circ \llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi) \\
 \llbracket \gamma_v ! \gamma_d \rrbracket_\xi(\mathbf{in\_return}(a)) &= \mathbf{in\_return}(\llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi(a)) \\
 \llbracket \gamma_v ! \gamma_d \rrbracket_\xi(\mathbf{in\_op}(u; k)) &= \mathbf{in}_{\llbracket \gamma_d \rrbracket_\xi(\text{op})}(u; \llbracket \gamma_v ! \gamma_d \rrbracket_\xi \circ k)
 \end{aligned}$$

The only nontrivial requirement is checking that the function coercion is valid. Take injections  $\llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi$  and  $\llbracket \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow \llbracket \underline{C}' \rrbracket_\xi$ , and take an arbitrary  $(f, f') \in \llbracket A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi$ , i.e.  $f \circ \iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} = \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} \circ f'$ . Let us first show that  $\llbracket \gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi(f, f')$  lies in  $\llbracket A' \rightarrow \underline{C}' \rrbracket_\xi$ , which follows from

$$f \circ \iota_{\llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi} = f \circ \iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} \circ \llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi = \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} \circ f' \circ \llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi = \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C}' \rrbracket_\xi} \circ \llbracket \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi \circ f' \circ \llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi$$

Showing that  $\iota_{\llbracket A' \rightarrow \underline{C}' \rrbracket_\xi} \circ \llbracket \gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi = \iota_{\llbracket A \rightarrow \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi}$  is trivial since the injections just project the first component, while  $\llbracket \gamma_v \rightarrow \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi$  preserves it. As coercions commute with injections into skeletons, their interpretation is uniquely determined.

**Proposition 6.1.** *For an arbitrary  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$ , the following holds:*

- If  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_d : \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_2$  and  $\Xi \vdash \gamma'_d : \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_2$ , then  $\llbracket \gamma_d \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \gamma'_d \rrbracket_\xi$ .
- If  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A_1 \leq A_2$  and  $\Xi \vdash \gamma'_v : A_1 \leq A_2$ , then  $\llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \gamma'_v \rrbracket_\xi$ .
- If  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_c : \underline{C}_1 \leq \underline{C}_2$  and  $\Xi \vdash \gamma'_c : \underline{C}_1 \leq \underline{C}_2$ , then  $\llbracket \gamma_c \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \gamma'_c \rrbracket_\xi$ .

Interpretation for typing contexts is again defined component wise.

$$\llbracket x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n \rrbracket_\xi := \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket_\xi \times \dots \times \llbracket A_n \rrbracket_\xi$$

Applying injections for each component also gives us  $\iota_{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi} : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi \hookrightarrow (\Gamma)_\xi$ .

**Theorem 6.2.** *For any  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A$  or  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C}$ , and for any  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi \rrbracket$ , there exist unique maps  $\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi$  or  $\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi : \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi \rightarrow \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi$  such that the following diagrams commute:*

*Proof.* Uniqueness follows from the fact that the connecting mappings are injections. The existence is proven by a routine induction on the typing derivation.

For example, take the case for  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v \triangleright \gamma_v : A'$ , where  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A$  and  $\Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A \leq A'$ . Then, we see that defining  $\llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v \triangleright \gamma_v : A' \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \Xi \vdash \gamma_v : A \leq A' \rrbracket_\xi \circ \llbracket \Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A \rrbracket_\xi$  makes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi & \xrightarrow{\llbracket v \rrbracket_\xi} & \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi \\
\downarrow \iota_{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi} & & \downarrow \iota_{\llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi} \\
(\Gamma)_\xi & \xrightarrow{\langle v \rangle_\xi} & (A)_\xi
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccc}
\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi & \xrightarrow{\llbracket c \rrbracket_\xi} & \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi \\
\downarrow \iota_{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi} & & \downarrow \iota_{\llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket_\xi} \\
(\Gamma)_\xi & \xrightarrow{\langle c \rangle_\xi} & (\underline{C})_\xi
\end{array}$$

the following diagram commute, where the left square commutes by induction hypothesis, and the right triangle commutes by definition of  $\llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \xrightarrow{\llbracket v \triangleright \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi} & & \\
& \nearrow & & \searrow & \\
\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi & \xrightarrow{\llbracket v \rrbracket_\xi} & \llbracket A \rrbracket_\xi & \xrightarrow{\llbracket \gamma_v \rrbracket_\xi} & \llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi \\
& \searrow & & \nearrow & \\
& & \xrightarrow{\langle v \triangleright \gamma_v \rangle_\xi = \langle v \rangle_\xi} & & \\
\downarrow \iota_{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_\xi} & & & & \downarrow \iota_{\llbracket A' \rrbracket_\xi} \\
(\Gamma)_\xi & & & & (A)_\xi
\end{array}$$

□

Recall that apart from Theorem 3.4, which shows that valid substitutions preserve typing judgements, Theorem 6.2 is the only requirement we require from our terms. Both being very natural conditions gives us strong confidence that results can be applied to a number of language extensions.

**6.4. Preservation.** We now turn to the crucial soundness result: a coercion family between two substitutions gives us injections between interpretations of substituted terms.

**Theorem 6.3.** *Take substitutions  $\vdash \sigma_1 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  and  $\vdash \sigma_2 : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi'$  together with a coercion family  $\Xi' \vdash Y : \sigma_1 \leq_F \sigma_2$ . Then, for any  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash v : A$  such that  $\mathbf{fp}(A) \cup \overline{\mathbf{fp}(\Gamma)} \subseteq F$ , and any  $\xi \in \llbracket \Xi' \rrbracket$ , we have*

$$\llbracket \Xi'; \sigma_1(\Gamma) \vdash \sigma_1(v) : \sigma_1(A) \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket Y(A) \rrbracket_\xi \circ \llbracket \Xi'; \sigma_2(\Gamma) \vdash \sigma_2(v) : \sigma_2(A) \rrbracket_\xi \circ \llbracket Y(\Gamma) \rrbracket_\xi$$

Similarly, for any  $\Xi; \Gamma \vdash c : \underline{C}$  such that  $\mathbf{fp}(\underline{C}) \cup \overline{\mathbf{fp}(\Gamma)} \subseteq F$ , we have

$$\llbracket \Xi'; \sigma_1(\Gamma) \vdash \sigma_1(c) : \sigma_1(\underline{C}) \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket Y(\underline{C}) \rrbracket_\xi \circ \llbracket \Xi'; \sigma_2(\Gamma) \vdash \sigma_2(c) : \sigma_2(\underline{C}) \rrbracket_\xi \circ \llbracket Y(\Gamma) \rrbracket_\xi$$

where  $Y(\Gamma)$  is defined component-wise as:

$$Y(x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n) := Y(A_1) \times \dots \times Y(A_n)$$

*Proof.* Let us consider only the case for values, as the one for computations proceeds analogously. The proof is nicely summed up with the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\llbracket \sigma_1(\Gamma) \rrbracket_\xi & \xrightarrow{\llbracket \sigma_1(v) \rrbracket_\xi} & \llbracket \sigma_1(A) \rrbracket_\xi \\
\uparrow \wr_{\llbracket \sigma_1(\Gamma) \rrbracket_\xi} & & \uparrow \wr_{\llbracket \sigma_1(A) \rrbracket_\xi} \\
\langle \sigma_1(\Gamma) \rangle_\xi & \xrightarrow{\langle \sigma_1(v) \rangle_\xi} & \langle \sigma_1(A) \rangle_\xi \\
\parallel & & \parallel \\
\langle \sigma_2(\Gamma) \rangle_\xi & \xrightarrow{\langle \sigma_2(v) \rangle_\xi} & \langle \sigma_2(A) \rangle_\xi \\
\uparrow \wr_{\llbracket \sigma_2(\Gamma) \rrbracket_\xi} & & \uparrow \wr_{\llbracket \sigma_2(A) \rrbracket_\xi} \\
\llbracket \sigma_2(\Gamma) \rrbracket_\xi & \xrightarrow{\llbracket \sigma_2(v) \rrbracket_\xi} & \llbracket \sigma_2(A) \rrbracket_\xi
\end{array}$$

$\wr_{\llbracket (\cdot) \rrbracket_\xi}$  (left side)       $\wr_{\llbracket Y(A) \rrbracket_\xi}$  (right side)

Here, the top and bottom square commute due to the definition of effectful semantics, the middle square commutes because the skeletal semantics is identical, and the side triangles commute because  $Y$  produces well-typed coercions, which commute with injections into skeletons. We conclude by noticing that conclusion follows from the fact that  $\wr_{\llbracket \sigma_1(A) \rrbracket_\xi}$  is an injection and can be cancelled from the left.  $\square$

From this, it immediately follows that complete phases preserve the semantics up to a coercion. In particular, every instantiation of a polymorphic value  $v$ , the scenario we are interested in, can be replaced with a suitably coerced instantiation of a simplified value  $\sigma(v)$ .

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let  $\Xi; \cdot \vdash v : A$  be a well-typed closed value,  $\Phi$  a complete phase such that  $\Phi(\Xi, \mathbf{fp}(A)) = (\Xi', \sigma)$ . Then, for any instantiation  $\vdash \eta : \Xi \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$ , there exists an instantiation  $\vdash \eta' : \Xi' \Rightarrow \Xi_{\text{use}}$  and a coercion  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash \gamma_v : \eta'(\sigma(A)) \leq \eta(A)$  such that*

$$\llbracket \Xi_{\text{use}}; \cdot \vdash \eta(v) : \eta(A) \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \Xi_{\text{use}}; \cdot \vdash \eta'(\sigma(v)) \triangleright \gamma_v : \eta(A) \rrbracket_\xi$$

for any assignment  $\xi$  of parameters in  $\Xi_{\text{use}}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\Phi$  is complete, we get  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y : (\eta' \circ \sigma) \leq \eta$ , and  $\Xi_{\text{use}} \vdash Y(A) : \eta'(\sigma(A)) \leq \eta(A)$  is the required coercion  $\gamma_v$ . From Theorem 6.3, we get  $\llbracket \Xi_{\text{use}}; \cdot \vdash \eta(v) : \eta(A) \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \Xi_{\text{use}}; \cdot \vdash \eta(v) : \eta(A) \rrbracket_\xi \circ \llbracket \Xi_{\text{use}}; \cdot \vdash \eta'(\sigma(v)) : \eta'(\sigma(A)) \rrbracket_\xi = \llbracket \Xi_{\text{use}}; \cdot \vdash \eta'(\sigma(v)) \triangleright Y(A) : \eta(A) \rrbracket_\xi$  with the second equation being exactly the one as in the proof of Theorem 6.2.  $\square$

## 7. IMPLEMENTATION

**7.1. Simplification pipeline.** We have implemented the simplification phases described in Section 5 in the existing EFF compiler as a default post-processing step after toplevel type inference [KPS<sup>+</sup>20]. Type inference produces explicitly typed terms in a core calculus, similar to one described in Section 2 in a given parameter context. Note that we generalize only top-level values [VJS10]. From the type of those values, we compute the polarities of parameters, apply all simplification phases, and map the resulting substitution to both the type and the term. Only after the simplification, we generalize the term and store it for

further use. Due to the Corollary 6.4, each time the original toplevel value is referenced, a simplified value can be used in its place, with both the instantiation and cast automatically inferred by type inference. In practice, the casts are usually trivial and optimized away by other source-level transformations [KKPS21].

The implementation of phases is a slightly different from the outline in the Section 5. As constraints are represented with simple directed graphs, phases  $\Phi_{\text{red}}$  and  $\Phi_{\text{loopPar}}$  are applied implicitly. To make the implementation simpler, we do not construct substitutions, but only collect equality constraints that we pass to the existing unification engine. Also, since type and type constraint parameters belonging to different skeletons are independent of each other, we perform all the simplifications separately on smaller graphs, significantly reducing their cost.

As mentioned in Section 5.4, we do not apply the phase  $\Phi_{\text{fullDirt}}$ , that would map all dirt parameters with no outgoing edges to the whole signature  $\Sigma$ . First, users can define operations at later time, so  $\Sigma$  can grow after the simplifications have been applied. Next, while removal slightly simplifies dirt coercions, those already disappear when compiling to OCaml, so unlike  $\Phi_{\text{emptyDirt}}$ , there is no additional efficiency benefit. Finally, we have not encountered such cases in practice.

**7.2. Results.** To measure the efficiency of simplification phases, we compiled the EFF standard library, which features multiple recursive higher-order polymorphic functions, mostly on lists. Without simplifications, the compiled version of the standard library functions featured 447 explicit coercions, all of which were all removed after applying the phases. Similarly, we took benchmarks for our optimizing compiler [KKPS21], which were previously manually monomorphised to avoid coercion overhead. After reverting back to polymorphic code, the newly added phases were able to reproduce the same code (up to formatting and renaming) with zero additional overhead.

To measure the impact of particular phases, we selectively disabled some of them when compiling the standard library. Table 1 shows the information about graph sizes of simplified constraints sets when compiling standard library with different simplification settings (recall that phases  $\Phi_{\text{red}}$  and  $\Phi_{\text{loopPar}}$  are performed implicitly). The number of edges in type graphs is shown in **bold** as these amount to additional coercion parameters in the compiled code. Additionally, we show the number of generated monadic artifacts that have significant impact on the final runtime efficiency [KKPS21].

simplification level	dirt nodes/edges	type nodes/edges	>>=	return
no simplification	632 / 644	435 / <b>447</b>	78	29
only $\Phi_{\text{scc}}$ (dirt and types)	47 / 53	242 / <b>193</b>	19	24
only dirt simplifications	0 / 0	435 / <b>447</b>	27	24
only type simplifications	632 / 644	0 / <b>0</b>	77	52
all simplifications	0 / 0	0 / <b>0</b>	17	31

TABLE 1. Impact of different simplification phases on graph sizes and generated artifacts when compiling EFF standard library.

Similarly, we compiled polymorphic versions of the suite we previously used to benchmark the efficiency of compiler optimizations [KKPS21], with the results shown in Table 2. Similarly

to the standard library, both the number of nodes, edges and monadic artifacts decreases with each simplification phase. The final result, where all simplifications are applied, is the same as the one obtained by manually monomorphising the benchmarks. One should notice the marked difference in the sizes of dirt and type constraints between the standard library and benchmarks. This is because the benchmarks are heavily skewed towards effects and handlers to showcase optimizations when inlining handlers, while the standard library is geared towards general purpose polymorphic functions (like `map` and `fold`).

simplification level	dirt nodes/edges	type nodes/edges	>>=	return
no simplification	4351 / 4832	89 / <b>98</b>	485	253
only $\Phi_{\text{scc}}$ (dirt and types)	6 / 8	29 / <b>20</b>	84	211
only dirt simplifications	0 / 0	89 / <b>98</b>	87	211
only type simplifications	4351 / 4832	0 / <b>0</b>	485	265
all simplifications	0 / 0	0 / <b>0</b>	84	213

TABLE 2. Impact of different simplification phases on graph sizes and generated artifacts when compiling polymorphic versions of EFF benchmark suite.

We can clearly see how progressive simplification phases reduce the size of the graphs down to zero. Dirt simplification phases do not reduce coercion parameters as those are irrelevant when compiling to OCaml anyway. However, they do reduce monadic artifacts as they allow purity based optimizations [KKPS21] to kick in and reduce the number of generated binds by more than 60% in favor of more efficient let bindings. As expected by Corollary 6.4, additional casts increase the number of monadic returns as more terminal values are recognized as pure and need to be lifted to be used in computations that remain monadic. Note that all those returns were present before, but in form of additional arguments to functions with coercion parameters.

## CONCLUSION

In this work, we have established a framework in which to explore semantics-preserving simplifications of coercions. Even though we mentioned effect handlers only briefly, they are our main motivation, as the massive overhead of polymorphic explicit coercions restricted programmers to using monomorphic functions. With the removal of practically all unnecessary coercion parameters, our work makes the overhead negligible and allows efficient compilation of significantly larger and more modular programs, which is likely to reveal further challenges.


**Related work.** There are of course multiple other approaches to the efficient evaluation of effect handlers. From OCaml 5 [DWS<sup>+</sup>15, SDW<sup>+</sup>21] onwards, effect handlers are available natively through an efficient runtime representation. As the main purpose for introducing handlers into OCaml was the support for various concurrency scheduling strategies, the implementation is focused on efficiency of single-shot handlers, i.e. ones where a continuation is called at most once. In this respect, our approach is agnostic and supports efficient compilation of arbitrary handlers.

Effect-aware compilation is also featured in Koka [Lei14] that, in addition to an efficient runtime, uses a row-based effect system to determine which functions are pure and do not

require a CPS translation [Lei17]. In contrast to the subtyping approach we use, row-based effect systems can suffer from the *poisoning problem* [WPJ99], where unification propagates effectful annotations even into pure parts of the program. In order to speed up the search for the appropriate encompassing handler, Koka uses *evidence passing*, where a vector of active handlers is passed around to operations at runtime [XL21]. Similar evidence is determined at compile time in Effekt [BSO20], which enforces lexical scoping of handlers [SBO20, SBMO22] at the slight cost of losing full polymorphism.

Work on simplifying both constraints and explicit coercions is vast [FM90, TS96, HR95], and uses similar techniques as we do: reduction of constraints where structural subtyping applies, followed by removal of loops, parallel edges, and cycles to obtain a DAG. Finally, additional context-specific simplifications are applied.

A significant improvement over these heuristics is *garbage collection* [Pot96, Pot01], which first transitively closes the constraints, and then keeps only those of the form  $\alpha_1^- \leq \alpha_2^+$ . Even though our earlier work [Pre14] was based on garbage collection, this fails to transfer over to explicit coercions. For example, consider the set of type constraints represented by the following graph:



Even if we add additional coercions from  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  to  $\alpha_4$  and  $\alpha_5$  to the graph, the removal of  $\alpha_3$  requires its instantiation, and there is no type we can assign it without changing the meaning. One could consider adding additional type constructors like  $\alpha_1 \sqcup \alpha_2$  or  $\alpha_4 \sqcap \alpha_5$  as done in algebraic subtyping [DM17]. But this then causes further issues when translating to OCaml, as there is no type we can assign to the translation of  $\omega : \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_4 \sqcap \alpha_5$  for example.

**Future work.** Even though the results in Section 7.2 indicate there is not a lot left to simplify, we would like to determine when a given set of constraints cannot be reduced further, like it is done for garbage collection [Pot01] or algebraic subtyping [DM17].

Similarly, we would like to explore the role that ordering of simplification phases plays in the end result. Outside of the framework of simplifying contexts, constraints can be reduced even further through transformations of terms, for example, with suitable rules that rearrange the coercions in terms [KKPS21], changing their local meaning whilst preserving the semantics of the whole program.

Another direction in which polymorphism can be combined with the optimizing compiler [KKPS21] is polymorphic function specialisation. For example, a polymorphic list map of type

$$(\alpha_1 \xrightarrow{\delta} \alpha_2) \rightarrow (\alpha_1 \text{ list} \xrightarrow{\delta} \alpha_2 \text{ list})$$

needs to be compiled using the monadic embedding as the given function can be effectful. Since this is inefficient for pure functions, it is beneficial to compile an additional variant [Lei17] with the assumption  $\delta = \emptyset$ . The number of possible variants is exponential in the number of dirt parameters, so the presented algorithm already helps in this regard. It remains to be



explored, but it is likely that in practice only two variants are sufficient, a general one and one with all dirt parameters set to  $\emptyset$ .

As the focus of our work was practical — how to best reduce the number of coercion parameters — we kept the denotational semantics as simple as necessary to still guarantee soundness of simplifications. However, the interplay between various constructs hints towards a 2-category with parameter contexts as objects, substitutions as morphisms, and coercion families as 2-morphisms, though the role of polarity remains to be explored.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their suggestions and comments, we would like to sincerely thank Danel Ahman, Andrej Bauer, George Karachalias, Sam Lindley, Tom Schrijvers and the participants of IFIP WG 2.1 meeting in Oxford, especially Fritz Henglein.

#### REFERENCES

- [BP14] Andrej Bauer and Matija Pretnar. An effect system for algebraic effects and handlers. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 10(4), 2014. doi:10.2168/LMCS-10(4:9)2014.
- [BP15] Andrej Bauer and Matija Pretnar. Programming with algebraic effects and handlers. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 84(1):108–123, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2014.02.001.
- [BSO20] Jonathan Immanuel Brachthäuser, Philipp Schuster, and Klaus Ostermann. Effects as capabilities: Effect handlers and lightweight effect polymorphism. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 4(OOPSLA), nov 2020. doi:10.1145/3428194.
- [DM17] Stephen Dolan and Alan Mycroft. Polymorphism, subtyping, and type inference in msub. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 60–72. ACM, 2017.
- [DWS<sup>+</sup>15] Stephen Dolan, Leo White, KC Sivaramakrishnan, Jeremy Yallop, and Anil Madhavapeddy. Effective concurrency through algebraic effects. In *OCaml Workshop*, 2015.
- [FM90] You-Chin Fuh and Prateek Mishra. Type inference with subtypes. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 73(2):155–175, 1990. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(90\)90144-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(90)90144-7), doi:10.1016/0304-3975(90)90144-7.
- [HR95] Fritz Henglein and Jakob Rehof. Safe polymorphic type inference for a dynamically typed language: Translating scheme to ml. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Functional Programming Languages and Computer Architecture, FPCA '95*, page 192–203, New York, NY, USA, 1995. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/224164.224203.
- [KKPS21] Georgios Karachalias, Filip Koprivec, Matija Pretnar, and Tom Schrijvers. Efficient compilation of algebraic effect handlers. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(OOPSLA), oct 2021. doi:10.1145/3485479.
- [KPS<sup>+</sup>20] Georgios Karachalias, Matija Pretnar, Amr Hany Saleh, Stien Vanderhallen, and Tom Schrijvers. Explicit effect subtyping. *Journal of Functional Programming*, 30, 2020. doi:10.1017/S0956796820000131.
- [Lei14] Daan Leijen. Koka: Programming with row polymorphic effect types. In Paul Levy and Neel Krishnaswami, editors, *Proceedings 5th Workshop on Mathematically Structured Functional Programming, MSFP@ETAPS 2014, Grenoble, France, 12 April 2014.*, volume 153 of *EPTCS*, pages 100–126, 2014. doi:10.4204/EPTCS.153.8.
- [Lei17] Daan Leijen. Type directed compilation of row-typed algebraic effects. In Giuseppe Castagna and Andrew D. Gordon, editors, *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2017, Paris, France, January 18-20, 2017*, pages 486–499. ACM, 2017. doi:10.1145/3093333.3009872.
- [LPT03a] Paul Blain Levy, John Power, and Hayo Thielecke. Modelling environments in call-by-value programming languages. *Inf. Comput.*, 185(2):182–210, 2003. doi:10.1016/S0890-5401(03)00088-9.

- [LPT03b] PaulBlain Levy, John Power, and Hayo Thielecke. Modelling environments in call-by-value programming languages. *Information and Computation*, 185(2):182–210, 2003. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890540103000889>, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-5401\(03\)00088-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-5401(03)00088-9).
- [Pot96] François Pottier. Simplifying subtyping constraints. In *ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*, pages 122–133, May 1996. URL: <http://cambium.inria.fr/~fpottier/publis/fpottier-icfp96.pdf>, doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/232627.232642>.
- [Pot01] François Pottier. Simplifying subtyping constraints: A theory. *Information and Computation*, 170(2):153–183, 2001. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0890540101929633>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.2001.2963>.
- [PP03] Gordon D. Plotkin and John Power. Algebraic operations and generic effects. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 11(1):69–94, 2003. doi:10.1023/A:1023064908962.
- [PP13] Gordon D. Plotkin and Matija Pretnar. Handling algebraic effects. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 9(4), 2013. doi:10.2168/LMCS-9(4:23)2013.
- [Pre14] Matija Pretnar. Inferring algebraic effects. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 10(3), 2014.
- [SBMO22] Philipp Schuster, Jonathan Immanuel Brachthäuser, Marius Müller, and Klaus Ostermann. A typed continuation-passing translation for lexical effect handlers. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2022*, page 566–579, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3519939.3523710.
- [SBO20] Philipp Schuster, Jonathan Immanuel Brachthäuser, and Klaus Ostermann. Compiling effect handlers in capability-passing style. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 4(ICFP), aug 2020. doi:10.1145/3408975.
- [SDW<sup>+</sup>21] KC Sivaramakrishnan, Stephen Dolan, Leo White, Tom Kelly, Sadiq Jaffer, and Anil Madhavapeddy. Retrofitting effect handlers onto ocaml. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2021*, page 206–221, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3453483.3454039.
- [SKPS18] Amr Hany Saleh, Georgios Karachalias, Matija Pretnar, and Tom Schrijvers. Explicit effect subtyping. In *ESOP*, volume 10801 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 327–354. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-89884-1\_12.
- [TS96] Valery Trifonov and Scott F. Smith. Subtyping constrained types. In Radhia Cousot and David A. Schmidt, editors, *Static Analysis, Third International Symposium, SAS’96, Aachen, Germany, September 24–26, 1996, Proceedings*, pages 349–365. Springer, 1996. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61739-6\\_52](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61739-6_52), doi:10.1007/3-540-61739-6\_52.
- [VJS10] Dimitrios Vytiniotis, Simon L. Peyton Jones, and Tom Schrijvers. Let should not be generalized. In Andrew Kennedy and Nick Benton, editors, *Proceedings of TLDI 2010: 2010 ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Types in Languages Design and Implementation, Madrid, Spain, January 23, 2010*, pages 39–50. ACM, 2010. doi:10.1145/1708016.1708023.
- [WPJ99] Keith Wansbrough and Simon L. Peyton Jones. Once upon a polymorphic type. In *POPL*, pages 15–28. ACM, 1999.
- [XL21] Ningning Xie and Daan Leijen. Generalized evidence passing for effect handlers: efficient compilation of effect handlers to C. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(ICFP):1–30, 2021. doi:10.1145/3473576.