Rewriting modulo traced comonoid structure

George Kaye Dan Ghica

University of Birmingham

04 July 2023 - FSCD 2023, Rome

We want to reason equationally with processes with notions of feedback, copying and discarding (e.g. digital circuits)

What should the syntax for these processes be? How do we reason with this syntax? What is the best way to rewrite with this syntax? Is this syntax suitable for automating rewrites?

We have specialised previous work on hypergraph string diagram rewriting to settings with a traced comonoid structure.

The graphical syntax of string diagrams

$$m-f-n$$
 $n-g-p$



(symmetric monoidal category)

We want to have feedback.



(traced structure)

We want to fork and stub.





(commutative comonoid structure)

We want to copy and discard.



(Cartesian structure)

















(unfolding, fixpoint equation)

We want to do this reasoning computationally.

This is hard for terms, even with string diagrams.

(lots of shuffling around and bookkeeping required with the comonoid)

But computers like graphs...

What came before

String graphs

Dixon, Kissinger

h





Bonchi, Gadduchi, Kissinger, Sobocinski, Zanasi



The hyper kind of graph



The hyper kind of (interfaced) graph



Goal

string diagrams as cospans of hypergraphs

But which hypergraphs?

Which cospans correspond to symmetric monoidal terms?

Monogamous acyclic hypergraphs



One connection on the left, one on the right



Getting the correspondence

monogamous acyclic hypergraphs



symmetric monoidal term





 \leftrightarrow

Monogamous acyclic hypergraphs are too restrictive.

Which terms correspond to arbitrary cospans of hypergraphs? Terms with a special commutative Frobenius structure



Another correspondence

isomorphism class of hypergraphs



Frobenius term modulo equations





 \leftrightarrow

Arbitrary hypergraphs are not restrictive enough.



Any category with Frobenius is self-dual compact closed...

Trace can be built from compact closed structure...



Monogamous on one side

Partial left-monogamous hypergraphs



One connection on the left, many on the right



Special cases...

Trace of the identity





One more correspondence

partial left-monogamous hypergraphs



traced comonoid term





We can interpret terms as graphs Now to reason with them! Applying equations ↔ Graph rewriting Double pushout (DPO) rewriting

One rule for them









Matching



Pushout complement



Pushout!

Symmetric monoidal setting? Exactly one pushout complement valid



Symmetric monoidal setting? Exactly one pushout complement valid



Frobenius setting? All pushout complements valid



Symmetric monoidal setting? Exactly one pushout complement valid



Traced comonoid setting? Some pushout complements valid



Frobenius setting? All pushout complements valid



I need some validation



I need some validation



Inputs of term Outputs of rule



Inputs of rule Outputs of term ²⁶

0 4

































Unfolding again



Unfolding again



32

Unfolding again



32

Two contributions

Characterised partial left-monogamous cospans of hypergraphs as a suitable hypergraph interpretation of traced comonoid terms

Characterised the correct notion of pushout complement for traced comonoid terms