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Abstract

Monads are now an everyday tool in functional programming for abstracting and delimiting effects. The link between monads and effect systems is well-known, but in their typical use, monads provide a much more coarse-grained view of effects. Effect systems capture fine-grained information about the effects, but monads provide only a binary view: effectful or pure.

Recent theoretical work has unified fine-grained effect systems with monads using a monad-like structure indexed by a monoid of effect annotations (called parametric effect monads). This aligns the power of monads with the power of effect systems.

This paper leverages recent advances in Haskell’s type system (as provided by GHC) to embed this approach in Haskell, providing user-programmable effect systems. We explore a number of practical examples that make Haskell even better and safer for effectful computing.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.3.2 [Programming Languages]: Applicative (functional) languages; F.3.3 [Logics and Meanings of Programs]: Type Structure

Keywords effect systems; parametric effect monads; type systems

1. Introduction

Side effects are an essential part of programming. There are many reasoning and programming techniques for working with them. Two well-known approaches in functional programming are effect systems, for analysis, and monads, for encapsulating and delimiting effects. Monads have a number of benefits. They provide a simple programming abstraction, or a design pattern, for encapsulating functionally. They also delimit the scope of effects, showing which parts of a program are pure and which parts are impure. However, compared to effect systems, monads have two limitations.

1). Granularity. The information provided by monadic typing is limited. We can look at the type of an expression and see, for example, that it has state effects if it uses the ST monad, but we no longer know whether all of the effects are from the type; the analysis provided by standard monadic typing provides only high-level information.

In contrast, effect systems annotate computations with finer-grained information. For example, stateful computations can be annotated with sets of triples of memory locations, types, and effect markers \( \sigma \in \{ \text{update, read, write} \} \). This provides information on how state is affected, without requiring the code to be examined.

One solution for improving granularity is to define a type class for every effectual operation, with a type class constraint over a polymorphic monadic type \([15]\). However, this restricts an effect analysis to sets with union and ordering by subsets.

2). Compositionality. Monads do not compose well. In Haskell, we often have to refactor monadic code or add additional bookkeeping (for example, insert lifting when using monad transformers) to compose different notions of effect. In contrast, effect systems which track information about different notions of effect can be more easily composed.

The recent notion of parametric effect monads \([12]\) (also called indexed monads \([19]\)) provides a solution to granularity, and a partial solution to compositionality. Parametric effect monads amplify the monadic approach with effect indices (annotations) which describe in more detail the effects of a computation. This effect information has the structure of a monoid \((F, \cdot, I)\), where \(I\) is the annotation of pure computations and \(\cdot\) composes effect information. The monoidal structure adorns the standard monad structure, leading to the operations of a monad having the types:

\[
\text{return} :: a \rightarrow M_I a
\]

\[
\text{bind} :: M_F a \rightarrow (a \rightarrow M_G b) \rightarrow M_{F \cdot G} b
\]

The indexed data type \(M_F a\) may be defined in terms of \(F\), giving a semantic, value-level counterpart to the effect information. This approach thus unifies monads with effect systems. This paper makes the following contributions:

- We encode parametric effect monads in Haskell, using them to embed effect systems (Section 2). This provides a general system for high-granularity effect information and better compositionality for some examples (Sections 3-5). This embedding is shallow; we do not require any macros or custom syntax.

- We leverage recent additions to the Haskell type system to make it possible (and practical) to track fine-grained information about effects in the type system, for example using type-level sets (Section 2). In particular, we use type families \([5]\), constraint kinds \([11][20]\), GADTs \([22]\), data kinds and kind polymorphism \([25]\), and closed type families \([7]\).

- A number of practical examples are provided, including effect systems arising from reader, writer, and state monads (Sections 5-6), and for analysing and verifying program properties including computational complexity bounds and completeness of data access patterns (Section 9). We provide a Haskell-friendly explanation of recent theoretical work and show how to use it to improve programming practice.

- We discuss the dual situation of coreffects and comonads (Section 8), and the connection of effect and coeffect systems to
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Haskell’s implicit parameters. Implicit parameters can be seen as an existing coeffect system in Haskell.

The code of this paper is available via Hackage (cabal install lmonad) or at http://github.com/dorchard/effect-monad

In the rest of this section we look at two examples that demonstrate the problems with the current state-of-the-art Haskell programming. The rest of the paper shows that we can do better.

**Problem 1** Consider programming stream processors. We define two stateful operations, writeS for writing to an output stream (modelled as a list) and incC for counting these writes:

- \( \text{writeS} :: (\text{Monad } m) \Rightarrow [a] \rightarrow \text{StateT } [a] m () \)
- \( \text{incC} :: (\text{Monad } m, \text{Num } s) \Rightarrow \text{StateT } s m () \)

We have planned ahead by using the state monad transformer to allow composing states. Thus, an operation that both writes to the output stream and increments the counter can be defined using lift :: (MonadTrans t, Monad m) \Rightarrow m a \rightarrow t m a:

- \( \text{write} :: (\text{Monad } m) \Rightarrow [a] \rightarrow \text{StateT } [a] (\text{StateT } \text{Int } m) () \)
- \( \text{write } x = \text{do} \{ \text{writeS } x; \text{lift } \& \text{ incC} \} \)

In combining the two states, an arbitrary choice is made of which one to lift (the counter state). The following example program

\[
\text{hellow} = \text{do} \{ \text{write } "\text{hello}"; \text{write } "\text{; world}" \}
\]

can be “run” by providing two initial states (in the correct order):

\[
\text{runStateT } \text{hellow } ** 0
\]
evaluating to \(((), \text{"hello world"}), 3)\). The type of \text{hellow} indicates in which order to supply the initial state arguments and which operations to lift in any future reuses of the state.

Consider writing another function which counts the number of times \text{hellow} is run. We reuse \text{incC}, lifting it to increment an additional state:

\[
\text{hellowC} = \text{do} \{ \text{hellow}; \text{lift } \& \text{ lift } \& \text{ incC} \}
\]

Now there are two \text{Int} states, so the types provide less guidance on the order to apply arguments. We also see that, for every new state, we have to add more and more lift operations, chained together.

The parametric effect monad for state (Section [5]) allows definitions of \text{incC} and \text{writeS} that have precise effect descriptions in their types, written:

- \( \text{incC} :: \text{State } \{[\text{"count"} : \rightarrow \text{Int } \downarrow \text{RW}] () \}
- \( \text{writeS} :: [a] \rightarrow \text{State } \{[\text{"out"} : \rightarrow [a] ! \text{RW}] () \}

meaning that \text{incC} has a read-write effect on a variable \"count\" and \text{writeS} has a read-write effect on a variable \"out\". The two can then be composed, using the usual do-notation, as:

\[
\text{write} :: [a] \rightarrow \text{State } \{[\text{"count"} : \rightarrow \text{Int } \downarrow \text{RW}, \\
\text{"out"} : \rightarrow [a] ! \text{RW}] () \}
\]

\[
\text{write } x = \text{do} \{ \text{writeS } x; \text{incC} \}
\]

whose effect information is the union of the effects for \text{writeS} and \text{incC}. Note that we didn’t need to use a lift operation, and we now also have precise effect information at the type level.

An alternate solution to granularity is to define a type class for each effectful operation parameterised by a result monad type, e.g.,

- \( \text{class Monad } m \Rightarrow \text{Output } m \text{ where writeS :: [a] → m ()} \)
- \( \text{class Monad } m \Rightarrow \text{Counting } m \text{ where incC :: m ()} \)

Suitable instances can be given using monad transformers. This approach provides an effect system via type class constraints, but restricts the effect annotations to sets with union (conjunction of constraints) and ordering of effects by subsets. In this paper, we embed a more general effect system, parameterised by a monoid of effects with a preorder, and show examples leveraging this generality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>class Effect (m :: k → * → *) where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>type Unit m :: k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type Plus m (f :: k) (g :: k) :: k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type Inv m (f :: k) (g :: k) :: Constraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type Inv m f g = ()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return :: a → m (Unit m) a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(⇒=) :: Inv m f g ⇒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m f a → (a → m g b) → m (Plus m f g) b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class Subeffect (m :: k → * → *) f g where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub :: m f a → m g a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Parametric effect monad and subeffecting classes

**Problem 2** Consider writing a DSL for parallel programming. We want to include the ability to use state, so the underlying implementation uses the state monad everywhere to capture stateful operations. However, we want to statically ensure that a parallel mapping function on lists \text{parMap} is only applied to functions with, at most, read-only state effects. The standard monadic approach does not provide any guidance, so we have to resort to other encodings.

With the embedded effect system approach of this paper we can write the following definition for \text{parMap}:

\[
\text{parMap} :: (\text{Writes } f \sim []) \Rightarrow |
\]

\[
(a → \text{State } f b) → [a] → \text{State } f [b]
\]

\[
\text{parMap } k [] = \text{sub } (\text{return } [])
\]

\[
\text{parMap } k (x : xs) = \text{do} (y, ys) \leftarrow (k x) \text{’par’ (parMap } k \text{ xs) \text{ return } (y : ys)}
\]

The predicate \text{Writes } f \sim [] on effect information constrains the computation to be free from write effects. The \text{par} combinator provides the parallel behaviour.

### 2. Parametric effect monads

While monads are defined over parametric types of kind \( m :: * → * \), parametric effect monads are defined over types of kind \( m :: k → * → * \) with an additional parameter of some kind \( k \) of effect types. We define parametric effect monads by replacing the usual \text{Monad} type class with the \text{Effect} class, which has the same operations, but with the effect-parameterisation described in the introduction.

Figure [1] gives the Haskell definition which uses type families, polymorphic kinds, and constraint kinds. \text{Plus} \( m \) declares a binary type family for composing effect annotations (of kind \( k \)) when sequentially composing computations with bind (\( \Rightarrow= \)). \text{Unit } m is a nullary type family computing the ‘unit’ annotation for the trivial (or pure) effect, arising from \text{return}. The idea is that \text{Plus} \( m \) and \text{Unit } m form a monoid which is shown by the parametric effect monad axioms (see below).

The \text{Inr} family is a constraint family \([5, 20]\) (i.e., constraint-kind type family) which can be used to restrict effect parameters in instances of \text{Effect}. The default is the empty constraint.

**do-notation** Haskell’s \text{do} notation provides convenient syntactic sugar over the operations of a monad, resembling the imperative programming approach of sequencing statements. By using the \text{rebindable} syntax extension of GHC, we can reuse the standard monadic \text{do} notation for programming with parametric effect monads in Haskell. This is why we have chosen to use the standard names for the \text{return} and (\( \Rightarrow= \)) operations here.

**Axioms** The axioms, or laws, of a parametric effect monad have exactly the same syntactic shape as those of monads, but with the additional effect parameters on the monadic type constructor. These
are as follows, along with their types (where for brevity here we elide the parameter \( m \) for \( \text{Plus} \) and \( \text{Unit} \) families and elide \( \text{Inv} \)):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{return} \ \&\ \rightarrow f \ &:: \ m \ (\text{Plus} \ \text{Unit} \ f) \ a \\
\text{f} \ x \ &:: \ m \ f \ a \\
\text{return} \ &:: \ m \ (\text{Plus} \ f \ \text{Unit}) \ a \\
\text{f} \ a \ &:: \ m \ f \ a \\
m \ (\text{Plus} \ f \ (\text{Plus} \ g \ h)) \ a \ &:: \ m \ (\text{Plus} \ f \ g) \ h \ a
\end{align*}
\]

For these equalities to hold, the type-level operations \( \text{Plus} \) and \( \text{Unit} \) must form a monoid, where \( \text{Unit} \) is the identity of \( \text{Plus} \) (for the first two laws), and \( \text{Plus} \) is associative (for the last law).

### Relation to monads

All monads are also parametric effect monads with a trivial singleton effect, i.e., if we take \( \text{Unit} \ m = () \) and \( \text{Plus} \ m () () = () \). We show the full construction to embed monads into parametric effect monads in Section 7.

### Relation to effect systems

Figure 2(a) recalls the rules of a simple type-and-effect system using sets of effect annotations. The correspondence between type-and-effect systems (hereafter just effect systems) and monads was made clear by Wadler and Thiemann, who established a syntactic correspondence by annotating monadic type constructors with the effect sets of an effect system [24]. This is shown for comparison in Figure 2(b), showing a correspondence between (var)-(unit), (let)-(bind), and (sub)-(does).

Wadler and Thiemann established soundness results between an effect system and an operational semantics, and conjectured a "coherent semantics" of effects and monads in a denotational style. They suggested associating to each effect \( F \) a different monad \( MF \). The effect-parameterised monad approach here differs: a type \( T \) parameterised by a monoid with a preorder, but sets are an important example used throughout. In this section, we develop a type-level notion of sets (that is, sets of types, as a type) with a corresponding value-level representation. We define set union (for the sequential composition of effect information) and the calculation of subsets—providing the monoid and preorder structure on effects.

Defining type-level sets would be easier in a dependently-typed language, but perhaps the most interesting (and practically useful) thing about this paper is that we can embed effect systems in a language without resorting to a fully dependently-typed system.

#### Representing sets with lists

We encode type-level sets using various advanced type system features of GHC. The main effort is in preventing duplicate elements and enforcing the irrelevance of the storage order for elements. These properties distinguish sets from lists, which are much easier to define at the type level and will form the basis of our encoding. Type-level functions will be used to remove duplicates and normalise the list (by sorting).

We start by inductively defining \( \text{Set} \) as a parameterised GADT:

\[
\text{data Set } (n :: [:]) \text{ where } \\
\text{Empty :: Set } []' \]

\[
\text{Ext :: } e \rightarrow \text{Set } s \rightarrow \text{Set } e :: s' \]

where the parameter has the \( \text{list kind } [:] \) (the kind of lists of types) [25]. This definition encodes heterogeneously-typed lists, with a type-level list representation via type operators of kind:

\[
[\cdot] :: [:] \quad \text{and} \quad (\cdot) :: s :: [:] \rightarrow [:] \]

These provide a compact notation for types. The data constructor names \( \text{Empty} \) and \( \text{Ext} \) (for extension) remind us that we will treat values of this type as sets, rather than lists.

The first step in using lists to represent sets is to make the ordering irrelevant by (perhaps ironically) fixing an arbitrary ordering on elements of the set and normalising by sorting. We use bubble sort here as it is straightforward to implement at the type level. A single pass of the bubble sort algorithm recurses over a list and orders successive pairs of elements as follows:

\[
\text{type family } \text{Pass } (l :: [:]) :: [:] \text{ where } \\
\text{Pass } []' = []' \\
\text{Pass } [e] = [e] \\
\text{Pass } (e :: f :: s) = \text{Min } e \ f :: (\text{Pass } ((\text{Max } e \ f) :: s)) \]

\[
\text{type family } \text{Min } (a :: k) (b :: k) :: k \quad \text{type family } \text{Max } (a :: k) (b :: k) :: k
\]

Here, \( \text{Min} \) and \( \text{Max} \) are open type families which are given instances later for specific applications. The definition of \( \text{Pass} \) here uses a closed type family [27]. Closed type families define all of
there instances together, i.e., further instances cannot be defined. This allows instances to be matched against in order, contrasting with open type families where there is no ordering on the instances (which may be scattered throughout different modules and compiled separately). Pass is defined as a closed family only because we do not need it to be open, not because we require the extra power of closed families; a standard open family would suffice here.

To complete the sorting, Pass is applied n-times for a list of length n. The standard optimisation is to stop once the list is sorted, but for brevity we take the simple approach, deconstructing the input list to build a chain of calls to Pass:

```haskell
type family Bubble l l’ where
  Bubble l []’ = l
  Bubble l (x ∷ xs)’ = Pass (Bubble l xs)

type Sort l = Bubble l l
```

Again, we use a closed type family here, not out of necessity but since we do not need an open definition.

This completes type-level sort. Definitions of the value-level counterparts follow exactly the same shape as their types, thus we relegate their full definition to Appendix A. The approach is to implement each type-level case as an instance of the classes:

```haskell
type Sortable s = Bubbler s s
class Bubbler s s’ where
  bubble :: Set s → Set s’ → Set (Bubble s s’)
class Passer s where
  pass :: Set s → Set (Pass s)
class OrdH e f where
  minH :: e → f → Min e f
  maxH :: e → f → Max e f
```

This provides the type-specific behaviour of each case of the type-level definitions, with room to raise the appropriate type-class constraints for OrdH (heterogeneously typed ordering).

The remaining idempotence property of sets requires the full power of closed type families, using equality on types. We define the following type-level function Nub to remove duplicates (named after nub for removing duplicates from a list in Data.List):

```haskell
type family Nub t where
  Nub []’ = []
  Nub [e]’ = [e]
  Nub (e ∷ e ∷ s) = Nub (e ∷ s)
  Nub (e ∷ f ∷ s) = e ∷ Nub (f ∷ s)
```

As mentioned, the closed form of type families allows a number of cases to be matched against in lexical order. This allows the type equality comparison in the third case which removes a duplicate when two adjacent elements have the same type. The pattern of the fourth case overlaps the third, but is only tried if the third fails.

A corresponding value-level nub is defined similarly to bubble and pass using a type class with instances for each case of Nub:

```haskell
class Nubable t where
  nub :: Set t → Set (Nub t)
instance Nubable []’ where
  nub Empty = Empty
instance Nubable [e]’ where
  nub (Ext x Empty) = Ext x Empty
instance (Nub (e ∷ f ∷ s) ∷ Ext x Empty) → Nubable (e ∷ f ∷ s) where
  nub (Ext x (Ext f s)) = Ext x (nub (Ext f s))
```

In the last case, the equality constraint is required to explain the behaviour of Nub. The type and value levels are in one-to-one correspondence however we have deliberately omitted the case for actually removing items with the same type. This class instance will be defined later with application-specific behaviour.

Putting this all together, type- and value-level conversion of the list format to the set format is defined:

```haskell
type AsSet s = Nub (Sort s)
asSet :: (Sortable s, Nubable (Sort s)) → Set s → Set (AsSet s)
asSet x = nub (bsort x)
```

We also define a useful predicate for later definitions which asks whether a type is in the set representation format:

```haskell
type IsSet s = (s ∷ Nub (Sort s)) :: Constraint
```

This uses the constraint kinds extension where the kind signature explains that this “type” definition is a unary constraint.

Now that we have the representation sorted, we define operations for taking the union and calculating subsets.

**Union** Set union is defined using our existing infrastructure and the concatenation of the underlying lists:

```haskell
type Union s t = AsSet (Append (s ∪ t))
```

Append concatenates the two list representations (acting like a disjoint union of sets) and AsSet normalises the result into the set form. Append is defined in the usual way as a type family:

```haskell
type family Append (s :: [s]) (t :: [s]) where
  Append []’ t = t
  Append (x ∷ xs)’ y = x ∷ (Append xs y)
```

The value-level version is identical (mutatis mutandis):

```haskell
append :: Set s → Set t → Set (Append s t)
append Empty x = x
append (Ext e xs)’ y = Ext e (append xs y)
```

This twin definition, and the previous definition for Nub/nub, exposes a weakness of Haskell: we have to write both the value and type level, even though they are essentially identical. Languages that implement richer dependent-type theories tend to avoid this problem but, for the moment, this is the state of play in Haskell.

Given all of the above, union of value sets is then:

```haskell
type Unionable s t = (Sortable (Append s t), Nubable (Append s t))
union :: (Unionable s t) ⇒ Set s → Set t → Set (Union s t)
union s t = nub (bsort (append s t))
```

with the binary predicate Unionable hiding the underlying type class constraints associated with sorting and removing duplicates.

**Subsets** A notion of subffecting is useful for combining effect information arising from non-linear control flow (for example, to implement conditionals). We recursively define a binary predicate Sub where Sub s t means s ⊆ t. This type class has a single method that calculates the value representation of the subset:

```haskell
class Subset s t where
  subset :: Set s → Set t
instance Subset []’ t where
  subset = Empty
instance Subset s t ⇒ Subset (x ∷ s) (x ∷ t) where
  subset (Ext x xs) = Ext x (subset xs)
instance Subset s t ⇒ Subset (x ∷ t) where
  subset (Ext _ xs) = subset xs
```

Thus, in the first instance: empty sets are subsets of all sets; in the second: \{x\} ∪ S ⊆ \{x\} ∪ T if S ⊆ T; and in the third,
$S \subseteq \{\{x\} \cup T\}$ if $S \subseteq T$. Note that we have used a multi-parameter type class here since the value-level behaviour depends on both the source and target types.

Set union and subset operations will be used in the next three sections, where additional set operations will appear as necessary.

4. Writer effects

Our first example effect system will capture write effects, related to the writer monad. The classic writer monad provides a write-only cumulative state, useful for producing a log (or trace) along with a computation. The data type is essentially that of a product. In Haskell, this monad is defined:

```haskell
data Writer w a = Writer { runWriter :: (a, w) }

instance Monoid w ⇒ Monad (Writer w) where
  return a = Writer (a, mempty)
  (Writer (a, w)) ⊔ k = let (b, w') = runWriter (k a) in Writer (b, w' `mappend` w')
```

where `mempty :: Monoid w ⇒ w` and `mappend :: Monoid w ⇒ w → w → w` are respectively the unit element and the binary operation of a monoid on `w`. Thus, a pure computation writes the element unit of the monoid and `⊔` composes write state using the binary operation of the monoid.

Using a parametric effect monad, we can define a more flexible version of the writer monad that allows multiple writes to be easily combined and extended (without the need for tuples or monad transformers), using an effect system for write effects. This approach allows us to define programs like the following:

```haskell
prog :: Writer "x" :→ Int, "y" :→ String
prog = do put varX
         put varY
         put (Var "hello"
         put (Var "world")
```

where "x" and "y" are type level symbols and `Writer` is parameterised by a set of variable-type mappings. Running this computation produces `(((), (x, 100), (y, "hello world")))`.

We use our type-level sets representation coupled with type-level symbols to provide variables, where the constructor describes a pair of a variable and its written type. The `Writer` data type and its accompanying parametric effect monad are defined as follows:

```haskell
data Writer w a = Writer { runWriter :: (a, Set w) }

instance Effect Writer where
  type Inv Writer s t = (IsSet s, IsSet t, Unliable s t)
  type Unit Writer = '[
  type Plus Writer s t = Union s t
  return x = Writer (x, Empty)
  (Writer (a, w)) ⊔ k = let Writer (b, w') = k a in Writer (b, w' `union` w')
```

Thus, `return` has the empty set effect, and `⊔` composes writer states by taking the union, with the `Union` effect annotation. The `IsSet` predicates ensure the effect indices are in the set format.

The `put` operation is then defined as follows, introducing an effect with a variable-type mapping:

```haskell
put :: Var v → t → Writer [v :→ t] ()
put v x = Writer ((), Ext v x Empty)
```

The mapping operator `→` and `Var` type are defined:

```haskell
data (v :: Symbol) :→ (t :: s) = (Var v :→ t)
data Var (v :: Symbol) = Var
```

Members of the kind of symbols `Symbol` are type-level strings, provided by the `data kinds` extension.

Recall that we did not define the `nub` operation on sets fully; the case for removing duplicates at the value level was not included in the definition of Section 3. We define this here by combining values of the same variable using the `mappend` operation of a monoid:

```haskell
instance (Monoid a, Nuable ((v :→ a) :→ s)) ⇒
  Nuable ((v :→ a) :→ (v :→ a) :→ s)
  where
  nub (Ext _ :→ a) (Ext (v :→ b)) s
   = nub (Ext (v :→ a `mappend` b) s)
```

We finally implement the type-level ordering of mappings `v :→ t` by providing instances for `Min` and `Max`:

```haskell
type instance Min (v :→ a) (w :→ b) =
  (Select v w v w) :→ (Select v w a b)
type instance Max (v :→ a) (w :→ b) =
  (Select v w v w) :→ (Select v w b a)
type Select a b p q = Choose (CmpSymbol a b) p q
type family Choose (a :: Ordering) p q where
  Choose LT p q = p
  Choose EQ p q = p
  Choose GT p q = q
```

where `CmpSymbol :: Symbol → Symbol → Ordering` from the base library compares symbols, returning a type of kind `Ordering` upon which `Choose` matches. The type function `Select` selects its third or fourth parameter based on the variables passed as its first two parameters; `Select` returns its third parameter if the first parameter is less than the second, otherwise it returns its fourth. The corresponding value level is a straightforward (and annoying!) transcription of the above, shown in Appendix B for reference.

Examples and polymorphism. The following gives a simple example (using an additive monoid on `Int`):

```haskell
varX = Var (: (Var "x")
varY = Var (: (Var "y")

test = do put varX (42 :: Int)
         put varY "hello"
         put varX (58 :: Int)
         put varY "world"
```

The effects are easily inferred (shown here by querying GHCi):

```haskell
*Main> :t test
```

```haskell
  test :: Writer ("x" :→ Int, "y" :→ [Char]) ()
```

and the code executes as expected:

```haskell
*Main> runWriter (test 1)
```

```haskell
(((),(x, 100), (y, "hello world"))
```

Explicit type signatures were used on assignments to "x" otherwise our implementation cannot unify the two writes to "x". If we want "x" to be polymorphic we must use a `scoped type variable` with a type signature fixing the type of each `put to x`. For example:

```haskell
test' (n :: a) = do put varX (42 :: a)
          put varY "hello"
          put varX (n :: a)
```

for which Haskell can infer the expected polymorphic effect type:

```haskell
*Main> :t test'
```

```haskell
  test' :: (Monoid a, Num a) ⇒
         a → Writer ("x" :→ a, "y" :→ [Char]) ()
```

While it is cumbersome to have to add explicit type signatures for the polymorphism here, the overhead is not vast and the type system can still infer the effect type for us. We can also be entirely polymorphic in an effect, and in a higher-order setting. For exam-
ple, the following function takes an effectful function as a parameter and applies it, along with some of its own write effects:

\[
\text{test2} :: (\text{IsSet} f, \text{Unionable} f \rightarrow \text{String}) \Rightarrow (\text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Writer} f) \rightarrow \text{Writer} (\text{Union} f \rightarrow \text{String})
\]

\[
\text{test2} f = \text{do} \{ f 3; \text{putVar} Y \text{"world."} \}
\]

Thus, \text{test2} takes an effectful function \( f \), calls it with 3, and then writes to "y". The resulting effect is thus the union of \( f \)'s effects and \( \{\text{"y"} : \rightarrow \text{String}\} \). To test, \( \text{runWriter} \ (\text{test2} \ \text{test'}) \) returns the expected values \( ((), \{(x, 45), (y, \text{"hello world."})\}) \).

While the type of \text{test2} can be inferred (if we give a signature on \text{3}, e.g., \text{3 :: Int}), we include an explicit type signature here as GHC has a habit of expanding type synonym definitions, making the inferred type a bit inscrutable.

**Subeffecting** Since sets appear in a positive position in our \text{Writer} data type, subeffecting overapproximates what is written, requiring a superset operation for writer effects. At the value level, we fill these additional writer cells with unit of the corresponding monoid (mempty), thus completing the use of monoids in this example (rather than just semigroups). We define a binary predicate \text{Superset} with a superset method:

\[
\text{class Superset} s t \text{ where superset :: Set s \rightarrow Set t}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \text{ Superset} [] [] \text{ where superset _ = Empty}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \text{ (Monoid a, Superset} [ ] [ ] s \Rightarrow \text{Superset} (\{v:a\} : s) \text{ where superset _ = Ext (Var :\rightarrow mempty) (Superset Empty)}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \text{ Superset} s t \Rightarrow \text{Superset} ((v:a) : s) ((v:a) : t) \text{ where superset (Ext x zs) = Ext x (superset zs)}
\]

The subeffecting operation for \text{Writer} is then:

\[
\text{instance} \text{ Superset} s t \Rightarrow \text{Subeffect} \text{ Writer} s t \text{ where sub (Writer} (a, w) = Writer (a, (superset w)) :: (Set t))
\]

To illustrate, we apply sub to our earlier example:

\[
\text{test3} :: \text{Writer}[\\text{z} : \rightarrow \text{Int}, \text{y} : \rightarrow \text{String}, \text{z} : \rightarrow \text{Int}]\}
\]

\[
\text{test3} = \text{sub} (\text{test2} \ \text{test'})
\]

which evaluates to the following showing the 0 value given to "z" coming from the additive monoid for \text{Int}:

\*Main> \text{runWriter} \text{test3} \{(0, (x, 45)), (y, \text{"hello world."}), (z, 0)\}

**Using plain lists** A simpler, but less useful version of writer effects uses just type-level lists, rather than sets. This provides a write-once writer where values can be written but with no accumulating behaviour. We elide this example here as it is less useful, but it can be found in \text{Control.Effect.WriteOnceWriter}.

### 4.1 Update effects

An alternate form of writer effect provides an updateable memory cell, without any accumulating behaviour. This corresponds to the usual writer monad with the monoid over \text{Maybe}; writing a value wrapped by the \text{Just} constructor updates the cell, writing \text{Nothing} leaves the cell unmodified. With a parametric effect monad we can treat the type of the cell as an effect annotation, providing a heterogeneously-typed update monad. The standard monadic definition must have the same type throughout the computation. Thus, this effect system is more about generalising the power of the monad than program analysis per se.

This parametric effect monad is defined by lifting the \text{Maybe}-monoid to types. We define a GADT parameterised by \text{Maybe} promoted to a kind:

\[
data \text{ Eff} (w :: \text{Maybe} *) \text{ where}
\]

\[
\text{Put} :: a \rightarrow \text{Eff} (\text{Just} a)
\]

\[
\text{NoPut} :: \text{Eff} \text{ Nothing}
\]

The effect-parameterised version of the update monad is then:

\[
data \text{Update} w a = U \{ \text{runUpdate} :: (a, \text{Eff} w) \}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \text{EffUpdate} \text{ where}
\]

\[
\text{type} \text{UnitUpdate} = \text{Nothing}
\]

\[
\text{type} \text{PlusUpdate} s \text{Nothing} = s
\]

\[
\text{type} \text{PlusUpdate} s (\text{Just} t) = \text{Just t}
\]

\[
\text{return} x = U (x, \text{NoPut})
\]

\[
(U (a, w)) \Rightarrow k = U (\text{update} w (\text{runUpdate} \$ k a))
\]

\[
\text{update} :: \text{Eff} s \rightarrow (b, \text{Eff} t) \rightarrow (b, \text{Eff} (\text{PlusUpdate} s t))
\]

\[
\text{update} w (b, \text{NoPut}) = (b, w)
\]

\[
\text{update} (b, \text{Put} w') = (b, \text{Put} w''')
\]

\[
\text{put} :: a \rightarrow \text{Update} (\text{Just} a) ()
\]

\[
\text{put} x = U (((), \text{Put} x)
\]

where \text{update} combines value- and type-level \text{Maybe} monoid behaviour. Note that we don’t have to use the GADT approach. We could equivalently define two data types \text{Put} and \text{NoPut} and implement the type-dependent behaviour of \text{update} using a type class.

The effect-parameterised writer monad therefore provides a heterogeneously-typed memory cell, where the final type of the state for a computation is that of the last write, e.g.

\*Main> \text{runUpdate} \text{test3} \{(0, (x, 45)), (y, \text{"hello world."}), (z, 0)\}

\text{foo} :: \text{Update} (\text{Just} \text{String}) \()
\]

\[
\text{foo} = \text{do} \{ \text{put} 42; \text{put} \text{"hello"} \}
\]

This parametric effect monad is a little baroque, but it serves to demonstrate the heterogeneous behaviour possible with parametric effect monads and gives an example effect system that is not based on sets (of which there are more examples later).

### 5. Reader effects

The classic reader monad provides a read-only value (or parameter) that is available throughout a computation. The data type of the reader monad is a function from the read-only state to a value:

\[
data \text{Reader} r a = \text{Reader} \{ \text{runReader} :: r \rightarrow a \}
\]

Similarly to the previous section, we can generalise this monad to a parametric effect monad providing an effect system for read effects and allowing multiple different reader values, solving the composition problem for multiple reader monads. The generalised type and parametric effect monad instance are defined:

\[
data \text{Reader} s a = R \{ \text{runReader} :: \text{Set} s \rightarrow a \}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \text{EffectReader} \text{ where}
\]

\[
\text{type} \text{InvReader} s t = (\text{IsSet} s, \text{IsSet} t, \text{Split} s t (\text{Union} s t))
\]

\[
\text{type} \text{UnitReader} = []
\]

\[
\text{type} \text{PlusReader} s t = \text{Union} s t
\]

\[
\text{return} x = R (\lambda \text{Empty} \rightarrow x)
\]

\[
(R e) \Rightarrow k = R (\lambda s \rightarrow \text{let} (s, t) = \text{split st} \in (\text{runReader} \$ k (e s)) t)
\]

A pure computation therefore reads nothing, taking the empty set as an argument. For the composition of effectful computations, we define a computation that takes in a set \(s \setminus \text{Set} (\text{Union} s t)\) and then splits it into two parts \(s : \text{Set} s\) and \(t : \text{Set} t\) which are passed to the subcomputations \(e : \text{Set} s \rightarrow a\) and \(k (e s) : \text{Set} t \rightarrow b\).

Although set union is not an injective operation (i.e., not invertible), the \text{split} operation here provides the inverse of \text{Union} s t
since s and f are known, provided by the types of the two subcomputations. We define \( \text{split} \) via a type class that is parameterised by its parameter set and return sets:

\[
\text{class} \ Split \ s \ t \ st \ where \ \text{split} :: \ Set \ s \rightarrow (\text{Set} \ s, \text{Set} \ t) \\
\text{instance} \ Split \ \{x\} \ {x'} \ {x'} \ where \ \text{split} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ t) = \text{let} \ (s, t) = \text{split} \ s \text{ in} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ s, \text{Ext} \ t \ t) \\
\text{instance} \ Split \ s \ t \ st \Rightarrow \text{Split} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ t) \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ t) \ where \ \text{split} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ t) = \text{let} \ (s, t) = \text{split} \ s \text{ in} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ s, \text{Ext} \ t \ t) \\
\text{instance} \ Split \ s \ t \ st \Rightarrow \text{Split} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ t) \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ t) \ where \ \text{split} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ t) = \text{let} \ (s, t) = \text{split} \ s \text{ in} \ (\text{Ext} \ s \ s, \text{Ext} \ t \ t)
\]

The first instance provides the base case. The second provides the case when an element of a \( \text{Union} \ f \ g \) is an element of both \( f \) and \( g \). The third and fourth instances provide the cases when an element of \( \text{Union} \ f \ g \) is only in \( f \) or only in \( g \).

The constraint \( \text{Split} \ s \ t \ (\text{Union} \ f \ g) \) in the \( \text{Effect} \) instance enforces that \( \text{Split} \) is the inverse of \( \text{Union} \).

Once we have the above parametric effect monad, the usual \( \text{ask} \) operation takes a variable as a parameter and produces a computation with a singleton effect for that variable:

\[
\text{ask} :: \text{Var} \ v \rightarrow \text{Reader} \ [v \rightarrow t] \ t \\
\text{ask} \ \text{Var} = R \ (x: (\text{Ext} \ (\text{Var} \rightarrow x) \ \text{Empty}) \rightarrow x)
\]

The following gives an example program, whose type and effects are easily inferred by GHC, so we do not give a type signature here:

\[
\text{foo} = \text{do} \ x \leftarrow \text{ask} \ ((\text{Var} :: ([\text{Var} \ "x"])) \\
\quad \text{xs} \leftarrow \text{ask} \ ((\text{Var} :: ([\text{Var} \ "xs"])) \\
\quad \text{x} \leftarrow \text{ask} \ ((\text{Var} :: ([\text{Var} \ "x"])) \\
\quad \text{return} \ ((x: x: \text{xs})) \\
\text{init1} = \text{Ext} \ (\text{Var} \rightarrow \text{t}) \ (\text{Ext} \ (\text{Var} \rightarrow \text{Empty})) \\
\text{runFoo} = \text{runReader} \ \text{foo} \ \text{init1}
\]

The inferred type is \( \text{foo} :: \text{Reader} \ [\text{Var} \ "x" : a, \ "xs" : a] \ \text{to} \ [a] \ [a] \) and \( \text{runFoo} \) evaluates to \([1 \, 1, \, 2, \, 3]\).

Note that we have not had to add a case for the \( \text{Nubable} \) type class with the \( \text{nu} \) method to removing duplicates in sets. This is because \( \text{Reader} \) does not use \( \text{union} \) (sets appear in a negative position, to the left of the function arrow). Instead, the idempotent behaviour is encoded by the definition of \( \text{split}/\text{Split} \).

### Sub effecting

Since sets appear in negative positions, we can use the \( \text{sub} \) function defined earlier for subeffecting:

\[
\text{instance} \ \text{Subset} \ s \ t \Rightarrow \text{Subeffect Reader} \ s \ t \ where \ \text{sub} \ (R \ e) = R \ (\lambda a \rightarrow \text{let} \ s = \text{sub} \ a \ \text{in} \ e \ a)
\]

The following overapproximates the above effects:

\[
\text{bar} :: (\text{Subset} \ [\text{Var} \ "x" : a, \ "xs" : a]) \Rightarrow \text{Int} \ t \ (\text{Int} \ t) \\
\text{bar} = \text{sub} \ \text{foo}
\]

This can be run by passing \( \perp \) into the additional slot in the incoming reader set with initial reader state:

\[
\text{init2} :: \text{Set} \ [\text{Var} \ "x" : a, \ "xs" : a] \Rightarrow \text{Int} \ t \ (\text{Int} \ t) \\
\text{runReader} \ \text{bar} \ \text{init2} \text{evalutates to} \ [1, \, 1, \, 2, \, 3] \). The explicit signature on \( \text{init2} \) is required for the subeffecting function to be correctly resolved.

This effect system resembles the **implicit parameters** extension of Haskell [13] providing most of the same functionality. However, some additional structure is need to fully replicate the implicit parameter behaviour. This is discussed in Section 3 where we briefly discuss the dual notion of coeffect systems.

### 6. State effects

The earliest effect systems were designed specifically to track side-effects relating to state, with sets of triples marking read, write, and update effects on typed locations. We combine the approaches thus far for reader and writer effects to define a parametric state effect monad with state effect system. As before, we will use sets for effects, but this time with additional type-level information for distinguishing between reads, writes, and updates (read/write), given by the \( \text{Eff} \) type:

\[
\text{data} \ \text{Eff} = \text{R} | \text{W} | \text{RW} \\
\text{data} \ \text{Effect} \ (s :: \text{Eff}) = \text{Eff}
\]

where the \( \text{Effect} \) type uses \( \text{Eff} \) as a data kind and provides a data constructor that acts as a proxy for \( \text{Eff} \). These effects markers are associated with types, describing the effect performed on a value of a particular type, with the constructor:

\[
\text{data} \ (s :: :: \ast) \ (s :: \text{Eff}) = a :: (\text{Effect} s)
\]

Effect annotations will be sets of mappings of the form \( (v : \rightarrow t | f) \) meaning variable \( v \) has type \( t \) and effect action \( f \) drawn from \( \text{Eff} \).

The parametric effect monad data type \( \text{State} \) is analogous to usual definition of \( \text{state} \rightarrow (a, s) \):

\[
\text{data} \ \text{State} \ s \ a = \text{State} \ (\text{runState} :: \text{Set} \ (\text{Reads} \ s) \rightarrow (a, \text{Set} \ (\text{Writes} \ s))
\]

where \( \text{Reads} \) and \( \text{Writes} \) refine the set of effects into the read and write effects respectively. \( \text{Read} \) is defined:

\[
\text{type family} \ \text{Reads} \ t \ where \\
\text{Reads} \ [\text{Int} \ t] = [\text{Int} \ t] \\
\text{Reads} \ ((\text{Var} : \rightarrow a :: !) \ (\text{R} :: s)) = (v : \rightarrow a :: !) \ : (\text{Reads} \ s) \\
\text{Reads} \ ((\text{Var} : \rightarrow a :: !) \ (\text{RW} :: s)) = (v : \rightarrow a :: !) \ : (\text{Reads} \ s) \\
\text{Reads} \ ((\text{Var} : \rightarrow a :: !) \ (\text{W} :: s)) = (v : \rightarrow a :: !) \ (\text{Reads} \ s)
\]

thus read-write effects \( \text{RW} \) are turned into read effects, and all write effects are ignored. The \( \text{Writes} \) operation (not shown here) removes \( \text{R} \) actions and turns \( \text{RW} \) actions into \( \text{W} \) actions.

Previously, set union combined effect sets, but now we need some additional behaviour in the case where both sets contain effects on a variable \( v \) but with different effect actions. For example, we require the behaviour that:

\[
\text{Union} \ [v : \rightarrow t | \text{R}] \ [v : \rightarrow t | \text{W}] = [v : \rightarrow t | \text{RW}]
\]

i.e., if one computation reads \( v \) and the other writes \( v \) the overall effect is a read-write effect (possible update). We thus redefine the previous \( \text{Nub} \) definition:

\[
\text{type family} \ \text{Nub} \ t \ where \\
\text{Nub} \ [\text{Int} \ t] = [\text{Int} \ t] \\
\text{Nub} \ [\text{Var} \ e] = [\text{Var} \ e] \\
\text{Nub} \ (v : \rightarrow e :: s) = \text{Nub} \ (v : \rightarrow e :: s)
\]

Again, closed type families are used to match against types in the given order. The definition is the same as before in Section 3 apart from the third case which is new: if there are two different effects \( f \) and \( g \) on variable \( v \) then these are combined into one effect annotation with action \( \text{RW} \). The value level is straightforward and analogous to the type-level (see Control.Effect.State) and is similar to the previous definition in Section 3.

The union of two sets is defined as before, using sorting and the above version of \( \text{Nub} \). To
distinguish this union from the previous (which is an actual union), we define type \(\text{UnionS}\) \(s t = \text{Nub} (\text{Sort} (\text{Append } s t))\).

A final operation is required to sequentially compose write effects of one computation with read effects of another. This amounts to a kind of intersection of two sets, between a set of write effects and a set of read \(w \cap r\) where at the type level this equals \(r\), but at the value level any reads in \(r\) that coincide with writes in \(w\) are replaced by the written values. We define this operation by first appending the two sets, sorting them, then filtering with \(\text{intersectR}\):

\[
\text{type} \hspace{1em} \text{IntersectR} s t = (\text{Sortable} (\text{Append } s t)),
\]

\[
\text{Update} (\text{Append } s t) t \Rightarrow \text{Set } s \rightarrow \text{Set } t 
\]

\[
\text{intersectR} ((\text{Write} s a s, \text{Reads} t a t), \text{IntersectR} s t) = \Rightarrow \text{Set } s \rightarrow \text{Set } t 
\]

\[
\text{intersectR} s t = (\text{update} (\text{sort} (\text{append } s t)))
\]

The constraints here restrict us to just read effects in \(s\) and write effects in \(t\). The \text{update} function replaces any reader values with written values (if available). This is defined by the \text{Update} class:

\[
\text{class} \hspace{1em} \text{Update} s t \hspace{1em} \text{where} \hspace{1em} \text{update} \_ = \text{Empty}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \hspace{1em} \text{Update} x \hspace{1em} \text{where} \hspace{1em} \text{update} x = \text{Empty}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \hspace{1em} \text{update} [x] \hspace{1em} \text{where} \hspace{1em} \text{update} [x] = \text{Empty}
\]

\[
\text{instance} \hspace{1em} \text{update} e \hspace{1em} \text{where} \hspace{1em} \text{update} e = e
\]

\[
\text{instance} \hspace{1em} \text{update} [x] \hspace{1em} \text{where} \hspace{1em} \text{update} [x] = x
\]

The first two instances provide the base cases. The third instance provides the intersection behaviour of replacing a read value with a written value. Since sorting is defined on the symbols used for variables, the ordering of write effects before read effects is preserved, hence we only need consider this case of a write preceding a read. The fourth instance ignores a write that has no corresponding read. The fifth instance keeps a read that has no overwriting write effect.

Finally, we can define the full state parametric effect monad:

\[
\text{instance} \hspace{1em} \text{Effect} \hspace{1em} \text{State} \hspace{1em} \text{where}
\]

\[
\text{type} \hspace{1em} \text{Unit} \hspace{1em} \text{State} = []
\]

\[
\text{type} \hspace{1em} \text{Plus} \hspace{1em} \text{State} \hspace{1em} s t = \text{UnionS } s t
\]

\[
\text{return} \hspace{1em} x \hspace{1em} \text{State} (x, \text{Empty})
\]

\[
\text{State} e \Rightarrow k = \text{State} (\lambda \rightarrow 
\text{let} \hspace{1em} (sR, tR) = \text{splitst}
\hspace{1em} (a, sW) = e \hspace{1em} sR
\hspace{1em} (b, tW) = \text{runState} (x, a)
\hspace{1em} \text{in} \hspace{1em} (b, sW \hspace{1em} \text{union'} tW))
\]

Thus, a pure computation has no reads and no writes. When composing computations, an input state \(st\) is split into the reader states \(sR\) and \(tR\) for the two subcomputations. The first computation is run with input state \(sR\) yielding some writes \(sW\) as output state. These are then intersected with \(tR\) to give the input state to \((k a)\) which produces output state \(tW\). This is then unioned with \(sW\) to get the final output state.

The definition for Inc is elided (see Control.Effect.State) since it is quite long but has no surprises. As before it constrains \(s\) and \(t\) to be in the set format, and includes various type-class constraints for Unionable, Split and IntersectR.

We can now encode the examples of the introduction. For the stream processing example, we can define the operations as:

\[
\text{varC} = \text{Var} :: (\text{Var} \text{"count"})
\]

\[
\text{varS} = \text{Var} :: (\text{Var} \text{"out"})
\]

\[
\text{incC :: State} :: \text{\"count\"} \rightarrow \text{Int} \oplus \text{RW} ()
\]

\[
\text{incC = do} \hspace{1em} \{ x \leftarrow \text{get varC}; \text{put varC} (x + 1) \}
\]

\[
\text{writeS :: \[a\] \rightarrow \text{State} :: \text{\"out\"} \rightarrow \text{\[a\]} \oplus \text{RW} ()
\]

\[
\text{writeS y = do} \hspace{1em} \{ x \leftarrow \text{get varS}; \text{put varS} (x + y) \}
\]

\[
\text{write :: \[a\] \rightarrow \text{State} :: \text{\"count\"} \rightarrow \text{Int} \oplus \text{RW}, \text{\"out\"} \rightarrow \text{\[a\]} \oplus \text{RW} ()
\]

\[
\text{write x = do} \hspace{1em} \{ \text{writeS x}; \text{incC} \}
\]

7. Monads as parametric effect monads

As explained in the introduction, all monads are parametric effect monads with a trivial singleton effect. This allows us to embed existing monads into parametric effect monads with a wrapper:

\[
\text{import qualified Prelude as P}
\]

\[
\text{data Monad m t a where}
\]

\[
\text{Wrap} : \text{P.Monad m} \Rightarrow m a \rightarrow \text{Monad m a}
\]

\[
\text{unWrap} : \text{Monad m} t a \rightarrow m a
\]

\[
\text{instance} \hspace{1em} \text{P.Monad m} \Rightarrow \text{Effect} (\text{Monad m}) \text{where}
\]

\[
\text{type} \hspace{1em} \text{Unit} (\text{Monad m}) = ()
\]

\[
\text{type} \hspace{1em} \text{Plus} (\text{Monad m}) s t = ()
\]

\[
\text{return} = \text{Wrap} (P.return)
\]

\[
(\text{Wrap} x) \Rightarrow f = \text{Wrap} ((P.f) \Rightarrow x) (\text{unWrap} o f)
\]

This provides a pathway to entirely replacing the standard Monad class of Haskell with Effect.

8. Implicit parameters and coeffects

The parametric effect reader monad of Section 5 essentially embeds an effect system for implicit parameters into Haskell, an existing extension of Haskell [4]. Implicit parameters provide dynamically scoped variables. For example, the following function sums three numbers, two of which are passed implicitly (dynamically):

\[
\text{sum3 :: \{(\text{Num } a, ?x :: a, ?y :: a) \Rightarrow a \rightarrow a\}
\]

\[
\text{sum3 z = ?x + ?y + z}
\]

where implicit parameters are syntactically introduced by a preceding question mark. Any implicit parameters used in an expression are represented in the expression’s type as constraints (shown above). These implicit parameter constraints are a kind of effect analysis, similar to that of our reader effect monad. In our approach, a similar definition to \text{sum3} is:

\[
\text{sum3 :: \{(\text{Num } a) \Rightarrow a \rightarrow \text{Reader} (\{ x :: a, ?y :: a \Rightarrow a \}, a)\}
\]

\[
\text{sum3 z = do} \hspace{1em} x \leftarrow \text{ask} (\text{Var} \{ \text{Var} \{ ?x = x \} \}
\hspace{1em} y \leftarrow \text{ask} (\text{Var} \{ ?y = y \})
\hspace{1em} \text{return} (x + y + z)
\]

This is longer than the implicit parameter approach since the do-notation is needed to implement effect sequencing and the symbol encoding of variables is required, but the essence is the same.

However, the two approaches have a significant difference. Our effect-parameterised reader monad provides fully dynamically scoped variables, that is, they are bound only when the computation is run. In contrast, implicit parameters allow a mix of dynamic and static (lexical) scoping. For example, we can write:

\[
\text{sum2 :: \{(\text{Num } a, ?y :: a) \Rightarrow a \rightarrow a\}
\]

\[
\text{sum2 = let} \hspace{1em} ?x = 42 \hspace{1em} \lambda z \rightarrow ?x + ?y + z
\]
where the let binds the lexically scoped ?x inside of the λ-expression, but ?y remains dynamically scoped, as shown by the type. Without entering into the internals of Reader we cannot (yet) implement the same behaviour with the monadic approach. This illustrates how the implicit parameters extension is not an instance of an effect system or monadic semantics approach, in the traditional sense. The main difference is in the treatment of λ-abstraction.

Recall the standard type-and-effect rule for λ-abstraction [9], which makes all effects latent. Unifying effect systems with monads via parametric effect monads gives the semantics [12]:

\[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \tau, F}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda e : \sigma \to \tau \to \tau, \emptyset} = \text{return}(\text{uncurry } g) : \Gamma \to M_\emptyset(\sigma \to M_\tau \tau)
\]

where the returned function is pure (as defined by return).

This contrasts with the abstraction rule for implicit parameters [14]. Lewis et al. describe implicit parameter judgments of the form \(\Gamma \vdash e : \tau\) where \(C\) augments the usual typing relation with a set of constraints. The rule for abstraction is then:

\[
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \lambda e : \sigma \to \tau, \emptyset}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda e : \sigma \to \tau, \emptyset} = \text{return}(\text{uncurry } g) : \Gamma \to M_\emptyset(\sigma \to M_\tau \tau)
\]

If constraints \(C\) are thought of as effect annotations, then we see that the λ-abstraction is not pure in the sense that the constraints of the body \(e\) are now the constraints of the λ-abstraction (no latent effects). When combined with their rule for discharging implicit parameters, this allows lexically scoped implicit parameters.

The semantics of these implicit parameters has been described separately in terms of a comonadic semantics for implicit parameters with a coeffect system [21].

**Comonads and coeffects** Comonads dualise monads, revealing a structure of the following form (taken from Control.Comonad):

\[
\text{class Comonad } (c) \text{ where}
\]

- extract :: c a → a
- extend :: (c a → b) → c a → c b

where extract is the dual of return and extend is the infux dual of (⇒). Comonads can be described as capturing input impurity, input effects, or context-dependent notions of computation. Recently, coeffect systems have been introduced as the comonadic analogues of effect systems for analysing resource usage and context-dependence in programs [3][8][21]. The semantics of theses systems each include a dual to parametric effect monads (in various forms), which we call here parametric coeffect comonads (earlier called indexed comonads [21]).

We write coeffect judgments as \(\Gamma \vdash R \vdash e : \tau\), meaning an expression \(e\) has coeffects (or requirements) \(R\). The key distinguishing feature between (simple) coeffect systems, shown in [21], and effect systems is the abstraction rule, which has the form:

\[
\frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \to F \times G \vdash e : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda e : \tau, \emptyset} = \text{merge}(g \cdot \text{return}) : \Gamma \to (D_F \sigma \to \tau) \times (D_G \sigma \to \tau)
\]

for some binary operation \(\otimes\) on coeffects. Thus, in a coeffect system, λ-abstraction is not “pure”. Instead, reading the rule top-down, coeffects of the body are split between the declaration site (immediate coeffects) and the call site (latent coeffects); reading bottom-up, the contexts available at the declaration site and call site are merged to give the context of the body.

In the semantics of coeffect systems, coeffect judgments are interpreted as morphisms: \([\Gamma \vdash e : \tau]\) : \(D_F[\Gamma] \to [\tau]\) where \(D_F\) is a parametric coeffect comonad. The semantics of abstraction requires an additional monoidal operation on D of type \(\text{merge} : D_F A \times D_G B \to D_{F \otimes G}(A \times B)\), giving the rule:

\[
\frac{\Gamma, x : a ? F \times G \vdash e : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda e : \tau, \emptyset} = \text{uncurry}(g \circ \text{merge}) : \Gamma \to (D_F \sigma \to \tau)\]

**Implicit parameters as coeffects** A coeffect system (with the above abstraction rule) with coeffects as sets of variable-type pairs provides the constraints behaviour of implicit parameters. This allows the sum2 example for implicit parameters to be typed, with additional syntax for binding implicit parameters:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{(let?)} & \quad \gamma \vdash \lambda e : \gamma + \gamma + z : a \quad \gamma \vdash \text{return}(\text{uncurry } g) : \gamma \to (\gamma + \gamma) \to a \\
\gamma \vdash ? x : e \quad \gamma = e \in (\lambda z. x + y + z : a) \quad (\gamma + \gamma) \to a
\end{aligned}
\]

Thus, the requirements of the function body are split, with \(?x : a\) becoming an immediate coeffect which is discharged by the let? binding, and \(?y : a\) remaining latent.

The semantics can be given in terms of a coeffect-parameterised product comonad on \(P_F A = A \times F\), and an operation \(\text{merge} : P_F A \times P_G B \to P_{F \otimes G}(A \times B)\) taking the union of the coeffects.

**Reader as a monad or comonad** By (un)currying, functions of type \(P_F A \to B\) (e.g., denotations of the coeffect semantics) are isomorphic to functions \(A \to \text{Reader } F B\) of our parametric effect reader, i.e., \(\text{curry} :: ((A \times F) \to B) \to (A \to (F \to B))\), and vice versa by uncurry. Thus, we can structure sequential reader computations using either the comonadic or monadic approach. The difference is in the treatment of abstraction, as we have seen above with merge. However, we can recover the mixed lexical/dynamic behaviour of the implicit parameters extension by providing the isomorphic version of merge for the Reader type:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{merge} :: (\text{Unionable } s t) &\Rightarrow (a \to \text{Reader } (\text{Union } s t) b) \\
&\Rightarrow \text{Reader } s (a \to \text{Reader } t b)
\end{aligned}
\]

This merges the immediate requirements/effects that occur before the function is applied and latent requirements/effects for when the function is applied, providing requirements \(\text{Union } s t\). We see here the merging behaviour described above in the coeffect setting, where the union of two implicit parameter environments is taken.

Therefore, merge allows mixed lexical/dynamic behaviour of implicit parameters: Reader. For example, sum2 (which used implicit parameters) can now be equivalently expressed as:

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{sum2} :: &\quad \text{Sum } a \Rightarrow a \to \text{Reader } ["?y"] \Rightarrow a \\
\text{sum2} &\quad = \text{let } x = (\text{Ext } ((\text{Var } ["?x"] : 42) \Rightarrow \text{Empty} ) \\
\text{ in } &\quad \text{runReader} (\text{merge } (\lambda x \to \text{do } x \leftarrow \text{ask } (\text{Var } ["?x"]) \\
\& \leftarrow \text{ask } (\text{Var } ["?y"])) \\
\text{ return } (x + y + z)) x)
\end{aligned}
\]

Thus, we lexically scope ?x via merge with our original sum3 definition, leaving only the requirement for ?y.

We have seen here that Haskell’s implicit parameters are a kind of coeffect analysis, or an effect analysis with some additional structure borrowed from the coeffect/comonadic approach. Furthermore, we can use the same approach to encode type class constraints, where dictionaries are encoded via the effect-parameterised reader monad. The mechanism for implicitly discharging constraints is not provided here, but our discussion shows how parametric effect monads could be used to emulate implicit parameters and type-class constraints or to give their semantics.

### 9. Program analysis and specification

In our examples so far, effect indices have had value-level counterparts. For example, the effect set for the reader monad corresponds to the set of values being read. However, we may not necessarily want, or need, to have a semantic, value-level counterpart to our
Thus, the effect system collects a set of relative indices. We can similarly define a backwards definition, and together form the common symmetrical stencil pattern:

\[
\text{localMean} \quad \text{::} \quad \text{Stenciled Float (Symm 1) Float}
\]

Such signatures provide specifications on stencils from which the type system checks whether the stencil function is correctly implemented, i.e., not missing any indices. The type system will reveal to us any omissions. For example, the following buggy definition raises a type error since the negative index \(-1\) is missing:

\[
\text{localMean} \quad \text{::} \quad \text{Stenciled Float (Symm 1) Float}
\]

In this effect system, effects are ordered by the superset relation since we want to recognise when indices are omitted. For example, the effect of \text{localMean} is a subset of (\text{Symm 1}) as an index is missing, therefore \text{localMean}'s effect is not a subeffect of (\text{Symm 1}) hence cannot be 'upcast' to it. Thus, effects are overapproximated here by the subset.

9.2 Counter

Prior to the work on effect parameterised monads, Danielsson proposed the Thunk "annotated monad" type \[\text{Symm} \subseteq \text{Nat}\], which is parameterised with natural numbers: 0 for \text{return}, and addition on the natural number parameters for (\text{\geq}). We call this the \text{counter} effect monad as it can be used for counting aspects of computation, such as time bounds in the case of Danielsson, or computation steps.

Thus we can use \text{tick} to denote some increment in computation steps or time. This effect system can be used to prove complexity bounds on our programs. For example, we can prove that the \text{map} function over a sized vector is linear in its size:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{data Vector (n :: Nat) a} & \quad \text{a} = \text{Vector 0 a} \\
\text{instance Effect Counter where} & \\
\text{type} & \quad \text{Plus Counter n m} = n + m \\
\text{return a} & = \text{Counter a} \\
\text{map a} & = \text{Counter . forget 0 m a} \\
\text{tick} & = \text{Counter 1 a} \\
\text{data IntT (n :: Sign Nat) = IntT} & \\
\text{localMean as:} & \\
\text{localMean :: Stenciled Float} & \\
\text{\quad ([\text{IntT} (\text{Neg 1}), \text{IntT} (\text{Pos 0}), \text{IntT} (\text{Pos 1})]) Float} & \\
\text{localMean = do} & \quad \text{a} \leftarrow \text{ix} ([\text{IntT} (\text{Pos 0}))) \\
\text{\quad b} & \leftarrow \text{ix} ([\text{IntT} (\text{IntT} (\text{Pos 1}))) \\
\text{\quad c} & \leftarrow \text{ix} ([\text{IntT} (\text{Neg 1})]) \\
\text{return} & \quad S (a + b + c) / 3.0
\end{align*}
\]

i.e., if we apply a function which takes \(m\) steps to a list of \(n\) elements, then this takes \(n + m\) steps.

The above is a slight simplification of the actual implementation (which can be found in \text{Control.Effect.Counter} since type-checking operations on type-level natural numbers are currently a little underpowered: the above does not type check. Instead, if we
implement our own inductive definitions of natural numbers, and the corresponding + and * operations, then the above type checks, and the type system gives us a kind of complexity proof. The only difference to the implementation and the above is that we do not get the compact natural number syntax in the types.

10. Category theory definition

Previous theoretical work introduced parametric effect monads [12, 19] (where in [19] we called them indexed monads). For completeness we briefly show the formal definition, which shows that parametric effect monads arise as a mapping between a monoid of effects \((\mathcal{I}, \bullet, I)\) and the monoid of endofunction composition (which models sequential composition).

Parametric effect monads comprise a functor \(T : \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}\) (i.e., an indexed family of endofunctors) where \(\mathcal{I}\) is the category providing effect annotations. This category \(\mathcal{I}\) is taken as a strict monoidal category \((\mathcal{I}, \bullet, I)\), i.e., the operations on effect annotations are defined as a binary functor \(\bullet : \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{I}\) and an object \(I \in \mathcal{I}\). The \(T\) functor is then a parametric effect monad when it is a lax monoidal functor, mapping the strict monoidal structure on \(\mathcal{I}\) to the strict monoid of endofunctor composition \((\mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}, \circ, I)\).

The operations of the lax monoidal structure are thus:

\[
\eta_i : I \to T I \quad \mu_{F,G} : TF \circ TG \to T(F \circ G)
\]

These lax monoidal operations of \(T\) match the shape of the regular monad operations. Furthermore, the standard associativity and unitality conditions of the lax monoidal functor give coherence conditions to \(\eta_i\) and \(\mu_{F,G}\), which are analogous to the regular monad laws, but with added indices, e.g., \(\mu_{F,G} \circ (\eta_i)_T = \mu_{F,G} \circ (\eta_i)_G = \mu_{F,G} \circ (\eta_i)_I = \mu_{F,G} \circ (\eta_i)_I\).

In our definition here, we have used the “extension form” in terms of \((\gg\gg)\), as is traditional in Haskell. This is derived from the \(\mu\) (join) operation by \(x \gg\gg y = (Tf \circ \mu)\). Index monads collapse to regular monads when \(\mathcal{I}\) is a single-object monoidal category. Thus, indexed monads generalise monads. Note that indexed monads are not indexed families of monads. That is, for all indices \(F \in \text{obj}(\mathcal{I})\) then \(TF\), may not be a monad.

11. Related notions

Parameterised monads and indexed monads Katsumata used the phrase parameteric effect monads [12], which we adopted here. In previous work, we referred to such structures as indexed monads [19], but we recognise this clashes with other earlier uses of the term. Most notably, Haskell already has an “indexed monad” library (Control.Monad.Indexed) which provides an interface for Atkey’s notion of parameterised monads [11] with operations:

\[
\text{ireturn} :: a \to m i a \quad \text{ibind} :: (a \to m j k b) \to m i j a \to m i k b
\]

The second and third indices on \(m\) can be read like Hoare triples (which McBride shows when embedding a similar definition to the above in Haskell [16]), where \(m i j a\) is the triple \((i)\{\{j\}\}a\) \(i.e., a computation starts with pre-condition \(i\), and computes a value of type \(a\) providing post-condition \(j\). An alternate view is that \(m\) here is indexed by the source and target types of morphisms, where \(\text{ireturn}\) is indexed by identities and \(\text{ibind}\) exhibits composition.

We can encode the same approach with our Effect class. Using data kinds, we define a kind of morphisms \(\text{Morph}\) inhabited by either the identity \(\text{Id}\) or a morphism \(M a b\) with source \(a\) and target \(b\). The type, together with the effect monad are defined as:

\[
\text{data}\ \text{Morph}\ a\ b\ |\ \text{Id} \\
\text{newtype}\ T\ (i:\ \text{Morph}\ \ast\ \ast)\ a\ =\ T\ a \\
\text{instance}\ \text{Effect}\ (T\ :\ ((\text{Morph}\ \ast\ \ast)\to \ast\ \to \ast))\ \text{where} \\
\text{type}\ \text{Unit}\ T\ =\ \text{Id}
\]

12. Epilogue

A whole menagerie of type system features were leveraged in this paper to give a shallow embedding of effect systems in Haskell types (without macros or custom syntax). The newest closed family extension to GHC was key to embedding sets in types, which was core to some of our examples.

While there is a great deal of power in the GHC type system, a lot of boilerplate code was required. Frequently, we have made almost identical type- and value-level definitions. Languages with richer dependent types are able to combine these. Going forward, it seems likely, and prudent, that such features will become part of Haskell, although care must be taken so that they do not conflict with other aspects of the core language. We also advocate for built-in type-level sets which would significantly simplify our library.

Further work is to extend our approach to allow different kinds of effect to be combined. One possible approach may be to define
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A. Typed value-level list sorting

The following gives the value-level definitions of sorting to normalise lists for the set representation, referenced from Section[3]

The top-level bubble function is defined by a type class:

```haskell
class Bubble s s' where
  bubble :: Set s -> Set s' -> Set (Bubble s s')
instance Bubble s [] where
  bubble s Empty = s
instance (Bubble s t, Passer (Bubble s t)) => Bubble s (e :: t) where
  bubble s (Ext t) = pass (bubble s t)
```

The individual bubble sort pass is defined also by a type class, so that the embedded constraints in the `swapping` case are captured:

```haskell
class Passer s where
  pass :: Set s -> Set (Pass s)
instance Passer [] where pass Empty = Empty
instance Passer [e] where
  pass (Ext e Empty) = Ext e Empty
instance (Passer ((Max e f) :: s), OrdH e f) => Passer (e :: f :: s) where
  pass (Ext e (Ext f s)) = Ext (minH e f) (pass (Ext (maxH e f) s))
```

B. Value comparison of variable-value mappings

Section[3] uses mappings v :: t between variables and values. Here, we add the value-level comparison operation. Scoped type variables are used along with the data type Proxy used for giving a value-level proxy to a type of kind k, i.e., Proxy :: Proxy k.

```haskell
select :: forall k a b. (Comparer (CmpSymbol j k)) => Var j -> Var k -> a -> b -> Select j k a b
select _ _ _ _ = choose
  (Proxy :: (Proxy (CmpSymbol j k))) x y
instance (Comparer (CmpSymbol u v)) =>
  OrdH (u ::-> a) (v ::-> b) where
  maxH (u ::-> a) (v ::-> b) = Var ::-> (select u v a b)
instance (Comparer (CmpSymbol u v) => OrdH (u ::-> a) (v ::-> b) where
  minH (u ::-> a) (v ::-> b) = Var ::-> (select u v a b)
```

```haskell
class Proxy o -> p -> q -> (Choose o p q)
instance Proxy LT where choose _ _ _ = p q = p
instance Proxy EQ where choose _ _ _ = p q = p
instance Proxy GT where choose _ _ _ = p q = q
```