

# Relators and Metric Bisimulations

(Extended Abstract)

J.J.M.M. Rutten

*CWI*

*P.O. Box 94079, 1090 GB Amsterdam*

*The Netherlands*

*Email: [janr@cwi.nl](mailto:janr@cwi.nl), URL: [www.cwi.nl/~janr](http://www.cwi.nl/~janr)*

## Abstract

Coalgebras of set functors preserving weak pullbacks are particularly well-behaved. Invoking a result by Carboni, Kelly, and Wood (1990), we show that this can be explained by the fact that such functors can be uniquely extended to a *relator*. This insight next suggests a definition of metric bisimulation.

## 1 Preliminaries

Let  $F : Set \rightarrow Set$  be a functor. An  $F$ -coalgebra is a pair  $(S, \alpha_S)$  consisting of a set  $S$  and a function  $\alpha_S : S \rightarrow F(S)$ . Let  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$  be two  $F$ -coalgebras. A function  $f : S \rightarrow T$  is a homomorphism of  $F$ -coalgebras, or  $F$ -homomorphism, if  $F(f) \circ \alpha_S = \alpha_T \circ f$ . The collection of  $F$ -coalgebras and  $F$ -homomorphisms forms a category, denoted by  $Set_F$ . A relation  $R \subseteq S \times T$  is called an  $F$ -bisimulation [AM89] between  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$  if there exists an  $F$ -coalgebra structure  $\alpha_R : R \rightarrow F(R)$  on  $R$  such that the projections  $\pi_1 : R \rightarrow S$  and  $\pi_2 : R \rightarrow T$  are  $F$ -homomorphisms. The following proposition is readily proved.

**Proposition 1.1** *A function  $f : S \rightarrow T$  is a homomorphism iff its graph  $\phi(f) = \{\langle s, f(s) \rangle \mid s \in S\}$  is a (functional)  $F$ -bisimulation.*

As we shall see, the following two observations turn out to be closely related, and are best understood in the world of relators, to be introduced in Section 2.

**Theorem 1.2** *A relation  $R \subseteq S \times T$  is an  $F$ -bisimulation iff for all  $s$  in  $S$  and  $t$  in  $T$ ,*

$$\langle s, t \rangle \in R \Rightarrow \langle \alpha_S(s), \alpha_T(t) \rangle \in F(\pi_2) \circ F(\pi_1)^{-1},$$

*where the latter term denotes the relational composition of the inverse of  $F(\pi_1)$  followed by  $F(\pi_2)$ .*

URL: <http://www.elsevier.nl/locate/entcs/volume11.html>

©1998 Published by Elsevier Science B. V.

**Theorem 1.3** *If a functor  $F : Set \rightarrow Set$  preserves weak pullbacks then the category  $Set_F$  is particularly well-behaved [Rut96]:*

- (i) *The composition of two  $F$ -bisimulations is again an  $F$ -bisimulation.*
- (ii) *If  $F$  has a final coalgebra  $(P, \pi)$  then for any  $F$ -coalgebra  $(S, \alpha_S)$ , the by finality unique  $F$ -homomorphism  $f : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (P, \pi)$  identifies precisely those elements of  $S$  that are bisimilar:  $f(s) = f(s')$  iff there exists an  $F$ -bisimulation  $R$  on  $(S, \alpha_S)$  with  $\langle s, s' \rangle \in R$ .*

## 2 Relators

Let  $Rel$  be the category with sets as objects and relations as arrows. Identity arrows are given, for any set  $S$ , by  $\Delta_S = \{\langle s, s \rangle \mid s \in S\}$ . Composition is given by the usual relational composition, which we shall write in the same order as composition of functions; i.e., for relations  $R \subseteq S \times T$  and  $Q \subseteq T \times U$ ,

$$Q \circ R = \{\langle s, u \rangle \in S \times U \mid \exists t \in T, \langle s, t \rangle \in R \text{ and } \langle t, u \rangle \in Q\}.$$

A functor  $\mathcal{F} : Rel \rightarrow Rel$  is called a *relator*<sup>1</sup>. Notably, relators preserve identities and composition:  $\mathcal{F}(\Delta_S) = \Delta_{\mathcal{F}(S)}$ , and  $\mathcal{F}(Q \circ R) = \mathcal{F}(Q) \circ \mathcal{F}(R)$ .

A well-known fact is that the category  $Set$  can be embedded into the category  $Rel$  by the functor  $\phi : Set \rightarrow Rel$  which is the identity on sets and maps a function  $f : S \rightarrow T$  to its graph  $\phi(f)$ . We say that a functor  $\mathcal{F} : Rel \rightarrow Rel$  *extends* a functor  $F : Set \rightarrow Set$  if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (i) For all sets  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{F}(S) = F(S)$ .
- (ii) For all functions  $f : S \rightarrow T$ ,  $\mathcal{F}(\phi(f)) = \phi(F(f))$ .

In other words, on the subcategory  $Set$  of  $Rel$ , the functor  $\mathcal{F}$  essentially behaves like  $F$ . One can easily prove that extensions are unique, and are locally monotone: if  $R \subseteq Q$  then  $\mathcal{F}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(Q)$ . Often the extension  $\mathcal{F}$  will be denoted again by  $F$ .

Many functors on  $Set$  have a (unique) extension to  $Rel$ . The following theorem, due to Carboni, Kelly, and Wood, makes precise which ones.

**Theorem 2.1** [CKW90]

*A functor  $F : Set \rightarrow Set$  can be extended to a relator  $\mathcal{F} : Rel \rightarrow Rel$  iff the functor  $F$  preserves weak pullbacks. In that case, the extension  $\mathcal{F}$  is given, for any relation  $R \subseteq S \times T$  with projections  $\pi_1 : R \rightarrow S$  and  $\pi_2 : R \rightarrow T$ , by*

$$\mathcal{F}(R) = F(\pi_2) \circ F(\pi_1)^{-1}.$$

*(Equivalently,  $\mathcal{F}(R)$  is the image of the function  $\langle F(\pi_1), F(\pi_2) \rangle : F(R) \rightarrow F(S) \times F(T)$ .)*

---

<sup>1</sup> The notion of relator has been defined by different authors in different ways. Relators also play a role in certain algebraic approaches to programming; see [BdM97] and the references therein.

In fact, [CKW90] contains the following more general version of the theorem above: Any endofunctor  $F$  on a regular category can be extended to the corresponding category of relations iff 1.  $F$  preserves strong epimorphisms, and 2.  $F$  nearly preserves pullbacks. The above theorem on  $Set$  is an immediate consequence of this more general statement, since condition 1 is trivially fulfilled for any endofunctor on  $Set$ , and condition 2 is equivalent to the preservation of weak pullbacks.

**Example 2.2** *The definitions of the following relators, which are all stemming from weak-pullback-preserving functors, follow from Theorem 2.1. Let  $A$  be an arbitrary set and  $R$  a relation on sets  $S$  and  $T$ .*

- (i) *The relator  $A \times (-) : Rel \rightarrow Rel$  is defined on sets as usual and on relations by*

$$\langle \langle a, s \rangle, \langle b, t \rangle \rangle \in A \times R \text{ iff } a = b \text{ and } \langle s, t \rangle \in R.$$

- (ii) *For  $A \rightarrow (-) : Rel \rightarrow Rel$ , we have*

$$\langle f, g \rangle \in A \rightarrow R \text{ iff } \forall a \in A, \langle f(a), g(a) \rangle \in R.$$

- (iii) *The powerset functor extends to a relator  $\mathcal{P} : Rel \rightarrow Rel$  assigning to a set the collection of all its subsets, and to a relation  $R$  the following relation:*

$$\langle V, W \rangle \in \mathcal{P}(R) \text{ iff } \forall v \in V \exists w \in W, \langle v, w \rangle \in R \text{ and} \\ \forall w \in W \exists v \in V, \langle v, w \rangle \in R.$$

### 3 Coalgebras of relators

In this section, let  $F$  be a functor that preserves weak pullbacks and hence extends to a relator, again denoted by  $F$ . Let the category  $Rel_F$  be defined as follows. Objects are, as before, coalgebras  $(S, \alpha_S)$ , consisting of a set  $S$  and a function  $\alpha_S : S \rightarrow F(S)$ . Arrows between coalgebras  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$  are relations  $R \subseteq S \times T$  such that

$$\langle s, t \rangle \in R \Rightarrow \langle \alpha_S(s), \alpha_T(t) \rangle \in F(R).$$

This definition generalizes an earlier definition of Hermida and Jacobs [HJ98] for polynomial functors to the case of arbitrary (weak-pullback-preserving) functors. (See also [Len98].)

The following is immediate by Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 2.1.

**Corollary 3.1** *Let  $(S, \alpha_S)$  and  $(T, \alpha_T)$  be two  $F$ -coalgebras. A relation  $R \subseteq S \times T$  is an  $F$ -bisimulation iff  $R : (S, \alpha_S) \rightarrow (T, \alpha_T)$  is an arrow in  $Rel_F$ .*

The above corollary establishes an equivalence between the definition of  $F$ -bisimulation in the style of Aczel and Mendler, on the one hand, and a definition of bisimulation in the style of Milner and Park [Mil80,Par81], on the other. For a prototypical example, consider the relator  $\mathcal{P}(A \times -) : Rel \rightarrow Rel$ , the coalgebras of which are  $(A)$ -labelled transition systems. Writing  $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$  for  $\langle a, s' \rangle \in \alpha_S(s)$ , for a coalgebra  $(S, \alpha_S)$  of  $\mathcal{P}(A \times -)$ , we have:

$R$  is a  $\mathcal{P}(A \times -)$ -bisimulation  
 iff  $R$  is an arrow in the category  $Rel_{\mathcal{P}(A \times -)}$   
 iff  $\langle s, t \rangle \in R \Rightarrow \langle \alpha_S(s), \alpha_T(t) \rangle \in \mathcal{P}(A \times R)$   
 iff  $\langle s, t \rangle \in R \Rightarrow \forall s \xrightarrow{a} s' \exists t' \xleftarrow{a} t, \langle s', t' \rangle \in R$   
     and  $\forall t \xrightarrow{a} t' \exists s' \xleftarrow{a} s, \langle s', t' \rangle \in R$ .

There is also the following corollary of Corollary 3.1 and Proposition 1.1.

**Corollary 3.2** *The embedding  $\phi : Set \rightarrow Rel$  can be extended to an embedding  $\phi : Set_F \rightarrow Rel_F$ .*

We briefly return to the second observation (Theorem 1.3) of Section 1. The fact that  $Set_F$  is well-behaved for functors  $F$  that preserve weak pullbacks is best explained by the fact that for such functors,  $Set_F$  is in essence a subcategory of  $Rel_F$ . For instance, the fact that the composition of bisimulations is again a bisimulation is equivalent to the observation that  $Rel_F$  indeed is a category, that is,  $Rel_F$  is closed under composition of arrows. Working in the ‘larger’ category  $Rel_F$  has some additional advantages. For instance, the greatest bisimulation relation (bisimilarity) on an  $F$ -coalgebra  $(S, \alpha_S)$  can be characterized, as in the original definitions of Milner and Park, as the largest (post-)fixpoint of the following monotone operator  $\Lambda : \mathcal{P}(S \times S) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S \times S)$ , defined, for  $R \subseteq S \times S$ , by

$$\langle s, s' \rangle \in \Lambda(R) \text{ iff } \langle \alpha_S(s), \alpha_S(s') \rangle \in F(R).$$

Using  $\Lambda$ , the *coinduction* proof principle for a final  $F$ -coalgebra  $(P, \pi)$ , looks like

$$\Delta_P = \bigcup \{R \mid R \subseteq \Lambda(R)\}.$$

## 4 Metric bisimulations

In this section, we sketch how to extend the framework of sets and relations to metric spaces, which are, in some sense, more expressive. We give a few examples of dynamical systems on metric spaces  $X$ :

- (i) One-dimensional discrete-time dynamical systems, which are continuous functions  $f : X \rightarrow X$ .
- (ii) Contractions  $f : \mathcal{P}_c(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_c(X)$  on the space of compact subsets of  $X$  are of particular interest, since their unique fixed points can be used to model fractals.
- (iii) Probabilistic transition systems can be modelled by continuous functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$ , which map a state  $x$  in  $X$  to a Borel measure on  $X$ .

Taking Lawvere’s [Law73] enriched-categorical view on metric spaces, the categories of interest are  $Met$  and  $MRel$ . The objects in  $Met$  are (generalized) metric spaces  $X$ , which consist of a set  $X$  and a distance function  $d_X$  taking values in  $[0, \infty]$ ; arrows are non-expansive functions. (See [BBR98] for a

detailed account of generalized metric spaces.) The category  $MRel$  has the same objects, and arrows are what we shall call *metric relations*, also called bimodules or distributors. A metric relation  $\Phi : X \rightrightarrows Y$  is a non-expansive function  $\Phi : Y^{op} \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]^2$ . A metric relation  $\Phi$  can be thought of as a fuzzy relation; it measures for any  $y$  and  $x$  the amount  $\Phi(y, x)$  to which these elements are related by  $\Phi$  ('the smaller this number the better'). The composition  $\Psi \circ \Phi : X \rightrightarrows Z$  of metric relations  $\Phi : X \rightrightarrows Y$  and  $\Psi : Y \rightrightarrows Z$  is given by the following 'least cost' composition:

$$\Psi \circ \Phi(z, x) = \inf_{y \in Y} \{\Phi(y, x) + \Psi(z, y)\}.$$

The distance function  $d_X : X^{op} \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  on a metric space  $X$  is an identity for this composition.

As with sets and relations, there exists an embedding functor  $G : Met \rightarrow MRel$ , which is the identity on metric spaces, and maps a non-expansive function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  to its fuzzy graph, defined by  $G(f)(y, x) = d_Y(y, f(x))$ .

A *metric relator* is now any endofunctor on the category  $MRel$ . As before, we say that a functor  $\mathcal{F} : MRel \rightarrow MRel$  extends a functor  $F : Met \rightarrow Met$  if it commutes with the functor  $G : Met \rightarrow MRel$ :  $\mathcal{F} \circ G = G \circ F$ . The guiding principle in extending a functor  $F$  on  $Met$  to a functor  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $MRel$  is the fact that  $F$  is already defined on one particular kind of metric relation:  $F$  assigns to any set and distance function again a set and a distance function. Distance functions are identity metric relations, so we already know what  $\mathcal{F}$  should look like on those. And this can often be easily generalized to arbitrary metric relations.

This may be illustrated by the following example. Let  $\mathcal{P} : Met \rightarrow Met$  be defined as the powerset functor on metric spaces, assigning to a metric space  $X$  the collection of subsets of  $X$ , with the familiar Hausdorff distance:

$$d_{\mathcal{P}(X)}(V, W) = \max \left\{ \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{w \in W} d_X(v, w), \sup_{w \in W} \inf_{v \in V} d_X(v, w) \right\}.$$

Now  $\mathcal{P}$  can be extended to  $MRel$  by defining, for any metric relation  $\Phi : X \rightrightarrows Y$ , a relation  $\mathcal{P}(\Phi) : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightrightarrows \mathcal{P}(Y)$ , given by

$$\mathcal{P}(\Phi)(V, W) = \max \left\{ \sup_{v \in V} \inf_{w \in W} \Phi(v, w), \sup_{w \in W} \inf_{v \in V} \Phi(v, w) \right\}.$$

This definition generalizes in a very precise sense the definition of the powerset relator (read 'max' as 'and', 'sup' as 'for all', and 'inf' as 'there exists').

Let  $F : Met \rightarrow Met$  be a functor with a (unique) extension, denoted by the same symbol,  $F : MRel \rightarrow MRel$ . The category  $MRel_F$  is defined as follows: objects are  $F$ -coalgebras  $(X, \alpha_X)$ , consisting of a metric space  $X$  and a non-expansive function  $\alpha_X : X \rightarrow F(X)$ . Arrows in  $MRel_F$  are *metric bisimulations*: given two metric  $F$ -coalgebras  $(X, \alpha_X)$  and  $(Y, \alpha_Y)$ , a metric  $F$ -bisimulation is a metric relation  $\Phi : X \rightrightarrows Y$  satisfying

$$F(\Phi)(\alpha_Y(y), \alpha_X(x)) \leq \Phi(y, x).$$

---

<sup>2</sup> The space  $Y^{op}$  is like  $Y$  but with distance  $d_{Y^{op}}(y, y') = d_Y(y', y)$ . Note that generalized distances are generally non-symmetric.

Examples of metric bisimulations are bismulations ‘up-to-depth- $n$ ’. An early example can be found in [TR98].

The goal will now be to develop a theory of metric coalgebras and bisimulations along the lines of the theory of (universal) coalgebra for sets. As an example of a theorem in such a theory, there is the following principle of *metric coinduction*.

**Theorem 4.1** *Under reasonable conditions<sup>3</sup> on the functor  $F$ , the distance function  $d_P$  of a final  $F$ -coalgebra  $(P, \pi)$  satisfies:*

$$d_P = \inf \{ \Phi \mid \Phi \text{ is a metric bisimulation on } (P, \pi) \}.$$

Again, this generalizes in a precise sense the coinduction principle for final coalgebras of endofunctors on *Set* (formulated at the very end of Section 3).

## References

- [AM89] P. Aczel and N. Mendler. A final coalgebra theorem. In D.H. Pitt, D.E. Ryeheard, P. Dybjer, A. M. Pitts, and A. Poigne, editors, *Proceedings category theory and computer science*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 357–365, 1989.
- [BBR98] M.M. Bonsangue, F. van Breugel, and J.J.M.M. Rutten. Generalized metric spaces: completion, topology, and powerdomains via the Yoneda embedding. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 193:1–51, 1998.
- [BdM97] R. Bird and O. de Moor. *Algebra of programming*. Prentice Hall International, 1997.
- [CKW90] A. Carboni, G.M. Kelly, and R.J. Wood. A 2-categorical approach to change of base and geometric morphisms I. Report 90-1, Department of Pure Mathematics, University of Sydney, 1990. ISSN 1033-2359.
- [HJ98] C. Hermida and B. Jacobs. Structural induction and coinduction in a fibrational setting. To appear in *Information and Computation*, 1998.
- [Law73] F.W. Lawvere. Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano*, 43:135–166, 1973.
- [Len98] M. Lenisa. *Themes in final semantics*. PhD thesis, University of Udine, Udine, Italy, 1998.
- [Mil80] R. Milner. *A Calculus of Communicating Systems*, volume 92 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980.

---

<sup>3</sup> The functor  $F$  should preserve (forward) completeness, and be locally non-expansive and continuous.

- [Par81] D.M.R. Park. Concurrency and automata on infinite sequences. In P. Deussen, editor, *Proceedings 5th GI conference*, volume 104 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 15–32. Springer-Verlag, 1981.
- [Rut96] J.J.M.M. Rutten. Universal coalgebra: a theory of systems. Report CS-R9652, CWI, 1996. FTP-available at `ftp.cwi.nl` as `pub/CWIreports/AP/CS-R9652.ps.Z`.
- [TR98] D. Turi and J.J.M.M. Rutten. On the foundations of final coalgebra semantics: non-well-founded sets, partial orders, metric spaces. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 1998. To appear.