Guaranteed Bounds for Posterior Inference in Universal Probabilistic Programming


Abstract

We propose a new method to approximate the posterior distribution of probabilistic programs by means of computing *guaranteed* bounds. The starting point of our work is an interval-based trace semantics for a recursive, higher-order probabilistic programming language with continuous distributions. Taking the form of (super-/subadditive) measures, these lower/upper bounds are non-stochastic and provably correct: using the semantics, we prove that the actual posterior of a given program is sandwiched between the lower and upper bounds (soundness); moreover the bounds converge to the posterior (completeness). As a practical and sound approximation, we introduce a weight-aware interval type system, which automatically infers interval bounds on not just the return value but also weight of program executions, simultaneously. We have built a tool implementation, called GuBPI, which automatically computes these posterior lower/upper bounds. Our evaluation on examples from the literature shows that the bounds are useful, and can even be used to recognize wrong outputs from stochastic posterior inference procedures.
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1 Introduction

Probabilistic programming is a rapidly developing discipline at the interface of programming and Bayesian statistics [30, 31, 59]. The idea is to express probabilistic models (incorporating the prior distributions) and the observed data as programs, and to use a general-purpose Bayesian inference engine, which acts directly on these programs, to find the posterior distribution given the observations.

Some of the most influential probabilistic programming languages (PPLs) used in practice are *universal* (i.e. the underlying language is Turing-complete); e.g. Church [29], Anglican [58], Gen [17], Pyro [5] and Turing [23]. Using stochastic branching, recursion and higher-order features, universal PPLs can express arbitrarily complex models. For instance, these language constructs can be used to incorporate probabilistic context free grammars [40], statistical phylogenetics [49], and even physics simulations [3] into probabilistic models. However, expressivity of the PPL comes at the cost of complicating the posterior inference. Consider, for example, the following problem from [38, 39].

Example 1.1 (Pedestrian). A pedestrian has gotten lost on a long road and only knows that they are a random distance between 0 and 3 km from their home. They repeatedly walk a uniformly random distance of at most 1 km in either direction, until they find their home. When they arrive, a step counter tells them that they have traveled a distance of 1.1 km in total. We assume that the measured distance is normally distributed around the true distance with standard deviation 0.1 km. Given this observation, what is the posterior distribution of the starting point? We can specify this as a probabilistic program as follows:

```plaintext
let start = sample uniform(0, 3) in
letrec walk x =
    if x ≤ 0 then 0 else
    let step = sample uniform(0, 1) in
    step + walk(x + step) \theta_{0.5} (x - step)
let distance = walk(start) in
observe distance from Normal(1.1, 0.1);
start
```

Here `sample uniform(a, b)` samples a uniform value in `[a, b]`, `M \theta_{0.5} N` is (fair) probabilistic branching, and `observe M from D` observes the value of `M` from distribution `D`. 
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Example 1.1 is a challenging model for inference algorithms in several regards: not only does the program use stochastic branching and recursion, but the number of random variables generated is unbounded — it’s nonparametric [27, 35, 39]. To approximate the posterior distribution of the program, we apply two standard inference algorithms: likelihood-weighted importance sampling (IS), a simple algorithm that works well on low-dimensional models with few observations [46]; and Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) [20], a successful MCMC algorithm that uses gradient information to efficiently explore the parameter space of high-dimensional models. Figure 1 shows the results of the two inference methods as implemented in Anglican [58] (for IS) and Pyro [5] (for HMC): they clearly disagree! But how is the user supposed to know which (if any) of the two results is correct?

Note that exact inference methods (i.e. methods that try to compute a closed form solution of the posterior inference problem using computer algebra and other forms of symbolic computation) such as PSI [24, 25], Hakaru [44], Dice [36], and SPPL [52] are only applicable to non-recursive models, and so they don’t work for Example 1.1.

1.1 Guaranteed Bounds

The above example illustrates central problems with both approximate stochastic and exact inference methods. For approximate methods, there are no guarantees for the results they output after a finite amount of time, leading to unclear inference results (as seen in Fig. 1). For exact methods, the symbolic engine may fail to find a closed-form description of the posterior distribution and, more importantly, they are only applicable to very restricted classes of programs (most notably, non-recursive models).

Instead of computing approximate or exact results, this work is concerned with computing guaranteed bounds on the posterior distribution of a probabilistic program. Concretely, given a probabilistic program \( P \) and a measurable set \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) (given as an interval), we infer upper and lower bounds on \([P](X)\) (formally defined in Section 2), i.e. the posterior probability of \( P \) on \( X \).

Such bounds provide a ground truth to compare approximate inference results with: if the approximate results violate the bounds, the inference algorithm has not converged yet or is even ill-suited to the program in question. Crucially, our method is applicable to arbitrary (and in particular recursive) programs of a universal PPL. For Example 1.1, the bounds computed by our method (which we give in Section 7) are tight enough to separate the IS and HMC output. In this case, our method infers that the results given by HMC are wrong (i.e. violate the guaranteed bounds) whereas the IS results are plausible (i.e. lie within the guaranteed bounds). To the best of our knowledge, no existing methods can provide such definite answers for programs of a universal PPL.

1.2 Contributions

The starting point of our work is an interval-based operational semantics [4]. In our semantics we evaluate a program on interval traces (i.e. sequences of intervals of reals with endpoints between 0 and 1) to approximate the outcomes of sampling, and use interval arithmetic [18] to approximate numerical operations (Section 3). Our semantics is sound in the sense that any (pairwise compatible and exhaustive) set of interval traces yields lower and upper bounds on the posterior distribution of a program. These lower/upper bounds are themselves super-/subadditive measures. Moreover, under mild conditions (mostly restrictions on primitive operations), our semantics is also complete, i.e. for any \( \epsilon > 0 \) there exists a countable pairwise compatible set of interval traces that provides \( \epsilon \)-tight bounds on the posterior. Our proofs hinge on a combination of stochastic symbolic execution and the convergence of Riemann sums, providing a natural correspondence between our interval trace semantics and the theory of (Riemann) integration (Section 4).

Based on our interval trace semantics, we present a practical algorithm to automate the computation of guaranteed bounds. It employs an interval type system (together with constraint-based type inference) that bounds both the value of an expression in a refinement-type fashion and the score weight of any evaluation thereof. The (interval) bounds inferred by our type system fit naturally in the domain of
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Figure 1. Histogram of samples from the posterior distribution of Example 1.1 and wrong samples produced by the probabilistic programming system Pyro.
our semantics. This enables a sound approximation of the behaviour of a program with finitely many interval traces (Section 5).

We implemented our approach in a tool called GuBPI\(^3\) (Guaranteed Bounds for Posterior Inference), pronounced “guppy”, described in Section 6, and evaluate it on a suite of benchmarks from the literature \([24, 25, 53]\). We find that the bounds computed by GuBPI are competitive in many cases where the posterior could already be inferred exactly. Moreover, GuBPI's bounds are useful (in the sense that they are precise enough to e.g. rule out erroneous approximate results as in Fig. 1) for recursive models that could not be handled rigorously by any method before (Section 7).

### 1.3 Scope and Limitations

The contributions of this paper are of both theoretical and practical interests. On the theoretical side, our novel semantics underpins a sound and deterministic method to compute guaranteed bounds on program denotations. As shown by our completeness theorem, this analysis is applicable—in the sense that it computes arbitrarily tight bounds—to a very guaranteed bounds on program denotations. As shown by our completeness theorem, this analysis is applicable—in the sense that it computes arbitrarily tight bounds—to a very broad class of programs. On the practical side, our analyser GuBPI implements (an optimised version of) our semantics. As is usual for exact/guaranteed\(^4\) methods, our semantics considers an exponential number of program paths, and partitions each sampled value into a finite number of interval approximations. Consequently, GuBPI generally struggles with high-dimensional models. We believe GuBPI to be most useful for unit-testing of implementations of Bayesian inference algorithms such as Example 1.1, or to compute results on (recursive) programs when non-stochastic bounds are needed.

### 2 Background

#### 2.1 Basic Probability Theory and Notation

We assume familiarity with basic probability theory, and refer to \([48]\) for details. Here we just fix notations. A measurable space is a pair \((\Omega, \Sigma_\Omega)\) where \(\Omega\) is a set (of outcomes) and \(\Sigma_\Omega \subseteq 2^\Omega\) is a \(\sigma\)-algebra defining the measurable subsets of \(\Omega\). A measure on \((\Omega, \Sigma_\Omega)\) is a function \(\mu : \Sigma_\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{0\}\) that satisfies \(\mu(\emptyset) = 0\) and is \(\sigma\)-additive. For \(\mathbb{R}^n\), we write \(\Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^n}\) for the Borel \(\sigma\)-algebra and \(\lambda_n\) for the Lebesgue measure on \((\mathbb{R}^n, \Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^n})\). The Lebesgue integral of a measurable function \(f\) with respect to a measure \(\mu\) is written \(\int f \, d\mu\) or \(\int f(x) \, d\mu(x)\). Given a predicate \(\psi\) on \(\Omega\), we define the Iverson brackets \([\psi] : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) by mapping all elements that satisfy \(\psi\) to 1 and all others to 0. For \(A \in \Sigma_\Omega\) we define the bounded integral \(\int_A f \, d\mu := \int f(x) \cdot [x \in A] \, d\mu\).

\(^3\)GuBPI is available at \url{gubpi-tool.github.io}.
\(^4\)By “exact/guaranteed methods”, we mean inference algorithms that compute deterministic (non-stochastic) results about the mathematical denotation of a program. In particular, they are correct with probability 1, contrary to stochastic methods.

\[\begin{align*}
\Gamma \vdash \text{sample} : \mathbb{R} & \quad \Gamma \vdash \text{score}(M) : \mathbb{R} \\
\Gamma, \varphi : \alpha \rightarrow \beta, x : \alpha \vdash M : \beta & \quad \Gamma \vdash \{M_1 : R\}_{i=1}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\
\Gamma \vdash \mu_\varphi^M, M : \alpha \rightarrow \beta & \quad \Gamma \vdash \{M_1 : R\}_{i=1}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}
\end{align*}\]

\(^5\)In Bayesian terms, an observe statement multiplies the likelihood function by the probability (density) of the observation \([53]\) (as we have used in Example 1.1). Scoring makes this explicit by keeping a weight for each program execution \([7]\). Observing a value \(v\) from a distribution \(D\) then simply multiplies the current weight by \(pdf_D(v)\) where \(pdf_D\) is the probability density function of \(D\) (for continuous distributions) or the probability mass function of \(D\) (for discrete distributions).
2.3 Trace Semantics

Following [7], we endow SPCF with a trace-based operational semantics. We evaluate a probabilistic program \( P \) on a fixed trace \( s = \langle r_1, \ldots, r_n \rangle \in T := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [0,1]^n \), which predetermines the probabilistic choices made during the evaluation. Our semantics therefore operates on configurations of the form \( (M, s, w) \) where \( M \) is an SPCF term, \( s \) is a trace and \( w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) a weight. The call-by-value (CbV) reduction is given by the rules in Fig. 2, where \( E[\cdot] \) denotes a CbV evaluation context. The definition is standard [4, 7, 38]. Given a program \( \vdash P : R \), we call a trace \( s \) terminating just if \( (P, s, 1) \rightarrow^* (V, (\cdot), w) \) for some value \( V \) and weight \( w \), i.e. if the samples drawn are as specified by \( s \), the program \( P \) terminates. Note that we require the trace \( s \) to be completely used up. As \( P \) is of type \( R \) we can assume that \( V = \tau \) for some \( \tau \in R \). Moreover (given \( P \)) each terminating \( s \) uniquely determines the returned value \( V \) where \( r := \text{val}_P(s) \in \mathbb{R} \), and the weight \( w := \text{wt}_P(s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \), of the execution. For a nonterminating trace \( s \), \( \text{val}_P(s) \) is undefined and \( \text{wt}_P(s) := 0 \).

Example 2.1. For an illustration, consider Example 1.1. On the terminating trace \( s = \langle 0.4, 0.1, 0.2, 0.8, 0.7 \rangle \in [0,1]^5 \subseteq T \) we recurze twice and obtain:
\[
\text{val}_P(s) = 0.4, \quad \text{wt}_P(s) = \text{pdf}_{\text{Normal}(1,0,1)}(0.9).
\]

In order to do measure theory, we need to turn our set of traces into a measurable space. The trace space \( T \) is equipped with the \( \sigma \)-algebra \( \Sigma_T := \{ \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n \mid U_n \in \Sigma_{[0,1]^n} \} \) where \( \Sigma_{[0,1]^n} \) is the Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra on \([0,1]^n\) \( \). We define a measure \( \mu_T \) by \( \mu_T(U) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda_n(U \cap [0,1]^n) \) \( \) \( \). We can now define the semantics of an SPCF program \( \vdash P : R \) by using the weight and returned value of (executions of \( P \) determined by) individual traces. Given \( U \in \Sigma_R \), we need to define the likelihood of \( P \) evaluating to a value in \( U \). To this end, we set \( \text{val}_P^\bullet(U) := \{ s \in T \mid (P, s, 1) \rightarrow^* (r, (\cdot), w), r \in U \} \), i.e. the set of traces on which the program \( P \) reduces to a value in \( U \). As shown in [7, Lem. 9], \( \text{val}_P^\bullet(U) \) is measurable. Thus, we can define (cf. [7, 38])
\[
\mathbb{E}[P](U) := \int_{\text{val}_P^\bullet(U)} \text{wt}_P(s) \, \text{pdf}_s(ds).
\]

That is, the integral takes all traces \( s \) on which \( P \) evaluates to a value in \( U \), weighting each \( s \) with the weight \( \text{wt}_P(s) \) of the corresponding execution. A program \( P \) is called almost surely terminating (AST) if it terminates with probability \( 1 \), i.e. \( \mu_T(\text{val}_P^\bullet(\mathbb{R})) = 1 \). This is a necessary assumption for approximate inference algorithms (since they execute the program). See [7] for a more in-depth discussion of this (standard) sampling-style semantics.

Normalizing constant and integrability. In Bayesian statistics, one is usually interested in the normalised posterior, which is a conditional probability distribution. We can obtain the normalised denotation as posterior \( P := \frac{[P](\mathbb{R})}{Z_P} \) where \( Z_P := \mathbb{E}[P](\mathbb{R}) \) is the normalising constant. We call \( P \) integrable if \( 0 < Z_P < \infty \). The bounds computed in this paper (on the unnormalised denotation \( [P] \)) allow us to compute bounds on the normalizing constant \( Z_P \), and thereby also on the normalised denotation. All bounds reported in this paper (in particular in Section 7) refer to the normalised denotation.

3 Interval Trace Semantics

In order to obtain guaranteed bounds on the distribution denotation \( [P] \) (and also on posterior \( P \)) of a program \( P \), we present an interval-based semantics. In our semantics we approximate the outcomes of sample with intervals and handle arithmetic operations by means of interval arithmetic (similar to the approach by Beutner and Ong [4] in the context of termination analysis). Our semantics enables us to reason about the denotation of a program without considering the uncountable space of traces explicitly.

3.1 Interval Arithmetic

For our purposes, an interval has the form \([a,b]\) which denotes the set \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R} \mid a \leq x \leq b \} \), where \( a \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\} \), \( b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \), and \( a \leq b \). For consistency, we write \([0,\infty)\) instead of the more typical \([0,\infty)\). For \( X \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty,\infty\} \), we denote by \( \mathbb{I}_X \) the set of intervals with endpoints in \( X \), and simply write \( \mathbb{I} \) for \( \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{R}(\{-\infty,\infty\})} \). We call an \( n \)-tuple of intervals an \( n \)-dimensional box.

We can lift functions on real numbers to intervals as follows: for each \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) we define \( f^\bullet : \mathbb{I}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{I} \) by
\[
f^\bullet([a_1, b_1], \ldots, [a_n, b_n]) := [\inf F, \sup F]
\]
where \( F := f([a_1, b_1], \ldots, [a_n, b_n]) \). For constants \( c \in \mathbb{R} \) (i.e. nullary functions), and common functions like \(+, -, \cdot, \cdot\), \( \min, \max \), and monotonically increasing/decreasing functions \( f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), their interval-lifted counterparts can easily be computed, from the values of the original function on just the endpoints of the input interval. For example, constants become point intervals \( c^\bullet = [c, c] \), and addition lifts to \([a_1, b_1] +^\bullet [a_2, b_2] = [a_1 + a_2, b_1 + b_2] \); similarly for multiplication \( \cdot^\bullet \).

3.2 Interval Traces and Interval SPCF

In our interval interpretation, probabilistic programs are run on interval traces. An interval trace, \( \langle i_1, \ldots, i_n \rangle \in T_I := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (I_{[0,1]})^n \), is a finite sequence of intervals \( i_1, \ldots, i_n \), each with endpoints between 0 and 1. To distinguish ordinary traces \( s \in T \) from interval traces \( t \in T_I \), we call the former concrete traces.

We define the refinement relation \( s \) between concrete and interval traces as follows: for \( s = \langle r_1, \ldots, r_n \rangle \in T \) and \( t = \langle i_1, \ldots, i_m \rangle \in T_I \), we define \( s \triangleright t \) just if \( n = m \) and for all \( i, r_i \in I_i \). For each interval trace \( t \), we denote by \( \langle t \rangle := \{ s \in T \mid s \triangleright t \} \) the set of all refinements of \( t \).

To define a reduction of a term on an interval trace, we extend SPCF with interval literals \([a, b]\), which replace the literals \( \tau \) but are still considered values of type \( R \). In fact, \( \tau \)
We define the *volume* of an interval trace $t = ([a_1, b_1], \ldots, [a_n, b_n])$ as $\text{vol}(t) := \prod_{i=1}^{n} (b_i - a_i)$.

Let $T \subseteq T_1$ be a countable set of pairwise compatible interval traces. Define the lower bound on $[P]$ by

$$\text{lowerBd}_T^P(U) := \sum_{t \in T} \text{vol}(t) \cdot (\min \text{wt}_P(t)) \cdot \text{val}_P(t) \subseteq U$$

for $U \in \Sigma_\mathbb{R}$. Note that in general lowerBd$_T^P$ is not a measure, but merely a superadditive measure.\(^7\)

**Upper bounds.** For upper bounds, we require the notion of a set of interval traces being *exhaustive*, which is easiest to express in terms of infinite traces. Let $T_\infty := [0, 1]^{\omega}$ be the set of infinite traces. Every interval trace $t$ covers the set of infinite traces with a prefix contained in $t$, i.e. $\text{cover}(t) := (t) \times T_\infty$ (where the Cartesian product $\times$ can be viewed as trace concatenation). A countable set of (finite) interval traces $T \subseteq T_1$ is called exhaustive if $\bigcup_{t \in T} \text{cover}(t)$ covers almost all of $T_\infty$, i.e. $\mu_{T_\infty}(T_\infty \setminus \bigcup_{t \in T} \text{cover}(t)) = 0.\(^8\)$ Phrased differently, almost all concrete traces must have a finite prefix that is contained in some interval trace in $T$; the analysis in the interval semantics on $T$ therefore covers the behaviour on almost all concrete traces (in the original semantics).

**Example 3.1.** (i) The singleton set $\{(\langle 0, 1 \rangle, \langle 0, 0.6 \rangle)\}$ is not exhaustive as, for example, all infinite traces $(r_1, r_2, \cdots)$ with $r_2 > 0.6$ are not covered. (ii) The set $\{\langle (0, 0.6) \rangle, \langle (0.3, 1) \rangle\}$ is exhaustive, but not pairwise compatible. (iii) Define $T_1 := \{\langle (\frac{1}{2}, 1)^{-n}, [0, 1/2] \rangle \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $T_2 := \{\langle (\frac{1}{2}, 1)^{-n}, [0, 1/2] \rangle \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ where $x^{-n}$ denotes $n$-fold repetition of $x$. $T_1$ is pairwise compatible but not exhaustive. For example, it doesn’t cover the set $\{\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle \times (\langle \frac{1}{2}, 1 \rangle \times T_\infty, \cdots \}$ where $r_1 \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ and $r_2 \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. $T_2$ is pairwise compatible and exhaustive (the set of non-covered traces $\{\frac{1}{2}, 1\}^{\omega}$ has measure 0).

Let $T \subseteq T_1$ be an exhaustive set of interval traces. Define the upper bound on $[P]$ by

$$\text{upperBd}_T^P(U) := \sum_{t \in T} \text{vol}(t) \cdot (\sup \text{wt}_P(t)) \cdot \text{val}_P(t) \cap U \neq \emptyset$$

for $U \in \Sigma_\mathbb{R}$. Note that upperBd$_T^P$ is not a measure but only a subadditive measure.\(^9\)

---

\(^7\)A superadditive measure $\mu$ on $(\Omega, \Sigma_\Omega)$ is a measure, except that $\sigma$-additivity is replaced by $\sigma$-superadditivity: $\mu(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i) \geq \sum_{i \in I} \mu(U_i)$ for a countable, pairwise disjoint family $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \Sigma_\Omega$.

\(^8\)The $\sigma$-algebra on $T_\infty$ is defined as the smallest $\sigma$-algebra that contains all sets $U \times T_\infty$ where $U \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{R}}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The measure $\mu_{T_\infty}$ is the unique measure with $\mu_{T_\infty}(U \times T_\infty) = \lambda_\mathbb{R}(U)$ when $U \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{R}}^{\omega}$.

\(^9\)A subadditive measure $\mu$ on $(\Omega, \Sigma_\Omega)$ is a measure, except that $\sigma$-additivity is replaced by $\sigma$-subadditivity: $\mu(\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \mu(U_i)$ for a countable, pairwise disjoint family $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \Sigma_\Omega$.
4 Soundness and Completeness

4.1 Soundness

We show that the two bounds described above are sound, in the following sense.

**Theorem 4.1** (Sound lower bounds). Let \( T \) be a pairwise compatible set of interval traces and \( \vdash P : R \) a program (which need not be almost surely terminating). Then \( \text{lowerBd}_P^T \leq \|P\| \).

**Proof.** For any \( U \in \Sigma_R \), we have:

\[
\text{lowerBd}_P^T(U) = \sum_{t \in T} \text{vol}(t) (\min \text{wt}_P(t))(\text{val}_P(t) \subseteq U) = \sum_{t \in T} \int \text{wt}_P(s)(\text{val}_P(s) \subseteq U) \, ds \
\leq \sum_{t \in T} \int \text{wt}_P(s)(\text{val}_P(s) \subseteq U) \, ds \quad (1) \\
= \int_{\cup_{t \in T} \{t\}} \text{wt}_P(s)(\text{val}_P(s) \subseteq U) \, ds \quad (2) \\
\leq \int_T \text{wt}_P(s)(\text{val}_P(s) \subseteq U) \, ds = \|P\|(U) \quad (3)
\]

where Eq. (1) follows from Lemma 3.1, Eq. (2) from pairwise compatibility, and Eq. (3) from \( \cup_{t \in T} \{t\} \subseteq T \). \( \square \)

**Theorem 4.2** (Sound upper bounds). Let \( T \) be an exhaustive set of interval traces and \( \vdash P : R \) a program (which need not be almost surely terminating). Then \( \|P\| \leq \text{upperBd}_P^T \).

**Proof sketch.** The formal proof is similar to soundness of lower bounds, but needs an infinite trace semantics for probabilistic programs and is given in the full version. The idea is then that each interval trace \( t \) summarizes all infinite traces starting with \( \{t\} \). Exhaustivity ensures that almost all infinite traces are "covered". \( \square \)

4.2 Completeness

The soundness results for upper and lower bounds allow us to derive bounds on the denotation of a program. One would expect that a finer partition of interval traces will yield more precise bounds. In this section, we show that for a program \( P \) and an interval \( I \in \mathbb{I} \), the approximations \( \text{lowerBd}_P^T(I) \) and \( \text{upperBd}_P^T(I) \) can in fact come arbitrarily close to \( \|P\|(I) \) for suitable \( T \). However, this is only possible under certain assumptions.

**Assumption 1: use of sampled values.** Interval arithmetic is imprecise if the same value is used more than once: consider, for instance, let \( s = \text{sample in if}(s-s, 0, 1) \) which deterministically evaluates to 0. In interval arithmetic however, if \( x \) is approximated by an interval \([a, b]\) with \( a < b \), the difference \( x-x \) is approximated as \([a-b, b-a]\), which always contains both positive and negative values. So no non-trivial interval trace can separate the two branches.

To avoid this, we could consider a call-by-name semantics (as done in [4]) where sample values can only be used once by definition. However, many of our examples cannot be expressed in the call-by-name setting, so we instead propose a less restrictive criterion to guarantee completeness for call-by-value: we allow sample values to be used more than once, but at most once in the guard of each conditional, at most once in each score expression, and at most once in the return value. While this prohibits terms like the one above, it allows, e.g. let \( s = \text{sample in if}(s, f(s), g(R)) \). We formalise this sufficient condition with a resource-aware type-system in the full version. Most examples we encountered in the literature satisfy this assumption.

**Assumption 2: primitive functions.** In addition, we need mild assumptions on the primitive functions, called boxwise continuity and interval separability.

We need to be able to approximate a program’s weight function by step functions in order to obtain tight bounds on its integral. A function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is *boxwise continuous* if it can be written as the countable union of continuous functions on boxes, i.e. if there is a countable union of pairwise almost disjoint boxes \( B_i \) such that \( \bigcup B_i = \mathbb{R}^n \) and the restriction \( f|_{B_i} \) is continuous for each \( B_i \).

Furthermore, we need to approximate preimages. Formally, we say that \( A \) is a *tight subset* of \( B \) (written \( A \Subset B \)) if \( A \subseteq B \) and \( B \backslash A \) is a null set. A function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) is called *interval separable* if for every interval \( [a, b] \in \mathbb{I} \), there is a countable set \( \mathcal{B} \) of boxes in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) that tightly approximates the preimage, i.e. \( \bigcup \mathcal{B} \Subset f^{-1}([a, b]) \). A sufficient condition for checking this is the following. If \( f \) is boxwise continuous and preimages of points have measure zero, then \( f \) is already interval separable (the full version).

We assume the set \( \mathcal{F} \) of primitive functions is admissible, meaning it is closed under composition and each \( f \in \mathcal{F} \) is interval separable and boxwise continuous.

**The completeness theorem.** Using these two assumptions, we can state completeness of our interval semantics.

**Theorem 4.3** (Completeness of interval approximations). Let \( I \in \mathbb{I} \) and \( \vdash P : R \) be an almost surely terminating program satisfying the two assumptions discussed above. Then, for all \( \epsilon > 0 \), there is a countable exhaustive set of pairwise compatible interval traces \( T \subseteq \mathbb{T}_I \) such that

\[
\text{upperBd}_P^T(I) - \epsilon \leq \|P\|(I) \leq \text{lowerBd}_P^T(I) + \epsilon.
\]

**Proof sketch.** We consider each branching path through the program separately. The set of relevant traces for a given path is a preimage of intervals for compositions of interval separable functions, hence can essentially be partitioned into boxes. By boxwise continuity, we can refine this partition such that the weight function is continuous on each box. To approximate the integral, we pass to a refined partition again, essentially computing Riemann sums. The latter converge...
to the Riemann integral, which agrees with the Lebesgue integral under our conditions, as desired.

For the lower bound, we can actually derive $\varepsilon$-close bounds using only finitely many interval traces:

**Corollary 4.4.** Let $I \in I$ and $+ P : R$ be as in Theorem 4.3. There is a sequence of finite, pairwise compatible sets of interval traces $T_1, T_2, \ldots \subseteq I$ s.t. $\lim_{n \to \infty} \text{lowerBd}^{\mu^\sigma}_I(I) = \langle P \rangle(I)$.

For the upper bound, a restriction to finite sets $T$ of interval traces is, in general, not possible: if the weight function for a program is unbounded, it is also unbounded on some $t \in T$. Then $\text{wt}_I^\sigma(t)$ is an infinite interval, implying upperBd$_I^\sigma(t) = \infty$ (see the full version for details). Despite the (theoretical) need for countably infinite many interval traces, we can, in many cases, compute finite upper bounds by making use of an interval-based static approximation, formalised as a type system in the next section.

## 5 Weight-aware Interval Type System

To obtain sound bounds on the denotation with only finitely many interval traces, we present an interval-based type system that can derive static bounds on a program. Crucially, our type-system is weight-aware: we bound not only the weightless types but also the weight of an execution. Our analyzer GuBPI uses it for two purposes. First, it allows us to derive upper bounds even for areas of the sample space not covered with interval traces. Second, we can use our analysis to derive a finite (and sound) approximation of the infinite number of symbolic execution paths of a program (more details in Section 6). Note that the bounds inferred by our system are interval bounds, which allow for a seamless integration with interval trace semantics. In this section we present the interval type system and sketch a constraint-based type inference method.

### 5.1 Interval Types

We define interval types by the following grammar:

$$\sigma ::= \emptyset \mid \sigma \Rightarrow \mathcal{A} \quad \mathcal{A} ::= \begin{cases} \sigma & \emptyset \\ I & \end{cases}$$

where $I \in I$ is an interval. For readers familiar with refinement types, it is easiest to view the type $\sigma \Rightarrow I$ as the refinement type $\{x : R \mid x \in I\}$. The definition of the syntactic category $\mathcal{A}$ by mutual recursion with $\sigma$ gives a bound on the weight of the execution. We call a type $\sigma$ weightless and a type $\mathcal{A}$ weighted. The following examples should give some intuition for the types.

**Example 5.1.** Consider the example term

$$\left(\mu^\sigma_x : 5 \cdot \mathbb{R} \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \text{sgn}(x + \text{score sample})\right)(4 \cdot \text{sample})$$

where $\text{sgn} : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ is the sigmoid function. In our type system, this term can be typed with the weighted type $\left[\begin{array}{c} 0.0 \\ 0.0 \end{array}\right]$, which indicates that any terminating execution of the term reduces to a value (a number) within $[0, 20]$ and the weight of any such execution lies within $[0, 1]$.

**Example 5.2.** We consider the fixpoint subexpression of the pedestrian example in Example 1.1.

$$\mu^\sigma_x : \text{if}(x, 0, (\lambda \text{step.step} + \varphi((x + \text{step}) \Theta_{0.5} (x - \text{step})))\text{sample})$$

Using the typing rules (defined below), we can infer the type $\left[\begin{array}{c} 0.0 \ 0.0 \end{array}\right]$ for any $a, b$. This type indicates that any terminating execution reduces to a function value (of simple type $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$) with weight within $[1, 1]$. If this function value is then called on a value within $[a, b]$, any terminating execution reduces to a value within $[0, \infty]$ with a weight within $[1, 1]$.

**Subtyping.** The partial order on intervals naturally extends to our type system. For base types $I_1$ and $I_2$, we define $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ just if $I_1 \subseteq I_2$, where $\subseteq$ is interval inclusion. We then extend this via:

$$\begin{array}{cc} \sigma_2 \subseteq \sigma_1 & \mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2 & \mathcal{A}_2 \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_2} \mathcal{A}_1 \frac{\mathcal{A}_2}{\mathcal{A}_2} \mathcal{A}_2 \end{array}$$

Note that in the case of weighted types, the subtyping requires not only that the weightless types be subtype-related ($\sigma_1 \subseteq \sigma_2$) but also that the weight bound be refined ($I_1 \subseteq I_2$). It is easy to see that both $\subseteq$ and $\subseteq$ are partial orders on types with the same underlying base type.
5.2 Type System
As for the interval semantics, we assume that every primitive operation \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) has an over-approximating interval abstraction \( \hat{f} : \mathbb{I}^n \to \mathbb{I} \) (c.f. Section 3.1). The typing judgments (Fig. 4) now have the form \( \Gamma \vdash P : \mathcal{A} \) where \( \Gamma \) is a typing context mapping variables to types \( \sigma \). Our system is sound in the following sense (which we here only state for first-order programs).

**Theorem 5.1.** Let \( \vdash P : \mathcal{R} \) be a simply-typed program. If \( \vdash P : \left[\begin{array}{c} a, b \\ c, d \end{array}\right] \) and \( (P, s, 1) \to^* (r, \{\}, w) \) for some \( s \in \mathbb{T} \) and \( r, w \in \mathbb{R} \), then \( r \in [a, b] \) and \( w \in [c, d] \).

Note that the bounds derived by our type system only refer to terminating executions, i.e. they are partial correctness statements. Theorem 5.1 formalises the intuition of an interval type, e.g. every type derivation in our system bounds both the returned value (in typical refinement-type fashion [22]) and the weight of this derivation. Our type system also comes with a weak completeness statement: for each term, we can derive some bounds in our system.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let \( P \) be a closed, simply-typed program. There exists an \( \mathcal{A} \) such that \( \vdash P : \mathcal{A} \).

5.3 Constraint-based Type Inference
In this section, we briefly discuss the automated type inference in our system, as needed in our tool GuBPI. For space reasons, we restrict ourselves to an informal overview (see the full version for a full account).

Given a program \( P \), we can derive the symbolic skeleton of a type derivation (the structure of which is determined by \( P \)), where each concrete interval is replaced by a placeholder variable. The validity of a typing judgment within this skeleton can then be encoded as constraints. Crucially, as we work in the fixed interval domain and the subtyping structure \( \subseteq_{\mathcal{A}} \) is compositional, they are simple constraints over the placeholder variables in the abstract interval domain. Solving the resulting constraints naïvely might not terminate since the interval abstract domain is not chain complete. Instead we approximate the least fixpoint (where the fixpoint denotes a solution to the constraints) using widening, a standard approach to ensure termination of static analysis on domains with infinite chains [13, 14]. This is computationally much cheaper compared to, say, types with general first-order refinements where constraints are typically phrased as constrained Horn clauses (see e.g. [11]). This gain in efficiency is crucial to making our GuBPI tool practical.

6 GuBPI and Symbolic Execution
In this section, we describe the overall structure of our tool GuBPI (gubpi-tool.github.io), which builds upon symbolic execution. We also outline how the interval-based semantics can be accelerated for programs containing certain linear subexpressions.

6.1 Symbolic Execution
The starting point of our analysis is a symbolic exploration of the term in question [10, 26, 38]. For space reasons we only give an informal overview of the approach. A detailed and formal discussion can be found in the full version.

The idea of symbolic execution is to treat outcomes of sample expressions fully symbolically: each sample evaluates to a fresh variable (called sample variable and denoted \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots \)). This requires us to postpone the evaluation of primitive functions, branching, and the weighting with score expressions (as the value in question is symbolic). The result of symbolic execution is thus a symbolic value (a term consisting of sample variables and delayed primitive function applications). During execution, we explore both branches of a conditional and keep track of the (symbolic) conditions on the sample variables that need to hold in the current branch. Similarly, we record the (symbolic) values of score expressions. Formally, our symbolic execution operates on configurations of the form \( \psi = (\mathcal{M}, n, \Delta, \Xi) \) where \( \mathcal{M} \) is a symbolic term containing sample variables instead of sample outcomes, \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) a natural number used to obtain fresh sample variables, \( \Delta \) a list of symbolic constraints of the form \( \mathcal{V} \Rightarrow r \), where \( \mathcal{V} \) is a symbolic value, \( r \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \Rightarrow \in \{\leq, <, >, \geq\} \), to keep track of the conditions for the current execution path; and \( \Xi \) is a set of values that records all symbolic values of score expressions encountered along the current path. Key reduction rules include the following.

- \( (\text{sample}, n, \Delta, \Xi) \Rightarrow (\alpha_{n+1}, n+1, \Delta, \Xi) \)
- \( (\text{if}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}), n, \Delta, \Xi) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{N}, n, \Delta \cup \{\mathcal{V} \leq 0\}, \Xi) \)
- \( (\text{if}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}), n, \Delta, \Xi) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{P}, n, \Delta \cup \{\mathcal{V} > 0\}, \Xi) \)
- \( \text{score}(\mathcal{V}), n, \Delta, \Xi) \Rightarrow (\mathcal{V}, n, \Delta \cup \{\mathcal{V} \geq 0\}, \Xi \cup \{\mathcal{V}\}) \)

That is, we replace sample outcomes with fresh variables (first rule), explore both paths of a conditional but track the necessary constraints (second and third rule), and record all score values (forth rule).

**Example 6.1.** Consider the symbolic execution of Example 1.1 where the first step moves to the left and the second step moves to the right. We reach a symbolic configuration \( (\mathcal{M}, 5, \Delta, \Xi) \) where \( \mathcal{M} \) is

\[
\text{score}(\text{pdf}_{\text{Normal}(1,1,0,1)}(\alpha_2 + \alpha_4 + (\mu_{\mathcal{N}} \cdot \mathcal{N})(3\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 + \alpha_4))) ; 3\alpha_1.
\]

Here \( \alpha_1 \) is the initial sample for \( \text{start} \); \( \alpha_2, \alpha_4 \) the two samples of \( \text{step} \); and \( \alpha_3, \alpha_5 \) the samples involved in the \( \ominus_{\text{or}} \) operator. The fixpoint \( \mu_{\mathcal{N}} \cdot \mathcal{N} \) is already given in Example 5.2, \( \Xi = \emptyset \) and \( \Delta = \{3\alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_3 > \frac{1}{2}, 3\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 > 0, \alpha_5 \leq \frac{1}{2}\} \).

For a symbolic value \( \mathcal{V} \) using sample variables \( \alpha = \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \) and \( s \in [0, 1]^n \) we write \( \mathcal{V}[s/\alpha] \in \mathbb{R} \) for the substitution of concrete values in \( s \) for the sample variables. Call a symbolic configuration of the form \( \psi = (\mathcal{V}, n, \Delta, \Xi) \) (i.e., a configuration that has reached a symbolic value) a symbolic path. We write \( \text{symPaths}(\psi) \) for the (countable) set of
symbolic paths reached when evaluating from configuration \( \psi \). Given a symbolic path \( \Psi = (V, n, \Delta, \Xi) \) and a set \( U \in \mathbb{R} \), we define the denotation along \( \Psi \), written \( \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket(U) \), as
\[
\int_{[0,1]^n} [V[s/\Xi] \in U] \prod_{C \rightarrow r \in \Delta} [C[s/\Xi] \Rightarrow r] \prod_{W \in \Xi} [W[s/\Xi] \text{ds}].
\]
I.e. the integral of the product of the score weights \( \Xi \) over the traces of length \( n \) where the result value in is \( U \) and all the constraints \( \Delta \) are satisfied. We can recover the denotation of a program \( P \) (as defined in Section 2) from all its symbolic paths starting in configuration \((P, 0, 0, 0)\).

**Theorem 6.1.** For any term \( P : R \) and \( U \in \mathbb{R} \), we have
\[
\llbracket P \rrbracket(U) = \sum_{\Psi \in \text{symPaths}(P,0,0,0)} \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket(U).
\]

Similarly to interval SPCF, we define **symbolic interval terms** as symbolic terms that may contain intervals (and similarly for symbolic interval configurations and paths).

### 6.2 GuBPI

With symbolic execution at hand, we can outline the structure of our analysis framework GuBPI (sketched in Algorithm 1). GuBPI’s analysis begins with symbolic execution of the input term to accumulate a set of symbolic interval paths \( T \). If a symbolic configuration \( \psi \) has exceeded the user-defined depth limit \( D \) and still contains a fixpoint, we over-approximate all paths that extend \( \psi \) to ensure a finite set \( T \). We accomplish this by using the interval type system (Section 5) to overapproximate all fixpoint subexpressions, thereby obtaining strongly normalizing terms (in line 11). Formally, given a configuration \( \psi = (M, n, \Delta, \Xi) \) we derive a typing judgment for the term \( M \) in the system in Fig. 4. Any first-order fixpoint subterm is then typed with a (weightless) type of the form \([a, b] = \frac{[c, d]}{r:e.f}]\). We replace this fixpoint with \( \lambda.(\text{score}(e,f)) \cdot [c,d] \). We denote this operation on configurations by \( \text{approxFix}(\psi) \) (it extends to higher-order fixpoints as expected). Note that \( \text{approxFix}(\psi) \) is a symbolic interval configuration.

**Example 6.2.** Consider the symbolic configuration given in Example 6.1. As in Example 5.2 we infer the type of \( \mu_{\Sigma}^\psi \) to be \([1,4] \rightarrow [0,\infty]) \). The function \( \text{approxFix} \) replaces \( \mu_{\Sigma}^\psi \) with \( \lambda. \text{score}(1,1] \cdot [0,\infty]) \). By evaluating the resulting symbolic interval configuration further, we obtain the symbolic interval path \( (\Delta_1, 5, \Delta, \Xi) \) where \( \Delta \) is as in Example 6.1 and \( \Xi = \{ \text{pdf}_{\text{Normal}}(1,1,0,1) \} \). Note that, in general, the further evaluation of \( \text{approxFix}(\psi) \) can result in multiple symbolic paths.

Afterwards, we’re left with a finite set of symbolic interval paths \( T \). Due to the presence of intervals, we cannot define a denotation of symbolic interval paths directly and instead define lower and upper bounds. For a symbolic interval value \( V \) that contains \( n \) sample variables we define \( r \cdot V \subseteq R \) as all value that the term can evaluate to by replacing every interval \([a, b]\) with some value \( r \cdot [a, b] \). We define \( \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ib}(U) \) by considering only those concrete traces that fulfill the constraints in \( \Psi \) for all concrete values within intervals and take the infimum over all scoring expressions:
\[
\int_{[0,1]^n} [V[s/\Xi] \subseteq U] \prod_{C \rightarrow r \in \Delta} [C[s/\Xi] \Rightarrow r] \prod_{W \in \Xi} \inf_r [W[s/\Xi] \text{ds}].
\]
Similarly we define \( \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ab}(U) \) as
\[
\int_{[0,1]^n} [V[s/\Xi] \cap U \neq \emptyset] \prod_{C \rightarrow r \in \Delta} [C[s/\Xi] \Rightarrow r] \prod_{W \in \Xi} \sup_r [W[s/\Xi] \text{ds}].
\]
We note that if \( \Psi \) contains no intervals then \( \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \) is defined and we have \( \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ib} = \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ab} = \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \). We can now state the following theorem that formalizes the observation that \( \text{approxFix}(\psi) \) soundly approximates all symbolic paths that result from \( \psi \).

**Theorem 6.2.** Let \( \psi \) be a symbolic (interval-free) configuration and \( U \in \mathbb{R} \). Define \( A = \text{symPaths}(\psi) \) as the (possibly infinite) set of all symbolic paths reached when evaluating \( \psi \) and \( B = \text{symPaths}(\text{approxFix}(\psi)) \) as the (finite) set of symbolic interval paths reached when evaluating \( \text{approxFix}(\psi) \). Then
\[
\sum_{\Psi \in B} \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ib}(U) \leq \sum_{\Psi \in A} \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket(U) \leq \sum_{\Psi \in B} \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ab}(U).
\]

The correctness of Algorithm 1 is then a direct consequence of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2.

**Corollary 6.3.** Let \( T \) be the set of symbolic interval paths computed when at line 12 of Algorithm 1 and \( U \in \mathbb{R} \). Then
\[
\sum_{\Psi \in T} \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ib}(U) \leq \llbracket P \rrbracket(U) \leq \sum_{\Psi \in T} \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ab}(U).
\]

What remains is to compute the bounds \( \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ib}(U) \) and \( \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket_{ab}(U) \) for a symbolic interval path \( \Psi \in T \). We first present the standard interval trace semantics (Section 6.3) and then a more efficient analysis for the case that \( \Psi \) contains only linear functions (Section 6.4).

### 6.3 Standard Interval Trace Semantics

For paths containing nonlinear functions, we employ the semantics as introduced in Section 3. Instead of applying
interval traces to the entire program, we can restrict to the current symbolic interval path \( \Psi \) (intuitively, by adding a score(0) to all other program paths). The interval traces split the domain of each sample variable in \( \Psi \) into intervals. It is easy to see that for any pairwise disjoint and exhaustive set of interval traces \( \mathcal{T} \), we have lower \( \text{Bd}^\mathcal{T}_U(U) \leq \|\Psi\|_{lb}(U) \) and \( \|\Psi\|_{ub}(U) \leq \text{upper} \text{Bd}^\mathcal{T}_U(U) \) (see Theorem 4.1 and 4.2).

Applying the interval-based semantics on the level of symbolic interval paths maintains the attractive features, namely soundness and completeness (relative to the current path) of the interval-based semantics. Note that the intervals occurring in \( \Psi \) seamlessly integrate with our already interval-based semantics.

### 6.4 Linear Interval Trace Semantics

In case the score values and the guards of all conditionals naturally defines a subset of interval traces, we call two boxes \( t_1, t_2 \) compatible if the intervals are almost disjoint in at least one position and a set of boxes \( B \) exhaustive if \( \bigcup_{t \in B} \|\Psi\|_{lb}(U) \) and \( \bigcup_{t \in B} \|\Psi\|_{ub}(U) \) (cf. Section 3.3).

**Proposition 6.4.** Let \( B \) be a pairwise compatible, exhaustive set of boxes. Then \( \sum_{t \in B} \text{lb}(t) \cdot \text{vol}(\|\Psi\|_{lb}(U)) \leq \|\Psi\|_{lb}(U) \) and \( \|\Psi\|_{ub}(U) \leq \sum_{t \in B} \text{ub}(t) \cdot \text{vol}(\|\Psi\|_{ub}) \).

As in the standard interval semantics, a finer partition into boxes yields more precise bounds. While the volume computation involved in Proposition 6.4 is expensive \([21]\), the number of splits on the linear functions is much smaller than that needed in the standard interval-based semantics. Our experiments empirically demonstrate that the direct splitting of linear functions (if applicable) is superior to the standard splitting. In GuBPI we compute a set of exhaustive boxes by first computing a lower and upper bound on each \( \Psi_t \in \Xi \) over \( \|\Psi\|_{lb} \) (or \( \|\Psi\|_{ub} \)) by solving a linear program (LP) and splitting the resulting range in evenly sized chunks.

**Beyond uniform samples and linear scores.** We can extend our linear optimization to non-uniform samples and arbitrary symbolic values in \( \Xi \). We accomplish the former by combining the optimized semantics (where we bound linear expressions) with the standard interval-trace semantics (where we bound individual sample variables). For the latter, we can identify linear sub-expressions of the expressions in \( \Xi \), use boxes to bound each linear sub-expression, and use interval arithmetic to infer bounds on the entire expression from bounds on its linear sub-expressions. More details can be found in the full version.

**Example 6.3.** Consider the path \( \Psi = (3a_i, 5, \Delta, \Xi) \) derived in Example 6.2. We use 1-dimensional boxes to bound \( a_i + a_4 \) (the single linear sub-expression of the symbolic values in \( \Xi \)). To obtain a lower bound on \( \|\Psi\|_{lb}(U) \), we sum over all boxes \( t = \langle \{a_i, b_1\} \rangle \) and take the product of \( \text{vol}(\|\Psi\|_{lb}) \) with the lower interval bound of pdf_{\text{Normal}(1,1,0,1)}(\langle \{a_i, b_1\} + [0, \infty) \rangle) \) (evaluated in interval arithmetic). Analogously, for the upper bound we take the product of \( \text{vol}(\|\Psi\|_{ub}) \) with the upper interval bound of pdf_{\text{Normal}(1,1,0,1)}(\langle \{a_i, b_1\} + [0, \infty) \rangle).

### 7 Practical Evaluation

We have implemented our semantics in the prototype GuBPI, written in F#. In cases where we apply the linear optimisation of our semantics we use Vinci \([8]\) to discharge volume computations of convex polytopes. We set out to answer the following questions:

1. How does GuBPI perform on instances that could already be solved (e.g. by PSI \([24]\))? 
2. Is GuBPI able to infer useful bounds on recursive programs that could not be handled rigorously before?
We collected a suite of 18 benchmarks from [53]. Each bench-
mark consists of a program $P$ and a query $\varphi$ over the vari-
ables of $P$. We bound the probability of the event described by $\varphi$
using the tool from [53] and GuBPI (Table 1). While our tool is
generally slower than that of [53], the completion times are still reasonable. Moreover, in many cases, the bounds returned by GuBPI are
tighter than those of [53]. In addition, for benchmarks marked with a $\star$, the two pairs of bounds contradict each other.\footnote{A stochastic simulation using $10^5$ samples in Anglican [58] yielded results that fall within GuBPI’s bounds but violate those computed by [53].} We should also remark that GuBPI cannot handle all benchmarks proposed in [53] because of the heavy use of conditionals, causing our precise symbolic analysis to suffer from the well-documented path explosion problem [6, 9, 28]. Perhaps unsurprisingly, [53] can handle those examples much better, as one of their core contributions is a stochastic method to reduce the number of paths considered (see Section 8). Also note that [53] is restricted to uniform samples, linear guards and score-free programs, whereas we tackle a much more general problem.

### 7.1 Probability Estimation

We collected a suite of 18 benchmarks from [53]. Each benchmark consists of a program $P$ and a query $\varphi$ over the variables of $P$. We bound the probability of the event described by $\varphi$ using the tool from [53] and GuBPI (Table 1). While our tool is generally slower than that of [53], the completion times are still reasonable. Moreover, in many cases, the bounds returned by GuBPI are tighter than those of [53]. In addition, for benchmarks marked with a $\star$, the two pairs of bounds contradict each other.\footnote{A stochastic simulation using $10^5$ samples in Anglican [58] yielded results that fall within GuBPI’s bounds but violate those computed by [53].} We should also remark that GuBPI cannot handle all benchmarks proposed in [53] because of the heavy use of conditionals, causing our precise symbolic analysis to suffer from the well-documented path explosion problem [6, 9, 28]. Perhaps unsurprisingly, [53] can handle those examples much better, as one of their core contributions is a stochastic method to reduce the number of paths considered (see Section 8). Also note that [53] is restricted to uniform samples, linear guards and score-free programs, whereas we tackle a much more general problem.

### 7.2 Exact Inference

To evaluate our tool on instances that can be solved exactly, we compared with PSI [24, 25] which can, in certain cases, compute a closed-form solution of the posterior. We note that whenever exact inference is possible, exact solutions will always be superior to mere bounds; and, due to the overhead of our semantics, exact solution will often be found faster. Because of the different output format (i.e. exact results vs. bounds), a direct comparison between exact methods and GuBPI is challenging. As a consistency check, we collected benchmarks from the PSI repository where the output domain is finite and GuBPI can therefore compute exact results (tight bounds). They agree with PSI in all cases, which includes 8 of the 21 benchmarks from [24]. We report the computation times in Table 2.

We then considered examples where GuBPI computes non-tight bounds. For space reasons, we can only include a selection of examples in this paper. The bounds computed by GuBPI and a short description of each example is shown

### Table 1. GuBPI evaluation on selected benchmarks from [53].

We give the times (in seconds) and bounds computed by [53] and GuBPI. Details on the exact queries (the Q column) can be found in the full version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Tool from [53]</th>
<th>GuBPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>tug-of-war</strong></td>
<td>Q1 1.29 [0.6126, 0.6227] 1.41 [0.6134, 0.6135]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>beaquirer-3</strong></td>
<td>Q1 1.15 [0.5000, 0.5261] 18.8 [0.4999, 0.5001]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-book-s</strong></td>
<td>Q1 8.48 [0.6633, 0.7234] 1.65 [0.7417, 0.7418]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cart</strong></td>
<td>Q2 10.3 [0.3365, 0.3848] 8.31 [0.4137, 0.4138]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cart</strong></td>
<td>Q2 2.41 [0.8980, 1.1573] 1.87 [0.9999, 1.0001]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cart</strong></td>
<td>Q3 2.40 [0.8897, 1.1573] 10.4 [0.9999, 1.0001]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cart</strong></td>
<td>Q3 0.15 [0.0000, 0.1150] 73.4 [0.0000, 0.0001]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cd-cd-dep-s</strong></td>
<td>Q1 0.15 [0.5515, 0.5632] 2.01 [0.0000, 0.0004]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cd-cd-dep-s</strong></td>
<td>Q2 0.08 [0.3019, 0.3149] 2.26 [0.0000, 0.0004]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cd-dep</strong></td>
<td>Q1 1.31 [0.1619, 0.7956] 19.5 [0.1899, 0.1903]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cd-dep</strong></td>
<td>Q2 1.80 [0.2916, 1.0571] 19.7 [0.3705, 0.3720]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cd-dep</strong></td>
<td>Q3 1.51 [0.4314, 2.0155] 23.2 [0.7438, 0.7668]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cd-dep</strong></td>
<td>Q4 3.96 [0.4400, 3.0956] 26.6 [0.8682, 0.9666]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ex-cd-dep</strong></td>
<td>Q3 0.04 [0.9921, 1.0000] 0.81 [0.9980, 0.9981]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>example1</strong></td>
<td>Q1 0.02 [0.1910, 0.1966] 0.52 [0.1918, 0.1919]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>example1</strong></td>
<td>Q1 0.06 [0.4478, 0.4708] 0.49 [0.4540, 0.4541]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>herman-3</strong></td>
<td>Q1 0.47 [0.3750, 0.4091] 110 [0.3749, 0.3751]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Probabilistic programs with discrete domains from PSI [24]. The times are given in seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instance</th>
<th>$t_{PSI}$</th>
<th>$t_{GuBPI}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>burglarAlarm</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twoCoins</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grass</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noisyOr</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bertrand</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coinPattern</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coinBiasSmall</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gossip</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Guaranteed Bounds computed by GuBPI for a selection of non-recursive models from [24, 25, 45, 62].

(a) coinBias example from [24]. The program samples a beta prior on the bias of a coin and observes repeated coin flips (16.5 seconds).
(b) max example from [24]. The program compute the maximum of two i.i.d. normal samples (31.8 seconds).
(c) Gaussian Mixture Model from [62] (39 seconds). MCMC methods (here Anglican’s LMH) usually find only one mode.
(d) Neal’s funnel from [32, 45] (2.8 seconds). HMC misses some of the probability mass around 0.
in Fig. 5. We can see that, despite the relatively loose bounds, they are still useful and provide the user with a rough—and most importantly, guaranteed to be correct—idea of the denotation.

The success of exact solvers such as PSI depends on the underlying symbolic solver (and the optimisations implemented). Consequently, there are instances where the symbolic solver cannot compute a closed-form (integral-free) solution. Conversely, while our method is (theoretically) applicable to a very broad class of programs, there exist programs where the symbolic solver finds solutions but the analysis in GuBPI becomes infeasible due to the large number of interval traces required.

### 7.3 Recursive Models

We then evaluated our tool on complex models that cannot be handled by any of the existing methods. For space reasons, we only give an overview of some examples. Unexpectedly, we found recursive models in the PSI repository: there are examples that are created by unrolling loops to a fixed depth. This fixed unrolling changes the posterior of the model. Using our method we can handle those examples without bounding the loop. Three such examples are shown in Figs. 6a to 6c. In Fig. 6a, PSI bounds the iterations resulting in a spike at 10 (the unrolling bound). For Fig. 6b, PSI does not provide any solution whereas GuBPI provides useful bounds. For Fig. 6c, PSI bounds the loop to compute results (displayed in blue) whereas GuBPI computes the green bounds on the unbounded program. It is obvious that the bounds differ significantly, highlighting the impact that unrolling to a fixed depth can have on the denotation. This again strengthens the claim that rigorous methods that can handle unbounded loops are needed. There also exist unbounded discrete examples where PSI computes results for the bounded version that are incorrect for the denotation of the unbounded program. Figs. 6d to 6f depict further recursive examples (alongside a small description).

Lastly, as a very challenging example, we consider the pedestrian example (Example 1.1) again. The bounds computed by GuBPI are given in Fig. 7 together with the two stochastic results from Fig. 1. It is clear that the bounds are precise enough to rule out the HMC samples. This example is very challenging (resulting in a running time of about 1.5h for GuBPI), so in this case guaranteed bounds are actually...
A general approach to validating inference algorithms for a generative Bayesian model is simulation-based calibration (SBC) [12, 57]. SBC draws a sample from the prior distribution, generates data y for these parameters, and runs the inference algorithm to produce posterior samples \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_L \) given y. If the posterior samples follow the true posterior distribution, the rank statistic of the prior sample \( \theta \) relative to the posterior samples will be uniformly distributed. If the empirical distribution of the rank statistic after many such simulations is non-uniform, this indicates a problem with the inference. While SBC is very general, it is computationally expensive because it undergoes inference in every simulation. Moreover, as SBC is a stochastic validation approach, any fixed number of samples may fail to diagnose inference errors that only occur on a very low probability region.

We compare the running times of GuBPI and SBC for three examples where Pyro’s HMC yields wrong results (Table 3). Running SBC for on the pedestrian example (with a reduced sample size and using the parameters recommended in [57]) took 32 hours and was still inconclusive because of strong autocorrelation. Reducing the latter via thinning requires more samples, and would increase the running time to >300 hours. Similarly, GuBPI diagnoses the problem with the mixture model in Fig. 5c in significantly less time than SBC. However, for higher-dimensional versions of this mixture model, SBC clearly outperforms GuBPI. We give a more detailed discussion of SBC for these examples in the full version.

### 7.4 Comparison with Statistical Validation

A general approach to validating inference algorithms for a generative Bayesian model is simulation-based calibration (SBC) [12, 57]. SBC draws a sample \( \theta \) from the prior distribution of the parameters, generates data \( y \) for these parameters, and runs the inference algorithm to produce posterior samples \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_L \) given \( y \). If the posterior samples follow the true posterior distribution, the rank statistic of the prior sample \( \theta \) relative to the posterior samples will be uniformly distributed. If the empirical distribution of the rank statistic after many such simulations is non-uniform, this indicates a problem with the inference. While SBC is very general, it is computationally expensive because it performs inference in every simulation. Moreover, as SBC is a stochastic validation approach, any fixed number of samples may fail to diagnose inference errors that only occur on a very low probability region.

We compare the running times of GuBPI and SBC for three examples where Pyro’s HMC yields wrong results (Table 3). Running SBC for on the pedestrian example (with a reduced sample size and using the parameters recommended in [57]) took 32 hours and was still inconclusive because of strong autocorrelation. Reducing the latter via thinning requires more samples, and would increase the running time to >300 hours. Similarly, GuBPI diagnoses the problem with the mixture model in Fig. 5c in significantly less time than SBC. However, for higher-dimensional versions of this mixture model, SBC clearly outperforms GuBPI. We give a more detailed discussion of SBC for these examples in the full version.

### 7.5 Limitations and Future Improvements

The theoretical foundations of our interval-based semantics ensure that GuBPI is applicable to a very broad class of programs (c.f. Section 4). In practice, as usual for exact methods, GuBPI does not handle all examples equally well.

Firstly, as we already saw in Section 7.1, the symbolic execution—which forms the entry point of the analysis—suffers from path explosion. On some extreme loop/recursion-free programs (such as example-ckd-epi from [53]), our tool cannot compute all (finitely many) symbolic paths in reasonable time, let alone analyse them in our semantics. Extending the approach from [53] to sample representative program paths (in the presence of conditioning) is an interesting future direction that we can combine with the rigour of analysis by using our type system.

Secondly, our interval-based semantics imposes bounds on each sampled variable and thus scales exponentially in the dimension of the model; this is amplified in the case where the optimised semantics (Section 6.4) is not applicable. It would be interesting to explore whether this can be alleviated using different trace splitting techniques.

Lastly, the bounds inferred by our interval type system take the form a single interval with no information on the exact distribution along this interval. For example, the most precise bound derivable for the term \( \mu_x \cdot f(x + \text{sample}) \oplus \mu_y \cdot f(x - \text{sample}) \) is \([a, b] - [-\infty, \infty] \] for any \( a, b \). After unrolling to a fixed depth, the approximation of the paths not terminating within the fixed depth is therefore imprecise. For future work, it would be interesting to improve the bounds in our type system to provide more information about the distribution by means of rigorous approximations of the denotation of the fixpoint in question (i.e. the probabilistic summary [43, 47, 60] of the fixpoint).

### 8 Related Work

**Interval trace semantics and Interval SPCF.** Our interval trace semantics to compute bounds on the denotation is similar to the semantics introduced by Beutner and Ong [4], who study an interval approximation to obtain lower bounds on the termination probability. By contrast, we study the more challenging problem of bounding the program denotation which requires us to track the weight of an execution, and to prove that the denotation approximates a Lebesgue integral, which requires novel proof ideas. Moreover, whereas

![Figure 7. Bounds for the pedestrian example Example 1.1](image-url)
the termination probability of a program is always upper bounded by 1, here we derive both lower and upper bounds.

**Probability estimation.** Sankaranarayanan et al. [53] introduced a static analysis framework to infer bounds on a class of definable events in (score-free) probabilistic programs. The idea of their approach is that if we find a finite set \( T \) of symbolic traces with cumulative probability at least \( 1 - c \), and a given event \( \varphi \) occurs with probability at most \( b \) on the traces in \( T \), then \( \varphi \) occurs with probability at most \( b + c \) on the entire program. In the presence of conditioning, the problem becomes vastly more difficult, as the aggregate weight on the unexplored paths can be unbounded, giving \( \infty \) as the only derivable upper bound, which is useless. In order to infer guaranteed bounds, it is necessary to analyse all paths in the program, which we accomplish via static analysis and in particular our interval type system.

The approach from [53] was extended by Albarghouthi et al. [1] to compute the probability of events defined by arbitrary SMT constraints but is restricted to score-free and non-recursive programs. Our interval-based approach, which may be seen as a variant of theirs, is founded on a complete semantics (Theorem 4.3), can handle recursive program with (soft) scoring and is applicable to a broad class of primitive functions.

Note that we consider programs with soft conditioning in which scoring cannot be reduced to volume computation directly. Intuitively, soft conditioning performs a (global) re-weighting of the set of traces, which cannot be captured by (local) volume computations. In our interval trace semantics we instead track approximation of the weight along each interval trace.

**Exact inference.** There are numerous approaches to inferring the exact denotation of a probabilistic program. Holtzen et al. [36] introduced an inference method to efficiently compute the denotation of programs with discrete distributions. By exploiting program structure to factorise inference, their system Dice can perform exact inference on programs with hundreds of thousands of random variables. Gehr et al. [24] introduced PSI, an exact inference system that uses symbolic manipulation and integration. A later extension, \( \lambda \)PSI [25], adds support for higher-order functions and nested inference. The PPL Hakaru [44] supports a variety of inference algorithms on programs with both discrete and continuous distributions. Using program transformation and partial evaluation, Hakaru can perform exact inference via symbolic disintegration [54] on a limited class of programs. Saad et al. [52] introduced SPPL, a system that can compute exact answers to a range of probabilistic inference queries, by translating a restricted class of programs to sum-product expressions, which are highly effective representations for inference.

While exact results are obviously desirable, this kind of inference only works for a restricted family of programs: none of the above exact inference systems allow (unbounded) recursion. Unlike our tool, they are therefore unable to, for instance, handle the challenging Example 1.1 or the programs in Fig. 6.

**Abstract interpretation.** Monniaux [41, 42] developed an abstract domain for (score-free) probabilistic programs given by a weighted sum of abstract regions. Smith [55] considered truncated normal distributions as an abstract domain and developed analyses restricted to score-free programs with only linear expressions. Extending both approaches to support soft conditioning is non-trivial as it requires the computation of integrals on the abstract regions. In our interval-based semantics, we abstract the concrete traces (by means of interval traces) and not the denotation (distribution of program states). This allows us to derive bounds on the weight (given by scoring) along the abstracted paths.

Huang et al. [37] discretise the domain of continuous samples into interval cubes and derive posterior approximations on each cube. The resulting approximation converges to the true posterior (similar to approximate, stochastic methods) but does not provide exact/guaranteed bounds and is not applicable to recursive programs.

**Refinement types.** Our interval type system (Section 5) may be viewed as a type system that refines not just the value of an expression but also its weight [22]. To our knowledge, no existing type refinement system can bound the weight of program executions. Moreover, the by-design seamless integration with our interval trace semantics allows for a much cheaper type inference, without resorting to an SMT or Horn constraint solver. This is a crucial advantage as a typical GuBPI inference queries the analysis numerous times (up to thousands of times for some examples).

**Stochastic methods.** A general approach to validating inference algorithms for a generative Bayesian model is simulation-based calibration (SBC) [12, 57], discussed in Section 7.4. Grosse et al. [34] introduced a method to estimate the log marginal likelihood of a model by constructing stochastic lower/upper bounds. They show that the true value can be sandwiched between these two stochastic bounds with high probability. In closely related work [16, 33], this was applied to measure the accuracy of approximate probabilistic inference algorithms on a specified dataset. By contrast, our posterior bounds are non-stochastic, and our method applicable to arbitrary programs of a universal PPL.

9 Conclusion

We have studied the problem of inferring guaranteed bounds on the posterior of programs of a universal PPL. Our work...
is based on the interval trace semantics, and our constraint-based interval type system gives rise to a tool that can infer useful bounds on the posterior of interesting recursive programs. This is a capability beyond the reach of existing methods, such as exact inference. As a method of Bayesian inference for statistical probabilistic programs, we can view our framework as occupying a useful middle ground between approximate stochastic inference and exact inference.
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