

Types, equations, dimensions and the Pi theorem

NICOLA BOTTA

*Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Potsdam, Germany,
Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg, Sweden. (e-mail: botta@pik-potsdam.de)*

PATRIK JANSSON

*Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, Göteborg, Sweden. (e-mail:
patrikj@chalmers.se)*

GUILHERME HORTA ALVARES DA SILVA

Chalmers University of Technology, Göteborg, Sweden. (e-mail: alvares@chalmers.se)

Abstract

The languages of mathematical physics and modelling are endowed with a rich “grammar of dimensions” that common abstractions of programming languages fail to represent. We propose a dependently typed domain-specific language (embedded in Idris) that captures this grammar. We apply it to explain basic notions of dimensional analysis and Buckingham’s Pi theorem. We hope that the language makes mathematical physics more accessible to computer scientists and functional programming more palatable to modelers and physicists.

1 Introduction

Motivation. The main motivation for this work comes from a failure. During more than one decade, two of the authors have been advocating mathematical specifications, type-driven analysis and functional programming (FP) as methodologies to better understand, specify and solve problems in climate impact research, climate policy advice and, by large, global systems science (Botta et al., 2011; Ionescu and Jansson, 2013; Botta et al., 2017, 2018; Ionescu et al., 2018; Botta et al., 2023).

Alas, after ten years of proselytism and intense collaborations, we have hardly been able to convince any climate modeler of the usefulness of FP, let apart convert them to “thinking functionally” with Haskell (Bird, 2014), Agda (Norell, 2007), Idris (Brady, 2017), or Coq (The Coq Development Team, 2021). Have we just done a bad job or is this failure a symptom of a deeper problem?

There is no need for FP in mathematical physics, is there? Physicists and modelers are well trained in exploiting established numerical libraries (The Numerical Algorithms Group (NAG), 1970 – 2023; Galassi et al., 1996 – 2023; The Python community, 2005 – 2023) and frameworks (OpenCFD, 2004 – 2023; Zhang et al., 2019) for approximating solutions of (ordinary, partial, stochastic) differential equations efficiently, implementing

large computer-based models in FORTRAN, C, C++, Java, Python, or Julia and testing model predictions against analytical solutions or observations.

In engineering and in many physical sciences, this methodology has lead to reliable computations and to computer-based modelling almost fully replacing physical modelling: for many applications, running computer programs is more flexible and much cheaper than running wind tunnels or full-scale experiments.

But there are important research areas in which empirical validations are beyond reach and the predictive capability of computer-based models is poorly known and needs to be questioned. In climate science but also in plasma physics, for example, it is simply impossible (or just too dangerous or too expensive) to test the correctness of computations empirically. It is not possible to study the effectiveness of a policy designed to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions without implementing that policy or, as argued in (Lucarini, 2004), “the usual Galilean scientific validation criteria do not apply to climate science”. In much the same way, plasma physicists and engineers cannot afford to damage hundreds of experimental tokamak fusion reactors to assess and validate optimal control options for such devices (Hoppe et al., 2021; Pusztai et al., 2023).

In these domains, scientists need methodologies that bring confidence that their computations are correct well before such computations can actually be applied to real world systems. Formal specifications is the key both for testing programs and for showing the *absence* of errors in computations (Ionescu and Jansson, 2013) and dependently typed FP languages have reached enough expressive power to support formulating very precise specifications. And yet climate modelers and physicists have, by large, stayed away from FP languages. Why so?

Educational gaps. It is probably fair to say that most physicists and modelers have never heard about mathematical program specifications, not to mention FP and dependently typed languages. In much the same way, most computer scientist have hardly been exposed to the language of mathematical physics, say, for example, that of Courant and Hilbert (1989); Arnold (1989); Barenblatt et al. (1996); Kuznetsov (1998).

Originally very close to elementary set theory and calculus, this language has evolved over the last decades and fragmented into a multitude of dialects or DSLs, perhaps through the pervasive usage of imperative programming and computer-based modelling.

Common traits of these dialects are the limited usage of currying and higher order functions, the overloading of the equality sign, the lack of referential transparency and explicit type information (although mnemonic rules are often introduced for encoding such information like in $x_{[0,T]}$ instead of $x : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) and the usage of parentheses to denote both function application and function composition as in $\dot{x} = f(x)$ instead of $\forall t, \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t))$ or, in point-free notation, $\dot{x} = f \circ x$.

These DSLs represent a major difficulty for computer scientists and systematic efforts have been undertaken by one of the authors to make them more accessible to computer science students (Ionescu and Jansson, 2016; Jansson and Ionescu, 2014 – 2016; Jansson et al., 2022) and improve the dialogue between the computational sciences and the physical sciences. Our paper is also a contribution to such dialogue.

We argue that the DSLs of mathematical physics are endowed with a rich but hidden “grammar of dimensions” that (functional) programming languages have failed to exploit or

even recognize. This grammar informs important notions of consistency and of correctness which, in turn, are the bread and butter of program analysis, testing and derivation.

From this perspective, it is not very surprising that physicists and modelers have hardly been interested in FP. Standard FP abstractions emphasize type annotations that do not matter to physicists and modelers (for the climate scientist, all functions are, bluntly speaking, of type $\mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ for some natural numbers m and n), while at the same time failing to highlight differences that do matter like the one between a *length* and a *time*. We hope that this work will also help making FP a bit more palatable to physicists and modelers.

Outline. In [Section 2](#) we briefly revise the role of equations, laws, types and *dimensions* in computer science and in mathematical physics and modelling.

In [Section 3](#) we discuss the ideas of dimension, *physical quantity*, and *units of measurement* informally. This is mainly meant to guide the computer scientist out of her comfort zone but also to answer a question that should be of interest also to readers who are familiar with modelling: “what does it mean for a parameter or for a variable to have a dimension?”

[Section 4](#) is a short account of similarity theory (Buckingham, 1914; Rayleigh, 1915; Bridgman, 1922) and of Buckingham’s Pi theorem, mainly following [Section 1](#) of (Barenblatt et al., 1996). This is going to be new ground for most computer scientists but, again, we hope to also provide a new angle to modelers who are young and have therefore mainly been imprinted with computer-based modelling.

In [Section 5](#) we formalize the notions of dimension function, dimensional judgment (in analogy to type judgment) and that of physical quantity. We also propose an encoding of Buckingham’s Pi theorem (an eminently non-implementable result) as a propositional type.

In [Section 6](#) we introduce a concrete DSL based on the formalization in [Section 5](#) and discuss possible generalization and more desiderata for this DSL. We also discuss “dimensional functions” and the possibility of exploiting the type system for implementing programs that are dimensionally consistent. [Section 7](#) wraps-up and discusses links between dimensional analysis and more general relativity principles.

Related work. Dimensional analysis (DA) (Bridgman, 1922; Barenblatt et al., 1996; Gibbings, 2011), see also (Jonsson, 2014), is closely connected with the theory of physical similarity (under which conditions is it possible to translate observations made on a scaled model of a physical system to the system itself, see [Section 4](#)) and thus with fundamental principles of invariance and relativity (of units of measurement), see (Arnold, 1989).

The theory of physical similarity was formulated well before the advent of digital computers and programming languages (Buckingham, 1914, 1915; Rayleigh, 1915; Bridgman, 1922) and its formalizations have been rare (Quade, 1961; Whitney, 1968a,b). With the advent of digital computers and massive numerical simulations, physical modeling has been almost completely replaced by computer-based modeling, mainly for economic reasons, and the theory of physical similarity and DA are not any longer an integral component of the education of physicists, modelers and data analysts¹.

The notions of invariance (with respect to a group of transformations) and relativity (e.g., of units of measurement) in physics are similar to the notions of parametricity

¹ But Bridgman’s work has been republished in 2007 by Kessinger Publishing and in 2018 by Forgotten Books

and polymorphism in computer science and thus it is perhaps not surprising that, as programming languages have gained more and more expressive power, mathematicians and computer scientists have started “rediscovering” DA, see (Kennedy, 1997; Atkey et al., 2015; Newman, 2011). More recently the idea that dependent types can be applied to enforce the dimensional consistency of expressions involving scalar physical quantities has been generalized to expressions with vectors, tensors and other derived quantities (McBride and Nordvall-Forsberg, 2022).

Dependent types can certainly be applied to enforce the dimensional consistency of expressions and libraries for annotating values of standard types with dimensional information are available in most programming languages (Eisenberg and Muranushi, 2022; Buckwalter, 2006 – 2022; Keller et al., 2023; Pint Developers, 2012 – 2023; The Astropy Developers, 2011 – 2023; Schabel and Watanabe, 2003 – 2010) and since quite some time (House, 1983).

But dependently typed languages can do more. The type checker of Idris, for example, can effectively assist the implementation of verified programs by interactively resolving the types of holes, suggesting tactics and recommending type consistent implementations. Similar support is available in other languages based on intensional type theory.

A DSL built on top of a dependently typed language that supports expressing Buckingham’s Pi theorem should in principle be able to assist the interactive implementation of dimensionally consistent programs. It should support the programmer formulating the question of how a function that computes a force, say F , may depend on arguments m and a representing masses and accelerations, leverage on the type system of the host language and automatically derive $F m a = \alpha * m * a$. The work presented here is a first step in this direction. We are not yet there and in [Section 7](#) we discuss which steps are left.

2 Equations, physical laws and types

In the preface to the second edition of “Programming from specifications” (Morgan, 1994), Carroll Morgan starts with the observation that, in mathematics, $x^2 = 1$ is an equation and that $x = 1$ and $x = -1$ are equations too. He then goes on pointing out that, because of the relationships between these three equations (the implications $x = 1 \Rightarrow x^2 = 1$ and $x = -1 \Rightarrow x^2 = 1$) and because $x = 1$ and $x = -1$ define the value of x “without further calculation”, these two equations are called *solutions* of $x^2 = 1$.

Thus equations in mathematics sometimes represent *problems*. In dependently typed languages, these problems can be formulated explicitly and the resulting expressions can be checked for consistency. For example, in Idris (Brady, 2017) one can specify the problem of finding a real number x whose square is 1 as

$$\begin{aligned} x & : \mathbb{R} \\ xSpec & : x \uparrow 2 = 1 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (\uparrow) & : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ x \uparrow Z & = 1 \\ x \uparrow (S n) & = x * (x \uparrow n) \end{aligned}$$

It is worth pointing out that 1) it is a context that is *not* immediately deducible from $x^2 = 1$ that determines the meaning of the equality sign in this equation and 2) that it is the type of x and that of the “to the power of 2” function that make such context clear. For example, in mathematics, x^n can also denote the n -th iteration of an endofunction, this time with:

$$\begin{aligned} (\uparrow) &: \{A : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow (A \rightarrow A) \\ x \uparrow Z &= id \\ x \uparrow (Sn) &= x \circ (x \uparrow n) \end{aligned}$$

In this context and with 1 denoting the identity function (id), the equation $x^2 = 1$ represents the problem of finding involutions and the equality in $x^2 = 1$ extensional equality. For example

$$\begin{aligned} x &: \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Bool} \\ xSpec &: x \uparrow 2 \doteq 1 \end{aligned}$$

with the identity and the negation functions as solutions. In this *specification* and throughout this paper we use the definition of (\doteq) from (Botta et al., 2021)

$$\begin{aligned} (\doteq) &: \{A, B : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow \text{Type} \\ (\doteq) \{A\} f g &= (x : A) \rightarrow f x = g x \end{aligned}$$

Because of the equivalence between logical propositions and types (Wadler, 2015), the type $f \doteq g$ means $\forall x, f x = g x$ and values of this type are proofs of this equality.

2.1 Generic differential equations

In mathematical physics but also in the social sciences and in modelling it is common to specify problems implicitly in terms of equations.

Typically, such specifications are *generic* and come in the form of systems of differential equations. In this context, generic means that the problem equations are given in terms of functions which are not defined explicitly². The focus is on the semantics and the syntax can be confusing. For example, the ordinary differential Equation (1.4) at page 18 of (Kuznetsov, 1998)

$$\dot{x} = f(x) \tag{2.1}$$

is said to define a continuous-time *dynamical system* $(\mathcal{T}, X, \varphi)$. In this context, \mathcal{T} is the *time set* (a real interval), X is the *state space* of the system, x is a function of type $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow X$, \dot{x} (also of type $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow X$) is the first derivative of x , and f is a function of type $X \rightarrow X$ smooth enough to grant existence and uniqueness of solutions. Thus, Eq. (2.1) contains a type error. The twist here is that the equation is just an abbreviation for the specification

$$\begin{aligned} x &: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow X \\ xSpec &: Dx \doteq f \circ x \end{aligned}$$

where we adopt the notation of (Jansson and Ionescu, 2014–2016) and use Dx to denote the derivative of x . When not otherwise stated, Dx has the type of x . When quoting textbooks

and DA still plays a crucial role in the analysis of computer-based models in climate science (Verbitsky and Crucifix, 2020, 2021; Verbitsky, 2022; Verbitsky and Crucifix, 2023).

² Thus, one has a family of systems in a function parameter. The idea is then to study how properties of these

verbatim, we also denote Dx by \dot{x} (and $D(Dx)$ by \ddot{x}), dx/dt or similar. The third element of the dynamical system associated to Eq. (2.1), φ , is a function of type $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow X \rightarrow X$. The idea is that $\varphi t x_0$ is the value of *the* solution of Eq. (2.1) for initial condition x_0 at time t . Thus φ does depend on f although this is not immediately visible from its type.

In mathematical physics, it is very common to use the same notation for function application and function composition as in Eq. (2.1). For example, Newton’s principle of determinacy³ is formalized in Equation (1) of (Arnold, 1989) as

$$\ddot{\mathbf{x}} = F(\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, t) \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathbf{x}, \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \ddot{\mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and $F : (\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N, \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$. Again, the equation is to be understood as an abbreviation for the composition between F and a higher order function.

Keeping in mind that $f(x)$ often just means $f \circ x$ and with a little bit of knowledge of the specific domain, it is often not difficult to understand the problem that equations represent. For example, in bifurcation theory, a slightly more general form of Eq. (2.1)

$$\dot{x} = f(x, p) \quad (2.3)$$

with parameter $p : P$ and $f : (X, P) \rightarrow X$ (again, with some abuse of notation) is often put forward to discuss three different but closely related problems:

- The problem of predicting how the system evolves in time from an initial condition $x_0 : X$ and for a given $p : P$.
- The problem of finding *stationary* points that is, values of $x : X$ such that $f(x, p) = 0$ for a given $p : P$ and to study their *stability*.
- The problem of finding *critical* parameters that is, values of $p : P$ at which the set of stationary points $\{x \mid x : X, f(x, p) = 0\}$ (or a more general *invariant* set associated with f) exhibits structural changes⁴.

Mathematical models of physical systems often involve *functional* equations and systems of partial differential equations. Understanding the problems associated with these equations from a FP perspective requires some more domain-specific expertise. But even these more advanced problems can often be understood by applying “type-driven” analysis, see for example the discussion of the Lagrangian in Chapter 3 “Types in Mathematics” of (Jansson et al., 2022).

2.2 Physical laws, specific models

Perhaps surprisingly, understanding basic physical principles but also mathematical models of specific systems in terms of well typed expressions is often tricky. Consider, for example, Newton’s second law as often stated in elementary textbooks

systems, for example that of having stationary solutions, depend on properties of the parameter.

³ Newton’s principle of determinacy maintains that the initial state of a mechanical systems (the positions and the velocities of its points at an initial time) uniquely determines its motion, see (Arnold, 1989), page 4

⁴ In the context of climate research, such critical values are often called “tipping points”.

$$F = ma \quad (2.4)$$

or the relationship between pressure, density and temperature in an ideal gas

$$p = \rho RT \quad (2.5)$$

In these equations F denotes a *force*, m a *mass*, a an *acceleration*, p a *pressure*, ρ a *density*, T a *temperature* and R a gas-specific constant. But what are the types of these quantities? What kind of equalities do these types imply?

In climate science, “conceptual” models of specific components of the climate system often consist of simple, low-dimensional systems of ordinary differential equations. For example, Stommel’s seminal 1961 paper starts by describing a simple system consisting of a vessel of water with “temperature T and salinity S (in general variable in time) separated by porous walls from an outside vessel whose temperature T_e and salinity S_e are maintained at constant values”, see Fig. 1 at page 1 of (Stommel, 1961).

The evolution of the temperature and of the salinity in the vessel are then modeled by two uncoupled linear differential equations:

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = c(T_e - T) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dS}{dt} = d(S_e - S) \quad (2.6)$$

In this context, T and S represent functions of type $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and T_e, S_e , the “temperature transfer coefficient” c , and the “salinity transfer coefficient” d are real numbers. We can formulate the problem of computing solutions of Eq. (2.6) through the specification:

$$TSpec : DT \doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow c * (T_e - T t); \quad SSpec : DS \doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow d * (S_e - S t)$$

The λ -expression in $TSpec$ denotes the function that maps t to $c * (T_e - T t)$. Thus (again, because of the equivalence between types and logical propositions) any (total) *definition* of $TSpec$ is (equivalent to) a proof that, $\forall t$, $dT(t)/dt = c(T_e - T(t))$ and its *declaration* specifies the task⁵ of providing one such proof.

The next step at the end of page 1 of Stommel’s paper is to make Eq. (2.6) “non-dimensional” by introducing

$$\tau = c t, \quad \delta = \frac{d}{c}, \quad y = T/T_e, \quad x = S/S_e \quad (2.7)$$

This yields

$$\frac{dy}{d\tau} = 1 - y \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dx}{d\tau} = \delta * (1 - x) \quad (2.8)$$

at the top of page 2. From there, Stommel then goes on discussing how a *density* of the vessel (a function of its temperature and salinity and, thus, of x and y) evolves in time as the solution of Eq. (2.8) for arbitrary initial conditions x_0, y_0

⁵ *Aufgabe*, (Kolmogoroff, 1932).

$$y(\tau) = 1 + (y_0 - 1)e^{-\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad x(\tau) = 1 + (x_0 - 1)e^{-\delta\tau} \quad (2.9)$$

approaches 1 as τ increases. Although Stommel's discussion is in many ways interesting, we do not need to be concerned with it here. What we need to understand, however, are the types of τ , δ , x and y and how Eq. (2.8) can be derived from Eq. (2.6) given Eq. (2.7). The first two equations of Eq. (2.7) are definitions of τ and δ :

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; & \delta &: \mathbb{R} \\ \tau t &= c * t; & \delta &= d / c \end{aligned}$$

However, the last two equations are not *explicit* definitions of y and x . Instead, they are *implicit* definitions, corresponding to the specifications

$$\begin{aligned} y &: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}; & x &: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ ySpec &: y \circ \tau \doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow T t / T_e; & xSpec &: x \circ \tau \doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow S t / S_e \end{aligned}$$

and it is easy to see that the definitions

$$y \sigma = T (\sigma / c) / T_e; \quad x \sigma = S (\sigma / c) / S_e$$

fulfil $ySpec$ and $xSpec$:

$$ySpec t = ((y \circ \tau) t) = \{ Refl \} = (T (c * t / c) / T_e) = \{ \mathbf{?h_0} \} = (T t / T_e) \quad QED$$

and similarly for $xSpec$. Filling the $\mathbf{?h_0}$ hole in the last step requires invoking congruence and a proof of $c * t / c = t$. Here, the types of c and t are aliases for double precision floating point numbers for which such an equality needs to be postulated. The differential equations Eq. (2.8) for y and x follow then from the definitions of τ and δ , from the specifications $TSpec$, $ySpec$, $SSpec$, $xSpec$ and from the rules for derivation. Informally:

$$\begin{aligned} y \circ \tau &\doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow T t / T_e \\ &= \text{-- congruence} \\ D (y \circ \tau) &\doteq D (\lambda t \Rightarrow T t / T_e) \\ &= \text{-- D-composition, ...} \\ \lambda t \Rightarrow (D y) (\tau t) * (D \tau) t &\doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow (D T) t / T_e \\ &= \text{-- } (D \tau) t = (const c) t = c, TSpec \\ \lambda t \Rightarrow (D y) (\tau t) * c &\doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow c * (T_e - T t) / T_e \\ &= \text{-- arithmetics} \\ \lambda t \Rightarrow (D y) (\tau t) &\doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow 1 - T (c * t / c) / T_e \\ &= \text{-- } ySpec, \text{ def. composition} \\ \lambda t \Rightarrow ((D y) \circ \tau) t &\doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow 1 - y (\tau t) \\ &= \text{-- } \beta\text{-reduction} \\ (D y) \circ \tau &\doteq \lambda t \Rightarrow 1 - (y \circ \tau) t \\ &= \text{-- factoring on the RHS} \\ (D y) \circ \tau &\doteq (\lambda \sigma \Rightarrow 1 - y \sigma) \circ \tau \\ &= \text{-- cancel the composition on both sides} \\ D y &\doteq \lambda \sigma \Rightarrow 1 - y \sigma \end{aligned}$$

We can turn this into a valid Idris proof but the point here is that the computation looks significantly more contrived than the straightforward (again, informal) derivation

$$\begin{aligned}
 y &= T / T_e \\
 &= \text{-- chain rule} \\
 \frac{dy}{d\tau} \frac{d\tau}{dt} &= \frac{dT}{dt} \frac{1}{T_e} \\
 &= \text{-- def. of } \tau, \text{ Eq. (2.8)} \\
 \frac{dy}{d\tau} c &= c (T_e - T) / T_e \\
 &= \text{-- def. of } y \\
 \frac{dy}{d\tau} &= 1 - y
 \end{aligned}$$

that is taken for granted and not even mentioned in Stommel’s paper. This complication is a consequence of having insisted on explicit types and on consistent typing rules in a language that lacks important abstractions. Namely, the rules for lifting the multiplication (division, addition, subtraction, etc.) between real numbers to the multiplication between real numbers and functions (and between functions and real numbers) with matching co-domain.

Such complication may partly explain why modelers and mathematicians have not found much added value in dependent types and functional languages: even for derivations as simple as those of the Stommel model, these languages add a formal layer that seems to unnecessarily obfuscate computations that are nearly self-evident.

It is not difficult to make the Idris (or Agda, Coq, etc.) type checker digest definitions like Eq. (2.7) and simplify derivations like those of *ySpec1* and *xSpec1* but, unfortunately, there are more bad news: the “dimensionality” of the expressions involved in Stommel’s derivation are not visible in their types! Stommel shows that by “making the equations non-dimensional” the number of parameters of Eq. (2.6) has been reduced to just one: the “non-dimensional” ratio δ .

This is an important result. It implies that the solution of Eq. (2.8) for a given value of δ allows one to recover a whole family of solutions of Eq. (2.6), namely, all those corresponding to values of c and d such that $d/c = \delta$. Or, the other way round, it shows that the problem defined by Eq. (2.6) is *inflated*.

In mathematical modeling but also in data analysis, inflated problems are ubiquitous. Recognizing that the solution of a problem can be reduced to the solution of a much simpler problem is often crucial to avoid the “curse of dimensionality”, e.g. when solving large systems of partial differential equations or in training deep neural networks.

But how can one recognize that a problem is inflated? What does it mean to say that δ is *non-dimensional*? And why are Eq. (2.6) dimensional and Eq. (2.8) non-dimensional? The types of the expressions involved do not provide us with any clue.

Like in the case of Newton’s second law and of the equation for ideal gases, we have to do with a *grammar* of properties (being a force, being a mass, being non-dimensional) that we do not grasp. As a consequence, our types are not well suited to that grammar: T and y , S and x , m and ρ have different properties and these properties are important in the domain of discourse. Yet, they all have the same types!

If we want to take mathematical physics and modeling seriously (and if we want experts in these domains to take FP seriously) we have to encode that grammar through suitable types. We will make a first step towards a DSL of dimensional quantities in Section 6.

Before getting there, however, we need to build a better understanding of the questions raised in this section. In the next one, we start with the question of what it means for a physical quantity to *have a dimension*.

3 Dimensions, physical quantities, units of measurement

In the last section we have discussed simple examples of equations and implicit problem specifications in the context of mathematical physics and modelling. We have seen that the variables that appear in equations like Newton’s second law Eq. (2.4) or in the ideal gas relationship are endowed with properties, like being a force or a temperature, that we do not know how to represent through the type system.

In the case of the Stommel model, we have encountered variables that were said to “have a dimension”, for example c . Other expressions were said to be “non-dimensional”. But what does it mean for c to have a dimension? In a nutshell, it means two things:

1. That c represents a *physical quantity* that can be measured in a system of *units* of measurement of a given *class*.
2. That, given a class, a system of units in that class and a measurement of c in that system, one can define another system of units in the same class that gives a different measurement.

An example will help illustrating the idea. Consider the sheet of paper on which this article is printed. Assume its width to be 20 centimeters and its height to be 30 centimeters.

If we measure *lengths* in centimeters, the measures of width and height will be 20 and 30, respectively. In meters, these measures will instead be 0.2 and 0.3. A change in the units of measurement of lengths has resulted in a change in the measures of the width and of the height of the paper: we say that the width and the height have a dimension or, equivalently, that they are dimensional quantities.

By contrast, the ratio between the height and the width of the paper is $3/2$ no matter whether we measure lengths in centimeters, meters or in other units: we say that the ratio is a non-dimensional quantity.

Notice that the distinction between dimensional and non-dimensional quantities crucially relies on the (implicit) assumption of measuring *both* the height and the width of the paper (more generally, all lengths) with the same units.

In strongly typed languages like Idris and Agda, the judgment $e : t$ means that expression e has type t . In the physical sciences, the judgment $[e] = d$ means that expression e (representing a physical quantity) has dimension d . At this point, we do not know how to formalize this judgment in type theory (we discuss how to do so in Section 5) but the idea is that d is a function of type $\mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ where the number $n : \mathbb{N}$ is domain-specific and \mathbb{R}_+ denotes the set of positive real numbers.

For example, in mechanics $n = 3$. In this domain, the judgment $[e] = \lambda(L, T, M) \Rightarrow L * T^{-1}$ means that e is a quantity that can be measured in a system of units of measurements, for example SI (international) or CGS (centimeter-gram-second), for *lengths*, *times* and *masses*, and that the measure of e *increases* by a factor $L * T^{-1}$ when the units for lengths, times and masses are *decreased* by factors L , T and M , respectively. Another way to express

the same judgment is to say that “ e is a velocity” or that “ e has the dimension of a velocity”. The notation was originally introduced by Maxwell, see (Barenblatt et al., 1996), section 1.1.3 and in DA (dimensional analysis) it is common to write $[e] = L T^{-1}$ as an abbreviation for $[e] = \lambda(L, T, M) \Rightarrow L * T^{-1}$.

In mechanics, physical quantities can also be measured in a system of units for *lengths*, *times* and *forces*. This defines a different *class* of units in the same domain. In plain geometry $n = 1$ and in classical mechanics with heat transfer $n = 4$: beside units for lengths, times and forces, in this domain we also need units for *temperatures*.

A physical quantity φ is called dimensionless if $[\varphi] = \text{const } 1$ and dimensional otherwise.

For the reader who finds all this very confusing and suspiciously far away from the clear and deep waters of type theory: it is! As we have seen in Section 2, the standard arsenal of functional programming abstractions is not yet ready to encode the grammar of dimensions that informs the language of mathematical physics and modeling.

If we want to develop DSLs that are palatable to mathematicians, physicists and modelers, we need to spend some time wading in shallow and muddy waters. The ideas summarized in this section are discussed more authoritatively and to a greater extent in the introduction and in section 1 of (Barenblatt et al., 1996).

We will give a precise specification of the higher order function $[\]$ and formalize the notion of physical quantity in type theory in Section 5. To get there, however, we need to first get an idea of the problems addressed by the theory of *similarity* and by Buckingham’s Pi theorem. This is done in the next two sections. We conclude this one with three remarks:

The first remark is that equations like Newton’s second principle Eq. (2.4) or the ideal gas law Eq. (2.5) represent relationships between physical quantities. The idea is that these equations summarize empirical facts about measurements (or put forward axioms about such measurements) of these quantities. These facts (or axioms) about measurements are understood to hold under a number of assumptions, typically implicit. A crucial one is that all measurements are done in the same class and system of units.

For example, Eq. (2.5) maintains that measurements of the pressure p of an ideal gas are proportional to the product of measurements of density ρ and measurements of temperature T , the factor of proportionality being a gas-specific constant R . We come back to the idea that equations like Newton’s second principle represent relationships between physical quantities and we present a more consistent interpretation of such equations in Section 6.3.

The second remark is that the result of such measurements (and thus the type of the variables entering the equations) depends on a context that is not visible in the equations themselves. For example, when the measurements of pressure, density and temperature are pertinent to a homogeneous gas, Eq. (2.5) can be interpreted as the specification

$$pSpec : \mu p = \mu \rho * \mu R * \mu T$$

In a context in which p , ρ and T represent the pressure, the density and the temperature of a gas in local thermodynamical equilibrium, the same equation can be interpreted as the specification

$$pSpec : p \doteq \lambda(x, t) \Rightarrow \mu(\rho(x, t)) * \mu R * \mu(T(x, t))$$

This is typically the case when a symbol that represents the pressure appears in the right hand side of a system of partial differential equations like the Euler or the Navier-Stokes equations of fluid mechanics (Chorin and Marsden, 2000). In yet another context, p , ρ and

T could represent probability density functions or other higher order functions. But what could be the types of p , ρ , R and T in these contexts? We propose answers to this question in [Sections 5.2](#) and [6.1](#).

The last remark is that, when p is a function taking values in, e.g., $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T})$, the judgment “ p is a pressure” (or “ p has the dimension of a pressure” or, $[p] = M L^{-1} T^{-2}$) is just an abbreviation for “ $\forall (x, t) : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}), p(x, t)$ is a pressure”. If p is differentiable with respect to both space and time and if the space and the time coordinates are dimensional (that is, $\forall (x, t) : (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{T}), [x] = L$ and $[t] = T$) then the partial derivatives of p with respect to space and time have the dimensions $M L^{-2} T^{-2}$ and $M L^{-1} T^{-3}$, respectively. More generally, if p is a function from a dimensional space-time set into real numbers and p has dimension d , the partial derivatives of p with respect to time and space are functions of the same type as p but with dimensions $d T^{-1}$ and $d L^{-1}$. Again, these are shortcuts for $\lambda(L, T, M) \Rightarrow d(L, T, M) * T^{-1}$ and $\lambda(L, T, M) \Rightarrow d(L, T, M) * L^{-1}$, respectively.

As already mentioned in [Section 2](#), the last specification for p could be written more concisely as $p \doteq \rho * R * T$ by introducing canonical abstractions for functions that return numerical values. To the best of our knowledge, no standard Idris library provides such abstractions although, as discussed in the introduction, there have been proposals for making types in FP languages more aware of dimensions and physical quantities, for example (Baumann et al., 2019).

4 Similarity theory and the Pi theorem

The notion of dimension function informally introduced in the last section is closely related with a fundamental principle in physical sciences and with a very pragmatic question in physical modeling.

We start with the latter. At the turn of the 20th century, no computers were available for approximating numerical solutions of mathematical models of physical systems, typically in the form of partial differential equations. Thus, models of physical systems, say of a ship cruising in shallow waters or of an airplane, were themselves physical systems, for convenience often at a reduced *scale*. This raised the obvious question of under which conditions careful measurements made on the scaled model could be “scaled up” to the real system and how this scaling up should be done.

For example, if the drag on a 1:50 model of a ship cruising in a water channel was found to be x Newton, what would be the drag of the real ship? And under which conditions is it possible to give a definite answer to this question?

At first glance, the problem seems to be one of engineering. But the theory that was developed to answer this question, similarity theory or dimensional analysis (DA), turned out to be a logical consequence of a fundamental principle: “physical laws do not depend on arbitrarily chosen basic units of measurement”, see (Barenblatt et al., 1996), section 0.1. This is, in turn, an instance of Galileo’s principle of relativity, see (Arnold, 1989), page 3.

The core results of DA can be summarized in Buckingham’s Pi theorem and this theorem is also an answer to the question(s) of model similarity raised above. We do not need to be concerned with these answers and with specific applications of the Pi theorem in the

physical sciences here. But we need to understand the notions that are at core of this theorem in order to develop a DSL that is suitable for mathematical physics and for modeling.

We introduce Buckingham's Pi theorem as it is stated in (Barenblatt et al., 1996). This formulation is consistent with textbook presentations and raises a number of questions. We flag these questions here and then tackle them from a functional programming perspective in Section 5. This will be the basis for the DSL that we build in Section 6.

4.1 Buckingham's Pi theorem

The theorem is stated at page 42 of (Barenblatt et al., 1996):

A physical relationship between some dimensional (generally speaking) quantity and several dimensional governing parameters can be rewritten as a relationship between some dimensionless parameter and several dimensionless products of the governing parameters; the number of dimensionless products is equal to the total number of governing parameters minus the number of governing parameters with independent dimensions.

This formulation comes at the end of a derivation that starts at page 39 by positing a “physical relationship” between a “dimensional quantity” a and $k + m$ “dimensional governing parameters” a_1, \dots, a_k and b_1, \dots, b_m

$$a = f(a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_m) \quad (4.1)$$

such that a_1, \dots, a_k “have independent dimensions, while the dimensions of parameters b_1, \dots, b_m can be expressed as products of powers of the dimensions of the parameters a_1, \dots, a_k ”:

$$[b_i] = [a_1]^{p_{i1}} \dots [a_k]^{p_{ik}} \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad (4.2)$$

With these premises, the conclusions are then 1) that “the dimension of a must be expressible in terms of the dimensions of the governing parameters a_1, \dots, a_k ”:

$$[a] = [a_1]^{p_1} \dots [a_k]^{p_k} \quad (4.3)$$

and 2) that the function f “possesses the property of generalized homogeneity or symmetry, i.e., it can be written in terms of a function of a smaller number of variables, and is of the following special form”:

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_m) = a_1^{p_1} \dots a_k^{p_k} \Phi(\Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_m) \quad (4.4)$$

where $\Pi_i = b_i / (a_1^{p_{i1}} \dots a_k^{p_{ik}})$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. On page 42ff, the author comments that the term “physical relationship” for f “is used to emphasize that it should obey the covariance principle” and, further, that the Π -theorem is “completely obvious at an intuitive level” and that “it is clear that physical laws should not depend on the choice of units” and that this “was realized long ago, and concepts from dimensional analysis were in use long before the Π -theorem had been explicitly recognized, formulated and proved formally” among others, by “Galileo, Newton, Fourier, Maxwell, Reynolds and Rayleigh”. Indeed, one of the most successful applications of the theorem was Reynolds' scaling law for fluid flows in pipes in 1883, well before Buckingham's seminal papers (Buckingham, 1914, 1915).

Here we do not discuss applications of the Π -theorem, but its relevance for data analysis, parameter identification, and sensitivity analysis is obvious: the computational cost of these

algorithms is typically exponential in the number of parameters. The theorem allows cost reductions that are exponential in the number of parameters with independent dimensions. In the case of f , for example, the theorem allows to reduce the cost from N^{k+m} to N^m where N denotes a sampling size. In data-based modelling and machine learning, this can make the difference between being able to solve a problem in principle and being able to solve it in practice.

The bottom line is that, even though DA and the Π -theorem were formulated at a time in which computer based modeling was not available and were mainly motivated by the questions of model similarity mentioned above, they are still very relevant today.

For us, the challenge is to understand how to apply dependent types to 1) systematically check the dimensional consistency of expressions and 2) assist DA.

In [Section 3](#), we have seen that what in mathematical physics and modeling are called physical quantities are equipped with a dimension function. In analogy with the judgment $e : t$ (or, *type $e = t$*), we have introduced informally the judgment $[e] = d$ to denote that expression e has dimension function d . With the Π -theorem, we have seen that physical quantities may have “independent dimensions” or be dimensionally dependent. With [Eqs. \(4.2\)](#) and [\(4.3\)](#), and we have also encountered (systems of) equations between dimension functions whose solutions play a crucial role in the Π -theorem [Eq. \(4.4\)](#). In the next section we come back to the notion of dimension function of a physical quantity $[x] : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, discuss its relationship with units of measurement, and argue that $[x]$ is a power-law monomial. This property is at the core of the Π -theorem and of the dependently typed formalization of DA outlined in [Sections 5](#) and [6](#).

5 The Pi theorem in Type Theory

In [Section 3](#), we said that the dimension function of a physical quantity x , $[x] : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ encodes the idea that x can be measured in a system of n fundamental units of measurement and that the number $[x](L_1, \dots, L_n)$ denotes the factor by which the measure of x increases (is multiplied) when the n units are decreased (divided) by L_1, \dots, L_n .

We can give a precise meaning to this idea by denoting the measure of x in the units of measurement u_1, \dots, u_n by $\mu x(u_1, \dots, u_n)$. For the time being, we posit $\mu x(u_1, \dots, u_n) : \mathbb{R}$ but the reader should keep in mind that x could represent a velocity or a stress tensor and the result of measuring x could be a vector or a tensor of real numbers.

Similarly, we do not specify the types of x and of u_1, \dots, u_n here: one of the goals of this work is to come up with suitable types for physical quantities and units of measurement, see [Section 5.2](#).

5.1 Dimension function

With these premises, we can make precise the notion of dimension function through:

$$[x](L_1, \dots, L_n) = \frac{\mu x(u_1 / L_1, \dots, u_n / L_n)}{\mu x(u_1, \dots, u_n)} \quad (5.1)$$

The specification suggests that the dimension function of x does not depend on the units of measurement. It formalizes the principle (of covariance, relativity of measurements) that

there is no privileged system of units of measurement or, in other words, that all systems are equally good:

$$\frac{\mu x (u_1 / L_1, \dots, u_n / L_n)}{\mu x (u_1, \dots, u_n)} = \frac{\mu x (u'_1 / L_1, \dots, u'_n / L_n)}{\mu x (u'_1, \dots, u'_n)} \quad (5.2)$$

for any physical quantity x , systems of units u_1, \dots, u_n and u'_1, \dots, u'_n and scaling factors L_1, \dots, L_n . It is easy to see that the principle 5.2 implies that the dimension function fulfills

$$[x] (L_1 / L'_1, \dots, L_n / L'_n) = \frac{[x] (L_1, \dots, L_n)}{[x] (L'_1, \dots, L'_n)} \quad (5.3)$$

by equational reasoning

$$\begin{aligned} & [x] (L_1, \dots, L_n) / [x] (L'_1, \dots, L'_n) \\ &= \text{-- use Eq. (5.1): def. of } [x] \text{ for units } (u_1, \dots, u_n) \\ & \mu x (u_1 / L_1, \dots, u_n / L_n) / \mu x (u_1 / L'_1, \dots, u_n / L'_n) \\ &= \text{-- let } u'_1 = u_1 / L'_1, \dots, u'_n = u_n / L'_n \\ & \mu x (u'_1 / (L_1 / L'_1), \dots, u'_n / (L_n / L'_n)) / \mu x (u'_1, \dots, u'_n) \\ &= \text{-- use Eq. (5.1): def. of } [x] \text{ for units } (u'_1, \dots, u'_n) \\ & [x] (L_1 / L'_1, \dots, L_n / L'_n) \end{aligned}$$

From Eq. (5.3) it follows that

$$[x] (1, \dots, 1) = 1 \quad (5.4)$$

and that dimension functions have the form of power-law monomials, see (Barenblatt et al., 1996) section 1.1.4

$$[x] (L_1, \dots, L_n) = L_1^{d_1 x} * \dots * L_n^{d_n x} \quad (5.5)$$

The exponents $d_1 x, \dots, d_n x$ are sometimes called (perhaps confusingly) the “dimensions” of x and x is said to “have dimensions” $d_1 x, \dots, d_n x$. Their value can be obtained by recalling the specification Eq. (5.1).

For concreteness, consider the case of mechanics already discussed in Section 3. Here $n = 3$ and, in a system of units of measurements for lengths, times and masses, the scaling factors L_1, L_2 and L_3 are denoted by L, M and T . For consistency, we denote the exponents $d_1 x, d_2 x$ and $d_3 x$ by $d_L x, d_M x$ and $d_T x$, respectively.

Thus, in mechanics, Eq. (5.1) tells us that $L^{d_L x} * M^{d_M x} * T^{d_T x}$ is the factor by which the measure of x gets multiplied when the units of measurement for lengths, masses and times are divided by L, M and T . Therefore, when x represents a length (for example, the distance between two points or a space coordinate) we have $d_L x = 1$ and $d_M x = d_T x = 0$. Similarly, when x represents a mass we have $d_M x = 1$ and $d_L x = d_T x = 0$ and when x represents a time we have $d_T x = 1$ and $d_L x = d_M x = 0$. And when x represents a velocity (a distance divided by a time), the factor by which the measure of x gets multiplied when the units of measurement for lengths, masses and times are divided by L, M and T shall be L/T and thus $d_L x = 1, d_M x = 0$ and $d_T x = -1$.

These judgments are a consequence of the notion of (direct or indirect) measurement as *counting*: when we say that the length of a pen is 20 centimeters we mean that we have to add 20 times the length of a centimeter to obtain the length of that pen.

The above analysis suggests that, in classical mechanics, the type of dimension functions is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^3 . Thus, in this domain, we can represent a dimension function with a vector of integers of length 3:

```
namespace Mechanics
  namespace LTM
    data Units = SI | CGS
    D : Type
    D = Vect 3 ℤ
```

Here, we have embedded the datatypes *Units* (with just two data constructors *SI* and *CGS* to denote the international and the centimeter-gram-second systems of units, respectively) and *D* in the namespaces *Mechanics* and *LTM*, the latter representing the class of units for lengths, times and masses, see [Section 3](#). Following our analysis, we can model the syntax of dimensional expressions in terms of a *DimLess* vector for dimensionless quantities, of *Length*, *Time* and *Mass* vectors for lengths, times and masses (the dimensions associated with the fundamental units of measurement in *LTM*)

```
DimLess : D;      Length : D;      Time : D;      Mass : D
DimLess = [0, 0, 0]; Length = [1, 0, 0]; Time = [0, 1, 0]; Mass = [0, 0, 1]
```

and of two combinators *Times* and *Over*:

```
Times : D → D → D; Over : D → D → D
Times = (+); Over = (-)
```

These correspond to the idea that the dimensions of derived units of measurement (for example, for velocities or for energies) are obtained by multiplying or by dividing the dimensions of the fundamental units:

```
Velocity : D;      Acceleration : D
Velocity = Length ‘Over’ Time; Acceleration = Velocity ‘Over’ Time
Force : D;      Work : D
Force = Mass ‘Times’ Acceleration; Work = Force ‘Times’ Length
Energy : D
Energy = Mass ‘Times’ (Velocity ‘Times’ Velocity)
```

One can easily check that energy and mechanical work are equivalent, as one would expect

```
check1 : Energy = Work
check1 = Refl
```

that force and energy are different notions

```
check2 : Not (Force = Energy)
check2 Refl impossible
```

and, of course compute the dimension functions of *D*-values:

```
df : D → ℝ+3 → ℝ+
df d ls = foldr (*) 1.0 (zipWith pow ls ds) where
  ds : Vect 3 ℝ
  ds = map fromInteger d
```

Notice that the fact that the exponents of the dimension function are integers makes dimensional judgments decidable (which not hold for real numbered exponents).

We come back to this idea in [Section 6](#) where we put forward specifications for data types that implement dimension functions in terms of type classes. For the rest of this section, we stick to the example of mechanics and to the representation of dimension functions in terms of vectors of three integer exponents.

5.2 Physical quantities

We are now ready to formalize the notion of physical quantity informally introduced in [Section 3](#). There, we posited that a parameter (e.g., the parameter c of the Stommel model discussed in [Section 2.2](#)) represents a *dimensional* physical quantity when 1) that parameter can be measured in a system of units of a given class and 2) one can define another system of units in the same class that gives a different measurement for the parameter. By contrast, measurements of *dimensionless* physical quantities do not change when the units of measurement are re-scaled.

This suggests that, in the context of mechanics and in the class of units for lengths, times and masses LTM , a (dimensional or dimensionless) physical quantity can be represented by values of type

data $Q : D \rightarrow \text{Type}$ **where**
 $\text{Val} : \{d : D\} \rightarrow (u : \text{Units}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q d$

This allows one to annotate \mathbb{R} values with different dimensions and systems of units, for example

$x : Q \text{Length}; \quad t : Q \text{Time}; \quad m : Q \text{Mass}$
 $x = \text{Val SI } 3; \quad t = \text{Val CGS } 1; \quad m = \text{Val SI } 2$

What kind of combinators shall be defined for physical quantities? As a minimum, one wants to be able to “compute” the D -value of a physical quantity

$\text{dim} : \{d : D\} \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow D$
 $\text{dim} \{d\} _ = d$

and its dimension function $df \circ \text{dim}$ and to measure physical quantities in different units of measurement

$\mu : \{d : D\} \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow \text{Units} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
 $\mu \{d\} (\text{Val } u x) u' = x * df d (fs u u')$

In the definition of μ , fs is the table that returns the scaling factors between units of measurement. Further, it is useful to define elementary binary (+), (−), (*) and (/) operations

$(+) : \{d : D\} \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow Q d$
 $(+) q_1 q_2 = \text{Val SI } (\mu q_1 \text{ SI} + \mu q_2 \text{ SI})$
 $(*) : \{d_1, d_2 : D\} \rightarrow Q d_1 \rightarrow Q d_2 \rightarrow Q (d_1 \text{ ‘Times’ } d_2)$
 $(*) q_1 q_2 = \text{Val SI } (\mu q_1 \text{ SI} * \mu q_2 \text{ SI})$

with similar definitions for subtraction and division. Notice that addition (subtraction) is only defined for quantities of the same dimensions. This helps avoiding “adding apples and oranges” in expressions involving physical quantities. When such additions make sense (as in the example at page 6 of (Barenblatt et al., 1996)), the computations can be implemented

by pattern matching, as done in the definition of μ . With this minimal infrastructure one can define new physical quantities from existing ones

$$\begin{aligned} v &: Q \text{ Velocity} \\ v &= (x + x) / t \end{aligned}$$

and implement dimensional judgments for verified programming like

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_3 &: \text{dim } (x / (t * t)) = \text{Acceleration} \\ \text{check}_3 &= \text{Refl} \end{aligned}$$

Here, values of type $\text{dim } (x / (t * t)) = \text{Acceleration}$ witness that $x / (t * t)$ is an acceleration. We have seen many examples of this kind of dimensional judgments in previous sections: f is a force, m is a mass, T is a temperature, p is a pressure, etc. We can express these judgments through the idiom

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Is} &: \{d : D\} \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow D \rightarrow \text{Type} \\ \text{Is } q \text{ } d &= \text{dim } q = d \end{aligned}$$

and write $\text{Is } q \text{ } d$ instead of $\text{dim } q = d$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_4 &: \text{Is } (m * x / (t * t)) \text{ Force} \\ \text{check}_4 &= \text{Refl} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can assess whether a physical quantity is dimensionless or not

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IsDimLess} &: \{d : D\} \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow \text{Type} \\ \text{IsDimLess } q &= \text{dim } q = \text{DimLess} \\ \text{check}_5 &: \text{IsDimLess } ((x + x) / x) \\ \text{check}_5 &= \text{Refl} \end{aligned}$$

As one would expect, dimensionless quantities are invariant under re-scaling of the units of measurement

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \Gamma > \mu ((x + x) / x) \text{ SI} \\ 2.0 &: \text{Double} \\ \lambda \Gamma > \mu ((x + x) / x) \text{ CGS} \\ 2.0 &: \text{Double} \end{aligned}$$

and the dimension function fulfills the specification [Eq. \(5.1\)](#): by the definition of μ , measurements only depend on the scaling factors between the units of measurement, not on the units themselves.

Notice, however, that for the (perhaps most discussed application of dimensional analysis) computation of the period τ of "small" oscillation of a simple pendulum of length l in a gravitational field of strength g

$$\begin{aligned} l &: Q \text{ Length}; & g &: Q \text{ Acceleration}; & \pi &: Q \text{ DimLess} \\ l &= \text{Val SI } 0.5; & g &= \text{Val SI } 9.81; & \pi &= \text{Val SI } 3.14 \end{aligned}$$

the definition

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &: Q \text{ Time} \\ \tau &= 2 * \pi * \text{sqrt } (l / g) \end{aligned}$$

does not type check. This is because of two reasons. The first one is that we have not defined rules for the multiplication between numerical literals and physical quantities. The second

reason is that we have not defined the computation of the square root of physical quantities. We come back to this point in the next section.

5.3 Dimensional (in)dependence

Dependence. Remember that the Pi theorem is about (two) properties of a generic “physical relationship” f between a “dimensional quantity” a and $k + m$ “dimensional governing parameters” a_1, \dots, a_k and b_1, \dots, b_m .

One conclusion of the theorem is that “the dimension of a can be expressed as a product of the powers of the dimensions of the parameters a_1, \dots, a_k ” as formulated in Eq. (4.2). We have just seen examples of physical quantities whose dimension functions can be expressed as products of powers of the dimension functions of other physical quantities:

$$[l] = [g][\tau]^2, \quad [g] = [l][\tau]^{-2}, \quad \text{or} \quad [\tau] = [l]^{1/2}[g]^{-1/2}$$

In the D -language, we can express and assert the first equality with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_6 & : \text{dim } l = (\text{dim } g \text{ 'Times' } (\text{dim } \tau \text{ 'Times' } \text{dim } \tau)) \\ \text{check}_6 & = \text{Refl} \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_7 & : \text{dim } l = \text{dim } g \text{ 'Times' } \text{Pow } (\text{dim } \tau) \ 2 \\ \text{check}_7 & = \text{Refl} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the second equality. In the definition of check_7 we have used the integer exponentiation function $\text{Pow} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow D$. This fulfills the specification

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pow } d \ 0 & = \text{DimLess} \\ \text{Pow } d \ (n + 1) & = \text{pow } D \ m \ \text{'Times' } D \\ \text{Pow } d \ (n - 1) & = \text{pow } D \ m \ \text{'Over' } D \end{aligned}$$

Notice, however, that formulating $[\tau] = [l]^{1/2}[g]^{-1/2}$ would require fractional exponents and extending our representation of dimension functions to vectors of rational numbers. In other words: the exponents in Eq. (4.2) (and those in Eq. (4.3)) are, in general, rational numbers and representing dimension functions in terms of vectors of rational numbers is perhaps the most natural setting for formulating the Pi theorem in type theory.

The drawback of this approach is that it requires implementing rational numbers in type theory. This is not a problem in principle, but integers have a simpler algebraic structure (initial ring) and more efficient implementations. Also, formulating the Pi theorem in terms of rational exponents does not seem strictly necessary: if dimensional analysis with rational exponents allows one to deduce that the period τ of a simple pendulum scales with $(l/g)^{1/2}$, integer-based dimensional analysis should be enough to deduce that τ^2 scales with l/g !

We explore this possibility in the next section. To this end, let’s formalize the notion that $d : D$ is dependent on $ds : \text{Vect } k \ D$ iff a non-zero integer power of d can be expressed as a product of integer powers of ds :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IsDep} & : \{k : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow (d : D) \rightarrow (ds : \text{Vect } k \ D) \rightarrow \text{Type} \\ \text{IsDep } \{k\} \ d \ ds & = \text{Exists } (\mathbb{Z}, \text{Vect } k \ \mathbb{Z}) (\lambda(p, ps) \Rightarrow (\text{Not } (p = 0), \text{Pow } d \ p = \text{ProdPows } ds \ ps)) \end{aligned}$$

where the function ProdPows implements the computation of products of integer powers of vectors of D values. It fulfills the specification

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{ProdPows} &: \{n : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \text{Vect } n D \rightarrow \text{Vect } n \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow D \\
\text{ProdPows Nil Nil} &= \text{DimLess} \\
\text{ProdPows } (d :: ds) (p :: ps) &= \text{Pow } d p \text{ 'Times' ProdPows } ds ps
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that, because of the definition of *DimLess*, *Times* and *Over* from [Section 5.1](#), *Pow* and *ProdPows* also fulfill

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Pow } d n &= n \triangleleft d \\
\text{ProdPows } ds ps &= \text{foldr } (+) \text{ DimLess } (\text{zipWith } (\triangleleft) ps ds)
\end{aligned}$$

where (\triangleleft) is generic scaling for vectors of numerical types:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\triangleleft) &: \{n : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{T : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Num } T \Rightarrow T \rightarrow \text{Vect } n T \rightarrow \text{Vect } n T \\
x \triangleleft v &= \text{map } (x*) v
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in the *D*-language, dependence between dimension functions boils down to linear dependence between their representations, as one would expect. By extension, we say that a physical quantity *q* is *dimensionally dependent* on a vector of physical quantities *qs* if *dim q* is dependent on the dimensions of *qs*:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IsDimDep} &: \{d : D\} \rightarrow \{k : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds : \text{Vect } k D\} \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow Q \text{Vect } k ds \rightarrow \text{Type} \\
\text{IsDimDep } \{d\} \{ds\} q qs &= \text{IsDep } d ds
\end{aligned}$$

In the definition of *IsDimDep* we have applied the data type *QVect* for vectors of physical quantities (of different dimensions):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{data} \text{ QVect} &: (n : \mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \text{Vect } n D \rightarrow \text{Type} \mathbf{where} \\
\text{Nil} &: \text{QVect } Z \text{ Nil} \\
(\text{::}) &: \{n : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{d : D\} \rightarrow \{ds : \text{Vect } n D\} \rightarrow Q d \rightarrow Q \text{Vect } n ds \rightarrow Q \text{Vect } (S n) (d :: ds)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that *IsDimDep a as* is an existential type. In order to assess that *a* is dimensionally dependent on *as*, one has to provide suitable integer exponents and an equality proof. For the simple pendulum, for example:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{check}_8 &: \text{IsDimDep } \tau [l, g] \\
\text{check}_8 &= \text{Evidence } (2, [1, -1]) (\text{not2eq0}, \text{Refl})
\end{aligned}$$

where *not2eq0* is a proof that 2 is not equal to 0. This evidence is just another way of asserting the equality

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{check}_9 &: \text{Pow } (\text{dim } \tau) 2 = \text{Pow } (\text{dim } l) 1 \text{ 'Times' Pow } (\text{dim } g) (-1) \\
\text{check}_9 &= \text{Refl}
\end{aligned}$$

For the simple pendulum example, it allows one to deduce that, under quite general assumptions⁶, the period of oscillation τ is proportional to the square root of l/g . Given a physical quantity which is dimensionally dependent on other physical quantities, one can make it dimensionless like the “II” quantities of the Pi theorem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{makeDimLess} &: \{d : D\} \rightarrow \{k : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds : \text{Vect } k D\} \rightarrow \\
& \quad (q : Q d) \rightarrow (qs : Q \text{Vect } k ds) \rightarrow (e : \text{IsDimDep } q qs) \rightarrow \\
& \quad Q (\text{dimMakeDimLess } d ds e) \\
\text{makeDimLess } q qs & (\text{Evidence } (p, ps) _) = (\text{pow } q p) / (\text{prodPows } qs ps)
\end{aligned}$$

In the definition of *makeDimLess* we have applied the function *dimMakeDimLess* that computes the dimension of the physical quantity returned by *makeDimLess*:

⁶ The assumptions are that the period of oscillation of the pendulum only depends on its mass, its length, the

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dimMakeDimLess} &: \{k : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow (d : D) \rightarrow (ds : \text{Vect } k D) \rightarrow \text{IsDep } d ds \rightarrow D \\ \text{dimMakeDimLess } d ds &(\text{Evidence } (p, ps) _) = \text{Pow } d p \text{'Over' ProdPows } ds ps \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that *makeDimLess* does indeed yield dimensionless results for specific computations, for example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_{10} &: \text{IsDimLess } (\text{makeDimLess } \tau [l, g] \text{check}_g) \\ \text{check}_{10} &= \text{Refl} \end{aligned}$$

However, proving this in general requires postulating that *d* ‘Over’ *d* is equal to *DimLess* for arbitrary *d*:

$$\text{dodIsDimLess} : \{d : D\} \rightarrow d \text{'Over' } d = \text{DimLess}$$

This is not a problem and suggests that *D* has to be a group (see [Section 6](#)).

Independence. Remember that a second condition for the function *f* of the Pi theorem to be reducible to the form of [Eq. \(4.4\)](#) is that the parameters a_1, \dots, a_k “have independent dimensions”. Perhaps not surprisingly, the idea is that $qs : QVect (S n) ds us$ are dimensionally independent iff expressing *DimLess* as a product of powers of their dimension functions requires all exponents to be zero. This is equivalent to say the vectors associated with their dimensions are linearly independent, see (Barenblatt et al., 1996) section 1.1.5:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AreDimIndep} &: \{n : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds : \text{Vect } n D\} \rightarrow QVect n ds \rightarrow \text{Type} \\ \text{AreDimIndep } \{ds\} _ &= \text{AreIndep } ds \end{aligned}$$

In the definition of *AreDimIndep* we have applied the predicate *AreIndep*. In mechanics, $m = 3$ and *AreIndep* can be defined straightforwardly and applied to assess the dimensional independence of physical quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_{11} &: \text{AreDimIndep } [l, g] \\ \text{check}_{11} &= \text{Refl} \\ \text{check}_{12} &: \text{Not } (\text{AreDimIndep } [\tau, l, g]) \\ \text{check}_{12} &\text{Refl impossible} \end{aligned}$$

5.4 The Pi theorem revisited

With the notions of dimension function, physical quantity and dimensional independence in place, we can formulate the Pi theorem of [Section 4](#) in type-theory. Following the principle that types can encode logical propositions (Wadler, 2015), our goal is to define a type, say *Pi*, such that values of type *Pi* are proofs of the Pi theorem.

In [Section 4.1](#) we saw that the Pi theorem asserts that a “physical relationship” *f* between a “dimensional quantity” *a* and $k + m$ “dimensional governing parameters” a_1, \dots, a_k and b_1, \dots, b_m that fulfill [Eqs. \(4.1\)](#) and [\(4.2\)](#) satisfies [Eqs. \(4.3\)](#) and [\(4.4\)](#). Thus the theorem entails two conclusions, both quantified over functions between physical quantities. We account for this through two higher-order function types $Pi_{4.3}, Pi_{4.4} : \text{Type}$

$$Pi_{4.3} = (f : QVect k ds \rightarrow QVect m ds' \rightarrow Q d) \rightarrow \dots$$

acceleration of gravity and the initial angle, see for example the introduction of (Barenblatt et al., 1996).

and similarly for $Pi_{4,4}$ with implicit parameters $k, m : \mathbb{N}$, $ds : Vect\ k\ D$, $ds' : Vect\ m\ D$ and $d : D$. As discussed in Section 4.1, the term “physical relationship” is used in (Barenblatt et al., 1996) to denote a function that fulfills the “covariance principle”.

We have seen in Section 5.1 that the covariance principle (or principle of relativity of measurements) posits that there is no privileged system of units of measurement or, equivalently, that all systems are equally good. So far, we have formalized the notion of covariance for dimension functions (through the specification 5.1) but we have not discussed this notion for a generic function between dimensional quantities. We will come back to this in Section 6.3. For the time being, let’s assume that $IsCovariant\ f$ is a type that explains what it means for f to fulfill the covariance principle:

$$Pi_{4,3} = (f : QVect\ k\ ds \rightarrow QVect\ m\ ds' \rightarrow Qd) \rightarrow (h_1 : IsCovariant\ f) \rightarrow \dots$$

We need to formalize the two assumptions Eqs. (4.1) and (4.2) about the arguments of f . The first one states that a_1, \dots, a_k “have independent dimensions”. We have seen how to formalize this assumption in Section 5.3:

$$Pi_{4,3} = (f : QVect\ k\ ds \rightarrow QVect\ m\ ds' \rightarrow Qd) \rightarrow (h_1 : IsCovariant\ f) \rightarrow (h_2 : AreIndep\ ds) \rightarrow \dots$$

The second assumption of the Pi theorem, Eq. (4.2), specifies m equalities between dimension functions. We have seen that equality between dimension functions boils down to equality in \mathbb{Z}^n (in mechanics $n = 3$) and is thus decidable.

In Section 5.3, we have also seen that the exponents in Eq. (4.2) are rational numbers and that we can rewrite these equalities as

$$[b_i]^{p_i} = [a_1]^{p_{i1}} \dots [a_k]^{p_{ik}} \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad (5.6)$$

with integers $p_i, p_{i,1}, \dots, p_{i,k}$ as we have done for the simple pendulum example. This states that the dimension functions of the physical quantities of the second argument bs of f can be expressed as products of powers of the dimension functions of the physical quantities of the first argument

$$Pi_{4,3} = (f : QVect\ k\ ds \rightarrow QVect\ m\ ds' \rightarrow Qd) \rightarrow (h_1 : IsCovariant\ f) \rightarrow (h_2 : AreIndep\ ds) \rightarrow (h_3 : AreDep\ ds'\ ds) \rightarrow \dots$$

where $h_3 : AreDep\ ds'\ ds$ is a vector of $IsDep$ proofs, one for each element of ds' :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{data}\ AreDep : \{k', k : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow (ds' : Vect\ k'\ D) \rightarrow (ds : Vect\ k\ D) \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}\ \mathbf{where} \\ Nil : \{k : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds : Vect\ k\ D\} \rightarrow AreDep\ Nil\ ds \\ (::) : \{d' : D\} \rightarrow \{k : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds : Vect\ k\ D\} \rightarrow \{k' : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds' : Vect\ k'\ D\} \rightarrow \\ IsDep\ d'\ ds \rightarrow AreDep\ ds'\ ds \rightarrow AreDep\ (d' :: ds')\ ds \end{aligned}$$

With these premises, the Pi theorem warrants the existence of exponents p_1, \dots, p_k and of a function Φ such that the equalities (4.3) and (4.4) do hold. As for Eq. (5.6), these are rational numbers but we can reformulate Eq. (4.3) as:

$$[a]^p = [a_1]^{p_1} \dots [a_k]^{p_k} \quad (5.7)$$

with integers exponents p, p_1, \dots, p_k and the first conclusion of the Pi theorem (with all its implicit arguments) as

$$Pi_{4,3} = \{k, m : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds : Vect\ k\ D\} \rightarrow \{ds' : Vect\ m\ D\} \rightarrow \{d : D\} \rightarrow (f : QVect\ k\ ds \rightarrow QVect\ m\ ds' \rightarrow Qd) \rightarrow (h_1 : IsCovariant\ f) \rightarrow (h_2 : AreIndep\ ds) \rightarrow (h_3 : AreDep\ ds'\ ds) \rightarrow IsDep\ d\ ds$$

The second conclusion of the Pi theorem is [Eq. \(4.4\)](#). This states the existence of a function Φ that allows one to express f as bs to the power of p as a product of powers of the as times Φ applied to the non-dimensional “ Π ” fractions of [Eq. \(4.4\)](#):

$$\begin{aligned}
 Pi_{4.4} = & \{k, m : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{ds : Vect\ k\ D\} \rightarrow \{ds' : Vect\ m\ D\} \rightarrow \{d : D\} \rightarrow \\
 & (f : QVect\ k\ ds \rightarrow QVect\ m\ ds' \rightarrow Q\ d) \rightarrow (h_1 : IsCovariant\ f) \rightarrow \\
 & (h_2 : AreIndep\ ds) \rightarrow (h_3 : AreDep\ ds'\ ds) \rightarrow \\
 & \text{Exists } (QVect\ m\ (dimMakeAllDimLess\ ds'\ ds\ h_3) \rightarrow Q\ DimLess) \\
 & (\lambda\Phi \Rightarrow (as : QVect\ k\ ds) \rightarrow (bs : QVect\ m\ ds') \rightarrow \\
 & \quad \text{let } (p, ps) = \text{exponents } (\pi_{4.3}\ f\ h_1\ h_2\ h_3) \\
 & \quad \quad \Pi s = \text{makeAllDimLess } bs\ as\ h_3 \\
 & \quad \text{in } \text{pow } (f\ as\ bs)\ p = \text{prodPows } as\ ps * \Phi\ \Pi s)
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the second conclusion of the Pi theorem is an existential type which depends on the first conclusion through the integer exponents p, p_1, \dots, p_k and one needs to postulate $\pi_{4.3} : Pi_{4.3}$ in order to define $Pi_{4.4}$. Alternatively, one could formulate the two conclusions as a dependent pair. Notice that, in order to define $Pi_{4.4}$, we need to “compute” the type of Φ , the exponents p, ps and the “ Π ” fractions Πs . We compute the domain of Φ by applying the function $dimMakeAllDimLess$. This is an extension of $dimMakeDimLess$ from [Section 5.3](#). Similarly, the “ Π ” fractions Πs are compute with an extension of $makeDimLess$ also from [Section 5.3](#).

In this section we have formalized the notions of dimension function, physical quantity, dimensional (in)dependence and given an account of the Pi theorem in type theory. We conclude with the remark that, while values of type $Pi_{4.3}$, $Pi_{4.4}$ allow one to compute Φ from f , the latter is typically an unknown function. In other words: $Pi_{4.3}$ and $Pi_{4.4}$ merely encodes Buckingham’s Pi theorem in type theory and, in applications of DA, the function Φ has to be identified via data analysis or through a theory, as discussed in [Section 4](#) and, in greater detail, in section one of (Barenblatt et al., 1996). For example, the constant $Phi = (2 * \pi)^2$ in the equation for the period of a simple pendulum $\tau^2 = l/g * Phi$ can be estimated empirically or obtained by solving the second order differential equation obtained by applying Newton’s second law in the limit of small amplitudes.

6 Towards a DSL for DA and dimensionally consistent programming

We review some notions from [Section 5](#), discuss possible generalizations, and put forward a number of desiderata for a DSL for DA and dimensionally consistent programming.

6.1 Dimensions and physical quantities

In the last section we have introduced the concrete data types D and Q and encoded the notions of dimensions and of physical quantities in the domain of mechanics and for the *LTE* (lengths, times and masses) class of units of measurement. This has allowed us to formalize basic notions of DA (among others, Buckingham’s Pi theorem) in type theory and to apply dependent types to ensure the dimensional consistency of expressions involving physical quantities. In doing so, we have exploited a number of properties that values of type D fulfilled by definition. For example, that equality is decidable. In [Section 5.3](#) we also suggested that D together with the binary operation *Times* form a group. In this section, we

generalize the approach of [Section 5](#) and discuss what are suitable requirements for data types that encode the notions of dimensions and of physical quantities. As in [Section 5](#), we do so in the domain of mechanics and for the *LTE* class of units of measurement.

As done in (Botta et al., [2021](#)) for the notions of functor and monad, we discuss the notion encoded by D through a type class. This is just for consistency, we could as well use Agda records or modules instead. In Idris, type classes are introduced through the **interface** keyword. For example

```
interface DecEq t where
  decEq : (x1 : t) → (x2 : t) → Dec (x1 = x2)
```

explains what it means for a type t to be in *DecEq*, the class of types for which propositional equality is decidable. The data constructor *Dec* in the definition of *DecEq* is defined as

```
data Dec : Type → Type where
  Yes : (prf : prop) → Dec prop
  No  : (contra : prop → Void) → Dec prop
```

A value of type *Dec prop* can only be constructed in two ways: either by providing a proof of *prop* (a value of type *prop*) or by providing a proof of *Not prop* (a function that maps values of type *prop* to values of the empty type, that is, a contradiction). Thus, a value of type *Dec (x₁ = x₂)* is either a proof of $x_1 = x_2$ or a proof of *Not (x₁ = x₂)* which is what it means for the equality to be decidable.

We can explain what it means for a type D to encode the notion of dimension through a *Dim* interface. As discussed in [Section 5.1](#), we need dimensional judgments to be decidable. This can be expressed by introducing *Dim* as a *refinement* of *DecEq*:

```
interface DecEq D ⇒ Dim D where
```

Perhaps confusingly, this says that *Dim D* implies *DecEq D* or, in other words, that being in *DecEq* is a necessary condition for being in *Dim*. This condition is certainly not sufficient. We have seen in [Section 5.1](#) that, as a minimum, we need to be able to define dimensionless physical quantities and the 3 fundamental dimensions of the *LTE* class:

```
DimLess : D; Length : D; Time : D; Mass : D
```

Further, we need the *Times* and *Over* combinators

```
Times : D → D → D
Over  : D → D → D
```

It is time to put forward some axioms. In [Section 5.3](#) we mentioned that $d \text{ 'Over' } d$ has to be equal to *DimLess* (for any $d : D$) and that D is a group. The idea is that D together with the *Times* operation is the free Abelian group generated by the fundamental dimensions. Thus, writing $(*)$ for *Times*, $(/)$ for *Over*, and 1 for *DimLess* we have

```
isCommutativeTimes      : {d1, d2 : D} → d1 * d2 = d2 * d1
isAssociativeTimes      : {d1, d2, d3 : D} → (d1 * d2) * d3 = d1 * (d2 * d3)
isLeftIdentityDimLess   : {d : D} → 1 * d = d
isRightIdentityDimLess  : {d : D} → d * 1 = d
isLeftInverseDimLessOver : {d : D} → (1/d) * d = 1
isRightInverseDimLessOver : {d : D} → d * (1/d) = 1
```


In order to derive $d/d = 1$ one also needs *Times* to associate with *Over* (Gibbons, 1991):

$$\text{noPrec} : \{d_1, d_2, d_3 : D\} \rightarrow (d_1 * d_2)/d_3 = d_1 * (d_2/d_3)$$

With *DimLess*, *Times* and *Over* one can implement the functions *Pow* and *ProdPows* from Section 5.3 generically

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pow} & : \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow D \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow D \\ \text{Pow } d \ n & = \text{pow } d \ (\text{integerRec } n) \ \mathbf{where} \\ \text{pow} & : \{n : \mathbb{Z}\} \rightarrow D \rightarrow \text{IntegerRec } n \rightarrow D \\ \text{pow } d \ \text{IntegerZ} & = 1 \\ \text{pow } d \ (\text{IntegerSucc } m) & = \text{pow } d \ m * d \\ \text{pow } d \ (\text{IntegerPred } m) & = \text{pow } d \ m / d \\ \text{ProdPows} & : \{n : \mathbb{N}\} \rightarrow \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow \text{Vect } n \ D \rightarrow \text{Vect } n \ \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow D \\ \text{ProdPows Nil Nil} & = 1 \\ \text{ProdPows } (d :: ds) \ (p :: ps) & = \text{Pow } d \ p * \text{ProdPows } ds \ ps \end{aligned}$$

and define derived dimensions as we did in Section 5.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Velocity} & : \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow D \\ \text{Velocity} & = \text{Length} / \text{Time} \\ \text{Acceleration} & : \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow D \\ \text{Acceleration} & = \text{Velocity} / \text{Time} \\ \text{Force} & : \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow D \\ \text{Force} & = \text{Mass} * \text{Acceleration} \\ \text{Energy} & : \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow D \\ \text{Energy} & = \text{Mass} * (\text{Velocity} * \text{Velocity}) \\ \text{Work} & : \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow D \\ \text{Work} & = \text{Force} * \text{Length} \end{aligned}$$

Notice, however, that the type of *Velocity*, *Acceleration*, etc. is generic rather than specific. As a consequence, proving elementary dimensional equalities requires some more work, as one would expect. For example, in Section 5.1, we could assess the equivalence between energy and mechanical work simply by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_1 & : \text{Energy} = \text{Work} \\ \text{check}_1 & = \text{Refl} \end{aligned}$$

because the type of *Energy* and *Work* was fully *defined*. A similar proof based on the *specification* *Dim D* would look like

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_1 & : \{D : \text{Type}\} \rightarrow \text{Dim } D \Rightarrow (=) \{A = D\} \{B = D\} \text{Energy } \text{Work} \\ \text{check}_1 & = \quad (\text{Energy}) \\ & = \{ \text{Refl} \} = \quad (\text{Mass} * (\text{Velocity} * \text{Velocity})) \\ & = \{ \text{Refl} \} = \quad (\text{Mass} * ((\text{Length} / \text{Time}) * (\text{Length} / \text{Time}))) \\ & = \{ ?\mathbf{h}_0 \} = \quad ((\text{Mass} * ((\text{Length} / \text{Time}) / \text{Time})) * \text{Length}) \\ & = \{ \text{Refl} \} = \quad ((\text{Mass} * (\text{Velocity} / \text{Time})) * \text{Length}) \\ & = \{ \text{Refl} \} = \quad ((\text{Mass} * \text{Acceleration}) * \text{Length}) \\ & = \{ \text{Refl} \} = \quad (\text{Force} * \text{Length}) \\ & = \{ \text{Refl} \} = \quad (\text{Work}) \\ & \text{QED} \end{aligned}$$

We can omit all *Refl* steps, which are only there to guide the reader (not the type checker) and perhaps make the type of *check*₁ more readable. However, filling in the *?h*₀ hole and

completing the proof requires invoking the axioms of *Dim*, see the literate Idris code that generates this document at <https://gitlab.pik-potsdam.de/botta/papers>. Alas, we know that implementing generic proofs can be awkward!

Thus, a DSL that supports *generic* DA and dimensionally consistent programming would have to provide a library of proofs of elementary equalities like the one between energy and work. Perhaps more importantly, it would also have to provide proofs of elementary inequalities, for example that *Not (Force = Energy)*. In [Section 5.1](#), we could assess this inequality by

```
check2 : Not (Force = Energy)
check2 Refl impossible
```

Implementing a generic proof on the only basis that the type of *Force* is equal to the type of *Energy* and that such type is in *Dim* would not be as easy. As a minimum, it would require extending the *Dim* interface with axioms that guarantee that the generators are not equal.

Beside providing the basic grammar of the *D*-language, a data type in *Dim* also needs to provide a dimension function. There are (at least) two ways of encoding this requirement. One is to require *Dim* to be equipped with a dimension function method

$$df : D \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+)$$

that fulfills the specifications (5.3) and (5.4):

```
dfSpec1 : {d : D} → df d [1.0, 1.0, 1.0] = 1.0
dfSpec2 : {d : D} → {L, L', T, T', M, M' : ℝ+} →
  df d [L / L', T / T', M / M'] = df d [L, T, M] / df d [L', T', M']
```

In [Section 5.2](#) we have seen that the dimension function indeed fulfilled these requirements up to floating point accuracy. But, with *dfSpec₁* and *dfSpec₂*, implementing *Dim* would have to rely on non-implementable assumptions (if \mathbb{R}_+ is just an alias for floating-point numbers) or on a formalization of real numbers. One way to circumvent this difficulty would be to restrict the type of *df d* to $\mathbb{Q}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$. This is awkward and conceptually unsatisfactory.

Another way of making *Dim* support the definition of a dimension function is to require it to provide the integer exponents of the dimension function of [Eq. \(5.5\)](#):

$$ds : D \rightarrow Vect\ 3\ \mathbb{Z}$$

One could then define the dimension function associated with a *D* type in *Dim* on the basis of such exponents, as done in [Section 5.2](#). For example

```
df : {D : Type} → Dim D ⇒ D → Vect 3 ℝ+ → ℝ+
df d ls = foldr (*) 1.0 (zipWith pow ls rds) where
  rds : Vect 3 ℝ
  rds = map fromInteger (ds d)
```

We do not follow this idea any further. The discussion above strongly suggests that a DSL for DA and dimensionally consistent programming should provide a concrete implementation of *D*, like the one discussed in [Section 5.1](#). We argue that this conclusion holds even if we define *Dim* as a refinement of a *Group* type class. By a similar token, we argue that a DSL for DA and dimensionally consistent programming should also provide a concrete implementation of the data type *Q* for physical quantities.

In the next section, we discuss some more desiderata for such a DSL. As always, implementing these features would necessarily be an iterative process and require a close collaboration between domain experts and computer scientists.

6.2 Towards a DSL: desiderata

In [Section 5.2](#) we have introduced the data type

data $Q : D \rightarrow \text{Type}$ **where**
 $\text{Val} : \{d : D\} \rightarrow (u : \text{Units}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \rightarrow Q d$

of physical quantities. The idea behind the definition of Q was very straightforward: annotating \mathbb{R} values with units of measurement and dimensions allows one to 1) prevent computations that are dimensionally inconsistent (like adding areas to times) and 2) ensure the correctness of computations that involve conversions between units of measurement, like adding meters to centimeters.

6.2.1 Functions

As we have seen in [Sections 2 to 4](#), most computations in mathematical physics involve operations on functions between physical quantities, for example

$\text{pos} : Q \text{Time} \rightarrow Q \text{Length}$
 $\text{pos } t = v * t$

for a function that describes the position of a body moving at constant speed. Standard arithmetic operations between such functions can be defined straightforwardly by lifting the corresponding operations on Q values. For example:

$(+) : \{d_1, d_2 : D\} \rightarrow (Q d_1 \rightarrow Q d_2) \rightarrow (Q d_1 \rightarrow Q d_2) \rightarrow (Q d_1 \rightarrow Q d_2)$
 $(+) f_1 f_2 = \lambda q \Rightarrow f_1 q + f_2 q$

Other operations, however, require some more care. Let pos' represent the first derivative of pos . What shall be the type of pos' ? The discussion at the end of [Section 3](#) suggests that this has to be $Q \text{Time} \rightarrow Q \text{Velocity}$.

A DSL should provide primitives for computing the types of (partial) derivatives of functions of physical quantities and for dimensionally consistent differentiation

$\text{pos}'' : \text{type} (\text{derivative} (\text{derivative } \text{pos}))$
 $\text{pos}'' t = v / t$

support elementary dimensional judgments,

$\text{check}_{13} : \text{dimCodomain } \text{pos}'' = \text{Acceleration}$
 $\text{check}_{13} = \text{Refl}$

and reject definitions that are dimensionally inconsistent like for example $\text{pos}'' t = x / t$. By the same token, a DSL for dimensionally consistent programming should provide primitives for dimensionally consistent “nabla” operations, integration and probabilistic reasoning.

6.2.2 More advanced features: DA driven program derivation and data analysis

Beside supporting program specification and verified programming, dependently typed languages are also powerful tools for type-driven program development (Brady, 2017). For

example, the Idris system can be queried interactively and asked to assist filling in holes like $?h_0$. We can try to exploit this system to derive implementations of physical relationships that fulfill the Pi theorem. For example, coming back to the simple pendulum example from [Section 5.2](#), implementing a function that computes the length of the pendulum that obtains oscillations of period τ given its mass m , the acceleration of gravity g and the amplitude α of the oscillations:

$$\text{length} : Q \text{DimLess} \rightarrow Q \text{Acceleration} \rightarrow Q \text{Mass} \rightarrow Q \text{Time} \rightarrow Q \text{Length}$$

As a first step, we assess that *Acceleration*, *Mass* and *Time* are independent and that *DimLess* depends on these three dimensions. This can be done straightforwardly:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{check}_{14} &: \text{AreIndep} [\text{Acceleration}, \text{Mass}, \text{Time}] \\ \text{check}_{14} &= \text{Refl} \\ \text{check}_{15} &: \text{IsDep DimLess} [\text{Acceleration}, \text{Mass}, \text{Time}] \\ \text{check}_{15} &= \text{Evidence} (1, [0, 0, 0]) (\text{not1eq0}, \text{Refl}) \end{aligned}$$

Then we define $\text{length } \alpha \ g \ m \ \tau$ as a product of powers of g , m and τ , consistently with the Pi theorem

$$\text{length } \alpha \ g \ m \ \tau = \text{pow } g \ ?h_1 * \text{pow } m \ ?h_2 * \text{pow } \tau \ ?h_3 * \text{Psi } \alpha$$

and fill in the holes with exponents that match the type of *length*: 1, 0 and 2. The function $\text{Psi} : Q \text{DimLess SI} \rightarrow Q \text{DimLess SI}$ remains undefined, but is the only part left to deduce from experiments. The type checker will not accept other implementations of *length* but notice that we are solving the system of equations $?h_1 = 1$, $-2 * ?h_1 + ?h_3 = 0$ and $?h_2 = 0$ by hand, with little help from the type checker!

A better approach would be to ask the type checker to solve the system for us, e.g. by searching for suitable values of $?h_1$, $?h_2$ and $?h_3$ in certain ranges. Perhaps more importantly, we would like the type checker to detect situations in which the system has no solutions and recommend possible decompositions of the arguments of physical relationships into lists of dimensionally independent and dimensionally dependent components: the *as* and the *bs* parameters of the Pi theorem. This would be particularly useful for data analysis: it would provide domain experts with alternative, dimensionally consistent views of a given dataset and help practitioners reducing the complexity of data-based studies.

6.3 Physical laws revisited, the covariance principle

In [Section 3](#), we have argued that equations like Newton's second principle, [Eq. \(2.4\)](#), or the ideal gas law, [Eq. \(2.5\)](#), summarize empirical facts about measurements (or put forward axioms about such measurements) of physical quantities. Specifically, we have argued that [Eq. \(2.4\)](#) posits that measurements of F (force) are equal to the product of measurements of m (mass) and measurements of a (acceleration). In [Section 5.2](#) we have formalized the notion of physical quantity and the form of functions between physical quantities that fulfill the covariance principle as expressed by the Pi theorem.

Now we can provide a better interpretation of [Eqs. \(2.4\)](#) and [\(2.5\)](#) and, more generally, equations that represent physical laws. The idea is that these equations specify functions between physical quantities. For example, [Eq. \(2.4\)](#) can be interpreted as

$$F : Q\text{Mass} \rightarrow Q\text{Acceleration} \rightarrow Q\text{Force}$$

$$F m a = m * a$$

Because of the definition of multiplication between physical quantities from [Section 5.2](#), measurements of $F m a$ are equal to the product of measurements of m and measurements of a in any system of units of measurement.

This is equivalent to saying that F fulfills the covariance principle and suggests how *IsCovariant* from [Section 5.4](#) shall be defined for generic functions. Informally, a function $f : Q\text{Vect } m \text{ ds} \rightarrow Qd$ fulfills the covariance principle iff the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Q\text{Vect } m \text{ ds} & \xrightarrow{\text{mapQ } \mu_u} & \text{Vect } m \mathbb{R} \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow f' \\
 Qd & \xrightarrow{\mu_u} & \mathbb{R}
 \end{array}$$

commutes. Here $\text{mapQ } \mu_u$ is the function that applies $\lambda q \Rightarrow \mu q u$ to the physical quantities of a $Q\text{Vect}$, u is an arbitrary system of units of measurement and $f' : \text{Vect } m \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is, up to the type, just f .

7 Conclusions

Specialization and the pervasive usage of computer-based modelling and simulation in the physical sciences have widened the gap between the languages of mathematical physics and modelling and those of mathematics and functional programming. This gap is a major obstacle to fruitful communication and to interdisciplinary collaborations: computer-based modelling badly needs precise specifications and dependently typed programming languages have enough expressive power to support formulating such specifications. But dependently typed programming languages are not (yet) well equipped for encoding the “grammar of dimensions” which rules the languages of mathematical physics and modelling. Our contribution is a first step towards making FP more suitable for developing applications in these domains.

We have studied the role of equations, laws and dimensions on the basis of established examples from the physical sciences and of seminal works in modelling. We have analyzed the notions of dimension function, physical quantity and units of measurement and we have provided an account of the theory of physical similarity and of Buckingham’s Pi theorem from the point of view of computer science and FP. Finally, we have proposed a small DSL that encodes these notions in Idris, supports dimensional judgments, and leverages the type system of the host language to provide tests of dimensional consistency, dependence, independence and to ensure the consistency of expressions involving physical quantities.

The DSL also supports dependently typed formulations of Buckingham’s Pi theorem and we have discussed and type checked one such formulation. From this perspective, our work is also a contribution towards understanding relativity principles through formalization. In the physical sciences these principles are well understood and appreciated. They have lead

to important applications in engineering and data science but also to surprising conceptual breakthroughs (Pauli, 2013). But it is not clear how relativity principles could be formulated in the economic sciences, in the biological sciences, and thus also in climate science. We believe that type theory and FP can contribute towards answering this question.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Prof. Jeremy Gibbons and Dr. Julian Newman, whose comments have lead to significant improvements of the original manuscript. The work presented in this paper heavily relies on free software, among others on Coq, Idris, Agda, GHC, git, vi, Emacs, \LaTeX and on the FreeBSD and Debian GNU/Linux operating systems. It is our pleasure to thank all developers of these excellent products. This is TiPES contribution No 231. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 820970.

Conflicts of Interest

None.

References

- Arnold, V. (1989) *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics*. Springer.
- Atkey, R., Ghani, N., Forsberg, F. N., Revell, T. & Staton, S. (2015) Models for polymorphism over physical dimensions. 13th International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications (TLCA’15). pp. 45–59.
- Barenblatt, G., Isaakovich, B., Crighton, D., Ablowitz, M., Davis, S., Hinch, E., Iserles, A., Ockendon, J. & Olver, P. (1996) *Scaling, Self-similarity, and Intermediate Asymptotics: Dimensional Analysis and Intermediate Asymptotics*. Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- Baumann *et al.* (2019) quantities: Type-safe physical computations and unit conversions in Idris. <https://github.com/timjb/quantities>.
- Bird, R. (2014) *Thinking Functionally with Haskell*. Cambridge University Press.
- Botta, N., Brede, N., Crucifix, M., Ionescu, C., Jansson, P., Li, Z., Martínez, M. & Richter, T. (2023) Responsibility under uncertainty: Which climate decisions matter most? *Environmental Modeling & Assessment*.
- Botta, N., Brede, N., Jansson, P. & Richter, T. (2021) Extensional equality preservation and verified generic programming. *Journal of Functional Programming*. **31**, e24.
- Botta, N., Jansson, P. & Ionescu, C. (2017) Contributions to a computational theory of policy advice and avoidability. *Journal of Functional Programming*. **27**, 1–52.
- Botta, N., Jansson, P. & Ionescu, C. (2018) The impact of uncertainty on optimal emission policies. *Earth System Dynamics*. **9**(2), 525–542.
- Botta, N., Mandel, A., Ionescu, C., Hofmann, M., Lincke, D., Schupp, S. & Jaeger, C. (2011) A functional framework for agent-based models of exchange. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*. **218**(8), 4025–4040.
- Brady, E. (2017) *Type-Driven Development in Idris*. Manning Publications Co.
- Bridgman, P. W. (1922) *Dimensional Analysis*. Yale University Press.
- Buckingham, E. (1914) On physically similar systems; illustrations of the use of dimensional equations. *Phys. Rev.* **4**(4), 345–376.

- Buckingham, E. (1915) Model experiments and the form of physical equations. *Transactions of The American Society of Mechanical Engineers*. **37**, 263–296.
- Buckwalter, B. (2006-2022) dimensionally: Statically checked physical dimensions. <https://hackage.haskell.org/package/dimensional>.
- Chorin, A. & Marsden, J. (2000) *A Mathematical Introduction to Fluid Mechanics*. Texts in Applied Mathematics. Springer New York.
- Courant, R. & Hilbert, D. (1989) *Methods of Mathematical Physics*. vol. 1. Wiley. New York.
- Eisenberg, R. & Muranushi, T. (2022) units: A domain-specific type system for dimensional analysis. <https://hackage.haskell.org/package/units>.
- Galassi *et al.*. (1996-2023) GSL - GNU Scientific Library. <https://www.gnu.org/software/gsl/>.
- Gibbins, J. C. (2011) *Dimensional analysis*. Springer. London.
- Gibbons, J. (1991) *Algebras for Tree Algorithms*. D.Phil. thesis. Programming Research Group, Oxford University. Available as Technical Monograph PRG-94. ISBN 0-902928-72-4.
- Hoppe, M., Embreus, O. & Fülöp, T. (2021) Dream: A fluid-kinetic framework for tokamak disruption runaway electron simulations. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **268**, 108098.
- House, R. T. (1983) A proposal for an extended form of type checking of expressions. *Comput. J.* **26**(4), 366–374.
- Ionescu, C. & Jansson, P. (2013) Testing versus proving in climate impact research. Proc. TYPES 2011. Dagstuhl, Germany. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. pp. 41–54.
- Ionescu, C. & Jansson, P. (2016) Domain-specific languages of mathematics: Presenting mathematical analysis using functional programming. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*. **230**, 1–15.
- Ionescu, C., Jansson, P. & Botta, N. (2018) Type theory as a framework for modelling and programming. ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22 WG2 N4768. Springer. pp. 119–133.
- Jansson, P. & Ionescu, C. (2014-2016) Domain-specific languages of mathematics (pedagogical project).
- Jansson, P., Ionescu, C. & Bernardy, J.-P. (2022) *Domain-Specific Languages of Mathematics*. vol. 24 of *Texts in Computing*. College Publications.
- Jonsson, D. (2014) Dimensional analysis: A centenary update.
- Keller *et al.*. (2023) Unitful: Physical quantities with arbitrary units. <https://github.com/PainterQubits/Unitful.jl>.
- Kennedy, A. J. (1997) Relational parametricity and units of measure. Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages. New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery. p. 442–455.
- Kolmogoroff, A. (1932) Zur deutung der intuitionistischen logik. *Math Z.* **35**, 58–65.
- Kuznetsov, Y. A. (1998) *Elements of Applied Bifurcation Theory*. Springer. Berlin. second edition.
- Lucarini, V. (2004) Towards a definition of climate science. *ArXiv Physics e-prints*.
- McBride, C. & Nordvall-Forsberg, F. (2022) Type systems for programs respecting dimensions. Advanced Mathematical and Computational Tools in Metrology and Testing XII. World Scientific. pp. 331–345.
- Morgan, C. (1994) *Programming from specifications, 2nd Edition*. Prentice Hall International series in computer science. Prentice Hall.
- Newman, J. (2011) A more "complete" version of the pi-theorem: Draft.
- Norell, U. (2007) *Towards a practical programming language based on dependent type theory*. Ph.D. thesis. Chalmers University of Technology.
- OpenCFD. (2004-2023) OpenFOAM. <https://www.openfoam.com/>.
- Pauli, W. (2013) *Theory of relativity*. Courier Corporation.
- Pint Developers. (2012-2023) Pint: makes units easy. <https://pint.readthedocs.io/en/stable/>.
- Pusztai, I., Ekmark, I., Bergström, H., Halldestam, P., Jansson, P., Hoppe, M., Vallhagen, O. & Fülöp, T. (2023) Bayesian optimization of massive material injection for disruption mitigation in tokamaks. *Journal of Plasma Physics*. **89**(2), 905890204.

- Quade, W. (1961) *Über die algebraische struktur des größenkalküls der physik.*
- Rayleigh, J. W. S. (1915) The principle of similitude. *Nature*. p. 66–68.
- Schabel, M. C. & Watanabe, S. (2003-2010) Boost.Units. https://www.boost.org/doc/libs/1_77_0/doc/html/boost_units.html.
- Stommel, H. (1961) Thermohaline convection with two stable regimes of flow. *Tellus*. **13**(2), 224–230.
- The Astropy Developers. (2011-2023) astropy: Units and Quantities. <https://docs.astropy.org/en/stable/units/index.html>.
- The Coq Development Team. (2021) The coq proof assistant (version 8.13.0). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4501022>.
- The Numerical Algorithms Group (NAG). (1970-2023) The NAG Library. <https://www.nag.com/content/nag-library>.
- The Python community. (2005-2023) Numerical computing with Python. <https://numpy.org/>.
- Verbitsky, M. Y. (2022) Inarticulate past: similarity properties of the ice–climate system and their implications for paleo-record attribution. *Earth System Dynamics*. **13**(2), 879–884.
- Verbitsky, M. Y. & Crucifix, M. (2020) π -theorem generalization of the ice-age theory. *Earth System Dynamics*. **11**(1), 281–289.
- Verbitsky, M. Y. & Crucifix, M. (2021) Esd ideas: The pecllet number is a cornerstone of the orbital and millennial pleistocene variability. *Earth System Dynamics*. **12**(1), 63–67.
- Verbitsky, M. Y. & Crucifix, M. (2023) Do phenomenological dynamical paleoclimate models have physical similarity with nature? seemingly, not all of them do. *Climate of the Past Discussions*. **2023**, 1–15.
- Wadler, P. (2015) Propositions as types. *Commun. ACM*. **58**(12), 75–84.
- Whitney, H. (1968a) The mathematics of physical quantities: Part i: Mathematical models for measurement. *The American Mathematical Monthly*. **75**(2), 115–138.
- Whitney, H. (1968b) The mathematics of physical quantities: Part ii: Quantity structures and dimensional analysis. *The American Mathematical Monthly*. **75**(3), 227–256.
- Zhang, W., Almgren, A., Beckner, V., Bell, J., Blaschke, J., Chan, C., Day, M., Friesen, B., Gott, K., Graves, D., Katz, M., Myers, A., Nguyen, T., Nonaka, A., Rosso, M., Williams, S. & Zingale, M. (2019) AMReX: a framework for block-structured adaptive mesh refinement. *Journal of Open Source Software*. **4**(37), 1370.