A linear perspective on cut-elimination for non-wellfounded sequent calculi with least and greatest fixed-points 1/\20

Alexis Saurin IRIF – CNRS, Université Paris Cité & INRIA

32nd TABLEAUX Conference 21 september 2023, Prague



Introduction and Background

- Aim
- Classical and Linear Logic
- μLL[∞]: Circular and Non-wellfounded Proofs for Linear Logic with Least and Greatest Fixed-points

2 μ LL^{∞} Cut-elimination

- Reviewing μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination
- Encoding μLL^{∞} in $\mu MALL^{\infty}$
- Simulation of μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps
- Cut-elimination for μLL^{∞}

3 Applications, Remarks and Conclusion

- Cut-elimination for μLK^{∞} , μLJ^{∞}
- Remarks on the encoding of the exponentials
- Conclusion



Introduction and Background

- Aim
- Classical and Linear Logic
- μLL[∞]: Circular and Non-wellfounded Proofs for Linear Logic with Least and Greatest Fixed-points

2 μ LL $^{\infty}$ Cut-elimination

- Reviewing μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination
- Encoding μLL^{∞} in $\mu MALL^{\infty}$
- Simulation of μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps
- Cut-elimination for μLL^{∞}

3 Applications, Remarks and Conclusion

- Cut-elimination for μLK[∞], μLJ[∞]
- Remarks on the encoding of the exponentials
- Conclusion

A <u>linear</u> perspective on <u>cut-elimination</u> for

non-wellfounded sequent calculi with least and greatest fixed-points

- Long-term goal: contribute to improve the support for inductive and coinductive constructs in ATP, FPL and ITP.
- *Medium-term:* Design and study logical frameworks combining good properties wrt. (i) proof construction and (ii) proof normalization (that is, open-goal-elimination and cut-elimination)

& admitting support for inductive and coinductive reasoning;

- Study circular & non-wellfounded proof systems for the μ -calculus:
 - pioneering works by Santocanale; Sprenger and Dam; Studer; Brotherston & Simpson; Dax, Hoffman & Lange;
 - recently, numerous developments of circular/cyclic proof systems (Afshari & Leigh, Baelde & Doumane & S., Berardi & Tatsuta, Cohen & Rowe, Das & Doumane & Pous, ... + a new generation of young researchers)
- This paper establishes a cut-elimination theorem for non-wellfounded proofs for μLL[∞], μLK[∞] and μLJ[∞] by relying on (a tiny bit of) what we have learnt from linear logic in the past 35 years.

Relating additive & multiplicative inferences

• In LK, additive and multiplicative inferences for \land and \lor are interderivable *thanks to availability of structural rules*:

$$\frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A, B \vdash A} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{l})} \frac{\overline{B \vdash B}}{A, B \vdash B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{l})} (\wedge^{a}_{r}) \qquad \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\wedge^{a}_{l}^{2})} \frac{\overline{B \vdash B}}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\wedge^{a}_{l}^{1})} (\wedge^{a}_{r})$$

Relating additive & multiplicative inferences

• In LK, additive and multiplicative inferences for \land and \lor are interderivable *thanks to availability of structural rules*:

$$\frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A, B \vdash A} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{l})} \frac{\overline{B \vdash B}}{A, B \vdash B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{l})} (\Lambda^{a}_{r}) \qquad \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A \wedge^{a} B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\Lambda^{a}_{r})} \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{(\Lambda^{a}^{2})} \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A \wedge^{m} B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\Lambda^{a}_{l})} (\Lambda^{a}_{r})$$

A, B are weakened on the left, $A \wedge^a B$ is contracted on the left.

Exponentials: Relating additive & multiplicative inferences

• In LK, additive and multiplicative inferences for \land and \lor are interderivable *thanks to availability of structural rules*:

$$\frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A, B \vdash A} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{l})} \frac{\overline{B \vdash B}}{A, B \vdash B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{l})} (\Lambda^{a}_{r}) \qquad \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A \wedge^{a} B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\Lambda^{a}_{r})} \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{(\Lambda^{a})} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\Lambda^{a})} \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A \wedge^{m} B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\Lambda^{a})} (\Lambda^{a}_{r})$$

- A, B are weakened on the left, $A \wedge^a B$ is contracted on the left.
 - In LL, no free structural rules: need to tag formulas with exponentials where structural rules are needed, leading to: !A⊗!B → !(A&B). (with one-sided sequents: ⊢?A[⊥] ??B[⊥],!(A&B) and ⊢!A⊗!B,?(A[⊥]⊕B[⊥]))

Exponentials: Relating additive & multiplicative inferences

• In LK, additive and multiplicative inferences for \land and \lor are interderivable *thanks to availability of structural rules*:

$$\frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A, B \vdash A} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{1})} \frac{\overline{B \vdash B}}{A, B \vdash B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(W_{1})} (\wedge^{a}_{r}) \qquad \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A \wedge^{a} B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\wedge^{a}_{r})} \frac{\overline{A \vdash A}}{(\wedge^{a}_{r})} \frac{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A}{A \wedge^{a} B \vdash A \wedge^{m} B} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\wedge^{a}_{r})} (\wedge^{a}_{r})$$

A, B are weakened on the left, $A \wedge^a B$ is contracted on the left.

In LL, no free structural rules: need to tag formulas with exponentials where structural rules are needed, leading to: ! A⊗! B → !(A&B). (with one-sided sequents: ⊢?A[⊥] ??B[⊥],!(A&B) and ⊢!A⊗!B,?(A[⊥]⊕B[⊥]))

$$\pi_{\otimes \vdash \&} = \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, A}{\vdash ?A^{\perp}, A}}^{(Ax)} (Ax)}{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash B^{\perp}, B}{\vdash ?B^{\perp}, B}}{(Ax)} (Ax)}{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash B^{\perp}, B}{\vdash ?B^{\perp}, B}}{(Ax)} (Ax)} \pi_{\& \vdash \otimes} = \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, A}{\vdash A^{\perp}, B^{\perp}, A}}^{(Ax)} (Ax)}{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B^{\perp}, B}{\vdash ?A^{\perp}, ?B^{\perp}, A}}{(Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)} \frac{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash B^{\perp}, B}{\vdash A^{\perp}, B^{\perp}, B}}{(Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, A}{\vdash A^{\perp}, B^{\perp}, A}}^{(A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, A} (B^{\perp})} (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, B^{\perp}, B})}{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash ?(A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}{\vdash ?A^{\perp}, ?B^{\perp}, (A \& B)}} (Ax)}{(Ax)}} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, A}{\vdash A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, A}}^{(Ax)} (B^{\perp})} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)}{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)}{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)}} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)}{\underset{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)$$
$$= \frac{\overbrace{\stackrel{\vdash A^{\perp}, B}{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}} (Ax)} (Ax)} (Ax)$$

Non-Wellfounded Sequent Calculus

Consider your favourite logic \mathscr{L} & add fixed points as in the μ -calculus

Pre-proofs are the trees coinductively generated by:

•
$$\mathscr{L}$$
 inference rules
• \mathscr{L} inference rules
• \mathcal{L} inference for μ, ν :
• $\frac{\Gamma + F[\mu X.F/X] + \Delta}{\Gamma, \mu X.F + \Delta}$ (μ_{l}) $\frac{\Gamma, F[\nu X.F/X] + \Delta}{\Gamma, \nu X.F + \Delta}$ (ν_{l})
• $\frac{\Gamma + F[\mu X.F/X], \Delta}{\Gamma + \mu X.F, \Delta}$ (μ_{r}) $\frac{\Gamma + F[\nu X.F/X], \Delta}{\Gamma + \nu X.F, \Delta}$ (ν_{r})

Fischer-Ladner Subformulas: induced by fixed-point unrolling: $F[\sigma X.F/X] \in FL(\sigma X.F)$ with $\sigma \in \{\mu, \nu\}$.

Circular (pre-)proofs: the regular fragment of infinite (pre-)proofs, ie finitely many sub-(pre)proofs.

Pre-proofs are unsound!! Need for a global validity condition

μLL^{∞} Non-Wellfounded Sequent Calculus

Consider your favourite logic LL & add fixed points as in the $\mu\text{-calculus}$

 μLL^{∞} **Pre-proofs** are the trees **coinductively** generated by:

LL inference rules

• inference for
$$\mu, \nu$$
:

$$\frac{\vdash F[\mu X.F/X], \Delta}{\vdash \mu X.F, \Delta} \quad (\mu_r) \quad \frac{\vdash F[\nu X.F/X], \Delta}{\vdash \nu X.F, \Delta} \quad (\nu_r)$$

Fischer-Ladner Subformulas: induced by fixed-point unrolling: $F[\sigma X.F/X] \in FL(\sigma X.F)$ with $\sigma \in \{\mu, \nu\}$.

Circular (pre-)proofs: the regular fragment of infinite (pre-)proofs, ie finitely many sub-(pre)proofs. μLL^{ω}

Pre-proofs are unsound!! Need for a global validity condition

$$\frac{\vdots}{\vdash \mu X.X} \begin{array}{c} (\mu) \\ \mu \chi.X \\ \mu \chi.X \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (\mu) \\ \mu \chi.X, \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \mu \chi.X, F \\ \mu \chi.X, F \\ \mu \chi.X, F \end{array} \begin{array}{c} (\nu) \\ (\nu) \\ (\nu) \\ (Cut) \end{array}$$

Involutive negation, ()^{\perp}: operator on formula, not a connective.One-sided sequents as lists: $\vdash A_1, \dots, A_n$.($\Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is a short for $\vdash \Gamma^{\perp}, \Delta$) μ and v are dual binders.Ex: $(vX.X \otimes X)^{\perp} = \mu X.X^{\Im} X$.

Inference Rules

$$\frac{}{\vdash F, F^{\perp}} \stackrel{(Ax)}{=} \frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \quad (Cut) \qquad \qquad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, G, F, \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma, F, G, \Delta} \quad (ex)$$

$$\frac{\vdash F, F, \Gamma}{\vdash F, \Gamma} \stackrel{(?c)}{=} \frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash F, \Gamma} \stackrel{(?w)}{=} \frac{\vdash F, \Gamma}{\vdash F, \Gamma} \stackrel{(?w)}{=} \frac{\vdash F, \Gamma}{\vdash F, \Gamma} \stackrel{(?w)}{=} \frac{\vdash G[vX.G/X], \Gamma}{\vdash vX.G, \Gamma} \quad (v) \qquad \frac{\vdash F[\mu X.F/X], \Gamma}{\vdash \mu X.F, \Gamma} \quad (\mu)$$

μ LL formulas					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
μ LL ^{∞} Inference Rules					
$\frac{1}{\vdash F, F^{\perp}} \text{(Ax)} \frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \text{(Cut)} \qquad \qquad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, G, F, \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma, F, G, \Delta} \text{(ex)}$					
$ \frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \bot, \Gamma} (\top) \qquad \frac{\vdash F, \Gamma \vdash G, \Gamma}{\vdash F \& G, \Gamma} (\&) \qquad \frac{\vdash A_i, \Gamma}{\vdash A_1 \oplus A_2, \Gamma} (\oplus_i) \text{(no rule for 0)} \\ \frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \bot, \Gamma} (\bot) \qquad \frac{\vdash F, G, \Gamma}{\vdash F \Im G, \Gamma} (\Im) \qquad \frac{\vdash F, \Gamma \vdash G, \Delta}{\vdash F \otimes G, \Gamma, \Delta} (\otimes) \qquad \overline{\vdash 1} (1) \\ \frac{\vdash G[vX.G/X], \Gamma}{\vdash vX.G, \Gamma} (v) \qquad \frac{\vdash F[\mu X.F/X], \Gamma}{\vdash \mu X.F, \Gamma} (\mu) $					

	ulas			
F ::=	a F&F a [⊥] F⊗F X μX.F	F ⅔ F F ⊕ F vX.F	⊤ ⊥ ?F 1 0 !F	negative <i>LL</i> formulas positive <i>LL</i> formulas lfp & gfp

μLL^{∞} Inference Rules

ull formulas

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \hline F,F^{\perp} & (Ax) & \frac{\vdash \Gamma,F & \vdash F^{\perp},\Delta}{\vdash \Gamma,\Delta} & (Cut) & \frac{\vdash \Gamma,G,F,\Delta}{\vdash \Gamma,F,G,\Delta} & (ex) \\ \hline \hline F,F,\Gamma & (?d) & \frac{\vdash F,?\Gamma}{\vdash IF,?\Gamma} & (!p) & \frac{\vdash ?F,?F,\Gamma}{\vdash ?F,\Gamma} & (?c) & \frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash ?F,\Gamma} & (?w) \\ \hline \hline \hline \hline F,\Gamma,\Gamma & (T) & \frac{\vdash F,\Gamma & \vdash G,\Gamma}{\vdash F\&G,\Gamma} & (\&) & \frac{\vdash A_i,\Gamma}{\vdash A_1\oplus A_2,\Gamma} & (\oplus_i) & (no rule for 0) \\ \hline \hline \hline \vdash \bot,\Gamma & (\bot) & \frac{\vdash F,G,\Gamma}{\vdash F\&G,\Gamma} & (?) & \frac{\vdash F,\Gamma & \vdash G,\Delta}{\vdash F\otimes G,\Gamma,\Delta} & (\otimes) & \overline{\vdash 1} & (1) \\ \hline \hline \hline VX.G,\Gamma & (v) & \frac{\vdash F[\mu X.F/X],\Gamma}{\vdash \mu X.F,\Gamma} & (\mu) \end{array}$$



μLL^{∞} Inference Rules (with ancestor relation)





μLL^{∞} Inference Rules (with ancestor relation)



How to distinguish valid nwf proofs from invalid ones?

Infinite traces, validity $F = vX.((a \Re a^{\perp}) \otimes (!X \otimes \mu Y.X)).$ $G = \mu Y.F$



A trace (or thread) on an infinite branch $(\Gamma_i)_{i \in \omega}$ is an infinite sequence of formula occurrences $(F_i)_{i \geq k}$ such that $\forall i \geq k, \ F_i \in \Gamma_i$ and F_{i+1} is an immediate ancestor of F_i . 8/20

Infinite traces, validity $F = vX.((a \Re a^{\perp}) \otimes (!X \otimes \mu Y.X)).$ $G = \mu Y.F$



A trace (or thread) on an infinite branch $(\Gamma_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is an infinite sequence of formula occurrences $(F_i)_{i\geq k}$ such that $\forall i \geq k, \ F_i \in \Gamma_i$ and F_{i+1} is an immediate ancestor of F_i .

A trace (or thread) is valid if the minimal *recurring* principal formula of the trace is a *v*-formula (\approx if it unfolds infinitely many *v*).

A proof is valid if every infinite branch contains a valid trace.

Infinite traces, validity $F = vX.((a \Im a^{\perp}) \otimes (!X \otimes \mu Y.X)).$ $G = \mu Y.F$



A trace (or thread) on an infinite branch $(\Gamma_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is an infinite sequence of formula occurrences $(F_i)_{i\geq k}$ such that $\forall i \geq k, \ F_i \in \Gamma_i$ and F_{i+1} is an immediate ancestor of F_i .

A trace (or thread) is valid if the minimal *recurring* principal formula of the trace is a *v*-formula (\approx if it unfolds infinitely many *v*).

A proof is valid if every infinite branch contains a valid trace.

Validity criteria ensure (productive) cut-elimination:

 μ ALL^{ω}: Santocanale in 2002, with Fortier in 2013; μ MALL^{∞}: Baelde, Doumane and S. in 2016; Bouncing μ MALL^{∞}: Baelde, Doumane, Kuperberg and S. in 2022.

Introduction and Background

- Aim
- Classical and Linear Logic
- μLL[∞]: Circular and Non-wellfounded Proofs for Linear Logic with Least and Greatest Fixed-points

2 μ LL^{∞} Cut-elimination

- Reviewing μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination
- Encoding μLL^{∞} in $\mu MALL^{\infty}$
- Simulation of μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps
- Cut-elimination for μLL^{∞}

Applications, Remarks and Conclusion

- Cut-elimination for μLK[∞], μLJ[∞]
- Remarks on the encoding of the exponentials
- Conclusion

Theorem (Baelde, Doumane & S, 2016)

Fair μ MALL^{∞} cut-reduction sequences converge to cut-free μ MALL^{∞} proofs.

Strategy: "push" the cuts away from the root.

• Cut-Cut Case $\frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta, G \quad (Cut)}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, G \quad \vdash G^{\perp}, \Sigma} \xrightarrow{(Cut)} \longleftrightarrow \underbrace{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \frac{\vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta, G \quad \vdash G^{\perp}, \Sigma}{\vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta, \Sigma}}_{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma} (Cut)$

Theorem (Baelde, Doumane & S, 2016)

Fair μ MALL^{∞} mcut-reduction sequences converge to cut-free μ MALL^{∞} proofs.

Strategy: "push" the cuts away from the root.

• Cut-Cut Case merge in a multicut:

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta, G}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, G} \quad (Cut) \quad \vdash G^{\perp}, \Sigma \quad (Cut) \quad \Rightarrow \frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta, G \quad \vdash G^{\perp}, \Sigma}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma} \quad (mcut)$$

Theorem (Baelde, Doumane & S, 2016)

Fair μ MALL^{∞} mcut-reduction sequences converge to cut-free μ MALL^{∞} proofs.

Strategy: "push" the cuts away from the root.

• Cut-Cut Case merge in a multicut:

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta, G}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, G} \xrightarrow{(\mathsf{Cut})} \quad \vdash G^{\perp}, \Sigma}_{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma} \quad (\mathsf{Cut}) \quad \Rightarrow \frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \vdash F^{\perp}, \Delta, G \quad \vdash G^{\perp}, \Sigma}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma} \quad (\mathsf{mcut})$$

• Cut-commutation steps are productive:

$$\frac{\vdash \Delta, F \vdash \Delta, G}{\vdash \Delta, F \& G} (\&) \qquad \dots \qquad (mcut) \qquad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\vdash \Delta, F \ldots}{\vdash \Sigma, F} (mcut) \qquad \frac{\vdash \Delta, G \ldots}{\vdash \Sigma, G} (\&) (mcut)$$

Theorem (Baelde, Doumane & S, 2016)

Fair μ MALL^{∞} mcut-reduction sequences converge to cut-free μ MALL^{∞} proofs.

Strategy: "push" the cuts away from the root.

• Cut-Cut Case merge in a multicut:

$$\frac{\vdash \Delta, F \vdash \Delta, G}{\vdash \Delta, F \& G} (\&) \qquad \longrightarrow \qquad \frac{\vdash \Delta, F \qquad \dots}{\vdash \Sigma, F \& G} (mcut) \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \frac{\vdash \Delta, F \qquad \dots}{\vdash \Sigma, F \& G} (mcut) \qquad \frac{\vdash \Delta, G \qquad \dots}{\vdash \Sigma, G} (mcut)$$

• Key cases are not productive:

$$\frac{\vdash \Delta, F[\mu X.F]}{\vdash \Delta, \mu X.F} \quad (\mu) \qquad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, F^{\perp}[\nu X.F^{\perp}]}{\vdash \Gamma, \nu X.F^{\perp}} \quad (\nu) \\ (\mathsf{mcut}) \qquad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\ldots \quad \vdash \Delta, F[\mu X.F] \quad \vdash \Gamma, F^{\perp}[\nu X.F^{\perp}]}{\vdash \Sigma} \quad (\mathsf{mcut})$$

Theorem

Fair μLL^{∞} mcut-reduction sequences converge to cut-free μLL^{∞} proofs.

11/20

Cut-elimination for μLL^{∞}

Theorem

Fair μLL^{∞} mcut-reduction sequences converge to cut-free μLL^{∞} proofs.

Why is it difficult?

 $\mu MALL^\infty$ cut-elimination proof uses a locative sequent calculus, that is difficult to extend to a non-linear calculus.

11/20

Cut-elimination for μLL^{∞}

Theorem

Fair μLL^{∞} mcut-reduction sequences converge to cut-free μLL^{∞} proofs.

Why is it difficult?

 $\mu MALL^\infty$ cut-elimination proof uses a locative sequent calculus, that is difficult to extend to a non-linear calculus.

Idea. The proof goes by:

- considering the following encoding of LL exponential modalities: $?F = \mu X.F \oplus (\perp \oplus (X \ \Re X))$ $!F = v X.F \& (1 \& (X \otimes X))$ and translating μLL^{∞} sequents & proofs in $\mu MALL^{\infty}$: $\pi^{\bullet} \vdash \Gamma^{\bullet}$,
- 2 simulating μLL^{∞} cut-reduction sequences in $\mu MALL^{\infty}$ and
- **③** applying μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination theorem.

1) Encoding μLL^{∞} in $\mu MALL^{\infty}$: $\pi^{\bullet} \vdash \Gamma^{\bullet}$. $F = \mu X.F \oplus (\bot \oplus (X \Im X))$ $F = vX.F \& (1 \& (X \otimes X))$

 μ MALL^{∞} derivability of the exponential rules (?d[•],?c[•], ?w[•], !p[•]): Dereliction : | Contraction : | Weakening :



Preservation of validity

 π is a valid μLL^{∞} pre-proof of $\vdash \Gamma$ iff π^{\bullet} is a valid $\mu MALL^{\infty}$ pre-proof of $\vdash \Gamma^{\bullet}$.

2) Simulation of μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps

 μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps can be simulated by the previous encoding. For instance, commutation of (Cut) with (?d) can be simulated as:

$$\frac{\vdash F, G, \Gamma}{\vdash \overset{?}{_{\mathcal{F}}}F, G, \Gamma} \stackrel{(?d^{\bullet})}{\vdash \overset{?}{_{\mathcal{F}}}F, \Gamma, \Delta} \vdash G^{\perp}, \Delta} \xrightarrow{(Cut)} \longrightarrow^{2} \frac{\vdash F, G, \Gamma \vdash G^{\perp}, \Delta}{\vdash \overset{F}{_{\mathcal{F}}}F, \Gamma, \Delta} \stackrel{(Cut)}{(?d^{\bullet})}$$

by applying the commutations (μ)/(Cut) followed by (\oplus)/(Cut).

Challenge: to show that the simulation of derivation also holds (i) for the reductions involving (!p) as well as (ii) for reductions occurring **above** a promotion rule (aka. in a box) since the encoding of (!p) uses an infinite, circular derivation.

13/20

2) Simulation of μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps Cut-commutation rules



2) Simulation of μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps Key-cut rules

$$\frac{\frac{\pi}{\vdash F, \Gamma}}{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 2F, \Gamma}(2\mathsf{e}^{\bullet})} \xrightarrow{\frac{\pi'}{\vdash F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}(\mathsf{Cut})} (\mathsf{l}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet}) \xrightarrow{2} \frac{\pi}{\vdash F, \Gamma} \xrightarrow{\pi'}{\stackrel{!}{\vdash F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}(\mathsf{Cut})} (\mathsf{Cut})$$

$$\frac{\pi}{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 2F, 2F, \Gamma}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 2F, \Gamma}(\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet})} \xrightarrow{\frac{\pi'}{\vdash F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}(\mathsf{Cut})} (\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet}) \xrightarrow{4\times(\#\Delta=1)} \frac{\pi}{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 2F, 2F, \Gamma}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}(\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\perp}) \xrightarrow{\pi'}{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}(\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet})} (\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet}) \xrightarrow{4\times(\#\Delta=1)} \frac{\pi}{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 2F, 2F, \Gamma}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}(\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet}) \xrightarrow{\pi'}{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}}_{\stackrel{!}{\vdash 1F^{\perp}, 2\Delta}(\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet})} (\mathsf{r}\mathfrak{p}^{\bullet})$$

14/20

• Let $\sigma = (\pi_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a fair μLL^{∞} cut-reduction seq. from π .

15/ 20

- Let $\sigma = (\pi_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a fair μLL^{∞} cut-reduction seq. from π .
- O converges to a cut-free μLL[∞] pre-proof π'. By contradiction: Otherwise, some suffix τ of σ contains only key-cut steps and τ• would be a fair μMALL[∞] mcut-reduction, contradicting μMALL[∞] cut-elim thm.

- Let $\sigma = (\pi_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a fair μLL^{∞} cut-reduction seq. from π .
- O converges to a cut-free μLL[∞] pre-proof π'. By contradiction: Otherwise, some suffix τ of σ contains only key-cut steps and τ[•] would be a fair μMALL[∞] mcut-reduction, contradicting μMALL[∞] cut-elim thm.
- As σ is productive, it strongly converges to π'.
 σ[•] is a transfinite sequence from π[•] strongly converging to π'[•].

- Let $\sigma = (\pi_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a fair μLL^{∞} cut-reduction seq. from π .
- O converges to a cut-free μLL[∞] pre-proof π'. By contradiction: Otherwise, some suffix τ of σ contains only key-cut steps and τ[•] would be a fair μMALL[∞] mcut-reduction, contradicting μMALL[∞] cut-elim thm.
- As σ is productive, it strongly converges to π['].
 σ[•] is a transfinite sequence from π[•] strongly converging to π['].
- We prove a compression lemma adapted from the theory of transfinite reduction sequences in infinitary rewriting:
 ∃ρ an ω-indexed μMALL[∞] cut-reduction seq. converging to π'[•].

- Let $\sigma = (\pi_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a fair μLL^{∞} cut-reduction seq. from π .
- O converges to a cut-free μLL[∞] pre-proof π'. By contradiction: Otherwise, some suffix τ of σ contains only key-cut steps and τ[•] would be a fair μMALL[∞] mcut-reduction, contradicting μMALL[∞] cut-elim thm.
- As σ is productive, it strongly converges to π['].
 σ[•] is a transfinite sequence from π[•] strongly converging to π['].
- We prove a compression lemma adapted from the theory of transfinite reduction sequences in infinitary rewriting:
 ∃ρ an ω-indexed μMALL[∞] cut-reduction seq. converging to π['].
- Series of σ transfers (almost) to ρ : ρ can be turned into a fair μ MALL^{∞} cut-reduction sequence ρ' . Therefore, by μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination theorem: ρ' has a limit, π' , which is a valid cut-free μ MALL^{∞} proof.

- Let $\sigma = (\pi_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a fair μLL^{∞} cut-reduction seq. from π .
- O converges to a cut-free μLL[∞] pre-proof π'. By contradiction: Otherwise, some suffix τ of σ contains only key-cut steps and τ[•] would be a fair μMALL[∞] mcut-reduction, contradicting μMALL[∞] cut-elim thm.
- As σ is productive, it strongly converges to π'.
 σ[•] is a transfinite sequence from π[•] strongly converging to π'[•].
- We prove a compression lemma adapted from the theory of transfinite reduction sequences in infinitary rewriting:
 ∃ρ an ω-indexed μMALL[∞] cut-reduction seq. converging to π'[•].

Series of σ transfers (almost) to ρ : ρ can be turned into a fair μ MALL^{∞} cut-reduction sequence ρ' . Therefore, by μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination theorem: ρ' has a limit, π'° , which is a valid cut-free μ MALL^{∞} proof.

By preservation of validity, validity of π^{/•} ensures that π['] is a valid cut-free μLL[∞]-proof.

- Let $\sigma = (\pi_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be a fair μLL^{∞} cut-reduction seq. from π .
- O converges to a cut-free μLL[∞] pre-proof π'. By contradiction: Otherwise, some suffix τ of σ contains only key-cut steps and τ[•] would be a fair μMALL[∞] mcut-reduction, contradicting μMALL[∞] cut-elim thm.
- As σ is productive, it strongly converges to π['].
 σ[•] is a transfinite sequence from π[•] strongly converging to π['].
- We prove a compression lemma adapted from the theory of transfinite reduction sequences in infinitary rewriting:
 ∃ρ an ω-indexed μMALL[∞] cut-reduction seq. converging to π'[•].
- Series of σ transfers (almost) to ρ : ρ can be turned into a fair μ MALL^{∞} cut-reduction sequence ρ' . Therefore, by μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination theorem: ρ' has a limit, π'° , which is a valid cut-free μ MALL^{∞} proof.
- By preservation of validity, validity of π^{/•} ensures that π['] is a valid cut-free μLL[∞]-proof.

Corollary

Cut-elimination also holds for two-sided μLL^{∞} and μILL^{∞} .

Introduction and Background

- Aim
- Classical and Linear Logic
- μ LL^{∞}: Circular and Non-wellfounded Proofs for Linear Logic with Least and Greatest Fixed-points

2 μ LL $^{\infty}$ Cut-elimination

- Reviewing μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination
- Encoding μLL^{∞} in $\mu MALL^{\infty}$
- Simulation of μLL^{∞} cut-elimination steps
- Cut-elimination for μLL^{∞}

3 Applications, Remarks and Conclusion

- Cut-elimination for μLK[∞], μLJ[∞]
- Remarks on the encoding of the exponentials
- Conclusion

Cut-elimination for μLK^{∞} , μLJ^{∞}

The usual linear embeddings of LJ and LK into ILL (intuitionnistic LL) and LL can be adapted to μ LJ^{∞} and μ LK^{∞} and μ LK^{∞} by adding exponentials in the translation of fixed-points in the natural way.

Theorem

If π is an μLK^{∞} (resp. μLJ^{∞}) proof of $\vdash \Gamma$ (resp. $\Gamma \vdash F$), there exists a μLL^{∞} (resp. μILL^{∞}) proof of the translated sequents.

Moreover, by erasing the exponentials (connectives and inferences) one obtains the skeleton of a $\mu LL^{\infty}/\mu ILL^{\infty}$ proof which is a $\mu LK^{\infty}/\mu LJ^{\infty}$ proof, preserving validity. The skeleton of a $\mu LL^{\infty}/\mu ILL^{\infty}$ cut-reduction sequence is a $\mu LK^{\infty}/\mu LJ^{\infty}$ cut-reduction sequence. As a result, one has:

Theorem (Productive cut-elimination for μLK^{∞} and μLJ^{∞}) For any μLK^{∞} (resp. μLJ^{∞}) proof, there are productive cut-reduction seq. producing cut-free μLK^{∞} (resp. μLJ^{∞}) proofs of the same sequent.

About Seely isomorphisms $!A \otimes !B \rightarrow !(A \& B)$

$$\pi_{\mathcal{Q}, \vdash \otimes} = \frac{\frac{\overbrace{\vdash A^{\perp}, A}}{\vdash A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, A}} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\oplus_1)} \qquad \frac{\frac{\overbrace{\vdash B^{\perp}, B}}{\vdash A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, B}}{(\oplus_2)} \stackrel{(Ax)}{(\oplus_2)} \\ \frac{\overbrace{\vdash (A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), A}}{\vdash ?(A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), !A} \stackrel{(P)}{(P)} \qquad \frac{\frac{\overbrace{\vdash A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}, B}}{\vdash ?(A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), !B}} \stackrel{(P)}{(\otimes)} \\ \frac{\overbrace{\vdash ?(A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), ?(A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), !A \otimes !B}}{\vdash ?(A^{\perp} \oplus B^{\perp}), !A \otimes !B} \quad (?c)$$



The left occurrences of A, B require two unfoldings of the fixed-point, while the right occurrences of A, B require only one unfolding of the fixed-point. The fixed-point unfolding structure tracks the history of the structural rules. This witnesses the existence of a non-uniform exponential in the encoding of !.

18/20

Conclusion

To sum up:

- Fixed-point logics with circular or non-wellfounded proofs equipped with a parity condition to discriminate valid from invalid proofs;
- Syntactic cut-elimination for various non well-founded calculi:

 μ MALL^{∞}, μ LL^{∞}, μ LJ^{∞}, μ LK^{∞};

- Using an fixed-point encoding of LL exponentials to deduce cut-elimination for μLL[∞] from that of μMALL[∞];
- Application to μLK^{∞} & μLJ^{∞} using standard tools from LL proof-theory.

Ongoing and future work:

- μ MALL^{∞} cut-elimination proof is used as a black-box: potential to apply the same method for other validity conditions;
- currently working at relaxing bouncing validity; (jww Bauer)
- the encoded exponential have very odd properties (loss of Seely iso, non-uniformity): explore the potentiality of this non-uniformity.

Announcements:

- We are looking for post-docs, to be funded by ANR RECIPROG...
- FICS workshop (Fixed-points in CS) to be held as a satellite of CSL 2024 next february in Naples: call for contributions published soon !

Questions?