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#### Abstract

The main aim of this paper is to promote a certain style of doing coinductive proofs, similar to inductive proofs as commonly done by mathematicians. For this purpose we provide a reasonably direct justification for coinductive proofs written in this style, i.e., converting a coinductive proof into a non-coinductive argument is purely a matter of routine. In this way, we provide an elementary explanation of how to interpret coinduction in set theory.
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## 1 Introduction

In its basic and most common form, coinduction is a method for reasoning about the greatest fixpoints of monotone functions on $\mathcal{P}(A)$ for some set $A$. Induction in turn may be seen as a way of reasoning about the least fixpoints of monotone functions.

Let $F: \mathcal{P}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ be monotone. By the Knaster-Tarski fixpoint theorem, the least fixpoint $\mu F$ and the greatest fixpoint $\nu F$ of $F$ exist and may be characterized as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu F=\bigcap\{X \in \mathcal{P}(A) \mid F(X) \subseteq X\} \\
& \nu F=\bigcup\{X \in \mathcal{P}(A) \mid X \subseteq F(X)\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This yields the following proof principles

$$
\frac{F(X) \subseteq X}{\mu F \subseteq X}(\mathrm{IND}) \quad \frac{X \subseteq F(X)}{X \subseteq \nu F}(\mathrm{COIND})
$$

where $X \in \mathcal{P}(A)$. The rule (COIND) is commonly used as the principle underlying coinductive proofs. However, this rule is arguably sometimes inconvenient to apply directly. Ordinarily, when doing inductive proofs mathematicians do not directly employ the dual rule (IND), explicitly providing the set $X$ and calculating $F(X)$. Nor do they think in terms of (IND). Instead, they show an inductive step, using the inductive hypothesis with parameters smaller in an appropriate sense. There is a common understanding when an inductive proof is correct. In ordinary mathematical practice, nobody bothers to argue each time that an inductive proof is indeed a valid application of a specific formal induction principle. Induction is well-understood, and it is sufficient for everyone that an inductive proof may be formalized "in principle".

In contrast to induction, coinduction is not so well-established and usually not trusted in the same way. One aim of this paper is to promote and provide a reasonably direct justification for a certain style of doing coinductive proofs: showing a coinductive step using a coinductive hypothesis. As such, the paper has a flavour of a tutorial with more space devoted to examples than to mathematical results.

From the point of view of someone familiar with research in coinduction, the results of Section $\mathbb{Z}$ are probably not very novel. They are known "in principle" to people studying coinduction. However, the author believes that there is a need to present coinductive techniques in a way accessible to a broad audience, giving simple criteria to verify the correctness of coinductive proofs and corecursive definitions without being forced to reformulate them too much to fit a specific formal principle. Our style of writing coinductive proofs is similar to how such proofs are presented in e.g. [28, 13, 35, 34, 33], but we justify them by direct reduction to transfinite induction. This seems to provide a more approachable correctness criterion for someone not familiar with infinite proofs in type theory [16, 29]. Our method for justifying (non-guarded) corecursive definitions usually boils down to solving some recursive equations in natural numbers. The coalgebraic approach to coinduction [32, 36] is perhaps more abstract and conceptually satisfying, but not so straightforward to apply directly. Even the rule (COIND) is rather inconvenient in certain more complex situations.

While the present paper does contain some (relatively simple and essentially known) mathematical results and rigorous theory, much of the paper has the status of a "meta-explanation" which establishes certain conventions and describes how to interpret and verify informal coinductive proofs and corecursive definitions using the theory. This is analogous to an explanation of how, e.g., the more sophisticated informal inductive constructions may be encoded in ZFC set theory. We do not provide a formal system in which coinductive proofs written in our style may be formalized directly, but only describe how to convert them so as to eliminate coinduction, by elaborating them to make explicit references to the results of our theory. Without a precisely defined formal system, this description is necessarily informal. However, we believe the translation is straightforward enough, so that after properly understanding the present paper it should be clear that coinduction may be eliminated in the described manner. It should also become clear how to verify such informally presented coinductive proofs. Again, the word "clear" is
used here in the same sense that it is "clear" that common informal presentations of inductive proofs may in principle be formalized in ZFC set theory.

### 1.1 Related work

Coinduction and corecursion are by no means new topics. We do not attempt here to provide an extensive overview of existing literature. We only mention the pioneering work of Aczel on non-well-founded set theory [5], the final coalgebra theorem of Aczel and Mendler [6], the subsequent work of Barr [10, and the work of Rutten [36] providing coalgebraic foundations for coinduction. A historical overview of coinduction may be found in [37]. An elementary introduction to coinduction and bisimulation is [38]. For a coalgebraic treatment see e.g. [32, 36].

Our approach in Section 4.1 is largely inspired by the work of Sijtsma 39 on productivity of streams, and the subsequent work on sized types [4, 3, 2, 1, 11, 30, In fact, the central Corollary 4.8 is a generalization of Theorem 32 from [39]. In contrast to the work on sized types, we are not interested in this paper in providing a formal system, but in explaining corecursion semantically, in terms of ordinary set theory. Related is also the work on productivity of streams and infinite data structures [31, 23, 24, 42, 27, 14, 40, and some of the examples in Section 4.2] are taken from the cited papers. Productivity was first mentioned by Dijkstra [22]. The articles [16, 29] investigate guarded corecursive definitions in type theory. The chapters [12, 15 are a practical introduction to coinduction in Coq. The papers [19, 17, 18] were to a large extent a motivation for writing the present paper and they contain many non-trivial coinductive proofs written in the style promoted here. The article 33] has a similar aim to the present paper, but its approach is quite different. Our style of presenting coinductive proofs is similar to how such proofs are presented in e.g. [28, [13, 35, 34, 33].

## 2 A crash-course in coinduction

In this section we give an elementary explanation of the most common coinductive techniques. This is generalised and elaborated in more detail in Section 4 . Some of the examples, definitions and theorems from the present section are leater repeated and/or generalised in Section 4. This section strives to strike a balance between generality and ease of understanding. The explanation given here treats only guarded corecursive definitions and only guarded proofs, but in practice this suffices in many cases.

### 2.1 Infinite terms and corecursion

In this section we define many-sorted coterms. We also explain and justify guarded corecursion using elementary notions.

Definition 2.1. A many-sorted algebraic signature $\Sigma=\left\langle\Sigma_{s}, \Sigma_{c}\right\rangle$ consists of a collection of sort symbols $\Sigma_{s}=\left\{s_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and a collection of constructors $\Sigma_{c}=\left\{c_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$. Each constructor $c$ has an associated type $\tau(c)=\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ where $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}, s \in \Sigma_{s}$. If $\tau(c)=(; s)$ then $c$ is a constant of sort $s$. In what follows we use $\Sigma, \Sigma^{\prime}$, etc., for many-sorted algebraic signatures, $s, s^{\prime}$, etc., for sort symbols, and $f, g, c, d$, etc., for constructors.

The set $\mathcal{T}^{\infty}(\Sigma)$, or just $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, of coterms over $\Sigma$ is the set of all finite and infinite terms over $\Sigma$, i.e., all finite and infinite labelled trees with labels of nodes specified by the constructors of $\Sigma$ such that the types of labels of nodes agree. More precisely, a term $t$ over $\Sigma$ is a partial function from $\mathbb{N}^{*}$ to $\Sigma_{c}$ satisfying:

- $t(\epsilon) \downarrow$, and
- if $t(p)=c \in \Sigma_{c}$ with $\tau(c)=\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ then
$-t(p i)=d \in \Sigma_{c}$ with $\tau(d)=\left(s_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, s_{m_{i}}^{\prime} ; s_{i}\right)$ for $i<n$,
$-t(p i) \uparrow$ for $i \geq n$,
- if $t(p) \uparrow$ then $t(p i) \uparrow$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,
where $t(p) \uparrow$ means that $t(p)$ is undefined, $t(p) \downarrow$ means that $t(p)$ is defined, and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ is the empty string. We use obvious notations for coterms, e.g., $f(g(t, s), c)$ when $c, f, g \in \Sigma_{c}$ and $t, s \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, and the types agree. We say that a term $t$ is of sort $s$ if $t(\epsilon)$ is a constructor of type $\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ for some $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} \in \Sigma_{s}$. By $\mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ we denote the set of all terms of sort $s$ from $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$.

Example 2.2. Let $A$ be a set. Let $\Sigma$ consist of two sorts $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{d}$, one constructor cons of type $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s} ; \mathfrak{s})$ and a distinct constant $a \in A$ of sort $\mathfrak{d}$ for each element of $A$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Sigma)$ is the set of streams over $A$. We also write $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Sigma)=A^{\omega}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{0}}(\Sigma)=A$. Instead of cons $(a, t)$ we usually write $a: t$, and we assume that : associates to the right, e.g., $x: y: t$ is $x:(y: t)$. We also use the notation $x: t$ to denote the application of the constructor for cons to $x$ and $t$. We define the functions hd : $A^{\omega} \rightarrow A$ and $\mathrm{tl}: A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{hd}(a: t) & =a \\
\operatorname{tl}(a: t) & =t
\end{aligned}
$$

Specifications of many-sorted signatures may be conveniently given by coinductively interpreted grammars. For instance, the set $A^{\omega}$ of streams over a set $A$ could be specified by writing

$$
A^{\omega}::=\operatorname{cons}\left(A, A^{\omega}\right) .
$$

A more interesting example is that of finite and infinite binary trees with nodes labelled either with $a$ or $b$, and leaves labelled with one of the elements of a set $V$ :

$$
T::=V\|a(T, T)\| b(T, T) .
$$

As such specifications are not intended to be formal entities but only convenient visual means for describing sets of coterms, we will not define them precisely. It is always clear what many-sorted signature is meant.

For the sake of brevity we often use $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{s}=\mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$, i.e., we omit the signature $\Sigma$ when clear from the context or irrelevant.

Definition 2.3. The class of constructor-guarded functions is defined inductively as the class of all functions $h: \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s^{\prime}}$ (for arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}, s, s^{\prime} \in \Sigma_{s}$ ) such that there are a constructor $c$ of type $\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{k} ; s^{\prime}\right)$ and functions $u_{i}: \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s_{i}}(i=1, \ldots, k)$ such that

$$
h\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)=c\left(u_{1}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right), \ldots, u_{k}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)\right)
$$

for all $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in \mathcal{T}_{s}$, and for each $i=1, \ldots, k$ one of the following holds:

- $u_{i}$ is constructor-guarded, or
- $u_{i}$ is a constant function, or
- $u_{i}$ is a projection function, i.e., $s_{i}=s$ and there is $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $u_{i}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)=y_{j}$ for all $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in \mathcal{T}_{s}$.

Let $S$ be a set. A function $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s^{\prime}}$ is constructor-guarded if for every $x \in S$ the function $h_{x}: \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s^{\prime}}$ defined by $h_{x}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)=h\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)$ is constructor-guarded. A function $f: S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ is defined by guarded corecursion from $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ and $g_{i}: S \rightarrow S$ $(i=1, \ldots, m)$ if $h$ is constructor-guarded and $f$ satisfies

$$
f(x)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)
$$

for all $x \in S$.
The following theorem is folklore in the coalgebra community. We sketch an elementary proof. In fact, each set of many-sorted coterms is a final coalgebra of an appropriate setfunctor. Then Theorem 2.4 follows from more general principles. See e.g. [32, 36] for a more general coalgebraic explanation of corecursion.

Theorem 2.4. For any constructor-guarded function $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ and any $g_{i}: S \rightarrow S$ ( $i=1, \ldots, m$ ), there exists a unique function $f: S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ defined by guarded corecursion from $h$ and $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$.

Proof. Let $f_{0}: S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ be an arbitrary function. Define $f_{n+1}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $f_{n+1}(x)=$ $h\left(x, f_{n}\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f_{n}\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)$. Using the fact that $h$ is constructor-guarded, one shows by induction on $n$ that:
( $) f_{n+1}(x)(p)=f_{n}(x)(p)$ for $x \in S$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ with $|p|<n$
where $|p|$ denotes the length of $p$. Indeed, the base is obvious. We show the inductive step. Let $x \in S$. Because $h$ is constructor-guarded, we have for instance

$$
f_{n+2}(x)=h\left(x, f_{n+1}\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f_{n+1}\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)=c_{1}\left(c_{2}, c_{3}\left(w, f_{n+1}\left(g_{1}(x)\right)\right)\right)
$$

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ with $|p| \leq n$. The only interesting case is when $p=11 p^{\prime}$, i.e., when $p$ points inside $f_{n+1}\left(g_{1}(x)\right)$. But then $\left|p^{\prime}\right|<|p| \leq n$, so by the inductive hypothesis $f_{n+1}\left(g_{1}(x)\right)\left(p^{\prime}\right)=$ $f_{n}\left(g_{1}(x)\right)\left(p^{\prime}\right)$. Thus $f_{n+2}(x)(p)=f_{n+1}\left(g_{1}(x)\right)\left(p^{\prime}\right)=f_{n}\left(g_{1}(x)\right)\left(p^{\prime}\right)=f_{n+1}(x)(p)$.

Now we define $f: S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ by

$$
f(x)(p)=f_{|p|+1}(x)(p)
$$

for $x \in S, p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$. Using $(\star)$ it is routine to check that $f(x)$ is a well-defined coterm for each $x \in S$. To show that $f: S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ is defined by guarded corecursion from $h$ and $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$, using $(*)$ one shows by induction on the length of $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ that for any $x \in S$ :

$$
f(x)(p)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)(p) .
$$

To prove that $f$ is unique it suffices to show that it does not depend on $f_{0}$. For this purpose, using ( $\star$ ) one shows by induction on the length of $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ that $f(x)(p)$ does not depend on $f_{0}$ for any $x \in S$.

We shall often use the above theorem implicitly, just mentioning that some equations define a function by guarded corecursion.

Example 2.5. Consider the equation

$$
\operatorname{even}(x: y: t)=x: \operatorname{even}(t)
$$

It may be rewritten as

$$
\operatorname{even}(t)=\operatorname{hd}(t): \operatorname{even}(\operatorname{tl}(\operatorname{tl}(t)))
$$

So even : $A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ is defined by guarded corecursion from $h: A^{\omega} \times A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ given by

$$
h\left(t, t^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{hd}(t): t^{\prime}
$$

and $g: A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ given by

$$
g(t)=\operatorname{tl}(\mathrm{tl}(t))
$$

By Theorem 2.4 there is a unique function even : $A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ satisfying the original equation.
Another example of a function defined by guarded corecursion is zip : $A^{\omega} \times A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ :

$$
\operatorname{zip}(x: t, s)=x: \operatorname{zip}(s, t)
$$

The following function merge : $\mathbb{N}^{\omega} \times \mathbb{N}^{\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\omega}$ is also defined by guarded corecursion:

$$
\operatorname{merge}\left(x: t_{1}, y: t_{2}\right)= \begin{cases}x: \operatorname{merge}\left(t_{1}, y: t_{2}\right) & \text { if } x \leq y \\ y: \operatorname{merge}\left(x: t_{1}, t_{2}\right) & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

### 2.2 Coinduction

In this section 1 we give a brief explanation of a certain style of writing coinductive proofs. Our presentation of coinductive proofs is similar to e.g. [28, 13, 35, 34, 33].

There are many ways in which coinductive proofs written in our style can be justified. With enough patience one could, in principle, reformulate all proofs to directly employ the usual coinduction principle in set theory based on the Knaster-Tarski fixpoint theorem 38]. Whenever proofs and corecursive definitions are guarded, one could formalize them in a proof assistant based on type theory with a syntactic guardedness check, e.g., in Coq [16, 29]. Nonguarded proofs can be formalized in recent versions of Agda with sized types [3, 2, 1, 11]. One may also use the coinduction principle from [33]. Finally, one can justify coinductive proofs by indicating how to interpret them in ordinary set theory, which is what we do in this section.

The purpose of this section is to explain how to justify coinductive proofs by reducing coinduction to transfinite induction. The present section does not provide a formal coinduction proof principle as such, but only indicates how one could elaborate the proofs so as to eliminate the use of coinduction. Theorem 4.29 provides a formal coinduction principle, though some reformulation is still needed to use it directly. The status of the present section is that of a "meta-explanation", analogous to an explanation of how, e.g., the informal presentations of inductive constructions found in the literature may be encoded in ZFC set theory.

Example 2.6. Let $T$ be the set of all finite and infinite terms defined coinductively by

$$
T::=V\|A(T)\| B(T, T)
$$

where $V$ is a countable set of variables, and $A, B$ are constructors. By $x, y, \ldots$ we denote variables, and by $t, s, \ldots$ we denote elements of $T$. Define a binary relation $\rightarrow$ on $T$ coinductively by the following rules.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\overline{x \rightarrow x}}(1) \frac{t \rightarrow t^{\prime}}{\overline{A(t) \rightarrow A\left(t^{\prime}\right)}}(2) \frac{s \rightarrow s^{\prime} t \rightarrow t^{\prime}}{\overline{B(s, t) \rightarrow B\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)}}(3) \frac{t \rightarrow t^{\prime}}{\overline{A(t) \rightarrow B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Formally, the relation $\rightarrow$ is the greatest fixpoint of a monotone function

$$
F: \mathcal{P}(T \times T) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(T \times T)
$$

[^0]defined by
$$
F(R)=\left\{\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle \mid \exists_{x \in V}\left(t_{1} \equiv t_{2} \equiv x\right) \vee \exists_{t, t^{\prime} \in T}\left(t_{1} \equiv A(t) \wedge t_{2} \equiv A\left(t^{\prime}\right) \wedge R\left(t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \vee \ldots\right\}
$$

Alternatively, using the Knaster-Tarski fixpoint theorem, the relation $\rightarrow$ may be characterised as the greatest binary relation on $T$ (i.e. the greatest subset of $T \times T$ w.r.t. set inclusion) such that $\rightarrow \subseteq F(\rightarrow)$, i.e., such that for every $t_{1}, t_{2} \in T$ with $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{2}$ one of the following holds:

1. $t_{1} \equiv t_{2} \equiv x$ for some variable $x \in V$,
2. $t_{1} \equiv A(t), t_{2} \equiv A\left(t^{\prime}\right)$ with $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$,
3. $t_{1} \equiv B(s, t), t_{2} \equiv B\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)$ with $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$,
4. $t_{1} \equiv A(t), t_{2} \equiv B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)$ with $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$.

Yet another way to think about $\rightarrow$ is that $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{2}$ holds if and only if there exists a potentially infinite derivation tree of $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{2}$ built using the rules $(1)-(4)$.

The rules $(1)-(4)$ could also be interpreted inductively to yield the least fixpoint of $F$. This is the conventional interpretation, and it is indicated with a single line in each rule separating premises from the conclusion. A coinductive interpretation is indicated with double lines.

The greatest fixpoint $\rightarrow$ of $F$ may be obtained by transfinitely iterating $F$ starting with $T \times T$. More precisely, define an ordinal-indexed sequence $\left(\rightarrow^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$ by:

- $\rightarrow^{0}=T \times T$,
- $\rightarrow^{\alpha+1}=F\left(\rightarrow^{\alpha}\right)$,
- $\rightarrow^{\lambda}=\bigcap_{\alpha<\lambda} \rightarrow^{\alpha}$ for a limit ordinal $\lambda$.

Then there exists an ordinal $\zeta$ such that $\rightarrow=\rightarrow^{\zeta}$. The least such ordinal is called the closure ordinal. Note also that $\rightarrow^{\alpha} \subseteq \rightarrow^{\beta}$ for $\alpha \geq \beta$ (we often use this fact implicitly). See Section 3 below. The relation $\rightarrow^{\alpha}$ is called the $\alpha$-approximant of $\rightarrow$, or the approximant of $\rightarrow$ at stage $\alpha$. If $t \rightarrow^{\alpha} s$ then we say that $t \rightarrow s$ (holds) at (stage) $\alpha$. Note that the $\alpha$-approximants depend on a particular definition of $\rightarrow$ (i.e. on the function $F$ ), not solely on the relation $\rightarrow$ itself. We use $R^{\alpha}$ for the $\alpha$-approximant of the relation $R$.

It is instructive to note that the coinductive rules for $\rightarrow$ may also be interpreted as giving rules for the $\alpha+1$-approximants, for any ordinal $\alpha$.

$$
\frac{}{x \rightarrow^{\alpha+1} x}(1) \frac{t \rightarrow^{\alpha} t^{\prime}}{A(t) \rightarrow^{\alpha+1} A\left(t^{\prime}\right)}(2) \frac{s \rightarrow^{\alpha} s^{\prime} t \rightarrow^{\alpha} t^{\prime}}{B(s, t) \rightarrow^{\alpha+1} B\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)}(3) \frac{t \rightarrow^{\alpha} t^{\prime}}{A(t) \rightarrow^{\alpha+1} B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)}(4
$$

Usually, the closure ordinal for the definition of a coinductive relation is $\omega$. In general, however, it is not difficult to come up with a coinductive definition whose closure ordinal is greater than $\omega$. For instance, consider the relation $R \subseteq \mathbb{N} \cup\{\infty\}$ defined coinductively by the following two rules.

$$
\frac{R(n) \quad n \in \mathbb{N}}{R(n+1)} \quad \frac{\exists n \in \mathbb{N} . R(n)}{R(\infty)}
$$

We have $R=\emptyset, R^{n}=\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \geq n\} \cup\{\infty\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}, R^{\omega}=\{\infty\}$, and only $R^{\omega+1}=\emptyset$. Thus the closure ordinal of this definition is $\omega+1$.

Usually, we are interested in proving by coinduction statements of the form $\psi\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)$ where

$$
\psi\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right) \equiv \forall x_{1} \ldots x_{n} \cdot \varphi(\vec{x}) \rightarrow X_{1}\left(g_{1}(\vec{x}), \ldots, g_{k}(\vec{x})\right) \wedge \ldots \wedge X_{m}\left(g_{1}(\vec{x}), \ldots, g_{k}(\vec{x})\right)
$$

and $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}$ are coinductive relations on $T$, i.e, relations defined as the greatest fixpoints of some monotone functions on the powerset of an appropriate cartesian product of $T$, and
$\psi\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)$ is $\psi\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right)$ with $R_{i}$ substituted for $X_{i}$. Statements with an existential quantifier may be reduced to statements of this form by skolemizing, as explained in Example 2.8 below.

Here $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}$ are meta-variables for which relations on $T$ may be substituted. In the statement $\varphi(\vec{x})$ only $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ occur free. The meta-variables $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}$ are not allowed to occur in $\varphi(\vec{x})$. In general, we abbreviate $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ with $\vec{x}$. The symbols $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{k}$ denote some functions of $\vec{x}$.

To prove $\psi\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)$ it suffices to show by transfinite induction that $\psi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$ holds for each ordinal $\alpha \leq \zeta$, where $R_{i}^{\alpha}$ is the $\alpha$-approximant of $R_{i}$. It is an easy exercise to check that because of the special form of $\psi$ (in particular because $\varphi$ does not contain $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}$ ) and the fact that each $R_{i}^{0}$ is the full relation, the base case $\alpha=0$ and the case of $\alpha$ a limit ordinal hold. They hold for any $\psi$ of the above form, irrespective of $\varphi, R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}$. Note that $\varphi(\vec{x})$ is the same in all $\psi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$ for any $\alpha$, i.e., it does not refer to the $\alpha$-approximants or the ordinal $\alpha$. Hence it remains to show the inductive step for $\alpha$ a successor ordinal. It turns out that a coinductive proof of $\psi$ may be interpreted as a proof of this inductive step for a successor ordinal, with the ordinals left implicit and the phrase "coinductive hypothesis" used instead of "inductive hypothesis".

Example 2.7. On terms from $T$ (see Example (2.6) we define the operation of substitution by guarded corecursion.

$$
\begin{aligned}
y[t / x] & =y & \text { if } x \neq y & (A(s))[t / x]
\end{aligned}=A(s[t / x]), ~\left(B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)\right)[t / x]=B\left(s_{1}[t / x], s_{2}[t / x]\right)
$$

We show by coinduction: if $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then $s[t / x] \rightarrow s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$, where $\rightarrow$ is the relation from Example 2.8. Formally, the statement we show by transfinite induction on $\alpha \leq \zeta$ is: for $s, s^{\prime}, t, t^{\prime} \in T$, if $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then $s[t / x] \rightarrow^{\alpha} s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$. For illustrative purposes, we indicate the $\alpha$-approximants with appropriate ordinal superscripts, but it is customary to omit these superscripts.

Let us proceed with the proof. The proof is by coinduction with case analysis on $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$. If $s \equiv s^{\prime} \equiv y$ with $y \neq x$, then $s[t / x] \equiv y \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$. If $s \equiv s^{\prime} \equiv x$ then $s[t / x] \equiv t \rightarrow{ }^{\alpha+1} t^{\prime} \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ (note that $\rightarrow \equiv \rightarrow^{\zeta} \subseteq \rightarrow^{\alpha+1}$ ). If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right), s^{\prime} \equiv A\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow s_{1}^{\prime}$, then $s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow^{\alpha} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ by the coinductive hypothesis. Thus $s[t / x] \equiv A\left(s_{1}[t / x]\right) \rightarrow{ }^{\alpha+1} A\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ by rule (2). If $s \equiv B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), s^{\prime} \equiv B\left(s_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ then the proof is analogous. If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right), s^{\prime} \equiv B\left(s_{1}^{\prime}, s_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow s_{1}^{\prime}$, then the proof is also similar. Indeed, by the coinductive hypothesis we have $s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow^{\alpha} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$, so $s[t / x] \equiv A\left(s_{1}[t / x]\right) \rightarrow{ }^{\alpha+1} B\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right], s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ by rule (4).

With the following example we explain how proofs of existential statements should be interpreted.

Example 2.8. Let $T$ and $\rightarrow$ be as in Example 2.6. We want to show: for all $s, t, t^{\prime} \in T$, if $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then there exists $s^{\prime} \in T$ with $t \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow s^{\prime}$. The idea is to skolemize this statement. So we need to find a Skolem function $f: T^{3} \rightarrow T$ which will allow us to prove the Skolem normal form:
$(\star)$ if $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then $t \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$.

The rules for $\rightarrow$ suggest a definition of $f$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x, x, x) & =x \\
f\left(A(s), A(t), A\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =A\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(A(s), A(t), B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right), f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(A(s), B(t, t), A\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right), f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(A(s), B(t, t), B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right), f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right), B\left(t_{1}^{\prime}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right) & =\text { some arbitrary term if none of the above matches }
\end{aligned}
$$

This is a definition by guarded corecursion, so there exists a unique function $f: T^{3} \rightarrow T$ satisfying the above equations. The last case in the above definition of $f$ corresponds to the case in Definition 4.22 where all $u_{i}$ are constant functions. Note that any fixed term has a fixed constructor (in the sense of Definition 4.22) at the root. In the sense of Definition 4.22 also the elements of $V$ are nullary constructors.

We now proceed with a coinductive proof of ( $\star$ ). Assume $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$. If $s \equiv t \equiv t^{\prime} \equiv x$ then $f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right) \equiv x$, and $x \rightarrow x$ by rule (1). If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right), t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}$, then by the coinductive hypothesis $t_{1} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. We have $f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right) \equiv A\left(f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)$. Hence $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right) \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ and $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$, by rule (2). If $s \equiv B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv B\left(t_{1}^{\prime}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}, s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}$ and $s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}^{\prime}$, then by the coinductive hypothesis we have $t_{1} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), t_{2} \rightarrow f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ and $t_{2}^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. Hence $t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right) \rightarrow B\left(f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right) \equiv f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Analogously, $t^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Other cases are similar.

Usually, it is inconvenient to invent the Skolem function beforehand, because the definition of the Skolem function and the coinductive proof of the Skolem normal form are typically interdependent. Therefore, we adopt an informal style of doing a proof by coinduction of a statement

$$
\begin{aligned}
\psi\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)= & \forall x_{1_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in T} \cdot \varphi(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \\
& \exists y \in T \cdot R_{1}\left(g_{1}(\vec{x}), \ldots, g_{k}(\vec{x}), y\right) \wedge \ldots \wedge R_{m}\left(g_{1}(\vec{x}), \ldots, g_{k}(\vec{x}), y\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with an existential quantifier. We intertwine the corecursive definition of the Skolem function $f$ with a coinductive proof of the Skolem normal form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \forall x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n} \in T \cdot \varphi(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \\
& \quad R_{1}\left(g_{1}(\vec{x}), \ldots, g_{k}(\vec{x}), f(\vec{x})\right) \wedge \ldots \wedge R_{m}\left(g_{1}(\vec{x}), \ldots, g_{k}(\vec{x}), f(\vec{x})\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We proceed as if the coinductive hypothesis was $\psi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$ (it really is the Skolem normal form). Each element obtained from the existential quantifier in the coinductive hypothesis is interpreted as a corecursive invocation of the Skolem function. When later we exhibit an element to show the existential subformula of $\psi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha+1}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha+1}\right)$, we interpret this as the definition of the Skolem function in the case specified by the assumptions currently active in the proof. Note that this exhibited element may (or may not) depend on some elements obtained from the existential quantifier in the coinductive hypothesis, i.e., the definition of the Skolem function may involve corecursive invocations.

To illustrate our style of doing coinductive proofs of statements with an existential quantifier, we redo the proof done above. For illustrative purposes, we indicate the arguments of the Skolem function, i.e., we write $s_{s, t, t^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ in place of $f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$. These subscripts $s, t, t^{\prime}$ are normally omitted.

We show by coinduction that if $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then there exists $s^{\prime} \in T$ with $t \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow s^{\prime}$. Assume $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$. If $s \equiv t \equiv t^{\prime} \equiv x$ then take $s_{x, x, x}^{\prime} \equiv x$. If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right)$, $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}$, then by the coinductive hypothesis we
obtain $s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ with $t_{1} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. More precisely: by corecursively applying the Skolem function to $s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}$ we obtain $s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$, and by the coinductive hypothesis we have $t_{1} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. Hence $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right) \rightarrow A\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$ and $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow A\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$, by rule (2). Thus we may take $s_{s, t, t^{\prime}}^{\prime} \equiv A\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$. If $s \equiv B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv$ $B\left(t_{1}^{\prime}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}, s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}$ and $s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}^{\prime}$, then by the coinductive hypothesis we obtain $s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ with $t_{1} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, t_{2} \rightarrow s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $t_{2}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. Hence $t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right) \rightarrow B\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}}^{\prime}, s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}}^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Analogously, $t^{\prime} \rightarrow B\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}}^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Thus we may take $s_{s, t, t^{\prime}}^{\prime} \equiv B\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$. Other cases are similar.

It is clear that the above proof, when interpreted in the way outlined before, implicitly defines the Skolem function $f$. It should be kept in mind that in every case the definition of the Skolem function needs to be guarded. We do not explicitly mention this each time, but verifying this is part of verifying the proof.

When doing proofs by coinduction the following criteria need to be kept in mind in order to be able to justify the proofs according to the above explanations.

- When we conclude from the coinductive hypothesis that some relation $R\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$ holds, this really means that only its approximant $R^{\alpha}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$ holds. Usually, we need to infer that the next approximant $R^{\alpha+1}\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}\right)$ holds (for some other elements $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}$ ) by using $R^{\alpha}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$ as a premise of an appropriate rule. But we cannot, e.g., inspect (do case reasoning on) $R^{\alpha}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$, use it in any lemmas, or otherwise treat it as $R\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$.
- An element $e$ obtained from an existential quantifier in the coinductive hypothesis is not really the element itself, but a corecursive invocation of the implicit Skolem function. Usually, we need to put it inside some constructor $c$, e.g. producing $c(e)$, and then exhibit $c(e)$ in the proof of an existential statement. Applying at least one constructor to $e$ is necessary to ensure guardedness of the implicit Skolem function. But we cannot, e.g., inspect $e$, apply some previously defined functions to it, or otherwise treat it as if it was really given to us.
- In the proofs of existential statements, the implicit Skolem function cannot depend on the ordinal $\alpha$. However, this is the case as long as we do not violate the first point, because if the ordinals are never mentioned and we do not inspect the approximants obtained from the coinductive hypothesis, then there is no way in which we could possibly introduce a dependency on $\alpha$.
Equality on coterms may be characterised coinductively.
Definition 2.9. Let $\Sigma$ be a many-sorted algebraic signature, as in Definition 2.1, Let $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$. Define on $\mathcal{T}$ a binary relation $=$ of bisimilarity by the coinductive rules

$$
\frac{t_{1}=s_{1} \quad \ldots \quad t_{n}=s_{n}}{\overline{f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)=f\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}\right)}}
$$

for each constructor $f \in \Sigma_{c}$.
It is intuitively obvious that on coterms bisimilary is the same as identity. The following easy (and well-known) proposition makes this precise.

Proposition 2.10. For $t, s \in \mathcal{T}$ we have: $t=s$ iff $t \equiv s$.

Proof. Recall that each term is formally a partial function from $\mathbb{N}^{*}$ to $\Sigma_{c}$. We write $t(p) \approx s(p)$ if either both $t(p), s(p)$ are defined and equal, or both are undefined.

Assume $t=s$. It suffices to show by induction of the length of $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ that $t_{\mid p}=s_{\mid p}$ or $t(p) \uparrow, s(p) \uparrow$, where by $t_{\mid p}$ we denote the subterm of $t$ at position $p$. For $p=\epsilon$ this is obvious. Assume $p=p^{\prime} j$. By the inductive hypothesis, $t_{\mid p^{\prime}}=s_{\mid p^{\prime}}$ or $t\left(p^{\prime}\right) \uparrow, s\left(p^{\prime}\right) \uparrow$. If $t_{\mid p^{\prime}}=s_{\mid p^{\prime}}$ then $t_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv f\left(t_{0}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$ and $s_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv f\left(s_{0}, \ldots, s_{n}\right)$ for some $f \in \Sigma_{c}$ with $t_{i}=s_{i}$ for $i=0, \ldots, n$. If $0 \leq j \leq n$ then $t_{\mid p} \equiv t_{j}=s_{j}=s_{\mid p}$. Otherwise, if $j>n$ or if $t\left(p^{\prime}\right) \uparrow, s\left(p^{\prime}\right) \uparrow$, then $t(p) \uparrow, s(p) \uparrow$ by the definition of coterms.

For the other direction, we show by coinduction that for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$ we have $t=t$. If $t \in \mathcal{T}$ then $t \equiv f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$ for some $f \in \Sigma_{c}$. By the coinductive hypothesis we obtain $t_{i}=t_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. Hence $t=t$ by the rule for $f$.

For coterms $t, s \in \mathcal{T}$, we shall theorefore use the notations $t=s$ and $t \equiv s$ interchangeably, employing Proposition 2.10 implicitly.

Example 2.11. Recall the coinductive definitions of zip and even from Example 2.5,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{even}(x: y: t) & =x: \operatorname{even}(t) \\
\operatorname{zip}(x: t, s) & =x: \operatorname{zip}(s, t)
\end{aligned}
$$

By coinduction we show

$$
\operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(t), \operatorname{even}(\mathrm{tl}(t)))=t
$$

for any stream $t \in A^{\omega}$. Let $t \in A^{\omega}$. Then $t=x: y: s$ for some $x, y \in A$ and $s \in A^{\omega}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(t), \operatorname{even}(\operatorname{tl}(t))) & =\operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(x: y: s), \operatorname{even}(y: s)) \\
& =\operatorname{zip}(x: \operatorname{even}(s), \operatorname{even}(y: s)) \\
& =x: \operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(y: s), \operatorname{even}(s)) \\
& =x: y: s \quad(\operatorname{by} \mathrm{CH}) \\
& =t
\end{aligned}
$$

In the equality marked with (by CH ) we use the coinductive hypothesis, and implicitly a bisimilarity rule from Definition 2.9,

The above explanation of coinduction is generalised and elaborated in much more detail in Section 4 The papers [19, 17, 18] contain many non-trivial coinductive proofs written in the style promoted here. Also [33] may be helpful as it gives many examples of coinductive proofs written in a style similar to the one used here. The book 38 is an elementary introduction to coinduction and bisimulation (but the proofs there are written in a different style than here, not referring to the coinductive hypothesis but explicitly constructing a backward-closed set). The chapters [12, 15] explain coinduction in Coq from a practical viewpoint. A reader interested in foundational matters should also consult [32, 36] which deal with the coalgebraic approach to coinduction.

## 3 Preliminaries

In this section we provide the necessary background on order theory. We also introduce some new or non-standard definitions and easy lemmas which will be needed in subsequent developments. For more background on order theory see e.g. [21].

Definition 3.1. A partial order is a pair $\mathbb{P}=\langle P, \leq\rangle$ where $P$ is a set and $\leq$ is an antisymmetric, reflexive and transitive binary relation on $P$. We often confuse $\mathbb{P}$ with $P$ or $\leq$. The dual of a
partial order $\mathbb{P}=\langle P, \leq\rangle$ is a partial order $\mathbb{P}^{\mathrm{op}}=\langle P, \geq\rangle$ where $x \geq y$ iff $y \leq x$. If $A$ is a set, and $\mathbb{P}_{a}=\left\langle P_{a}, \leq_{a}\right\rangle$ is a partial order for each $a \in A$, then the product $\prod_{a \in A} \mathbb{P}_{a}=\left\langle\prod_{a \in A} P_{a}, \leq\right\rangle$ is a partial order with $\leq$ defined by: $p \leq q$ iff $p(a) \leq_{a} q(a)$ for each $a \in A$. If $A=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$ is finite, then we write $\prod_{a \in A} P_{a}=P_{a_{1}} \times \ldots \times P_{a_{n}}$. If $P_{a}=P$ for each $a \in A$ then we write $\prod_{a \in A} P=P^{A}=A \rightarrow P$.

An element $x \in P$ is maximal (minimal) if there is no $y \in P$ with $y>x(y<x)$. The set of all maximal (minimal) elements of $P$ is denoted by $\operatorname{Max}(P)(\operatorname{Min}(P))$. A function $f: P \rightarrow Q$ is max-preserving (min-preserving) if $f(\operatorname{Max}(P)) \subseteq \operatorname{Max}(Q)(f(\operatorname{Min}(P)) \subseteq \operatorname{Min}(Q))$. The least element (greatest element) of a set $X \subseteq P$ is an element $x \in X$ such that $x \leq y(x \geq y)$ for all $y \in X$. A well-order is a partial order in which every nonempty subset has the least element.

An up-set (down-set) is a subset $U \subseteq P$ such that if $x \in U$ and $y \geq x(y \leq x)$ then $y \in U$. A chain is a subset $C \subseteq P$ satisfying: for all $x, y \in C, x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$. A directed set in a parital order $P$ is a nonempty subset $D \subseteq P$ such that for all $x, y \in D$ there exists $z$ such that $z \geq x, y$. A bottom $\perp(\operatorname{top} \mathrm{T})$ of $P$, is an element of $P$ satisfying $\perp \leq x(x \leq \top)$ for any $x \in P$. We sometimes write $\perp_{P}$ and $\top_{P}$ when ambiguity may arise. An upper bound (lower bound) of a subset $D \subseteq P$ is an element $x \in P$ such that $x \geq y(x \leq y)$ for all $y \in D$, which we denote $D \leq x(x \leq D)$. A supremum or least upper bound or join (infimum or greatest lower bound or meet) of a subset $D \subseteq P$ is an element $\bigvee D \in P(\bigwedge D \in P)$ such that $D \leq \bigvee D(\bigwedge D \leq D)$ and for any $s \in P$ with $D \leq s(s \leq D)$ we have $s \leq \bigvee D(s \geq \wedge D)$. We sometimes denote the supremum of $D$ by $\sup D$ and the infimum by $\inf D$.

A partial order is chain-complete if every chain has a supremum. A complete partial order (CPO) is a partial order with bottom in which every directed set has a supremum. A partial order is a complete lattice if every set has a supremum.

A function $f: P \rightarrow Q$ between partial orders is monotone if it preserves the ordering, i.e., $x \leq y$ implies $f(x) \leq f(y)$. A function $f: P \rightarrow Q$ between CPOs is continuous if for every directed set $D \subseteq P, f(D)$ is directed and $f(\bigvee D)=\bigvee f(D)$. A fixpoint of an function $f: P \rightarrow P$ on a partial order $P$ is an element $x \in P$ such that $f(x)=x$. The set of all fixpoints of $f$ is denoted by $\operatorname{Fix}(f)$. The least fixpoint $\mu f$ (greatest fixpoint $\nu f$ ) of a function $f$ is a fixpoint of $f$ such that $\mu f \leq x(\nu f \geq x)$ for any fixpoint $x$ of $f$.

An initial (final) sequence of a function $f$ on $P$ is an ordinal-indexed sequence $\left(f^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$ of elements of $P$ satisfying:

- $f^{0}=\perp\left(f^{0}=\mathrm{T}\right)$,
- $f^{\alpha+1}=f\left(f^{\alpha}\right)$,
- $f^{\lambda}=\bigvee_{\alpha<\lambda} f^{\alpha}\left(f^{\lambda}=\bigwedge_{\alpha<\lambda} f^{\alpha}\right)$ for a limit ordinal $\lambda$.

A limit of an initial (final) sequence of $f$ is an element $x \in P$ for which there exists an ordinal $\zeta$ such that $f^{\alpha}=x$ for $\alpha \geq \zeta$. The least such $\zeta$ is called the closure ordinal of the sequence.

For an ordinal $\alpha$, we denote by $\operatorname{On}(\alpha)$ the set of all ordinals $\leq \alpha$.
The following lemma is folklore.
Lemma 3.2. Let $\left(f^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$ be the initial (final) sequence of a monotone function $f$. Then $f^{\alpha} \leq f^{\beta}$ ( $f^{\alpha} \geq f^{\beta}$ ) for $\alpha \leq \beta$.
Proof. Suppose $\left(f^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$ is the initial sequence of $f$. The proof for the final sequence is dual. We show by induction on $\beta$ that $f^{\alpha} \leq f^{\beta}$ for all $\alpha \leq \beta$. The base case $\beta=0$ is obvious.

If $\beta=\gamma+1$ then $f^{\beta}=f\left(f^{\gamma}\right)$ and by the inductive hypothesis $f^{\gamma} \geq f^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \leq \gamma$. Hence, it suffices to show $f^{\beta} \geq f^{\gamma}$. If $\gamma=0$ then obviously $f^{\beta} \geq f^{\gamma}=\perp$. If $\gamma=\delta+1$ then $f^{\gamma} \geq f^{\delta}$, and thus $f^{\beta}=f\left(f^{\gamma}\right) \geq f\left(f^{\delta}\right)=f^{\gamma}$ by the monotonicity of $f$. If $\gamma$ is a limit ordinal then

$$
f^{\beta}=f\left(f^{\gamma}\right)=f\left(\bigvee_{\alpha<\gamma} f^{\alpha}\right) \geq \bigvee_{\alpha<\gamma} f\left(f^{\alpha}\right)=\bigvee_{\alpha<\gamma} f^{\alpha+1}=\bigvee_{\alpha<\gamma} f^{\alpha}=f^{\gamma}
$$

where the inequality follows from the monotonicity of $f$ and the definition of supremum.
Thus assume $\beta$ is a limit ordinal. But then by definition $f^{\beta}=\bigvee_{\alpha<\beta} f^{\alpha} \geq f^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \leq \beta$.
In the following lemma we collect simple well-known properites of lattices and CPOs.

## Lemma 3.3.

- In a complete lattice each subset has an infimum.
- Any complete lattice has the bottom and top elements.
- The dual of a complete lattice is also a complete lattice.
- For any set $A$, the power set $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is a complete lattice.
- If $P_{a}$ is a CPO for each $a \in A$, then $\prod_{a \in A} P_{a}$ is a CPO with $\perp_{\prod_{a \in A} P_{a}}$ defined by $\perp_{\prod_{a \in A} P_{a}}(a)=\perp_{P_{a}}$.
- Every continuous function is monotone.
- Every CPO is chain-complete.

It is also true that every chain-complete partial order is a CPO [21, Theorem 8.11].
An initial (final) sequence of a function on a partial order need not exist. Even if it exists, its limit need not exist. However, the situation is more definite for monotone functions on CPOs or complete lattices.

Theorem 3.4. Every monotone function $f$ on a CPO has the least fixpoint $\mu f$. Moreover, $\mu f$ is the limit of the initial sequence of $f$.

Proof. See e.g. [21, Theorem 10.5 and Exercise 8.19].
Theorem 3.5. Every monotone function $f$ on a complete lattice $L$ has the least and greatest fixpoints. Moreover, $\mu f$ is the limit of the initial, and $\nu f$ of the final, sequence of $f$.

Proof. The part about $\mu f$ follows from the previous theorem, because every complete lattice is a CPO. The part about $\nu f$ also follows from the previous theorem, by applying it to the dual of $L$.

The following theorem implies that every CPO has a maximal element.
Theorem 3.6 (Kuratowski-Zorn Lemma). If $P$ is a partial order in which every non-empty chain has an upper bound, then for every $x \in P$ there exists a maximal $y \geq x$.

Proof. See e.g. [21, Chapter 10].
Lemma 3.7. Let $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}$ be CPOs, and let $F: \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}}$ be monotone. If $F(f)$ is monotone for each monotone $f \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}}$, then the least fixpoint of $F$ is monotone.

Proof. Since $F$ is monotone, its least fixpoint $\mu F$ is the limit of the initial sequence $\left(f^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$ of $F$. It suffices to show by induction on $\alpha$ that each $f^{\alpha}$ is monotone. If $\alpha=0$ then this is obvious, because $f^{0}(x)=\perp$ for each $x \in \mathbb{A}$. For $\alpha=\beta+1, f^{\alpha}=F\left(f^{\beta}\right)$ is monotone, because $f^{\beta}$ is monotone by the inductive hypothesis. Thus let $\alpha$ be a successor ordinal. Then $f^{\alpha}=\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} f^{\beta}$. By Lemma 3.2, $\left\{f^{\beta} \mid \beta<\alpha\right\}$ is a chain in $\mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}}$. Thus $\left\{f^{\beta}(x) \mid \beta<\alpha\right\}$ is a chain in $\mathbb{B}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{A}$. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{A}$ and $x \leq y$. Then $f^{\beta}(x) \leq f^{\beta}(y)$ for $\beta<\alpha$, because $f^{\beta}$ is monotone by the inductive hypothesis. Hence $f^{\beta}(x) \leq \bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} f^{\beta}(y)$. This holds for any $\beta<\alpha$, so $\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} f^{\beta}(x) \leq \bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} f^{\beta}(y)$. Thus $f^{\alpha}(x) \leq f^{\alpha}(y)$. Therefore $f^{\alpha}$ is monotone.

## 4 Coinductive techniques

In this section we give an elementary presentation of coinductive techniques.
In Section 4.1 we develop a theory to justify possibly non-guarded corecursive definitions. The approach is to extend the codomains to sized CPOs (see Definition 4.2). In principle, this approach is fairly general, because any final coalgebra in the category of sets may be converted into a sized CPO (see the appendix). It is important to note that the theory is formulated in such a way as to make it unnecessary in most cases to deal directly with any CPO structure. Usually, to prove that a function is well-defined by corecursion, it suffices to show that a certain prefix production function $\eta: \mathbb{N}^{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $\eta\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{k}\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, k} n_{i}$.

In Section 4.2 we apply the theory to some concrete examples. The examples involve manysorted coterms. We also develop a style of justifying corecursive definitions. This style is close enough to our theory to be considered rigorous - only some straightforward checks are left implicit.

In Section 4.3 we develop a style of doing coinductive proofs. Some complex examples are presented, with explanations of how to rigorously justify their correctness.

In Section 4.4 we give some examples of definitions and proofs mixing coinduction with induction, or nesting coinduction.

As already mentioned, the theory and the results of this section are not really new. The aim of this section is to give an explanation of coinduction understandable to a broad audience, and to introduce a certain style of doing coinductive proofs. For this purpose, we give a new presentation of "essentially known" facts, which may serve as a reasonably direct justification for coinductive proofs.

### 4.1 Corecursion

We are mostly interested in corecursion as a definition method for functions with a set of possibly infinite objects as codomain. The following example illustrates the kind of arguments which we want to make precise.

Example 4.1. A stream over a set $A$ is an infinite sequence from $A^{\omega}$. For $s \in A^{\omega}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by $s_{n}$ we denote the $n$-th element of $s$. If $a \in A$ and $s \in A^{\omega}$, then by $a: s$ we denote the stream $s$ with $a$ prepended, i.e., $(a: s)_{0}=a$ and $(a: s)_{n+1}=s_{n}$. Consider the equation

$$
\operatorname{even}(x: y: t)=x: \operatorname{even}(t)
$$

Intuitively, this equation uniquely determines a function even on streams such that $(\operatorname{even}(s))_{n}=$ $s_{2 n}$. In this simple case, using inductive reasoning one could show that the function even defined by $(\text { even }(s))_{n}=s_{2 n}$ is indeed the unique solution of the given equation. The problem is how to prove existence and uniqueness without finding an explicit definition of the function, which is often inconvenient or difficult.

Informally, one way would be to argue as follows. We show by induction that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any stream $s$, even $(s)$ approximates a stream up to depth $n$, i.e., at least the first $n$ elements of even $(s)$ are well-defined. Then it will follow that every element of even $(s)$ is well-defined, so even $(s)$ is a stream. For $n=0$ it is obvious that even $(s)$ approximates a stream up to depth 0 . Assume that for every stream $s$, even $(s)$ approximates a stream up to depth $n$. Let $s$ be a stream. Since $s=x: y: s^{\prime}$ for some stream $s^{\prime}$, we have even $(s)=x: \operatorname{even}\left(s^{\prime}\right)$. By the inductive hypothesis, even $\left(s^{\prime}\right)$ approximates a stream up to depth $n$, so even $(s)$ approximates a stream up to depth $n+1$.

Of course, this argument is not rigorous, because we did not formally define what it means to approximate a stream up to depth $n \in \mathbb{N}$ - only an informal explanation was given. More formally, the proof could be formulated as follows.

Let $P=A^{*} \cup A^{\omega}$ be ordered by $\sqsubseteq$ where: $s \sqsubseteq s^{\prime}$ iff $s$ is a prefix of $s^{\prime}$. One easily checks that $\langle P, \sqsubseteq\rangle$ is a CPO. For $s \in P$, by $|s| \in \mathbb{N} \cup\{\infty\}$ we denote the length of $s$. The function $F: P^{A^{\omega}} \rightarrow P^{A^{\omega}}$ defined for $f \in P^{A^{\omega}}, s \in A^{\omega}$ by

$$
F(f)(s)=x: f\left(s^{\prime}\right) \text { where } s=x: y: s^{\prime}
$$

is monotone. Therefore, by Theorem 3.4 it has the least fixpoint even. By induction we show that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\operatorname{even}(s)| \geq n$ for any $s \in A^{\omega}$. This is obvious for $n=0$. Assume $|\operatorname{even}(s)| \geq n$ for every $s \in A^{\omega}$. Let $s \in A^{\omega}$. We have even $(s)=F($ even $)(s)=x: \operatorname{even}\left(s^{\prime}\right)$ where $s=x: y: s^{\prime}$. From this and the inductive hypothesis we obtain $|\operatorname{even}(s)| \geq n+1$. Therefore $|\operatorname{even}(s)|=\infty$ for every $s \in A^{\omega}$. Hence even $\in A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$, i.e., it is maximal in $P^{A^{\omega}}$. Since even is maximal and it is the least fixpoint of $F$, it must be the unique fixpoint of $F$. Because every solution (in $A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ ) of

$$
\operatorname{even}(x: y: s)=x: \operatorname{even}(s)
$$

is a fixpoint of $F$, we conclude that this equation has a unique solution in $A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ (namely, the fixpoint even of $F$ ).

In what follows we develop a theory which generalizes the above kind of reasoning. To formulate the theory, we introduce a CPO structure on each set of infinite objects we are interested in. The original objects are maximal elements of the CPO, with other elements of the CPO being their "approximations".

More specifically, let $A$ and $B$ be sets. We are interested in the existence of a unique fixpoint $f: A \rightarrow B$ of a function $F: B^{A} \rightarrow B^{A}$. The strategy for finding $f$ is to find a CPO $\mathbb{B}$ and a monotone function $F^{+}: \mathbb{B}^{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^{A}$ such that $\operatorname{Max}(\mathbb{B})=B, F^{+}(g)(x)=F(g)(x)$ for $x \in A$ and $g \in B^{A}$ (i.e. $F^{+}$agrees with $F$ on maximal elements of $\mathbb{B}^{A}$ ), and the least fixpoint $f$ of $F^{+}$is in $B^{A}$ (i.e. it is maximal in $\mathbb{B}^{A}$ ). Then $f$ is the unique fixpoint of $F^{+}$, so it is also the unique fixpoint of $F$, because any fixpoint of $F$ is a fixpoint of $F^{+}$. To show that the least fixpoint of $F^{+}$is maximal, we need a notion of the size of an element of a CPO. This leads to the following definition.

Definition 4.2. A sized $C P O$ is a tuple $\langle\mathbb{A}, \zeta, s$, cut $\rangle$ where $\mathbb{A}$ is a CPO, $\zeta$ is a size ordinal, $s: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \operatorname{On}(\zeta)$ is a size function, and cut $: \operatorname{On}(\zeta) \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ is a cut function, such that the following conditions are satisfied for $x \in \mathbb{A}$ and $\alpha \leq \zeta$ :

1. $s$ is surjective and continuous,
2. $s(x)=\zeta$ iff $x \in \mathbb{A}$ is maximal,
3. cut is monotone in both arguments,
4. $s(\operatorname{cut}(\alpha, x))=\alpha$ if $s(x)>\alpha$,
5. $\operatorname{cut}(\alpha, x)=x$ if $s(x) \leq \alpha$.

Usually, we confuse a sized CPO with its underlying CPO. Thus e.g. by a function between sized CPOs we just mean a function between their underlying CPOs. We say that a CPO $\mathbb{A}$ is a sized CPO if there exists a size ordinal $\zeta$, a size function $s: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{On}(\zeta)$ and a cut function cut: $\operatorname{On}(\zeta) \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ such that $\langle\mathbb{A}, \zeta, s$, cut $\rangle$ is a sized CPO. Given a sized CPO $\mathbb{A}$ we use $\zeta_{\mathbb{A}}$ for its associated size ordinal, $s_{\mathbb{A}}$ for the associated size function, and $\operatorname{cut}_{\mathbb{A}}$ for the associated cut function. We often drop the subscripts when clear from the context.

Let $S$ be a nonempty set. The flat sized $C P O S_{\perp}$ on $S$ is defined as $\langle\langle S \cup\{\perp\}, \leq\rangle, 1, s$, cut $\rangle$ where the following holds for $x, y \in S_{\perp}$ :

- $x \leq y$ iff $x=\perp$ or $x=y$,
- $s(x)=1$ if $x \neq \perp, s(\perp)=0$,
- $\operatorname{cut}(0, x)=\perp, \operatorname{cut}(1, x)=x$.

It is not difficult to check that $S_{\perp}$ is indeed a sized CPO.
Let $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}$ be CPOs and $A, B$ their sets of maximal elements. For $f^{*}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, the restriction $f^{*}{ }_{\lceil A}: A \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ of $f^{*}$ is defined by $f^{*}{ }_{\mid A}(x)=f^{*}(x)$ for $x \in A$. Then $f^{*}$ is an extension of $f^{*}{ }_{\mid A}$. A function between CPOs is regular if it is monotone and max-preserving. Let $S$ be an arbitrary set. A function $f: S \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is regular it $2 \lambda . f(x, y)$ is regular for each $x \in S$.

Intuitively, in a sized CPO $\mathbb{A}$ the cut function cut $(\alpha, x)$ "cuts" an element $x$ of size $>\alpha$ to its approximation of size $\alpha$, i.e., $\operatorname{cut}(\alpha, x) \leq x$ for every $x \in \mathbb{A}$. Indeed, let $x \in \mathbb{A}$. If $s(x) \leq \alpha$ then $\operatorname{cut}(\alpha, x)=x \leq x$. So assume $s(x)>\alpha$. Then $\operatorname{cut}(\alpha, x) \leq \operatorname{cut}(s(x), x)=x$.

In the rest of this section we assume that $S, Q, \ldots$ are arbitrary sets, and $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B}, \ldots$ are sized CPOs, and $A, B, \ldots$ are their corresponding sets of maximal elements, unless otherwise stated.

Lemma 4.3. Suppose $F: \mathbb{A}^{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^{S}$ is a monotone function satisfying

$$
\min _{x \in S} s(F(g)(x))>\min _{x \in S} s(g(x))
$$

for each non-maximal $g \in \mathbb{A}^{S}$. Then $F$ has a unique fixpoint. Moreover, this fixpoint is maximal (i.e. a member of $A^{S}$ ).

Proof. Because $F$ is monotone, by Theorem 3.4 it has the least fixpoint $f$. It suffices to show that $f \in A^{S}$. Assume otherwise. Then $f$ is not maximal, so

$$
\min _{x \in S} s(f(x))<\min _{x \in S} s(F(f)(x))=\min _{x \in S} s(f(x))
$$

Contradiction.
Lemma 4.4. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a $C P O$ and $\mathbb{B}$ a sized $C P O$. Let $h: \mathbb{A} \times \mathbb{B}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and $g_{i}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ ( $i=1, \ldots, m$ ) be regular. Suppose

$$
(\star) \quad s\left(h\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, m} s\left(y_{i}\right)
$$

for all $x \in A$ and all $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in \mathbb{B}$ with some $y_{k}$ non-maximal. Then there exists the least fixpoint $f^{*}$ of a function $F^{*}: \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}}$ defined by

$$
F^{*}(f)(x)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)
$$

for $f \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}}$ and $x \in \mathbb{A}$. Moreover, $f^{*}$ is regular and $f^{*}{ }_{\mid A} \in B^{A}$ is the unique function in $B^{A}$ satisfying

$$
f^{*}{ }_{\lceil A}(x)=h\left(x, f^{*}{ }_{\lceil A}\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f^{*}{ }_{\lceil A}\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)
$$

for $x \in A$.
Proof. Since $h$ is monotone, so is $F^{*}$. Indeed, assume $f \leq f^{\prime}$ where $f, f^{\prime} \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}}$. To show $F^{*}(f) \leq F^{*}\left(f^{\prime}\right)$ it suffices to prove $F^{*}(f)(x) \leq F^{*}\left(f^{\prime}\right)(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{A}$. But this follows from $f \leq f^{\prime}$ and the monotonicity of $h$. Therefore, since $F^{*}$ is monotone, by Theorem 3.4 it has the least fixpoint $f^{*}$.

[^1]Let $F: \mathbb{B}^{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^{A}$ be defined by $F(f)(x)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)$. Note that indeed $F(f) \in \mathbb{B}^{A}$ for $f \in \mathbb{B}^{A}$, because each $g_{i}$ is max-preserving.

We show that for non-maximal $f \in \mathbb{B}^{A}$ we have $\min _{x \in A} s(F(f)(x))>\min _{x \in A} s(f(x))$. Let $f \in \mathbb{B}^{A}$ be non-maximal. Let $A^{\prime} \subseteq A$ be the set of all $x \in A$ such that $f\left(g_{i}(x)\right)$ is not maximal for some $i$.

First assume $A^{\prime}=\emptyset$, i.e., $f\left(g_{i}(x)\right)$ is maximal for all $i=1, \ldots, m$ and all $x \in A$. Then $F(f)(x)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)$ is maximal for $x \in A$, because $h$ is max-preserving. Hence

$$
\min _{x \in A} s(F(f)(x))=\zeta>\min _{x \in A}(s(f(x)))
$$

because $F(f)(x)$ is maximal for all $x \in A$, but there is $x \in A$ for which $f(x)$ is not maximal.
Thus assume $A^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$. Since, for $x \in A, s\left(h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)\right)=\zeta$ if $f\left(g_{i}(x)\right)$ is maximal for all $i \in I$, and $A \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$
\min _{x \in A} s\left(h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)\right)=\min _{x \in A^{\prime}} s\left(h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)\right)
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min _{x \in A} s(F(f)(x)) & =\min _{x \in A} s\left(h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\min _{x \in A^{\prime}} s\left(h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)\right) \\
& >\min _{x \in A^{\prime}} \min _{i=1, \ldots, m} s\left(f\left(g_{i}(x)\right)\right) \\
& \geq \min _{x \in A} s(f(x))
\end{aligned}
$$

where the strict inequality follows from $(\star)$.
Therefore, for non-maximal $f \in \mathbb{B}^{A}$ we have $\min _{x \in A} s(F(f)(x))>\min _{x \in A} s(f(x))$. Thus by Lemma 4.3 the function $F$ has a unique fixpoint $u$. Recall that $f^{*}$ is the least fixpoint of $F^{*}$. Note that $f^{*}{ }_{\mid A}$ is a fixpoint of $F$. Indeed, for $x \in A$ we have

$$
f^{*}(x)=F^{*}\left(f^{*}\right)(x)=h\left(x, f^{*}\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f^{*}\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)=F\left(f^{*}\right)(x)
$$

Therefore, $f^{*}{ }_{\mid A}=u$, so it is the unique function in $B^{A}$ satisfying

$$
f^{*}{ }_{\lceil A}(x)=h\left(x, f^{*}{ }_{\lceil A}\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f^{*}{ }_{\lceil A}\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)
$$

for $x \in A$.
It remains to check that $f^{*}$ is regular. Since $f^{*}{ }_{\mid A} \in B^{A}$, the function $f^{*}$ is max-preserving. Because $h$ and all $g_{i}$ are monotone, for monotone $f$ the function $F^{*}(f)$ is monotone. By Lemma 3.7 we thus conclude that $f^{*}$ is monotone. Hence $f^{*}$ is regular.

Corollary 4.5. Let $h: S \times \mathbb{B}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ be regular. Let $g_{i}: S \rightarrow S(i=1, \ldots, m)$. Suppose

$$
(\star) \quad s\left(h\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, m} s\left(y_{i}\right)
$$

for all $x \in S$ and all $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in \mathbb{B}$ with some $y_{k}$ non-maximal. Then there exists a unique function $f: S \rightarrow B$ satisfying

$$
f(x)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)
$$

for $x \in S$.
Proof. Let $\mathbb{S}=S_{\perp}$ be the flat CPO on $S$. There exists a regular extension $g_{i}^{*}: \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ of each $g_{i}$, defined by

$$
g_{i}^{*}(x)= \begin{cases}x & \text { if } x \in S \\ \perp & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

for $x \in \mathbb{S}$. Analogously, there exists a regular $h^{*}: \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{B}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ defined by

$$
h^{*}(x, \bar{y})=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
h(x, \bar{y}) & \text { if } x \in S \\
\perp & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

for $x \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{B}^{m}$. Moreover, $h^{*}$ satisfies $(\star)$ in Lemma 4.4. Therefore, we may apply Lemma 4.4 to obtain the required function $f$.

At this point it is worthwhile to emphasize one aspect of our approach. Ultimately, we really only care about the maximal elements in a CPO , and only about functions between sets of maximal elements. That we introduce a structure of a CPO is only to be able to rigorously justify certain methods for defining corecursive functions. But once these methods have been shown correct, to apply them we usually do not need to directly deal with the CPO structure at all. The following makes this more apparent.

Definition 4.6. A function $f: S \rightarrow Q$ is defined by substitution from $h: Q_{1} \times \ldots \times Q_{m} \rightarrow Q$ and $g_{i}: S \rightarrow Q_{i}(i=1, \ldots, m)$ if $f(x)=h\left(g_{1}(x), \ldots, g_{m}(x)\right)$ for $x \in S$. A function $f: S \rightarrow Q$ is defined by cases from functions $g_{i}: S \rightarrow Q$ and condition functions $h_{i}: S \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ for $i=1, \ldots, m$, if for $x \in S$ :

- $f(x)=g_{i}(x)$ if $h_{i}(x)=1$,
- $f(x)=g_{0}(x)$ if $h_{i}(x)=0$ for all $i=1, \ldots, m$,
- there is no $x \in S$ with $h_{i}(x)=h_{j}(x)=1$ for $i \neq j$.

A function $f: S \rightarrow Q$ is defined by corecursion from $h: S \times Q^{m} \rightarrow Q$ and $g_{i}: S \rightarrow S$ $(i=1, \ldots, m)$ if it is the unique function in $Q^{S}$ satisfying

$$
f(x)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)
$$

for all $x \in S$. We say that $h$ is a prefix function for $f$, and each $g_{i}$ is an argument function for $f$. Note that given $h$ and $g_{i}$, there might not exist any function defined by corecursion from $h$ and $g_{i}$.

A production function $\eta_{f}: \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{1}}\right) \times \ldots \times \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{n}}\right) \rightarrow \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}\right)$ for $f: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$ is any function satisfying

$$
\eta_{f}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right)=s\left(f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)
$$

for $x_{i} \in \mathbb{A}_{i}(i=1, \ldots, n)$, where $f^{*} \in \mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is a regular extension of $f$. We then also say that $\eta_{f}$ is a production function for $f^{*}$, or that $f^{*}$ is associated with $\eta_{f}$. If a production function $\eta_{f}$ for $f: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$ is clear from the context, then we use $f^{*}$ to denote the regular extension of $f$ associated with $\eta_{f}$.

Any production function $\eta_{h}$ for a prefix function $h$ for $f$ is called a global prefix production function for $f$. If $x \in S$ and $h: S \times B^{m} \rightarrow B$ is a prefix function for $f: S \rightarrow B$, then any production function $\eta_{h}^{x}: \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}\right)^{m} \rightarrow \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}\right)$ for the $x$-local prefix function $\lambda \bar{y} . h(x, \bar{y})$ is called an $x$-local prefix production function for $f$. We use the term prefix production function for either a local or a global prefix production function, depending on the context.

Lemma 4.7. Any production function $\eta_{f}: \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{1}}\right) \times \ldots \times \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{n}}\right) \rightarrow \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}\right)$ for a function $f: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$ is regular.

Proof. Let $f^{*}: \mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ be the regular extension of $f$ associated with $\eta_{f}$. Let $\alpha_{i} \leq \beta_{i} \leq \zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{i}}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. Because the size functions for each $\mathbb{A}_{i}$ are surjective, for every $i=1, \ldots, n$ there is $y_{i} \in \mathbb{A}_{i}$ such that $s\left(y_{i}\right)=\beta_{i}$. Let $x_{i}=\operatorname{cut}\left(\alpha_{i}, y_{i}\right)$. Because of the
monotonicity of the cut function we have $x_{i} \leq \operatorname{cut}\left(\beta_{i}, y_{i}\right)=y_{i}$. Also $s\left(x_{i}\right)=\alpha_{i}$ by the definition of cut. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{f}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right) & =\eta_{f}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =s\left(f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& \leq s\left(f^{*}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\eta_{f}\left(s\left(y_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(y_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\eta_{f}\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $f^{*}$ and $s$ are monotone. Therefore $\eta_{f}$ is monotone.
To show that $\eta_{f}$ is max-preserving, we need to prove $\eta_{f}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{1}}, \ldots, \zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{n}}\right)=\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}$. Let $x_{i} \in$ $A_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. Then $f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ is maximal, because $f^{*}$ is max-preserving. Thus $\eta_{f}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{1}}, \ldots, \zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{n}}\right)=\eta_{f}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right)=s\left(f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)=\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}$.

The following corollary implies that to determine whether there exists a function defined by corecursion it suffices to bound the values of local prefix production functions. Thus no analysis of the underlying CPO structure is needed, as long as we are able to calculate the production functions.

Corollary 4.8. Let $h: S \times B^{m} \rightarrow B$ and $g_{i}: S \rightarrow S(i=1, \ldots, m)$. Suppose for each $x \in S$, a function $\eta_{h}^{x}$ is an x-local prefix production function, i.e., a production function for $\lambda \bar{y} . h(x, \bar{y})$. Assume

$$
(\star) \quad \eta_{h}^{x}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, m} \alpha_{i}
$$

for each $x \in S$ and all $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m} \leq \zeta_{\mathbb{B}}$ such that $\alpha_{k}<\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq m$. Then there exists a function defined by corecursion from $h$ and $g_{i}(i=1, \ldots, m)$, i.e., a unique function $f: S \rightarrow B$ satisfying

$$
f(x)=h\left(x, f\left(g_{1}(x)\right), \ldots, f\left(g_{m}(x)\right)\right)
$$

for all $x \in S$.
Proof. Follows from Corollary 4.5,
Note that for any function $f: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$ there exists a production function. Simply take the function $\eta_{f}$ defined by:

$$
\eta_{f}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
\zeta_{\mathbb{B}} & \text { if } \alpha_{i}=\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{i}} \text { for } i=1, \ldots, n \\
0 & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

Then the regular function $f^{*}: \mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ associated with $\eta_{f}$ is defined by

$$
f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) & \text { if } x_{i} \in A_{i} \text { for } i=1, \ldots, n \\
\perp & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

The point is to be able to find "sensible" production functions, and then use them to verify ( $\star$ ) in Corollary 4.8. Below we show how to compute production functions for functions defined by substitution, cases or corecursion.

Let $\mathbf{2}=\{0,1\}_{\perp}$ be the flat sized CPO on $\{0,1\}$. In what follows we assume that $\mathbf{2}$ is the sized CPO associated with $\{0,1\}$, e.g., a production function for $f: A \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ is assumed to have $\operatorname{On}(1)=\{0,1\}$ as its codomain. Recall that $s_{\mathbf{2}}(0)=s_{\mathbf{2}}(1)=1$ and $s_{\mathbf{2}}(\perp)=0$.

## Lemma 4.9.

- The function $\eta\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)=\alpha_{i}$ is a continuous production function for the $i$-th projection function $\pi_{i}: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow A_{i}$ defined by $\pi_{i}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=x_{i}$.
- The function $\eta(\alpha)=\alpha$ is a continuous production function for the identity function id : $A \rightarrow A$.
- The function $\eta:\{0,1\}^{n} \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ defined by $\eta\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)=\min _{i=1, \ldots, n} \alpha_{i}$ is a continuous production function for any function $f:\{0,1\}^{m} \rightarrow\{0,1\}$.

Proof. Follows from definitions.
Lemma 4.10. If a function $f: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$ is defined by substitution from functions $h: B_{1} \times \ldots \times B_{m} \rightarrow B$ and $g_{i}: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B_{i}(i=1, \ldots, m)$, and $\eta_{h}$ and $\eta_{g_{i}}$ are production functions for $h$ and $g_{i}$ respectively, then the function $\eta_{f}$ defined by

$$
\eta_{f}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)=\eta_{h}\left(\eta_{g_{1}}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right), \ldots, \eta_{g_{m}}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)\right)
$$

is a production function for $f$. Moreover, if $\eta_{h}$ and all $\eta_{g_{i}}$ are continuous, then so is $\eta_{f}$.
Proof. Follows directly from definitions.

## Corollary 4.11.

- If $\eta_{g}$ is a (continuous) production function for $g: A^{m} \rightarrow B$, then

$$
\eta\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}\right)=\eta_{g}\left(\alpha_{\tau(1)}, \ldots, \alpha_{\tau(m)}\right)
$$

is a (continuous) production function for $f: A^{m} \rightarrow B$ defined by

$$
f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\right)=g\left(x_{\tau(1)}, \ldots, x_{\tau(m)}\right)
$$

where $\tau:\{1, \ldots, m\} \rightarrow\{1, \ldots, m\}$.

- If $\eta_{g}$ is a (continuous) production function for $g: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$, then

$$
\eta\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}, \beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{k}\right)=\eta_{g}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)
$$

is a (continuous) production function for $f: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \times B_{1} \times \ldots \times B_{k} \rightarrow B$ defined by $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}\right)=g\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ for $x_{i} \in A_{i}(i=1, \ldots, n), y_{i} \in B_{i}(i=1, \ldots, k)$.

Proof. Follows from the first point of Lemma 4.9 and from Lemma 4.10.
Lemma 4.12. If a function $f: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$ is defined by cases from $g_{i}: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow B$ $(i=0, \ldots, m)$ and $h_{i}: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow\{0,1\} \quad(i=1, \ldots, m)$, and $\eta_{g_{i}}$ is a production function for $g_{i}$, and $\eta_{h_{i}}$ is a production function for $h_{i}$, then the function $\eta_{f}$ defined by

$$
\eta_{f}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right) & \text { if } \eta_{h_{i}}\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n}\right)=1 \text { for every } i=1, \ldots, m \\
0 & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

is a production function for $f$. Moreover, if all $\eta_{g_{i}}$ and all $\eta_{h_{i}}$ are continuous, then so is $\eta_{f}$.
Proof. Let $g_{i}^{*}: \mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and $h_{i}^{*}: \mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ be the regular extensions associated with $\eta_{g_{i}}$ and $\eta_{h_{i}}$ respectively. Define $f^{*}: \mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ by
$f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}\operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), g_{k}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) & \text { if } h_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \neq \perp \text { for } 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ \operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), g_{0}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) & \text { and } k \text { is least s.t. } h_{k}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=1 \\ \perp & \text { if } h_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=0 \text { for } 1 \leq i \leq m \\ \perp & \text { otherwise }\end{array}\right.$
where $x_{i} \in \mathbb{A}_{i}(i=1, \ldots, n)$ and $\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right)$. One easily checks that $f^{*}$ is an extension of $f$. Hence $f^{*}$ is max-preserving. To show that $f^{*}$ is regular it thus suffices to check that it is monotone. Assume $x_{i} \leq y_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. We need to show $f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \leq f^{*}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)$. If $f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\perp$ then this is obvious. So assume, e.g., $h_{k}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=1$ and $h_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \neq \perp$ for $i=1, \ldots, m$. Then $h_{i}^{*}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)=h_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ for $i=1, \ldots, m$, because each $h_{i}^{*}$ is monotone. Thus it suffices to show $\operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), g_{k}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) \leq \operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right), g_{k}^{*}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)\right)$. Because $g_{i}^{*}$ for $i=0, \ldots, m$ and $s$ are monotone, $s\left(g_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) \leq s\left(g_{i}^{*}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)\right)$ for $i=0, \ldots, m$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) & =\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} s\left(g_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& \leq \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} s\left(g_{i}^{*}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(s\left(y_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(y_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\kappa\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$
\operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), g_{k}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) \leq \operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right), g_{k}^{*}\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)\right)
$$

because $g_{k}^{*}$ and cut are monotone.
We now check that the function $\eta_{f}$ defined in the statement of the theorem is a production function for $f^{*}$. Let $x_{i} \in \mathbb{A}_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. If $h_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\perp$ for some $i=1, \ldots, m$, then $\eta_{h_{i}}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right)=0$ and $f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\perp$. Hence

$$
\eta_{f}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right)=0=s\left(f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)
$$

Thus assume, e.g., $h_{i}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=0$ for all $i=1, \ldots, m$. Then $\eta_{h_{i}}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right)=1$ for every $i=1, \ldots, m$, and $f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), g_{0}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{f}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right) & =\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \\
& =\min \left\{\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), \eta_{g_{0}}\left(s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right)\right\} \\
& =\min \left\{\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), s\left(g_{0}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)\right\} \\
& =s\left(\operatorname{cut}\left(\kappa\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), g_{0}^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)\right) \\
& =s\left(f^{*}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

It remains to show that if all $\eta_{g_{i}}$ and $\eta_{h_{i}}$ are continuous, then so is $\eta_{f}$. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n}$ be a directed set. First assume $\eta_{h_{i}}(\bigvee D)=0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $\eta_{f}(\bigvee D)=0$ by the definition of $\eta_{f}$. Also $\bigvee \eta_{h_{i}}(D)=\eta_{h_{i}}(\bigvee D)=0$ by continuity of $\eta_{h_{i}}$. Hence $\eta_{h_{i}}(d)=0$ for every $d \in D$. So $\eta_{f}(d)=0$ for $d \in D$. Hence $\bigvee \eta_{f}(D)=0=\eta_{f}(\bigvee D)$.

So assume $\eta_{h_{i}}(\bigvee D)=1$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then

$$
\eta_{f}(\bigvee D)=\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}(\bigvee D)=\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \bigvee \eta_{g_{i}}(D)
$$

by the continuity of $\eta_{g_{i}}$. Let $D^{*}$ be the set of all $d \in D$ such that $\eta_{h_{i}}(d)=1$ for all $i=1, \ldots, m$. We have $\bigvee \eta_{h_{i}}(D)=\eta_{h_{i}}(\bigvee D)=1$ for every $i=1, \ldots, m$. So for every $i=1, \ldots, m$ there is $d_{i} \in D$ such that $\eta_{h_{i}}\left(d_{i}\right)=1$. Because $D$ is directed and each $\eta_{h_{i}}$ is monotone, we thus have $D^{*} \neq \emptyset$ (an element greater or equal all of $d_{1}, \ldots, d_{m}$ is in $D^{*}$ ). Hence for every $d \in D$ there is $d^{*} \in D^{*}$ such that $d^{*} \geq d$ (take an element greater or equal than $d$ and than some element of $\left.D^{*}\right)$. Thus for every $d \in D$ there is $d^{*} \in D^{*} \operatorname{such}$ that $\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}(d) \leq \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(d^{*}\right)$. Therefore

$$
\bigvee \eta_{f}(D)=\bigvee_{d^{*} \in \mathcal{D}^{*}} \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(d^{*}\right)=\bigvee_{d \in D} \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}(d)
$$

Hence it suffices to show

$$
\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \bigvee \eta_{g_{i}}(D)=\bigvee_{d \in D} \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}(d)
$$

Let $L=\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \bigvee \eta_{g_{i}}(D)$ and $R=\bigvee_{d \in D} \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}(d)$. Without loss of generality, assume $L=\bigvee \eta_{g_{0}}(D)$. We need to show $L \leq R$ and $R \leq L$. For $R \leq L$ it suffices to show that $L \geq \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}(d)$ for $d \in D$. But $L \geq \eta_{g_{0}}(d) \geq \min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}(d)$ for $d \in D$. For $L \leq R$ it suffices to show $R \geq \eta_{g_{0}}(d)$ for $d \in D$. So let $d \in D$ and assume $R<\eta_{g_{0}}(d)$. We have $\bigvee \eta_{g_{i}}(D) \geq \eta_{g_{0}}(d)$ for $i=0, \ldots, m$, so for every $i=0, \ldots, m$ there exists $d_{i} \in D$ with $\eta_{g_{i}}\left(d_{i}\right)>R$. Because $D$ is directed there is a $d^{\prime} \in D$ such that $d^{\prime} \geq d_{i}$ for $i=0, \ldots, m$. Then $\eta_{g_{i}}\left(d^{\prime}\right)>R$ for $i=0, \ldots, m$, because each $\eta_{g_{i}}$ is monotone. Hence $\min _{i=0, \ldots, m} \eta_{g_{i}}\left(d^{\prime}\right)>R$. This contradicts the definition of $R$.

The following theorem shows how to calculate a production function for a function defined by corecursion.
Theorem 4.13. Let $h: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \times B^{m} \rightarrow B$ and $g_{i}: A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n} \rightarrow A_{1} \times \ldots \times A_{n}$ $(i=1, \ldots, m)$ where

$$
g_{i}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\left\langle g_{i}^{1}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), \ldots, g_{i}^{n}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right\rangle
$$

for $x_{j} \in A_{j}(i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, n)$. Let $\eta_{h}$ be a production function for $h$, and $\eta_{i, j}$ a production function for $g_{i}^{j}(i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, n)$. Assume that $\eta_{h}$ satisfies:
(夫) $\quad \eta_{h}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{1}}, \ldots, \zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{n}}, \beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{m}\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, m} \beta_{i}$
for all $\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{m} \leq \zeta_{\mathbb{B}}$ with $\beta_{i}<\zeta_{\mathbb{B}}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$.
If $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a function defined by corecursion from $h$ and $g_{i}(i=1, \ldots, m)$, then there exists a production function $\eta_{f}$ for $f$ satisfying for all $\bar{\alpha} \in \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{1}}\right) \times \ldots \times \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{n}}\right)$ the equation

$$
\eta_{f}(\bar{\alpha})=\eta_{h}\left(\bar{\alpha}, \eta_{f}\left(\eta_{1,1}(\bar{\alpha}), \ldots, \eta_{1, n}(\bar{\alpha})\right), \ldots, \eta_{f}\left(\eta_{m, 1}(\bar{\alpha}), \ldots, \eta_{m, n}(\bar{\alpha})\right)\right)
$$

Moreover, if $\eta_{h}$ and all $\eta_{i, j}(i=1, \ldots, m, j=1, \ldots, n)$ are continuous, then so is $\eta_{f}$.
Proof. Let $h^{*}$ be the regular extension associated with $\eta_{h}$, and $g_{i, j}^{*}$ the regular extension associated with $\eta_{i, j}$ for $i=1, \ldots, m$ and $j=1, \ldots, n$. Let $\mathbb{A}=\mathbb{A}_{1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{A}_{n}$. For $i=1, \ldots, m$, let $g_{i}^{*}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be defined by

$$
g_{i}^{*}(\bar{x})=\left\langle g_{i, 1}^{*}(\bar{x}), \ldots, g_{i, n}^{*}(\bar{x})\right\rangle
$$

for $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{A}$. Let $F^{*}: \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{A}}$ be defined by

$$
F^{*}\left(f^{\prime}\right)(\bar{x})=h^{*}\left(\bar{x}, f^{\prime}\left(g_{1}^{*}(\bar{x})\right), \ldots, f^{\prime}\left(g_{m}^{*}(\bar{x})\right)\right)
$$

for $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{A}$. Then $f$ is the restriction of the least fixpoint $f^{*}$ of $F^{*}$, by $(\star)$ and Lemma 4.4. Let $\left(f^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$ be the initial sequence of $F^{*}$. Let $W=\operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{1}}\right) \times \ldots \times \operatorname{On}\left(\zeta_{\mathbb{A}_{n}}\right)$. Let $\eta_{i}: W \rightarrow W$ be defined by

$$
\eta_{i}(w)=\left\langle\eta_{i, 1}(w), \ldots, \eta_{i, n}(w)\right\rangle
$$

for $w \in W$. If $\bar{x}=\left\langle x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\rangle \in \mathbb{A}$ then we write $s(\bar{x})$ for $\left\langle s\left(x_{1}\right), \ldots, s\left(x_{n}\right)\right\rangle$. Note that

$$
\eta_{i}(s(\bar{x}))=s\left(g_{i}^{*}(\bar{x})\right)
$$

for $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{A}$.

By transfinite induction on $\alpha$ we show that there exists a production function $\eta^{\alpha}$ for $f^{\alpha}$. For $\alpha=0$ we may define $\eta^{0}$ by $\eta^{0}(w)=0$ for $w \in W$, because $f^{0}(\bar{x})=\perp$ for any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{A}$.

For $\alpha=\beta+1$ we define

$$
\eta^{\beta+1}(w)=\eta_{h}\left(w, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{1}(w)\right), \ldots, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{m}(w)\right)\right)
$$

Then the equality

$$
f^{\beta+1}(\bar{x})=h^{*}\left(\bar{x}, f^{\beta}\left(g_{1}^{*}(\bar{x})\right), \ldots, f^{\beta}\left(g_{m}^{*}(\bar{x})\right)\right)
$$

and the inductive hypothesis imply that $\eta^{\beta+1}(s(\bar{x}))=s\left(f^{\beta+1}(\bar{x})\right)$.
Finally, let $\alpha$ be a limit ordinal. For $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{A}$ we have

$$
f^{\alpha}(\bar{x})=\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} h^{*}\left(\bar{x}, f^{\beta}\left(g_{1}^{*}(\bar{x})\right), \ldots, f^{\beta}\left(g_{m}^{*}(\bar{x})\right)\right)
$$

Because $s_{\mathbb{B}}$ is continuous and $f^{\beta} \leq f^{\beta+1}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
s\left(f^{\alpha}(\bar{x})\right) & =s\left(\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} f^{\beta}(\bar{x})\right) \\
& =s\left(\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} f^{\beta+1}(\bar{x})\right) \\
& =s\left(\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} h^{*}\left(\bar{x}, f^{\beta}\left(g_{1}^{*}(\bar{x})\right), \ldots, f^{\beta}\left(g_{m}^{*}(\bar{x})\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} s\left(h^{*}\left(\bar{x}, f^{\beta}\left(g_{1}^{*}(\bar{x})\right), \ldots, f^{\beta}\left(g_{m}^{*}(\bar{x})\right)\right)\right) \\
& =\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \eta_{h}\left(s(\bar{x}), \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{1}(s(\bar{x}))\right), \ldots, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{m}(s(\bar{x}))\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the last equality we use the inductive hypothesis. Therefore, we may define

$$
\eta^{\alpha}(w)=\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \eta_{h}\left(w, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{1}(w)\right), \ldots, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{m}(w)\right)\right)
$$

The join always exists, because $s_{\mathbb{A}_{i}}$ is surjective for $i=1, \ldots, m$. Indeed, for any $w \in W$ there is $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $w=s(\bar{x})$, by surjectivity. So

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta^{\alpha}(w) & =\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \eta_{h}\left(w, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{1}(w)\right), \ldots, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{m}(w)\right)\right) \\
& =\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \eta_{h}\left(s(\bar{x}), \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{1}(s(\bar{x}))\right), \ldots, \eta^{\beta}\left(\eta_{m}(s(\bar{x}))\right)\right) \\
& =\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} s\left(f^{\beta}(\bar{x})\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

which exists because $\left\{f^{\beta}(\bar{x}) \mid \beta<\alpha\right\}$ is a chain and $s_{\mathbb{B}}$ is continuous.
Let $\kappa$ be the closure ordinal of $\left(f^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$. Then $f^{\kappa+1}=f^{\kappa}$, so for $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{A}$ :

$$
\eta^{\kappa+1}(s(\bar{x}))=s\left(f^{\kappa+1}(\bar{x})\right)=s\left(f^{\kappa}(\bar{x})\right)=\eta^{\kappa}(s(\bar{x}))
$$

Since $s_{\mathbb{A}_{i}}$ is surjective for $i=1, \ldots, m$, we thus have $\eta^{\kappa+1}=\eta^{\kappa}$. So for $w \in W$ :

$$
\eta^{\kappa}(w)=\eta^{\kappa+1}(w)=\eta_{h}\left(w, \eta^{\kappa}\left(\eta_{1}(w)\right), \ldots, \eta^{\kappa}\left(\eta_{m}(w)\right)\right)
$$

Therefore, $\eta^{\kappa}$ is the required production function for $f^{*}=f^{\kappa}$.
If $\eta_{h}$ and all $\eta_{i, j}$ are continuous, then it follows by transfinite induction on $\alpha$ that each $\eta^{\alpha}$ is continuous.

### 4.2 Coterms

The above general theory for defining corecursive functions will now be illustrated with some concrete examples. The examples will involve many-sorted coterms.

Definition 4.14. A many-sorted algebraic signature $\Sigma=\left\langle\Sigma_{s}, \Sigma_{f}\right\rangle$ consists of a collection of sort symbols $\Sigma_{s}=\left\{s_{i}\right\}_{i \in I}$ and a collection of function symbols $\Sigma_{f}=\left\{f_{j}\right\}_{j \in J}$. Each function symbol $f$ has an associated type $\tau(f)=\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ where $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}, s \in \Sigma_{s}$. If $\tau(f)=(; s)$ then $f$ is a constant of sort $s$. In what follows we use $\Sigma, \Sigma^{\prime}$, etc., for many-sorted algebraic signatures, $s, s^{\prime}$, etc., for sort symbols, and $f, g, c$, etc., for function symbols.

The set $\mathcal{T}^{\infty}(\Sigma)$, or just $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, of coterms over $\Sigma$ is the set of all finite and infinite terms over $\Sigma$, i.e., all finite and infinite labelled trees with labels of nodes specified by the function symbols of $\Sigma$ such that the types of labels of nodes agree. More precisely, a coterm over $\Sigma$ is a function $t: \mathbb{N}^{*} \rightarrow \Sigma_{f} \cup\{\perp\}$, where $\perp \notin \Sigma_{f}$, satisfying:

- $t(\epsilon) \neq \perp$, and
- if $t(p)=f \in \Sigma_{f}$ with $\tau(f)=\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -t(p i)=g \in \Sigma_{f} \text { with } \tau(g)=\left(s_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, s_{m_{i}}^{\prime} ; s_{i}\right) \text { for } i<n, \\
& -t(p i)=\perp \text { for } i \geq n,
\end{aligned}
$$

- if $t(p)=\perp$ then $t(p i)=\perp$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,
where $\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ is the empty string. We use obvious notations for coterms, e.g., $f(g(t, s), c)$ when $c, f, g \in \Sigma_{f}$ and $t, s \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, and the types agree. We say that a coterm $t$ is of sort $s$ if $t(\epsilon)$ is a function symbol of type $\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ for some $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} \in \Sigma_{s}$. By $\mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ we denote the set of all coterms of sort $s$ from $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$. We also write $\mathcal{T}_{*}(\Sigma)$ for $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$, i.e., by $*$ we denote a special sort of all coterms.

The $n$-th approximant of a coterm $t \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ is a function $t^{\mid n}: \mathbb{N}^{*} \rightarrow \Sigma_{f} \cup\{\perp\}$ such that

- $t^{\mid n}(p)=t(p)$ if $|p|<n$, or $|p|=n>0$ and $t(p)$ is a constant, i.e., $\tau(t(p))=(; s)$ for some $s \in \Sigma_{s}$,
- $t^{\mid n}(p)=\perp$ otherwise,
where by $|p|$ we denote the length of $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$. In other words, $t^{\mid n}$ is $t$ cut at depth $n$, but we do not change constants in leaves at depth $n>0$ into $\perp$. By $\mathcal{T}^{n}(\Sigma)$ we denote the set of all $n$-th approximants of coterms over $\Sigma$. We extend the notation $t^{\upharpoonright m}$ to approximants $t \in \mathcal{T}^{n}(\Sigma)$ in the obvious way. We also use obvious notations for approximants, e.g., the first approximant of $f\left(g\left(t_{1}\right), h\left(t_{2}\right), c\right)$ is denoted by $f(\perp, \perp, c)$. We say that an approximant $t \in \mathcal{T}^{n}(\Sigma)$ is of sort $s \in \Sigma_{s}$ if either $t(\epsilon)=\perp$ or $t(\epsilon)$ is a function symbol of type $\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ for some $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} \in \Sigma_{s}$. By $\mathcal{T}_{s}^{n}(\Sigma)$ we denote the set of all $t \in \mathcal{T}^{n}(\Sigma)$ of sort $s$.

The partial order $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}=\langle\mathbb{N} \cup\{\infty\}, \leq\rangle$ is ordered by the usual order on $\mathbb{N}$ extended with $n \leq \infty$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$. Note that $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ is isomorphic to $\operatorname{On}(\omega)$. We extend the arithmetical operations on $\mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ in an obvious way, with $\infty-n=\infty, n+\infty=\infty+n=\infty+\infty=\infty$, $n \cdot \infty=\infty \cdot n=\infty \cdot \infty=\infty$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $A_{i}$ for $i \in I$ are sets, then by $\amalg_{i \in I} A_{i}$ we denote the coproduct of the $A_{i}$ s, i.e., the set of all pairs $\langle i, a\rangle$ such that $i \in I$ and $a \in A_{i}$. We define the partial order $\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)=\left\langle\amalg_{n \in \mathbb{N}_{\infty}} \mathcal{T}^{n}(\Sigma)\right.$, $\left.\sqsubseteq\right\rangle$ by: $\langle i, t\rangle \sqsubseteq\langle j, s\rangle$ iff $i \leq j$ and $s^{\lceil i}=t$. The size $|t| \in \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ of $t \in \mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ is the first component of $t$. We will often confuse $\langle i, t\rangle \in \mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ with $t \in \mathcal{T}^{i}(\Sigma)$. For a sort symbol $s \in \Sigma_{s}$, by $\mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ we denote the subset of $\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ consisting of all $\langle i, t\rangle$ such that $t$ is of sort $s$. We also use the notation $\mathbb{T}_{*}(\Sigma)$ for $\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$.

We define cut : $\mathbb{N}_{\infty} \times \mathbb{T}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ by $\operatorname{cut}(n,\langle i, t\rangle)=\langle i, t\rangle$ if $i \leq n$, and $\operatorname{cut}(n,\langle i, t\rangle)=$ $\left\langle n, t^{\mid n}\right\rangle$ if $i>n$. Note that if $t \in \mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ then $\operatorname{cut}(n, t) \in \mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$.

Let $f \in \Sigma_{f}$ be a function symbol of type $\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$ and let $1 \leq i \leq n$. The $i$-th destructor for $f$ is a function $d_{f, i}: \mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s_{i}}(\Sigma)$ defined by:

$$
d_{f, i}(t)= \begin{cases}t_{i} & \text { if } t \equiv f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right) \\ t^{\prime} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

where $t^{\prime} \in \mathcal{T}_{s_{i}}(\Sigma)$ is arbitrary. The constructor for $f$ is a function $c_{f}: \mathcal{T}_{s_{1}}(\Sigma) \times \ldots \times \mathcal{T}_{s_{n}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow$ $\mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ defined by

$$
c_{f}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)=f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)
$$

The test for $f$ is a function $o_{f}: \mathcal{T}_{s} \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ defined by

$$
o_{f}(t)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } t \equiv f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right) \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

If $t \in \mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ and $t \equiv\left\langle i, t^{\prime}\right\rangle$ with $t^{\prime} \in \mathcal{T}^{\infty}(\Sigma)$ (this may happen for $i<\infty$ if e.g. $t^{\prime}$ is a constant), then by $t \uparrow$ we denote $\left\langle\infty, t^{\prime}\right\rangle$.

Lemma 4.15. The partial order $\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ is a $C P O$. Also, for each $s \in \Sigma_{s}$, the partial order $\mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ is a CPO.

Proof. The bottom of $\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ is $\langle 0, \perp\rangle$, where $\perp$ is the sole element of $\mathcal{T}^{0}(\Sigma)$.
Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ be a directed set. Let $n$ be the supremum of the first coordinates of elements of $D$. Define $t \in \mathcal{T}^{n}(\Sigma)$ by:

- $t(p)=f$ if $f \in \Sigma_{f}$ and there is $s \in D$ with $s(p)=f$,
- $t(p)=\perp$ otherwise.
where $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$. This is a good definition, because $D$ is directed. By definition we of course have $\langle n, t\rangle \sqsupseteq s$ for all $s \in D$. If $n<\infty$ then $\langle n, t\rangle \in D$, so it is the supremum of $D$. Assume $n=\infty$. Suppose $u \in \mathcal{T}^{m}(\Sigma)$ and $\langle m, u\rangle \sqsupseteq s$ for all $s \in D$. Then $m=\infty$. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$. Then there exists $s \in D$ with $|s| \geq|p|$, and so $t(p)=s(p)$. Since $u \sqsupseteq s$, we obtain $u(p)=s(p)=t(p)$. Thus $u=t$, so $\langle\infty, t\rangle$ is the supremum of $D$.

That for each $s \in \Sigma_{s}$, the order $\mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ is a CPO follows from the fact that if all elements of a directed set are of sort $s$, then its supremum is also of sort $s$.

Lemma 4.16. The tuple $\langle\mathbb{T}(\Sigma), \infty,| \cdot \mid$, cut $\rangle$ is a sized $C P O^{3}$ Also for each $s \in \Sigma_{s}$, the tuple $\left\langle\mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma), \infty,\right| \cdot \mid$, cut $\rangle$ is a sized CPO.

Proof. The only part which is not completely obvious is the continuity of the size function $|\cdot|$. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ be a directed set. The set $|D|$ is directed. By the definition of $\bigvee D$ in the proof of Lemma 4.15, we have $|\bigvee D|=\bigvee|D|$.

Our definition of $\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ may seem somewhat convoluted. One may wonder why we do not simply use $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_{\infty}} \mathcal{T}^{n}(\Sigma)$, or even the set of all coterms with some arbitrary subterms changed into $\perp$, with an obvious "information" ordering. The answer is that then there would be no cut function cut with the desired properties. Also, the construction of $\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ is a slightly modified instance of a more general sized CPO construction for an arbitrary final coalgebra in the category of sets (see the appendix).

For the sake of brevity we often use $\mathcal{T}=\mathcal{T}(\Sigma), \mathcal{T}_{s}=\mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma), \mathbb{T}=\mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathbb{T}_{s}=\mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$, i.e., we omit the signature $\Sigma$ when clear from the context or irrelevant. We also confuse $\mathbb{T}$ and $\mathbb{T}_{s}$ with the sized CPOs from Lemma 4.16.

[^2]Lemma 4.17. Assume $f \in \Sigma_{f}$ has type $\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} ; s\right)$.

1. The function $\eta_{d_{f, i}}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ defined by $\eta_{d_{f, i}}(n)=\max (0, n-1)$ is a production function for $d_{f, i}$.
2. If all elements of $\mathcal{T}_{s_{i}}$ are constants, then $\eta_{\infty}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ defined by

$$
\eta_{\infty}(n)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\infty & \text { if } n>0 \\
0 & \text { if } n=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

is a production function for $d_{f, i}$.
3. The function $\eta_{c_{f}}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ defined by $\eta_{c_{f}}\left(m_{1}, \ldots, m_{n}\right)=\min _{i=1, \ldots, n} m_{i}+1$ is a production function for $c_{f}$.
4. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the function $\eta_{o_{f}}^{k}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty} \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ defined by

$$
\eta_{o_{f}}^{k}(n)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } n>k \\ 0 & \text { if } n \leq k\end{cases}
$$

is a production function for $o_{f}$.
5. If all elements of $\mathcal{T}_{s}$ are constants and $g: \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ then the function $\eta_{g}^{\infty}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ given by

$$
\eta_{g}^{\infty}\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
\infty & \text { if } n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}>0 \\
0 & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

is a production function for $g$.
6. If all elements of $\mathcal{T}_{s}$ are constants and $\chi: \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ then the function $\eta_{\chi}^{\infty}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \rightarrow\{0,1\}$ defined by

$$
\eta_{\chi}^{\infty}\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}>0 \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

is a production function for $\chi$.

## Proof.

1. The $i$-th destructor $d_{f, i}: \mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}(\Sigma)$ extends to a regular $d_{f, i}^{*}: \mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{s_{i}}(\Sigma)$ :

$$
d_{f, i}^{*}(t)= \begin{cases}t_{i} & \text { if } t \equiv f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right) \\ t^{\prime} & \text { otherwise, where } t^{\prime} \in \mathbb{T}_{s_{i}}(\Sigma) \text { is arbitrary with }\left|t^{\prime}\right|=\max (0,|t|-1)\end{cases}
$$

2. We may take the regular extension

$$
d_{f, i}^{\infty}(t)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
t_{i} \uparrow & \text { if } t \equiv f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right) \\
t^{\prime} & \text { if } t \equiv g\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k}\right) \text { with } g \neq f, \text { where } t^{\prime} \in \mathbb{T}_{s_{i}}(\Sigma) \\
& \text { is arbitrary with }\left|t^{\prime}\right|=\infty \\
\perp & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

This is well-defined, because $t_{i}$ above is a constant.
3. The constructor $c_{f}$ extends to a regular $c_{f}^{*}: \mathbb{T}_{s_{1}}(\Sigma) \times \ldots \times \mathbb{T}_{s_{n}}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(\Sigma)$ as follows:

$$
c_{f}^{*}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)=f\left(t_{1}^{\upharpoonright m}, \ldots, t_{n}^{\lceil m}\right)
$$

where $m=\min _{i=1, \ldots, n}\left|t_{i}\right|$.
4. The test $o_{f}$ extends to a regular $o_{f}^{*}: \mathbb{T}_{s}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ as follows:

$$
o_{f}^{*}(t)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if }|t|>k \text { and } t \equiv f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right) \\ 0 & \text { if }|t|>k \text { and } t \equiv g\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k}\right) \text { for } g \in \Sigma_{f}, g \neq f \\ \perp & \text { otherwise, if }|t| \leq k\end{cases}
$$

5. A regular extension $g^{\infty}: \mathbb{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{s}$ of $g$ is given by

$$
g^{\infty}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{m}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
g\left(t_{1} \uparrow, \ldots, t_{m} \uparrow\right) & \text { if } t_{i} \neq \perp \text { for } i=1, \ldots, m \\
\perp & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

6. A regular extension $\chi^{\infty}: \mathbb{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ of $\chi$ is given by

$$
\chi^{\infty}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{m}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
\chi\left(t_{1} \uparrow, \ldots, t_{m} \uparrow\right) & \text { if } t_{i} \neq \perp \text { for } i=1, \ldots, m \\
\perp & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

The following simple lemma implies that all the production functions from the above lemma are continuous.

Lemma 4.18. A production function $\eta: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ is continuous iff $\eta(\bigvee D)=\bigvee \eta(D)$ for any infinite directed $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m}$.

Proof. The implication from left to right is obvious. For the converse, let $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m}$ be a finite directed set. Then $\bigvee D$ is the largest element of $D$. So $\eta(\bigvee D)$ is the largest element of $\eta(D)$, because $\eta$ is monotone by Lemma 4.7. Thus $\bigvee \eta(D)=\eta(\bigvee D)$.

Because any $p \in \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \backslash \mathbb{N}^{m}$ is a join of an infinite chain $C \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{m}$, the above lemma implies that the values of continuous functions in $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ are uniquely determined by their values on $\mathbb{N}^{m}$. We shall thus often treat continuous functions as if they were defined on $\mathbb{N}^{m}$, and leave their values at infinity implicit.

Lemma 4.19. If $\eta: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ is continuous and for every $n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m} \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$
\eta\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, m} n_{i}
$$

then also for every $n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m} \in \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ such that $n_{k}<\infty$ for some $1 \leq k \leq m$, we have $\eta\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, m} n_{i}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we consider the case $m=2$ and show that if $\eta\left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right)>$ $\min \left(n_{1}, n_{2}\right)$ for $n_{1}, n_{2} \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\eta(n, \infty)>n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $k \geq n$ we have $\eta(n, k)>$ $\min (n, k)=n$, i.e., $\eta(n, k) \geq n+1$. Because $D=\{\langle n, k\rangle \mid k \geq n\}$ is directed, $\bigvee D=\langle n, \infty\rangle$ and $\eta$ is continuous, we have

$$
\eta(n, \infty)=\eta(\bigvee D)=\bigvee \eta(D)=\bigvee_{k \geq n} \eta(n, k) \geq \bigvee_{k \geq n} n+1=n+1>n
$$

The method for showing well-definedness of functions given by corecursive equations is to use Lemma 4.17 and lemmas 4.9 4.12 and Theorem 4.13 from Section 4.1 to calculate production functions, and then apply Corollary 4.8. For convenience of reference, we reformulate Corollary 4.8 specialized to many-sorted coterms, in its most useful form.

Corollary 4.20. Let $S$ be an arbitrary set. Let $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ and $g_{i}: S \rightarrow S(i=1, \ldots, m)$. For each $x \in S$, let $\eta_{h}^{x}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ be a continuous production function for $\lambda \bar{y} . h(x, \bar{y})$. If

$$
(\star) \quad \eta_{h}^{x}\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)>\min _{i=1, \ldots, m} n_{i}
$$

for all $x \in S$ and all $n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m} \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists a function $f: S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ defined by corecursion from $h$ and $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$.

Proof. Follows from Corollary 4.8 and Lemma 4.19.
Note that if $S=\mathcal{T}_{s_{1}} \times \ldots \times \mathcal{T}_{s_{k}}$, the local prefix production functions $\eta_{h}^{x}$ above are all the same and a global prefix production function $\eta_{h}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{k+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ satisfies $\eta_{h}\left(\infty, \ldots, \infty, n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)=$ $\eta_{h}^{x}\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)$, then $(\star)$ in Corollary 4.20 implies $(\star)$ in Theorem4.13. This situation is usually the case, and we will often avoid mentioning it explicitly.

Example 4.21. Let $A$ be a set. Let $\Sigma$ consist of two sorts $\mathfrak{s}$ and $\mathfrak{d}$, one function symbol cons of type $(\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{s} ; \mathfrak{s})$ and a distinct constant symbol $a \in A$ of sort $\mathfrak{d}$ for each element of $A$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Sigma)$ is the set of streams over $A$. We also write $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Sigma)=A^{\omega}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{d}}(\Sigma)=A$. Instead of cons $(a, t)$ we usually write $a: t$, and we assume that : associates to the right, e.g., $x: y: t$ is $x:(y: t)$. We also use the notation $x: t$ to denote the application of the constructor for cons to $x$ and $t$. Instead of $d_{\text {cons }, 1}$ we write hd, and instead of $d_{\text {cons }, 2}$ we write tl. Instead of $o_{a}(x)=1$, where $a \in A$, we write $x=a$. For tl we shall use the continuous production function $\eta_{\mathrm{tl}}(n)=\max (0, n-1)$, and for cons we shall use the function $\eta_{\text {cons }}(n)=n+1$. Since all elements of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{d}}$ are constants, we may use

$$
\eta_{\infty}(n)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\infty & \text { if } n>0 \\
0 & \text { if } n=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

as a continuous production function for hd. For $o_{\text {cons }}$ we use the continuous production function $\eta_{o_{\text {cons }}}^{0}$. See Lemma 4.17.

Consider the equation

$$
\operatorname{even}(x: y: t)=x: \operatorname{even}(t)
$$

We shall show that the above equation determines a unique function even : $A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$.
The equation may be rewritten as

$$
\operatorname{even}(t)=\operatorname{hd}(t): \operatorname{even}(\operatorname{tl}(\operatorname{tl}(t))) \text { if } o_{\text {cons }}(t)=1
$$

So even is defined by corecursion from $h: A^{\omega} \times A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ given by

$$
h\left(t, t^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{hd}(t): t^{\prime} \text { if } o_{\text {cons }}(t)=1
$$

and $g: A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ given by

$$
g(t)=\operatorname{tl}(\mathrm{tl}(t))
$$

The function $h$ is defined by cases from $h_{0}: A^{\omega} \times A^{\omega} \rightarrow A^{\omega}$ given by

$$
h_{0}\left(t, t^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{hd}(t): t^{\prime}
$$

and from the test function $o_{\text {cons }}$ (formally, we also need some function for $g_{0}$ in Definition 4.6, i.e., for the case when none of the conditions holds, but in the present instance $o_{\text {cons }}$ never gives the value 0 so this does not matter). Using Lemma 4.10 we conclude that for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$ a continuous $t$-local prefix production function $\xi^{t}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is defined by $\xi^{t}(n)=n+1$. Therefore,

[^3]even is well-defined (i.e. it exists and is unique) by Corollary 4.20, Using Lemma 4.10 we see that a continuous production function $\eta_{g}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for $g$ is defined by
\[

\eta_{g}(n)=\left\{$$
\begin{array}{cl}
n-2 & \text { if } n \geq 2 \\
0 & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}
$$\right.
\]

From Lemma 4.10 and Lemma 4.12 a continuous production function $\eta_{h}: \mathbb{N}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for $h$ is given by

$$
\eta_{h}(n, m)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
m+1 & \text { if } n>0 \\
0 & \text { if } n=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

Therefore, by Theorem4.13 there exists a continuous production function $\eta_{\text {even }}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for even satisfying

$$
\eta_{\text {even }}(n)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
\eta_{\text {even }}(n-2)+1 & \text { if } n \geq 2 \\
\eta_{\text {even }}(0)+1 & \text { if } n=1 \\
0 & \text { if } n=0
\end{array}\right.
$$

Thus $\eta_{\text {even }}(n)=\left\lceil\frac{n}{2}\right\rceil$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Usually, we do not get into so much detail when justifying well-definedness of a function given by some corecursive equations. Formally, sets of equations of the form

$$
\begin{gathered}
f\left(t_{1}\right)=s_{1} \\
\vdots \\
f\left(t_{k}\right)=s_{k}
\end{gathered}
$$

where $t_{1}, \ldots, t_{k}$ are some patterns and $s_{1}, \ldots, s_{k}$ some expressions possibly involving $f$, are always interpreted as defining a function $f$ by (corecursion from a function defined by) cases from appropriate functions corresponding to the $s_{i}$ and from some combinations of test functions corresponding to the patterns. These correspondences are usually straightforward and left implicit. To prove well-definedness of $f$ we implicitly use lemmas $4.9+4.12$ to calculate all local prefix production functions, and then we show $(\star)$ in Corollary 4.20. If we are also interested in a production function for $f$, then we calculate production functions for the argument functions $g_{i}$ and the prefix function $h$ (using lemmas 4.9,4.12), and then we apply Theorem 4.13 to obtain recursive equations for a production function for $f$. The resulting production functions are typically continuous. We leave this observation implicit and consider the production functions as functions defined on $\mathbb{N}^{m}$ (which we can do by Lemma 4.18 and Lemma 4.19).

Applying the remarks of the preceding paragraph, we now give arguments justifying the well-definedness of even and the form of its production function in a style which we shall adopt from now on.

A prefix production function $\sqrt[5]{ }$ for a function even satisfying

$$
\operatorname{even}(x: y: t)=x: \operatorname{even}(t)
$$

is given by $\xi(n)=n+1>n$. Thus even is well-defined and its production function $\eta_{\text {even }}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfies ${ }^{6}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\text {even }}(0) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {even }}(1) & =1+\eta_{\text {even }}(0) \\
\eta_{\text {even }}(n+2) & =1+\eta_{\text {even }}(n)
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $\eta_{\text {even }}(n)=\left\lceil\frac{n}{2}\right\rceil$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

[^4]The above definition of even is actually an instance of a common form of definition by guarded corecursion.
Definition 4.22. A function $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s^{\prime}}$ (for $m \in \mathbb{N}, s, s^{\prime} \in \Sigma_{s}$ ) is non-consuming if for each $x \in S$ there is a continuous production function $\eta_{h}^{x}: \mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ for $\lambda \bar{y} . h(x, \bar{y})$ satisfying

$$
\eta_{h}^{x}\left(n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m}\right) \geq \min _{i=1, \ldots, m} n_{i}
$$

for all $n_{1}, \ldots, n_{m} \in \mathbb{N}$.
The class of constructor-guarded functions is defined inductively as the class of all functions $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s^{\prime}}$ (for arbitrary $m \in \mathbb{N}, s, s^{\prime} \in \Sigma_{s}$ ) such that

$$
h\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)=c\left(u_{1}\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right), \ldots, u_{k}\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)\right)
$$

where $c$ is a constructor for a function symbol of type $\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{k} ; s^{\prime}\right)$ and each $u_{i}: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s_{i}}$ is non-consuming.

We say that a function $f: S \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ is defined by guarded corecursion from $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}$ and $g_{i}: S \rightarrow S(i=1, \ldots, m)$ if it is defined by corecursion from $h$ and $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$, with $h$ defined by cases from some constructor-guarded functions $h_{j}: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s}(j=0, \ldots, k)$ and some condition functions $o_{j}: S \rightarrow\{0,1\}(j=1, \ldots, k)$, i.e., the condition functions depend only on the first argument of $h$.

Note that every function $h: S \times \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{s^{\prime}}$ which

- depends only on its first argument, or
- satisfies $h\left(x, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m}\right)=y_{i}$ for all $x \in S, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{m} \in \mathcal{T}_{s}^{m}$, fixed $i$, or
- is constructor-guarded
is also non-consuming.
By Corollary 4.20, for every $h$ and $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{m}$ satisfying the requirements of Definition 4.22, there exists a unique function defined by guarded corecursion. When some corecursive equations involving a function $f$ straightforwardly translate to a definition by guarded corecursion, then we say that the definition of $f$ is guarded, which implies well-definedness of $f$. If $f$ is defined by guarded corecursion, $S=\mathcal{T}_{s_{1}} \times \ldots \times \mathcal{T}_{s_{l}}$ and there exist appropriate production functions for the $u_{j}(j=1, \ldots, k)$, then $(\star)$ in Theorem 4.13 holds, so we may then use Theorem 4.13 to calculate a production function for $f$.

The functions $\eta_{f}^{\infty}$ and $\eta_{\chi}^{\infty}$ for various $f$ and $\chi$ (see Lemma 4.17) will be used implicitly in calculations of production functions in the following examples.

Example 4.23. Consider the equations over streams of natural numbers:

```
add(x:t,y:s)=(x+y):\operatorname{add}(t,s)
    zip}(x:t,s)=x:zip(s,t
    D= 0:1:1: zip (add (tl (D), tl (tl (D))), even(tl(D)))
```

We show that these equations define unique functions add: $\mathbb{N}^{\omega} \times \mathbb{N}^{\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\omega}$, zip : $\mathbb{N}^{\omega} \times \mathbb{N}^{\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\omega}$, and a unique stream $D \in \mathbb{N}^{\omega}$.

The function add is well-defined, because its definition is guarded. A production function $\eta_{\text {add }}: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for add satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\text {add }}(0, m) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {add }}(n, 0) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {add }}(n+1, m+1) & =\eta_{\text {add }}(n, m)+1
\end{aligned}
$$

[^5]Thus $\eta_{\text {add }}(n, m)=\min (n, m)$.
The definition of zip is also guarded, so zip is well-defined. A production function $\eta_{\text {zip }}$ : $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for zip satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\text {zip }}(0, m) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {zip }}(n+1, m) & =\eta_{\text {zip }}(m, n)+1
\end{aligned}
$$

The equations for $\eta_{\text {zip }}$ are equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\text {zip }}(0, m) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {zip }}(n+1,0) & =1 \\
\eta_{\text {zip }}(n+1, m+1) & =\eta_{\text {zip }}(n, m)+2
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $\eta_{\text {zip }}(n, m)=\min (2 n, 2 m+1)$.
Using the formulas for $\eta_{\text {even }}, \eta_{\text {add }}$ and $\eta_{\text {zip }}$ we now calculate a prefix production function $\xi$ for $D$. For $n<2$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\xi(n) & =3+\eta_{\mathrm{zip}}\left(\eta_{\text {add }}(0,0), \eta_{\text {even }}(0)\right) \\
& =3+\eta_{\mathrm{zip}}(0,0) \\
& =3
\end{aligned}
$$

so $\xi(n)>n$ for $n<2$. For $n \geq 2$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\xi(n) & =3+\eta_{\mathrm{zip}}\left(\eta_{\text {add }}(n-1, n-2), \eta_{\text {even }}(n-1)\right) \\
& =3+\eta_{\mathrm{zip}}\left(\min (n-1, n-2),\left\lceil\frac{n-1}{2}\right\rceil\right) \\
& =3+\eta_{\mathrm{zip}}\left(n-2,\left\lceil\frac{n-1}{2}\right\rceil\right) \\
& =3+\min \left(2(n-2), 2\left\lceil\frac{n-1}{2}\right\rceil+1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We have $2(n-2)=2 n-4>n-3$ for $n \geq 2$. Also $2\left\lceil\frac{n-1}{2}\right\rceil+1 \geq n-1+1=n>n-3$. Hence for $n \geq 2$ we have $\xi(n)>3+n-3=n$. Thus $\xi(n)>n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and therefore $D$ is well-defined.

Example 4.24. Consider the following specification of the Hamming string $H$ of positive natural numbers not divisible by primes other than 2,3 and 5 .

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{mul}(x, y: t) & =x \cdot y: \operatorname{mul}(x, t) \\
\operatorname{merge}\left(x: t_{1}, y: t_{2}\right) & = \begin{cases}x: \operatorname{merge}\left(t_{1}, y: t_{2}\right) & \text { if } x \leq y \\
y: \operatorname{merge}\left(x: t_{1}, t_{2}\right) & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
H & =1: \operatorname{merge}(\operatorname{merge}(\operatorname{mul}(2, H), \operatorname{mul}(3, H)), \operatorname{mul}(5, H))
\end{aligned}
$$

We show that mul : $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^{\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\omega}$, merge : $\mathbb{N}^{\omega} \times \mathbb{N}^{\omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\omega}$ and $H \in \mathbb{N}^{\omega}$ are well-defined.
The function mul is well-defined, because the definition is guarded. A production function ${ }^{8} \eta_{\text {mul }}$ for mul is given by $\eta_{\text {mul }}(n)=n$. The definition of merge is also guarded, so merge is well-defined. A production function $\eta_{\text {merge }}$ for merge satisfies 9 :

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\text {merge }}(0, m) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {merge }}(n, 0) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {merge }}(n+1, m+1) & =\min \left(\eta_{\text {merge }}(n, m+1), \eta_{\text {merge }}(n+1, m)\right)+1
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $\eta_{\text {merge }}(n, m)=\min (n, m)$. Note that the form of this production function or even its existence is not completely intuitive - one would expect that the "size" of the resulting stream

[^6]may depend on the elements of the argument streams, not only on their sizes. The trick is that we use cut functions in the proof of Lemma 4.12 to effectively select the least possible size, disregarding any side conditions.

Therefore, a prefix production function $\xi$ for $H$ satisfies $\xi(n)=1+\min (\min (n, n), n)=$ $n+1>n$. So $H$ is well-defined.

Specifications of many-sorted signatures may be conveniently given by coinductively interpreted grammars. For instance, the set $S$ of streams over a set $A$ could be specified by writing

$$
S::=\operatorname{cons}(A, S)
$$

A more interesting example is that of finite and infinite binary trees with nodes labelled either with $a$ or $b$, and leaves labelled with one of the elements of a set $V$ :

$$
T::=V\|a(T, T)\| b(T, T)
$$

As such grammars are not intended to be formal entities but only convenient visual means for specifying sets of coterms, we will not define them precisely. It is always clear what many-sorted signature is meant.

Example 4.25. We define the set $\Lambda$ of infinitary $\epsilon-\lambda$-terms by

$$
\Lambda::=V\|\Lambda \Lambda\| \lambda V . \Lambda \| \epsilon(\Lambda)
$$

where $V$ is a set of variables. For $s, t \in \Lambda$ and $x \in V$, the operation of substitution $\operatorname{subst}_{x}$ : $\Lambda \times \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ is defined by guarded corecursion

$$
\begin{aligned}
x[t / x] & =t \\
y[t / x] & =y \quad \text { if } x \neq y \\
\left(s_{1} s_{2}\right)[t / x] & =\left(s_{1}[t / x]\right)\left(s_{2}[t / x]\right) \\
(\lambda y \cdot s)[t / x] & =\lambda y \cdot s[t / x] \quad \text { if } x \neq y \\
(\lambda x . s)[t / x] & =\lambda x \cdot s \\
(\epsilon(s))[t / x] & =\epsilon(s[t / x])
\end{aligned}
$$

where $s[t / x]=\operatorname{subst}_{x}(s, t)$.
Note that substitution defined in this way may capture variables. For the sake of simplicity, we disregard this problem by assuming that in all terms the free variables are distinct from the bound ones.

A production function $\eta_{\text {subst }}$ for subst ${ }_{x}$ is given by the equations 10

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\text {subst }}(0, m) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {subst }}(n, 0) & =0 \\
\eta_{\text {subst }}(n+1, m) & =\min \left(m, n+1, \eta_{\text {subst }}(n, m)+1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus $\eta_{\text {subst }}(n, m)=\min (n, m)$.
The definition of substitution on infinitary $\epsilon$ - $\lambda$-terms will be used in an example in the next section.

[^7]
### 4.3 Coinduction

Coinduction is a method of proving statements involving coinductive relations, i.e., relations defined as greatest fixpoints of certain monotone operators. Coinductive relations are most useful in conjunction with infinite objects and corecursively defined functions.

Definition 4.26. Let $A$ be a set. An $n$-ary relation $R \subseteq A^{n}$ is a coinductive relation if it is the greatest fixpoint of some monotone function $F: \mathcal{P}\left(A^{n}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(A^{n}\right)$. Since $\mathcal{P}\left(A^{n}\right)$ is a complete lattice, for any monotone function $F: \mathcal{P}\left(A^{n}\right) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\left(A^{n}\right)$ there exists an associated coinductive relation $R=\nu F$, and it is the limit of the final sequence of $F$. The final sequence of a function for a coinductive relation $R$ will be denoted by $\left(R^{\alpha}\right)_{\alpha}$. The $\alpha$-th element $R^{\alpha}$ of the final sequence is called the approximant of $R$ at stage $\alpha$. If $\left\langle x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right\rangle \in R$ then we say that $R\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ (holds). If $R^{\alpha}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ then we say that $R\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ (holds) at (stage) $\alpha$.

Note that the approximants $R^{\alpha}$ of a coinductive relation $R$ depend on the function $F$ of which $R$ is the greatest fixpoint, i.e., they depend on a particular definition of $R$, not on the relation $R$ itself.

Example 4.27. We define a set of coterms $T$ by

$$
T::=V\|A(T)\| B(T, T)
$$

where $V$ is a countable set of variables, and $A, B$ are constructors. By $x, y, \ldots$ we denote variables, and by $t, s, \ldots$ we denote coterms (i.e. elements of $T$ ).

We define a coinductive relation $\rightarrow \subseteq T \times T$ by a set of coinductive rules:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{\overline{x \rightarrow x}}(1) \frac{t \rightarrow t^{\prime}}{\overline{A(t) \rightarrow A\left(t^{\prime}\right)}}(2) \xlongequal{\overline{B(s, t) \rightarrow B\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)}}(3) \frac{t \rightarrow t^{\prime}}{\overline{A(t) \rightarrow B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)}}(4) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Formally, the relation $\rightarrow$ is the greatest fixpoint of a monotone $F: \mathcal{P}(T \times T) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(T \times T)$ defined by

$$
F(R)=\left\{\left\langle t_{1}, t_{2}\right\rangle \mid \exists_{x \in V}\left(t_{1} \equiv t_{2} \equiv x\right) \vee \exists_{t, t^{\prime} \in T}\left(t_{1} \equiv A(t) \wedge t_{2} \equiv B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right) \wedge R\left(t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \vee \ldots\right\} .
$$

It is always straightforward to convert rules of the above form into an appropriate monotone function (provided the rules actually are monotone). We shall always leave this conversion implicit.

Alternatively, using the Knaster-Tarski fixpoint theorem, the relation $\rightarrow$ may be characterized as the greatest binary relation on $T$ (i.e. the greatest subset of $T \times T$ w.r.t. set inclusion) such that $\rightarrow \subseteq F(\rightarrow)$, i.e., such that for every $t_{1}, t_{2} \in T$ with $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{2}$ one of the following holds:

1. $t_{1} \equiv t_{2} \equiv x$ for some variable $x \in V$,
2. $t_{1} \equiv A(t), t_{2} \equiv A\left(t^{\prime}\right)$ with $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$,
3. $t_{1} \equiv B(s, t), t_{2} \equiv B\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)$ with $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$,
4. $t_{1} \equiv A(t), t_{2} \equiv B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)$ with $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$.

Yet another way to think about $\rightarrow$ is that $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{2}$ holds iff there exists a potentially infinite derivation tree of $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{2}$ built using the rules (1) - (4).

The rules (1) - (4) could also be interpreted inductively to yield the least fixpoint of $F$. This is the conventional interpretation, and it is indicated with single line in each rule separating premises from the conclusion. A coinductive interpretation is indicated with double lines.

It is instructive to note that the coinductive rules may also be interpreted as giving (ordinary) rules for approximants at each successor ordinal stage $\alpha+1$.

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{t \rightarrow t^{\prime} \text { at } \alpha}{x \rightarrow x \text { at } \alpha+1} \text { (1) } \frac{t(2)}{A(t) \rightarrow A\left(t^{\prime}\right) \text { at } \alpha+1} \frac{s \rightarrow s^{\prime} \text { at } \alpha t \rightarrow t^{\prime} \text { at } \alpha}{B(s, t) \rightarrow B\left(s^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right) \text { at } \alpha+1} \\
\frac{t \rightarrow t^{\prime} \text { at } \alpha}{A(t) \rightarrow B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right) \text { at } \alpha+1} \text { (4) } \tag{4}
\end{gather*}
$$

This follows directly from the way $F$ and the approximants are defined. We will often use this observation implicitly.

Usually, the closure ordinal for the definition of a coinductive relation is $\omega$. In general, however, it is not difficult to come up with a coinductive definition whose closure ordinal is greater than $\omega$. For instance, consider the relation $R \subseteq \mathbb{N} \cup\{\infty\}$ defined coinductively by the following two rules.

$$
\frac{R(n) \quad n \in \mathbb{N}}{\underline{R(n+1)}} \quad \frac{\exists n \in \mathbb{N} \cdot R(n)}{R(\infty)}
$$

We have $R=\emptyset, R^{n}=\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \geq n\} \cup\{\infty\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}, R^{\omega}=\{\infty\}$, and only $R^{\omega+1}=\emptyset$. Thus the closure ordinal of this definition is $\omega+1$.

Definition 4.28. Let $\Sigma$ be a first-order signature. The first-order language over the signature $\Sigma$ is defined in the standard way, except that we additionally allow free relational variables (but not bound ones - quantification is only over individuals). We use the symbol $\equiv$ to denote syntactic identity of terms and formulas.

A sentence is a formula without free variables (relational or individual). Given a $\Sigma$ structure $\mathbb{A}$ and a sentence $\varphi$, we write $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi$ if $\varphi$ is true in $\mathbb{A}$. If $\mathbb{A}$ is clear or irrelevant, we sometimes simply say that $\varphi$ holds.

Since we will usually work with a fixed structure $\mathbb{A}$, to save on notation we often confuse function and relation symbols in the language with corresponding functions and relations on $\mathbb{A}$. We will also often confuse a structure $\mathbb{A}$ with its carrier set. Moreover, we usually implicitly assume that in the signature $\Sigma$ there is a corresponding constant (i.e. a nullary function symbol) for every element of $\mathbb{A}$.

If $\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma^{\prime}$ and $\mathbb{A}$ is a $\Sigma$-structure, then a $\Sigma^{\prime}$-expansion of $\mathbb{A}$ is a $\Sigma^{\prime}$-structure $\mathbb{A}^{\prime}$ with the same carrier set and the same interpretation of symbols from $\Sigma$ as $\mathbb{A}$.

We write $\varphi \equiv \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{X}) \equiv \varphi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right)$ for a formula with all free individual variables among $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, and all free relational variables among $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}$. We then write $\varphi\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}, R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)$ to denote $\varphi$ with each $x_{i}$ substituted with the term $t_{i}$, and each $X_{i}$ substituted with the relation symbol $R_{i}$.

A formula $\varphi$ is in prenex normal form if $\varphi \equiv \forall_{x_{1}} \exists_{y_{1}} \forall_{x_{2}} \exists_{y_{2}} \ldots \forall_{x_{n}} \exists_{y_{n}} \psi$ where $\psi$ is quantifierfree. It is a standard result in elementary logic that any first order formula may be effectively translated into an equivalent formula in prenex normal form. A formula $\varphi$ is universal if it is equivalent to a formula $\forall_{x_{1}} \forall_{x_{2}} \ldots \forall_{x_{n}} \psi$ with $\psi$ quantifier-free. A formula $\varphi$ is standard if it is equivalent to a conjunction of formulas of the form ${ }^{11}$

$$
\forall_{x_{1}} \ldots \forall_{x_{n}}\left(\psi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right) \rightarrow X_{i_{1}}\left(t_{1}^{1}, \ldots, t_{n_{1}}^{1}\right) \wedge \ldots \wedge X_{i_{k}}\left(t_{1}^{k}, \ldots, t_{n_{k}}^{k}\right)\right)
$$

where $\psi$ is quantifier-free.
The following simple but important theorem states the coinduction principle.

[^8]Theorem 4.29 (Coinduction principle). Let $\Sigma$ be a first-order signature, $\varphi\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right)$ a standard formula over $\Sigma$, and $\mathbb{A}$ a $\Sigma$-structure. Let $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}$ be coinductive relations on $\mathbb{A}$, with arities matching the arities of $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}$. Suppose the coinductive step holds:

- for every ordinal $\alpha$, if $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$ then $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha+1}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha+1}\right)$.

Then $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$ for every ordinal $\alpha$. In particular, $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)$.
Proof. By transfinite induction on $\alpha$ we show $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$. For $\alpha=0$ this follows from the fact that $\varphi$ is standard and each $R_{i}^{0}$ is a full relation, i.e., $R_{i}^{0}=\mathbb{A}^{k}$ for some $k>0$. For $\alpha$ a successor ordinal this follows from the coinductive step. So assume $\alpha$ is a limit ordinal. Since $\varphi$ is a universal formula, it is equivalent to a formula $\forall_{x_{1}} \ldots \forall_{x_{n}} \psi$ with $\psi$ quantifier-free in disjunctive normal form. So $\psi \equiv \psi_{1} \vee \ldots \vee \psi_{k}$ with each disjunct $\psi_{i}$ a conjunction of literals. We need to show that for all $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n} \in \mathbb{A}$ we have $\mathbb{A} \models \psi\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$.

Let $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n} \in \mathbb{A}$. Let $\beta<\alpha$. Then $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi\left(R_{1}^{\beta}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\beta}\right)$, so $\mathbb{A} \models \psi\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\beta}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\beta}\right)$. Hence $\mathbb{A} \models \psi_{i}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\beta}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\beta}\right)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$. Since the number $k$ of disjuncts is finite, there must be $1 \leq i \leq k$ with $\mathbb{A} \models \psi_{i}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\beta}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\beta}\right)$ for arbitrarily large $\beta<\alpha$, i.e., for every $\gamma<\alpha$ there is $\gamma \leq \beta<\alpha$ with $\mathbb{A} \models \psi_{i}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\beta}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\beta}\right)$.

Assume $\psi_{i} \equiv \theta_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \theta_{r}$ with each $\theta_{j}$ a literal. Thus $\mathbb{A} \models \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\beta}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\beta}\right)$ for arbitrarily large $\beta<\alpha$, for $j=1, \ldots, r$. It suffices to show

$$
\mathbb{A} \models \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)
$$

for every $1 \leq j \leq r$. Let $1 \leq j \leq r$.
If $\theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right) \equiv \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right)$, i.e., $\theta_{j}$ does not depend on the relational variables $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}$, then $\mathbb{A} \models \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$, because $\mathbb{A} \models \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\beta}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\beta}\right)$ for some $\beta<\alpha$, i.e., $\mathbb{A} \models \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right)$.

Now assume $\theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right) \equiv \neg X_{p}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$. Then $\mathbb{A} \models \neg R_{p}^{\beta}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$ for some $\beta<\alpha$. We have $R_{p}^{\alpha}=\bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} R_{p}^{\beta}$ because $\alpha$ is a limit ordinal (recall the definition of the final sequence in Definition 3.1). Hence $\mathbb{A} \not \vDash R_{p}^{\alpha}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$, and thus $\mathbb{A} \vDash \neg R_{p}^{\alpha}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$, i.e., $\mathbb{A} \models \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$.

So finally assume $\theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, X_{1}, \ldots, X_{m}\right) \equiv X_{p}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$. Then $\mathbb{A} \models R_{p}^{\beta}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$ for arbitrarily large $\beta<\alpha$. By Lemma 3.2, if $\mathbb{A} \models R_{p}^{\beta}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$ then $\mathbb{A} \models R_{p}^{\gamma}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$ for all $\gamma \leq \beta$. Thus in fact $\mathbb{A} \models R_{p}^{\beta}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$ for all $\beta<\alpha$, i.e., $\mathbb{A} \models \bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} R_{p}^{\beta}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$. Since $R_{p}^{\alpha}=\bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} R_{p}^{\beta}$, we have $\mathbb{A} \models R_{p}^{\alpha}\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{q}\right)$. Hence $\mathbb{A} \models \theta_{j}\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}, R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$.
Example 4.30. Let $T$ be the set of coterms, and $\rightarrow$ the coinductive relation, from Example4.27. We show by coinduction that for arbitrary $t \in T$ we have $t \rightarrow t$. For the coinductive step, assume the coinductive hypothesis (CH), i.e., that for $\beta \leq \alpha$ : for all $t \in T$ we have $t \rightarrow t$ at stage $\beta$. Consider possible forms of $t$. If $t \equiv x \in V$, then $t \rightarrow t$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (1). If $t \equiv A\left(t^{\prime}\right)$ then $t^{\prime} \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ by the CH , so $t \equiv A\left(t^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow A\left(t^{\prime}\right) \equiv t$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (2). If $t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ then $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}$ at $\alpha$ and $t_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}$ at $\alpha$ by the CH, so $t \rightarrow t$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (3). Therefore, for all $t \in T$ we have $t \rightarrow t$ at $\alpha+1$, which shows the coinductive step.

The correctness of the above reasoning relies on Theorem 4.29. The signature $\Sigma$ and the structure $\mathbb{A}$ are left implicit. For every function and relation on $T$ that we use in the proof there is a corresponding symbol in $\Sigma$. The structure $\mathbb{A}$ has the set $T$ as its carrier, and the expected interpretation of all symbols from $\Sigma$ (as the corresponding actual functions and relations on $T$ ).

Usually, we do not get into so much detail when doing coinductive proofs. The ordinal stages are also left implicit, unless they occur in the statement we ultimately want to show or the argument that the stage increases is not completely trivial. Below we give the proof again in a style which we adopt from now on.

We show by coinduction that if $t \in T$ then $t \rightarrow t$. If $t \equiv x$ then this follows by rule (1). If $t \equiv A\left(t^{\prime}\right)$ then $t^{\prime} \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ by the CH , so $t \rightarrow t$ by rule (2). If $t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ then $t_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}$ and $t_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}$ by the CH , so $t \rightarrow t$ by rule (3).

When doing a proof by coinduction one must be careful to ensure that the implicit stages actually do increase. The most common way to ensure this is to immediately provide the conclusion of the coinductive hypothesis as a premise of some coinductive rule, since applying a rule increases the stage. Note that $R^{\alpha} \subseteq R^{\beta}$ for $\beta<\alpha$, by Lemma 3.2. This has the important practical consequence that we do not have to worry ${ }^{12}$ to increase the stage by exactly one, as it would at first sight seem necessary from the statement of Theorem 4.29, We may increase it by an arbitrary $n>0$, and the proof is still correct. In particular, it is harmless to apply rules repeatedly a positive number of times to a conclusion of the coinductive hypothesis, e.g., to conclude $R(x)$ (at $\alpha$ ) by the CH , then to conclude $R(s(x))$ (at $\alpha+1$ ) by some rule $(r)$ with $R(x)$ (at $\alpha$ ) as a premise, then conclude $R(s(s(x)))$ (at $\alpha+2$, so also at $\alpha+1$ by Lemma 3.2) by rule $(r)$ with $R(s(x))$ (at $\alpha+1$ ) as a premise, finishing the proof of the coinductive step.

In general, Lemma 3.2 implies that we may always decrease the stage of a coinductive relation. But to increase it we need to apply at least one rule.

Note that because we are usually just interested in showing properties of some coinductive relations on certain sets, we have some freedom in choosing the signature $\Sigma$ and the structure $\mathbb{A}$ in Theorem 4.29, as well as the actual formula $\varphi$ we want to prove. Hence the restriction on $\varphi$ in Theorem 4.29 to standard formulas is less limiting than it might at first seem. For instance, suppose $\varphi(X) \equiv \forall x((\forall y \psi(x, y)) \rightarrow X(f(x)))$, i.e., $X$ does not occur in $\psi$. We are interested in showing $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi(R)$ for some structure $\mathbb{A}$ and a coinductive relation $R$. One cannot apply Theorem 4.29 directly to $\varphi$ because of the negative occurence of the univeral quantifier $\forall y$ (the prenex normal of $\varphi$ has an existential quantifier). However, one may add a new unary relation symbol $r$ to the signature, interpreted in an expansion $\mathbb{A}^{\prime}$ of $\mathbb{A}$ by the relation $\{a \in \mathbb{A} \mid \mathbb{A} \models \forall y \psi(a, y)\}$. Then $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi(R)$ iff $\mathbb{A}^{\prime} \models \forall x(r(x) \rightarrow R(f(x)))$. In practice, we thus do not need to worry about negative (resp. positive) occurences of universal (resp. existential) quantifiers which do not have any relational variables within their scope.

Example 4.31. On coterms from $T$ (from Example4.27) we define the operation of substitution by guarded corecursion.

$$
\begin{aligned}
y[t / x] & =y \quad \text { if } x \neq y \\
x[t / x] & =t \\
(A(s))[t / x] & =A(s[t / x]) \\
\left(B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)\right)[t / x] & =B\left(s_{1}[t / x], s_{2}[t / x]\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We show by coinduction: if $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then $s[t / x] \rightarrow s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$, where $\rightarrow$ is the relation from Example 4.27. Formally, the statement we show is: for $s, s^{\prime}, t, t^{\prime} \in T$, if $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then $s[t / x] \rightarrow s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$. So we do not track the stages in the antecedent of the implication, as this is not necessary for the proof to go through. It is somewhat arbitrary how to choose the occurences of coinductive relations for which we track the stages. Generally, tracking stages for negative occurences makes the proof harder, while tracking them for positive occurences makes it easier. So we adopt the convention of tracking the stages only for positive occurences of coinductive relations, and leave this choice implicit.

Let us proceed with the proof. The proof is by coinduction with case analysis on $s \rightarrow s^{\prime}$. If $s \equiv s^{\prime} \equiv y$ with $y \neq x$, then $s[t / x] \equiv y \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$. If $s \equiv s^{\prime} \equiv x$ then $s[t / x] \equiv t \rightarrow t^{\prime} \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$

[^9](at $\alpha+1$ - we implicitly use Lemma 3.2 here). If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right), s^{\prime} \equiv A\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow s_{1}^{\prime}$, then $s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ by the CH. Thus $s[t / x] \equiv A\left(s_{1}[t / x]\right) \rightarrow A\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ by rule (2). If $s \equiv B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), s^{\prime} \equiv B\left(s_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ then the proof is analogous. If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right), s^{\prime} \equiv B\left(s_{1}^{\prime}, s_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow s_{1}^{\prime}$, then the proof is also similar. Indeed, by the CH we have $s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$, so $s[t / x] \equiv A\left(s_{1}[t / x]\right) \rightarrow B\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right], s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ by rule (4).

Let us reiterate the convention introduced in the above example.
Important convention. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, we track the stages only for positive occurences of coinductive relations, i.e., we do not treat negative occurences as relational variables in the formula we feed to Theorem 4.29, For instance, let $f: T \rightarrow T$, let $R \subseteq T$ be a coinductive relation, and suppose we want to show that for all $x \in T$ such that $R(x)$ we have $R(f(x))$. Then by default we take $\varphi(X) \equiv \forall_{x \in T} \cdot R(x) \rightarrow X(f(x))$ to be the formula used with Theorem4.29. To override this convention one may mention the stages explicitly, e.g.: for all $x \in T$ such that $R(x)$ at stage $\alpha$ we have $R(f(x))$ at stage $\alpha$. Then the formula we take is $\varphi(X) \equiv \forall_{x \in T} \cdot X(x) \rightarrow X(f(x))$. In conclusion, by default we track the stages of all positive occurences of coinductive relations, and only those negative occurences for which the stage is explicitly mentioned.

Definition 4.32. Let $\Sigma$ be a many-sorted algebraic signature, as in Definition 4.14, Let $\mathcal{T}=$ $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$. Define on $\mathcal{T}$ a binary relation $=$ of bisimilarity by the coinductive rules

$$
\frac{t_{1}=s_{1} \quad \ldots \quad t_{n}=s_{n}}{\overline{f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)=f\left(s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}\right)}}
$$

for each $f \in \Sigma_{f}$.
It is intuitively obvious that on coterms bisimilary is the same as identity. The following easy theorem makes this precise.

Theorem 4.33. For $t, s \in \mathcal{T}$ we have: $t=s$ iff $t \equiv s$.
Proof. Recall that each coterm is formally a function from $\mathbb{N}^{*}$ to $\Sigma_{f} \cup\{\perp\}$.
Assume $t=s$. It suffices to show by induction of the length of $p \in \mathbb{N}^{*}$ that $t_{\mid p}=s_{\mid p}$ or $t_{\mid p} \equiv s_{\mid p} \equiv \perp$, where by $t_{\mid p}$ we denote the subterm of $t$ at position $p$. For $p=\epsilon$ this is obvious. Assume $p=p^{\prime} j$. By the inductive hypothesis (IH), $t_{\mid p^{\prime}}=s_{\mid p^{\prime}}$ or $t_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv s_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv \perp$. If $t_{\mid p^{\prime}}=s_{\mid p^{\prime}}$ then $t_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv f\left(t_{0}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$ and $s_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv f\left(s_{0}, \ldots, s_{n}\right)$ for some $f \in \Sigma_{f}$ with $t_{i}=s_{i}$ for $i=0, \ldots, n$. If $0 \leq j \leq n$ then $t_{\mid p} \equiv t_{j}=s_{j}=s_{\mid p}$. Otherwise, if $j>n$ or if $t_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv s_{\mid p^{\prime}} \equiv \perp$, then $t_{\mid p} \equiv s_{\mid p} \equiv \perp$ by the definition of coterms.

For the other direction, we show by coinduction that for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$ we have $t=t$. If $t \in \mathcal{T}$ then $t \equiv f\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n}\right)$ for some $f \in \Sigma_{f}$. By the CH we obtain $t_{i}=t_{i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. Hence $t=t$ by the rule for $f$.

For coterms $t, s \in \mathcal{T}$, we shall theorefore use the notations $t=s$ and $t \equiv s$ interchangeably, employing Theorem 4.33 implicitly.

Example 4.34. Recall the coinductive definitions of zip and even from Section 4.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{even}(x: y: t) & =x: \operatorname{even}(t) \\
\operatorname{zip}(x: t, s) & =x: \operatorname{zip}(s, t)
\end{aligned}
$$

By coinduction we show

$$
\operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(t), \operatorname{even}(\operatorname{tl}(t)))=t
$$

for any stream $t \in A^{\omega}$.
Let $t \in A^{\omega}$. Then $t=x: y: s$ for some $x, y \in A$ and $s \in A^{\omega}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(t), \operatorname{even}(\operatorname{tl}(t))) & =\operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(x: y: s), \operatorname{even}(y: s)) \\
& =\operatorname{zip}(x: \operatorname{even}(s), \operatorname{even}(y: s)) \\
& =x: \operatorname{zip}(\operatorname{even}(y: s), \operatorname{even}(s)) \\
& =x: y: s \quad(\operatorname{by} C H) \\
& =t
\end{aligned}
$$

In the equality marked with (by CH ) we use the coinductive hypothesis, and implicitly a bisimilarity rule from Definition 4.32,

Theorem 4.29 gives a coinduction principle only for standard formulas. By the discussion just above Example 4.31, this essentially means that we cannot do coinductive proofs for formulas with some positive (resp. negative) occurences of existential (resp. universal) quantifiers which have some relational variables in their scope. However, even this is not so much of a restriction as it may seem, because any formula without free individual variables may be converted into Skolem normal form.

Definition 4.35. Let $\varphi \equiv \forall_{x_{1}} \exists_{y_{1}} \ldots \forall_{x_{n}} \exists_{y_{n}} \psi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}, X_{1}, \ldots, X_{k}\right)$ be a formula over a signature $\Sigma$, with $\psi$ quantifier-free. The Skolem normal form of $\varphi$ is

$$
\varphi^{S} \equiv \forall_{x_{1}} \ldots \forall_{x_{n}} \psi\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right), f_{2}\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right), \ldots, f_{n}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right), X_{1}, \ldots, X_{k}\right)
$$

where $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}$ are distinct new $S k o l e m$ function symbols, i.e., $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n} \notin \Sigma$. The signature $\Sigma^{S}=\Sigma \cup\left\{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}\right\}$ is called a Skolem signature for $\varphi$. Thus $\varphi^{S}$ is a formula over $\Sigma^{S}$. The definition of Skolem normal form extends in a natural way to arbitrary formulas without free individual variables, by converting them into equivalent prenex normal form first. A Skolem expansion $\mathbb{A}^{S}$ of a $\Sigma$-structure $\mathbb{A}$ wrt. $\varphi$ is a $\Sigma^{S}$-expansion of $\mathbb{A}$. The functions interpreting Skolem function symbols in a Skolem expansion are called Skolem functions.

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a $\Sigma$-structure, and $\varphi\left(X_{1}, \ldots, X_{n}\right)$ a formula over $\Sigma$. Let $R_{1}, \ldots, R_{n}$ be coinductive relations on $\mathbb{A}$ with matching arities. It is obvious that if there exists a Skolem expansion $\mathbb{A}^{S}$ of $\mathbb{A}$ with $\mathbb{A}^{S} \models \varphi^{S}\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{n}^{\alpha}\right)$ for all ordinals $\alpha$, then $\mathbb{A} \models \varphi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{n}^{\alpha}\right)$ for all ordinals $\alpha$.

The method for showing by coinduction a formula $\varphi\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{n}\right)$ with existential quantifiers occuring positively is to first convert $\varphi$ into Skolem normal form $\varphi^{S}$ and find appropriate Skolem functions, and then show using Theorem4.29 that $\varphi^{S}\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{n}\right)$ is true in the Skolem expansion. Usually, it is convenient to define the required Skolem functions by corecursion, using methods from Section 4.1.

Example 4.36. Let $T$ be the set of coterms and $\rightarrow$ the binary relation from Example 4.27, We show: for all $s, t, t^{\prime} \in T$, if $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then there exists $s^{\prime} \in T$ with $t \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow s^{\prime}$. So we need to find a Skolem function $f: T \times T \times T \rightarrow T$ which will allow us to prove:
$(\star)$ if $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then $t \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$.
The rules for $\rightarrow$ suggest a definition of $f$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(x, x, x) & =x \\
f\left(A(s), A(t), A\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =A\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(A(s), A(t), B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right), f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(A(s), B(t, t), A\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right), f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(A(s), B(t, t), B\left(t^{\prime}, t^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right), f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right), B\left(t_{1}^{\prime}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right) & =B\left(f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right) \\
f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right) & =\text { some arbitrary coterm if none of the above matches }
\end{aligned}
$$

The definition is guarded, so $f$ is well-defined.
We now proceed with a coinductive proof of $(\star)$. Assume $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$. If $s \equiv t \equiv t^{\prime} \equiv x$ then $f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)=x$, and $x \rightarrow x$ by rule (1). If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right), t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}$, then by the $\mathrm{CH} t_{1} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. We have $f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right) \equiv A\left(f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right)$. Hence $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right) \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ and $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$, by rule (2). If $s \equiv B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv B\left(t_{1}^{\prime}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}, s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}$ and $s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}^{\prime}$, then by the CH we have $t_{1} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), t_{2} \rightarrow f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ and $t_{2}^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. Hence $t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right) \rightarrow B\left(f\left(s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}\right), f\left(s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right) \equiv f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Analogously, $t^{\prime} \rightarrow f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Other cases are similar.

Usually, it is inconvenient to invent Skolem functions beforehand, because definitions of the Skolem functions and the coinductive proof of the Skolem normal form are typically interdependent. Therefore, we adopt a style of doing a proof by coinduction of a formula $\varphi\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)$ in prenex normal form with existential quantifiers. We intertwine mutually corecursive definitions of Skolem functions with a coinductive proof of the Skolem normal form $\varphi^{S}\left(R_{1}, \ldots, R_{m}\right)$. We pretend that the coinductive hypothesis is $\varphi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha}\right)$. Each element obtained from an existential quantifier in the coinductive hypothesis is interpreted as a corecursive invocation of the corresponding Skolem function. When later we exhibit an element to show an existential subformula of $\varphi\left(R_{1}^{\alpha+1}, \ldots, R_{m}^{\alpha+1}\right)$, we interpret this as the definition of the corresponding Skolem function in the case specified by the assumptions currently active in the proof. Note that this exhibited element may (or may not) depend on some elements obtained from existential quantifiers in the coinductive hypothesis, i.e., the definition of the corresponding Skolem function may involve corecursive invocations of Skolem functions.

To illustrate the style of doing coinductive proofs of formulas with existential quantifiers, we redo the proof done above. For illustrative purposes, we indicate the arguments of the Skolem function, i.e., we write $s_{s, t, t^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ in place of $f\left(s, t, t^{\prime}\right)$. These subscripts $s, t, t^{\prime}$ are normally omitted.

We show by coinduction that if $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then there exists $s^{\prime} \in T$ with $t \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow s^{\prime}$. Assume $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$. If $s \equiv t \equiv t^{\prime} \equiv x$ then take $s_{x, x, x}^{\prime}=x$. If $s \equiv A\left(s_{1}\right)$, $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}$, then by the CH we obtain $14 s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ with $t_{1} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. Hence $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}\right) \rightarrow A\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$ and $t \equiv A\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow A\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$, by rule (2). Thus we may take $s_{s, t, t^{\prime}}^{\prime}=A\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$. If $s \equiv B\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right), t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv B\left(t_{1}^{\prime}, t_{2}^{\prime}\right)$, with $s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}, s_{1} \rightarrow t_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}$ and $s_{2} \rightarrow t_{2}^{\prime}$, then by the CH we obtain $s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ with $t_{1} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, t_{2} \rightarrow s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $t_{2}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. Hence $t \equiv B\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right) \rightarrow$ $B\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Analogously, $t^{\prime} \rightarrow B\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$ by rule (3). Thus we may take $s_{s, t, t^{\prime}}^{\prime} \equiv B\left(s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, s_{s_{2}, t_{2}, t_{2}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right)$. Other cases are similar.

It is clear that the above proof, when interpreted in the way outlined before, implicitly defines the Skolem function $f$. Also, in each case a local prefix production function is implicitly defined. From Corollary 4.8 it follows that to justify the well-definedness of the implicit Skolem function it suffices to bound a local prefix production function for each case separately. If the definition is guarded in a given case, the well-definedness argument for this case is left implicit. Otherwise, a justification is needed.

Note that for a coinductive proof to implicitly define a Skolem function, the elements exhibited for existential statements must not depend on the (implicit) stage $\alpha$. In other words, the Skolem functions must be the same for all $\alpha$. This is the reason why Theorem 4.29 does not

[^10]generalize to arbitrary formulas in the first place. However, it is usually the case that there is no dependency on $\alpha$, and thus the justification of this is typically left implicit. But the necessity of this requirement should be kept in mind.

Example 4.37. We now give an example of an incorrect coinductive argument. Let $\rightarrow$ and $T$ be like in the previous example. Define $\rightarrow_{i}$ inductively by the rules (1) - (4) from Example 4.27. We show: if $s \rightarrow t$ and $s \rightarrow t^{\prime}$ then there exists $s^{\prime}$ such that $t \rightarrow s^{\prime}$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow_{i} s^{\prime}$. By inspecting the proof in the previous example one sees that it also works for the new statement. Simply, we need to change $\rightarrow$ to $\rightarrow_{i}$ in certain places. The proof is still correct - we just no longer need to track stages for the occurences of $\rightarrow$ replaced by $\rightarrow_{i}$.

What is wrong with this argument? The modified coinductive step is indeed correct, but the formula we show is no longer standard, so Theorem 4.29 cannot be applied. Formally, we now show $\varphi\left(\rightarrow^{\alpha}\right)$ for each ordinal $\alpha$, where $\varphi(X) \equiv \forall s, t, t^{\prime} \in T . \exists s^{\prime} \in T .\left(s \rightarrow t \wedge s \rightarrow t^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow$ $\left(X\left(t, s^{\prime}\right) \wedge t^{\prime} \rightarrow_{i} s^{\prime}\right)$ and $\rightarrow^{\alpha}$ is the approximant of $\rightarrow$ at stage $\alpha$. In fact, $\varphi\left(\rightarrow^{0}\right)$ is false e.g. if $t^{\prime}$ is infinite then there is no $s^{\prime}$ such that $t^{\prime} \rightarrow_{i} s^{\prime}$.

We finish this section with a complex example of a proof of the diamond property of a certain relation on infinitary $\epsilon$ - $\lambda$-terms.

Definition 4.38. The binary relation $\rightarrow_{1}$ on infinitary $\epsilon-\lambda$-terms $\Lambda$ from Example 4.25 is defined by the following coinductive rules.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \overline{\overline{x \rightarrow \rightarrow_{1} x}}(1) \begin{aligned}
\stackrel{s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime} \quad t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}}{s t \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime} t^{\prime}}(2) & \frac{s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}}{\overline{\lambda x . s \rightarrow_{1} \lambda x \cdot s^{\prime}}}(3) \frac{s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime} \quad t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}}{(\lambda x . s) t \rightarrow_{1} \epsilon\left(s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right)}
\end{aligned}(4) \\
& \frac{t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}}{\overline{\epsilon(t) \rightarrow_{1} \epsilon\left(t^{\prime}\right)}}(5)
\end{align*}
$$

Lemma 4.39. For $t \in \Lambda$ we have $t \rightarrow_{1} t$.
Proof. Coinduction. If $t \equiv x$ then $t \rightarrow_{1} t$ by rule (1). If $t \equiv t_{1} t_{2}$ then $t_{1} \rightarrow_{1} t_{1}$ and $t_{2} \rightarrow_{1} t_{2}$ by the CH. Thus $t \rightarrow_{1} t$ by rule (2). Other cases are analogous.

Lemma 4.40. If $y \notin \mathrm{FV}(t)$ then $s_{1}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x] \equiv s_{1}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right]$.
Proof. By coinduction, implicitly using Theorem 4.33, If $s_{1} \equiv y$ with $x \neq y$, then $s_{1}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x] \equiv$ $s_{2}[t / x] \equiv s_{1}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right]$, because $s_{1}[t / x] \equiv y[t / x] \equiv y$. If $s_{1} \equiv x$ then $s_{1}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x] \equiv$ $x[t / x] \equiv t \equiv s_{1}[t / x] \equiv s_{1}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right]$, because $y \notin \mathrm{FV}(t)$. If $s_{1} \equiv u_{1} u_{2}$ then $u_{i}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x] \equiv$ $u_{i}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right]$ by the CH. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_{1}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x] & \equiv\left(u_{1}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x]\right)\left(u_{2}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x]\right) \\
& \equiv\left(u_{1}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right]\right)\left(u_{2}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right]\right) \\
& \equiv s_{1}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $s_{1} \equiv \lambda z . s_{1}^{\prime}$ with ${ }^{15} z \neq x, y$ then $s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x] \equiv s_{1}^{\prime}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right]$ by the CH. Thus

$$
s_{1}\left[s_{2} / y\right][t / x] \equiv \lambda z \cdot s_{1}^{\prime}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right] \equiv \lambda z \cdot s_{1}^{\prime}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right] \equiv s_{1}[t / x]\left[s_{2}[t / x] / y\right] .
$$

If $s_{1} \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ then the proof is analogous.
Lemma 4.41. If $s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ and $t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ then $s[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$.

[^11]Proof. We proceed by coinduction. The coinductive hypothesis is: for all $s, s^{\prime}, t, t^{\prime} \in \Lambda, x \in V$, if $s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ and $t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ then $s[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$. The statement that we need to show in the inductive step is: for all $s, s^{\prime}, t, t^{\prime} \in \Lambda, x \in V$, if $s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}$ at $\alpha+1$ and $t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}$ at $\alpha+1$ then $s[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha+1$.

So assume $s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}$ at $\alpha+1$ and $t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}$ at $\alpha+1$. If $s \equiv s^{\prime} \equiv x$ then $s[t / x] \equiv t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime} \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha+1$. If $s \equiv s^{\prime} \equiv y$ with $x \neq y$ then $s[t / x] \equiv y \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$, so $s[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha+1$ by Lemma 4.39. If $s \equiv s_{1} s_{2}$ and $s^{\prime} \equiv s_{1}^{\prime} s_{2}^{\prime}$ with $s_{1} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ and $s_{2} \rightarrow_{1} s_{2}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$, then ${ }^{16} s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1}$ $s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$ and $s_{2}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s_{2}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$ by the CH. Thus $s[t / x] \equiv\left(s_{1}[t / x]\right)\left(s_{2}[t / x]\right) \rightarrow_{1}$ $\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right)\left(s_{2}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (2). If $s \equiv \lambda y . s_{1}, s^{\prime} \equiv \lambda y . s_{1}^{\prime}$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$, then $s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$ by the CH. Thus $s[t / x] \equiv \lambda y \cdot s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} \lambda y \cdot s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right] \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (3). If $s \equiv\left(\lambda y \cdot s_{1}\right) s_{2}$ and $s^{\prime} \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / y\right]\right)$ with $s_{1} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ and $s_{2} \rightarrow_{1} s_{2}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$, then $s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$ and $s_{2}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s_{2}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$ by the CH. By Lemma 4.40 we have $s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right] \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / y\right]\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\left[s_{2}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right] / y\right]\right)$. Thus $s[t / x] \equiv\left(\lambda y . s_{1}[t / x]\right) s_{2}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1}$ $\epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\left[s_{2}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right] / y\right]\right) \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (4). Finally, if $s \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}\right), s^{\prime} \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $s_{1} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$, then $s_{1}[t / x] \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$ by the CH. Thus $s[t / x] \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}[t / x]\right) \rightarrow_{1} \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \equiv s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (5).

Proposition 4.42. If $s \rightarrow_{1} t$ and $s \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}$ then there exists $s^{\prime}$ with $t \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}$.
Proof. By coinduction. If $s \equiv t \equiv t \equiv x$ then take $s^{\prime} \equiv x$. If $s \equiv s_{1} s_{2}, t \equiv t_{1} t_{2}$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv t_{1}^{\prime} t_{2}^{\prime}$ with $s_{i} \rightarrow_{1} t_{i}$ and $s_{i} \rightarrow_{1} t_{i}^{\prime}$, then by the CH we obtain $s_{1}^{\prime}$ and $s_{2}^{\prime}$ with $t_{i} \rightarrow_{1} s_{i}^{\prime}$ and $t_{i}^{\prime} \rightarrow_{1} s_{i}^{\prime}$. Thus $t_{1} t_{2} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime} s_{2}^{\prime}$ and $t_{1}^{\prime} t_{2}^{\prime} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime} s_{2}^{\prime}$ by rule (2), and we may take $s^{\prime} \equiv s_{1}^{\prime} s_{2}^{\prime}$.

If $s \equiv\left(\lambda x . s_{1}\right) s_{2}, t \equiv\left(\lambda x . t_{1}\right) t_{2}$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv \epsilon\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\left[t_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$ with $s_{i} \rightarrow_{1} t_{i}$ and $s_{i} \rightarrow_{1} t_{i}^{\prime}$, then by the CH we obtain $s_{1}^{\prime}$ and $s_{2}^{\prime}$ with $t_{i} \rightarrow_{1} s_{i}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ and $t_{i}^{\prime} \rightarrow_{1} s_{i}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$. We have $t \equiv\left(\lambda x . t_{1}\right) t_{2} \rightarrow_{1}$ $\epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (4). By Lemma 4.41 we have $t_{1}^{\prime}\left[t_{2}^{\prime} / x\right] \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$, so $t^{\prime} \equiv$ $\epsilon\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\left[t_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \rightarrow_{1} \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$ at $\alpha+1$ by rule (5). Therefore take $s^{\prime} \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$. It remains to justify the well-definedness of the implicit Skolem function in this case - note that its definition is not guarded because we apply the substitution operation to results of corecursive invocations $\left(s_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. However, a local prefix production function for this case is $\xi(n, m)=\eta_{\text {subst }}(n, m)+1=$ $\min (n, m)+1>\min (n, m)$ and well-definednes follows.

Assume $s \equiv\left(\lambda x . s_{1}\right) s_{2}, t \equiv \epsilon\left(t_{1}\left[t_{2} / x\right]\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv \epsilon\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\left[t_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$ with $s_{i} \rightarrow_{1} t_{i}$ and $s_{i} \rightarrow_{1} t_{i}^{\prime}$. By the CH we obtain $s_{1}^{\prime}, s_{2}^{\prime}$ with $t_{i} \rightarrow_{1} s_{i}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$ and $t_{i}^{\prime} \rightarrow_{1} s_{i}^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$. By Lemma 4.41 we have $t_{1}\left[t_{2} / x\right] \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$ and $t_{1}^{\prime}\left[t_{2}^{\prime} / x\right] \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]$ at $\alpha$. Thus $t \equiv \epsilon\left(t_{1}\left[t_{2} / x\right]\right) \rightarrow_{1} \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$ at $\alpha+1$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv \epsilon\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\left[t_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right) \rightarrow_{1} \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$ at $\alpha+1$, by rule (5). Therefore take $s^{\prime} \equiv \epsilon\left(s_{1}^{\prime}\left[s_{2}^{\prime} / x\right]\right)$. A local prefix production function for this case is $\xi(n, m)=\eta_{\text {subst }}(n, m)+1=\min (n, m)+1>$ $\min (n, m)$, which implies well-definedness.

Other cases are similar and left to the reader.
Note that the two last cases considered in the proof above would not go through if rule (4) was simply

$$
\frac{s \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime} \quad t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}}{\overline{(\lambda x . s) t \rightarrow_{1} s^{\prime}\left[t^{\prime} / x\right]}}
$$

### 4.4 Nested induction and coinduction

It is often useful to mix coinduction with induction, or to nest coinductive definitions. For instance, the definition from [26, 25] of infinitary reduction of arbitrary ordinal length in infinitary term rewriting systems uses mixed induction-coinduction. Some other examples may be

[^12]found in [20, 35, 13]. In this section we give a few example proofs and definitions which nest induction and/or coinduction.

Example 4.43. Define the set $T$ coinductively:

$$
T::=A T \| B T
$$

For $X \subseteq T$, we define the relation $R(X) \subseteq T$ coinductively.

$$
\xlongequal[\overline{A t \in R(X)}]{t \in X} \quad \frac{t \in R(X)}{\overline{B t \in R(X)}}
$$

For $X \subseteq T$, the relation $S(X) \subseteq T$ is defined inductively.

$$
\frac{t \in S(X)}{A t \in S(X)} \quad \frac{t \in X}{B t \in S(X)}
$$

Both $R$ and $S$ are monotone in $X$, i.e., $X \subseteq Y$ implies $R(X) \subseteq R(Y)$ and $S(X) \subseteq S(Y)$. Hence, the following definitions of $Q_{1}, Q_{2} \subseteq T$ make sense.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{t \in S\left(Q_{1}\right)}{\overline{A t \in Q_{1}}} \quad \frac{t \in Q_{1}}{\overline{B t \in Q_{1}}} \\
& \frac{t \in Q_{2}}{A t \in Q_{2}}
\end{aligned} \quad \frac{t \in R\left(Q_{2}\right)}{B t \in Q_{2}}
$$

Intuitively, $t \in Q_{1}$ means that $t$ contains infinitely many $B \mathrm{~s}$, and $t \in Q_{2}$ means that $t$ contains only finitely many $A$ s.

First, we show $Q_{1} \subseteq S\left(Q_{1}\right)$. Let $t \in Q_{1}$. If $t \equiv A t^{\prime}$ then $t^{\prime} \in S\left(Q_{1}\right)$, so $A t^{\prime} \in S\left(Q_{1}\right)$. If $t \equiv B t^{\prime}$ then $t^{\prime} \in Q_{1}$, so $B t^{\prime} \in S\left(Q_{1}\right)$.

Now we show that if $t \in Q_{2}$ then $t \in Q_{1}$. The proof proceeds by induction on the length of derivation of $t \in Q_{2}$. Let $t \in Q_{2}$. If $t \equiv A t^{\prime}$ then $t^{\prime} \in Q_{2}$, so $t^{\prime} \in Q_{1}$ by the inductive hypothesis. Since $Q_{1} \subseteq S\left(Q_{1}\right)$ we have $t \equiv A t^{\prime} \in Q_{1}$. If $t \equiv A t^{\prime}$ then $t^{\prime} \in R\left(Q_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ where $Q_{2}^{\prime}$ is the set of $s \in Q_{2}$ with shorter derivations than $t \in Q_{2}$. By nested coinduction we show that if $t^{\prime} \in R\left(Q_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ then $t^{\prime} \in Q_{1}$. This actually follows from the inductive hypothesis (which implies $\left.Q_{2}^{\prime} \subseteq Q_{1}\right)$, the monotonicity of $R$, and $R\left(Q_{1}\right) \subseteq Q_{1}$, but we give a direct proof. If $t^{\prime} \equiv A t^{\prime \prime}$ then $t^{\prime \prime} \in Q_{2}^{\prime}$. So $t^{\prime \prime} \in Q_{1}$ by the inductive hypothesis. Thus $t^{\prime \prime} \in S\left(Q_{1}\right)$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv A t^{\prime \prime} \in Q_{1}$. If $t^{\prime} \equiv B t^{\prime \prime}$ then $t^{\prime \prime} \in R\left(Q_{2}^{\prime}\right)$. By the coinductive hypothesis $t^{\prime \prime} \in Q_{1}$. Hence $t^{\prime} \equiv B t^{\prime \prime} \in Q_{1}$.

Example 4.44. Let $Q_{1}$ and $T$ be as in the previous example. Consider the following corecursive definition of a function $e: Q_{1} \rightarrow T$ which erases all $A \mathrm{~s}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e(A t)=e(t) \\
& e(B t)=B(e(t))
\end{aligned}
$$

Formally, to make the definition of $e$ consistent with our theory we should also specify $e(t)$ for $t \in T \backslash Q_{1}$, but in this case we may simply take $e(t)$ to be an arbitrary element of $T$.

One shows by induction that a function $e: Q_{1} \rightarrow T$ satisfies the above equations if and only if it satisfies

$$
e(A \ldots A B t)=B(e(t))
$$

where $A$ occurs a finite number of times (possibly 0 ). But this definition of $e$ is guarded, so we conclude that there exists a unique function $e: Q_{1} \rightarrow T$ satisfying the original equations.

Example 4.45. Define the set $T$ of coterms coinductively:

$$
T::=A(T)\|B(T)\| C(T)\|D(T)\| E(T)
$$

We define the relations $\rightarrow_{1}$ and $\rightarrow_{2}$ by mutual coinduction.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\overline{\overline{t \rightarrow \rightarrow_{1} t}} & \frac{t \rightarrow_{2} s}{\overline{A(t) \rightarrow_{1} C(s)}} & \frac{t \rightarrow_{1} s}{\overline{B(t) \rightarrow_{1} D(s)}} \\
\frac{t \rightarrow_{2} s}{\overline{C(t) \rightarrow_{1} C(s)}} & \frac{t \rightarrow_{1} s}{\overline{D(t) \rightarrow_{1} D(s)}} & \frac{t \rightarrow_{1} s}{\overline{E(t) \rightarrow_{1} E(s)}} \\
\overline{\overline{t \rightarrow \rightarrow_{2} t}} & \overline{\overline{A(t) \rightarrow_{2} C(s)}} & \overline{\overline{B(t) \rightarrow_{2} E(s)}} \\
\frac{t \rightarrow_{1} s}{\overline{C(t) \rightarrow_{2} C(s)}} & \overline{\overline{D(t) \rightarrow_{2} D(s)}} & \overline{\overline{E(t) \rightarrow_{2} E(s)}}
\end{array}
$$

Intuitively, the reduction $\rightarrow_{1}$ changes $A$ to $C$, and $B$ either to $D$ or $E$, starting with $D$ and switching when encountering $A$ or $C$. For instance

$$
B(B(A(B(C(B(B(t))))))) \rightarrow_{1} D(D(C(E(C(D(D(t)))))))
$$

Formally, the above rules define in an obvious way a monotond 17 function

$$
F: \mathcal{P}(T \times T) \times \mathcal{P}(T \times T) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(T \times T) \times \mathcal{P}(T \times T)
$$

such that $\left\langle\rightarrow_{1}, \rightarrow_{2}\right\rangle$ is the greatest fixpoint of $F$. Setting $F(X, Y)=\left\langle F_{1}(X, Y), F_{2}(X, Y)\right\rangle$, by the Bekič principle (see e.g. [8, Lemma 1.4.2]) we have ${ }^{18}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow_{1}=\nu X \cdot F_{1}\left(X, \nu Y \cdot F_{2}(X, Y)\right) \\
& \rightarrow_{2}=\nu Y \cdot F_{2}\left(\nu X \cdot F_{1}(X, Y), Y\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In other words, one may also think of $\rightarrow_{1}$ as the greatest fixpoint of the monotone function $G: \mathcal{P}(T \times T) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(T \times T)$ defined by $G(X)=F_{1}(X, H(X))$ where $H(X)=\nu Y . F_{2}(X, Y)$, i.e., $\nu G$ is defined by the coinductive rules for $\rightarrow_{1}$ but instead of the premises $t \rightarrow_{2} s$ we use $\langle t, s\rangle \in H\left(\rightarrow_{1}\right)$, and $H(X)$ is defined by the coinductive rules for $\rightarrow_{2}$ but with the premises $t \rightarrow_{1} s$ replaced by $\langle t, s\rangle \in X$. Analogous considerations apply to the definition of $\rightarrow_{2}$.

We shall now give an example by showing by coinduction that if $t \rightarrow_{i} t_{1}$ and $t \rightarrow_{i} t_{2}$ then there is $s$ with $t_{1} \rightarrow_{i} s$ and $t_{2} \rightarrow_{i} s$, for $i=1,2$. The proof is rather straightforward. If $t \equiv t_{1}$ then we may take $s \equiv t_{2}$. If $t \equiv A\left(t^{\prime}\right), t_{1} \equiv C\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $t \rightarrow_{1} t_{1}$, then also $t_{2} \equiv C\left(t_{2}^{\prime}\right), t^{\prime} \rightarrow_{2} t_{1}^{\prime}$ and $t^{\prime} \rightarrow_{2} t_{2}^{\prime}$. By the coinductive hypothesis we obtain $s^{\prime}$ such that $t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow_{2} s^{\prime}$ and $t_{2}^{\prime} \rightarrow_{2} s^{\prime}$. Thus $t_{1} \equiv C\left(t_{1}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow_{1} C\left(s^{\prime}\right)$ and $t_{2} \equiv C\left(t_{2}^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow_{1} C\left(s^{\prime}\right)$, so we may take $s \equiv C\left(s^{\prime}\right)$. Other cases are similar.

Formally, in the above proof we show the statement:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\forall t, t_{1}, t_{2} \in T . \exists s_{1}, s_{2} \in T . & \left(\left(t \rightarrow_{1} t_{1} \wedge t \rightarrow_{1} t_{2}\right) \Rightarrow\left(t_{1} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1} \wedge t_{2} \rightarrow_{1} s_{1}\right)\right) \wedge \\
& \left(\left(t \rightarrow_{2} t_{1} \wedge t \rightarrow_{2} t_{2}\right) \Rightarrow\left(t_{1} \rightarrow_{2} s_{2} \wedge t_{2} \rightarrow_{2} s_{2}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

So, after skolemizing, we actually show

$$
\begin{aligned}
\forall t, t_{1}, t_{2} \in T . & \left(\left(t \rightarrow_{1} t_{1} \wedge t \rightarrow_{1} t_{2}\right) \Rightarrow\left(t_{1} \rightarrow_{1} f_{1}\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right) \wedge t_{2} \rightarrow_{1} f_{1}\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)\right)\right) \wedge \\
& \left(\left(t \rightarrow_{2} t_{1} \wedge t \rightarrow_{2} t_{2}\right) \Rightarrow\left(t_{1} \rightarrow_{2} f_{2}\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right) \wedge t_{2} \rightarrow_{2} f_{2}\left(t_{1}, t_{2}\right)\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

[^13]for appropriate $f_{1}, f_{2}: T \times T \rightarrow T$. The mutually corecursive definitions of $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ follow from the proof. Formally, we define a corecursive function $f: T \times T \rightarrow T \times T$ such that $f(t, s)=\left\langle f_{1}(t, s), f_{2}(t, s)\right\rangle$ for $t, s \in T$. The cartesian product $T \times T$ may be treated as a set of coterms $\mathcal{T}_{p}$ of a special sort $p$. Then the projections $\pi_{1}$ and $\pi_{2}$ are destructors with a production function $\eta_{d}(n)=\max (0, n-1)$. The pair-forming operator $\pi: T \times T \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{p}$, defined by $\pi(t, s)=\langle t, s\rangle$, is then a constructor with a production function $\eta_{c}(n, m)=\min (n, m)+1$. Thus formally we have for instance $f(C(t), C(s))=\left\langle C\left(\pi_{2}(f(t, s))\right), C\left(\pi_{1}(f(t, s))\right)\right\rangle$. Hence, strictly speaking, the definition of $f$ is not guarded, but it is easily seen to be correct nonetheless. Indeed, each clause of the definition of $f$ has the form $f\left(c_{1}(t), c_{2}(s)\right)=\left\langle c_{3}\left(\pi_{i}(f(t, s))\right), c_{4}\left(\pi_{j}(f(t, s))\right)\right\rangle$, where $c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}, c_{4}$ are constructors and $i, j \in\{1,2\}$, so the prefix production function is
$$
\eta(n, m)=\min (n-1+1, m-1+1)+1>\min (n, m)
$$

The above example of mutually corecursive functions is generalized in the following.
Definition 4.46. We say that functions $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}: S \rightarrow Q$ are defined by mutual corecursion from $h_{j}: S \times Q^{m_{j}} \rightarrow Q$ and $g_{i}^{j}: S \rightarrow S$, and $k_{i}^{j} \in\{1, \ldots, n\}, j=1, \ldots, n, i=1, \ldots, m_{j}$, if for a function $f: S \rightarrow Q^{n}$ defined by corecursion from

$$
\lambda x \overrightarrow{y_{1}} \ldots \overrightarrow{y_{n}} \cdot\left\langle h_{1}\left(x, \pi_{k_{1}^{1}}\left(y_{1}^{1}\right), \ldots, \pi_{k_{1}^{m_{1}}}\left(y_{1}^{m_{1}}\right)\right), \ldots, h_{n}\left(x, \pi_{k_{n}^{1}}\left(y_{n}^{1}\right), \ldots, \pi_{k_{n}^{m_{n}}}\left(y_{n}^{m_{n}}\right)\right)\right\rangle
$$

and $g_{i}^{j}$ we have

$$
f(x)=\left\langle f_{1}(x), \ldots, f_{n}(x)\right\rangle
$$

for $x \in S$. We say that a definition by mutual corecursion is guarded if each $h_{j}$ is defined by cases from some constructor-guarded functions.

It follows from our theory that a guarded mutually corecursive definition uniquely determines the functions $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}$. In coinductive proofs, if the Skolem functions are defined by guarded mutual corecursion then their well-definedness justifications may be left implicit.
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## A Extending final coalgebras to sized CPOs

In this section we relate our method from Section 4.1 for defining corecursive functions to the well-established method of finding unique morphisms into the final coalgebra of a functor. We show a theorem which says that for every final coalgebra in the category of sets there exists a "canonical" sized CPO. The proof of this theorem is an adaptation of the construction in [7, Theorem 4]. First, we need some background on the coalgebraic approach to coinduction.

## A. 1 Coalgebraic foundations of coinduction

In this section we provide a brief overview of coalgebraic foundations of coinduction. Familiarity with basic category theory is assumed, in particular with the notions of functor, final object, cone and limit. We consider only functors in the category of sets. For an introduction to category theory see e.g. [9]. For more background on the coalgebraic approach to coinduction see e.g. [32, 36].

Definition A.1. A coalgebra of an endofunctor $F:$ Set $\rightarrow$ Set, or $F$-coalgebra, is a pair

$$
\langle A, f: A \rightarrow F A\rangle
$$

where $A$ is the carrier set of the coalgebra. A homomorphism of $F$-coalgebras $\langle A, f\rangle$ and $\langle B, g\rangle$ is a morphism $h: A \rightarrow B$ such that $F h \circ f=g \circ h$, i.e., the following diagram commutes:


A final $F$-coalgebra is a final object in the category of $F$-coalgebras and $F$-homomorphisms.
The final sequence of an endofunctor $F:$ Set $\rightarrow$ Set is an ordinal-indexed sequence of sets $\left\langle A_{\alpha}\right\rangle_{\alpha}$ with morphisms $\left(w_{\gamma}^{\beta}: A_{\beta} \rightarrow A_{\gamma}\right)_{\gamma \leq \beta}$ uniquely defined by the conditions:

- $A_{\beta+1}=F\left(A_{\beta}\right)$,
- $w_{\gamma+1}^{\beta+1}=F\left(w_{\gamma}^{\beta}\right)$,
- $w_{\beta}^{\beta}=\mathrm{id}$,
- $w_{\delta}^{\beta}=w_{\delta}^{\gamma} \circ w_{\gamma}^{\beta}$ for $\delta \leq \gamma \leq \beta$,
- if $\beta$ is a limit ordinal then the cone $\left(w_{\gamma}^{\beta}: A_{\beta} \rightarrow A_{\gamma}\right)_{\gamma<\beta}$ is the limit of the cochain $\left\langle A_{\gamma}\right\rangle_{\gamma<\beta}$, i.e., of the diagram $\left\langle\left\{A_{\gamma}\right\}_{\gamma<\beta},\left(w_{\gamma}^{\delta}: A_{\delta} \rightarrow A_{\gamma}\right)_{\gamma \leq \delta<\beta}\right\rangle$.

It follows by transfinite induction that the final sequence is indeed well-defined by the given conditions. See e.g. [41] for the (easy) proof.

The following two theorems were shown by Adamek and Koubek in [7].
Theorem A.2. Suppose the final sequence $\left\langle A_{\alpha}\right\rangle_{\alpha}$ of $F$ stabilizes at $\zeta$, i.e., $w_{\zeta}^{\zeta+1}$ is an isomorphism. Then $\left\langle A_{\zeta},\left(w_{\zeta}^{\zeta+1}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle$ is a final $F$-coalgebra.

Theorem A.3. If a set-functor has a final coalgebra, then its final sequence stabilizes.

## A. 2 The theorem

The following theorem shows that for every final coalgebra in the category of sets there exists a "canonical" sized CPO. Moreover, it is always, in principle, possible to define any morphism into the final coalgebra as a unique fixpoint of an appropriate monotone function. This shows that the method of defining corecursive functions as fixpoints of monotone functions, using an underlying sized CPO, is fairly general. The construction in Theorem A.4 is an adaptation of the construction in [7, Theorem 4].

Theorem A.4. Let $\langle A, t\rangle$ be the final coalgebra for a set-functor $T$. There exists a sized $C P O$ $\langle\mathbb{A}, \zeta, s$, cut $\rangle$ with $\operatorname{Max}(\mathbb{A})=A$, such that for any set $S$ and any function $f: S \rightarrow T S$, the unique morphism $u: S \rightarrow A$ from $f$ into the final coalgebra $\langle A, t\rangle$ is the unique fixpoint of some monotone function $F: \mathbb{A}^{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^{S}$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{x \in S} s(F(g)(x))>\min _{x \in S} s(g(x)) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for non-maximal $g \in \mathbb{A}^{S}$.
Proof. Let $\left\langle A_{\alpha}\right\rangle_{\alpha}$ with $\left(w_{\beta}^{\alpha}: A_{\alpha} \rightarrow A_{\beta}\right)_{\beta \leq \alpha}$ be the final sequence of $T$. Since $T$ has a final coalgebra, by Theorem A. 3 the final sequence stabilizes at some ordinal $\zeta$. By Theorem A. 2 we may assume without loss of generality that $\langle A, t\rangle=\left\langle A_{\zeta},\left(w_{\zeta}^{\zeta+1}\right)^{-1}\right\rangle$ (otherwise we just need to compose some morphisms below with the isomorphism between $A$ and $A_{\zeta}$ ). Without loss of generality we may identify $A$ with $\{\zeta\} \times A$ (otherwise the definition of $\mathbb{A}$ below just needs to be complicated slightly by taking the carrier set to be e.g. $A \cup\left(\{A\} \times \amalg_{\alpha<\zeta} A_{\alpha}\right)$ and adjusting the definition of $\sqsubseteq$ accordingly). If $p$ is a pair, then by $p_{1}$ we denote the first and by $p_{2}$ the second component of $p$. Take $\mathbb{A}=\left\langle\amalg_{\alpha \leq \zeta} A_{\alpha}\right.$, $\zeta$ with $p \sqsubseteq q$ iff $p_{1} \leq q_{1}$ and $w_{p_{1}}^{q_{1}}\left(q_{2}\right)=p_{2}$. It follows from the definition of the final sequence of an endofunctor that $\sqsubseteq$ is a partial order.

We show that $\mathbb{A}$ is a CPO. The bottom of $\mathbb{A}$ is $\langle 0, \perp\rangle$ where $\perp$ is the sole element of $A_{0}$. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ be a directed set. First, we show that $D$ is in fact a chain. Let $p, q \in D$ with $p_{1} \leq q_{1}$. Because $D$ is directed there is $r \in D$ with $p, q \sqsubseteq r$, i.e., $p_{1} \leq q_{1} \leq r_{1}, w_{q_{1}}^{r_{1}}\left(r_{2}\right)=q_{2}$ and $w_{p_{1}}^{r_{1}}\left(r_{2}\right)=p_{2}$. Because $w_{p_{1}}^{r_{1}}=w_{p_{1}}^{q_{1}} \circ w_{q_{1}}^{r_{1}}$ we have $w_{p_{1}}^{q_{1}}\left(q_{2}\right)=w_{p_{1}}^{q_{1}}\left(w_{q_{1}}^{r_{1}}\left(r_{2}\right)\right)=w_{p_{1}}^{r_{1}}\left(r_{2}\right)=p_{2}$. Hence $p \sqsubseteq q$.

Let $\alpha$ be the least upper bound of $D_{1}=\left\{p_{1} \mid p \in D\right\}$. If there is $p \in D$ with $p_{1}=\alpha$, i.e., $\alpha \in D_{1}$ is the largest element of $D_{1}$, then $p$ is the largest element of $D$, and thus the supremum. Indeed, let $q \in D$. Since $D$ is a chain, $q \sqsubseteq p$ or $p \sqsubseteq q$. If $p \sqsubseteq q$ then $q_{1}=\alpha$, because $p_{1}=\alpha$ is the largest element of $D_{1}$. But this implies $q=p$, because $w_{\alpha}^{\alpha}=\mathrm{id}$.

So assume $\alpha \notin D_{1}$. Then $\alpha$ must be a limit ordinal. So the cone $C=\left(w_{\beta}^{\alpha}: A_{\alpha} \rightarrow A_{\beta}\right)_{\beta<\alpha}$ is the limit of the cochain $\left\langle A_{\beta}\right\rangle_{\beta<\alpha}$. Let $A_{\alpha}^{\prime}=A_{\alpha} \cup\{a\}$ where $a \notin A_{\alpha}$. We define functions $f_{\beta}^{\alpha}: A_{\alpha}^{\prime} \rightarrow A_{\beta}$ for $\beta<\alpha$ as follows: $f_{\beta}(x)=w_{\beta}^{\alpha}(x)$ if $x \neq a$, and $f_{\beta}(a)=w_{\beta}^{\gamma}\left(z_{2}^{\beta}\right)$ for the element $z^{\beta} \in D$ such that $z_{1}^{\beta}=\gamma \geq \beta$ is smallest in $\left\{\gamma \in D_{1} \mid \gamma \geq \beta\right\}$. The element $z^{\beta}$ is uniquely defined, because distinct elements of $\mathbb{A}$ with the same first components are pairwise incomparable, and $D$ is a chain with elements with first components arbitrarily close to $\alpha$, and $\beta<\alpha$. We show that $\left(f_{\beta}: A_{\alpha}^{\prime} \rightarrow A_{\beta}\right)$ is a cone over the cochain $\left\langle A_{\beta}\right\rangle_{\beta<\alpha}$, i.e., over the diagram $\left\langle\left\{A_{\beta}\right\}_{\beta<\alpha},\left(w_{\beta}^{\gamma}: A_{\gamma} \rightarrow A_{\beta}\right)_{\beta \leq \gamma<\alpha}\right\rangle$. Let $\gamma \geq \beta$. We have $w_{\beta}^{\gamma}\left(f_{\gamma}(a)\right)=w_{\beta}^{\gamma_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\gamma}\right)$ where $\gamma_{1} \geq \gamma$ and $z_{2}^{\gamma}$ are such that $f_{\gamma}(a)=w_{\gamma}^{\gamma_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\gamma}\right)$. Let $\beta_{1} \geq \beta$ be such that $f_{\beta}(a)=w_{\beta}^{\beta_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\beta}\right)$. Then $\beta_{1} \leq \gamma_{1}$, so $z_{2}^{\beta} \sqsubseteq z_{2}^{\gamma}$, because $D$ is a chain. Thus $w_{\beta_{1}}^{\gamma_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\gamma}\right)=z_{2}^{\beta}$, so $w_{\beta}^{\gamma_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\gamma}\right)=w_{\beta}^{\beta_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\beta}\right)$. Hence $w_{\beta}^{\gamma}\left(f_{\gamma}(a)\right)=w_{\beta}^{\gamma_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\gamma}\right)=w_{\beta}^{\beta_{1}}\left(z_{2}^{\beta}\right)=f_{\beta}(a)$. For $x \in A_{\alpha}$ the condition $f_{\beta}(x)=w_{\beta}^{\gamma}\left(f_{\gamma}(x)\right)$ follows directly from definitions. Therefore $\left(f_{\beta}: A_{\alpha}^{\prime} \rightarrow A_{\beta}\right)_{\beta<\alpha}$ is a cone, and since $C$ is the limit, there exists a unique $u: A_{\alpha}^{\prime} \rightarrow A_{\alpha}$ such that $f_{\beta}=w_{\beta}^{\alpha} \circ u$ for $\beta<\alpha$. We show that $\bar{a}=\langle\alpha, u(a)\rangle$ is the supremum of $D$. To prove that $\bar{a}$ is an upper bound, it suffices to show
that if $d \in D$ then $w_{d_{1}}^{\alpha}(u(a))=d_{2}$. But this holds because $w_{d_{1}}^{\alpha}(u(a))=f_{d_{1}}(a)=d_{2}$. So suppose $\bar{b}$ is also an upper bound. Then so is $\left\langle\alpha, w_{\alpha}^{\bar{b}_{1}}\left(\bar{b}_{2}\right)\right\rangle$, hence we may assume $\bar{b}_{1}=\alpha$. Define $u^{\prime}: A_{\alpha}^{\prime} \rightarrow A_{\alpha}$ by: $u^{\prime}(x)=u(x)$ if $x \neq a$, and $u^{\prime}(a)=\bar{b}_{2}$. Since $w_{d_{1}}^{\alpha}\left(u^{\prime}(a)\right)=d_{2}$ for $d \in D$, we have $f_{\beta}(a)=w_{\beta}^{\gamma}\left(z_{2}^{\beta}\right)=w_{\beta}^{\gamma}\left(w_{\gamma}^{\alpha}\left(u^{\prime}(a)\right)\right)=w_{\beta}^{\alpha}\left(u^{\prime}(a)\right)$ for $\beta<\alpha$, where $\gamma=z_{1}^{\beta}$. This implies $f_{\beta}=w_{\beta}^{\alpha} \circ u^{\prime}$ for $\beta<\alpha$. Thus $u^{\prime}=u$, because $u: A_{\alpha}^{\prime} \rightarrow A_{\alpha}$ is unique such that $f_{\beta}=w_{\beta}^{\alpha} \circ u$ for $\beta<\alpha$. Hence $\bar{b}=\bar{a}$. So $\bar{a}$ is the supremum of $D$. Therefore, $\mathbb{A}$ is a CPO.

It is clear that $\operatorname{Max}(\mathbb{A})=A(=\{\zeta\} \times A)$. The size function $s: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \operatorname{On}(\zeta)$ is defined by $s(x)=x_{1}$ for $x \in \mathbb{A}$. It is obviously surjective. That $s$ is continuous follows from the construction of supremums we have given in the previous paragraph. Of course, $s(x)=\zeta$ iff $x \in \mathbb{A}$ is maximal. The cut-function cut $: \operatorname{On}(\zeta) \times \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ is defined by:

- $\operatorname{cut}(\alpha, x)=\left\langle\alpha, w_{\alpha}^{x_{1}}\left(x_{2}\right)\right\rangle$ if $x_{1} \geq \alpha$,
- $\operatorname{cut}(\alpha, x)=x$ otherwise.

It follows from definitions that cut is monotone in both arguments. Therefore, $\langle\mathbb{A}, \zeta, s$, cut $\rangle$ is a sized CPO with $\operatorname{Max}(\mathbb{A})=A$. To save on notation, from now on we confuse $x \in \mathbb{A}$ with $x_{2}$, using $s(x)$ to denote the first component.

Let $S$ be a set and let $f: S \rightarrow T S$. Suppose $u: S \rightarrow A$ is the unique morphism from $f$ into the final coalgebra $\langle A, t\rangle$. For $g: S \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ define $m(g)=\min _{x \in S} s(g(x))$, and define $g^{*}: S \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ by $g^{*}(x)=w_{m(g)}^{s(g(x))}(g(x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{A}$. Note that $g^{*}: S \rightarrow A_{m(g)}$, so $T g^{*}: T S \rightarrow A_{m(g)+1}$, and if $m(g)=\zeta$ then $g^{*}=g$. Let $F: \mathbb{A}^{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^{S}$ be defined by

$$
F(g)=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
T g^{*} \circ f & \text { if } m(g)<\zeta \\
t^{-1} \circ T g \circ f & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

for $g \in \mathbb{A}^{S}$. For non-maximal $g \in \mathbb{A}^{S}$ we have $m(g)<\zeta$, and thus

$$
\min _{x \in S} F(g)(x)=\min _{x \in S} T g^{*}(f(x))=m(g)+1>m(g)=\min _{x \in S}(s(g(x)))
$$

so (11) is satisfied. We show that $F$ is monotone. So let $g, h \in \mathbb{A}^{S}$ with $g \sqsubseteq h$, i.e., $g(x) \sqsubseteq h(x)$ for all $x \in S$. Then $m(g) \leq m(h)$. We may assume $m(g)<\zeta$, because if $m(g)=m(h)=\zeta$ then $g=h$. We have $g^{*}(x) \sqsubseteq h^{*}(x)$ for all $x \in S$. Indeed, for $x \in S$ we have $g(x)=w_{s(g(x))}^{s(h(x))}(h(x))$ and thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
g^{*}(x) & =w_{m(g)}^{s(g(x))}(g(x)) \\
& =w_{m(g)}^{s(g(x))}\left(w_{s(g(x))}^{s(h(x))}(h(x))\right) \\
& =w_{m(g)}^{s h(x))}(h(x)) \\
& =w_{m(g)}^{m(h)}\left(w_{m(x)}^{s(g(x))}(h(x))\right) \\
& =w_{m(g)}^{m(h)}\left(h^{*}(x)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

So $g^{*}=w_{m(g)}^{m(h)} \circ h^{*}$, and hence $T g^{*}=T w_{m(g)}^{m(h)} \circ T h^{*}$. We have $T w_{m(g)}^{m(h)}=w_{m(g)+1}^{m(h)+1}$, so

$$
F(g)=T g^{*} \circ f=T w_{m(g)}^{m(h)} \circ T h^{*} \circ f=w_{m(g)+1}^{m(h)+1} \circ T h^{*} \circ f .
$$

If $m(h)<\zeta$ then this implies $F(g)=w_{m(g)+1}^{m(h)+1} \circ F(h)$, so $F(g) \sqsubseteq F(h)$. If $m(h)=\zeta$ then $F(g)=w_{m(g)+1}^{\zeta+1} \circ T h \circ f=w_{m(g)+1}^{\zeta} \circ w_{\zeta}^{\zeta+1} \circ T h \circ f=w_{m(g)+1}^{\zeta} \circ F(h)$ because $t^{-1}=w_{\zeta}^{\zeta+1}$. So then also $F(g) \sqsubseteq F(h)$. Therefore $F$ is monotone.

It remains to show that $u$ is the unique fixpoint of $F$. Let $v$ be a fixpoint of $F$. By (11) we must have $v \in A^{S}$. Then $F(v)=t^{-1} \circ T v \circ f$, so $t^{-1} \circ T v \circ f=v$. This implies $T v \circ f=t \circ v$, so $v$ is a morphism from the coalgebra $\langle S, f\rangle$ into the final coalgebra $\langle A, t\rangle$. Therefore $v=u$.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This section is largely based on [19] Sections 2,3 ] and [18, Section 2].

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ By $\lambda y . f(x, y)$ we denote a function $f^{\prime}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ defined by $f^{\prime}(y)=f(x, y)$. We will sometimes use the lambda notation in what follows.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Since $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}$ and $\operatorname{On}(\omega)$ are isomorphic we identify them without loss of generality. So $\infty=\omega$.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ Recall that by Lemma 4.18 we may consider continuous production functions as defined on $\mathbb{N}^{m}$ instead of $\mathbb{N}_{\infty}^{m}$.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ More precisely: for each $r \in A^{\omega}$ a continuous $r$-local prefix production function...
    ${ }^{6}$ We leave implicit the verification of $(\star)$ in Theorem 4.13. which follows from the fact that a global prefix production function $\xi^{\prime}$ (see the definition of $\eta_{h}$ above) satisfies $\xi^{\prime}(\infty, n)=\xi(n)$, and $\xi(n)>n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ To make the definition of $D$ consistent with our theory, which considers only functions, we could provide $D$ with one dummy argument.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ Formally, we consider infinitely many functions $\lambda t \cdot \operatorname{mul}(n, t)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and apply Theorem 4.13 to each of them.
    ${ }^{9}$ We use Lemma 4.12 and Theorem 4.13.

[^7]:    ${ }^{10}$ We again implicitly use Lemma 4.12 and Theorem 4.13

[^8]:    ${ }^{11}$ The individual variables $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ may of course occur in the terms $t_{i}^{j}$.

[^9]:    ${ }^{12}$ As long as we are showing a statement with only positive occurences of the coinductive relations for which we (implicitly) track the stages.

[^10]:    ${ }^{13}$ Section 4.1 directly deals only with corecursive definitions of single functions, but mutual corecursion may be easily handled by considering an appropriate function on tuples of elements. See also Example 4.45 and Definition 4.46
    ${ }^{14}$ More precisely: by corecursively applying the Skolem function to $s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}$ we obtain $s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$, and by the coinductive hypothesis we have $t_{1} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ and $t_{1}^{\prime} \rightarrow s_{s_{1}, t_{1}, t_{1}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$.

[^11]:    ${ }^{15}$ Recall that we assume bound variables to be distinct from the free ones.

[^12]:    ${ }^{16}$ Recall that $t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}$ at $\alpha+1$ implies $t \rightarrow_{1} t^{\prime}$ at $\alpha$, by Lemma 3.2

[^13]:    ${ }^{17}$ We use the product ordering, i.e., pairs of sets are compared with $\subseteq$ componentwise.
    ${ }^{18}$ For monotone $f$ we use the notation $\nu x . f(x)$ to denote the greatest fixpoint of $f$.

