

A Rewriting Logic Approach to Specification, Proof-search, and Meta-proofs in Sequent Systems

Carlos Olarte · Elaine Pimentel · Camilo Rocha

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract This paper develops an algorithmic-based approach for proving inductive properties of propositional sequent systems such as admissibility, invertibility, cut-elimination, and identity expansion. Although undecidable in general, these structural properties are crucial in proof theory because they can reduce the proof-search effort and further be used as scaffolding for obtaining other meta-results such as consistency. The algorithms –which take advantage of the rewriting logic meta-logical framework, and use rewrite- and narrowing-based reasoning– are explained in detail and illustrated with examples throughout the paper. They have been fully mechanized in the L-Framework, thus offering both a formal specification language and off-the-shelf mechanization of the proof-search algorithms coming together with semi-decision procedures for proving theorems and meta-theorems of the object system. As illustrated with case studies in the paper, the L-Framework achieves a great degree of automation when used on several propositional sequent systems, including single conclusion and multi-conclusion intuitionistic logic, classical logic, classical linear logic and its dyadic system, intuitionistic linear logic, and normal modal logics.

Keywords Sequent systems · L-Framework · Rewriting logic · Proof Theory

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Structural Properties of Sequent-Based Proof Systems	4
3	Rewriting Logic Preliminaries	7
4	A Rewriting View of Sequent Systems	9
5	Proving Admissibility and Invertibility	12
6	Proving Cut-Elimination and Identity Expansion	18
7	Reflective Implementation	22

Carlos Olarte and Elaine Pimentel
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, Brazil

Camilo Rocha
Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Cali, Colombia

8	Case Studies	33
9	Concluding Remarks	48

1 Introduction

Gentzen’s sequent systems [13] have proved to be a flexible and robust logical formalism for specifying proof systems. With the advent of new needs in the form of techniques and technologies (e.g., to reason in temporal, epistemic, and modal domains), the past decades have witnessed a vivid scene where novel sequent-based calculi have been proposed (see, e.g., [5, 18]). It is fair to say that one of the most important aims of these new systems is the ultimate goal of having both a formal specification language and a mechanization of proof-search algorithms coming together with decision procedures –whenever possible and feasible.

Cut-free sequent systems are key for this latter purpose. Intuitively, the cut-rule expresses the mathematical use of lemmas in proofs: if A follows from B and C follows from A , then C follows from B . That is, one can cut the intermediate lemma A . Cut-elimination theorems then state that any judgment that possesses a proof making use of the cut-rule, also possesses a proof that does not make use of it. This is of practical convenience for proof-search purposes because it is often much easier to find proofs when the need to mechanically come up with auxiliary lemmas can be avoided. Moreover, there are important applications of cut-elimination theorems, such as the reduction of consistency proofs and “subformula properties” to mere structural syntactic checks. However, structural properties of a logical system such as cut-freeness are actually inductive meta-properties and thus undecidable to check in general. In practice, proof-theoretic approaches to establish them usually require combinatorial search heuristics based on the structure of formulas of each particular system. These heuristics, in turn, may depend on the ability to prove other inductive properties. For instance, Gentzen-style proofs of cut-elimination heavily depends on checking admissibility of other structural rules (e.g., weakening and contraction) and showing that some of the sequent rules defining the system are invertible.

The main goal of this article is to present the L-Framework¹, a tool for algebraically specifying and analyzing propositional sequent systems. It provides both a specific scaffolding of constructs usually found in a sequent system, and off-the-shelf algorithms for proving inductive properties such as admissibility, invertibility, cut-elimination, and identity expansion. The proposed framework is *generic* in the sense that only mild restrictions are imposed on the formulas of the sequent system, and *modular* since cut-elimination, admissibility, invertibility, and identity expansion can be proved incrementally.

The algorithms and their implementation in the L-Framework are based on the expressive power of rewriting logic [24], both as a logical and a reflective meta-logical framework [2,23]. A sequent system is specified as a rewriting logic theory \mathcal{S} and a sequent as a formula φ in the syntax of \mathcal{S} . In this setting, the process of building a proof of φ in \mathcal{S} is cast as a reachability goal of the form $\mathcal{S} \vdash \varphi \xrightarrow{*} \top$, where

¹ <https://carlosolarte.github.io/L-framework/>

\top denotes the empty sequent. Therefore, as a logical framework, rewriting logic directly serves the purpose of providing a proof-search algorithm at the *object* level of \mathcal{S} . Since rewriting logic is reflective, a universal rewrite theory \mathcal{U} is further used to prove meta-logical properties (e.g., cut-freeness) of the system \mathcal{S} . More precisely, such proofs are specified as reachability goals of the form $\mathcal{U} \vdash (\overline{\mathcal{S}}; \overline{\Gamma}) \xrightarrow{*} (\overline{\mathcal{S}}; \overline{\top})$, where Γ is a set of sequents representing the proof-obligations to be discharged, and $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ and $\overline{\Gamma}$ are the meta-representation of \mathcal{S} and Γ in the syntax of the universal theory \mathcal{U} , respectively. In this way, starting with the specification of the propositional sequent \mathcal{S} in rewriting logic, the framework presented in this paper enables both the proof of theorems and inductive meta-theorems of \mathcal{S} .

The framework comprises a *generic* rewrite theory offering sorts, operators, and standard procedures for proof-search at the object- and meta-level. The sorts are used to represent different elements of the syntactic structure of a sequent system such as formulas, sets of formulas, sequents, and collections of sequents. The inference rules of a sequent system are specified as reversed rewrite rules, so that an inference step of the mechanized system is carried out by matching a sequent to the conclusion of an inference rule, and replacing the latter by the corresponding substitution instance of the rule's premises. Conceptually, a proof at the object level is found when all proof-obligations are conclusions of inference rules without premises (i.e., axioms).

Once a sequent system \mathcal{S} is specified, proofs of its cut-freeness, admissibility, invertibility, and identity expansion properties can be searched for. The process of obtaining proofs for each one of these properties follows a similar pattern. Namely, the rules of \mathcal{S} are used by pair-wise comparison and narrowing to generate the inductive hypothesis \mathcal{H} and the proof obligations Γ . Therefore, if for each pair (\mathcal{H}, Γ) the (meta-)reachability goal $\mathcal{U} \vdash (\overline{\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{H}}; \overline{\Gamma}) \xrightarrow{*} (\overline{\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{H}}; \overline{\top})$ can be answered positively, then the corresponding property of the sequent system \mathcal{S} holds. The universal theory \mathcal{U} contains the rewrite- and narrowing-based heuristics that operate over $\overline{\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{H}}$ and $\overline{\Gamma}$. Much of the effort in obtaining the proposed framework was devoted designing such meta-level heuristics and fully implementing them in Maude [8], a high-performance reflective language and system supporting rewriting logic.

The case studies presented in this paper comprise several propositional sequent systems, encompassing different proof-theoretical aspects. The chosen systems include: single conclusion (G3ip) and multi-conclusion intuitionistic logic (mLJ), classical logic (G3cp), classical linear logic (LL) and its dyadic system (DyLL), intuitionistic linear logic (ILL), and normal modal logics (K and S4). Beyond advocating for the use of rewriting logic as a meta-logical framework, the novel algorithms presented here are able to automatically discharge many proof obligations and ultimately obtain the expected results.

This paper is an extended version of the work [30], bringing not only new results and analyses, but also new uses of the L-Framework tool. In particular:

- *Properties and the spectrum of logics*: the procedures have been updated and extended to automatically check invertibility of rules in a larger class of logical systems, including modal logics and variants of linear logic. Moreover, the current analyses prove stronger properties: invertibility lemmas and admissibility of structural rules are shown to be *height-preserving* (a fact needed in the proof of

cut-elimination). For that, the definitions and necessary conditions in Section 5 were refined.

- *New reasoning techniques:* cut-elimination is probably the most important property of sequent systems. This paper shows how to use the proposed framework to automatically discard most of the cases in proofs of cut-elimination. In some cases, the proposed algorithms are able to complete entire cut-elimination proofs. The cases of failure are also interesting, since they tell much about the reasons for such failure. Some are fixable by proving and adding invertibility and admissibility lemmas. Others can be used in order to shed light on the reason for the failure. Finally, this work also addresses the dual property of identity expansion. Together with cut-elimination, this property is core on designing harmonical systems [12].
- *Pretty printing and output:* the previous implementation has been updated to generate proof terms that can be used, e.g., to produce \LaTeX files with the proof trees in the meta-proofs. This allows for generating documents with complete and detailed proofs of several results in the literature, as well as identifying dependencies among the different theorems.

Outline. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the structural properties of sequent systems that are considered in this work and Section 3 presents order-sorted rewriting logic and its main features as a logical framework. Section 4 presents the machinery used for specifying sequent systems as rewrite theories. Then, Section 5 establishes how to prove the structural properties based on a rewriting approach. Section 6 addresses cut-elimination and identity expansion. The design principles behind the L-Framework are described in Section 7. Section 8 presents different sequent systems and properties that can be proved with the approach. Finally, Section 9 concludes the paper and presents some future research directions.

2 Structural Properties of Sequent-Based Proof Systems

This section presents and illustrates with examples the properties of *admissibility* and *invertibility* of rules in sequent systems [27, 35]. Additional notation and standard definitions are established to make the text self-contained.

Definition 1 (Sequent) Let \mathcal{L} be a formal language consisting of well-formed formulas. A *sequent* is an expression of the form $\Gamma \vdash \Delta$ where Γ (the *antecedent*) and Δ (the *succedent*) are finite multisets of formulas in \mathcal{L} , and \vdash is the *consequence* symbol. If the succedent of a sequent contains at most one formula, it is called *single-conclusion*; otherwise, it is called *multiple-conclusion*.

Definition 2 (Sequent System) A *sequent system* \mathcal{S} is a set of inference rules. Each inference rule is a *rule schema* and a rule instance is a *rule application*. An inference rule has the form

$$\frac{S_1 \quad \cdots \quad S_n}{S} r$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Gamma, p \vdash p} I \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \top} \top_R \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma, \top \vdash C} \top_L \quad \frac{}{\Gamma, \perp \vdash C} \perp_L \\
\frac{\Gamma, F \vdash C \quad \Gamma, G \vdash C}{\Gamma, F \vee G \vdash C} \vee_L \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash F_i}{\Gamma \vdash F_1 \vee F_2} \vee_{R_i} \quad \frac{\Gamma, F, G \vdash C}{\Gamma, F \wedge G \vdash C} \wedge_L \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash F \quad \Gamma \vdash G}{\Gamma \vdash F \wedge G} \wedge_R \\
\frac{\Gamma, F \supset G \vdash F \quad \Gamma, G \vdash C}{\Gamma, F \supset G \vdash C} \supset_L \quad \frac{\Gamma, F \vdash G}{\Gamma \vdash F \supset G} \supset_R
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1: System G3ip for propositional intuitionistic logic. In the I axiom, p is atomic.

where the sequent S is the *conclusion* inferred from the *premise* sequents S_1, \dots, S_n in the rule r . If the set of premises is empty, then r is an *axiom*. In a rule introducing a connective, the formula with that connective in the conclusion sequent is the *principal formula*. When sequents are restricted to having empty antecedents (hence being of the shape $\vdash \Delta$), the system is called *one-sided*; otherwise it is called *two-sided*.

As an example, Fig. 1 presents the two-sided single-conclusion propositional intuitionistic sequent system G3ip [35], with formulas built from the grammar:

$$F, G ::= p \mid \top \mid \perp \mid F \vee G \mid F \wedge G \mid F \supset G$$

where p ranges over atomic propositions. In this system, for instance, the formula $F \vee G$ in the conclusion sequent of the inference rule \vee_L is the principal formula.

Definition 3 (Derivation) A *derivation* in a sequent system \mathcal{S} (called \mathcal{S} -derivation) is a finite rooted tree with nodes labeled by sequents, axioms at the top nodes, and where each node is connected with the (immediate) successor nodes (if any) according to its inference rules. A sequent S is *derivable* in the sequent system \mathcal{S} , notation $\mathcal{S} \blacktriangleright S$, iff there is a derivation of S in \mathcal{S} . The system \mathcal{S} is usually omitted when it can be inferred from the context.

It is important to distinguish the two different notions associated to the symbols \vdash and \blacktriangleright , namely: the former is used to build sequents and the latter denotes derivability in a sequent system.

Definition 4 (Height of derivation) The *height* of a derivation is the greatest number of successive applications of rules in it, where an axiom has height 1. The expression

$$\mathcal{S} \blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash \Delta$$

denotes that the sequent $\Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is derivable in \mathcal{S} with a height of derivation *at most* n . A property is said *height-preserving* if such n is an invariant. The annotated sequent

$$\Gamma \vdash_n \Delta$$

is a shorthand for $\mathcal{S} \blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ when \mathcal{S} is clear from the context. Moreover, when Γ and Δ are unimportant or irrelevant, this notation is further simplified to $n : S$.

In what follows, annotated sequents are freely used in inference rules. For instance, if $s(\cdot)$ represents the successor function on natural numbers, then

$$\frac{n : S_1 \quad \dots \quad n : S_k}{s(n) : S} r$$

represents the annotated rule r stating that

$$\text{if } \mathcal{S} \triangleright_n S_i \text{ for each } i = 1, \dots, k, \text{ then } \mathcal{S} \triangleright_{s(n)} S$$

It may be useful to derive new rules from the ones initially proposed in a system, since this may ease the reasoning when proving properties. Such derived new rules are said to be *admissible* in the system. *Invertibility*, on the other hand, is the admissibility of “upside-down” rules, where the premises of a rule are derived from the conclusion. Invertibility is one of the most important properties in proof theory, since it is the core of proofs of cut-elimination [13], as well as the basis for tailoring focused proof systems [1, 21].

Definition 5 (Admissibility and Invertibility) Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system. An inference rule

$\frac{S_1 \quad \dots \quad S_k}{S}$ is called:

- i. *admissible* in \mathcal{S} if S is derivable in \mathcal{S} whenever S_1, \dots, S_k are derivable in \mathcal{S} .
- ii. *invertible* in \mathcal{S} if the rules $\frac{S}{S_1}, \dots, \frac{S}{S_k}$ are admissible in \mathcal{S} .

The admissibility of structural rules is often required in the proof of other properties. A *structural rule* does not introduce logical connectives, but instead changes the structure of the sequent. Since sequents are built from multisets, such changes are related to the cardinality of a formula or its presence/absence in a context.

In the intuitionistic setting, the structural rules for *weakening* and *contraction*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash C}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash C} W \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma, \Delta, \Delta \vdash C}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash C} C \quad (1)$$

are height-preserving admissible in G3ip. A proof of the admissibility of weakening can be built by induction on the height of derivations (considering all possible rule applications) and it is often independent of any other results. For example, suppose that $G3ip \triangleright_n \Gamma \vdash C$ and consider, e.g., the case where $C = A \supset B$ and that the last rule applied in the proof of $\Gamma \vdash A \supset B$ is \supset_R

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash_{s(i)} A \supset B} \supset_R$$

By inductive hypothesis, the sequent $\Gamma, \Delta, A \vdash B$ is derivable and then,

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Delta, A \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash_{s(i)} A \supset B} \supset_R$$

The same exercise can be done for the other rules of the system, thus showing that W is height-preserving admissible:

G3ip $\blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash C$ implies G3ip $\blacktriangleright_n \Gamma, \Delta \vdash C$

On the other hand, proving invertibility may require the admissibility of weakening. For example, for proving that \supset_R is height-preserving invertible in G3ip, one has to show that G3ip $\blacktriangleright_n \Gamma, F \vdash G$ whenever G3ip $\blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash F \supset G$. The proof follows by induction on the height of the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash F \supset G$. Consider, e.g., the case when $\Gamma = \Gamma', A \supset B$ and the last rule applied is \supset_L

$$\frac{\Gamma', A \supset B \vdash_1 A \quad \Gamma', B \vdash_1 F \supset G}{\Gamma', A \supset B \vdash_{s(i)} F \supset G} \supset_L$$

By inductive hypothesis on the right premise, $\Gamma', B, F \vdash_1 G$ is derivable. Considering the left premise, since $\Gamma \vdash_1 A$ is derivable, height-preserving admissibility of weakening implies that $\Gamma, F \vdash_1 A$ is derivable and the result follows:

$$\frac{\Gamma, F \vdash_1 A \quad \Gamma', B, F \vdash_1 G}{\Gamma, F \vdash_{s(i)} G} \supset_L$$

Note that not all introduction rules in G3ip are invertible: if p_1, p_2 are different atomic propositions, then $p_i \vdash p_1 \vee p_2$ is derivable for $i = 1, 2$, but $p_i \vdash p_j$ is not for $i \neq j$. Indeed, \vee_{R_i} and \supset_L are the only non-invertible rules in G3ip.

Finally, admissibility of contraction (C) often depends on invertibility results. As an example, consider that G3ip $\blacktriangleright_n \Gamma, F \vee G, F \vee G \vdash C$ with last rule applied \vee_L

$$\frac{\Gamma, F \vee G, F \vdash_1 C \quad \Gamma, F \vee G, G \vdash_1 C}{\Gamma, F \vee G, F \vee G \vdash_{s(i)} C} \vee_L$$

The inductive hypothesis cannot be applied since the premises do not have duplicated copies of formulas. Since \vee_L is height-preserving invertible, the derivability of $\Gamma, F \vee G, F \vdash_1 C$ and $\Gamma, F \vee G, G \vdash_1 C$ implies the derivability of $\Gamma, F, F \vdash_1 C$ and $\Gamma, G, G \vdash_1 C$. By induction, $\Gamma, F \vdash_1 C$ and $\Gamma, G \vdash_1 C$ are derivable and the result follows:

$$\frac{\Gamma, F \vdash_1 C \quad \Gamma, G \vdash_1 C}{\Gamma, F \vee G \vdash_{s(i)} C} \vee_L$$

Invertibility and admissibility results will be largely used for showing cut-elimination in Section 6.

3 Rewriting Logic Preliminaries

This section briefly explains order-sorted rewriting logic [24] and its main features as a logical framework. Maude [8] is a language and tool supporting the formal specification and analysis of rewrite theories, which are the specification units of rewriting logic.

An *order-sorted signature* Σ is a tuple $\Sigma = (S, \leq, F)$ with a finite poset of sorts (S, \leq) and a set of function symbols F typed with sorts in S , which can be subsort-overloaded. For $X = \{X_s\}_{s \in S}$ an S -indexed family of disjoint variable sets with each X_s countably infinite, the *set of terms of sort s* and the *set of ground terms of sort*

s are denoted, respectively, by $T_\Sigma(X)_s$ and $T_{\Sigma,s}$; similarly, $T_\Sigma(X)$ and T_Σ denote the set of terms and the set of ground terms. A *substitution* is an S -indexed mapping $\theta : X \rightarrow T_\Sigma(X)$ that is different from the identity only for a finite subset of X and such that $\theta(x) \in T_\Sigma(X)_s$ if $x \in X_s$, for any $x \in X$ and $s \in S$. A substitution θ is called *ground* iff $\theta(x) \in T_\Sigma$ or $\theta(x) = x$ for any $x \in X$. The application of a substitution θ to a term t is denoted by $t\theta$. Acquaintance with the usual notions of *position* p in a term t , *subterm* $t|_p$ at position p , and *term replacement* $t[u]_p$ at of t 's subterm at position p with term u is assumed (see, e.g., [11]). The expression $u \preceq t$ (resp., $u \prec t$) denotes that term u is a subterm (resp., proper subterm) of term t . Given a term $t \in T_\Sigma(X)$, $\bar{t} \in T_{(S, \leq, F \cup C_{\bar{T}})}(X)$ is the ground term obtained from t by turning each variable $x \in \text{vars}(t)$ of sort $s \in S$ into the fresh constant \bar{x} of sort s and where $C_{\bar{T}} = \{\bar{x} \mid x \in \text{vars}(t)\}$.

A *rewrite theory* is a tuple $\mathcal{R} = (\Sigma, E \uplus B, R)$ with: (i) $(\Sigma, E \uplus B)$ an order-sorted equational theory with signature Σ , E a set of (possibly conditional) equations over $T_\Sigma(X)$, and B a set of structural axioms – disjoint from the set of equations E – over $T_\Sigma(X)$ for which there is a finitary matching algorithm (e.g., associativity, commutativity, and identity, or combinations of them); and (ii) R a finite set of rewrite rules over $T_\Sigma(X)$ (possibly with equational conditions). A rewrite theory \mathcal{R} induces a rewrite relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ on $T_\Sigma(X)$ defined for every $t, u \in T_\Sigma(X)$ by $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} u$ if and only if there is a *one-step* rewrite proof of $(\forall X)t \rightarrow u$ in \mathcal{R} . More precisely, $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} u$ iff there is a rule $(l \rightarrow r \text{ if } \gamma) \in R$, a term t' , a position p in t' , and a substitution $\theta : X \rightarrow T_\Sigma(X)$ satisfying $t =_{E \uplus B} t' = t'[l\theta]_p$, $u =_{E \uplus B} t'[r\theta]_p$, and $\mathcal{R} \vdash \gamma\theta$.

The tuple $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{R}} = (\mathcal{I}_{\Sigma/E}, \overset{*}{\rightarrow}_{\mathcal{R}})$, where $\overset{*}{\rightarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the reflexive-transitive closure of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, is called the *initial reachability model* of \mathcal{R} [3]. An inductive property of a rewrite theory \mathcal{R} does not need to hold for any model of \mathcal{R} , but just for $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Using a suitable inductive inference system, for example, one based on a convenient notion of constructors as proposed in [34], the semantic entailment \models in $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{R}}$ can be under-approximated by an inductive inference relation \Vdash in \mathcal{R} , which is shown to be sound with respect to \models (i.e., for any property φ , if $\mathcal{R} \Vdash \varphi$, then $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{R}} \models \varphi$). A Σ -sentence $(\forall X)\varphi$ is called an *inductive consequence* of \mathcal{R} iff $\mathcal{R} \Vdash (\forall X)\varphi$, and this implies that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{R}} \models \varphi$.

Appropriate requirements are needed to make an equational theory \mathcal{R} *executable* in Maude. It is assumed that the equations E can be oriented into a set of (possibly conditional) sort-decreasing, operationally terminating, and confluent rewrite rules \overrightarrow{E} modulo B [8]. For a rewrite theory \mathcal{R} , the rewrite relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is undecidable in general, even if its underlying equational theory is executable, unless conditions such as coherence [36] are given (i.e., rewriting with $\rightarrow_{R/E \uplus B}$ can be decomposed into rewriting with $\rightarrow_{E/B}$ and $\rightarrow_{R/B}$). The executability of a rewrite theory \mathcal{R} ultimately means that its mathematical and execution semantics coincide.

In this paper, the rewriting logic specification of a sequent system \mathcal{S} is a rewrite theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}, E_{\mathcal{S}} \uplus B_{\mathcal{S}}, R_{\mathcal{S}})$ where: $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$ is an order-sorted signature describing the syntax of the logic \mathcal{S} ; $E_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a set of executable equations modulo the structural axioms $B_{\mathcal{S}}$; and $R_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a set of executable rewrite rules modulo $B_{\mathcal{S}}$ capturing those non-deterministic aspects of logical inference in \mathcal{S} that require proof search. The point is that although both the computation rules $E_{\mathcal{S}}$ and the deduction rules $R_{\mathcal{S}}$

are executed by rewriting modulo $B_{\mathcal{G}}$, by the executability assumptions on $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$, the rewrite relation $\rightarrow_{E_{\mathcal{G}}/B_{\mathcal{G}}}$ has a single outcome in the form of a canonical form and thus can be executed blindly with a “don’t care” non-deterministic strategy. Furthermore, $B_{\mathcal{G}}$ provides yet one more level of computational automation in the form of $B_{\mathcal{G}}$ -matching and $B_{\mathcal{G}}$ -unification algorithms. This interplay between axioms, equations, and rewrite rules can ultimately make the executable specification $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$ very efficient with modest memory requirements.

Finally, the expression $CSU_B(t, u)$ denotes the *complete set of unifiers* of terms t and u modulo the structural axioms B . Recall that for each substitution $\sigma : X \rightarrow T_{\Sigma}(X)$, there are substitutions $\theta \in CSU_B(t, u)$ and $\gamma : X \rightarrow T_{\Sigma}(X)$ such that $\sigma =_B \theta\gamma$. For a combination of free and associative and/or commutative and/or identity axioms B , except for symbols that are associative but not commutative, such a finitary unification algorithm exists [16]. In the case of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$, the structural axioms are identity, commutativity, and associativity, which are the usual structural axioms for multisets of formulas and sequents.

4 A Rewriting View of Sequent Systems

This section presents the machinery used for specifying a propositional sequent system \mathcal{S} as a rewrite theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Such a framework is equipped with sorts that represent formulas, set of formulas, sequents, and lists of sequents. The user of the framework is expected to inhabit the sort for formulas in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ with the concrete syntax of the system \mathcal{S} . This has the immediate effect of fully inhabiting the remaining sorts of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$. As shown below, rewrite rules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ correspond to backwards inference rules of \mathcal{S} , so that proof-search in the former is successful whenever all leaves in a proof-tree are instances of axioms. The system G3ip (Fig. 1) is used throughout the section for illustrating the proposed approach.

The notation of Maude [8] is adopted as an alternative representation to the rewriting logic one introduced in Section 3. This decision has the immediate effect of producing an executable specification of sequent systems, while providing a precise mathematical semantics of the given definitions. Additional details about the implementation in Maude are given in Section 7.

As a reference for the development of this section, Maude declarations are summarized next.

```

mod M is ... endm          --- rewrite theory M
sort S .                  --- declaration of sort S
subsort S1 < S2 .        --- subsort relation
op f : S1, ..., Sn -> T . --- function symbol f of sort S1, ..., Sn --> T
op c : -> T .             --- constant c of sort T
rl [rule-name] : l => r . --- rewrite rule with name 'rule-name'
crl [rule-name] : l => r if c . --- conditional rewrite rule

```

An order-sorted signature $\Sigma_{\mathcal{G}}$ defining the sorts for building formulas (and multisets of formulas and sequents, which are introduced later), is assumed:

```

sort Prop .              --- Atomic propositions
sort Formula .          --- Formulas
subsort Prop < Formula . --- Atomic propositions are formulas

```

The object logic to be specified must provide suitable constructors for these two sorts. For instance:

```
mod G3i is
...
op p : Nat -> Prop .          --- Atomic Propositions
op _/\_ : Formula Formula -> Formula . --- Conjunction
op False : -> Formula .     --- False/bottom
...
endm
```

Atomic propositions take the form $p(n)$, where the natural number n is the identifier of the proposition (e.g., the proposition p_3 is written as $p(3)$). Constructors for `Prop` are not allowed to have arguments of type `Formula`.

Multisets of formulas are built in the usual way:

```
sort MSFormula .          --- Multiset of Formulas
subsort Formula < MSFormula . --- A formula is a singleton multiset of formulas
op * : -> MSFormula .    --- Empty multiset
op _;_ : MSFormula MSFormula -> MSFormula [assoc comm id: * ] . --- Union
```

Given two multisets M and N , the term $M;N$ denotes $M \uplus N$. Note that the mixfix operator `op _;_` (in Maude, `_` denotes the position of the parameters) is declared with three structural axioms: associativity, commutativity, and the empty multiset as its identity element. Due to the subsort relation `Formula < MSFormula`, the sort `Formula` is the least sort of a formula F , while F is also a singleton containing F .

Sequents, as expected, are built as pairs of multisets of formulas. A *goal* is a list of sequents to be proved:

```
sorts Sequent Goal .          --- Sequents and lists of sequents
subsort Sequent < Goal .
op _|_ : MSFormula MSFormula -> Sequent . --- Sequents
--- Goals: List of sequents to be proved
op proved : -> Goal [ctor] . --- The empty list of sequents
op _|_ : Goal Goal -> Goal [frozen(2) id: proved] .
```

The attribute `frozen` used in the declaration of the operator `op _|_` (goals' concatenation) means that inference steps can only be performed on the head of a non-empty list of goals (i.e., the usual 'head-tails' recursive structure). More precisely, the attribute `frozen(2)` defines a rewriting strategy where the second parameter cannot be subject of rewriting. In this way, only the first sequent s in the list $s \mid G$ can be reduced until it becomes `proved` (when possible), as will be explained shortly.

Inference rules in the rewrite theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$ are specified as rewrite rules that rewrite list of sequents. There are two options for expressing an inference rule as a rewrite rule. Namely, they can be axiomatized as *backwards* inference (i.e., from conclusion to premises) or as *forward* inference (i.e., from premises to conclusion). In this paper, as explained in Section 3, the backwards inference approach is adopted, so that a proof-search process advances by rewriting the target goal of an inference rule to its premises, thus aiming at a bottom-up proof-search procedure. For instance, the initial rule, and the left and right introduction rules for conjunction in the system `G3ip` are specified as follows:

```
var P : Prop .
```

```

var Gamma : MSFormula .
vars A B C : Formula .
--- Rules
rl [I] : P ; Gamma |-- P => proved .
rl [AndL] : A /\ B ; Gamma |-- C => A ; B ; Gamma |-- C .
rl [AndR] : Gamma |-- A /\ B => (Gamma |-- A) | (Gamma |-- B) .

```

Variables in rules are implicitly universally quantified. The type of variables is specified with the syntax `var x : s`. Hence, the initial rule must be read as

$$(\forall P : \text{Prop}, \Gamma : \text{MSFormula})(P, \Gamma \vdash P) \rightarrow \text{proved}$$

The constant `proved` denotes the empty list of goals or, equivalently, the empty collection of (pending) proof obligations. Rules with more than one premise, such as `AndR`, are specified using `op: _|_`. Modulo the axioms $B_{\mathcal{S}}$, a term `proved | G` is structurally equal to `G`, thus making the goal `G` automatically active for proof-search under the rewrite strategy declared for goals.

As illustrated with the running example, the syntax of the object logic in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$, as well as its inference rules, is straightforward. This is usually called in rewriting logic the ε -representational distance [25], where the system being specified mathematically as a rewrite theory and its codification in Maude as a system module are basically the same. This is certainly an appealing feature that can widen the adoption of the framework proposed here for implementing and analyzing sequent systems.

In face of the ε -representational distance, the adequacy of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ with respect to \mathcal{S} follows from the soundness of rewriting logic itself.

Proposition 1 (Adequacy) *Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system, $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ the resulting rewrite theory encoding the syntax and inference rules of \mathcal{S} , S a sequent in \mathcal{S} , and t_S its representation in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{S} \triangleright S \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \Vdash t_S \xrightarrow{*} \text{proved}.$$

Observe that the proof of a sequent S in \mathcal{S} may follow different strategies depending on the order the subgoals are proved. Such strategies are irrelevant because all the branches in the derivation of a proof must be closed (i.e., ending with an instance of an axiom). Hence, if S is provable, it can be proved using the strategy enforced by `op _|_` in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$: always trying to first solve the left-most subgoal of the pending goals.

Let r be a sequent rule in \mathcal{S} and R the corresponding rewrite rule in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Modulo the associativity and commutativity of multisets of formulas, it is easy to show that, for any sequent S and its representation t_S , $t_S \xrightarrow{1}_{R_{\mathcal{S}}} t'_S$ iff t'_S is the representation of the premises (where `proved` means no premises) obtained when r is applied (on the same active formula) in S . Hence, rewrite steps are in one-to-one correspondence with proof search (bottom-up) steps in \mathcal{S} -derivations.

When using the proposed framework, the resulting rewrite theory becomes a proof search procedure. For instance, Maude's command

```
search p(1) /\ p(2) |-- p(2) /\ p(1) =>* proved .
```

answers the question of whether the sequent $p_1 \wedge p_2 \vdash p_2 \wedge p_1$ is provable in G3ip.

For the proof analyses later developed in this paper, operations to the rewrite theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ are added. A new constructor for annotated sequents (see Definition 4) and also a copy of the inference rules dealing with annotations are included:

```

op _:_ : Nat Sequent -> Sequent . --- Annotated sequents
var k : Nat .
--- Automatically generated annotated sequent rules
rl [I] : s(k) : P ; Gamma |-- P => proved.
rl [AndL] : s(k) : A /\ B ; Gamma |-- C => k : A ; B ; Gamma |-- C .
rl [AndR] : s(k) : Gamma |-- A /\ B =>
  ( k : Gamma |-- A ) | ( k : Gamma |-- B ) .

```

The function application $s(\cdot)$ denotes the successor function on Nat . Note that axioms are annotated with an arbitrary height $k \geq 1$. In rules with two premises, both of them are marked with the same label. This is, without loss of generality, since it is always possible to obtain larger annotations from shorter ones (see Theorem 1).

In the rest of the paper, given a sequent system \mathcal{S} , $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ will denote the resulting rewrite theory that encodes the syntax, inference, and annotated inference rules of \mathcal{S} . By abusing the notation, when a sequent $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is used in the context of the rewrite theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ (e.g., in $S \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}} S'$), such S must be understood as the corresponding term $t_S \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}}(X)$ representing S in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Similarly, “a sequent rule r ” in the context of the theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is to be understood as “the representation of r in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ ”. The expression $\mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_2$ denotes the extension of the theory \mathcal{R}_1 by adding the inference rules of \mathcal{R}_2 (and *vice versa*); in this case, the sequents in the resulting theory $\mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_2$ are terms in the signature $\Sigma_{\mathcal{R}_1} \cup \Sigma_{\mathcal{R}_2}$. If S is a sequent, the expression $\mathcal{R} \cup \{S\}$ denotes the extension resulting from \mathcal{R} by adding the sequent S as an axiom, understood as a zero-premise rule (i.e., \mathcal{R} is extended with the rule `rl [ax] S => proved .`). Moreover, given a rewrite theory \mathcal{R} and a sequent S , the notation $\mathcal{R} \Vdash S$ means $\mathcal{R} \Vdash S \xrightarrow{*} \text{proved}$, i.e., there is a derivation of S in the system specified by \mathcal{R} . Similarly, for annotated sequents, $\mathcal{R} \Vdash n : S$ means $\mathcal{R} \Vdash (n : S) \xrightarrow{*} \text{proved}$.

Theorem 1 *Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system, S a sequent, and $k \geq 1$. Then,*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \Vdash k : S \quad \text{implies} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \Vdash s(k) : S.$$

Proof By induction on k . If $k = 1$, then S is necessarily an instance of an axiom and $s(1) : S \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}} \text{proved}$ using the same axiom. The case $k > 1$ is immediate by applying induction on the premises (with shorter derivations).

5 Proving Admissibility and Invertibility

This section presents rewrite- and narrowing-based techniques for proving admissibility and invertibility of inference rules of a sequent system specified as a rewrite theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ (see Section 4). They are presented as meta-theorems about sequent systems with the help of rewrite-related scaffolding, such as terms and substitutions, and they provide sufficient conditions for obtaining the desired properties. The system G3ip is, as in previous sections, used as running example (Section 8 presents the complete set of case studies).

The procedures proposed here heavily depend on *unification*, hence a brief discussion on the subject is presented next. First, note that, if no additional axioms are

added to the symbols in the syntax of the object logic \mathcal{S} , the existence of a unification algorithm for terms in the sort `sequent` is guaranteed. As a matter of example, consider the unification of the conclusions of the right and left rules for conjunction in G3ip. Unification problems take the form $t_1 =? t_1' \wedge \dots \wedge t_n =? t_n'$ and Maude's command `variant unify` computes the set of unifiers modulo the declared axioms in the theory:

```
variant unify suc(n) : A /\ B ; Gamma |-- C =? suc(n') : Gamma' |-- A' /\ B' .
```

```
Unifier #1
n --> %3:FNat          n' --> %3:FNat
A --> %1:Formula       A' --> %4:Formula
B --> %2:Formula       B' --> %5:Formula
C --> %4:Formula /\ %5:Formula
Gamma --> %6:MSFormula
Gamma' --> %6:MSFormula ; %1:Formula /\ %2:Formula
```

```
No more unifiers.
```

Observe that the variables of the second rule are renamed to avoid clash of names. The term `%1:Formula` denotes a fresh variable of sort `Formula`. Let t and t' be the two terms in the above unification problem and θ the (unique) substitution computed. Consider the least signature $\Sigma'_{\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S}}$ that contains $\Sigma_{\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S}}$ as well as a fresh constant `%i.Type` for each variable `%i.Type` in $t\theta$. Note the “:” in the variable `%i.Type` and the “.” in the constant `%i.Type`. To avoid confusion, when the sort can be inferred from the context, the constant `%i.Type` is written as `%i`, but variables always carry their typing information. In this example, $\Sigma'_{\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S}}$ extends $\Sigma_{\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S}}$ with constants `op %1 : -> Formula .`, `op %6 : -> MSFormula .`, etc. The ground term $\overline{t\theta}$ in the signature $\Sigma'_{\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S}}$ is `s(%4) : %1 /\ %2 ; %6 |-- %4 /\ %5`. As expected, on this (ground) sequent it is possible to apply both `AndL` and `AndR`.

5.1 Admissibility of Rules

This section introduces sufficient conditions to prove theorems of the form

$$\text{if } \mathcal{S} \triangleright_n \Gamma' \vdash \Delta', \text{ then } \mathcal{S} \triangleright_n \Gamma \vdash \Delta$$

i.e., height preserving admissibility of the rule ²

$$\frac{\Gamma' \vdash \Delta'}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta} r$$

Admissibility is often proved by induction on the height of the derivation π of the sequent $\Gamma' \vdash \Delta'$ in combination with case analysis on the last rule applied in π . It turns out that this analysis may depend on other results. For example, as illustrated in Section 2, proving admissibility of contraction often depends on invertibility results.

² The admissibility problems considered in this section correspond to one-premise rules only. Observe that a general approach for proving admissibility of rules with more than one premise does not exist. Indeed, cut-elimination itself is an admissibility problem, which will be addressed in Section 6.

Hence, any general definition of admissibility of rules in the rewriting setting has to internalize such reasoning. This will be formalized by *closing* the leaves in π w.r.t. theorems of the form “if S_1 is provable, so is S_2 ”. Such theorems will be encoded as rewrite rules of the form $r : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$. More precisely, let t_s be a ground term denoting a sequent and $r : t \rightarrow t'$ be a rule. The set

$$\llbracket t_s \rrbracket_r = \{t_s\} \cup \{t'\theta \mid \theta \in CSU(t, t_s)\}$$

is the least set containing t_s and the resulting premises after the instantiation of r in t_s . Let T_s be a set of ground terms and $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$ be a set of theorems of the form $r_k : t^k \rightarrow t_1^k$. Then,

$$\llbracket T_s \rrbracket_R = T_s \cup \bigcup_{k \in 1..m} \{t_1^k \theta \mid t \in T_s, \theta \in CSU(t^k, t)\}.$$

Proofs of admissibility need to consider all the cases of the last rule applied in a proof π . Definition 6 identifies rules that are height-preserving admissible *relative* to one of the sequent rules of the system.

Definition 6 (Local admissibility) Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system, \mathcal{R} be a (possibly empty) set of rules, and $r_t \in \mathcal{S}$ and r_s be rules given by

$$\frac{k : T_1 \cdots k : T_n}{s(k) : T} r_t \quad \frac{S_1}{S} r_s$$

The rule r_s is *height-preserving admissible relative to r_t in \mathcal{S}* under the assumptions \mathcal{S} iff assuming that $i : S_1$ is provable then, for each $\theta \in CSU(i : S_1, s(k) : T)$,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \{\overline{\{(k : T_j)\theta} \mid j \in 1..n\}}\}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \{(\forall \vec{x})(\overline{k\theta} : S_1 \rightarrow \overline{k\theta} : S)\} \Vdash \overline{(i : S)\theta},$$

where $\text{vars}(i : S_1) \cap \text{vars}(s(k) : T) = \emptyset$ and $\vec{x} = \text{vars}(S) \cup \text{vars}(S_1)$.

For proving admissibility of the rule r_s , the goal is to prove that, if S_1 is derivable with height i , then S is also derivable with at most the same height. The proof follows by induction on i (the height of a derivation π of S_1). Suppose that the last rule applied in π is r_t . This is only possible if S_1 and T “are the same”, up to substitutions. Hence, the idea is that each unifier θ of $i : S_1$ and $s(k) : T$ covers the cases where the rule r_t can be applied on the sequent S_1 . For computing this unifier, it is assumed that the rules do not share variables (the implementation takes care of renaming the variables if needed). A proof obligation is generated for each unifier. Consider, for instance, the proof obligation of the ground sequent $\overline{(i : S)\theta}$ for a given $\theta \in CSU(i : S_1, s(k) : T)$. This means that, as hypothesis, the derivation below is valid

$$\frac{(k : T_1)\theta \quad \cdots \quad (k : T_n)\theta}{(i : S_1)\theta} r_t \quad (2)$$

Hence, all the premises in this derivation are assumed derivable. This is the purpose of extending the theory with the following set of ground sequents (which are interpreted as rules of the form $t \rightarrow \text{proved}$):

$$\{\overline{(k : T_j)\theta} \mid j \in 1..n\} \quad (3)$$

The proof of admissibility theorems may require auxiliary lemmas. Assuming the theorems \mathcal{I} , the sequents resulting after an application of $r \in \mathcal{I}$ to the sequents in Equation 3 can be also assumed to be provable (notation $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\mathcal{I}}$). The typical instantiation of \mathcal{I} in admissibility analysis will be the already proved invertibility lemmas.

If $\theta \in CSU(i : S_1, s(k) : T)$, then θ should map k to a fresh variable, say $\%1 : \text{Nat}$ and i to $s(\%1 : \text{Nat})$. Hence, the (ground) goal $\overline{(i : S)\theta}$ to be proved takes the form $s(\%1) : \overline{S\theta}$ where $\%1 = \overline{k\theta}$ is the freshly generated constant in the extended signature. By induction, it can be assumed that the theorem (i.e., S_1 implies S) is valid for shorter derivations, i.e., derivations of height at most $\%1$. This is the purpose of the added rule

$$\{(\forall \bar{x})(\overline{k\theta} : S_1 \rightarrow \overline{k\theta} : S)\} \quad (4)$$

where the height of the derivation is “frozen” to be the constant $\overline{k\theta}$. This allows for applying r_s only on sequent of height $\overline{k\theta}$. In particular, induction can be used on all the premises of the rule r_i in Equation (2).

If it is possible to show that the ground sequent $\overline{(i : S)\theta}$ is derivable from the extended rewrite theory, then the admissibility result will work for the particular case when r_i is the last applied rule in the derivation π of S_1 . Since a complete set of unifiers is finite for terms of the sort Sequent , then there are finitely many proof obligations to discharge in order to check if a rule is admissible relative to a rule in a sequent system. Observe that the set $CSU(i : S, s(k) : T)$ may be empty. In this case, the set of proof obligations is empty and the property vacuously holds.

The base cases in this proof correspond to axiom rules. Consider for instance the case where r_i is the initial rule in the system G3ip. Since there are no premises, the set in Equation (3) is empty and hence there are no ground sequents of the form $\%1 : \overline{T_j\theta}$ as hypothesis. Consider the hypothetical case that $s(\%1) : \overline{S\theta}$ is rewritten to a term of the form $\%1 : s'$ by using another rule of the system (different from the initial rule r_i). Note that it is not possible to use the rule in Equation (4) to reduce the goal to proved: an application of this rule produces inevitably yet another sequent of the form $\%1 : s''$. Thus the only hope to finishing the proof is to apply the initial rule on the sequent $s(\%1) : \overline{S\theta}$ and the rule in Equation (4) is never used in such a proof.

The notion of admissibility relative to a rule is the key step in the inductive argument, when establishing sufficient conditions for the admissibility of a rule in a sequent system.

Theorem 2 *Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system, \mathcal{I} be a (possibly empty) set of rules, and $\frac{\Gamma' \vdash \Delta'}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta} r_s$ be an inference rule. If r_s is admissible relative to each r_i in \mathcal{S} under the assumption \mathcal{I} , then r_s is height-preserving admissible in \mathcal{S} under the assumption \mathcal{I} , i.e., $\mathcal{S} \blacktriangleright_n \Gamma' \vdash \Delta'$ implies $\mathcal{S} \blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ assuming the theorems \mathcal{I} .*

Proof Assume that $\Gamma' \vdash_n \Delta'$ is derivable in the system \mathcal{S} . The proof proceeds by induction on n with case analysis on the last rule applied. Assume that the last applied rule is r_i . By hypothesis (using Definition 6), it can be concluded that $\Gamma \vdash_n \Delta$ is derivable and the result follows.

It is important to highlight the rationale behind Definition 6, which is similar to the results in the forthcoming sections. The proof search procedures try to show

that $\overline{(i : S)\theta}$ is provable by reducing it to `provable` (Proposition 1). Since rules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$ are encoded in a backward fashion (rewriting the conclusion into the premises), the procedure attempts to build a bottom-up derivation of that sequent. The set of assumptions (Equation (3)) is added as axioms and it is closed under the rules in \mathcal{S} . The closure reflects a forward reasoning: if the (ground) sequent S is provable and theorem $r \in \mathcal{S}$ applies on it, then the right-hand side of r can be also assumed to be provable. During the search procedure, a goal is immediately discharged if it belongs to that set of assumptions. Finally, the induction principle is encoded by specializing the theorem to be proved, and allowing applications of it to ground sequents with shorter height annotations (Equation (4)).

The proof of admissibility of weakening for G3ip and some other systems studied in Section 8 does not rely on any result (and hence, \mathcal{S} is empty). Also, the proof of Theorem 1, mechanized by stating it as the admissibility of the annotated rule

$$\frac{n : S}{s(n) : S} \text{ H} \quad (5)$$

is also proved with $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ in all the systems in Section 8. The proof of contraction requires some invertibility lemmas and they must be added to \mathcal{S} . The use of \mathcal{S} thus presents a convenient and modular approach because properties can be proved incrementally.

5.2 Invertibility of Rules

This section gives a general definition for proving height-preserving invertibility of rules. Observe that such analysis is done premise-wise. The case of rules with several premises is performed for each one of them separately. For instance, consider the rule \supset_L of G3ip, and let \supset_{L1} and \supset_{L2} be the rules

$$\frac{\Gamma, F \supset G \vdash C}{\Gamma, F \supset G \vdash F} \supset_{L1} \quad \frac{\Gamma, F \supset G \vdash C}{\Gamma, G \vdash C} \supset_{L2}$$

It can be shown that \supset_{L1} is not admissible while \supset_{L2} is. Hence, \supset_L is invertible only in its right premise (see Definition 5).

Some invertibility results depend on, e.g., the admissibility of weakening. Hence, for modularity, the invertibility analysis is parametric under a set of rules \mathcal{H} of admissible rules of the system (that can be used during the proof search procedure).

Definition 7 (Local invertibility) Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system and \mathcal{H} be a (possibly empty) set of rules. Consider the following annotated inference rules:

$$\frac{k : S_1 \cdots k : S_m}{s(k) : S} r_s \quad \frac{m : T_1 \cdots m : T_n}{s(m) : T} r_t$$

Under the assumption \mathcal{H} , the premise $l \in 1..m$ of the rule r_s is *height-preserving invertible relative to the rule r_t* iff for each $\theta \in CSU(s(k) : S, s(m) : T)$:

$$\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \left\{ \overline{(m : T_j)\theta} \mid j \in 1..n \right\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in 1..n} \left\{ \overline{(m : S_l)\gamma} \mid \gamma \in CSU(k : S, \overline{(m : T_j)\theta}) \right\} \Vdash \overline{(k : S_l)\theta}$$

where the variables in S and T are assumed disjoint. Under the assumption \mathcal{H} , the rule r_s is height-preserving invertible relative to r_t if all its premises are.

In order to show the invertibility of a rule r_s , the goal is to check that derivability is not lost when moving from the conclusion S to the premises S_1, \dots, S_m . Each premise S_l entails a different proof obligation. Let $\frac{S_l}{S} r_{sl}$ be the ‘‘sliced’’ version of rule r_s when the case of the premise $l \in 1..m$ is considered. The proof is by induction on the derivation π of S . Suppose that the last rule applied in π is r_t . Observe that this is only possible if S and T unify. Let $\theta \in CSU(s(k) : S, s(m) : T)$ and assume that $\theta(k) = \%1 : \text{Nat}$ (and hence $\theta(m) = \%1 : \text{Nat}$). The resulting derivation π takes the form

$$\frac{\%1 : \overline{T_1\theta} \dots \%1 : \overline{T_n\theta}}{s(\%1) : \overline{S\theta}} r_t \quad (6)$$

The premises of this derivation are assumed to be provable and the theory is extended with the axioms $(m : T_j)\theta$. Since those premises have shorter derivations, induction applies on them. More precisely, given that the ground sequent $(m : T_j)\theta$ is provable and the rule r_{sl} can be applied on it, the resulting sequent after the application of r_{sl} is also provable with the same height of derivation $m\theta$:

$$\text{if } \frac{T_j S_l}{T_j \theta} r_{sl} \text{ then the sequent } T_j S_l \text{ is provable with height } \%1 \quad (7)$$

This inductive reasoning is captured by the expression

$$\bigcup_{j \in 1..n} \{ \overline{(m : S_l)\gamma} \mid \gamma \in CSU(k : S, \overline{(m : T_j)\theta}) \}$$

The unifier γ checks whether it is possible to apply r_{sl} on the premise T_j . If this is the case, the resulting premise $S_l\gamma$ is added as an axiom. If, from the extended theory, it is possible to prove derivable the premise S_l with height $k\theta$, then the invertibility result will work for the particular case when r_t was the last applied rule in the derivation π of S . If the set $CSU(s(k)S, s(m) : T)$ is empty, it means that the rules r_t and r_s cannot be applied on the same sequent and the property vacuously holds for that particular case of r_t . For instance, in G3ip, the proof of invertibility of \wedge_R does not need to consider the case of invertibility relative to \vee_R since it is not possible to have, at the same time, a conjunction and a disjunction on the succedent of the sequent. In multiple-conclusion systems as e.g. G3cp (see Section 8.3), this proof obligation is not vacuously discarded.

Theorem 3 presents sufficient conditions for checking the invertibility of a rule r_s in a sequent system. Note that if r_s is a rule without premises (i.e., an axiom), the result vacuously holds. Hence, only the case for $m \geq 1$ premises is considered. The proof of the next theorem is similar to the one given for Theorem 2.

Theorem 3 *Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system, \mathcal{H} be a set of rules, and r_s be an inference rule with $m \geq 1$ premises in \mathcal{S} . Let $l \in 1..m$. If the premise l of r_s is height-preserving invertible relative to each r_t in \mathcal{S} under the assumption \mathcal{H} , then the premise l in r_s is height-preserving invertible in \mathcal{S} under the assumption \mathcal{H} .*

Most of the proofs of invertibility require Theorem 1 and, in some cases, admissibility of weakening. Hence, the assumption \mathcal{H} must contain those theorems for each case. The dependencies among the different proofs will be stated in Section 8 for each of the systems under analysis.

6 Proving Cut-Elimination and Identity Expansion

One of the most fundamental properties of a proof system is *analyticity*, expressing that in a proof of a given formula F , only subformulas of F need to appear. In sequent calculus, this property is often proved by showing that the *cut-rule* is admissible. Roughly, the cut-rule introduces an auxiliary lemma A in the reasoning “if A follows from C and B follows from A , then B follows from C ”. The admissibility of the cut rule (known as the cut-elimination property) states that adding intermediary lemmas does not change the set of theorems of the logical system. That is, the lemma A is not needed in the proofs of the system. This implies that, if B is provable from the hypothesis C , then there exists a direct (cut-free) proof of this fact.

The cut-rule may take different forms depending on the logical system at hand. For concreteness, consider the following cut-rule for the system G3ip:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash B} \text{Cut} \quad (8)$$

This rule has an *additive* flavor: the context Γ is shared by the premises. Later, different cut-rules will be considered, including multiplicative-like cut-rules (splitting the context Γ in the premises) and also cut-rules for one-sided sequent systems.

Gentzen’s style proof of admissibility of the cut-rule [13] generally follows by proving that top-most applications of cut can be eliminated. This is usually done via a nested induction on the *complexity* of the cut-lemma A and sub-induction on the *cut-height*, i.e., the sum of the heights of the derivations of the premises. In the following, the rationale behind this cut-elimination procedure will be formalized by means of rewrite-based conditions. The next section discusses how these conditions become a semi-automatic procedure for checking the cut-elimination property for different logical systems.

The analyses in Section 5 showed how to inductively reason on the height of derivations inside the rewriting logic framework. But what about the induction on the complexity of formulas? In general, it is possible to inductively reason about terms built from algebraic specifications. The unification of a sequent against the conclusion of an inference rule $r_s \in \mathcal{S}$ uniquely determines the active formula F introduced by r_s . Since terms in the sort `Formula` are inductively generated from the constructors of that sort, special attention can be given to the sub-terms (if any) of F since those are the *only* candidates that are useful to build the needed inductive hypothesis in the cut-elimination proof. Such sub-terms are called *auxiliary formulas*.

Gentzen’s procedure consists of reducing topmost cut-applications to the atomic case, then showing that these cuts can be eliminated. The reduction step to be performed depends on the status of the cut-formula in the premises: *principal* on both or *non-principal* on at least one premise. This procedure is formalized next.

Principal Cases. If the cut-formula is principal (see Definition 2) in both premises of the cut-rule, then induction on the *complexity* of the cut-formula is applied. For instance, consider the case when the cut-formula is $A \wedge B$:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash_n A \quad \Gamma \vdash_n B}{\Gamma \vdash_{s(n)} A \wedge B} \wedge_R \quad \frac{\Gamma, A, B \vdash_m C}{\Gamma, A \wedge B \vdash_{s(m)} C} \wedge_L}{\Gamma \vdash C} \text{Cut} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash B}{\Gamma, A \vdash B} W \quad \Gamma, A, B \vdash C}{\Gamma, A \vdash C} \text{Cut}}{\Gamma \vdash C} \text{Cut}$$

Both applications of the cut-rule in the right-hand derivation are on smaller formulas and then induction applies. Note that this kind of reduction does not necessarily preserve the height of the derivation. Hence, no height-annotation can be used on the resulting premises. Note also that weakening is needed in order to match the derivation leaves.

If the cut-formula $A \wedge B$ is frozen (making A, B constants of type `Formula`), then the inductive reasoning is formalized with the following rules:

```
r1 [cutF] : Gamma |-- C => (Gamma |-- cA) | (Gamma, cA |- C)
r1 [cutF] : Gamma |-- C => (Gamma |-- cB) | (Gamma, cB |- C)
```

Here cA, cB are constants representing the sub-terms of the ground term $\overline{A \wedge B}$. The other terms are variables. More generally, if the cut formula is a term of the form $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, each t_i of sort `Formula` gives rise to a different rule. In the case of constants (e.g., `False`) and atomic propositions (no sub-terms of sort `Formula`), the set of generated rules is empty.

Non-principal Cases. The non-principal cases in the proof of cut-elimination require permuting up the application of the cut-rule w.r.t. the application of an inference rule, thus reducing the *cut-height*. As an example, assume that the left premise of the cut-rule is the conclusion of an application of the rule \wedge_L . Hence, it must be the case that the antecedent of the sequent contains a conjunct $F \wedge G$. The reduction is as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma, F, G \vdash_n A}{\Gamma, F \wedge G \vdash_{s(n)} A} \wedge_L \quad \Gamma, F \wedge G, A \vdash_{s(m)} B}{\Gamma, F \wedge G \vdash B} \text{Cut} \quad \rightsquigarrow \quad \frac{\Gamma, F, G \vdash_n A \quad \Gamma, F, G, A \vdash_{s(m)} B}{\Gamma, F, G \vdash B} \text{Cut}}{\Gamma, F \wedge G \vdash B} \wedge_L$$

Permuting up cuts results in an application of the cut-rule on shorter derivations. The top-rightmost sequent in the right-hand side derivation is deduced via the height-preserving invertibility of the \wedge_L rule and the fact that $\Gamma, F \wedge G, A \vdash_{s(m)} B$ is provable. Similar reductions are possible when the cut formula A is not principal in the right premise of the cut-rule.

If the height of the premises in the above derivation is frozen, it is possible to extend the theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{G}}$ with two new rules that exactly mimic the behavior of replacing a non-principal cut with a smaller one. Those rules are:

```
r1 [CutH] : Gamma |-- G => (cn : Gamma |-- cA) | (s(cm) : Gamma, cA |-- G) .
r1 [CutH] : Gamma |-- G => (s(cn) : Gamma |-- cA) | (cm : Gamma, cA |-- G) .
```

where cn (resp., cm) is the frozen constant resulting from n (resp., m) and cA the ground term representing the cut-formula. The first rule reflects the principle behind the above reduction where the height of the left premise of the cut-rule is reduced. The second rule reflects the case where the cut-formula is not principal in the right premise. Note that the first rule cannot be applied directly on the sequent $\Gamma, F \wedge G \vdash B$:

the left premise $\Gamma, F \wedge G \vdash A$ is provable with height $s(n)$ but, not necessarily, with height n . Similarly for the second rule and the right premise of the cut-rule.

6.1 Cut Elimination

The scenario is ready for establishing the necessary conditions for cut-elimination. The specification of the additive cut-rule for the system G3ip can be written as

r1 [cut] : $\text{Gamma} \dashv\vdash C \Rightarrow (\text{Gamma} \dashv\vdash A) \mid (\text{Gamma}, A \dashv\vdash C)$ [nonexec] .

This rewrite rule has an extra variable (A) in the right-hand side and cannot be used for execution (unless a strategy is provided). Hence, the attribute `nonexec` identifies this rule as no executable. In the following, `lcut` (resp., `rcut`) is used to denote the term $\text{Gamma} \dashv\vdash A$ (resp., $\text{Gamma}, A \dashv\vdash C$) whose set of variables is $\{\text{Gamma}, A\}$ (resp., $\{\text{Gamma}, A, C\}$). Moreover, `hcut` denotes the head/conclusion of the cut-rule, i.e., the term $\text{Gamma} \dashv\vdash C$.

As already illustrated, admissibility results and invertibility lemmas are usually needed in order to complete the proof of cut-elimination. Such auxiliary results are specified in the analysis, respectively, as \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{I} . As explained in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, a rule in \mathcal{H} encodes an admissible rule of the system that can be used, in a backward fashion, during the proof-search procedure. Moreover, a rule in \mathcal{I} is used to close the assumptions under the invertibility results.

Given a logical system \mathcal{S} , every possible derivation of the premises of the cut-rule should be considered. This means that there is a proof obligation for each $r_s, r_t \in \mathcal{S}$ s.t. r_s (resp., r_t) is applied on the left (resp., right) premise (i.e., when r_s matches `lcut` and r_t matches `rcut`). More precisely:

Definition 8 (Local cut-elimination) Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system, and \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{I} a set of rules. Let

$$\frac{n : S_1 \cdots n : S_m}{s(n) : S} r_s \quad \frac{k : T_1 \cdots k : T_n}{s(k) : T} r_t$$

be inference rules in \mathcal{S} . Under the assumptions \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{I} , the cut rule is admissible relative to r_s and r_t iff for each $\theta \in \text{CSU}(S, \text{lcut})$ and $\gamma \in \text{CSU}(T, \text{rcut}\theta)$:

$$\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{I}} \cup \text{ind-F} \cup \text{ind-H} \cup \\ \llbracket \{ \overline{(n : S_j)\gamma}, \overline{S_j\gamma} \mid j \in 1..m \} \cup \{ \overline{(n : T_j)\gamma}, \overline{T_j\gamma} \mid j \in 1..n \} \rrbracket_{\mathcal{I}} \Vdash \overline{\text{hcut}\gamma}$$

where the variables in S and T are assumed disjoint and

$$\text{ind-F} = \{ (\text{hcut} \rightarrow \text{lcut} \mid \text{rcut})[t/A] \mid t \prec \overline{A\gamma} \text{ and } t \text{ has sort Formula} \} \\ \text{ind-H} = \{ \text{hcut} \rightarrow (\overline{n\gamma} : \text{lcut} \mid \overline{s(n)\gamma} : \text{rcut})[\overline{A\gamma}/A] \} \cup \\ \{ \text{hcut} \rightarrow (\overline{s(n)\gamma} : \text{lcut} \mid \overline{n\gamma} : \text{rcut})[\overline{A\gamma}/A] \}$$

The rules in \mathcal{S} are extended with axioms corresponding to the sequents resulting after the application of r_s and r_t on the premises of the cut-rule. Note that those premises are added with and without the height annotations, which can be used in applications of inductive hypothesis with shorter derivations and (non-height preserving) applications of the cut-rule over simpler formulas, respectively. Note also that the set of axioms is closed under applications of the rules in \mathcal{S} .

The set of rules in $ind-F$ specifies a valid application of the cut-rule with sub-terms of the cut-formula ($t \prec A\bar{\gamma}$). As usual, this rule is assumed to be universally quantified on the remaining variables (t is a ground term). On the other hand, the set of rules in $ind-H$ specifies a valid application of the cut-rule with shorter derivations. As discussed previously, two cases need to be considered: when the left and right premises are shorter. In both cases, the height of the derivation is fixed ($\bar{n}\bar{\gamma}$) as well as the cut-formula ($[A\bar{\gamma}/A]$).

Regarding the base-cases of the induction, if the cut-formula is a constant or an atomic proposition, the set $ind-F$ is empty. If the rule r_s is an axiom, then the set $\{\bar{n} : \overline{S_j\bar{\gamma}}, \overline{S_j\bar{\gamma}} \mid j \in 1..m\}$ is also empty. In this case, an attempt of proving $\overline{hc\bar{u}t\bar{\gamma}}$ by starting with the first rule in $ind-H$ leads to a goal of the form $\bar{n}\bar{\gamma} : 1cut$ where no inference rule $r \in \mathcal{S}$ can be applied: $\bar{n}\bar{\gamma}$ is a constant of the form $\%1$ and it does not unify with the annotation $s(n)$ in the conclusion of r . Hence, if r_s is an axiom, a proof of $\overline{hc\bar{u}t\bar{\gamma}}$ cannot start with $ind-H$. A similar analysis applies for r_t .

The cut-elimination proof needs to consider all the possible matchings of the rules of the system and the premises of the cut-rule.

Theorem 4 *Let \mathcal{S} be a sequent system, and \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{I} be set of rules. If for each r_s and $r_t \in \mathcal{S}$ the cut-rule is admissible relative to r_s and r_t under the assumptions \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{I} , then the cut-rule is admissible in \mathcal{S} (relative to \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{I}).*

Proof Consider the annotated cut-rule below (a similar analysis applies for the other cut-rules introduced in Section 8):

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{s(n)} A \quad \Gamma, A \vdash_{s(m)} B}{\Gamma \vdash B} \text{Cut}$$

Assume that there exists a derivation of the premises starting, respectively with the rules r_s and r_t . By the hypothesis and Definition 8, there is a valid derivation of the sequent in the conclusion and the result follows.

6.2 Identity Expansion

The identity axiom states that any atomic formula is a consequence of itself. It has a dual flavor w.r.t. the cut-rule, in the sense that, while in the cut-rule a formula is eliminated, in the identity axiom an atomic formula is introduced. In G3ip, I represents the general schema for the identity axiom (see Fig. 1), where p is an atomic formula.

In Section 6.1, the cut-rule was proved admissible relative to some assumptions. The correspondent dual property w.r.t. the identity axiom is the *identity expansion*: assuming I , is *any* well founded formula a consequence of itself? Or equivalently:

Is the general identity axiom – not restricted to atoms – admissible? For example, in G3ip, proving identity expansion requires proving the admissibility of the axiom I_A for an arbitrary formula A :

$$\overline{\Gamma, A \vdash A} \quad I_A$$

Observe that the cut/identity duality is also reflected during (bottom-up) proof-search: while applications of the cut-rule should be avoided because arbitrary formulas need to be produced “out of thin air”, applications of general identity axioms are most welcome, since they may make the proof smaller and proof-search simpler.

The proof of identity expansion proceeds by induction on the formula A . Consider a constructor $C = f(\vec{t})$ of type $S_1, \dots, S_n \rightarrow \text{Formula}$ and let \overline{C} be the ground term $f(\vec{t})$ where each $t_i \in \vec{t}$ is replaced by a fresh constant \vec{t}_i of sort S_i . Hence, the goal is to prove $\overline{C} \vdash \overline{C}$ assuming that $\vec{t}_i \vdash \vec{t}_i$ is provable for each $t_i \in \vec{t}$ of sort Formula .

Theorem 5 *Let \mathcal{S} be a propositional sequent system and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$, with signature (S, \leq, F) , be the resulting rewrite theory encoding \mathcal{S} . Identity expansion holds in \mathcal{S} iff for each symbol $f \in F$ of type $S_1, \dots, S_n \rightarrow \text{Formula}$ ($n \geq 0$),*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}} \cup \{t' \vdash t' \mid t' \prec \overline{f(\vec{t})} \text{ and } t' \text{ has sort } \text{Formula}\} \Vdash \overline{(f(\vec{t}) \vdash f(\vec{t}))}$$

In one-sided systems, the goal is to show that $\vdash A, A^\perp$ is provable for any A , where A^\perp denotes the *dual* of A (see Section 8.4 for the definition of duality). Theorem 5 can be easily adapted to the one-sided case.

7 Reflective Implementation

This section details the design principles behind the L-Framework³, a tool implementing the narrowing procedures described in Sections 5 and 6. The L-Framework receives as input the object logic sequent system (OL) to be analyzed, as a rewrite theory $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}}$, and the specification of the properties of interest. Then, it outputs L^AT_EX files with the results of the analyses of, e.g., the proof reductions needed to establish cut-elimination. The specification of the OL follows as in Section 4 (details can be found in Section 7.1). As explained in Section 7.2, the implementation of the algorithms heavily relies on the reflective capabilities of rewriting logic. Moreover, the specification of the properties for each kind of analysis follows a similar pattern where a suitable functional theory needs to be instantiated (Section 7.3). The subsequent sections offer further details about the implementation of each kind of analysis: admissibility of rules (Section 7.4), invertibility of rules (Section 7.5), cut elimination (Section 7.6), and identity expansion (Section 7.7).

For readers interested in the details of the implementation, pointers to the Maude files and definitions are given in this section. However, readers interested only in the results of the analyses can safely skip this section; several examples and instances of the definitions presented here can be found in Section 8.

³ <https://carlosolarte.github.io/L-framework/>

7.1 Sequent System Specification

The starting point for a sequent system specification is the definition of its syntax and inference rules. The file `syntax.maude` contains the functional module (i.e., an equational theory and no rewriting rules) `SYNTAX-BASE`. Such a module defines the sorts `Prop` and `Formula`, as well as the subsort relation `Prop < Formula`. No constructors for these sorts are given since those depend on the OL and hence must be provided. The sort `MSFormula`, for multiset of formulas, is pre-defined here with the constructors presented in Section 4: `op *` denoting the empty multiset and `op _;_` for multiset union. Some auxiliary functions, needed to produce L^AT_EX outputs, are declared in this module. In particular, the OL may define a mapping to replace symbols of the syntax with L^AT_EX macros, e.g.,

```
eq TEXReplacement = ('|-- |-> '\vdash), ('/\ |-> '\wedge) , ('\| |-> '\vee) ...
```

The `sequent.maude` file defines the functional module `SEQUENT` with the sort `Sequent` and the following constructors:

```
op |--_ : MSFormula -> Sequent . --- one sided
op _|--_ : MSFormula MSFormula -> Sequent . --- two sided
```

This syntax should suffice for most of the sequent-based inference systems. As shown in Section 8, it is also possible to provide more constructors to deal, for instance, with dyadic systems (i.e., one-sided sequents with two separated contexts).

Internally, the tool annotates sequents with inductive measures. For this purpose, the constructor

```
op _:_ : INat Sequent -> Sequent . --- height annotations
```

is added to the specification. The sort `INat` (file `nat-inf.maude`) extends the natural numbers expressed in Peano-like notation as $s^n(z)$ with a constant `inf` denoting “unknown”. This constant is used, e.g., in the cut-elimination procedure where structural cuts do not preserve/decrease the height of the derivation and, therefore, the resulting sequent does not have any (known) measure.

OLs are also allowed to define equations to complete the definition of the mapping `TEXReplacementSeq` that replaces the name of the rules with suitable L^AT_EX symbols:

```
eq TEXReplacementSeq = ('AndL |-> '\wedge_L), ('AndR |-> '\wedge_R) ...
```

The sort `Goal`, the subsort relation `Sequent < Goal`, the constructors `op _|_`, and `proved` (for building list of sequents) are also defined in the module `SEQUENT`.

The `sequent.maude` file also specifies the module `SEQUENT-SOLVING` with auxiliary procedures for building derivation trees and outputting L^AT_EX code. This module uses reflection heavily (more on this in the next section) in order to deal, in a general and uniform way, with the representation of any sequent regardless of its specific syntax. Moreover, Maude’s module `LEXICAL` is used for converting between strings and lists of Maude’s quoted identifiers (terms of the form `'identifier` with sort `Qid`). As shown below, `Qids` materialize the meta-representation of any term.

7.2 Reflection and the Core System

A reflective logic is a logic in which important aspects of its meta-theory can be represented consistently at the object level. In a nutshell, a reflective logic is a logic that can be faithfully interpreted in itself. In this way, the object-level representation can correctly simulate the relevant deductive aspects of its meta-theory. Maude's language design and implementation make systematic use of the fact that rewriting logic is reflective, making the meta-theory of rewriting logic accessible to the user as a programming module [7].

For the purpose of this paper, the focus is on two meta-theoretic notions, namely, those of theory/module and the deductive entailment relation \Vdash . Formally, there is an *universal* rewrite theory \mathcal{U} in which any finitely represented rewrite theory \mathcal{R} can be represented as a term $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$, including \mathcal{U} itself, any terms t, u in \mathcal{R} as terms \widehat{t}, \widehat{u} , respectively, and a pair (\mathcal{R}, t) as a term $\langle \widehat{\mathcal{R}}, \widehat{t} \rangle$ in such a way that the equivalence $\mathcal{R} \Vdash t \rightarrow u \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{U} \Vdash \langle \widehat{\mathcal{R}}, \widehat{t} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \widehat{\mathcal{R}}, \widehat{u} \rangle$ holds. Since \mathcal{U} is representable in itself, a “reflective tower” can be achieved with an arbitrary number of levels of reflection.

In general, simulating a single step of rewriting at one level involves many rewriting steps one level up. Therefore, in naive implementations, each step up the reflective tower comes at considerable computational cost. In Maude, key functionalities of the universal theory \mathcal{U} have been efficiently implemented in the functional module `META-LEVEL`, providing ways to perform reflective computations.

Additional utilities for manipulating modules and terms in the L-Framework are implemented in the `meta-level-ext.maude` file. For instance, all the operations on theories described in Section 5 are contained there (some of them are detailed below).

The module `META-LEVEL` implements the so called *descent* functions that manipulate (meta-) terms. The function `op upTerm : Universal -> Term` returns the (meta) representation \widehat{t} of a term t . For example, constants are represented as `Id.Type` (e.g., `'proved.Goal`), variables as `Id.Type` (e.g., `'F:Formula`), and functions as `Id[Params]` (e.g., the term `'_[_Gamma:MSFormula,Delta:MSFormula]` represents the multiset of formulas `Gamma ; Delta`).

From a well-formed (meta-) term \widehat{t} it is possible to recover the term t (one level down). Note, however, that not all meta-terms have a suitable representation in the theory in the level below, for instance, `'_[_S:Sequent, F:Formula]` is not the image of any valid sequent or formula in the module specifying the system `G3ip`. The function `op downTerm : Term Universal -> Universal` takes as parameter the (meta) representation of a term \widehat{t} and a term t' . It returns the canonical form of t if it is a term having the same sort of t' ; otherwise, it returns t' . Usually, t' is an error term used to denote that the descent translation was not possible. For instance, if \widehat{t} is expected to be the meta-representation of a formula, then t' can be the constant `op error : -> Formula`.

At the meta-level, modules in Maude (i.e., rewrite theories) are represented as terms with sort `Module`. The function `op upModule` can be used to obtain such a term. All the components of a module (sorts, functions, equations and rules) have a suitable sort and representation in the meta-level, thus making them first-class citizens. For instance, most of the analyses require to extend the sequent theory with new rules. The function `below` adds to the module \mathbb{M} a set of rules `RS`:


```

op newModuleRls : Module RuleSet -> Module .
eq newModuleRls(M, RS)
  = (mod 'NEW-MOD is
      getImports(M)    --- Sorts, imports, equations, etc remain the same
      sorts getSorts(M) .
      getSubsorts(M) getOps(M) getMbs(M) getEqs(M)
      (getRls(M) RS)   --- Union of the rules of M and RS
    endm ) .

```

Rules at the meta-level are terms of sort `Rule` built from the constructors

```

op rl=>_[] . : Term Term AttrSet -> Rule .
op crl=>_if_[] . : Term Term Condition AttrSet -> Rule . --- conditional rule

```

The parameter of sort `AttrSet` is a set of attributes of the rule, including, e.g., the label used as identification (`[label('AndR)]`). This representation opens the possibility of manipulating rules in a simple way. For instance, consider a sequent rule $r = (S \rightarrow S')$, for some conclusion S and premise S' , to be proved height-preserving admissible. Consider also that the current goal is to show that a given ground sequent is provable with height at most $s(h)$. A call to the function below with parameters h and r produces a restricted version of r where it can be applied only on sequents annotated with (the constant height) h :

```

op inductive-rule : GroundTerm Rule -> Rule .
eq inductive-rule(gt, rl ':_:_'n:FNat , S] => ':_:_'n:FNat , S'] [ AS ]) =
    rl ':_:_'gt , S] => ':_:_'gt , S'] [ AS ] .

```

The module `META-LEVEL` offers functions to perform Maude's operations at the meta-level. For instance, the function `metaRewrite` allows for rewriting the meta-representation of a term in a given module and `metaVariantDisjointUnify` to solve unification problems. Moreover, given a theory \mathcal{R} and two terms t, u in that theory, `metaSearchPath` allows for checking the entailment $\mathcal{R} \Vdash t \rightarrow u$ by testing whether $\mathcal{U} \Vdash \langle \widehat{\mathcal{R}}, \widehat{t} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \widehat{\mathcal{R}}, \widehat{u} \rangle$. For instance, in the following assignment:

```
Ans := metaSearchPath(M, SGoal, upTerm(proved), nil, '*', bound-spec, 0) .
```

the term `M` is the meta-representation of a sequent system; `SGoal` is a term representing the goal/sequent to be proved; `nil` specifies that there are no additional conditions to be satisfied by the solution; `*` means that the reduction may take 0 or more steps; `bound-spec` indicates the maximum depth of the search; and the final `0` is the solution number. The term `Ans` is a term of type `Trace?`. It can be `failure` or a list of trace steps showing how to perform each of the reductions $t \rightarrow_r t'$ where the rule r is applied to t leading to t' . It is worth noticing that `metaSearchPath` implements a breadth-first search strategy. Hence, if `SGoal` can be rewritten into `proved` with at most `bound-spec` steps, then `metaSearchPath` will eventually find such proof (if the executability conditions for the rewrite theory are met [8]). Moreover, since `Ans` is a proof term evidencing how to prove the rewriting $SGoal \xrightarrow{*} proved$, it can be used to rebuild the needed derivation of `SGoal` in the sequent system at hand.

7.3 The General Approach for Implementing the Algorithms

All the analyses implemented in `L-Framework` are instances of the same template:

1. A module interface (called *theory* in Maude) specifies the input for the analysis. This theory includes parameters such as: the name of the module implementing the OL; the specification, as a rewrite rule, of the theorem to be proved; the extra hypotheses (set of rewrite rules) corresponding to the already proved theorem; the bound for the search depth; etc.
2. A module implementing the decision procedures proposed in Sections 5 and 6. All algorithms follow the same principles:
 - (a) A function `generate-cases` uses unification to generate all the proof obligations to be discharged. In each kind of analysis, there are suitable sorts and constructors to represent the proof obligations. Normally, the cases include the terms denoting the premises (that can be assumed to be provable) as well as the goal to be proved.
 - (b) Auxiliary definitions to extend the theory with new axioms and the right inductive hypothesis. Take for instance the function `inductive-rule` explained above.
 - (c) A function `holds?` that receives as parameter one of the proof obligations, uses the functions in (b) to extend the theory and calls to `metaSearchPath` to check if the goal can be proved.
3. An extra module providing facilities to produce the \LaTeX output.

The following sections give some details about the components (1) and (2) for each kind of analysis. Common facilities for all the analyses are implemented in the `theorem-proving-base.maude` file, including: converting the term t into the ground term \bar{t} (i.e., replacing variables with fresh constants) and generating axioms (rules of the form `rl [ax] T => proved .`) from the assumptions of the theorem.

7.4 Admissibility Analysis

The core procedures for automating the proof of admissibility theorems, following the definitions in Section 5.1, are specified in `admissibility.maude`. The input point is the definition of the *functional theory* below.

```

fth ADMISSIBILITY-SPEC is
pr META-LEVEL .
op th-name      : -> String .  --- Name of the theorem
op mod-name     : -> Qid  .  --- Module with the OL specification
op file-name    : -> String .  --- Output file
op rule-spec    : -> Rule  .  --- Rule to be proved admissible (goal => premise)
op bound-spec   : -> Nat  .  --- Depth-search
--- Already proved admissibility lemmas (set of rules)
op already-proved-theorems : -> RuleSet .
--- Identifiers of the height preserving invertible rules
op inv-rules    : -> QidList .
--- Mutual inductive rule (for mutual inductive proofs).
op mutual-ind   : GroundTerm -> RuleSet .
endfth

```

Theories in Maude are module interfaces used for declaring parameterized modules. Such interfaces define the syntactic and semantic properties to be satisfied by the actual parameter modules used in an instantiation [7].

The name of the theorem is specified with the string `th-name` (e.g., “Admissibility of weakening.”). The identifier of the module `mod-name` (e.g., `'G3ip`) is used to obtain the meta-representation of the OL module defining the syntax and inference rules of the sequent system. The field `file-name` specifies the output (L^AT_EX) file.

The theorem to be proved is specified via a rewriting rule (a term of sort `Rule`). As an example, the height-preserving admissibility of weakening for `G3ip` is:

```
eq rule-spec =
rl '[_:FNat, '|--[_:Gamma:MSFormula, 'F:Formula], 'G:Formula]] =>
  '[_:FNat, '|--[_:Gamma:MSFormula, 'G:Formula]]
  [ label('W) ]. ) .
```

This term is the meta-representation of the rule

```
rl [W] n : Gamma, F |-- G => n : Gamma |-- G .
```

Note that the premise and the conclusion have the same height, specifying that if the premise is provable with height at most n so is the conclusion. Since the entailment relation is undecidable in general, all the analyses are performed up to a given search depth (field `bound-spec`). Hence the procedures are sound (in the sense of the theorems in Sections 5 and 6), but not complete.

As already explained, for modularity, the analyses can depend on external lemmas. Those auxiliary results are specified as `already-proved-theorem` (backward reasoning) and `inv-rules` (forward reasoning). Finally, some theorems require mutual induction. For instance, admissibility of contraction for the system of classical logic (Section 8.3) requires a mutual induction on the the right and left rule for contraction. The field `mutual-ind` specifies the other theorems that can be applied on shorter derivations. For that, if the parameter of type `GroundTerm` is of the form `'s[h.Nat]`, the `mutual-theorem` is instantiated with sequents of (constant) height h .

The main procedures implementing the analysis of admissibility of rules can be found in the parametric module `ADMISSIBILITY-ALG{SPEC :: ADMISSIBILITY-SPEC}`. Consider, for instance, the task of proving the admissibility of a rule `rs`. Such a rule is specified as the parameter `rule-spec` in `SPEC`. For each rule `rt` of the system, proof obligations are generated by the module’s functionality. Following Definition 6, this is done by unifying the premise/body of `rs` with the conclusion/head of `rt`:

```
U := metaVariantDisjointUnify(module,
  getBody(rule-spec, module) =? getHead(rt, module), empty, 0, N) .
```

Here, N is a natural number used to enumerate the unifiers. By identifying the unifier u , it is possible to obtain the resulting premises when `rt` is applied on the body/premise of `rs` (see Equation (2)). For that, the descent function `metaXapply` enables the application of a rule to a term according to a given substitution. Computing the ground term that substitutes the variables by fresh constants is a routine exercise by following the inductive definition of the sort `Term`.

The cases for admissibility take the form `adm-case(Q, M, GTC, GTP, GG)`, where: Q is the identifier of the rule `rt` in Definition 6; M is the module implementing the OL, `GTC` and `GTP` correspond to the conclusion and the premises in Equation (2), and `GG` is the goal to be proved ($(i : S)\theta$ in Definition 6).

A useful mnemonic that applies from now on: *g* is for *ground*, *t* for *term*, *c* for *conclusion*, *p* for *premise(s)*, and the last *g* in *gg* for *goal*.

The module *M* above is extended as follows:

```
M' := newModuleRls(M,
  inductive(getHeight(GG))          --- theorem instantiated on shorter derivations
  mutual-ind(getHeight(GG))
  premises(GTP)                    --- all premises in GTP as axioms
  inv-premises(M, inv-rules, GTP)  --- closing w.r.t invertible rules
  already-proved-theorems ) .
```

The function `inductive` takes as parameter the annotated height of the current goal *gg*. If it is of the form *s(h)*, *rule-spec* is instantiated with the height *h* (as explained in the Section 7.2). Otherwise, `inductive` and `mutual-ind` return `none` (an empty list of rules). The function call `premises(GTP)` generates, for each sequent *s* in the set of premises *GTP*, a new axiom rule (*s* => proved); `inv-premises` generates further axioms by applying the invertible rules *inv-rules* in the premises *GTP*; and `already-proved-theorems` adds already proved theorems (specified as rules).

From the extended theory *M'*, `metaSearchPath` is used to check whether *gg* can reach `proved` and determine the status of the current proof obligation.

7.5 Invertibility of Rules

The core procedures are in `invertibility.maude`. The input to the invertibility analysis is specified as a realization of the functional theory `INV-SPEC`:

```
fth INV-SPEC is
  pr META-LEVEL .
  op th-name : -> String . --- Name of the theorem
  op mod-name : -> Qid . --- Module with the OL specification
  op bound-spec : -> Nat . --- Bound of the search procedure
  op file-name : -> String . --- File name to write the output
  op already-proved-theorems : -> RuleSet . --- Admissible rules
endfth
```

There is no need to specify the theorem to be proved, because it suffices to take each of the rules of the input module and “flip” it in order to obtain the invertibility lemma to be proved (see Definition 5). This procedure outputs a \LaTeX file with the invertibility status of each rule in the system. In the case of rules with two premises, each premise is analyzed separately (see Def. 7). This allows for proving, e.g., that the rule \supset_L in the system *G3ip* is invertible only in its right premise (see Section 8.1).

Following the same recipe for admissibility, the proof obligations for invertibility are generated by solving unification problems. Assume that the rule being analyzed is *q* and it is to be tested invertible with respect to the rule *q'*. If *q* is a two-premise rule, then it is split into two different rules to be analyzed separately. Assume that the resulting sliced rule with at most one premise is *r*. The *N*-th unifier between the heads/conclusions of the rules is

```
T := getHead(R)
T' := getHead(Q', module)
U := metaVariantDisjointUnify(module, getHead(T) =? getHead(T'), empty, 0, N)
```

The case to be analyzed is then:

```
inv-case(R, Q',
  apply(T', U), --- the sequent where R and Q' can be applied
  applyRule(apply(T, U), Q', module, U), --- applying Q' on the resulting seq.
  applyRule(apply(T, U), R, module, U) --- applying R on the resulting seq.
```

The first two parameters identify the case. The third parameter corresponds to the sequent where both rules can be applied, i.e., the conclusion in Equation (6). The fourth parameter corresponds to the premises after the application of Q' , i.e., the premises in Equation (6). The last parameter is the goal being proved, i.e., the premise resulting after the application of R on the same sequent ($(k : S_l)\theta$ in Definition 7). Call GTC , GTP , and GG to the last three parameters of the case once their variables are replaced with fresh constants.

The inductive reasoning consists in applying, when possible, the rule R on the sequents in GTP . By induction, such application of R on a sequent S in GTP must preserve the height annotation of S . Hence, a modified version of R is needed:

```
op inductive-rule : Rule -> Rule .
eq inductive-rule( ( rl ':-_'s[T],T'] => T'' [ AS ]. ) )
  = ( rl ':-_' T, T'] => T'' [ label('IND) ]. ) .
```

Note the use of the height T (instead of $s[T]$) in the resulting rule. Call RI the rule resulting from the application of this function to the rule R being analyzed.

Computing the set of sequents that can be assumed as axioms by induction becomes now a simple task. It suffices to compute one step of rewriting for each sequent GT in the set GTP as follows:

```
metaSearch(MRI, GT, 'G:Goal, nil, '+, 1, k) .
```

The term MRI inherits all the functional description of the module specifying the OL, but it contains only one single rule, namely, RI . The (ground) sequent GT is rewritten to any possible list of sequents (variable $'G:Goal$) in this theory in exactly one step ($'+$ means one or more steps and the bound in the 6th parameter forces it to be exactly one). The last parameter is used to enumerate all the possible solutions.

Finally, the OL theory M can be extended before attempting a proof of the goal GG of the current case:

```
M' := newModuleRIs(M, premises(GTP) --- axioms from GTP
  inductive(M, GTP, R) --- inductive reasoning
  already-proved-theorems)
```

7.6 Cut Elimination

There are different cut-rules depending on the shape of the sequent system at hand (e.g., one-sided, two-sided, dyadic) and also on the structural rules allowed. The file `cut-elimination-base.maude` defines common facilities for all the cut-elimination procedures. Impressive enough, minor extensions to this module have been required to implement cut-elimination procedures for the systems in Section 8.

The common interface is the following functional theory:

```

fth CUT-SPEC is
  pr META-LEVEL .
  op th-name      : -> String . --- Name of the theorem
  op mod-name     : -> Qid .    --- Module with the OL specification
  op bound-spec   : -> Nat .    --- Bound of the search procedure
  op file-name    : -> String . --- File name to write the output
  op already-proved-theorems : -> RuleSet . --- Admissible rules
  op inv-rules    : -> QidList . --- Invertible rules
endfth

```

The parametric module `CUT-BASE{SPEC :: CUT-SPEC}` contains the common definitions. An operator for the cut rule is defined `op cut-rule : -> Rule .`, but no equation for it is provided. Each OL is responsible for completing this definition. For instance, in `G3ip`, the cut-rule shares the context in the antecedent of the sequent between the two premises. Hence, the file `cut-add-scon.maude` (additive cut for single conclusion systems) extends `CUT-BASE` with the following equation:

```

eq cut-rule =
  (rl '[_:_'inf.INat, '[_|--_'Gamma:MSFormula, 'F:Formula]] =>
  '[_|_'
  '[_:_'h1$:FNat, '[_|--_'[_:_'Gamma:MSFormula, 'FCut$:Formula], 'F:Formula]],
  '[_:_'h2$:FNat, '[_|--_'[_:_'Gamma:MSFormula, 'FCut$:Formula]]
  [ label('\Cut) ]. ) .

```

The conclusion of the rule is annotated with `inf` (the constant of type `INat` denoting “don’t know”). This specification is nothing else than the meta-representation of the rule in Equation (8). In all the analyses, the cut-formula is expected to be named as `FCut$` and the height of the two premises as `h1$` and `h2$`.

The module `CUT-BASE` offers mechanisms to generate, in a uniform way, the proof obligations for the cut-elimination procedures considered here. This is done in two steps. First, one of the rules of the system identified as `Q1` is matched against the first premise of the cut-rule (`lcut` below):

```
U := metaVariantDisjointUnify(module, lcut =? getHead(Q1, module), empty, 0, N)
```

The unifier `U` must map the variables of `lcut` to some fresh variables. Hence, before unifying a second rule `Q2` against the second premise of the cut-rule, denoted as `rcut`, the substitution `U` must be applied on `rcut` (see Definition 8):

```
U' := metaVariantDisjointUnify(module, apply(rcut, U) =?
                                getHead(Q2, module), empty, Nvars, M) .
```

A proof obligation takes the following form:

```

cut-case(
  cut-sub-case(TC, TP), --- left premise (conclusion and premises)
  cut-sub-case(TC', TP'), --- right premise (conclusion and premises)
  apply(getHead(cut-rule), (U ; U')), --- goal to be proved
  apply('FCut$:Formula, (U ; U')) --- the cut formula
)

```

The notation `U ; U'` is used for composition of substitutions.

Induction on the height of the derivation is also defined in `CUT-BASE` in a general way and independently of the cut-rule.

```

op induct-height : GroundTerm GroundTerm GroundTerm -> RuleSet .
eq induct-height('suc[gh], 'suc[gh'], GF) =
  ( rl getHead(cut-rule) =>
    '_|_|[ --- Fixing heights (gh and suc[gh']) and the cut-formula (GF)
      apply(lcut, ('h1$$:FNat <- gh ; 'FCut$$:Formula <- GF)),
      apply(rcut, ('h2$$:FNat <- 'suc[gh] ; 'FCut$$:Formula <- GF))]
    [ label('\hCut) ]. )
  ( rl getHead(cut-rule) =>
    '_|_|[ --- Fixing heights (suc[gh] and gh') and the cut-formula (GF)
      apply(lcut, ('h1$$:FNat <- 'suc[gh] ; 'FCut$$:Formula <- GF)),
      apply(rcut, ('h2$$:FNat <- gh' ; 'FCut$$:Formula <- GF))]
    [ label('\hCut) ]. ) .

```

The syntax $x \leftarrow t$ is used to denote the substitution $[t/x]$. This specification implements *ind-H* in Definition 8. The first two parameters are the height of the left and the right premises above the cut. The last parameter is the cut-formula considered in the current goal.

Induction on the structure of the formula is partially defined in `CUT-BASE`, but additional work is needed in the specific OL. General definitions include, e.g.,

```

op induct-struct : GroundTerm -> RuleSet .
eq induct-struct(Q[LGT]) = $induct-struct(LGT) .
eq induct-struct(GT) = none [otherwise] .

```

The first equation applies to constructors for formulas (e.g., `'_/_[A, B]`, representing $A \wedge B$) and then, induction applies on all the sub-terms in the list of ground terms `LGT` (if they are of sort `Formula`). If the parameter is a constant, e.g., `'False.Formula`, only the second equation applies and no inductive rule is generated. The keyword `otherwise` (a shorthand for `otherwise`) means “use this equation if all the others defining the corresponding function symbol fail”. This is syntactic sugar to simplify the specification and it can be encoded in plain conditional equational theories [8].

The function `$induct-struct` calls to `induct-struct-formula` for each term in `LGT`. The definition of `induct-struct-formula` is specific for each OL. Here the one defined in `cut-add-scon.maude`:

```

op induct-struct-formula : GroundTerm -> RuleSet .
eq induct-struct-formula(GTA)
  = if getType(GTA) == 'Formula --- only sub-terms of sort Formula
    then ( rl getHead(cut-rule) => --- head unchanged
      '_|_|[ --- premises with height 'inf and the cut-formula fixed to GTA
        apply(lcut, ('h1$$:FNat <- 'inf.INat ; 'FCut$$:Formula <- GTA)),
        apply(rcut, ('h2$$:FNat <- 'inf.INat ; 'FCut$$:Formula <- GTA)) ]
      [ label('\sCut) ]. )
    else none --- no rule if GTA is not a formula
  fi .

```

The parameter `GTA` is a ground term denoting a proper sub-formula of the cut-formula. The cut-rule is instantiated as follows: the head of the rule is unchanged, the height of the premises is `'inf.INat`, and the cut-formula is fixed to be (the ground term) `GTA`. The change in the height of the premises is due to the fact that cuts on smaller formulas do not preserve necessarily the height of the derivation.

The above definition seems to be general enough for any cut-rule and, in theory, it would be possible to define it once and for all the systems. However, the generated

rule is problematic from the point of view of proof search. Note that both premises are annotated with `'inf.INat`. Hence, even if the rule does not need to “guess” the cut-formula (since it is fixed to a ground term A), it is always possible to rewrite the goal $\Gamma \vdash G$ into $\Gamma, A \vdash G$ and later into $\Gamma, A, A \vdash G$, etc. For this reason, in some systems, extra conditions are needed to restrict the application of this rule and reduce the search space (more about this in Section 8). Of course, a bad choice of such conditions may render the analysis inconclusive. A natural rule of thumb that worked in most of the cases was to restrict the application of this rule when the sub-formula A is not already in the context Γ .

Finally, the main search procedure must be also tailored for each OL. There is a template that, with little modifications, can be used in all systems reported here. In particular, OLs may define different conditions for the application of the rules with the aim of reducing the search space. The main definition in `cut-add-scon.maude` is:

```
ceq holds$(cut-case( ... ))
= output ...
if      --- Premises with implicit weakening
  RS := premises-W(GTC) premises-W(GTC') premises-W(GTP) premises-W(GTP')
  --- invertibility lemmas on the premises
  inv-premises(M, inv-rules, GTP) inv-premises(M, inv-rules, GTP')
  already-proved-theorems --- adding admissibility lemmas
  --- Induction on the height of the derivation
  induct-height(getHeight(gtc), getHeight(gtc'), GF)
  --- Induction on the formula only in principal cases
  if numFormulas(GG) <= 1 then induct-struct(GF) else none fi
```

In the code above, `rs` is the set of rules used to extend the theory of the OL before calling the search procedure. This extension is similar to the ones presented for admissibility and invertibility. There are, however, two new ingredients: (a) the way the axioms are generated and (b) the additional condition deciding whether the rule for structural induction is added or not to solve the current goal `gg`:

- (a) `premises-W(S)` converts into an axiom the sequent s . Unlike `premises(S)` used in the previous sections, the resulting rule in `premises-W(S)` internalizes weakening: if S is the (ground) sequent $\Gamma \vdash F$, then $\Delta \vdash F$ is provable for any $\Delta \supseteq \Gamma$. This avoids the need for adding the rule W into `already-proved-theorems`, thus reducing the search space. This simplification cannot be used, of course, in substructural logics, such as linear logic (Section 8.4).
- (b) As already explained, the rule for structural induction is problematic from the point of view of proof search. In some OLs it is possible to control its use. For example, in `G3ip`, the application of *ind-F* can be restricted to solve only the principal cases (and the non-principal cases will run faster). Such cases can be identified by counting the number of constants of type `Formula` in the current goal `gg` (see the last line in the code above). In other systems, however, this simplification does not work as in the case of the system `mLJ` (Section 8.2) where structural induction is also needed in some of the non-principal cases.

Wrapping up, configuring the cut-elimination procedure requires adjusting and tuning some parameters. As shown in Section 8, some logics that share the same

structural properties may reuse a common infrastructure. For instance, the cut-rule and procedures defined in file `cut-add-mcon.maude` (two-sided and multi-conclusion systems where weakening and contraction are allowed) can be used to prove cut-elimination for the system G3cp (Sec. 8.3), mLJ (Sec. 8.2), and some systems for modal logics (Sec. 8.5). However, cut-elimination is a non-trivial property and hence, full automation is impossible for ‘the’ general case. In each of these systems, the user must determine the invertibility lemmas that will be considered during the search procedure. This is done by simply modifying the input parameter `inv-rules` in `CUT-SPEC`.

7.7 Identity Expansion

This analysis uses the following functional theory as interface (`id-expand.maude`):

```
fth ID-EXP-SPEC is
op mod-name : -> Qid .
op file-name : -> String .
op bound-spec : -> Nat .
op goal : GroundTerm -> GroundTerm . --- e.g., F |-- F or |- F, dual(F)
op already-proved-theorems : -> RuleSet .
op types-formula : -> TypeList . --- types different from 'Formula to be analyzed
endfth
```

Given a ground term F denoting a formula, the call `goal(F)` returns the sequent to be proved. This definition allows to consider id-expansion theorems for one-sided and two-sided systems. The last field is used to define other sorts that need to be considered in the analysis. For instance, the specification of modal logics includes the sort `BFormula < Formula` for boxed formulas (see Section 8.5). By adding `BFormula` in `types-formula`, the case $\Box F \vdash \Box F$ is generated.

8 Case Studies

This section explains how structural meta-properties of several propositional sequent systems can be specified and proved with the approach presented in this paper. The site hosting the L-Framework⁴ includes all the logical systems described here, the proof-search implementation of the strategies, and the PDFs generated by the proof-search algorithms. The chosen methodology for proving the (meta-)theorems in this section is modular: first, it attempts to build a proof without any external lemma; second, when needed, it analyzes the failing cases and adds already proved theorems for completing the proof. This methodology allows for analyzing interdependencies between the different results inside various logical systems. Since there are no similar tools to compare the performance of the L-Framework, the main benchmark pursued is to show that it is flexible enough to deal with several proof-theoretic properties with little effort in defining the object logic and the properties of interest. In all the cases, but those reported in Section 8.4 (where the proof of cut-elimination requires induction on two different rules), implementing the analyses amounts only to instantiate the interfaces/theories described in Section 7.

⁴ <https://carlosolarte.github.io/L-framework/>

In order to show the feasibility of the L-Framework, time-related observations are reported. In all the cases, the depth bound (`bound-spec`) is set to 15 and the experiments are performed on a MacBook Pro, 4 cores 2.3 GHz, and 8GB of RAM, running Maude 3.0. On average, the admissibility analyses are completed in about 5 seconds. Once all the auxiliary lemmas are added, the time needed to complete the proof of cut-elimination depends on whether explicit structural rules are used (about 30 seconds) or not (about 15 seconds).

8.1 System G3ip for Propositional Intuitionistic Logic

The system G3ip and its specification as a rewrite theory are presented in Section 5. The proof of meta-theoretical properties is next described in detail.

Weakening. Theorem 1 (see rule H in Equation (5)) and height-preserving admissibility of weakening can be proved without auxiliary lemmas.

Theorem 6 (Weakening and Weak-height) *If G3ip $\triangleright_n \Gamma \vdash C$, then G3ip $\triangleright_{s(n)} \Gamma \vdash C$. Moreover, the rule W (Equation (1)) is height-preserving admissible in G3ip.*

Proof See the specification of the theorems in `g3i/prop-w.maude` and `g3i/prop-h.maude`. The resulting proofs are in `g3i/g3i.pdf`. Both properties are proved in less than 1 second without any additional lemma. \square

Invertibility. All the rules in G3ip are invertible, but \vee_R and \supset_L . However, the tool initially fails (in 7.6s) to prove the invertibility of \supset_R , \wedge_R , \wedge_L , \vee_L , and \top_L .

Consider the rule \supset_R . Recall that the invertibility of a rule is proven by testing the local invertibilities relative to all possible rules (see Definition 7). Hence, the tool proves, e.g., that \supset_R is invertible w.r.t \wedge_L (the symbol \bullet denotes successor):

$$\frac{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_4, F_5 \vdash F_1 \supset F_2}{\bullet h_3 : \Delta_6, F_4 \wedge F_5 \vdash F_1 \supset F_2} \wedge_L \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_4, F_5 \vdash F_2}{\bullet h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \wedge F_5 \vdash F_2} \text{ax/ind}}{\bullet h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \wedge F_5 \vdash F_2} \wedge_L$$

Note the application of the inductive hypothesis on the shorter derivation of height h_3 . All the other cases of local invertibility of \supset_R are similar, but the cases w.r.t. \supset_R and \supset_L fail. As shown below, when the admissible rules H and W (Theorem 6) are added to the set of `already-proved-theorems`, the tool completes the missing cases. The failure w.r.t. \supset_R is:

$$\frac{h_1 : \Delta_2, F_3 \vdash F_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_3 \supset F_4} \supset_R \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2, F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{fail}$$

This is the dummy case where the same rule is applied on the same formula and the proof transformation should be trivial. In fact, an application of H completes the case:

$$\frac{h_1 : \Delta_2, F_3 \vdash F_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_3 \supset F_4} \supset_R \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_2, F_3 \vdash F_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2, F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{ax}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2, F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{H}$$

Regarding the failure of the invertibility of \supset_R w.r.t \supset_L

$$\frac{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_4 \quad h_3 : \Delta_6, F_5 \vdash F_1 \supset F_2}{\bullet h_3 : \Delta_6, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_1 \supset F_2} \supset_L \rightarrow \frac{\text{fail}}{\bullet h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_2}$$

If \supset_L is applied on the sequent $\Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash_{s(h_3)} F_2$, two premises are obtained: $\Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash_{h_3} F_4$ and $\Delta_6, F_1, F_5 \vdash_{h_3} F_2$. The second premise is provable by induction. The proof of the first premise requires weakening on F_1 :

$$\frac{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_4 \quad h_3 : \Delta_6, F_5 \vdash F_1 \supset F_2}{\bullet h_3 : \Delta_6, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_1 \supset F_2} \supset_L \rightarrow \frac{\frac{\frac{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_4}{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_4} \text{ax} \quad W \quad \frac{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_5 \vdash F_2}{h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_2} \text{ax/ind}}{\bullet h_3 : \Delta_6, F_1, F_4 \supset F_5 \vdash F_2} \supset_L$$

Once W is added, the proofs of invertibility of \wedge_R , \wedge_L , \vee_L and \top_L are also completed.

Some cases are vacuously discharged. For instance, there are no proof obligations for the invertibility of \supset_R w.r.t. \wedge_R (it is impossible to unify the conclusion of these rules). Moreover, the cases of the axioms I , \top_R , and \perp_L are trivial since the only proof obligation is to reduce proved into proved:

$$\frac{h_1 : \Delta_4, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash F_2 \quad h_1 : \Delta_4, F_3 \vdash \top}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_4, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \top} \supset_L \rightarrow \text{trivial}$$

The rules \vee_{R1} , \vee_{R2} , and the left premise of \supset_L are clearly not invertible. The following failures provide good evidences that these cases do not succeed:

$$\frac{h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_3 \vee F_4} \vee_2 \rightarrow \frac{\text{fail}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_3} \text{fail} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{h_3 : \Delta_4, F_1 \supset F_2 \vdash \top}{h_3 : \Delta_4, F_1 \supset F_2 \vdash F_1} \top_R \rightarrow \frac{\text{fail}}{h_3 : \Delta_4, F_1 \supset F_2 \vdash F_1} \text{fail}$$

Theorem 7 (Invertibility) *All the rules, but \vee_{Ri} and \supset_L , are height-preserving invertible in G3ip. Moreover, the right premise of \supset_L is height-preserving invertible.*

Proof The invertibility of \wedge_R , \wedge_L , \vee_L , and \top_L depends on the admissibility of W (Theorem 6). The invertibility of \supset_R and the invertibility of the right premise of \supset_L require Theorem 6 (W and H). The specification of the property is in `prop-inv.maude`. The analysis is completed in 7.7 seconds. \square

Contraction. When attempting a proof of admissibility of contraction, the local admissibility cases w.r.t. \supset_L , \wedge_L , \vee_L , and \top_L fail. Here is the failing case for \vee_L :

$$\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4 \quad h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \vee_L \rightarrow \frac{\text{fail}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{fail}$$

Note that the inductive hypothesis cannot be used neither on the left nor on the right premise. After adding `'0rL` to the set of already-proved invertible rules (field `inv-rules`), the L-Framework completes this case as follows:

$$\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4 \quad h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \vee_L \rightarrow \frac{\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2, F_2 \vdash F_4}{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vdash F_4} \text{inv-th/ax}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{IH} \quad \frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_3 \vdash F_4}{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{inv-th/ax}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{IH}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \vee_L$$

$$\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2, F_6, F_6 \vdash F_4 \quad h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6, F_6 \vdash F_4}{\bullet h_1 : (\Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3), F_6, F_6 \vdash F_4} \vee_L \rightarrow \frac{\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2, F_6 \vdash F_4}{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2, F_6 \vdash F_4} \text{ax}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2, F_6 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{IH} \quad \frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6 \vdash F_4}{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6 \vdash F_4} \text{ax}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3 \vdash F_4} \text{IH}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \vee F_3, F_6, F_6 \vdash F_4} \vee_L$$

Due to unification, there are indeed two cases: one in which the disjunctive formula is contracted and one of the copies is principal, and another case with the disjunction not being contracted (instead, another formula F_6 is). The second case follows without using the invertibility lemma.

Theorem 8 (Contraction) *The contraction rule C (Equation (1)) is height-preserving admissible in G3ip.*

Proof The cases \vee_L , \wedge_L , and \top_L require the invertibility of the respective rules (Theorem 7). The case \supset_L requires invertibility of the right premise of this rule (specified in `inv-rules` as `'impL$1`). The proof takes 1.3 seconds. \square

Cut-Elimination. Controlling the structural rules is one of the key points to reduce the search space in sequent systems. The system G3ip embeds weakening in its initial rule (Γ can be an arbitrary context) and contraction in rules with two premises (all rules are additive and contraction is explicit in the left premise of \supset_L). Thus, W and C are admissible in G3ip, and the proof search procedure does not need to guess how many times a formula must be contracted or whether some of them need to be weakened. The cut-rule considered for G3ip is additive (see Equation (8)), hence also carrying an implicit contraction.

The cut-elimination procedure for G3ip implements two strategies for reducing the search space (see Section 7.6):

1. If \mathcal{GTP} is the resulting set of sequents that can be assumed to be provable, then such sequents are added as axioms that internalize weakening. For instance, if $\Gamma \vdash F$ is a (ground) sequent in \mathcal{GTP} , then, $\Delta \vdash F$ is assumed to be provable whenever $\Delta \supseteq \Gamma$. This avoids the need for adding the rule W to the set of already proved theorems, thus reducing the non-determinism during proof-search: weakening is “delayed” until the leaves of the derivation are reached.
2. The inductive hypothesis on the structure of the formula is only used in the principal cases. Hence, less alternatives are explored when proving the non-principal cases.

The strategy (1) considerably affects the performance in both failing and successful attempts as explained below. The strategy (2) saves few seconds when all the needed auxiliary lemmas are added and the proof succeeds. In failing attempts, this strategy has an important impact.

Due to (1), W and C are not added to `already-proved-theorems` and, for the moment, consider also that none of the invertibility lemmas is added. This experiment leads to proofs for the trivial cases (\top_R , \perp_L , I and \top_L) and fails for the other rules in almost 15 seconds⁵.

Non-principal Cases. Usually the non-principal cases are easily solved by permuting down the application of a rule and reducing the height of the cut. Some of these cases are already proved in this first iteration. For instance, the case $(\wedge_L, \vee_1) \text{---} \wedge_L$ applied on the left premise and \vee_1 on the right premise — is solved as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_{11}, F_6, F_7 \vdash F_{12}}{h_1 : \Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_{12}} \wedge_L \quad \frac{h_8 : \Delta_{11}, F_{12}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9}{h_8 : (\Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7), F_{12} \vdash F_9 \vee F_{10}} \vee_1}{\vdash : \Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9 \vee F_{10}} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_{12}}{h_1 : \Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9} \text{ax/W} \quad \frac{h_8 : \Delta_{11}, F_{12}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9}{h_8 : \Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9} \text{ax/W}}{\vdash : \Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9} \text{hCut} \quad \vee_1}{\vdash : \Delta_{11}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9 \vee F_{10}} \vee_1$$

In the right derivation, `hCut` is an application of the cut-rule with shorter derivations. Moreover, `ax/W` finishes the proof due to the sequents assumed to be provable (on

⁵ In the same experiment, if the strategy (2) is not considered, the case \supset_R does not finish after 15 min.

the left derivation), possibly applying W . In this particular case, weakening is not needed. Some other similar cases, however, fail. Take for instance the case (\wedge_L, \wedge_L) :

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_{12}, F_6, F_7 \vdash F_9 \wedge F_{10}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_{12}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_9 \wedge F_{10}} \wedge_L \quad \frac{h_8 : \Delta_{12}, F_9, F_{10}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_{11}}{\bullet h_8 : (\Delta_{12}, F_6 \wedge F_7), F_9 \wedge F_{10} \vdash F_{11}} \wedge_L}{\vdash : \Delta_{12}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_{11}} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{}{\vdash : \Delta_{12}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_{11}} \text{fail}$$

What is missing here is the invertibility of \wedge_L on the assumption $\Delta_{12}, F_9, F_{10}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash_{h_8} F_{11}$. If this invertibility lemma is added, the tool completes the case:

$$\rightarrow \frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_{12}, F_6, F_7 \vdash F_9 \wedge F_{10}}{\vdash : \Delta_{12}, F_6, F_7 \vdash F_9 \wedge F_{10}} \text{ax/w} \quad \frac{\frac{h_8 : \Delta_{12}, F_{10}, F_6, F_7, F_9 \vdash F_{11}}{\bullet h_8 : \Delta_{12}, F_6, F_7, F_9 \wedge F_{10} \vdash F_{11}} \text{inv-th/ax}}{\vdash : \Delta_{12}, F_6, F_7 \vdash F_{11}} \wedge_L}{\vdash : \Delta_{12}, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_{11}} \wedge_L \text{hCut}$$

Inspecting similar failing cases suggests the need for including also the invertibility of the rules \wedge_R and \vee_L , and also the invertibility of the right premise of \supset_L . This solves some missing cases but still, the cases for \supset_L , \wedge_L and \vee_L are not complete. One of the failures for (\supset_L, \supset_L) is the following:

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_7 \quad h_1 : \Delta_{10}, F_8 \vdash F_{11}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_{11}} \supset_L \quad \frac{h_6 : \Delta_{10}, F_{11}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_7 \quad h_6 : \Delta_{10}, F_8, F_{11} \vdash F_9}{\bullet h_6 : (\Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8), F_{11} \vdash F_9}}{\vdash : \Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_9} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{}{\vdash : \Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_9} \text{fail}$$

The cut-formula is F_{11} and it is not principal in any of the premises. Once \supset_L is applied on the goal $\Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_9$, the resulting left premise is already proved (see the left-most sequent in the left derivation). The right premise can be proved with H (Theorem 6) if it is added to **already-proved-theorems**:

$$\rightarrow \frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_7}{\vdash : \Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_7} \text{ax/w} \quad \frac{\frac{h_6 : \Delta_{10}, F_{11}, F_8 \vdash F_9}{\bullet h_6 : \Delta_{10}, F_{11}, F_8 \vdash F_9} \text{ax/w} \quad \frac{}{\vdash : \Delta_{10}, F_{11}, F_8 \vdash F_9} H}{\vdash : \Delta_{10}, F_{11}, F_8 \vdash F_9} \text{hCut}}{\vdash : \Delta_{10}, F_7 \supset F_8 \vdash F_9} \supset_L$$

Principal Cases. Note that in all the above derivations, due to unification, there is always more than one constant of sort `Formula` in the goal: besides the formula in the succedent of the sequent, there are formulas in the antecedent that are needed for the application of a left rule in the left premise of the cut. Due to the strategy (2), cuts on smaller formulas are not considered during the proof search for these cases. The situation is different in the principal cases. Consider for instance the case (\supset_R, \supset_L) :

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_9, F_6 \vdash F_7}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_9 \vdash F_6 \supset F_7} \supset_R \quad \frac{h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_6 \quad h_5 : \Delta_9, F_7 \vdash F_8}{\bullet h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_8} \supset_L}{\vdash : \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow$$

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_9 \vdash F_6 \supset F_7}{\vdash : \Delta_9 \vdash F_6} \text{ax/w} \quad \frac{h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_6}{\vdash : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_6} \text{ax/w}}{\vdash : \Delta_9 \vdash F_6} \text{hCut} \quad \frac{\frac{h_5 : \Delta_9, F_7 \vdash F_8}{\vdash : \Delta_9, F_7 \vdash F_8} \text{ax/w} \quad \frac{}{\vdash : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_8} \text{sCut}}{\vdash : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_8} \text{sCut}$$

Rule `sCut` corresponds to a cut on a sub-formula. Note that the antecedent of the the goal is just a constant of sort `MSFormula` (Δ_9).

Theorem 9 (Cut elimination) *The cut-rule in Equation (8) is admissible in G3ip.*

Proof See the specification and dependencies in `g3i/prop-cut.maude`. The proof requires Theorem 6. All the cases –except for \top_R , \top_L , \perp_L , and I – require Theorem 7. The proof is completed in 13.8 sec. \square

Multiplicative Cut in G3ip. Observe that, by adopting the additive version of the cut-rule, several common proof search problems are avoided, e.g., loops created by the uncontrolled use of contraction. But what if the following *multiplicative cut* is considered in G3ip instead, where the context is split between the two premises?

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta, A \vdash B}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash B} \text{Cut} \quad (9)$$

The search tree now is considerably bigger since all the alternatives on how to split the context Γ, Δ need to be considered (see `cut-mul-scon.maude`). This is an interesting question, and the discussion presented next will serve to pave the way to the analysis of sequent systems with linear contexts (see Section 8.4).

Note that, if only the rule H (Theorem 6) is added, then all the cases but the principal cases for \supset and \wedge succeed in 26 seconds. The failure on (\wedge_R, \wedge_L) is:

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_6 \quad h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_7}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_6 \wedge F_7} \wedge_R \quad \frac{h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6, F_7 \vdash F_8}{\bullet h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6 \wedge F_7 \vdash F_8} \wedge_L}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \text{fail}$$

This case is solved by cutting with F_6 and F_7 . However, since the cut-rule is multiplicative, the contexts Δ_2 and Δ_9 need to be contracted first. Adding contraction, on terms of sort `MSFormula` makes infeasible the proof search procedure: any subset of the antecedent context can be chosen for contraction and such rule can be applied on any sequent/goal. Instead, a more controlled version of contraction can be added: contract the whole context only if there are no duplicated elements in it. This more restricted rule cannot be applied twice on the same goal, thus reducing the number of alternatives leading to the following proof transformation:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_2, F_6 \vdash F_7}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_6 \supset F_7} \supset_R \quad \frac{h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_6 \quad h_5 : \Delta_9, F_7 \vdash F_8}{\bullet h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_8} \supset_L}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \text{Cut}}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \rightarrow$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_2 \vdash F_6 \supset F_7}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9 \vdash F_6} \text{ax/W} \quad \frac{h_5 : \Delta_9, F_6 \supset F_7 \vdash F_6}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9, F_6 \vdash F_6} \text{hCut} \quad \frac{\vdash : \Delta_2, F_6 \vdash F_7}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9, F_6 \vdash F_7} \text{ax/W} \quad \frac{\vdash : \Delta_9, F_7 \vdash F_8}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9, F_6 \vdash F_8} \text{sCut}}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_2, \Delta_9, \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \text{c} \quad \frac{}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \text{sCut}}{\vdash : \Delta_2, \Delta_9 \vdash F_8} \text{C}$$

Theorem 10 (Multiplicative Cut-elim.) *The rule in Eq. (9) is admissible in G3ip.*

Proof The specification is in `prop-cut-mul.maude`. See the contraction rule used in the definition of `already-proved-theorems`. No invertibility lemma is needed for this proof. The analysis is completed in 25.6 seconds. \square

If W is not embedded in the initial axioms and C is allowed on arbitrary contexts, there is little hope to conclude these proofs in reasonable time.

Identity Expansion. Finally, the dual property of cut-elimination, identity expansion, is easily proved in the L-Framework.

Theorem 11 (Identity-Expansion) *If F is a formula, then $F \vdash F$ is provable in G3ip.*

$$\frac{\Gamma, A \supset B \vdash A, \Delta \quad \Gamma, B \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, A \supset B \vdash \Delta} \supset_L \quad \frac{\Gamma, A \vdash B}{\Gamma \vdash A \supset B, \Delta} \supset_R \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A, B, \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash A \vee B, \Delta} \vee_R$$

Fig. 2: The multi-conclusion intuitionistic sequent system mLJ.

Proof See `prop-ID.maude`. The rule W needs to be added to the set of already proved

$$\frac{\frac{}{- : F_0 \vdash F_0} \text{IH} \quad \frac{}{- : F_1 \vdash F_1} \text{IH}}{- : F_0, F_0 \supset F_1 \vdash F_0} W \quad \frac{}{- : F_0, F_1 \vdash F_1} W}{- : F_0, F_0 \supset F_1 \vdash F_1} \supset_L$$

theorems. It is used, e.g., in the following case:

$$\frac{}{- : F_0, F_0 \supset F_1 \vdash F_1} \supset_R \quad \frac{}{- : F_0 \supset F_1 \vdash F_0 \supset F_1}$$

□

8.2 Multi-conclusion Propositional Intuitionistic Logic (mLJ)

Maehara's mLJ [22] is a multiple conclusion system for intuitionistic logic. The rules in mLJ have the exact same shape as in G3ip, except for the right rules for disjunction and implication (see Fig. 2). The disjunction right rule in mLJ matches the correspondent rule in classical logic where the disjunction is interpreted as the comma in the succedent of sequents. The right implication, on the other hand, forces all formulas in the succedent of the premise to be weakened. This guarantees that, when the \supset_R rule is applied on $A \supset B$, the formula B should be proved assuming *only* the pre-existent antecedent context extended with the formula A . This creates an interdependency between A and B .

Weakening. The proof of admissibility of weakening in mLJ is similar to G3ip, only noting that, in the former, weakening is also height-preserving admissible in the succedent of sequents.

Theorem 12 (Weakening and Weak-height) *If mLJ $\blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, then mLJ $\blacktriangleright_{s(n)} \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ (H). Moreover, the following rules are height-preserving admissible in mLJ:*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, F \vdash \Delta} W_L \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, F} W_R$$

Proof The three properties are specified in `mLJ/prop-WH.maude`. No auxiliary lemmas are needed. This theorem is proved in less than 3 seconds. □

Invertibility. All the rules in mLJ are invertible, with the exception of \supset_R .

Theorem 13 (Inv.) *All the rules but \supset_R are height-preserving invertible in mLJ.*

Proof See the specification in `mLJ/prop-inv.maude`. H (Theorem 12) is needed for all the cases but \top_R , \perp_L and I . This proof takes 15.1 seconds. □

Contraction. Contraction is also admissible, on both sides of sequents.

Theorem 14 (Contraction) *The rules*

$$\frac{\Gamma, F, F \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, F \vdash \Delta} C_L \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash F, F, \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash F, \Delta} C_R$$

are both height-preserving admissible in mLJ.

Proof The specification is in `mLJ/prop-c.maude`. The proof of admissibility of C_L (resp. C_R) requires the invertibility of \top_L, \vee_L, \wedge_L , and \supset_L (resp., \perp_R, \vee_R and \wedge_R). \square

Cut-elimination and Identity Expansion. In the cut-elimination procedure for G3ip, the application of the rule for structural induction (`sCut`) is restricted to goals with at most one term of sort `Formula` (corresponding to the principal cases). That simplification is not possible in mLJ: with that restriction, the cases for \wedge_R and \vee_R fail w.r.t. \supset_R . Here is the case for (\vee_R, \supset_R) :

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_{12} \vdash (\Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}), F_6, F_7}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_{12} \vdash (\Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}), F_6 \vee F_7} \vee_R \quad \frac{h_8 : \Delta_{12}, F_9, F_6 \vee F_7 \vdash F_{10}}{\bullet h_8 : \Delta_{12}, F_6 \vee F_7 \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \supset_R}{\frac{- : \Delta_{12} \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}}{\text{Cut}}} \rightarrow \frac{}{- : \Delta_{12} \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \text{fail}$$

Note that the cut formula $F_6 \vee F_7$ is principal on the left premise, but it is not on the right premise. This case cannot be solved by reducing the height of the cut by first applying \supset_R since this would remove the context Δ_{11} (needed in the left premise).

The cut-elimination procedure for mLJ is based on the module defined in the file `cut-add-mcon.maude` (additive multiple-conclusion) where `sCut` is added in cases where the goal sequent has at most two terms of sort `Formula`. Hence, `sCut` is allowed also in non-principal cases. This solves the previous case and the search procedure finds the following proof transformation:

$$\rightarrow \frac{\frac{\frac{}{- : \Delta_{12} \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_6, F_7, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \text{ax/w} \quad \frac{\frac{}{- : \Delta_{12}, F_7, F_9 \vdash F_{10}} \text{inv-th/ax}}{- : \Delta_{12}, F_7 \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_6, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \supset_R}{\frac{}{- : \Delta_{12} \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_6, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \text{sCut}} \quad \frac{\frac{}{- : \Delta_{12}, F_6, F_9 \vdash F_{10}} \text{inv-th/ax}}{- : \Delta_{12}, F_6 \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \supset_R}{\frac{}{- : \Delta_{12} \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \text{sCut}}}{\frac{}{- : \Delta_{12} \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9 \supset F_{10}} \text{Cut}}$$

Theorem 15 (Cut-elimination and ID-expansion) *The following cut rule*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, A \quad \Gamma, A \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{Cut}$$

is admissible in mLJ. Moreover, for any F , the sequent $F \vdash F$ is provable.

Proof For cut-elimination (`prop-cut.maude`), H as well as the invertibility of the rules $\wedge_L, \wedge_R, \vee_L, \vee_R$, and \supset_L are needed. For identity-expansion (`prop-ID.maude`), the admissibility of W_R and W_L (Theorem 12) is needed. The proof takes 35.2 seconds. \square

8.3 System G3cp for Propositional Classical Logic

G3cp [35] is a well known two-sided sequent system for classical logic, where the structural rules are implicit and all the rules are invertible. The rules are similar to those of m LJ with the exception of \supset_R :

$$\frac{\Gamma, F \vdash \Delta, G}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, F \supset G} \supset_R$$

Weakening. Admissibility of weakening of G3cp follows that same lines as in m LJ.

Theorem 16 (Weakening and Weak-height) *If G3cp $\blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, then G3cp $\blacktriangleright_{s(n)} \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ (H). The rules W_L and W_R (see Theorem 12) are height-preserving admissible in G3cp.*

Proof The three properties are specified in `g3c/prop-wH.maude`. No auxiliary lemmas are needed. \square

Invertibility. All the rules in G3cp are invertible.

Theorem 17 (Invertibility) *All the rules in G3cp are height-preserving invertible.*

Proof See the specification in `g3c/prop-inv.maude`. H (Theorem 16) is needed. This proof takes 15.1 seconds. \square

Contraction. An attempt of proving admissibility of contraction on the left side of the sequent fails due to \supset_L (and on the right due to \supset_R). Here the failing case for C_L :

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2 \quad h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \supset_L \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4}{\text{fail}}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \supset_L$$

Due to invertibility of \supset_L , the sequent $\Delta_5 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2, F_2$ is provable. However, induction does not apply on this sequent since F_2 is on the right side of the sequent.

Hence, the proof of admissibility of contraction is by mutual induction on C_L and C_R . For instance, the case of \supset_L is solved by applying C_R on a shorter derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2 \quad h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \supset_L \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2, F_2}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2} \supset_L \quad \text{inv-th/ax} \quad \frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_3 \vdash \Delta_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \text{IH}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \text{IH-Mutual} \quad \text{inv-th/ax} \quad \frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_3 \vdash \Delta_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \text{IH}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \supset_L$$

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_6, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2 \quad h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4}{\bullet h_1 : (\Delta_5, F_2 \supset F_3), F_6, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4} \supset_L \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_6, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2} \supset_L \quad \text{ax} \quad \frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4} \text{IH}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4, F_2} \text{IH} \quad \text{ax} \quad \frac{h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_3, F_6 \vdash \Delta_4} \text{IH}}{\bullet h_1 : \Delta_5, F_6, F_2 \supset F_3 \vdash \Delta_4} \supset_L$$

In the second proof transformation, contraction is applied on a formula different from the implication and mutual induction is not needed.

Theorem 18 (Contraction) *The rules C_L and C_R are height-preserving admissible in G3cp.*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\vdash p^\perp, p} I \quad \frac{}{\vdash 1} 1 \quad \frac{\vdash F}{\vdash F, \perp} \perp \quad \frac{}{\vdash F, \top} \top \\
\frac{\vdash \Gamma_1, A \quad \vdash \Gamma_2, B}{\vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, A \otimes B} \otimes \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \wp B} \wp \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A \quad \vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \& B} \& \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A}{\vdash \Gamma, A \oplus B} \oplus_1 \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, B}{\vdash \Gamma, A \oplus B} \oplus_2
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3: One-sided multiplicative-additive linear logic (MALL).

Proof The specification is in `prop-c.maude`. The proof of admissibility of C_L (resp., C_R) requires the invertibility of \top_L, \vee_L, \wedge_L , and \supset_L (resp., $\perp_R, \vee_R, \wedge_R$, and \supset_R). For C_L , the specification includes the following definition for mutual induction:

```

eq mutual-ind('suc[GT]) =
  rl '[_:_[GT, '[_|--_['Gm:MSFormula, '[_:_'F:Formula, 'Dt:MSFormula]]] =>
    '[_:_[GT, '[_|--_['Gm:MSFormula, '[_:_'F:Formula, 'F:Formula],
      'Dt:MSFormula]]] [label('\IHMutual)].) .
eq mutual-ind(GT) = none [owise] .

```

This means that C_R can be applied on shorter derivations of height `GT` (due to the pattern “`'suc[GT]`” in the definition of the equation). Similarly, the proof of C_R requires mutual induction on C_L (specifically for the case \supset_R). \square

Cut-elimination and Identity Expansion. The proofs of cut-elimination and identity expansion are also similar to the cases of `mLJ`.

Theorem 19 (Cut-elimination and ID-expansion) *The cut-rule in Theorem 15 is admissible in `G3cp`. Moreover, for any F , the sequent $F \vdash F$ is provable.*

Proof For cut-elimination (`prop-cut.maude`), `H` as well as the invertibility of the rules $\supset_L, \supset_R, \wedge_L, \wedge_R, \vee_L$, and \vee_R are needed. For identity-expansion (`prop-ID.maude`), the admissibility of W_R and W_L is needed. The proof of cut-elimination takes 22.5 seconds and id-expansion less than one second. \square

8.4 Propositional linear logic

Linear logic (LL) [14] is a resource-conscious logic. Formulas are consumed when used during proofs, unless they are marked with the exponential $?$ (whose dual is $!$), in which case they can be weakened and contracted. Besides the exponentials, propositional LL connectives include the additive conjunction $\&$ and disjunction \oplus , their multiplicative versions \otimes and \wp , and the unities $1, 0, \top, \perp$. These connectives form actually pairs of *dual* operators:

$$(A \& B)^\perp \equiv A^\perp \oplus B^\perp \quad (A \otimes B)^\perp \equiv A^\perp \wp B^\perp \quad (!A)^\perp \equiv ?A^\perp \quad 0^\perp \equiv \top \quad 1^\perp \equiv \perp$$

where A^\perp denotes the negation of the formula A . All negations in LL can be pushed inwards and restricted to the atomic scope.

First, consider the fragment of LL without the exponentials, that is, (classical) propositional multiplicative-additive linear logic (MALL). The one-sided proof system for MALL is depicted in Fig. 3. As expected, the structural rules for weakening and contraction are not admissible in this system.

$$\frac{\vdash ?A_1, \dots, ?A_n, A}{\vdash ?A_1, \dots, ?A_n, !A} ! \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, A}{\vdash \Gamma, ?A} ? \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \Gamma, ?A} ?_W \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, ?A, ?A}{\vdash \Gamma, ?A} ?_C$$

Fig. 4: Exponential rules for LL.

Invertibility. The well known invertibility results for MALL are easily proved in the L-Framework.

Theorem 20 (Weak-height and Invertibility) *If MALL $\blacktriangleright_n \vdash \Gamma$, then MALL $\blacktriangleright_{s(n)} \vdash \Gamma$ (H). Moreover, all the rules but \otimes and $\oplus_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$, are height-preserving invertible.*

Proof See MALL/prop-H.maude and MALL/prop-inv.maude. Due to the splitting of the context, clearly \otimes is not invertible. Here two (failing) cases showing that the left premise of this rule is not invertible. The first one corresponds to invertibility w.r.t. \top and the second one w.r.t. \otimes :

$$\frac{\bullet h_3 \vdash \top, \Delta_4, \Delta_5, F_1 \otimes F_2}{\bullet h_3 \vdash F_1, \Delta_4} \top \text{ fail} \quad \frac{h_3 \vdash F_4, \Delta_6, \Delta_7, F_1 \otimes F_2 \quad h_3 \vdash F_5, \Delta_8, \Delta_9}{\bullet h_3 \vdash (\Delta_6, \Delta_7, F_1 \otimes F_2), (\Delta_8, \Delta_9), F_4 \otimes F_5} \otimes \text{ fail} \rightarrow \frac{\bullet h_3 \vdash F_1, \Delta_6, \Delta_8, F_4 \otimes F_5}{\bullet h_3 \vdash F_1, \Delta_4} \text{ fail} \quad \square$$

Cut-elimination and Identity Expansion. Since the system under consideration is one-sided, the cut-rule has a one-sided presentation. The theory in cut-lin-osided.maude (linear cut, one sided) specifies the operation `op dual : Formula -> Formula .` and the OL must define equations for it reflecting the De Morgan dualities of the connectives. Here some examples for the LL connectives:

$$\text{eq dual(p(i)) = perp(i) . eq dual(perp(i)) = p(i) . eq dual(1) = bot .}$$

$$\text{eq dual(F ** G) = dual(F) \$ dual(G) . eq dual(F \$ G) = dual(F) ** dual(G) .}$$

Theorem 21 (Cut-elim. and identity-expansion) *The rule $\frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \vdash \Delta, F^\perp}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta}$ Cut is admissible in MALL. Moreover, for any formula F , the sequent $\vdash F, F^\perp$ is provable.*

Proof The notation F^\perp corresponds to `dual(F)`. The proof of cut-elimination (specification in MALL/prop-cut.maude) relies only on the admissibility of H. Here the principal case (\otimes, \wp):

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 \vdash F_6, \Delta_4 \quad h_1 \vdash F_7, \Delta_5}{\bullet h_1 \vdash F_6 \otimes F_7, \Delta_4, \Delta_5} \otimes \quad \frac{h_8 \vdash \Delta_9, \text{dual}(F_6), \text{dual}(F_7)}{\bullet h_8 \vdash \text{dual}(F_6 \otimes F_7), \Delta_9} \wp}{\vdash (\Delta_4, \Delta_5), \Delta_9} \text{Cut} \rightarrow \frac{\frac{\vdash \Delta_5, F_7 \quad \vdash \Delta_9, \text{dual}(F_6), \text{dual}(F_7)}{\vdash \Delta_5, \Delta_9, \text{dual}(F_6)} \text{ax} \quad \frac{\vdash \Delta_4, F_6}{\vdash \Delta_4, \Delta_5, \Delta_9} \text{ax}}{\vdash \Delta_4, \Delta_5, \Delta_9} \text{sCut} \quad \square$$

Exponentials. Consider the one-sided system for linear logic obtained by adding the exponential $?$ and its dual $!$. The system LL results from the inclusion of the inference in Fig. 4 to those in Fig. 3. Note the explicit rules for weakening and contraction on formulas marked with $?$.

The specification of the rule $!$ (called *promotion*) requires a new sort to guarantee that the context only contains formulas marked with $?$ (see LL.maude):

```

sorts ?Formula ?MSFormula . --- Formulas and multisets of formulas marked with ?
op ?_ : Formula -> ?Formula . --- a ?-Formula is built with ?
subsort ?Formula < ?MSFormula . --- A single ?-Formula is also a ?-multiset
subsort ?MSFormula < MSFormula . --- Multisets of ?-formulas are also multisets
--- In Rule !, the context must contain only ?-Formulas
var CLq : ?MSFormula . rl [bang] : |-- CLq ; ! F => |-- CLq ; F .

```

Theorem 22 (Weak-height, Weak-! and inv.) *If $\text{LL} \blacktriangleright_n \vdash \Gamma$, then $\text{LL} \blacktriangleright_{s(n)} \vdash \Gamma$ (H).*

The rule $\frac{\vdash \Gamma, !F}{\vdash \Gamma, F} \text{W!}$ is height-preserving admissible. Moreover, none of the rules in Fig. 4 is height-preserving invertible.

Proof See LL/prop-H.maude, LL/prop-WB.maude and LL/prop-inv.maude. The invertibility results and the admissibility of W! depend on H. Note that the rule $?_C$ is invertible: it is always possible to apply it to later use $?_W$ on the same contracted formula. However, such procedure does not preserve the height of the derivation. \square

The cut elimination procedure for this system is certainly more involved. An attempt of proving this result fails for ! and $?_C$:

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 \vdash F_4, ?F_3}{\bullet h_1 \vdash !F_4, ?F_3} ! \quad \frac{h_5 \vdash A_6, ?dual(F_4), ?dual(F_4)}{\bullet h_5 \vdash dual(!F_4), A_6} ?_C}{- \vdash ?F_3, A_6} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{}{- \vdash ?F_3, A_6} \text{fail}$$

This is the principal case where the cut formula is $!F$ and it is promoted, and its dual contracted. This case is solved by using the rule below that cuts $!F$ with n copies of the formula $?F^\perp$:

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, !F \quad \vdash \Delta, (?F^\perp)^n}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \text{mCut} \quad (10)$$

Hence, the cut-elimination procedure for this system must mutually eliminate the cut-rules in Theorem 21 and Equation 10. More precisely, the elimination of one of the cases of *Cut* relies on the application of *mCut* on shorter derivations and one of the cases in the elimination of *mCut* requires the application of *Cut* on smaller formulas. Here are the two relevant cases:

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 \vdash F_4, ?F_3}{\bullet h_1 \vdash !F_4, ?F_3} ! \quad \frac{h_5 \vdash A_6, ?dual(F_4), ?dual(F_4)}{\bullet h_5 \vdash dual(!F_4), A_6} ?_C}{- \vdash ?F_3, A_6} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{}{\bullet h_1 \vdash ?F_3, !F_4} \text{ax} \quad \frac{}{h_5 \vdash A_6, ?dual(F_4), ?dual(F_4)} \text{ax}}{- \vdash ?F_3, A_6} \text{mCut}}$$

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 \vdash F_4, ?F_3}{\bullet h_1 \vdash !F_4, ?F_3} ! \quad \frac{h_6 \vdash \Delta_7, dual(F_4), ctr(n_5, ?dual(F_4))}{\bullet h_6 \vdash ctr(s n_5, ?dual(F_4)), \Delta_7} ?}{- \vdash ?F_3, \Delta_7} \text{mCut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{}{- \vdash ?F_3, F_4} \text{ax} \quad \frac{\frac{}{\bullet h_1 \vdash ?F_3, !F_4} \text{ax} \quad \frac{}{h_6 \vdash \Delta_7, dual(F_4), ctr(n_5, ?dual(F_4))} \text{ax}}{- \vdash ?F_3, \Delta_7, dual(F_4)} \text{hCut}}{- \vdash ?F_3, \Delta_7} \text{Cut}}$$

In the last derivation, $ctr(s n_5, ?dual(F_4))$ denotes $(?F_4^\perp)^{s(n_5)}$ and the application of *Cut* is on a smaller formula (F_4 instead of $!F_4$).

Theorem 23 (Cut-elim. and id-exp.) *The following rules are admissible in LL:*

$$\frac{\vdash \Gamma, F \quad \vdash \Gamma, F^\perp}{\vdash \Gamma} \text{Cut} \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, !F \quad \vdash \Delta, (?F^\perp)^n}{\vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \text{mCut} .$$

Moreover, for all formulas F , the sequent $\vdash F, F^\perp$ is provable.

Proof The procedures using mutual-induction are defined in `LL/cut-11.maude` and `LL/cut-11-cc.maude` (for *mCut*). The properties are specified in `prop-cut.maude` and `prop-cut-cc.maude`. Discharging the cases for *Cut* (resp., *mCut*) takes 13.2 seconds (resp. 115.6 seconds). In `cut-11.maude`, the definition

```
op mutual-induct : GroundTerm GroundTerm GroundTerm -> RuleSet .
eq mutual-induct('suc[gh], 'suc[gh'], '!_[GTA]) = ... --- specification of mCut
eq mutual-induct('suc[gh], 'suc[gh'], '?_[GTA]) = ... --- specification of mCut
eq mutual-induct(gh, gh', GTA) = none [owise] .
```

receives as parameter the height of the two premises of the cut and the cut-formula F . If F is not a formula marked with ! or ?, no additional rule is generated (the [owise] case in the definition). Also, the patter matching on the heights of the derivation allows for controlling the application of the cut-rule on shorter derivations. A similar definition can be found in `cut-11-cc.maude`.

The elimination of *Cut* assumes as auxiliary lemmas H and also a generalization of $?_W$ on terms of sort `?MSFormula`: $\frac{\vdash \Gamma}{\vdash \Gamma, ?\Delta} ?_{GW}$. Note that this rule is not height-preserving admissible, but it is clearly admissible (and hence, it can be used only on sequents marked with 'inf.INat). Currently, the L-Framework does not support inductive proofs on the size of lists/multisets as needed for this auxiliary lemma. This rule is used in the following case (where the height of the derivation is irrelevant):

$$\frac{\frac{h_1 \vdash F_4, ?F_3}{\bullet h_1 \vdash F_4, ?F_3} ! \quad \frac{h_5 \vdash A_6}{\bullet h_5 \vdash \text{dual}(F_4), A_6} ?_W}{\vdash ?F_3, A_6} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{\text{ax}}{\vdash ?F_3, A_6} ?_{GW}$$

The elimination of *mCut* assumes H and the admissibility of W! (Th. 22), e.g.,

$$\frac{\frac{h_2 \vdash F_3, ?I_4, F_5}{\bullet h_2 \vdash F_3, ?I_4, F_5} ? \quad \frac{h_7 \vdash \Delta_8, \text{dual}(F_5), \text{ctr}(n_6, ?\text{dual}(F_5))}{\bullet h_7 \vdash \text{ctr}(n_6, ?\text{dual}(F_5)), \Delta_8} ?}{\vdash (?I_4, F_3), \Delta_8} \text{Cut} \quad \rightarrow$$

$$\frac{\frac{\text{ax}}{\vdash ?I_4, F_5, F_3} \text{W!} \quad \frac{\frac{\bullet h_2 \vdash ?I_4, F_5, F_3}{\vdash ?I_4, F_5, F_3} \text{ax} \quad \frac{h_7 \vdash \Delta_8, \text{dual}(F_5), \text{ctr}(n_6, ?\text{dual}(F_5))}{\vdash ?I_4, \Delta_8, F_3, \text{dual}(F_5)} \text{ax}}{\vdash ?I_4, \Delta_8, F_3} \text{hCut}}{\vdash ?I_4, \Delta_8, F_3} \text{mCut}$$

Also, a generalization of $?_C$ on terms of sort `?MSFormula` is used here:

$$\frac{\frac{h_2 \vdash F_3, ?I_4, F_5}{\bullet h_2 \vdash F_3, ?I_4, F_5} ? \quad \frac{h_7 \vdash \Delta_{10}, F_8, \text{ctr}(n_6, ?\text{dual}(F_5)) \quad h_7 \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9, ?\text{dual}(F_5)}{\bullet h_7 \vdash \text{ctr}(n_6, ?\text{dual}(F_5)), \Delta_{10}, \Delta_{11}, F_8 \otimes F_9} \text{Cut}}{\vdash (?I_4, F_3), \Delta_{10}, \Delta_{11}, F_8 \otimes F_9} \otimes \quad \rightarrow$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\bullet h_2 \vdash ?I_4, F_5, F_3}{\vdash ?I_4, F_5, F_3} \text{ax} \quad \frac{h_7 \vdash \Delta_{10}, F_8, \text{ctr}(n_6, ?\text{dual}(F_5))}{\vdash ?I_4, \Delta_{10}, F_8, F_3} \text{hCut} \quad \frac{\frac{\bullet h_2 \vdash ?I_4, F_5, F_3}{\vdash ?I_4, F_5, F_3} \text{ax} \quad \frac{h_7 \vdash \Delta_{11}, F_9, ?\text{dual}(F_5)}{\vdash ?I_4, \Delta_{11}, F_9, F_3} \text{hCut}}{\vdash ?I_4, \Delta_{10}, \Delta_{11}, F_3, F_8 \otimes F_9} \otimes}{\vdash ?I_4, \Delta_{10}, \Delta_{11}, F_3, F_8 \otimes F_9} ?_{GC}$$

As explained in Sec. 8.1, arbitrary applications of contraction are problematic for proof search. Hence, in `prop-cut-cc.maude`, $?_{GC}$ is introduced as a conditional rule that can be applied on a given multiset only if there are exactly one occurrence of it in the current sequent. As in the case of $?_{GW}$, the admissibility of $?_{GC}$ cannot be proved in L-Framework. Discharging the cases of *Cut* (resp., *mCut*) takes 30s (resp. 124s). \square

$$\frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma, F : \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta, ?F} ? \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma : F}{\vdash \Gamma : !F} ! \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma, F : \Delta, F}{\vdash \Gamma, F : \Delta} ?_C \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta_1, A \quad \vdash \Gamma : \Delta_2, B}{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta_1, \Delta_2, A \otimes B} \otimes}$$

Fig. 5: Some rules of the dyadic system DyLL ([1]).

Dyadic System for Linear Logic. Since formulas of the form $?F$ can be contracted and weakened, such formulas can be treated as in classical logic. This rationale is reflected into the syntax of the so called *dyadic sequents* of the form $\vdash \Gamma : \Delta$, interpreted as the linear logic sequent $\vdash ?\Gamma, \Delta$ where $?\Gamma = \{?A \mid A \in \Gamma\}$. It is then possible to define a proof system without explicit weakening and contraction (system DyLL in Fig. 5). The complete dyadic proof system for linear logic can be found in [1].

Theorem 24 (Weak-height, Weak-! and invertibility) *If DyLL $\triangleright_n \vdash \Gamma : \Delta$, then DyLL $\triangleright_{s(n)} \vdash \Gamma : \Delta$ (H). The following three rules are height-preserving admissible:*

$\frac{\Gamma, F, F : \Delta}{\Gamma, F : \Delta} C \quad \frac{\Gamma : \Delta}{\Gamma, F : \Delta} W \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta, !F}{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta, F} W!$. Moreover, all the rules of the system but \oplus_i , \otimes and $?_C$ are height-preserving invertible.

Proof For the admissibility results, see `DyLL/prop-H.maude`, `prop-C.maude` `prop-W.maude` and `prop-WB.maude`. The invertibility results are specified in `DyLL/prop-inv.maude`. H and the admissibility of C and W do not require any additional lemma. The admissibility of W! depends on H. The invertibility results rely on H, W, and W!. \square

As in the system LL, the cut-elimination theorem for DyLL requires mutual induction on two different rules. The rule *Cut!* below internalizes the storage of formulas marked with ? into the classical context.

Theorem 25 (Cut-elim. and id-exp.) *The following rules are admissible in LL:*

$$\frac{\frac{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta_1, F \quad \vdash \Gamma : \Delta_2, F^\perp}{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta_1, \Delta_2} Cut \quad \frac{\vdash \Gamma : !F \quad \vdash \Gamma, F^\perp : \Delta}{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta} Cut!}{\vdash \Gamma : \Delta} mCut$$

Moreover, for any formula F , the sequent $\vdash \cdot : F, F^\perp$ is provable.

Proof The procedures are defined in `DyLL/cut-dyadic.maude` and `DyLL/cut-dyadic-cc` (for *Cut!*). The properties are specified in `prop-cut.maude` and `prop-cut-cc.maude`. Discharging the cases for *Cut* (resp., *Cut!*) takes 32.4 seconds (resp., 4 seconds). The admissibility of *Cut* (resp., *Cut!*) relies on H and W (resp., H, W and W!). \square

Intuitionistic Linear Logic. The directory `ILL` contains the specification and analyses for intuitionistic linear logic (ILL). In this system, the multiplicative disjunction \wp is not present and the linear implication \multimap needs to be added (in classical LL, $F \multimap G$ is a shorthand for $F^\perp \wp G$). The resulting system is two-sided and single-conclusion. Formulas marked with ! on the left of the sequent can be weakened and contracted. The proof of cut-elimination follows the same principles that the one for LL and the multicut rule below is required where $!\Gamma$ is a multiset of formulas marked with ! (specified as the sort `!MSFormula`)

$$\frac{!\Gamma \vdash !F \quad \Delta, (!F)^n \vdash G}{!\Gamma, \Delta \vdash G} mCut$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma', \Box \Gamma \vdash \Box A, \Delta} \text{ k} \quad \frac{\Gamma, \Box A, A \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma, \Box A \vdash \Delta} \text{ T} \quad \frac{\Box \Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma', \Box \Gamma \vdash \Box A, \Delta} \text{ 4}$$

Fig. 6: The modal sequent rules for K (k) and S4 (T + 4)

8.5 Normal modal logics: K and S4

Modal logics extend classical logic with the addition of modal connectives (e.g., the unary modal connective \Box), used to qualify the truth of a judgment, widening the scope of logical-conceptual analysis. The alethic interpretation of $\Box A$ is “the formula A is necessarily true”. A modal logic is *normal* if it contains the axiom

$$(k) \Box(A \supset B) \supset \Box A \supset \Box B$$

and it is closed under *generalization*: if A is a theorem then so is $\Box A$.

The smallest normal modal logic is called K, and S4 extends K by assuming the axioms (T) $\Box A \supset A$ and (4) $\Box A \supset \Box \Box A$. The sequent systems considered here for the modal logics K and S4 are extensions of G3cp with the additional rules for the modalities depicted in Fig. 6.

Structural rules. The admissibility of the structural rules follows as in Section 8.3.

Theorem 26 (Structural rules) *If $K \blacktriangleright_n \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, then $K \blacktriangleright_{s(n)} \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ (H). Similarly for S4. Moreover, the rules W_L , W_R , C_L , and C_R are height-preserving admissible in both K and S4.*

Invertibility. As in G3cp, all the rules for the propositional connectives are invertible. Furthermore, T is invertible, but k and 4 are not (due to the implicit weakening).

Theorem 27 (Invertibility) *Only the rule T in Fig. 6 is invertible.*

Proof See the specification in `K/prop-inv.maude` and `S4/prop-inv.maude`. H is required in this proof. Below, one of the trivial cases showing that the rule k is not invertible:

$$\frac{}{\bullet h_2 : \Box A_4, A_5 \vdash T, A_3, \Box F_1} \text{ T}_R \quad \rightarrow \quad \frac{}{\bullet h_2 : \text{unbox}(\Box A_4) \vdash F_1} \text{ fail}$$

Multisets of boxed formulas belong to the sort `MSBFormula` and the operation

`op unbox : MSBFormula -> MSFormula` . removes the boxes. □

Cut-elimination and Identity Expansion. The cut-elimination procedure for K and S4 uses the same infrastructure developed for G3cp.

Theorem 28 (Cut-elimination and ID-expansion) *The cut-rule in Theorem 15 is admissible in both K and S4. Moreover, for any F , the sequent $F \vdash F$ is provable in K and S4.*

Proof The specifications are in `K/prop-cut.maude` and `S4/prop-cut.maude`. In both cases, H is required as well as the invertibility of the propositional rules. □

Modal Logic S5. Some extensions of the modal logic K do not have (known) cut-free sequent systems. In particular, consider the system S5, obtained by extending K with the axiom T and the rule below:

$$\frac{\Box \Gamma \vdash A, \Box \Delta}{\Gamma', \Box \Gamma \vdash \Delta', \Box A, \Box \Delta} \text{ 45}$$

(see `KT45/KT45.maude`). Using the same strategy as in Theorem 28, the tool is able to discard some of the proof obligations for cut-elimination. However, some subcases involving 45 and the other two modal rules (T and k) fail. Here, one example:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{h_1 : \Box \Delta_{13} \vdash \Box \Delta_{11}, F_8, \Box F_{10}}{\bullet h_1 : \Box \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{14} \vdash (\Box \Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Box F_8), \Box F_{10}} \text{ A45} \quad \frac{h_9 : \Box \Delta_{13}, F_{10}, \Delta_{14}, \Box F_{10} \vdash \Box \Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Box F_8}{\bullet h_9 : (\Box \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{14}), \Box F_{10} \vdash \Box \Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Box F_8} \text{ AT}}{\vdash : \Box \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{14} \vdash \Box \Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Box F_8} \text{ Cut}}{\vdash : \Box \Delta_{13}, \Delta_{14} \vdash \Box \Delta_{11}, \Delta_{12}, \Box F_8} \text{ fail}$$

This case is clearly not provable: the cut-formula $\Box F_{10}$ is not decomposed in the left premise. Hence, cutting with F_{10} will not finish the proof. The only alternative is to reduce the height of the cut. The rule T cannot be applied (on F_{10}) on the last sequent. If 45 is applied on the last sequent, either F_8 or one of the formulas in the boxed context Δ_{11} will lose the box. In both cases, none of the leaves of the left derivation can be used.

The failing cases are interesting, because they spot the point where the cut-elimination fails: if the goal is to propose a cut-free sequent system for a logic, certain shapes of rules should be avoided.

9 Concluding Remarks

Checking structural properties of proof systems demands trustful methods. Usually, proving such properties is done via case-by-case analysis, where all the possible combinations of rule applications in a system are exhausted. The advent of automated reasoning has changed completely the landscape, since theorems can nowadays be proved automatically in meta-logical frameworks (see e.g. [10]). This approach has brought a fresh perspective to the field of proof theory: useless proof search steps, usually singular to a specific logic, have been disregarded in favor of developing universal methods for providing general automation strategies. These developments have ultimately helped in abstracting out conceptual characteristics of logical systems, as well as in identifying effective frameworks that can capture (and help in reasoning about) them in a natural way.

This work moves forward towards such a direction: it proposes a general, natural, and uniform way of proving key structural properties of sequent systems by using the rewriting logic logical and meta-logical framework [2]. It ultimately enables modular and incremental proofs of meta-level properties of propositional sequent systems, both specified and mechanized in the language of Maude [8]. The approach builds on top of core algorithms that are combined and used for proving admissibility and invertibility of rules, as well as cut-elimination and identity expansion of sequent systems.

The choice of rewriting logic as a meta-logical framework brings key advantages. Indeed, as detailed below, while approaches using logical frameworks depend heavily on the specification method and/or the implicit properties of the meta and object logics, rewriting logic enables the specification of the rules as they are actually written in text and figures [2, 23]. Moreover, notions as derivability and admissibility of rules can be neatly formulated in the context of rewriting systems [15].

Consider, for instance, the LF framework [32] based on intuitionistic logic, where the left context is handled by the framework as a set. Specifying sequent systems based on multisets requires elaborated mechanisms in most logical frameworks, which makes the encoding of the system of interest far from being natural and straightforward. Moving from intuitionistic to linear logic solves this problem [6, 26], but still several sequent systems cannot be naturally specified in frameworks based on LL, as it is the case of mLJ. This latter situation can be partially fixed by adding subexponentials [9] to linear logic (SELL) [28, 29]. However, the resulting encodings are often non-trivial and difficult to automate. Moreover, several logical systems cannot be naturally specified in SELL, such as the modal sequent system K [31].

A completely different approach is presented in [37], where cut-elimination is obtained by considering the relation between the cut-rule in Gentzen's system LK and the resolution rule for (propositional) classical logic. But, again, this method is restricted to systems having a (classical) semantics as a starting point.

All in all, this paper presents yet more evidence of the fact that rewriting logic is an innovative and elegant framework for both specifying and reasoning in and about logical systems, with the further benefit of easy modular extension. In fact, a strong conjecture is that mild adjustments to the proposed approach and algorithms are needed to reason about other systems, including normal (multi-)modal [19] and paraconsistent [17] sequent systems. It seems also possible to have an extension to handle variants of sequent systems themselves, like nested [4] or linear nested [18] systems. This ultimately widens the scope of logics that can be analyzed in the L-Framework, such as normal and non-normal modal logics [20]. It is also an interesting future research path to consider first-order sequent systems. Previous work on mechanizing first-order sequent systems in rewriting logic, including proof-search heuristics at the meta-level, has been presented before in [33].

A usual concern when a new sequent system is proposed is to implement it. Few implementational efforts have provided tools for emerging sequent systems for logics such as epistemic, lax, deontic, knotted, linear-modal, etc., logics. It would not require much effort to reuse some of the algorithms presented here to implement a procedure that, given the inference rules of a sequent system, outputs an implementation of such a system in Maude. Also, implementing new induction principles on lists/multisets may help in obtaining new automatic proofs (see Theorem 23). More interestingly, using invertibility lemmas would also enable the generation of a weak-focus [1] version of the original systems, thus eliminating part of the non-determinism during proof-search. It should be noted, however, that this depends on a deeper investigation of the role of invertible rules as equational rules in rewriting logic. While this idea sounds more than reasonable, it is necessary to check whether promoting invertible rules to equations preserves completeness of the system (e.g., the resulting equational theory needs to be Church-Rosser and terminating modulo the structural

axioms of the operators). If the answer to this question is in the affirmative for a large class of systems, then the approach presented here also opens the possibility to the automatic generation of focused systems.

Finally, a word about cut-elimination. The usual Gentzen's cut-elimination proof strategy can be summarized by the following steps: (i) transforming a proof with cuts into a proof with principal cuts; (ii) transforming a proof with principal cuts into a proof with atomic cuts; and (iii) transforming a proof with atomic cuts into a cut-free proof. While step (ii) is not difficult to solve (see, e.g., [26]), steps (i) and (iii) can be problematic to mechanize. The results presented in this work suggest that such techniques can be fully automated to a certain degree, as showcased with various proof systems in Section 8.

References

1. J.-M. Andreoli. Logic programming with focusing proofs in linear logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 2(3):297–347, 1992.
2. D. Basin, M. Clavel, and J. Meseguer. Reflective metalogical frameworks. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 5(3):528–576, 2004.
3. R. Bruni and J. Meseguer. Semantic foundations for generalized rewrite theories. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 360(1-3):386–414, 2006.
4. K. Brünnler. Deep sequent systems for modal logic. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 48:551–577, 2009.
5. S. Burns and R. Zach. Relational hypersequents for modal logics. *CoRR*, abs/1805.09437, 2018. arXiv.
6. I. Cervesato and F. Pfenning. A Linear Logical Framework. *Information and Computation*, 179(1):19–75, 2002.
7. M. Clavel, F. Durán, S. Eker, P. Lincoln, N. Martí-Oliet, J. Meseguer, and J. F. Quesada. Maude: specification and programming in rewriting logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 285(2):187–243, 2002.
8. M. Clavel, F. Durán, S. Eker, P. Lincoln, N. Martí-Oliet, J. Meseguer, and C. Talcott. *All About Maude - A High-Performance Logical Framework*, volume 4350 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2007.
9. V. Danos, J.-B. Joinet, and H. Schellinx. The structure of exponentials: Uncovering the dynamics of linear logic proofs. In *Kurt Gödel Colloquium*, pages 159–171, 1993.
10. J. E. Dawson and R. Goré. Generic methods for formalising sequent calculi applied to provability logic. In *LPAR-17*, pages 263–277, 2010.
11. N. Dershowitz and J.-P. Jouannaud. Rewrite systems. In J. van Leeuwen, editor, *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. B*, pages 243–320. North-Holland, 1990.
12. N. Francez and R. Dyckhoff. A note on harmony. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 41(3):613–628, 2012.
13. G. Gentzen. Investigations into logical deduction. In *The Collected Papers of Gerhard Gentzen*, pages 68–131. North-Holland, 1969.
14. J.-Y. Girard. Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 50:1–102, 1987.
15. C. Grabmayer. From abstract rewriting systems to abstract proof systems. *CoRR*, abs/0911.1412, 2009. arXiv.
16. J. Hendrix and J. Meseguer. Order-sorted equational unification revisited. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 290:37 – 50, 2012.
17. O. Lahav, J. Marcos, and Y. Zohar. Sequent systems for negative modalities. *Logica Universalis*, 11(3):345–382, 2017.
18. B. Lellmann. Linear nested sequents, 2-sequents and hypersequents. In *TABLEAUX-24*, pages 135–150, 2015.
19. B. Lellmann and E. Pimentel. Proof search in nested sequent calculi. In *LPAR-20*, pages 558–574, 2015.
20. B. Lellmann and E. Pimentel. Modularisation of sequent calculi for normal and non-normal modalities. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 20(2):7:1–7:46, 2019.

21. C. Liang and D. Miller. Focusing and polarization in linear, intuitionistic, and classical logics. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(46):4747–4768, 2009.
22. S. Maehara. Eine darstellung der intuitionistischen logik in der klassischen. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, pages 45–64, 1954.
23. N. Marti-Oliet and J. Meseguer. Rewriting Logic as a Logical and Semantic Framework. In *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, pages 1–87. Springer, Dordrecht, 2002.
24. J. Meseguer. Conditional rewriting logic as a unified model of concurrency. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 96(1):73–155, 1992.
25. J. Meseguer. Twenty years of rewriting logic. *Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 81(7-8):721–781, Oct. 2012.
26. D. Miller and E. Pimentel. A formal framework for specifying sequent calculus proof systems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 474:98–116, 2013.
27. S. Negri and J. von Plato. *Structural Proof Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
28. V. Nigam, E. Pimentel, and G. Reis. An extended framework for specifying and reasoning about proof systems. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 26(2):539–576, 2016.
29. V. Nigam, G. Reis, and L. Lima. Quati: An automated tool for proving permutation lemmas. In *IJCAR-7*, pages 255–261, 2014.
30. C. Olarte, E. Pimentel, and C. Rocha. Proving structural properties of sequent systems in rewriting logic. In *WRLA-12*, pages 115–135, 2018.
31. C. Olarte, E. Pimentel, and B. Xavier. A fresh view of linear logic as a logical framework. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 351:143 – 165, 2020.
32. F. Pfenning. Structural Cut Elimination I. Intuitionistic and classical logic. *Information and Computation*, 157(1/2):84–141, Mar. 2000.
33. C. Rocha and J. Meseguer. Theorem Proving Modulo Based on Boolean Equational Procedures. In *RelMiCS-10*, pages 337–351. 2008.
34. C. Rocha and J. Meseguer. Constructors, Sufficient Completeness, and Deadlock Freedom of Rewrite Theories. In *LPAR-17*, pages 594–609. Springer, 2010.
35. A. Troelstra and H. Schwichtenberg. *Basic Proof Theory*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
36. P. Viry. Equational rules for rewriting logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 285(2):487–517, 2002.
37. R. Zach. Cut elimination and normalization for generalized single and multi-conclusion sequent and natural deduction calculi. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, pages 1–42, 2020.