

A Subatomic Proof System for Decision Trees*

Chris Barrett, Alessio Guglielmi

University of Bath

December 12, 2021

Abstract

We design a proof system for propositional classical logic that integrates two languages for Boolean functions: standard conjunction-disjunction-negation and binary decision trees. We give two reasons to do so. The first is proof-theoretical naturalness: the system consists of all and only the inference rules generated by the single, simple, linear shape of the recently introduced subatomic logic. Thanks to this regularity, cuts are eliminated via a natural construction. The second reason is that the system generates efficient proofs. Indeed, we show that a certain class of tautologies due to Statman, which cannot have better than exponential cut-free proofs in the sequent calculus, have polynomial cut-free proofs in our system. We achieve this by using the same construction that we use for cut elimination. In summary, by expanding the language of propositional logic, we make its proof theory more regular and generate more proofs, some of which are very efficient.

That design is made possible by considering propositional variables as superpositions of their truth values, which are connected by self-dual, non-commutative connectives. A proof can then be projected via each propositional variable into two proofs, one for each truth value, without a need for cuts. Those projections are semantically natural and are at the heart of all the constructions in this paper. To accommodate self-dual non-commutativity, we compose proofs by deep inference.

1 Introduction

In this work, we contribute to the proof theory of classical logic in two ways:

- we design a new proof system with a more natural and simpler normalisation theory;
- we show that, within this proof system, significantly smaller proofs become available.

We do so by augmenting the standard, Boolean algebraic language of propositional classical logic formulae with decision trees [19]. In other words, we build a new proof system around a language based on standard connectives (conjunction, disjunction, negation) and augmented by expressions in which atoms are connectives denoting choice: formula $(A b C)$ has the truth value of formula A if atom b is negative and that of C if b is positive. For example, if c is negative, the formula $A \wedge (B c ((D \vee E) f G))$ is interpreted as $A \wedge B$. If c is positive and f negative, the formula is interpreted as $A \wedge (D \vee E)$. We limit ourselves, in this paper, to propositional proof systems, but those can be extended with quantifiers and modalities in standard ways. At first sight, the integration of the two languages of Boolean operators and decision trees is not compelling because each language is complete for Boolean functions. However, an important reason for that integration comes from normalisation. Developing the basic theory requires some work, which we do in this paper. The highlight is a very simple and natural cut-elimination

*This research has been supported by EPSRC project EP/K018868/1, ‘Efficient and Natural Proof Systems’.

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &\equiv (\bar{a}_1 \wedge \bar{b}_1) \vee (a_1 \vee b_1) \\
S_2 &\equiv \begin{array}{l} (\bar{a}_2 \wedge \bar{b}_2) \\ \vee (((a_2 \vee b_2) \wedge \bar{a}_1) \wedge \\ ((a_2 \vee b_2) \wedge \bar{b}_1) \quad) \\ \vee \qquad \qquad \qquad (a_1 \vee b_1) \end{array} \\
S_3 &\equiv \begin{array}{l} (\bar{a}_3 \wedge \bar{b}_3) \\ \vee (((a_3 \vee b_3) \wedge \bar{a}_2) \wedge \\ ((a_3 \vee b_3) \wedge \bar{b}_2) \quad) \\ \vee (((a_3 \vee b_3) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \wedge \bar{a}_1) \wedge \\ ((a_3 \vee b_3) \wedge (a_2 \vee b_2) \wedge \bar{b}_1) \quad) \\ \vee \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad (a_1 \vee b_1) \end{array}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 1: First three Statman tautologies.

procedure that is, to the best of our knowledge, based on new principles which could have a very wide applicability in other parts of proof theory.

The technical starting point is the observation that extending the standard language by decision trees is natural from the point of view of *subatomic logic* [2] in deep inference [5, 11, 13]. Subatomic logic unifies the structural treatment of several inference rules, such as identity/cut and contraction/weakening, that are seemingly unrelated. That unification works both at the level of inference-rule design and of normalisation. From the subatomic-logic perspective, all inference steps become linear at the structural level, where normalisation is performed. Non-linearity, which can manifest itself in inferences as duplication or negation of atoms, is revealed by means of an interpretation map that does not affect normalisation and that maps the subatomic proofs to the standard ones.

Despite the novelty, and perhaps the exoticism, of the subatomic perspective, the constructions in this paper are very natural and can be easily understood, at least at an intuitive level, without any previous exposure to background material. Indeed, they could be considered a good introduction to the whole area of deep inference. Our aim for the rest of the introduction is to show the main ideas with a simple example. Let us consider the series of tautologies defined by Statman in [17] (of which a more accessible, equivalent definition can be found in [8], Section 5.3.2). The series is defined in Section 6, but, for this introduction, the first three tautologies, shown in Figure 1, are sufficient. S_1 is obviously a tautology. To see that S_2 is a tautology, one can do a case analysis on the truth values of a_2 and b_2 : if both atoms are false the tautology is trivial and, if any of them is true, S_2 reduces to S_1 because $(a_2 \vee b_2)$ is true. The same argument works for all the other tautologies in the sequence S_1, \dots, S_n, \dots . That constitutes a polynomial-time proof method, and it is immediate to translate it into a formal proof of some proof system containing a cut rule, to be used for the case analyses. Indeed, Statman proved that there are polynomial-size tree-like sequent proofs with cut for the tautologies, but only exponential-size tree-like ones if cut is not allowed. It would seem that if we remove the cut from a proof system, we remove the means for generating small proofs by case analysis. However, it turns out that augmenting the language with decision trees circumvents this problem: we can indeed obtain polynomial-size cut-free proofs of Statman tautologies based on case analysis.

In our example, we can reduce the proof of S_2 to the proof of $(\downarrow_{a_2} S_2 \ a_2 \ r_{a_2} S_2)$. Here, $\downarrow_{a_2} S_2$ denotes a formula that is the *projection* of S_2 where each occurrence of a_2 is substituted by ‘false’. Similarly, in $r_{a_2} S_2$, each occurrence of a_2 is substituted by ‘true’. Accordingly to the argument outlined above, $r_{a_2} S_2$ can be easily derived from S_1 , while $\downarrow_{a_2} S_2$ needs to be further reduced to $(\downarrow_{b_2} \downarrow_{a_2} S_2 \ b_2 \ r_{b_2} \downarrow_{a_2} S_2)$: its left branch is a trivial tautology and the the right one depends on S_1 , as expected. The construction is shown in detail in Figure 7 and Figure 8.

In deep inference, and in particular in subatomic logic, projections can be lifted from for-

mulae to proofs with minimal effort. This way, by the same construction mentioned above, we can transform a proof of A , which might contain cuts, into a proof of $(l_b A \ b \ r_b A)$, where b is an atom that we are free to choose. $(l_b A \ b \ r_b A)$, in turn, proves A . The whole proof of A so obtained has the remarkable property of not containing any cut on atom b . By repeating the construction on all the atoms appearing in cuts, we obtain a cut-free proof of A . It is interesting to note that, if we interpret the cuts in the original proof of A as case analyses, we have turned them into decision points in a decision tree. Semantically, they might constitute the same case analysis, but they have an entirely different computational and complexity-theoretic behaviour. We think that this idea is general, novel and natural, and indeed the main interest of this paper because it might have far-reaching consequences in proof theory and proof complexity.

Finally, there is another aspect that makes the proof system in this paper attractive, in our opinion. Perhaps counterintuitively, the *augmenting* of the standard language for propositional logic results in a *reduction* of structure of the proof system operating on that language. The reason is that a new symmetry between atoms and connectives is revealed. Indeed, it turns out that *all* the instances of a very general rule scheme are sound and complete for the extended language: there is no difference between Boolean operators and atoms; they are interchangeable in the inference scheme. That is not the case for the standard language of propositional classical logic, for which only a subset of instances of the scheme is sound. The fact that all the inference rules come from a common matrix makes the study of normalisation much easier because there is a sort of closure on their set. This is demonstrated in [2], the foundational paper of subatomic logic, and is apparent in this paper as well.

2 Decision Trees and the Subatomic Language

A decision tree is a data structure that forms the basis of many modern, efficient implementations of Boolean functions. For example, the decision tree represented by $(A \ a \ B)$ is read as ‘if a then B , else A ’, where a is a Boolean variable. Just as in subatomic logic, we consider atoms as two-place self-dual, non-commutative connectives.

Suppose we wish to prove that two decision trees represent the same function; we could do so by building a proof system around decision trees. In what follows, we take an approach which enriches the language of decision trees with propositional connectives \wedge and \vee in order to express implication between formulae and gain access to the proof compression mechanisms of contraction and cut.

Definition 2.1. A *decision tree* is a binary tree, where each node is labelled by a Boolean variable and each leaf is labelled by a unit 0 or 1.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{A} be a countable set of *atoms* whose elements are denoted by $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}, \dots$. We define the *formulae* of the (subatomic) language DT as the language generated by the grammar

$$\text{DT} ::= 0 \mid 1 \mid (\text{DT} \wedge \text{DT}) \mid (\text{DT} \vee \text{DT}) \mid (\text{DT} \ \mathcal{A} \ \text{DT}),$$

where the distinct symbols 0, 1, \wedge and \vee do not appear in \mathcal{A} . We call 0 and 1 *units*. Atoms, \wedge and \vee are *connectives*. We denote formulae in DT as A, B, C, D, \dots . The expression $A \equiv B$ denotes syntactic equality of formulae. A *context* is a formula where some subformulae are substituted by holes, which are denoted $\{ \}$. Given a context with a single hole, denoted $K \{ \}$, and a formula A , let $K\{A\}$ denote the formula given by substituting A into the hole. In a formula $K\{A \ \mathbf{a} \ B\}$, for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$, each atom occurrence in A or B is said to be *nested*. We may drop parentheses when there is no ambiguity. The *size* $s(A)$ of a formula A is the number of unit occurrences appearing in it.

Definition 2.3. We equip the language DT with an involution $\bar{\cdot} : \text{DT} \rightarrow \text{DT}$, which we call *negation*, defined inductively as follows, for all atoms \mathbf{a} :

$$\bar{0} = 1, \quad \bar{1} = 0, \quad \overline{A \wedge B} = \bar{A} \vee \bar{B}, \quad \overline{A \vee B} = \bar{A} \wedge \bar{B}, \quad \overline{A \ \mathbf{a} \ B} = \bar{A} \ \mathbf{a} \ \bar{B}.$$

We also use the same notation to denote the *dual* of connectives, *i.e.*, $\bar{\wedge} = \vee$, $\bar{\vee} = \wedge$ and $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{a}$.

We take as equalities on formulae the linear unit equations of classical logic, plus two new subatomic unit equations.

Definition 2.4. The equivalence $=$ on formulae is the minimal equivalence relation, closed under context ($A = B$ implies $K\{A\} = K\{B\}$, for any context $K\{\ \}$), defined by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} A \wedge 1 &= A, & 1 \vee 1 &= 1, & 1 \mathbf{a} 1 &= 1, \\ A \vee 0 &= A, & 0 \wedge 0 &= 0, & 0 \mathbf{a} 0 &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for every atom \mathbf{a} .

For example, the formula $(1 \vee (0 \mathbf{a} 1))$ is equal under $=$ to $(1 \vee (((0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge 1) \vee (0 \mathbf{b} 0)))$, but neither is equal to 1.

The language DT contains both the language of decision trees and the language of classical propositional formulae. We characterise these two sub-languages as follows.

Definition 2.5. Given $A \in \text{DT}$, we say that A is a *propositional formula* if there is a $B = A$ with no nested atom occurrences; we say that A is a *strict decision tree* if there is a $B = A$ with no conjunctions or disjunctions. We denote with **Prop** and **SDT**, respectively, the subsets of DT containing all the propositional formulae and the strict decision trees.

For example, a formula which contains no nested atom occurrences, and thus is in **Prop**, is $((1 \mathbf{a} 0) \vee (1 \mathbf{b} 0))$. Any formula equivalent to this is also in **Prop**, even if it contains nested atom occurrences. For example, $((1 \mathbf{a} (0 \mathbf{c} 0)) \vee (1 \mathbf{b} 0))$. Similarly, the formula $((1 \mathbf{b} 0) \mathbf{a} (1 \mathbf{c} 1))$ is in **SDT**, and thus so is the equivalent formula $((1 \mathbf{b} 0) \mathbf{a} (0 \vee 1))$, even though it contains a disjunction.

Remark 2.6. There is a natural map from the formulae of classical propositional logic to the language **Prop**, given by substituting positive and negative atoms with the corresponding decision trees $(0 \mathbf{a} 1)$ and $(1 \mathbf{a} 0)$, respectively.

The language DT thus contains both the language of decision trees and the language of classical propositional formulae. Later, we will exhibit constructions which allow us to translate between these two languages within our proof system; that is, for any formula in **Prop**, we are able to find a semantically equivalent formula in **SDT** and vice versa, and proofs of the equivalence. These languages are syntax for Boolean functions and can be interpreted as such via a standard evaluation function $\llbracket - \rrbracket$. In the following, we will use the symbols \wedge and \vee also as Boolean operators on the set of values $\{0, 1\}$.

Definition 2.7. For any assignment of Boolean values to atoms $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we define the *value* of formulae $\llbracket - \rrbracket_X: \text{DT} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as:

$$\llbracket 0 \rrbracket_X = 0, \quad \llbracket 1 \rrbracket_X = 1, \quad \llbracket A \wedge B \rrbracket_X = \llbracket A \rrbracket_X \wedge \llbracket B \rrbracket_X, \quad \llbracket A \vee B \rrbracket_X = \llbracket A \rrbracket_X \vee \llbracket B \rrbracket_X$$

$$\text{and} \quad \llbracket A \mathbf{a} B \rrbracket_X = \begin{cases} \llbracket A \rrbracket_X & \text{if } X(\mathbf{a}) = 0, \\ \llbracket B \rrbracket_X & \text{if } X(\mathbf{a}) = 1, \end{cases}$$

for every atom \mathbf{a} . We say that A *implies* B if, for every assignment X , $\llbracket A \rrbracket_X \leq \llbracket B \rrbracket_X$. We say that A is a *tautology* if for every assignment X , $\llbracket A \rrbracket_X = 1$. We say two formulae A and B are *semantically equivalent* if for every assignment X , $\llbracket A \rrbracket_X = \llbracket B \rrbracket_X$.

For the sub-languages **SDT** and **Prop**, this evaluation function coincides with the usual one.

3 Deep Inference and a Subatomic Proof System for Decision Trees

Deep inference is, essentially, the ability to apply inference rules at arbitrary depth within a formula [2, 11, 12]. Thus, derivations are composable horizontally by the same connectives as

formulae, as well as in the usual vertical manner. Subatomic proof systems [1,2] represent atoms as non-commutative self-dual connectives and, to accommodate this choice, we compose proofs by deep inference. Consequently, it is possible to adopt a unique, linear rule shape that can generate all the standard inference rules for a wide class of logics including classical, MALL [9] and BV [11].

For example, in system SKS [5] for classical logic, non-linear rules such as identity/cut and contraction appear in the subatomic system as the following instances of more general *linear* inferences. Working modulo some unit equations, the correspondence is clear:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{v}}\mathbf{a} \frac{(0 \mathbf{a} 1) \vee (0 \mathbf{a} 1)}{(0 \vee 0) \mathbf{a} (1 \vee 1)} &\leftrightarrow \frac{a \vee a}{a}, \\ \widehat{\mathbf{v}}\mathbf{a} \frac{(0 \vee 1) \mathbf{a} (1 \vee 0)}{(0 \mathbf{a} 1) \vee (1 \mathbf{a} 0)} &\leftrightarrow \frac{1}{a \vee \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, it turns out that *all* the instances of the very general rule scheme are sound and complete for our extended language. That is not the case for the standard language for propositional classical logic, for which only a subset of instances of the scheme is sound. Thus, by extending the language, we have actually simplified the proof system. The rule shape is as follows.

Definition 3.1. The inference rules of *subatomic shape* are those of the form

$$\alpha\widehat{\beta} \frac{(A \beta B) \alpha (C \widehat{\beta} D)}{(A \alpha C) \beta (B \alpha D)} \quad \text{or} \quad \beta\widetilde{\alpha} \frac{(A \beta B) \alpha (C \beta D)}{(A \alpha C) \beta (B \widetilde{\alpha} D)},$$

for connectives $\alpha, \beta \in \{\wedge, \vee\} \cup \mathcal{A}$ and formulae A, B, C and D of DT. The *names* of inference rules of subatomic shape are given by $\alpha\widehat{\beta}$ and $\beta\widetilde{\alpha}$ respectively. We define $\widehat{\wedge} = \widehat{\vee} = \wedge$, $\widetilde{\wedge} = \widetilde{\vee} = \vee$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{a}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{a}$. This notation relates two dual connectives, assigning a *stronger* $\widehat{\cdot}$ and *weaker* $\widetilde{\cdot}$ of the pair.

Remark 3.2. Note that the name $\mathbf{a}\widetilde{\wedge}$ is *not* equal to $\mathbf{a}\vee$ (which is not considered a name at all), even though $\widetilde{\wedge} = \vee$. That is to say, although $\widehat{\cdot}$ and $\widetilde{\cdot}$ are considered as functions on connectives when appearing in a rule instance, when appearing in the name of a rule they are considered as decorations.

Remark 3.3. Some subatomic rules will be assigned two names under this scheme, for example $\wedge\widetilde{\vee}$ and $\vee\widehat{\wedge}$:

$$\wedge\widetilde{\vee} \frac{(A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge D)}{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \widetilde{\vee} D)} \equiv \vee\widehat{\wedge} \frac{(A \wedge B) \vee (C \widehat{\wedge} D)}{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee D)}.$$

We consider this as one rule, with two distinct names. Another example is the pair $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}\mathbf{b}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{a}}\mathbf{b}$.

We define our subatomic proof system for decision trees, which we call DT^{sa} , as the set of all possible rules of the subatomic shape.

Definition 3.4. A *subatomic proof system* is defined by a set of inference rules of subatomic shape, together with *equality rules*, for an equational theory $=$, given by $= \frac{A}{B}$, for every formulae A and B such that $A = B$. System DT^{sa} is the subatomic proof system defined by taking all rules of the subatomic shape $\alpha\widehat{\beta}$ and $\alpha\widetilde{\beta}$ for connectives $\alpha, \beta = \{\wedge, \vee\} \cup \mathcal{A}$ together with the set of equality rules generated by $=$ from Definition 2.4.

See Figure 2 for the complete list of non-equality inference rules of DT^{sa} . The list of rules in the figure is only provided to facilitate the reading of the various derivations in this paper. We hope that the reader keeps in mind that all those rules are generated by the subatomic shape and, indeed, the best way to understand our work is to familiarise oneself with the shape rather than using Figure 2 as a dictionary.

We deal with commutativity and associativity of \wedge and \vee using inference rules of the subatomic shape, rather than equality rules.

The first subatomic system for classical logic was introduced in [2] as SAKS. In this paper we will refer to this system as SKS^{sa} .

Definition 3.5. The subatomic proof system for classical logic, SKS^{sa} , is defined as the set of inference rules given by $\{\vee\tilde{\lambda}, \wedge\tilde{\vee}, \vee\tilde{\vee}, \wedge\tilde{\wedge}, \vee\tilde{\wedge}, \wedge\tilde{\vee}\} \cup (\cup_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}} \{\vee\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \wedge\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \wedge\tilde{\mathbf{a}}, \vee\tilde{\mathbf{a}}\})$, together with the set of equality rules generated by $=$ from Definition 2.4.

The system DT^{sa} can be seen as the subatomic system SKS^{sa} for classical logic extended with the rule $\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ (or, equivalently, $\mathbf{a}\widehat{\mathbf{b}}$), which allows the manipulation of decision trees. For example, the proof in Figure 3 would be in SKS^{sa} except for this rule. In other words, we can define $\text{SKS}^{\text{sa}} = \text{DT}^{\text{sa}} \setminus \cup_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{A}} \{\mathbf{a}\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \mathbf{a}\widehat{\mathbf{b}}\}$.

Note that this definition includes some rules not originally in SKS^{sa} as it appears in [2], namely $\{\wedge\tilde{\lambda}, \mathbf{a}\tilde{\lambda}, \vee\tilde{\wedge}, \vee\tilde{\vee}, \mathbf{a}\tilde{\vee}\}$. However, each of these rules can be replaced by a derivation in the original system for only a linear cost in complexity. An example of this can be found after the following definition.

Definition 3.6. Given a subatomic proof system \mathcal{S} , a *derivation* ϕ in \mathcal{S} with *premise* and

conclusion A and B , also said *from* A to B , is denoted by $\phi \parallel_{\mathcal{S}} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline A \\ \hline \phi \parallel_{\mathcal{S}} \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}$; its *width* is denoted $w(\phi)$ and

its *height* is denoted $h(\phi)$. We define derivations inductively; they can be:

- a formula $\phi \equiv A \equiv B$; $w(\phi) = s(A)$; $h(\phi) = 0$;
- a *composition by inference*

$$\phi \equiv \rho \frac{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline A \\ \hline \psi \parallel_{\mathcal{S}} \\ \hline A' \\ \hline \end{array}}{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline B' \\ \hline \chi \parallel_{\mathcal{S}} \\ \hline B \\ \hline \end{array}},$$

where $\rho \frac{A'}{B'}$ is an instance of an inference rule in \mathcal{S} , which could be an equality rule, and ψ and χ are derivations in \mathcal{S} ; $w(\phi) = \max(w(\psi), w(\chi))$; $h(\phi) = h(\psi) + h(\chi) + 1$;

- a *composition by connective*

$$\phi \equiv \left(\begin{array}{|c|} \hline C \\ \hline \psi \parallel_{\mathcal{S}} \\ \hline E \\ \hline \end{array} \alpha \begin{array}{|c|} \hline D \\ \hline \chi \parallel_{\mathcal{S}} \\ \hline F \\ \hline \end{array} \right),$$

where $\alpha \in \{\wedge, \vee\} \cup \mathcal{A}$, $A \equiv (C \alpha D)$ and $B \equiv (E \alpha F)$, and ψ and χ are derivations in \mathcal{S} ; $w(\phi) = w(\psi) + w(\chi)$; $h(\phi) = \max(h(\psi), h(\chi))$.

We consider composition by inference associative. We call a derivation with premise 1 a *proof*. The *size* of a derivation is the number of units appearing within it. We will omit the name of a derivation or of a proof system if there is no ambiguity. The boxes around derivations are essentially brackets, and so we sometimes also omit them.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{\vee\checkmark}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \vee (C \vee D)}{(A \vee C) \vee (B \vee D)} & \frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge D)}{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee D)} & \frac{\mathbf{a}\checkmark}{\mathbf{a}\checkmark} \frac{(A \mathbf{a} B) \vee (C \mathbf{a} D)}{(A \vee C) \mathbf{a} (B \vee D)} \\
\frac{\vee\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D)}{(A \wedge C) \vee (B \vee D)} & \frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \wedge B) \wedge (C \wedge D)}{(A \wedge C) \wedge (B \vee D)} & \frac{\mathbf{a}\checkmark}{\mathbf{a}\checkmark} \frac{(A \mathbf{a} B) \wedge (C \mathbf{a} D)}{(A \wedge C) \mathbf{a} (B \vee D)} \\
\frac{\vee\checkmark}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \mathbf{a} (C \vee D)}{(A \mathbf{a} C) \vee (B \mathbf{a} D)} & \frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \wedge B) \mathbf{a} (C \wedge D)}{(A \mathbf{a} C) \wedge (B \mathbf{a} D)} & \frac{\mathbf{a}\checkmark}{\mathbf{a}\checkmark} \frac{(A \mathbf{a} B) \mathbf{b} (C \mathbf{a} D)}{(A \mathbf{b} C) \mathbf{a} (B \mathbf{b} D)} \\
\frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \wedge B) \wedge (C \wedge D)}{(A \wedge C) \wedge (B \wedge D)} & \frac{\vee\checkmark}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{(A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge D)}{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee D)} & \frac{\mathbf{a}\checkmark}{\mathbf{a}\checkmark} \frac{(A \wedge B) \mathbf{a} (C \wedge D)}{(A \mathbf{a} C) \wedge (B \mathbf{a} D)} \\
\frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \wedge (C \wedge D)}{(A \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge D)} & \frac{\vee\checkmark}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \vee (C \wedge D)}{(A \vee C) \vee (B \vee D)} & \frac{\mathbf{a}\checkmark}{\mathbf{a}\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \mathbf{a} (C \wedge D)}{(A \mathbf{a} C) \vee (B \mathbf{a} D)} \\
\frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \mathbf{a} B) \wedge (C \mathbf{a} D)}{(A \wedge C) \mathbf{a} (B \wedge D)} & \frac{\vee\checkmark}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{(A \mathbf{a} B) \vee (C \mathbf{a} D)}{(A \vee C) \mathbf{a} (B \vee D)} & \frac{\mathbf{a}\checkmark}{\mathbf{a}\checkmark} \frac{(A \mathbf{b} B) \mathbf{a} (C \mathbf{b} D)}{(A \mathbf{a} C) \mathbf{b} (B \mathbf{a} D)}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2: System DT^{sa} (excluding equations). Every inference rule is generated by the unique subatomic rule shape, and no rules of the shape are excepted from inclusion. Some rules such as $\mathbf{a}\checkmark$ and $\wedge\checkmark$ appear twice (denoted by distinct names). Atoms \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} range over all of \mathcal{A} .

Remark 3.7. Later in the text, we will reference the *mirror image* of a derivation. For example, the mirror image of the rule

$$\frac{\vee\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D)}{(A \wedge C) \vee (B \vee D)} \quad \text{is} \quad \frac{(D \vee C) \wedge (B \vee A)}{(D \vee B) \vee (C \wedge A)}.$$

Technically, the latter rule is not included in the proof system. We can either choose to include the mirror image rules in the proof system, or for each mirror image construction we can make use of commutativity. In both cases, all important proof theoretic properties are preserved.

Proposition 3.8. *System DT^{sa} is sound with respect to the semantics defined by $\llbracket - \rrbracket$, i.e., if there exists a derivation in DT^{sa} with premise A and conclusion B , then A implies B .*

Proof. By inspection of the rules. □

Remark 3.9. For every inference rule $\alpha\checkmark$ of subatomic shape from A to B , there exists a *dual inference rule* $\gamma\checkmark$ of subatomic shape from \overline{B} to \overline{A} , with $\gamma \equiv \overline{\alpha}$ and $\checkmark \equiv \overline{\checkmark}$, and vice versa. Thus, given a derivation ϕ from A to B in DT^{sa} , we can obtain a *dual derivation* from \overline{B} to \overline{A} by inverting ϕ , dualising every formula occurring in it and renaming each inference rule as its dual. For example, the dual of

$$\frac{\frac{\vee\checkmark}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D)}{(A \wedge C) \vee (B \vee D)} \wedge \frac{\vee\checkmark}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{(E \vee F) \wedge (G \vee H)}{(E \wedge G) \vee (F \vee H)}}{\vee\checkmark} \frac{((A \wedge C) \wedge (E \wedge G)) \vee ((B \vee D) \vee (F \vee H))}{((\overline{A} \vee \overline{C}) \vee (\overline{E} \vee \overline{G})) \wedge ((\overline{B} \wedge \overline{D}) \wedge (\overline{F} \wedge \overline{H}))}$$

$$\frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{\frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(\overline{A} \vee \overline{C}) \wedge (\overline{B} \wedge \overline{D})}{(\overline{A} \wedge \overline{B}) \vee (\overline{C} \wedge \overline{D})} \vee \frac{\wedge\checkmark}{\wedge\checkmark} \frac{(\overline{E} \vee \overline{G}) \wedge (\overline{F} \wedge \overline{H})}{(\overline{E} \wedge \overline{F}) \vee (\overline{G} \wedge \overline{H})}}{\wedge\checkmark}.$$

The dual of a sound derivation is sound.




Figure 3: An example proof in system DT^{sa} .

The following definition introduces derivation composition.

Definition 3.10. Let $\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B}$ and $\psi \parallel \frac{B}{C}$ be two derivations. We define $\frac{\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B}}{\psi \parallel \frac{B}{C}}$, which we call the *(synchronal) composition* of ϕ and ψ , as follows:

- where $\phi \equiv B$, define $\frac{\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B}}{\psi \parallel \frac{B}{C}} \equiv \psi \parallel \frac{B}{C}$; similarly, where $\psi \equiv B$, define $\frac{\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B}}{\psi \parallel \frac{B}{C}} \equiv \phi \parallel \frac{A}{B}$;

- where $\phi \equiv \rho \frac{A}{B'}$, define $\frac{\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B'}}{\omega \parallel \frac{B}{C}} \equiv \frac{\rho \frac{A}{B'}}{\omega \parallel \frac{B}{C}}$; similarly, where $\psi \equiv \rho \frac{B'}{C'}$, define $\frac{\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B'}}{\omega \parallel \frac{B}{C}} \equiv \frac{\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B'}}{\rho \frac{B'}{C'}}$;

- where $\phi \equiv \left(\frac{A_1}{x \parallel B_1} \alpha \frac{A_2}{\omega \parallel B_2} \right)$ and $\psi \equiv \left(\frac{B_1}{x' \parallel C_1} \alpha \frac{B_2}{\omega' \parallel C_2} \right)$, define $\frac{\phi \parallel \frac{A}{B}}{\omega \parallel \frac{B}{C}} \equiv \frac{\frac{A_1}{x \parallel B_1} \alpha \frac{A_2}{\omega \parallel B_2}}{\frac{B_1}{x' \parallel C_1} \alpha \frac{B_2}{\omega' \parallel C_2}}$;

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \boxed{A_1} \\ x \parallel \\ \boxed{B_1} \\ \hline \boxed{B_1} \\ x' \parallel \\ \boxed{C_1} \end{array} \right) \alpha \left(\begin{array}{c} \boxed{A_2} \\ \omega \parallel \\ \boxed{B_2} \\ \hline \boxed{B_2} \\ \omega' \parallel \\ \boxed{C_2} \end{array} \right) \text{ for any connective } \alpha.$$

For example, we have

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{(A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge D)}{\wedge \checkmark}}{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee D)}{\wedge E}}{\frac{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee D)}{\vee \checkmark}}{\wedge E}}{\frac{(A \wedge B) \vee (C \vee D)}{\wedge E}}{\wedge E} \equiv \left(\begin{array}{c} \boxed{\frac{(A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge D)}{\wedge \checkmark}} \\ \boxed{\frac{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee D)}{\vee \checkmark}} \\ \wedge E \end{array} \right).$$

We call cuts those inferences which correspond to an atomic cut in system SKS via the embedding in Remark 2.6.

Definition 3.11. A *cut on a* is any instance of the rule:

$$\frac{\frac{(A \mathbf{a} B) \wedge (C \mathbf{a} D)}{\wedge \mathbf{a}}}{(A \wedge C) \mathbf{a} (B \wedge D)},$$

such that $A = D = 0$ and $B = C = 1$, or $A = D = 1$ and $B = C = 0$ in the equational theory $=$. We define an *identity* as the dual of a cut. A *cut-free (identity-free)* derivation is a derivation which contains no cuts (identities) on any atom.

For example, an instance of the cut rule on the atom \mathbf{a} is:

$$\frac{\frac{((0 \wedge 0) \mathbf{a} (0 \vee 1)) \wedge ((1 \vee 1) \mathbf{a} (0 \wedge 1))}{\wedge \mathbf{a}}}{((0 \wedge 0) \wedge (1 \vee 1)) \mathbf{a} ((0 \vee 1) \wedge (0 \wedge 1))}.$$

Remark 3.12. Derivations of system SKS^{sa} are in one-to-one correspondence (via the embedding of Remark 2.6) with derivations of SKS, and thus SKS^{sa} is both cut-free complete for tautologies of Prop, as well as implicationally complete for Prop. We refer the interested reader to [2].

4 Completeness

In this section, we will prove completeness of our proof system with respect to the semantics described in Section 2. We will first describe a few constructions which will be useful in this proof, and later in the paper.

Proposition 4.1. *In system DT^{sa} , for every formula A , there exist cut-free and identity-free derivations of the form*

$$\frac{0}{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{A}{1}.$$

Their width is $O(n)$ and their height is constant, where n is the size of A .

Proof. We construct the first derivation by replacing each unit 1 appearing in A with

$$\frac{\frac{0}{(0 \wedge 1) \vee (1 \wedge 0)}}{\frac{(0 \vee 1) \wedge (1 \vee 0)}{1}}.$$

The second derivation can be obtained as the dual of the first. No cuts or identities are used. \square

Definition 4.2. We call *weakenings* and *co-weakenings* respectively the derivations constructed in Proposition 4.1.

Lemma 4.3. In system DT^{sa} , for every formula A , there exist cut-free and identity-free derivations of the form

$$\frac{A}{A \mathbf{a} 1}, \quad \frac{A}{1 \mathbf{a} A}, \quad \frac{A \mathbf{a} 0}{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{0 \mathbf{a} A}{A}.$$

Their height and width are $O(n)$, where n is the size of A .

Proof. We construct the first derivation by structural induction on A . The second derivation can be constructed as the mirror image. The final two can be recovered as duals of the first two.

If $A \equiv 0$, the necessary derivation is given by a weakening. If $A \equiv 1$, take the derivation $= \frac{1}{1 \mathbf{a} 1}$. If $A \equiv (B \alpha C)$ for some connective α , construct

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{B}{B \mathbf{a} 1} \parallel \alpha \parallel \frac{C}{C \mathbf{a} 1}}{\alpha \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}}{(B \alpha C) \mathbf{a} \frac{1 \alpha 1}{1}}.$$

Note that the occurrence of $\alpha \widehat{\mathbf{a}}$ here is not an instance of the cut rule, and when dualised, not an instance of the identity rule. \square

The semantic equivalence between $(B \mathbf{a} C)$ and $((B \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} 0)) \vee ((0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge C))$ is cut-free provable within the system, *i.e.*, there is a cut-free derivation from one to the other and vice versa. These constructions allow us to nest and un-nest atom occurrences, which in turn allows us to show that for any formula of DT , there is a semantically equivalent formula in Prop , and vice versa, and that this equivalence is provable within the system. This reduces completeness of system DT^{sa} to that of system SKS^{sa} , which is known.

Lemma 4.4. In system DT^{sa} , for every formulae B and C , we can construct cut-free derivations of the form

$$\frac{B \mathbf{a} C}{(B \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} 0)) \vee ((0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge C)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{(B \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} 0)) \vee ((0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge C)}{B \mathbf{a} C}$$

Their width and height are $O(n)$, where n is the size of $(B \mathbf{a} C)$.

Proof. If $B \neq 0 \neq C$, we construct the two derivations as

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{B}{(B \wedge 1) \vee (0 \wedge 0)}}{\alpha \widehat{\mathbf{a}}} \mathbf{a} \frac{\frac{C}{(0 \wedge 0) \vee (1 \wedge C)}}{\alpha \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}}{\frac{\frac{(B \wedge 1) \mathbf{a} (0 \wedge 0)}{\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}} \vee \frac{(0 \wedge 0) \mathbf{a} (1 \wedge C)}{\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}}{\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}}{\frac{\frac{\frac{B \mathbf{a} 0}{\phi \parallel B} \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} 0)}{\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}} \vee \frac{(0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge \frac{0 \mathbf{a} C}{\psi \parallel C}}{\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}}{\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}}{\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}}$$

and

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{B}{\chi \parallel} \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} 0)}{B \mathbf{a} 1} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}{(B \wedge 1) \mathbf{a} (1 \wedge 0)} \quad \vee \quad \frac{\frac{(0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge \frac{\omega \parallel}{1 \mathbf{a} C}}{(0 \wedge 1) \mathbf{a} (1 \wedge C)} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}{(B \wedge 1) \vee (0 \wedge 1)} \quad \mathbf{a} \quad \frac{(1 \wedge 0) \vee (1 \wedge C)}{C}}{\frac{(B \wedge 1) \vee (0 \wedge 1)}{B} \quad \mathbf{a} \quad \frac{(1 \wedge 0) \vee (1 \wedge C)}{C}}{\vee \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}$$

respectively, where ϕ , ψ , χ and ω are instances of the constructions of Lemma 4.3. No occurrence of rule $\wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}$ can be a cut. If $B = 0$ or $C = 0$, the latter derivation will contain a cut in at least one of the sub-derivations

$$\frac{\frac{B}{\chi \parallel} \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} 0)}{B \mathbf{a} 1} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{(0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge \frac{\omega \parallel}{1 \mathbf{a} C}}{(0 \wedge 1) \mathbf{a} (1 \wedge C)} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}$$

To fix this, we replace the problematic sub-derivation(s) with

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{B}{0 \mathbf{a} 0} \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} 0)}{0 \mathbf{a} 0} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}{\frac{\frac{0}{B} \wedge 1}{\pi \parallel} \mathbf{a} \quad \frac{0}{1} \wedge 0} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{(0 \mathbf{a} 1) \wedge \frac{C}{0 \mathbf{a} 0}}{0 \mathbf{a} 0} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{a}}}{0 \wedge \frac{0}{\theta \parallel} \mathbf{a} \quad 1 \wedge \frac{0}{C}}$$

respectively, where in each case π and θ is an instance of the weakening construction.

The width of these derivations is $O(n)$. The derivations ϕ , ψ , χ and ω each have height $O(n)$ and thus each derivation has height $O(n)$ also. \square

Lemma 4.5. *In system DT^{sa} , for every formula A in DT , there exist some semantically equivalent formula B in Prop and cut-free derivations*

$$\frac{A}{B} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{B}{A}$$

Proof. We construct the first derivation. If there exist nested atoms occurring in A , then we have $A \equiv K\{C \mathbf{a} D\}$ for some atom \mathbf{a} , where either C or D contain an atom occurrence. Applying the first construction from Lemma 4.4 to $(C \mathbf{a} D)$ strictly reduces the number of nested atoms in A . Repeatedly applying this construction until there are no more nested atoms yields a derivation with conclusion B which is semantically equivalent to A and such that B is in Prop .

Repeatedly applying the second construction from Lemma 4.4 to B allows us to nest atom occurrences until we have recovered A . \square

Proposition 4.6. *System DT^{sa} is implicationally complete with respect to the semantics defined by $\llbracket - \rrbracket$, i.e., if A implies B then there exists a derivation with premise A and conclusion B .*

Proof. Using Lemma 4.5, we can find formulae C and D in **Prop** which are semantically equivalent to A and B respectively, together with derivations ϕ from A to C and χ from D to B in **DT**. Because C and D are both in **Prop**, and because C implies D , there exists a derivation with premise C and conclusion D in system SKS^{sa} by implicational completeness of SKS^{sa} (see Remark 3.12), which we will call ψ . Since SKS^{sa} contains all the inference rules of SKS^{sa} , we can thus construct within DT^{sa} the derivation

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{A}{\phi} \parallel \frac{C}{\psi}}{-\frac{C}{D}} \parallel \frac{D}{\chi}}{-\frac{D}{B}} .$$

□

Proposition 4.7. *System DT^{sa} is cut-free complete with respect to the semantics defined by $\llbracket - \rrbracket$, i.e., if A is a tautology, there exists a cut-free proof of A .*

Proof. Using Lemma 4.5, we can find a formula B in **Prop** which is semantically equivalent to A , together with a cut-free derivation ψ from B to A . Since B is a tautology in **Prop**, there exists a cut-free proof ϕ of B in SKS^{sa} by the completeness of SKS^{sa} for **Prop** (see Remark 3.12). In fact, this is also a proof in DT^{sa} . Thus construct

$$\frac{\frac{1}{\phi} \parallel \frac{B}{\psi}}{-\frac{B}{A}} .$$

□

5 Cut Elimination

We describe a construction whereby a proof can be projected via each propositional variable into two proofs, one for each truth value, without a need for cuts. Given a formula, there is an obvious notion of left (right) projection on an atom a given by taking the value of that formula when a is false (true). We can then lift the definition of projections from formulae to proofs with minimal effort. Thus, we can transform a proof of A , which might contain cuts, into a proof of $(\mathbf{l}_b A \mathbf{b} \mathbf{r}_b A)$, where b is an atom that we are free to choose and $\mathbf{l}_b A$ and $\mathbf{r}_b A$ are left and right projections of A respectively. $(\mathbf{l}_b A \mathbf{b} \mathbf{r}_b A)$, in turn, proves A . The whole proof of A so obtained has the remarkable property of not containing any cut on atom b . By repeating the construction on all the atoms appearing in cuts, we obtain a cut-free proof of A .

Lemma 5.1. *In system DT^{sa} , for every formula A and every connective $\alpha \in \{\vee\} \cup \mathcal{A}$, $\beta \in \{\wedge\} \cup \mathcal{A}$, we can construct cut-free and identity-free derivations of the form*

$$\frac{A \alpha A}{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{A}{A \beta A} .$$

Their size is $O(n^2)$ where n is the size of A .

Proof. We construct the first derivation by induction on A . The second derivation can be recovered as the dual of the first.

In the case $A \equiv 0$, take $\frac{0 \alpha 0}{0}$. In the case $A \equiv 1$, take $\frac{1 \alpha 1}{1}$. Otherwise, we have $A \equiv (B \gamma C)$, for some connective γ , and we construct the derivation

$$\frac{\gamma \bar{\alpha} \left(\frac{B \gamma C}{\alpha} \right) \alpha (B \gamma C)}{\left[\begin{array}{c} B \alpha B \\ \parallel \\ B \end{array} \right] \gamma \left[\begin{array}{c} C \alpha C \\ \parallel \\ C \end{array} \right]}.$$

The width of the derivation is $O(n)$, and the height of the derivation is $O(n)$. \square

Definition 5.2. We call *contractions* and *co-contractions* respectively the derivations constructed in Lemma 5.1.

Lemma 5.3. In system DT^{sa} , for every formulae A and B and every context $K\{ \}$, there exist cut-free and identity-free derivations of the form

$$\frac{K\{A\} \wedge B}{\parallel} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{K\{A \vee B\}}{\parallel}.$$

Their width is $O(m+n+l)$ and their height is $O(ml)$, where m is the size of $K\{ \}$, $n = \text{s}(A)$ and $l = \text{s}(B)$.

Proof. We construct the first derivation; the second can be obtained as the dual of the first. We proceed by induction on $K\{ \}$. In the base case, $K\{ \} \equiv \{ \}$ and we take the trivial derivation. In the cases where $K\{ \} \equiv (H\{ \} \wedge C)$, $K\{ \} \equiv (H\{ \} \vee C)$ or $K\{ \} \equiv (H\{ \} \mathbf{a} C)$, where \mathbf{a} is any atom, take

$$\frac{\wedge \bar{\alpha} \left(\frac{H\{A\} \wedge C}{\wedge} \right) \wedge \left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \hline B \wedge 1 \end{array} \right]}{\left[\begin{array}{c} H\{A\} \wedge B \\ \parallel \\ H\{A \wedge B\} \end{array} \right] \wedge \left[\begin{array}{c} C \wedge 1 \\ \hline C \end{array} \right]}, \quad \frac{\wedge \bar{\vee} \left(\frac{H\{A\} \vee C}{\vee} \right) \wedge \left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \hline B \vee 0 \end{array} \right]}{\left[\begin{array}{c} H\{A\} \wedge B \\ \parallel \\ H\{A \wedge B\} \end{array} \right] \vee \left[\begin{array}{c} C \vee 0 \\ \hline C \end{array} \right]} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\wedge \bar{\mathbf{a}} \left(\frac{H\{A\} \mathbf{a} C}{\mathbf{a}} \right) \wedge \left[\begin{array}{c} B \\ \phi \\ \hline B \mathbf{a} 1 \end{array} \right]}{\left[\begin{array}{c} H\{A\} \wedge B \\ \parallel \\ H\{A \wedge B\} \end{array} \right] \mathbf{a} \left[\begin{array}{c} C \wedge 1 \\ \hline C \end{array} \right]},$$

respectively, where ϕ is as in Lemma 4.3. The remaining cases of $K\{ \} \equiv (C \wedge H\{ \})$, $K\{ \} \equiv (C \vee H\{ \})$ and $K\{ \} \equiv (C \mathbf{a} H\{ \})$ can all be dealt with similarly. Note that these derivations contain no instances of the cut or identity rule.

The width of each derivation is $O(n+m+l)$. Note that the height of the third case dominates the other cases; ϕ is of height $O(l)$, whereas the corresponding part of the other two derivations is an equality rule of constant height. There are $O(m)$ inductive steps in the derivation, each contributing height $O(l)$, thus the height of the derivation in total is $O(ml)$. \square

In decision trees such as $((A \mathbf{a} B) \mathbf{a} C)$, there is semantically irrelevant information – the truth of the formula does not depend on B . The equivalence of this formula to $(A \mathbf{a} C)$ is provable within the system. We state and prove the general case below.

Lemma 5.4. In system DT^{sa} , for every formulae A , B and C and every atom \mathbf{a} , there exist cut-free derivations of the form

$$\frac{K\{A\} \mathbf{a} C}{\parallel} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{C \mathbf{a} K\{A\}}{\parallel},$$

$$\frac{K\{A \mathbf{a} B\} \mathbf{a} C}{\parallel} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{C \mathbf{a} K\{B \mathbf{a} A\}}{\parallel}.$$




Figure 4: Derivation of DT-weakening.

for any context $K\{ \}$. Their width is $O(m+n)$ and their height is $O(m+n)$, where m is the size of $K\{ \}$ and n is the size of $((A \mathbf{a} B) \mathbf{a} C)$.

Proof. We construct the first derivation; the second can be obtained as the mirror image of the first. The derivation is shown in Figure 4.

We take derivations ϕ , ψ and χ to be instances of the constructions which nest and un-nest atom occurrences from Lemma 4.4, while ω is an instance of weakening. The derivation π is the construction from Lemma 5.3. The derivation contains no cuts.

The width of the derivation is $O(m+n)$. The sub-derivations ϕ and χ have height $O(m+n)$, while ψ has height $O(n)$ and π has height $O(m)$ so overall the height of the derivation is $O(m+n)$. \square

Definition 5.5. We call *DT-weakenings* the derivations constructed in Lemma 5.4.

The following definition of the ‘projection’ of an atom on a derivation is key to our proof of cut elimination. The right projection on \mathbf{a} is defined on formulae by replacing every subformula of the form $(A \mathbf{a} B)$ with B , with the left projection defined analogously. For example, the right projection on \mathbf{a} of the formula $((0 \vee (0 \mathbf{a} 1)) \wedge (1 \mathbf{a} (0 \mathbf{a} 1)))$ is $((0 \vee 1) \wedge 1)$. The obvious extension of this definition to derivations is well-defined, with any inference rules that are broken easily fixed.

Definition 5.6. For any atom \mathbf{a} , we denote the *right projection on \mathbf{a}* of a derivation ϕ in system DT^{sa} as $r_{\mathbf{a}}\phi$, which we define inductively as follows. Note that the right projection on \mathbf{a} of a derivation ϕ with premise E and conclusion F will have premise $r_{\mathbf{a}}E$ and conclusion $r_{\mathbf{a}}F$.

- The base cases are $r_{\mathbf{a}}(0) \equiv 0$ and $r_{\mathbf{a}}(1) \equiv 1$.
- In the case that ϕ is a horizontal composition of two derivations ψ and χ by either the

$$\begin{array}{c}
= \\
\hline
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
1 \text{ a } (1 \vee 0) \\
\phi \parallel \\
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{1 \text{ a } 0}{0 \vee (1 \text{ a } 0)} \text{ a } 1 \vee \begin{array}{c} \omega_1 \parallel \\ 1 \text{ b } 0 \end{array} \\
\text{v}\bar{\text{a}}
\end{array} \\
(0 \text{ a } 1) \vee ((1 \text{ a } 0) \text{ a } (1 \text{ b } 0))
\end{array} \\
\wedge \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
1 \vee \omega_2 \parallel \\
1 \text{ b } 0
\end{array} \\
\text{v}\bar{\text{a}} \\
(1 \text{ a } 0) \vee \begin{array}{c} \text{b}\bar{\text{a}} \\ \frac{(1 \text{ b } 0) \text{ a } (1 \text{ b } 1)}{1} \text{ b } (0 \text{ a } 1) \end{array}
\end{array} \\
\text{v}\bar{\text{x}} \\
\frac{\text{cut} \frac{(0 \text{ a } 1) \wedge (1 \text{ a } 0)}{(0 \wedge 1) \text{ a } (1 \wedge 0)}}{\text{v}\bar{\text{x}}} \vee (((1 \text{ a } 0) \text{ a } (1 \text{ b } 0)) \vee (1 \text{ b } (0 \text{ a } 1))) \\
= \\
\hline
(1 \text{ a } 0) \text{ a } (1 \text{ b } 0) \vee (1 \text{ b } (0 \text{ a } 1))
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

Figure 5: An example proof of the implication $((0 \text{ a } 1) \text{ a } (0 \text{ b } 1)) \rightarrow (1 \text{ b } (0 \text{ a } 1))$, i.e., $\overline{((0 \text{ a } 1) \text{ a } (0 \text{ b } 1)) \vee (1 \text{ b } (0 \text{ a } 1))}$ in system DT^{sa} . The black elements are those in the *left projection on a* of the proof, while the grey elements are those discarded in taking the left projection. The derivation ϕ is an instance of DT-weakening, while ω_1 and ω_2 are weakenings. Figure 3 displays a fragment of this proof, with the definition of ω_2 unfolded.

connective \mathbf{a} or else a connective $\beta \neq \mathbf{a}$ (which is possibly another atom), we define

$$r_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\begin{array}{c} A \\ \psi \parallel \\ B \end{array} \mathbf{a} \begin{array}{c} C \\ \chi \parallel \\ D \end{array} \right) \equiv \begin{array}{c} r_{\mathbf{a}} C \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} \chi \parallel \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} D \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad r_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\begin{array}{c} A \\ \psi \parallel \\ B \end{array} \beta \begin{array}{c} C \\ \chi \parallel \\ D \end{array} \right) \equiv \left(\begin{array}{c} r_{\mathbf{a}} A \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} \psi \parallel \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} B \end{array} \beta \begin{array}{c} r_{\mathbf{a}} C \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} \chi \parallel \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} D \end{array} \right).$$

- When ϕ is the composition of derivations ψ and χ by the inference rule $\mathbf{a}\hat{\vee}$, define

$$r_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\begin{array}{c} E \\ \psi \parallel \\ (A \vee B) \mathbf{a} (C \wedge D) \\ \mathbf{a}\hat{\vee} \frac{(A \mathbf{a} C) \vee (B \mathbf{a} D)}{\chi \parallel} \\ F \end{array} \right) \equiv \begin{array}{c} r_{\mathbf{a}} E \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} \psi \parallel \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} C \wedge r_{\mathbf{a}} D \\ = \frac{(0 \vee r_{\mathbf{a}} C) \wedge (0 \vee r_{\mathbf{a}} D)}{(0 \wedge 0) \vee (r_{\mathbf{a}} C \vee r_{\mathbf{a}} D)}; \\ = \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} C \vee r_{\mathbf{a}} D}{r_{\mathbf{a}} \chi \parallel} \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} F \end{array}$$

we do analogously when the composition is by inference $\mathbf{a}\hat{\wedge}$.

- When ϕ is the composition of derivations ψ and χ by an inference rule $\alpha\bar{\text{a}}$ or $\alpha\hat{\text{a}}$, for any connective α , we define

$$r_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\begin{array}{c} E \\ \psi \parallel \\ (A \alpha B) \mathbf{a} (C \alpha D) \\ \alpha\bar{\text{a}} \frac{(A \mathbf{a} C) \alpha (B \mathbf{a} D)}{\chi \parallel} \\ F \end{array} \right) \equiv \begin{array}{c} r_{\mathbf{a}} E \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} \psi \parallel \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} (C \alpha D) \\ \alpha\bar{\text{a}} \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} (C \alpha D)}{r_{\mathbf{a}} (C \alpha D)} \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} \chi \parallel \\ r_{\mathbf{a}} F \end{array}$$

and

$$r_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\begin{array}{c} E \\ \psi \parallel \\ (A \mathbf{a} B) \alpha (C \mathbf{a} D) \\ \hline (A \alpha C) \mathbf{a} (B \alpha D) \\ \chi \parallel \\ F \end{array} \right) \equiv \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} E}{r_{\mathbf{a}}(B \alpha D)} \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} \psi \parallel}{r_{\mathbf{a}}(B \alpha D)} \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} \chi \parallel}{r_{\mathbf{a}} F}.$$

- Otherwise, where ϕ is the composition of derivations ψ and χ by an inference or equality ρ , then ρ survives the projection unchanged (although it may act on different formulae) and we define

$$r_{\mathbf{a}} \left(\begin{array}{c} E \\ \psi \parallel \\ A \\ \rho \frac{\quad}{B} \\ \chi \parallel \\ F \end{array} \right) \equiv \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} E}{r_{\mathbf{a}} \psi \parallel} \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} A}{r_{\mathbf{a}} B} \frac{r_{\mathbf{a}} \chi \parallel}{r_{\mathbf{a}} F};$$

in the case ρ is an equality, note that if $A = B$, then $r_{\mathbf{a}} A = r_{\mathbf{a}} B$ for our equivalence relation \equiv .

We also analogously define the *left projection on \mathbf{a}* of a derivation ϕ , denoted $l_{\mathbf{a}}\phi$. For an example of the left projection of a proof, see Figure 5.

Remark 5.7. There are no occurrences of atom \mathbf{a} in either $l_{\mathbf{a}}\phi$ or $r_{\mathbf{a}}\phi$, and thus no cuts on \mathbf{a} in either – even if there are cuts on \mathbf{a} in ϕ .

The final construction we will use in our cut-elimination procedure expresses the semantic equivalence between $(l_{\mathbf{a}}A \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}A)$ and A , for any formula A and atom \mathbf{a} .

Lemma 5.8. *In system DT^{sa} , for every formula A and every atom \mathbf{a} , there exist derivations*

$$\frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}A \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}A}{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{A}{l_{\mathbf{a}}A \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}A},$$

the first of which is cut-free. The size of each derivation is $O(n^3)$, where n is the size of A . In the case that A contains no nested atom occurrences \mathbf{a} , the size of each derivation is $O(n^2)$.

Proof. We construct the first derivation; the second can be obtained dually. We proceed by structural induction on A . In the base case, where $A \equiv 0$ or $A \equiv 1$, we take the derivation

$$= \frac{0 \mathbf{a} 0}{0} \quad \text{or} \quad = \frac{1 \mathbf{a} 1}{1},$$

respectively. In the case where $A \equiv (B \beta C)$, for $\beta \neq \mathbf{a}$ (but is possibly another atom), we construct the derivation given in the first case below; in the remaining case that $A \equiv (B \mathbf{a} C)$, we construct the derivation given in the second case below:

$$\frac{\beta \bar{\mathbf{a}} \frac{(l_{\mathbf{a}}B \beta l_{\mathbf{a}}C) \mathbf{a} (r_{\mathbf{a}}B \beta r_{\mathbf{a}}C)}{\frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}B \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}B}{\psi \parallel B} \beta \frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}C \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}C}{\chi \parallel C}}}{\frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}B \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}B}{\psi \parallel B} \mathbf{a} \frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}C \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}C}{\chi \parallel C}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}B \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}C}{\omega \parallel \frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}B \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}B}{\psi \parallel B} \mathbf{a} \frac{l_{\mathbf{a}}C \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}C}{\chi \parallel C}};$$





Figure 6: An example of the cut elimination construction applied once, for atom \mathbf{a} , to the proof we presented in Figure 5. The green and red boxes denote the left and right projections of the proof of Figure 5 respectively. The derivation ψ is an instance of DT-weakening. Some equality rule instances have been grouped together.

in either case, ψ and χ are obtained via the inductive assumption; in the latter case, ω is made up of two instances of DT-weakening. If A contains no nested atom occurrences \mathbf{a} , then the second case can be considered as $A \equiv (B \mathbf{a} C) \equiv (l_{\mathbf{a}}B \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}C) \equiv (l_{\mathbf{a}}A \mathbf{a} r_{\mathbf{a}}A)$, *i.e.*, we can replace the second case derivation with the trivial derivation.

The width of the derivation is $O(n)$; the DT-weakenings used in the second case are of height $O(n)$, while the $\beta \tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ of the first case is of constant size. Thus, in the worst-case, we have DT-weakenings of height $O(n)$ stacked $O(n)$ times by the inductive step, for a total height of $O(n^2)$. Thus, the total size is $O(n^3)$. However, in the case A contains no nested atom occurrences \mathbf{a} , we never need the DT-weakening case and thus we have constant size rules stacked $O(n)$ times, for a total size of $O(n^2)$. \square

Theorem 5.9. *In system DT^{sa} , the cut rule is admissible.*

Proof. Take a proof ϕ of a formula A . If there exists a cut on \mathbf{a} , construct:



where χ is the cut-free derivation of Lemma 5.8. This proof has no cuts on \mathbf{a} . Iterating this construction yields a cut-free proof. \square

For an example of the cut-elimination procedure, see Figure 6. Note that the procedure blows up the size of the proof exponentially, but in particular it grows exponentially in the number of *distinct* atoms in the original proof upon which there are cuts (rather than exponentially in the number of cuts). The procedure is not confluent, due to an arbitrary ordering of the atoms upon which there are cuts. The proof is, somewhat, conceptually similar to the ‘experiments method’ for system SKS [15] which is, however, confluent.




Figure 7: Base case for construction of polynomial size proofs of Statman tautologies.

6 Statman Tautologies

We mentioned in the introduction that our proof system generates efficient proofs. Indeed, we show that a certain class of tautologies due to Statman, which cannot have better than exponential cut-free proofs in the sequent calculus, have polynomial cut-free proofs in our system. We achieve this by using projections – the same construction that we use for cut elimination. Further, the proofs are semantically natural, being a formalization of the argument described in the introduction.

Definition 6.1. We call *Statman tautologies* the formulae S_1, S_2, \dots , where a_i and b_i stand for $(0 \mathbf{a}_i 1)$ and $(0 \mathbf{b}_i 1)$, and \bar{a}_i and \bar{b}_i stand for $(1 \mathbf{a}_i 0)$ and $(1 \mathbf{b}_i 0)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_1 &\equiv (\bar{a}_1 \wedge \bar{b}_1) \vee (a_1 \vee b_1), \\
 &\dots, \\
 S_n &\equiv (\bar{a}_n \wedge \bar{b}_n) \vee ((A_{n-1}^n \wedge B_{n-1}^n) \vee \dots \\
 &\quad \vee (A_1^n \wedge B_1^n)) \vee (a_1 \vee b_1), \\
 &\dots
 \end{aligned}$$

where we work modulo associativity and where, for $n > k \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_k^n &\equiv (a_n \vee b_n) \wedge \dots \wedge (a_{k+1} \vee b_{k+1}) \wedge \bar{a}_k, \\
 B_k^n &\equiv (a_n \vee b_n) \wedge \dots \wedge (a_{k+1} \vee b_{k+1}) \wedge \bar{b}_k.
 \end{aligned}$$


Note that, in the previous definition, $A_k^n \equiv (a_n \vee b_n) \wedge A_k^{n-1}$ and $B_k^n \equiv (a_n \vee b_n) \wedge B_k^{n-1}$, whenever $n - 1 > k$.

Theorem 6.2. *There exist cut-free proofs of the Statman tautologies of size $O(m^{2.5})$, where m is the size of the tautologies.*

Proof. We construct the proof from Figure 7 and Figure 8. Let m be the size of the Statman tautologies. Then ω is a weakening with size $O(m)$; π is a co-contraction of size $O(m^2)$; ρ is the construction from Lemma 4.3, also with size $O(m^2)$; χ and θ are the construction from Lemma 5.8, with size $O(m^2)$ (since there are no nested \mathbf{a}_n 's in S_n).

Note that S_n is of size $O(m) = O(n^2)$. Each derivation from S_i to S_{i+1} is of size $O(m^2)$ and there are $O(n) = O(m^{0.5})$ inductive steps in the proof, giving a total size of $O(m^{2.5})$. \square

This bound on the size of Statman tautologies matches the bound for dag-like, cut-free sequent proofs presented in [8] (Theorem 5.3.3).



where:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\phi \equiv 1 \vee \boxed{\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
\omega \\
\parallel \\
(0 \wedge \bar{a}_{n-1} \wedge 0 \wedge \bar{b}_{n-1}) \vee ((0 \wedge A_{n-2}^{n-1} \wedge 0 \wedge B_{n-2}^{n-1}) \vee \dots \vee (0 \wedge A_1^{n-1} \wedge 0 \wedge B_1^{n-1})) \vee (a_1 \vee b_1)
\end{array}} \\
\psi \equiv \boxed{\begin{array}{c}
(\bar{a}_{n-1} \wedge \bar{b}_{n-1}) \vee ((A_{n-2}^{n-1} \wedge B_{n-2}^{n-1}) \vee \dots \vee (A_1^{n-1} \wedge B_1^{n-1})) \vee (a_1 \vee b_1) \\
= \left(0 \wedge \begin{array}{c} \parallel \\ 0 \\ \parallel \\ \bar{b}_n \end{array} \right) \vee \left(\left(1 \vee \begin{array}{c} \parallel \\ 0 \\ \parallel \\ b_n \end{array} \right) \wedge \bar{a}_{n-1} \wedge \left(1 \vee \begin{array}{c} \parallel \\ 0 \\ \parallel \\ b_n \end{array} \right) \wedge \bar{b}_{n-1} \right) \vee \dots \vee \left(\left(1 \vee \begin{array}{c} \parallel \\ 0 \\ \parallel \\ b_n \end{array} \right) \wedge A_1^{n-1} \wedge \left(1 \vee \begin{array}{c} \parallel \\ 0 \\ \parallel \\ b_n \end{array} \right) \wedge B_1^{n-1} \right) \vee (a_1 \vee b_1)
\end{array}$$

Figure 8: Inductive construction of polynomial size proofs of Statman tautologies.

7 Strict Decision Trees

We have already seen how to translate between DT and Prop within system DT^{sa}. Here, we will see how to translate between DT and SDT, and thus also between Prop and SDT.

Lemma 7.1. *In system DT^{sa}, for every formula A in DT, there exists some semantically equivalent formula B in SDT and derivations*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A & & B \\
\parallel & \text{and} & \parallel \\
B & & A
\end{array}$$

Proof. Here, we construct the second derivation. The first derivation can be obtained dually.

We proceed by induction on the number of distinct atoms (not atom occurrences) appearing in A. In the case there are no atoms in A, the formula is made up of only conjunctions and disjunctions of units, which is equal under = to a unit 0 or 1 and thus is in SDT.

In the case where A contains at least one atom \mathbf{a} , we construct the following derivation:

$$\frac{\boxed{\begin{array}{c|c} C & D \\ \phi \parallel & \mathbf{a} \quad \psi \parallel \\ \mathbf{l}_{\mathbf{a}}A & \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{a}}A \end{array}}}{\chi \parallel A},$$

where χ is the construction from Lemma 5.8, and ϕ and ψ can be obtained from the inductive hypothesis, since both $\mathbf{l}_{\mathbf{a}}A$ and $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{a}}A$ must contain strictly fewer distinct atoms than A (they no longer contain any occurrences of \mathbf{a}). Take $B \equiv (C \mathbf{a} D)$. Because C and D are both in SDT by the inductive hypothesis, B is also in SDT. In fact, B is semantically equivalent to A . \square

Remark 7.2. Lemma 7.1 can be used to obtain a B which is an *ordered* decision tree, *i.e.*, given a total ordering \leq on atoms, in every path from the root to a leaf of (the syntax tree of) B , each atom occurs at most once and the sequence of atom occurrences given by each such path respects \leq .

Remark 7.3. Lemma 7.1 yields an easy alternate proof of completeness. Given a tautology A , the construction of Lemma 7.1 yields an equivalent decision tree B , and a derivation ϕ from B to A . In fact, by Remark 7.2, we can take B to be an ordered decision tree. Thus, since B is also a tautology, B must be equal under $=$ to the unit 1, and so ϕ is a proof – in fact, a cut-free one.

We can now translate between the two languages Prop and SDT within our system.

Theorem 7.4. *In system DT^{sa}, given a formula A in Prop, there exists a semantically equivalent formula B in SDT, a derivation from A to B and a derivation from B to A . Given a formula C in SDT, there exists a semantically equivalent formula D in Prop, a derivation from C to D and a derivation from D to C .*

Proof. The combination of Lemmas 4.5 and 7.1. \square

A *reduced ordered decision tree (RODT)* is an ordered decision tree where every subformula of the form $(A \mathbf{a} A)$ is replaced with A [19]. For a given Boolean function and a total ordering on variables, there is a unique RODT which represents that function and respects the ordering in the sense of Remark 7.2. Instead of decision trees, RODTs are often used in practical applications.

Remark 7.5. This proof system contains derivations which correspond to runs of some common algorithms used in working with decision trees. An especially common algorithm, known as ‘apply’, takes two RODTs A and B with the same ordering and a binary Boolean connective \wedge or \vee , and produces a new RODT with that ordering which represents the same function as $(A \wedge B)$ or $(A \vee B)$ respectively.

For example, in the case of applying \wedge to two RODTs $((0 \mathbf{a} 1) \mathbf{b} (1 \mathbf{a} 0)) \mathbf{c} (0 \mathbf{a} 1)$ and $((0 \mathbf{a} 1) \mathbf{c} (1 \mathbf{a} 0))$, which both have ordering $\mathbf{c} < \mathbf{b} < \mathbf{a}$, the derivation corresponding to a run of the algorithm is given in Figure 9. The conclusion of the derivation is the RODT representation of the premise, respecting the ordering $\mathbf{c} < \mathbf{b} < \mathbf{a}$.

8 Conclusions and Further Research

Decision trees and closely related structures have been extended in the past with Boolean operators, typically to improve their expressiveness and efficiency, as in [3]. More recently, proof theory has entered the picture in [7], where the authors provide sequent proof systems for decision trees and study their complexity. Against that background, the present work could be

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{(((0 a 1) b (1 a 0)) c (0 a 1)) \wedge ((0 a 1) c (1 a 0))} \\
\hline
\wedge \bar{c} \\
\left[\begin{array}{c}
((0 a 1) b (1 a 0)) \wedge \left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{0}{0 b 0} \quad a \quad \frac{1}{1 b 1} \\ \hline (0 a 1) b (0 a 1) \end{array} \right] \\
\wedge \bar{b} \\
\left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{(0 a 1) \wedge (0 a 1)}{\wedge \bar{a}} \\ \frac{0 \wedge 0}{0} \quad a \quad \frac{1 \wedge 1}{1} \\ \hline (1 a 0) \wedge (0 a 1) \\ \frac{(1 \wedge 0) a (0 \wedge 1)}{0} \end{array} \right] b \\
\hline
\frac{(0 a 1) \wedge (1 a 0)}{\wedge \bar{a}} \\
\frac{(0 \wedge 1) a (1 \wedge 0)}{0}
\end{array} \right] c
\end{array}$$

Figure 9: A derivation corresponding to a run of the common ‘apply’ algorithm on two reduced ordered DTs.

seen as a way to design a proof system for decision trees whose proof theory is guaranteed to be natural by the previous research on deep inference. Indeed, nested atoms and the corresponding rules could simply be added to the current standard system for first order classical logic, which is presented in [4], and that would effortlessly extend the expressivity of our proof system. We believe that our cut-elimination technique based on projections would extend to that case but we have not explored this yet.

The simplicity of our proof system and cut-elimination procedure is striking, and is a direct consequence of deep inference’s ability to deal with non-commutative connectives [18]. Also, the work [16] is very close to ours because it uses subatomic logic in deep inference to study the normalisation of a proof system with projections, which behave very similarly to decision trees. We would expect that, eventually, all these lines of research will converge towards a standard proof theory of Boolean functions, including decision trees, that supports the applications and whose complexity is well understood.

The expressiveness of our proof system can naturally be extended by quantifiers and modalities. There is now a rich literature in deep inference about standard methods to do so [10]. As we mentioned, the cut-elimination procedure in this paper is exponential in the size of the proof to be normalised. However, in deep inference, quasi-polynomial cut elimination procedures are available for propositional classical logic [6, 14]. It is natural to wonder whether those results could be extended to our proof system, and possibly improved.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Andrea Aler Tubella, Anupam Das and Willem Heijltjes for helpful exchanges and insights.

References

- [1] Andrea Aler Tubella. *A Study of Normalisation Through Subatomic Logic*. PhD thesis, University of Bath, 2017.
- [2] Andrea Aler Tubella and Alessio Guglielmi. Subatomic proof systems: Splittable systems. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 19(1):5:1–33, 2017.
- [3] Henrik Reif Andersen and Henrik Hulgaard. Boolean expression diagrams. In Glynn Winskel, editor, *12th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 88–98. IEEE, 1997.

- [4] Kai Brünnler. Cut elimination inside a deep inference system for classical predicate logic. *Studia Logica*, 82(1):51–71, 2006.
- [5] Kai Brünnler and Alwen Fernanto Tiu. A local system for classical logic. In R. Nieuwenhuis and Andrei Voronkov, editors, *Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning (LPAR)*, volume 2250 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 347–361. Springer, 2001.
- [6] Paola Bruscoli, Alessio Guglielmi, Tom Gundersen, and Michel Parigot. Quasipolynomial normalisation in deep inference via atomic flows and threshold formulae. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 12(1):5:1–30, 2016.
- [7] Sam Buss, Anupam Das, and Alexander Knop. Proof complexity of systems of (non-deterministic) decision trees and branching programs. In Maribel Fernández and Anca Muscholl, editors, *28th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL)*, volume 152 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 12:1–17. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [8] Peter Clote and Evangelos Kranakis. *Boolean Functions and Computation Models*. Springer, 2002.
- [9] Jean-Yves Girard. Linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 50:1–102, 1987.
- [10] Alessio Guglielmi. Deep inference. Web site at <http://alessio.guglielmi.name/res/cos>.
- [11] Alessio Guglielmi. A system of interaction and structure. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 8(1):1:1–64, 2007.
- [12] Alessio Guglielmi, Tom Gundersen, and Michel Parigot. A proof calculus which reduces syntactic bureaucracy. In Christopher Lynch, editor, *21st International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications (RTA)*, volume 6 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 135–150. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2010.
- [13] Alessio Guglielmi and Lutz Straßburger. Non-commutativity and MELL in the calculus of structures. In L. Fribourg, editor, *Computer Science Logic (CSL)*, volume 2142 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 54–68. Springer, 2001.
- [14] Emil Jeřábek. Proof complexity of the cut-free calculus of structures. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 19(2):323–339, 2009.
- [15] Benjamin Ralph. *Modular Normalisation of Classical Proofs*. PhD thesis, University of Bath, 2019.
- [16] Luca Roversi. Subatomic systems need not be subatomic. Technical report, Università di Torino, 2018.
- [17] Richard Statman. Bounds for proof-search and speed-up in the predicate calculus. *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, 15:225–287, 1978.
- [18] Alwen Tiu. A system of interaction and structure II: The need for deep inference. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 2(2):4:1–24, 2006.
- [19] Ingo Wegener. *Branching Programs and Binary Decision Diagrams: Theory and Applications*. SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2000.