

# Conservation theorems on semi-classical arithmetic

Makoto Fujiwara<sup>\*†</sup> and Taishi Kurahashi<sup>‡§</sup>

March 15, 2022

## Abstract

We systematically study conservation theorems on theories of semi-classical arithmetic, which lie in-between classical arithmetic PA and intuitionistic arithmetic HA. Using a generalized negative translation, we first provide a new structured proof of the fact that PA is  $\Pi_{k+2}$ -conservative over HA +  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM where  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM is the axiom scheme of the law-of-excluded-middle restricted to formulas in  $\Sigma_k$ . In addition, we show that this conservation theorem is optimal in the sense that for any semi-classical arithmetic  $T$ , if PA is  $\Pi_{k+2}$ -conservative over  $T$ , then  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM. In the same manner, we also characterize conservation theorems for other well-studied classes of formulas by fragments of classical axioms or rules. This reveals the entire structure of conservation theorems with respect to the arithmetical hierarchy of classical principles.

## 1 Introduction

It is well-known that classical first-order arithmetic PA is  $\Pi_2$ -conservative over intuitionistic first-order arithmetic HA. There are several approaches to prove this fundamental fact. One simple and well-known approach is to apply the negative (or double negation) translation followed by the Friedman A-translation [3]. Another possible approach is to apply a generalized negative translation developed systematically by Ishihara [8, 9]. In fact, the latter is a combination of Gentzen's negative translation and the Friedman A-translation (cf. [9, Section 4]). In [6, Theorem 6.14], the authors showed a conservation result which generalizes the aforementioned conservation result on PA and HA in the context of semi-classical arithmetic (which lies between classical and intuitionistic arithmetic). In fact, the following is an immediate corollary of [6, Theorem 6.14]:

---

<sup>\*</sup>Email: makotofujiwara@meiji.ac.jp

<sup>†</sup>School of Science and Technology, Meiji University, 1-1-1 Higashi-Mita, Tama-ku, Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa 214-8571, Japan.

<sup>‡</sup>Email: kurahashi@people.kobe-u.ac.jp

<sup>§</sup>Graduate School of System Informatics, Kobe University, 1-1 Rokkodai, Nada, Kobe 657-8501, Japan.

**Proposition 1.1.** *PA is  $\Pi_{k+2}$ -conservative over  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  where  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  is the axiom scheme of the law-of-excluded-middle restricted to formulas in  $\Sigma_k$ .*

The proof of [6, Theorem 6.14] in that paper is similar to the former approach in the sense of using the Friedman A-translation. However, the proof has somewhat intricate structure in dealing with the Friedman A-translation of the inner part of Kuroda's negative translation. In Section 3, by extending the latter approach from [8, 9] in the context of semi-classical arithmetic, we provide a much more structured proof of [6, Theorem 6.14]. As an advantage of the structured proof, we obtain an extended conservation result for much larger classes of formulas (see Theorem 3.17 and Remark 3.18).

In Section 4, we relate the classes used in Section 3 (which are based on the classes introduced in [8]) to the classes  $U_k$  and  $E_k$  introduced in Akama et. al [1] for studying the hierarchy of the constructively-meaningful fragments of classical axioms (including the law-of-excluded-middle and the double-negation-elimination). The classes  $E_k$  and  $U_k$  correspond to classical  $\Sigma_k$  and  $\Pi_k$  respectively in the sense that every formula in  $E_k$  (resp.  $U_k$ ) is equivalent over PA to some formula in  $\Sigma_k$  (resp.  $\Pi_k$ ) and vice versa. This investigation reveals that our extended conservation theorem for  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  is applicable to all formulas in  $E_{k+1}$  (see Corollary 4.3).

In Sections 5, 6 and 7, we investigate the entire structure of conservation theorems in the arithmetical hierarchy of classical principles which was systematically studied first in Akama et. al [1] and further extended by the authors recently in [5]. The first motivation of this investigation comes from the observation that for any semi-classical arithmetic  $T$  such that PA is  $\Pi_{k+2}$ -conservative over  $T$ ,  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  (cf. Lemma 5.5). This means that Proposition 1.1 is optimal in the sense that one cannot replace  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  by any semi-classical arithmetic which does not prove  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ . Another motivating fact is that for any semi-classical arithmetic  $T$ , PA is  $\Pi_2$ -conservative over  $T$  if and only if  $T$  is closed under Markov's rule for primitive recursive predicate (cf. [13, Section 3.5.1]). Thus the  $\Pi_2$ -conservativity is also characterized by the  $\Sigma_1$ -fragment of the double-negation-elimination rule. Then it is natural to ask whether this can be relativized in the context of semi-classical arithmetic. Motivated by these facts, in Sections 5 and 6, we study the conservation theorems for the well-studied classes (including  $\Pi_k$ ,  $\Sigma_k$ , the classes in [1] and their closed variants) and characterize them by fragments of classical axioms or rules. The conservativity for a class of formulas is equivalent to that restricted only to sentences if the class is closed under taking a universal closure. Then the strength of the conservativity for e.g.  $\Pi_k$  does not vary even if we restrict them only to sentences. On the other hand, since  $\Sigma_k$  etc. are not closed under taking a universal closure, this is not the case for such classes. We investigate the conservation theorems for classes of formulas in Section 5 and those for sentences in Section 6. Through a lot of delicate arguments in semi-classical arithmetic, we reveal the detailed structure consisting of the conservation theorems and some fragment of logical principles, which are summarized in Section 7. This exhaustive investigation shed light on the close connection between the notion of conservativity

and classical axioms and rules in semi-classical arithmetic. For the purpose of future use, we present our characterization results in a generalized form with adding a set  $X$  of sentences into the theories in question.

In the end of this paper, as an appendix, we show the relativized soundness theorem of the Friedman A-translation for  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ . By this relativized soundness theorem, one may obtain a simple proof of Proposition 1.1 just by imitating the aforementioned Friedman's approach.

## 2 Framework

We work with a standard formulation of intuitionistic arithmetic  $\text{HA}$  described e.g. in [12, Section 1.3], which has function symbols for all primitive recursive functions. Our language contains all the logical constants  $\forall, \exists, \rightarrow, \wedge, \vee$  and  $\perp$ . In our proofs, when we use some principle (including induction hypothesis [I.H.]) which is not available in  $\text{HA}$ , it will be exhibited explicitly. As regards basic reasoning over intuitionistic first-order logic, we refer the reader to [14, Section 6.2].

Throughout this paper, let  $k$  be a natural number (possibly 0). The classes  $\Sigma_k$  and  $\Pi_k$  of  $\text{HA}$ -formulas are defined as follows:

- Let  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Pi_0$  be the set of all quantifier-free formulas;
- $\Sigma_{k+1} := \{\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \varphi \mid \varphi \in \Pi_k\}$ ;
- $\Pi_{k+1} := \{\forall x_1, \dots, x_n \varphi \mid \varphi \in \Sigma_k\}$ .

Let  $\text{FV}(\varphi)$  denote the set of all free variables in  $\varphi$ . Note that every formula  $\varphi$  in  $\Sigma_{k+1}$  (resp.  $\Pi_{k+1}$ ) is equivalent over  $\text{HA}$  to some formula  $\psi$  in  $\Sigma_{k+1}$  (resp.  $\Pi_{k+1}$ ) such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\psi)$  and  $\psi$  is of the form  $\exists x\psi'$  (resp.  $\forall x\psi'$ ) where  $\psi'$  is  $\Pi_k$  (resp.  $\Sigma_k$ ). For convenience, we assume that  $\Sigma_m$  and  $\Pi_m$  denote the empty set for negative integers  $m$ .

The classical variant  $\text{PA}$  of  $\text{HA}$  is defined as  $\text{HA} + \text{LEM}$  or  $\text{HA} + \text{DNE}$ , where  $\text{LEM}$  is the axiom scheme of the law-of-excluded-middle  $\varphi \vee \neg\varphi$  and  $\text{DNE}$  is that of the double-negation-elimination  $\neg\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ . Recall that  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$  are  $\text{LEM}$  and  $\text{DNE}$  restricted to formulas in  $\Sigma_k$  (possibly containing free variables) respectively. Similarly,  $\Pi_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $\Pi_k\text{-DNE}$  are defined for  $\Pi_k$ . We call a theory  $T$  such that  $\text{HA} \subseteq T \subseteq \text{PA}$  **semi-classical arithmetic**.

Unless otherwise stated, the inclusion between classes of  $\text{HA}$ -formulas is to be understood modulo equivalences over  $\text{HA}$ . That is, for classes  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$  of  $\text{HA}$ -formulas,  $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$  denotes that for all  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ , there exists  $\varphi' \in \Gamma'$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi$ , and  $\Gamma = \Gamma'$  denotes  $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$  and  $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ . In this sense, one may think of  $\Sigma_k$  and  $\Pi_k$  as sub-classes of  $\Sigma_{k'}$  and  $\Pi_{k'}$  for all  $k' > k$  (see [6, Remark 2.5]).

### 3 A relativization of Ishihara’s conservation result in semi-classical arithmetic

In this section, we simulate Ishihara’s proof of [8, Theorem 10] in the specific context of semi-classical arithmetic studied in [1, 6] with some additional arguments. We first recall the translation studied in [8]. In the context of the translation, without otherwise stated, we work in the language with an additional predicate symbol  $\$$  of arity 0, which behaves as “place holder” (See [8, 9] for more information). Let  $\text{HA}^\$$  denote  $\text{HA}$  in that language. On the other hand,  $\text{HA}^\$ + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  denotes  $\text{HA}^\$$  augmented with  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  for “ $\text{HA}$ ”-formulas.

**Definition 3.1** (cf. [8, Definition 3]). Let  $\neg_\$ \varphi$  denote  $\varphi \rightarrow \$$ . For each formula  $\varphi$ , its  $\$$ -translation  $\varphi^\$$  is defined inductively by the following clauses:

- For  $P$  prime such that  $P \neq \perp$ ,  $P^\$ := \neg_\$ \neg_\$ P$ ;
- $\perp^\$ := \$$ ;
- $(\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2)^\$ := \varphi_1^\$ \circ \varphi_2^\$$  for  $\circ \in \{\wedge, \rightarrow\}$ ;
- $(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)^\$ := \neg_\$ \neg_\$ (\varphi_1^\$ \vee \varphi_2^\$)$ ;
- $(\forall x \varphi)^\$ := \forall x \varphi^\$$ ;
- $(\exists x \varphi)^\$ := \neg_\$ \neg_\$ \exists x \varphi^\$$ .

It is straightforward to see  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi^\$)$ .

**Proposition 3.2** (cf. [8, Proposition 4] and [9, Section 4]).

1. For any  $\text{HA}$ -formula  $\varphi$ ,  $\text{HA}^\$ \vdash \neg_\$ \neg_\$ \varphi^\$ \leftrightarrow \varphi^\$$ ;
2. For any  $\text{HA}$ -formula  $\varphi$  and any set  $X$  of  $\text{HA}$ -sentences, if  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi$ , then  $\text{HA}^\$ + X^\$ \vdash \varphi^\$$ , where  $X^\$ := \{\psi^\$ \mid \psi \in X\}$ .

*Proof.* The proofs are routine: One can show (1) by induction on the structure of formulas, and (2) by induction on the length of the proof of  $\varphi$  in  $\text{PA} + X$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.** For any  $\text{HA}$ -formulas  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ , if  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2$ , then  $\text{HA}^\$ \vdash \varphi_1^\$ \leftrightarrow \varphi_2^\$$ .

*Proof.* If  $\text{PA}$  proves  $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2$ , by Proposition 3.2.(2), we have that  $\text{HA}^\$$  proves  $(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)^\$$ , which is in fact  $\varphi_1^\$ \leftrightarrow \varphi_2^\$$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** For a quantifier-free formula  $\varphi_{\text{qf}}$  of  $\text{HA}$ ,  $\text{HA}^\$$  proves  $\varphi_{\text{qf}}^\$ \leftrightarrow \varphi_{\text{qf}} \vee \$$ .

*Proof.* By induction on the structure of quantifier-free formulas of  $\text{HA}$ .

The case of  $\perp$ : Since  $\perp^\$ \equiv \$$ , we have trivially  $\text{HA}^\$ \vdash \perp^\$ \leftrightarrow \perp \vee \$$ .

The case of that  $\varphi_{\text{qf}}$  is a prime formula but  $\perp$ : It is trivial that  $\text{HA}^\$$  proves  $\varphi_{\text{qf}} \vee \$ \rightarrow \neg_\$ \neg_\$ \varphi_{\text{qf}}$ . On the other hand, since  $\text{HA}^\$$  proves  $\varphi_{\text{qf}} \vee \neg \varphi_{\text{qf}}$  and  $\neg_\$ \neg_\$ \varphi_{\text{qf}} \wedge \neg \varphi_{\text{qf}} \rightarrow \$$ , we also have that  $\text{HA}^\$$  proves  $\neg_\$ \neg_\$ \varphi_{\text{qf}} \rightarrow \varphi_{\text{qf}} \vee \$$ .

The case of  $\varphi_{\text{qf}} \equiv \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ : We have that  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  proves

$$(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)^{\$} \leftrightarrow \varphi_1^{\$} \wedge \varphi_2^{\$} \xleftrightarrow{\text{I.H.}} (\varphi_1 \vee \$) \wedge (\varphi_2 \vee \$) \leftrightarrow (\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \vee \$.$$

The case of  $\varphi_{\text{qf}} \equiv \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ : Since  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are decidable in  $\text{HA}$  (note that they are quantifier-free), we have that  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  proves  $(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \vee (\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2)$ . In the latter case of the disjunction, we have  $\neg_{\$}(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \vee \$)$ . Thus  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  proves

$$\neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \vee \$) \rightarrow (\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \vee \$.$$

On the other hand,  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  also proves

$$(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \vee \$ \rightarrow \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \vee \$).$$

Thus  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  proves

$$(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)^{\$} \equiv \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}(\varphi_1^{\$} \vee \varphi_2^{\$}) \xleftrightarrow{\text{I.H.}} \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \vee \$) \leftrightarrow (\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \vee \$.$$

The case of  $\varphi_{\text{qf}} \equiv \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ : Assume  $\varphi_1 \vee \$ \rightarrow \varphi_2 \vee \$$ . Then we have

$$\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \vee \$.$$
 (1)

Since  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are decidable in  $\text{HA}$  (note that they are quantifier-free), we have that  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  proves  $(\varphi_2 \vee \neg\varphi_1) \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2)$ . In the former case, we have  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ . In the latter case, by (1), we have  $\$$ . Thus  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  proves

$$(\varphi_1 \vee \$ \rightarrow \varphi_2 \vee \$) \rightarrow (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \vee \$.$$

On the other hand,  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  also proves

$$(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \vee \$ \rightarrow (\varphi_1 \vee \$ \rightarrow \varphi_2 \vee \$).$$

Thus  $\text{HA}^{\$}$  proves

$$(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_1) \vee \$ \leftrightarrow (\varphi_1 \vee \$ \rightarrow \varphi_2 \vee \$) \xleftrightarrow{\text{I.H.}} (\varphi_1^{\$} \rightarrow \varphi_2^{\$}) \equiv (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)^{\$}.$$

□

The following lemma is the key for our generalized conservation result:

**Lemma 3.5.** *For a formula  $\varphi$  of  $\text{HA}$ , the following hold:*

1. *If  $\varphi \in \Pi_k$ ,  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^{\$} \leftrightarrow \varphi \vee \$$ ;*
2. *If  $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$ ,  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^{\$} \leftrightarrow \varphi \vee \$$ .*

*Note that  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  is an axiom scheme in the language of  $\text{HA}$  (which does not contain  $\$$ ).*

*Proof.* By simultaneous induction on  $k$ . The base case is by Lemma 3.4. Assume items 1 and 2 for  $k$  to show those for  $k+1$ . First, for the first item, let  $\varphi := \forall x\varphi_1$  where  $\varphi_1 \in \Sigma_k$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi_1^{\mathfrak{s}} \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \vee \$$ . Note that  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}}$  proves  $\forall x\varphi_1 \vee \$ \rightarrow \forall x(\varphi_1 \vee \$)$ . In the following, we show the converse  $\forall x(\varphi_1 \vee \$) \rightarrow \forall x\varphi_1 \vee \$$  inside  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$ . Since  $\neg\varphi_1$  has some equivalent formula in  $\Pi_k$  in the presence of  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$  (cf. Remark 5.3 below), by  $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$ , we have now  $\exists x\neg\varphi_1 \vee \neg\exists x\neg\varphi_1$ . In the former case, we have  $\$$  by using our assumption  $\forall x(\varphi_1 \vee \$)$ . In the latter case, we have  $\forall x\varphi_1$  since  $\neg\exists x\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \forall x\neg\neg\varphi_1$  and  $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$  implies  $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE}$ . Thus  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\forall x(\varphi_1 \vee \$) \rightarrow \forall x\varphi_1 \vee \$$ . Then we have that  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\varphi^{\mathfrak{s}} \equiv \forall x\varphi_1^{\mathfrak{s}} \underset{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}}{\longleftrightarrow} \forall x(\varphi_1 \vee \$) \underset{\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}}{\longleftrightarrow} \forall x\varphi_1 \vee \$.$$

Next, for the second item, let  $\varphi := \exists x\varphi_1$  where  $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_k$ . Note that  $\varphi^{\mathfrak{s}}$  is  $\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\exists x\varphi_1^{\mathfrak{s}}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi_1^{\mathfrak{s}} \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \vee \$$ , and hence,  $\varphi^{\mathfrak{s}} \leftrightarrow \neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\exists x\varphi_1$ . Then it is trivial that  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\exists x\varphi_1 \vee \$ \rightarrow \varphi^{\mathfrak{s}}$ . In the following, we show the converse direction inside  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$ . By  $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$ , we have now  $\exists x\varphi_1 \vee \neg\exists x\varphi_1$ . Then it suffices to show  $\neg\exists x\varphi_1 \wedge \neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\exists x\varphi_1 \rightarrow \$$ , which is trivial since  $\neg\exists x\varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\exists x\varphi_1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *For a formula  $\varphi$  of  $\text{HA}$ , if  $\varphi \equiv \exists x\varphi_1$  with  $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_k$ , then  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \exists x(\varphi_1^{\mathfrak{s}}) \leftrightarrow \varphi \vee \$$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\exists x\varphi_1 \vee \$ \leftrightarrow \exists x(\varphi_1 \vee \$)$ , the corollary is trivial by Lemma 3.5.(1).  $\square$

In the context of intuitionistic/semi-classical arithmetic, a formula does not have an equivalent formula of the prenex normal form (namely, formula in  $\Sigma_k$  or  $\Pi_k$ ) while it does in classical arithmetic. Because of this fact, the conservation theorem only for prenex formulas is not applicable in many practical cases. On the other hand, Akama et. al [1] introduced the classes  $U_k$  and  $E_k$  of formulas which correspond to classical  $\Pi_k$  and  $\Sigma_k$  respectively in the sense that every formula in  $U_k$  (resp.  $E_k$ ) is equivalent over  $\text{PA}$  to some formula in  $\Pi_k$  (resp.  $\Sigma_k$ ) and vice versa. In addition, the authors introduced in [6] the classes  $U_k^+$  and  $E_k^+$ , which are cumulative versions of  $U_k$  and  $E_k$ . For obtaining the conservation results for the classes as large as possible, we introduce classes  $\mathcal{R}_k$  and  $\mathcal{J}_k$  (see Definition 3.11), which relativize  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  in [8] respectively with regard to the formulas of degree  $\leq k$  in the sense of [1, 6].

To make the definitions absolutely clear, we recall some notions in [1, 6]: An **alternation path** is a finite sequence of  $+$  and  $-$  in which  $+$  and  $-$  appear alternatively. For an alternation path  $s$ , let  $i(s)$  denote the first symbol of  $s$  if  $s \neq \langle \rangle$  (empty sequence);  $\times$  if  $s \equiv \langle \rangle$ . Let  $s^\perp$  denote the alternation path which is obtained by switching  $+$  and  $-$  in  $s$ , and let  $l(s)$  denote the length of  $s$ . For a formula  $\varphi$ , the set of alternation paths  $\text{Alt}(\varphi)$  of  $\varphi$  is defined as follows:

- If  $\varphi$  is quantifier-free, then  $\text{Alt}(\varphi) := \{\langle \rangle\}$ ;
- Otherwise,  $\text{Alt}(\varphi)$  is defined inductively by the following clauses:

- If  $\varphi \equiv \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$  or  $\varphi \equiv \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ , then  $Alt(\varphi) := Alt(\varphi_1) \cup Alt(\varphi_2)$ ;
- If  $\varphi \equiv \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ , then  $Alt(\varphi) := \{s^\perp \mid s \in Alt(\varphi_1)\} \cup Alt(\varphi_2)$ ;
- If  $\varphi \equiv \forall x\varphi_1$ , then  $Alt(\varphi) := \{s \mid s \in Alt(\varphi_1) \text{ and } i(s) \equiv -\} \cup \{-s \mid s \in Alt(\varphi_1) \text{ and } i(s) \not\equiv -\}$ ;
- If  $\varphi \equiv \exists x\varphi_1$ , then  $Alt(\varphi) := \{s \mid s \in Alt(\varphi_1) \text{ and } i(s) \equiv +\} \cup \{+s \mid s \in Alt(\varphi_1) \text{ and } i(s) \not\equiv +\}$ .

In addition, for a formula  $\varphi$ , the degree  $deg(\varphi)$  of  $\varphi$  is defined as

$$deg(\varphi) := \max\{l(s) \mid s \in Alt(\varphi)\}.$$

**Definition 3.7** (cf. [1, Definition 2.4] and [6, Definition 2.11]). The classes  $F_k, U_k, E_k, F_k^+, U_k^+$  and  $E_k^+$  of HA-formulas are defined as follows:

- $F_k := \{\varphi \mid deg(\varphi) = k\}$ ;  $F_k^+ := \{\varphi \mid deg(\varphi) \leq k\}$ ;
- $U_0 := E_0 := F_0 (= \Sigma_0 = \Pi_0)$ ;
- $U_{k+1} := \{\varphi \in F_{k+1} \mid i(s) \equiv - \text{ for all } s \in Alt(\varphi) \text{ such that } l(s) = k+1\}$ ;
- $E_{k+1} := \{\varphi \in F_{k+1} \mid i(s) \equiv + \text{ for all } s \in Alt(\varphi) \text{ such that } l(s) = k+1\}$ ;
- $U_k^+ := U_k \cup \bigcup_{i < k} F_i$ ;  $E_k^+ := E_k \cup \bigcup_{i < k} F_i$ .

*Remark 3.8.* As shown in [6, Proposition 4.6], for any  $\varphi \in U_k^+$  and  $\psi \in E_k^+$ , there exist  $\varphi' \in U_k$  and  $\psi' \in E_k$  such that  $FV(\varphi) = FV(\varphi')$ ,  $FV(\psi) = FV(\psi')$ ,  $HA \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'$  and  $HA \vdash \psi \leftrightarrow \psi'$ . Then it also follows that for any  $\varphi \in F_k^+$ , there exists  $\varphi' \in F_k$  such that  $FV(\varphi) = FV(\varphi')$  and  $HA \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'$ . Thus one may identify  $E_k^+, U_k^+$  and  $F_k^+$  with  $E_k, U_k$  and  $F_k$  respectively without loss of generality.

Then the authors showed the following prenex normal form theorem:

**Theorem 3.9** (cf. [6, Theorem 5.3] which corrects [1, Theorem 2.7]). *For a HA-formula  $\varphi$ , the following hold:*

1. *If  $\varphi \in E_k^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$  such that  $FV(\varphi) = FV(\varphi')$  and*

$$HA + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + U_k\text{-DNS} \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi';$$

2. *If  $\varphi \in U_k^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$  such that  $FV(\varphi) = FV(\varphi')$  and*

$$HA + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi';$$

where  $U_k\text{-DNS}$  is the axiom scheme of the double-negation-shift restricted to formulas in  $U_k$  and  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  is DNE restricted to formulas of the form  $\varphi \vee \psi$  with  $\varphi, \psi \in \Pi_k$ .

*Remark 3.10.*  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ ,  $\text{U}_k\text{-DNS}$  and  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ . Then the prenex normal form theorems for  $\text{E}_k^+$  and  $\text{U}_k^+$  are available in  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ .

**Definition 3.11** (cf. [8, Definition 6]). Define  $\mathcal{R}_0 := \mathcal{J}_0 := \Sigma_0 (= \Pi_0)$ . In addition, we define simultaneously classes  $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{k+1}$  as follows: Let  $F$  range over formulas in  $\text{F}_k^+$ ,  $R$  and  $R'$  over those in  $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ , and  $J$  and  $J'$  over those in  $\mathcal{J}_{k+1}$  respectively. Then  $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{k+1}$  are inductively generated by the clauses

1.  $F, R \wedge R', R \vee R', \forall xR, J \rightarrow R \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ ;
2.  $F, J \wedge J', J \vee J', \exists xJ, R \rightarrow J \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ .

**Lemma 3.12** (A relativized version of [8, Proposition 7.(2, 3)]). *For a HA-formula  $\varphi$ , the following hold:*

1. *If  $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ , then  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi^{\mathfrak{s}}$ ;*
2. *If  $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ , then  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi^{\mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow \neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\varphi$ .*

*Proof.* We show items 1 and 2 simultaneously by induction on the structure of formulas.

Let  $\varphi$  be prime. Since  $\varphi$  is in  $\text{F}_0$ , we have  $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1} \cap \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ . Since  $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ , we have  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} \vdash \neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi \vee \$$ . Then we have item 1 by Lemma 3.4. Item 2 is trivial.

The induction step is the same as that for [8, Proposition 7] in addition with the cases of  $\varphi := \forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$  and  $\varphi := \exists x\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ :

If  $\varphi := \forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ , then we have  $\varphi \in \text{F}_k^+$ , and hence,  $\varphi \in \text{U}_k^+$ . By Remark 3.10, one may assume  $\varphi \in \Pi_k$ . By Lemma 3.5.(1), we have  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^{\mathfrak{s}} \leftrightarrow \varphi \vee \$$ . Since  $\varphi \vee \$$  implies  $\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\varphi$ , we have  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^{\mathfrak{s}} \rightarrow \neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\varphi$ .

If  $\varphi := \exists x\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ , then we have  $\varphi \in \text{F}_k^+$ , and hence,  $\varphi \in \text{E}_k^+$  (and  $k > 0$ ). By Remark 3.10, one may assume  $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_{k-1}$ . Reason in  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ . Now we have  $\exists x\varphi_1 \vee \neg\exists x\varphi_1$ . In the latter case, we have  $\$$  in the presence of  $\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg\exists x\varphi_1$ . Thus we have  $\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg\exists x\varphi_1 \rightarrow \exists x\varphi_1 \vee \$$ . By Corollary 3.6, we have that  $\neg_{\mathfrak{s}}\neg\exists x\varphi_1$  implies  $\exists x(\varphi_1^{\mathfrak{s}})$ , and hence,  $(\exists x\varphi_1)^{\mathfrak{s}}$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.13** (cf. [8, Definition 6]). Define  $\mathcal{Q}_0 := \Sigma_0 (= \Pi_0)$ . In addition, we define a class  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$  as follows. Let  $P$  range over prime formulas,  $Q$  and  $Q'$  over formulas in  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , and  $J$  over those in  $\mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ . Then  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$  is inductively generated by the clause

$$P, Q \wedge Q', Q \vee Q', \forall xQ, \exists xQ, J \rightarrow Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}.$$

**Lemma 3.14** (A relativized version of [8, Proposition 7.(1)]). *For a HA-formula  $\varphi$ , if  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , then  $\text{HA}^{\mathfrak{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi^{\mathfrak{s}}$ .*



*Proof.* By induction on the structure of formulas, we show that for any HA-formula  $\varphi$ , if  $\varphi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , then  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi^{\$}$ .

If  $\varphi$  is prime, then we have  $\text{HA}^{\$} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi^{\$}$  trivially by the definition of  $\varphi^{\$}$ . If  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ ,  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ ,  $\varphi := \forall x\varphi_1$  or  $\varphi := \exists x\varphi_1$ , we have  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi^{\$}$  in a straightforward way by using the induction hypothesis (as for [8, Proposition 7.(1)]).

Assume  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ . Then we have  $\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$  and  $\varphi_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi_2^{\$}$ . On the other hand, by Lemma 3.12.(2), we have  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi_1^{\$} \rightarrow \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}\varphi_1$ . Since  $\text{HA}^{\$} \vdash \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}\varphi_2^{\$} \leftrightarrow \varphi_2^{\$}$  by Proposition 3.2.(1), we have that  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) & \xrightarrow{\text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} & (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2^{\$}) \\ & \longrightarrow & (\neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}\varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}\varphi_2^{\$}) \\ & \xrightarrow{\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} & (\varphi_1^{\$} \rightarrow \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}\varphi_2^{\$}) \\ & \longleftrightarrow & (\varphi_1^{\$} \rightarrow \varphi_2^{\$}). \end{array}$$

□

Now we define a class  $\mathcal{V}_k$  of HA-formulas by using the class  $\mathcal{J}_k$  in Definitions 3.11.

**Definition 3.15.** Let  $J$  range over formulas in  $\mathcal{J}_k$ ,  $V$  and  $V'$  over those in  $\mathcal{V}_k$ . Then  $\mathcal{V}_k$  is inductively generated by the clause

$$J, V \wedge V', \forall xV \in \mathcal{V}_k.$$

For our conservation result, we use the following fact on substitution.

**Lemma 3.16** (cf. [14, Theorem 6.2.4] and [6, Lemma 6.10]). *Let  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences and  $\varphi$  be a  $\text{HA}^{\$}$ -formula. If  $\text{HA}^{\$} + X \vdash \varphi$ , then  $\text{HA} + X \vdash \varphi[\psi/\$]$  for any HA-formula  $\psi$  such that the free variables of  $\psi$  are not bounded in  $\varphi$ , where  $\varphi[\psi/\$]$  is the HA-formula obtained from  $\varphi$  by replacing all the occurrences of  $\$$  in  $\varphi$  with  $\psi$ .*

**Theorem 3.17.** *For any HA-formulas  $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$  and  $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , if  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ , then  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ .*

*Proof.* Since one can freely replace the bounded variables, it suffices to show that for any HA-formulas  $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$  and  $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$  such that the free variables of  $\varphi$  are not bounded in  $\psi$ , if  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ , then  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ . We show this assertion by induction on the structure of formulas in  $\mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ .

Case of  $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ : Fix  $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$  such that the free variables of  $\varphi$  are not bounded in  $\psi$ . Suppose  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ . Then, by Proposition 3.2.(2), we have  $\text{HA}^{\$} \vdash \psi^{\$} \rightarrow \varphi^{\$}$ . By Lemma 3.14 and Lemma 3.12.(2), we have  $\text{HA}^{\$} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \neg_{\$}\neg_{\$}\varphi$ . By Lemma 3.16, we have that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\psi \rightarrow ((\varphi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow \varphi)$ , equivalently,  $\psi \rightarrow \varphi$ .

Case of  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ : Then  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ . Fix  $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$  such that the free variables of  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$  are not bounded in  $\psi$ . Suppose  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ . Then  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi_1$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi_2$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi_1$  and  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi_2$ , and hence,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ .

Case of  $\varphi := \forall x \varphi_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ : Then  $\varphi_1 \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ . Fix  $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$  such that the free variables of  $\forall x \varphi_1$  are not bounded in  $\psi$ . In addition, assume that  $x$  does not appear in  $\psi$  without loss of generality. Suppose  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \forall x \varphi_1$ . Then  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi_1$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\psi \rightarrow \varphi_1$ . Since  $x \notin \text{FV}(\psi)$ , we have  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \forall x \varphi_1$ .  $\square$

*Remark 3.18.* Since  $\Pi_{k+2}$  is a sub-class of  $\mathcal{V}_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$  contains all prenex formulas, we have [6, Theorem 6.14] (and a-fortiori Proposition 1.1) as a corollary of Theorem 3.17.

**Corollary 3.19.** *Let  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ . For any HA-formulas  $\varphi \in \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$  and  $\psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , if  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ , then  $\text{HA} + X + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ .*

*Proof.* Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ . Then there exists a finite number of sentences  $\psi_0, \dots, \psi_m \in X$  such that  $\text{PA} + \psi_0 + \dots + \psi_m \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ . Since PA satisfies the deduction theorem, we have  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_m \wedge \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ . Since  $\psi_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_m \wedge \psi \in \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , by Theorem 3.17, we have  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_m \wedge \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ , and hence,  $\text{HA} + X + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$ .  $\square$

## 4 The relation of the classes $\mathcal{R}_k$ and $\mathcal{J}_k$ with the existing classes $\mathcal{U}_k$ and $\mathcal{E}_k$

In the following, we show that our classes  $\mathcal{R}_k$  and  $\mathcal{J}_k$  in Definition 3.11 are in fact equivalent over HA to  $\mathcal{U}_k$  and  $\mathcal{E}_k$  (see Definition 3.7) respectively.

**Proposition 4.1.**  $\mathcal{U}_k^+ = \mathcal{R}_k$  and  $\mathcal{E}_k^+ = \mathcal{J}_k$ .

*Proof.* By induction on  $k$ . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, assume  $\mathcal{U}_k^+ = \mathcal{R}_k$  and  $\mathcal{E}_k^+ = \mathcal{J}_k$ . We show

1.  $\varphi \in \mathcal{U}_{k+1}^+$  if and only if  $\varphi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$
2.  $\varphi \in \mathcal{E}_{k+1}^+$  if and only if  $\varphi \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$

simultaneously by induction on the structure of formulas. If  $\varphi$  is prime, since  $\varphi \in \mathcal{F}_0$ , we are done. Assume that items 1 and 2 hold for  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ . Using [6, Lemma 4.5.(1)], we have

$$\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{k+1}^+ \stackrel{\text{I.H.}}{\Leftrightarrow} \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1} \Leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}.$$

In the same manner, we also have  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ ,  $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ ,  $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{E}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{J}_{k+1}$ . For  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ ,

using [6, Lemma 4.5.(3)] we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \mathbf{U}_{k+1}^+ \\
\iff & \varphi_1 \in \mathbf{E}_{k+1}^+ \text{ and } \varphi_2 \in \mathbf{U}_{k+1}^+ \\
\iff & \varphi_1 \in \mathbf{J}_{k+1} \text{ and } \varphi_2 \in \mathbf{R}_{k+1} \\
\text{I.H.} & \\
\iff & \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \mathbf{R}_{k+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the same manner, we also have  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \mathbf{E}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \mathbf{J}_{k+1}$ . For  $\forall x\varphi_1$ , using [6, Lemma 4.5.(4,6)], we have

$$\forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{U}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \in \mathbf{U}_{k+1}^+ \stackrel{\text{I.H.}}{\iff} \varphi_1 \in \mathbf{R}_{k+1} \Leftrightarrow \forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{R}_{k+1},$$

and

$$\forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{E}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{U}_k^+ \Leftrightarrow \forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{F}_k^+ \Leftrightarrow \forall x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{J}_{k+1}.$$

In the same manner, we also have  $\exists x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{U}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \exists x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{R}_{k+1}$  and  $\exists x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{E}_{k+1}^+ \Leftrightarrow \exists x\varphi_1 \in \mathbf{J}_{k+1}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.2.**  $\mathbf{U}_k = \mathbf{R}_k$  and  $\mathbf{E}_k = \mathbf{J}_k$ .

*Proof.* Immediate by Proposition 4.1 and Remark 3.8.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.3.** For a set  $X$  of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ ,  $\text{PA}+X$  is  $\mathbf{E}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $\text{HA} + X + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ .

*Proof.* Immediate from Corollaries 3.19 and 4.2 since  $\mathbf{J}_{k+1} \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.4.* Corollary 4.3 deals with the conservativity of the class of formulas in  $\mathbf{E}_{k+1}$ , which seems to be strictly stronger than that for sentences in  $\mathbf{E}_{k+1}$  (cf. Section 6.1).

*Remark 4.5.* Similar to Definition 3.11, define the classes  $\mathcal{R}'_k$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_k$  as follows. Define  $\mathcal{R}'_0 := \mathcal{J}'_0 := \Sigma_0 (= \Pi_0)$  and  $\mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  simultaneously as follows: Let  $E$  range over formulas in  $\mathbf{E}_k^+$ ,  $U$  over those in  $\mathbf{U}_k^+$ ,  $R$  and  $R'$  over those in  $\mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$ , and  $J$  and  $J'$  over those in  $\mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  respectively. Then  $\mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  are inductively generated by the clauses

1.  $E, R \wedge R', R \vee R', \forall xR, J \rightarrow R \in \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$ ;
2.  $U, J \wedge J', J \vee J', \exists xJ, R \rightarrow J \in \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$ .

Then the proof of Proposition 4.1 shows that  $\mathbf{U}_k^+ = \mathcal{R}'_k$  and  $\mathbf{E}_k^+ = \mathcal{J}'_k$ . Hence  $\mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{R}'_k$  and  $\mathcal{J}_k = \mathcal{J}'_k$ .

*Remark 4.6.* Define  $\mathcal{R}''_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}''_{k+1}$  as for  $\mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  in Remark 4.5 with replacing  $\mathbf{E}_k^+$  and  $\mathbf{U}_k^+$  by  $\Sigma_k$  and  $\Pi_k$ . Then, as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 with using the prenex normal form theorems in  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  (cf. Remark 3.10), one can show  $\mathbf{U}_{k+1}^+ = \mathcal{R}''_{k+1}$  and  $\mathbf{E}_{k+1}^+ = \mathcal{J}''_{k+1}$  over  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ .

As described in Definition 3.7, the classes  $E_k$  and  $U_k$  are originally defined by using the notion of alternation path. On the other hand, Remark 4.6 reveals that one can define these classes (via Remark 3.8) inductively without using the notion of alternation path. A technical advantage of this usual way of defining classes is that one can prove properties of these classes by induction on the structure of formulas in those classes.

## 5 Conservation theorems for the classes of formulas

In this section, we explore the notion that PA is  $\Gamma$ -conservative over  $T$  for semi-classical arithmetic  $T$  and a class  $\Gamma$  of formulas (especially,  $\Pi_k, \Sigma_k, U_k, E_k, F_k$  etc.).

**Definition 5.1.** For classes of HA-formulas  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma'$ ,  $\Gamma \vee \Gamma'$  is the class of formulas of form  $\varphi \vee \psi$  where  $\varphi \in \Gamma$  and  $\psi \in \Gamma'$ .

We recall the notion of duals for prenex formulas from [1, 5].

**Definition 5.2** (cf. [5, Definition 3.2]). For any formula  $\varphi$  in prenex normal form, we define the dual  $\varphi^\perp$  of  $\varphi$  inductively as follows:

1.  $\varphi^\perp := \neg\varphi$  if  $\varphi$  is quantifier-free;
2.  $(\forall x\varphi)^\perp := \exists x(\varphi)^\perp$ ;
3.  $(\exists x\varphi)^\perp := \forall x(\varphi)^\perp$ .

*Remark 5.3.* For  $\varphi$  in  $\Sigma_k$  (resp.  $\Pi_k$ ),  $\varphi^\perp$  is in  $\Pi_k$  (resp.  $\Sigma_k$ ),  $FV(\varphi^\perp) = FV(\varphi)$  and  $(\varphi^\perp)^\perp$  is equivalent to  $\varphi$  over HA. For each prenex formula  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi^\perp$  implies  $\neg\varphi$  intuitionistically. On the other hand, the converse direction for formulas in  $\Sigma_k$  (resp.  $\Pi_k$ ) is equivalent to  $\Sigma_{k-1}$ -DNE (resp.  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE). Then it follows that for  $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$  there exists  $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$  such that  $FV(\varphi') = FV(\varphi)$  and  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi$  (cf. [6, Lemma 4.8.(2)]). In addition,  $\neg\varphi^\perp$  implies  $\neg\neg\varphi$  in the presence of  $\Sigma_{k-1}$ -DNE for the both cases of  $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$  and  $\varphi \in \Pi_k$ . Note also that PA proves  $\varphi \vee \varphi^\perp$  for each prenex formula  $\varphi$ . We refer the reader to [5, Section 3] for more information about the dual principles for prenex formulas in semi-classical arithmetic.

### 5.1 Conservation theorems for $\Pi_k, \Sigma_k, E_k$ and $F_k$

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $T$  be a theory in the language of HA and  $\Gamma$  be a class of HA-formulas.

- $T$  is closed under  $\Gamma$ -DNE-R if  $T \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$  implies  $T \vdash \varphi$  for all  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ .
- $T$  is closed under  $\Gamma$ -CD-R if  $T \vdash \forall x(\varphi \vee \psi)$  implies  $T \vdash \varphi \vee \forall x\psi$  for all  $\varphi, \psi \in \Gamma$  such that  $x \notin FV(\varphi)$ .

- $T$  is closed under  $\Gamma$ -DML-R (resp.  $\Gamma$ -DML<sup>⊥</sup>-R) if  $T \vdash \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  implies  $T \vdash \neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi$  (resp.  $T \vdash \varphi^\perp \vee \psi^\perp$ ) for all  $\varphi, \psi \in \Gamma$ .

Note that  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  in the above may contain free variables.

As mentioned in [13, Section 3.5.1],  $\Sigma_1$ -DNE-R is known as Markov’s rule (for primitive recursive predicates). The fact that  $\text{PA}$  is  $\Sigma_1$ -conservative (equivalently,  $\Pi_2$ -conservative) over  $\text{HA}$  implies that  $\text{HA}$  is closed under Markov’s rule ( $\Sigma_1$ -DNE-R), and vice versa. The generalization  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE-R of Markov’s rule is already mentioned in [7, Section 4.4]. It is easy to see that for semi-classical arithmetic  $T$ , if  $\text{PA}$  is  $\Sigma_k$ -conservative over  $T$ , then  $T$  is closed under  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE-R. Then it is natural to ask about the converse. As we show in Theorem 5.9 below, this is also the case (note that the case for  $k = 2$  is essentially shown in the proof of [11, Proposition 3.3]).

The following are our “reversal” results.

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing  $\text{HA}$ . If  $\text{PA}$  is  $(\Sigma_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -conservative over  $T$ , then  $T \vdash \Sigma_k$ -LEM.*

*Proof.* Fix  $\xi \in \Sigma_k$ . Let  $\xi^\perp \in \Pi_k$  be the dual of  $\xi$ . Since  $\text{PA} \vdash \xi \vee \xi^\perp$ , by our assumption, we have  $T \vdash \xi \vee \xi^\perp$ , and hence,  $T \vdash \xi \vee \neg\xi$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing  $\text{HA}$ . If  $T$  is closed under  $\Sigma_{k+1}$ -DNE-R, then  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM.*

*Proof.* We show that for all  $m \leq k$ ,  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_m$ -LEM, by induction on  $m$ . Since  $T$  contains  $\text{HA}$ , the base case is trivial. Assume  $m + 1 \leq k$  and  $T \vdash \Sigma_m$ -LEM. Let  $\varphi \in \Sigma_{m+1}$ . Since  $\text{HA} \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi \vee \neg\varphi)$ , by Remark 5.3 and the fact that  $\Sigma_m$ -LEM implies  $\Sigma_m$ -DNE, we have  $T \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi \vee \varphi^\perp)$  where  $\varphi^\perp \in \Pi_{m+1}$ . Since  $\varphi \vee \varphi^\perp$  is equivalent over  $\text{HA}$  to some formula in  $\Sigma_{m+2}$  (cf. [6, Lemma 4.4]), by  $\Sigma_{k+1}$ -DNE-R, we have  $T \vdash \varphi \vee \varphi^\perp$ , and hence,  $\varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ . Thus we have shown  $T \vdash \Sigma_{m+1}$ -LEM.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing  $\text{HA}$ . If  $T$  is closed under  $\Sigma_k$ -CD-R, then  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM.*

*Proof.* We show that for all  $m \leq k$ ,  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_m$ -LEM, by induction on  $m$ . Since  $T$  contains  $\text{HA}$ , the base case is trivial. Assume  $m + 1 \leq k$  and  $T \vdash \Sigma_m$ -LEM. Let  $\varphi := \exists x\varphi_1$  where  $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_m$ . Since  $T$  proves  $\Pi_m$ -LEM and  $\Sigma_m$ -DNE, we have  $T \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \neg\varphi_1$ , and hence,  $T \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_1^\perp$  (cf. Remark 5.3). Then  $T \vdash \forall x(\exists x\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_1^\perp)$  follows. Since  $\exists x\varphi_1, \varphi_1^\perp \in \Sigma_{m+1}$ , by  $\Sigma_k$ -CD-R, we have  $T \vdash \exists x\varphi_1 \vee \forall x\varphi_1^\perp$ , and hence,  $T \vdash \exists x\varphi_1 \vee \neg\exists x\varphi_1$ . Thus we have shown  $T \vdash \Sigma_{m+1}$ -LEM.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.8.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing  $\text{HA}$ . Then  $T$  is closed under  $\Pi_k$ -DML<sup>⊥</sup>-R if and only if  $T$  is closed under  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE-R.*

*Proof.* We first show the “only if” direction. Assume that  $T$  is closed under  $\Pi_k$ -DML<sup>⊥</sup>-R and  $T \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$  where  $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$ . Since  $\neg\neg\varphi$  is equivalent over  $\text{HA}$  to  $\neg(\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\varphi)$ , by Remark 5.3, we have

$$T \vdash \neg(\varphi^\perp \wedge \varphi^\perp).$$

Since  $\varphi^\perp \in \Pi_k$ , by  $\Pi_k\text{-DML}^\perp\text{-R}$ , we have  $T \vdash (\varphi^\perp)^\perp \vee (\varphi^\perp)^\perp$ , and hence,  $T \vdash \varphi$  (cf. Remark 5.3).

For the converse direction, assume that  $T$  is closed under  $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE-R}$  and  $T \vdash \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  where  $\varphi, \psi \in \Pi_k$ . Since  $\neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  is intuitionistically equivalent to  $\neg(\neg\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\neg\psi)$ , by Lemma 5.6 and Remark 5.3 (note that  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  implies  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$ ), we have  $T \vdash \neg(\neg\varphi^\perp \wedge \neg\psi^\perp)$  where  $\varphi^\perp, \psi^\perp \in \Sigma_k$ . Then  $T \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi^\perp \vee \psi^\perp)$  follows. By  $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE-R}$ , we have  $T \vdash \varphi^\perp \vee \psi^\perp$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.9.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ . The following are pairwise equivalent:*

1.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\mathcal{V}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
2.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\Pi_{k+2}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
3.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\Sigma_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
4.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE-R}$ ;
5.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\Pi_{k+1}\text{-DML}^\perp\text{-R}$ ;
6.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\text{E}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
7.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\text{F}_k$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
8.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $(\Sigma_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
9.  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ ;
10.  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-CD}$ ;
11.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\Sigma_k\text{-CD-R}$ ;

where  $\Sigma_k\text{-CD}$  is the scheme  $\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow \varphi \vee \forall x\psi$  with  $\varphi, \psi \in \Sigma_k$  such that  $x \notin \text{FV}(\varphi)$  (cf. [5, Section 7]).

*Proof.* The implications (1)  $\rightarrow$  (6)  $\rightarrow$  (7)  $\rightarrow$  (8), (1)  $\rightarrow$  (2)  $\rightarrow$  (3)  $\rightarrow$  (4) and (9)  $\rightarrow$  (10)  $\rightarrow$  (11) are trivial (cf. Corollary 4.3 and Remark 3.18). The implications (8)  $\rightarrow$  (9), (4)  $\rightarrow$  (9), (11)  $\rightarrow$  (9) and (9)  $\rightarrow$  (1) are by Lemmata 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and Corollary 3.19 respectively. The equivalence (4)  $\leftrightarrow$  (5) is by Lemma 5.8.  $\square$

## 5.2 Conservation theorem for $\text{U}_k$

In contrast to the fact that  $\text{E}_{k+1}$ -conservativity and  $\text{F}_k$ -conservativity are characterized by  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  (see Theorem 5.9),  $\text{U}_{k+1}$ -conservativity requires more than  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ :

**Proposition 5.10.**  *$\text{PA}$  is not  $(\Pi_1 \vee \Pi_1)$ -conservative over HA.*

*Proof.* We use the same argument as in [6, Section 3]. Suppose that PA is conservative over HA for all formulas  $\varphi \vee \psi$  with  $\varphi, \psi \in \Pi_1$ . Let  $\Phi(x)$  be the following formula:

$$\forall u \neg(\mathsf{T}(x, x, u) \wedge \mathsf{U}(u) = 0) \vee \forall u \neg(\mathsf{T}(x, x, u) \wedge \mathsf{U}(u) \neq 0), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathsf{T}$  and  $\mathsf{U}$  are the standard primitive recursive predicate and the function from the Kleene normal form theorem. Since

$$\neg(\exists u(\mathsf{T}(x, x, u) \wedge \mathsf{U}(u) = 0) \wedge \exists u(\mathsf{T}(x, x, u) \wedge \mathsf{U}(u) \neq 0))$$

is provable in HA, we have  $\mathsf{PA} \vdash \Phi(x)$ . Then, by our assumption, we have  $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \Phi(x)$ , and hence,  $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \forall x \Phi(x)$ . On the other hand, as shown in the proof of [6, Proposition 3.1],  $\neg \forall x \Phi(x)$  is provable in  $\mathsf{HA} + \mathsf{CT}_0$  where  $\mathsf{CT}_0$  is the arithmetical form of Church's thesis from [12, Section 3.2.14]. Then we have  $\mathsf{HA} + \mathsf{CT}_0 \vdash \perp$ , which is a contradiction by [12, Section 3.2.22].  $\square$

Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic. By Theorems 3.9.(2) and 5.9, if  $T$  proves  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -DNE, then PA is  $\mathsf{U}_{k+1}$ -conservative (and hence, a-fortiori  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -conservative) over  $T$ . On the other hand, if PA is  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -conservative over  $T$ , then  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM by Lemma 5.5 and the fact that both of  $\Sigma_k$  and  $\Pi_k$  can be seen as sub-classes of  $\Pi_{k+1}$ . Thus  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -DNE implies the  $\mathsf{U}_{k+1}$ -conservativity, which implies the  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -conservativity, which implies  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM and not vice versa. For further studying the relation of the  $\mathsf{U}_{k+1}/(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -conservativity and semi-classical arithmetic, we introduce some extended classes of  $\Pi_k$  and  $\Sigma_k$ .

**Definition 5.11.**

- $\bigvee \Pi_k$  denotes the class consisting of disjunctions of formulas in  $\Pi_k$ .
- A class  $\mathsf{E}\Pi_k$  is defined by the following clauses:
  - $\varphi \in \Pi_k$ ;
  - If  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathsf{E}\Pi_k$ , then  $\varphi \vee \psi \in \mathsf{E}\Pi_k$ ;
  - If  $\varphi \in \mathsf{E}\Pi_k$ , then  $\forall x \varphi \in \mathsf{E}\Pi_k$ .
- $\mathsf{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  denotes the class consisting of formulas of the form  $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \varphi$  where  $\varphi \in \mathsf{E}\Pi_k$ .

*Remark 5.12.*  $\Pi_k \subseteq \Pi_k \vee \Pi_k \subseteq \bigvee \Pi_k \subseteq \mathsf{E}\Pi_k \subseteq \mathsf{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$ .

**Lemma 5.13.** *For any HA-formulas  $\varphi, \psi \in \mathsf{E}\Pi_k$ , there exists  $\xi \in \mathsf{E}\Pi_k$  such that  $\mathsf{FV}(\xi) = \mathsf{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$  and  $\mathsf{HA} \vdash \xi \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge \psi$ .*

*Proof.* By induction on the sum of the complexity of  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ .

If both of  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are in  $\Pi_k$ , then we are done by [6, Lemma 4.3.(2)].

Suppose  $\psi := \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$  where  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_k$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exist  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\xi_1) = \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi_1)$ ,  $\text{FV}(\xi_2) = \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi_2)$ ,  $\text{HA} \vdash \xi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge \psi_1$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \xi_2 \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge \psi_2$ . Then we have that

$$\text{FV}(\xi_1 \vee \xi_2) = \text{FV}(\xi_1) \cup \text{FV}(\xi_2) = \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi_2) = \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$$

and that HA proves

$$\xi_1 \vee \xi_2 \leftrightarrow (\varphi \wedge \psi_1) \vee (\varphi \wedge \psi_2) \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge (\psi_1 \vee \psi_2) \equiv \varphi \wedge \psi.$$

Thus one can take  $\xi_1 \vee \xi_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_k$  as a witness.

Suppose  $\psi := \forall x \psi_1$  where  $\psi_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_k$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $x \notin \text{FV}(\varphi)$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exists  $\xi_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\xi_1) = \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi_1)$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \xi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge \psi_1$ . Then we have

$$\text{FV}(\forall x \xi_1) = \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \psi_1) \setminus \{x\} = \text{FV}(\varphi \wedge \forall x \psi_1)$$

and that HA proves

$$\forall x \xi_1 \leftrightarrow \forall x(\varphi \wedge \psi_1) \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge \forall x \psi_1.$$

Thus one can take  $\forall x \xi_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_k$  as a witness.  $\square$

In what follows, we use [6, Lemma 4.5] many times implicitly.

**Lemma 5.14.** *For a HA-formula  $\varphi$ , the following hold:*

1. *If  $\varphi \in \text{U}_{k+1}^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ ;*
2. *If  $\varphi \in \text{E}_{k+1}^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \neg\varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ .*

*Proof.* We show items 1 and 2 by simultaneous induction on the structure of formulas. We suppress the arguments on the condition on free variables when they are clear from the context.

If  $\varphi$  is prime, then items 1 and 2 are trivial since  $\varphi$  is decidable in HA. For the induction step, assume items 1 and 2 hold for  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ .

Case of  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ : For item 1, suppose  $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in \text{U}_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \text{U}_{k+1}^+$ . By using the induction hypothesis, there exist  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi'_1 \rightarrow \varphi_1$  and  $\varphi'_2 \rightarrow \varphi_2$  and PA proves  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$  and  $\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi'_2$ . Now  $\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  and  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2 \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2.$$

On the other hand, PA proves the converse. For item 2, suppose  $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in \text{E}_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \text{E}_{k+1}^+$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exist  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi'_1 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi'_2 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_2$  and PA proves  $\neg\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$  and  $\neg\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi'_2$ . By Lemma 5.13, there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such



that  $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2)$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$ . Then we have that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2 \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} \neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)$$

and also PA proves the converse.

Case of  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ : For item 1, suppose  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in U_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in U_{k+1}^+$ . By using the induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.13, one can take a witness for  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$  in a straightforward way. Item 2 follows from the induction hypothesis as in the case of  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ :  $\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  is the witness since  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2 \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} \neg\varphi_1 \vee \neg\varphi_2 \rightarrow \neg(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$$

and PA proves the converse.

Case of  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ : For item 1, suppose  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in U_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\varphi_1 \in E_{k+1}^+$  and  $\varphi_2 \in U_{k+1}^+$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exist  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi'_1 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi'_2 \rightarrow \varphi_2$  and PA proves  $\neg\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$  and  $\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi'_2$ . Now  $\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  and  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2 \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} \neg\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \rightarrow (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2).$$

On the other hand, PA proves the converse. For item 2, suppose  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in E_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\varphi_1 \in U_{k+1}^+$  and  $\varphi_2 \in E_{k+1}^+$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exist  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi'_1 \rightarrow \varphi_1$  and  $\varphi'_2 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_2$  and PA proves  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$  and  $\neg\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi'_2$ . By Lemma 5.13, there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2)$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$ . Then we have that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2 \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} \varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2 \rightarrow \neg(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)$$

and also that PA proves the converse.

Case of  $\varphi := \exists x\varphi_1$ : For item 1, suppose  $\exists x\varphi_1 \in U_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\exists x\varphi_1 \in E_k^+$ . By Remark 3.10, there exists  $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi)$  and  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi$ . Since  $\Sigma_k$  can be seen as a subclass of  $\Pi_{k+1}$ , we are done. For item 2, suppose  $\exists x\varphi_1 \in E_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\varphi_1 \in E_{k+1}^+$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exists  $\varphi'_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi'_1) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1)$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi'_1 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_1$  and PA  $\vdash \neg\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$ . Now  $\forall x\varphi'_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  and  $\text{FV}(\forall x\varphi'_1) = \text{FV}(\exists x\varphi_1)$ . Then we have that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\forall x\varphi'_1 \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}} \forall x\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\exists x\varphi_1$$

and also that PA proves the converse.

Case of  $\varphi := \forall x\varphi_1$ : For item 1, suppose  $\forall x\varphi_1 \in U_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\varphi_1 \in U_{k+1}^+$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exists  $\varphi'_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi'_1) =$

$\text{FV}(\varphi_1)$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi'_1 \rightarrow \varphi_1$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$ . It is straightforward to see that  $\forall x\varphi'_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  is a witness for  $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \text{U}_{k+1}^+$ . For item 2, suppose  $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \text{E}_{k+1}^+$ . Then  $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \text{U}_k^+$ . By Remark 3.10, there exists  $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi)$  and  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi$ . Since  $\neg\varphi'$  is equivalent to some  $\varphi'' \in \Sigma_k$  in the presence of  $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$  (cf. Remark 5.3), we are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.15.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing  $\text{HA}$  and  $X$  be a set of  $\text{HA}$ -sentences. If  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ , then so is  $\text{U}_{k+1}$ -conservative.*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi \in \text{U}_{k+1}$ . Suppose  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi$ . By Lemma 5.14, there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi'$ . By our assumption, we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi'$ . As in the proof of Lemma 5.5, one can show  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  by using the  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$ -conservativity. Then  $T + X \vdash \varphi$  follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.16.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic and  $X$  be a set of  $\text{HA}$ -sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ . Then the following are pairwise equivalent:*

1.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\text{U}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
2.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
3.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}\text{-DNE-R}$ ;
4.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}\text{-CD-R}$ ;
5.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{U}_{k+1}\text{-DNE-R}$ ;
6.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{U}_{k+1}\text{-CD-R}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1} \subseteq \text{U}_{k+1}$ , the equivalence between (1) and (2) follows immediately from Lemma 5.15.

(2  $\rightarrow$  3) : Let  $\varphi \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  and assume  $T + X \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$ . Since  $T + X \subseteq \text{PA} + X$ , we have  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi$ . By (2), we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi$ .

(3  $\rightarrow$  4) : Let  $\varphi, \psi(x) \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  and  $x \notin \text{FV}(\varphi)$ . Assume  $T + X \vdash \forall x(\varphi \vee \psi(x))$ . Since  $\text{HA}$  proves  $\neg\neg(\varphi \vee \neg\varphi)$  and  $(\varphi \vee \neg\varphi) \wedge \forall x(\varphi \vee \psi(x)) \rightarrow \varphi \vee \forall x\psi(x)$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi \vee \forall x\psi(x))$ . Since  $\varphi \vee \forall x\psi(x) \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$ , by  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}\text{-DNE-R}$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi \vee \forall x\psi(x)$ .

(4  $\rightarrow$  2) : Assume that  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}\text{-CD-R}$ . By Lemma 5.7, we have  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ . We show that  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_n$  implies  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_n$  for any  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  by induction on the sum of the complexity of  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$ .

First, suppose that all of  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$  are in  $\Pi_{k+1}$ . Let  $\varphi_i := \forall x_i\varphi'_i$  with  $\varphi'_i \in \Sigma_k$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_n$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi'_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi'_n$ . Since  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $X \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , by Corollary 4.3, we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi'_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi'_n$ . Then  $T + X \vdash \forall x_1(\varphi'_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi'_n)$  follows. By  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}\text{-CD-R}$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \forall x_1\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2 \vee \dots \vee \varphi'_n$ . Iterating this procedure for more  $n - 1$  times, we have  $T + X \vdash \forall x_1\varphi'_1 \vee \dots \vee \forall x_n\varphi'_n$ .

Secondly, suppose  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  and  $\varphi_n := \varphi'_n \vee \varphi''_n$  with  $\varphi'_n, \varphi''_n \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$ . Without loss of generality, let  $n > 1$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi_n$ , equivalently,  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi'_n \vee \varphi''_n$ . By the induction hypothesis, we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi'_n \vee \varphi''_n$ , equivalently,  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi_n$ .

Finally, suppose  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$  and  $\varphi_n := \forall x_n \varphi'_n$  with  $\varphi'_n \in \text{E}\Pi_{k+1}$ . Without loss of generality, let  $n > 1$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi_n$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi'_n$  follows. By the induction hypothesis, we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi'_n$ , and hence,  $T + X \vdash \forall x_n (\varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi'_n)$ . By  $\text{E}\Pi_{k+1}\text{-CD-R}$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi_n$ .

The implications (1  $\rightarrow$  5) and (5  $\rightarrow$  6) are shown as for (2  $\rightarrow$  3) and (3  $\rightarrow$  4) respectively. In addition, (6  $\rightarrow$  4) is trivial.  $\square$

Next, we characterize the  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -conservativity by several rules.

**Lemma 5.17.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing HA. If  $T$  is closed under  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE-R, then so is  $\Pi_k$ -CD-R.*

*Proof.* The proof of (3  $\rightarrow$  4) of Theorem 5.16 works.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.18.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing HA. Then  $T$  is closed under  $\Sigma_k$ -DML $^\perp$ -R if and only if  $T$  is closed under  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE-R.*

*Proof.* One can show the “only if” direction as in the proof of that in Lemma 5.8. For the converse direction, again by the corresponding proof in Lemma 5.8, it suffices to show that if  $T$  is closed under  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE-R, then  $T$  proves  $\Sigma_{k-1}$ -LEM. The latter is the case by Lemmata 5.17 and 5.7.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.19.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ . Then the following are pairwise equivalent:*

1.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
2.  $T + X$  is closed under  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -DNE-R;
3.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\Pi_{k+1}$ -CD-R;
4.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\Sigma_{k+1}$ -DML $^\perp$ -R;
5.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\Sigma_{k+1}$ -DML-R and  $T + X$  proves  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE.

*Proof.* One can show (1  $\rightarrow$  2) as in the proof of (2  $\rightarrow$  3) of Theorem 5.16. The implication (2  $\rightarrow$  3) is by Lemma 5.17.

We show (3  $\rightarrow$  1). Assume that  $T + X$  is closed under  $\Pi_{k+1}$ -CD-R. By Lemma 5.7, we have  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_k$ -LEM. Let  $\varphi_1 := \forall x_1 \psi_1$  and  $\varphi_2 := \forall x_2 \psi_2$  with  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \Sigma_k$ . Suppose  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \forall x_1 \psi_1 \vee \forall x_2 \psi_2$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \neg(\exists x_1 \psi_1^\perp \wedge \exists x_2 \psi_2^\perp)$ . Since  $\exists x_1 \psi_1^\perp \wedge \exists x_2 \psi_2^\perp$  is equivalent to a formula in  $\Sigma_{k+1}$  (cf. [6, Lemma 4.3.(2)]), by Remark 5.3, there exists  $\xi \in \Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\xi) = \text{FV}(\forall x_1 \psi_1 \vee \forall x_2 \psi_2)$  and  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \xi \leftrightarrow \neg(\exists x_1 \psi_1^\perp \wedge \exists x_2 \psi_2^\perp)$ . Then we have  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \xi$ . Since  $X \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ , by Corollary 3.19, we have  $\text{HA} + X + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \xi$ . Since  $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$  is derivable from  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ , we have that  $T + X$

proves  $\neg(\exists x_1 \psi_1^\perp \wedge \exists x_2 \psi_2^\perp)$ , equivalently,  $\forall x_1, x_2 \neg(\psi_1^\perp \wedge \psi_2^\perp)$ . Since  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_k$ -DNE, again by Remark 5.3, we have that  $T + X$  proves  $\forall x_1, x_2 \neg(\neg\psi_1 \wedge \neg\psi_2)$ , equivalently,  $\forall x_1, x_2 \neg\neg(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)$ . Since  $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$  is equivalent to a formula in  $\Sigma_k$  (cf. [6, Lemma 4.4]),  $T + X \vdash \forall x_1, x_2(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)$  follows. By using  $\Pi_{k+1}$ -CD-R twice, we have  $T + X \vdash \forall x_1 \psi_1 \vee \forall x_2 \psi_2$ .

The equivalence (2  $\leftrightarrow$  4) is by Lemma 5.18. The implication (5  $\rightarrow$  4) is by the fact that for  $\varphi \in \Sigma_{k+1}$ ,  $\varphi^\perp$  is derived from  $\neg\varphi$  in the presence of  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE (cf. Remark 5.3). The implication (3 & 4  $\rightarrow$  5) is by Lemma 5.7 (note that  $\Sigma_k$ -LEM implies  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE).  $\square$

*Remark 5.20.* From the perspective of Remark 5.12, it is natural to ask the status of the  $\bigvee \Pi_{k+1}$ -conservativity. As in the proof of Theorem 5.19, one can show the following equivalence:

1.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\bigvee \Pi_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
2. For any  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \Pi_{k+1}$ , if  $T + X \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_n)$ , then  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_n$ ;
3. For any  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \Pi_{k+1}$  such that  $x \notin \text{FV}(\varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1})$ , if  $T + X \vdash \forall x(\varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \varphi_n)$ , then  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1} \vee \forall x \varphi_n$ ;
4. For any  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \Sigma_{k+1}$ , if  $T + X \vdash \neg(\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n)$ , then  $T + X \vdash \varphi_1^\perp \vee \dots \vee \varphi_n^\perp$ ;
5.  $T + X$  proves  $\Sigma_k$ -DNE and for any  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \in \Sigma_{k+1}$ , if  $T + X \vdash \neg(\varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_n)$ , then  $T + X \vdash \neg\varphi_1 \vee \dots \vee \neg\varphi_n$ ;

where  $X \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_{k+1}$ . This characterization suggests that the  $\bigvee \Pi_{k+1}$ -conservativity lies strictly between the  $\text{U}_{k+1}$ -conservativity and the  $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})$ -conservativity, but we do not have the proof of the strictness.

*Remark 5.21.* From the comparison between [5, Corollary 7.6] and the equivalences in Theorem 5.19, it is natural to ask whether the (contrapositive) collection rule restricted to formulas in  $\Pi_{k+1}$  is also equivalent to the items in Theorem 5.19. This question is still open.

## 6 Conservation theorems for the classes of sentences

In the study of fragments of PA, the conservativity for classes of sentences has been studied extensively e.g. in [10, Section 2]. The following proposition states that the conservativity for a class of formulas is equivalent to that restricted only to sentences if the class is closed under taking a universal closure:

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a class of HA-formulas such that  $\Gamma$  is closed under taking a universal closure. For any theories  $T$  and  $T'$  containing HA in the language of HA, if  $T'$  is conservative over  $T$  for any sentences in  $\Gamma$ , then  $T'$  is  $\Gamma$ -conservative over  $T$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ . Assume  $T' \vdash \varphi$ . Then we have  $T' \vdash \tilde{\varphi}$  where  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is the universal closure of  $\varphi$ . Since  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is a sentence in  $\Gamma$ , by our assumption, we have  $T \vdash \tilde{\varphi}$ , and hence,  $T \vdash \varphi$ .  $\square$

Therefore, for classes as  $\Pi_k, U_k, E\Pi_k$  etc., the strength of the conservativity does not vary even if we restrict them only to sentences. On the other hand, since  $\Sigma_k, E_k, F_k$  etc. are not closed under taking a universal closure, this is not the case for such classes. In what follows, we explore the relation on the notion that PA is  $\Gamma$ -conservative over  $T$  for semi-classical arithmetic  $T$  and the class  $\Gamma$  of sentences.

**Definition 6.2.** For a class  $\Gamma$  of HA-formulas,  $\underline{\Gamma}$  denotes the class of HA-sentences in  $\Gamma$ .

## 6.1 Conservation theorems for $\Sigma_k$ sentences and $E_k$ sentences

For the  $\underline{\Sigma}_k$ -conservativity, we have the following:

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic containing  $\Sigma_{k-1}$ -LEM, and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$  if and only if  $T + X$  is closed under  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -DNE-R.*

*Proof.* We first show the “only if” direction. Let  $\varphi \in \underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ . Assume  $T + X \vdash \neg\varphi$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi$ . Since  $\text{PA} + X$  is now  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi$ .

In the following, we show the converse direction. Without loss of generality, assume  $k > 0$ . Let  $\exists x\forall y\psi \in \underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$  with  $\psi$  in  $\Sigma_{k-1}$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \exists x\forall y\psi$ . By Proposition 3.2.(2), we have  $\text{HA}^\$ + X^\$ \vdash \neg_\$ \neg_\$ \exists x\forall y\psi^\$, and hence,  $\text{HA}^\$ + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} + X \vdash \neg_\$ \neg_\$ \exists x\forall y\psi^\$$  by Lemma 3.14. Using Lemma 3.5.(2), we have  $\text{HA}^\$ + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} + X \vdash \neg_\$ \neg_\$ \exists x\forall y(\psi \vee \$)$ . By substituting  $\$$  with  $\perp$  (cf. Lemma 3.16), we have  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} + X \vdash \neg\neg\exists x\forall y\psi$ . Since  $T$  is semi-classical arithmetic containing  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \neg\neg\exists x\forall y\psi$ . By  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -DNE-R,  $T + X \vdash \exists x\forall y\psi$  follows.  $\square$$

Proposition 6.3 is a counterpart of the equivalence between (3) and (4) in Theorem 5.9 for the case of sentences. In what follows, we deal with the  $\underline{E}_{k+1}$ -conservativity. In particular, we show that the  $\underline{E}_{k+1}$ -conservativity can be reduced to  $\underline{E\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservativity.

**Lemma 6.4.** *For HA-formulas  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in E\Sigma_{k+1}$ , there exist  $\psi, \xi \in E\Sigma_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\psi) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) = \text{FV}(\xi)$  and HA proves  $\psi \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$  and  $\xi \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi_1 := \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \varphi'_1$  and  $\varphi_2 := \exists y_1, \dots, y_m \varphi'_2$  with  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in E\Pi_k$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $x_1, \dots, x_n \notin \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_m \notin \text{FV}(\varphi'_1)$ .

By Lemma 5.13, there exists  $\psi' \in \text{E}\Pi_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\psi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2)$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \psi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$ . Put  $\psi := \exists x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m \psi'$ , which is in  $\text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$ . Then it is trivial that  $\text{FV}(\psi) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \psi \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ .

Put  $\xi := \exists x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m (\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2)$ , which is in  $\text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$ . Since  $\xi$  is equivalent to  $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \varphi'_1 \vee \exists y_1, \dots, y_m \varphi'_2$  over  $\text{HA}$ , we have that  $\text{FV}(\xi) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)$  and  $\text{HA} \vdash \xi \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.5.** *For a HA-formula  $\varphi$ , the following hold:*

1. If  $\varphi \in \text{U}_{k+1}^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \neg\varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ .
2. If  $\varphi \in \text{E}_{k+1}^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\text{U}_{k+1}^+ = \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\text{E}_{k+1}^+ = \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  where  $\mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  are the classes defined in Remark 4.5. Then it suffices to show items 1 and 2 where  $\text{U}_{k+1}^+$  and  $\text{E}_{k+1}^+$  are replaced by  $\mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  respectively. In the following, we show the assertions by induction on the constructions of  $\mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$ .

For  $\varphi \in \text{E}_k^+ \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$ , by Lemma 5.14, there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_k (\subseteq \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1})$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \neg\varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ . For  $\varphi \in \text{U}_k^+ \subseteq \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$ , by Lemma 5.14, there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_k (\subseteq \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1})$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ . For the induction step, let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$  and  $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$  and  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2, \psi'_1, \psi'_2 \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  satisfy  $\text{FV}(\varphi_1) = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1)$ ,  $\text{FV}(\varphi_2) = \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$ ,  $\text{FV}(\psi_1) = \text{FV}(\psi'_1)$ ,  $\text{FV}(\psi_2) = \text{FV}(\psi'_2)$  and that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi'_1 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_1$ ,  $\varphi'_2 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_2$ ,  $\psi'_1 \rightarrow \psi_1$ ,  $\psi'_2 \rightarrow \psi_2$  and  $\text{PA}$  proves  $\neg\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$ ,  $\neg\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi'_2$ ,  $\psi_1 \rightarrow \psi'_1$ ,  $\psi_2 \rightarrow \psi'_2$ . By Lemma 6.4, for any conjunction and disjunction of  $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2, \psi'_1, \psi'_2 \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$ , there exists an equivalent (over  $\text{HA}$ )  $\xi \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  which preserves the free variables. For  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  as an equivalent of  $\varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$ . For  $\varphi := \psi_1 \vee \psi_2 \in \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  as an equivalent of  $\psi'_1 \vee \psi'_2$ . For  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  as an equivalent of  $\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2$ . For  $\varphi := \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 \in \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  as an equivalent of  $\psi'_1 \wedge \psi'_2$ . For  $\varphi := \psi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  as an equivalent of  $\psi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$ . For  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi_2 \in \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  as an equivalent of  $\varphi'_1 \vee \psi'_2$ . For  $\varphi := \forall x \varphi_1 \in \mathcal{R}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' := \exists x \varphi'_1 \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$ . For  $\varphi := \exists x \psi_1 \in \mathcal{J}'_{k+1}$ , take  $\varphi' := \exists x \psi'_1 \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$ . We leave the routine verification for the reader.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.6.** *For a HA-formula  $\varphi$ , the following hold:*

1. If  $\varphi \in \text{U}_{k+1}^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \Sigma_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \neg\varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ .
2. If  $\varphi \in \text{E}_{k+1}^+$ , then there exists  $\varphi' \in \Sigma_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Sigma_{k+1}$  is of the form  $\exists x \varphi'_1$  where  $\varphi'_1 \in \text{E}\Pi_k \subseteq \text{U}_k^+$ , by Theorem 3.9.(2), there exists  $\psi \in \Sigma_{k+1}$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\psi)$  and  $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \psi$ . Since  $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  proves  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ , our corollary follows from Lemma 6.5.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.7.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences. Then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\widetilde{\text{E}}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$  if and only if  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\widetilde{\text{E}}_{\Sigma_{k+1}}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ .*

*Proof.* The “only if” direction is trivial since  $\text{E}\Sigma_{k+1} \subseteq \widetilde{\text{E}}_{k+1}$ . We show the converse direction. Let  $\varphi \in \widetilde{\text{E}}_{k+1}$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi$ . By Lemma 6.5, there exists  $\varphi' \in \widetilde{\text{E}}_{\Sigma_{k+1}}$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi'$ . By our assumption, we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi'$ . On the other hand, as in the proof of Lemma 5.5, one can show  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  (note that  $\widetilde{\text{E}}\Pi_k$  can be seen as a sub-class of  $\widetilde{\text{E}}_{\Sigma_{k+1}}$  and the  $\widetilde{\text{E}}\Pi_k$ -conservativity implies the  $\text{E}\Pi_k$ -conservativity by Proposition 6.1). Then we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi$ .  $\square$

## 6.2 Conservation theorem for $\text{F}_k$ sentences

Next, we characterize the  $\widetilde{\text{F}}_k$ -conservativity. To investigate the class  $\text{F}_k$ , it is convenient to consider the following class:

**Definition 6.8.** Let  $\text{B}_k^+$  be the class of formulas which are constructed from formulas in  $\text{E}_k^+ \cup \text{U}_k^+$  by using logical connectives  $\wedge, \vee$  and  $\rightarrow$ . Let  $\text{B}_k^+\text{-LEM}$  be LEM restricted to formulas in  $\text{B}_k^+$ .

**Proposition 6.9.**  $\text{HA} \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \leftrightarrow \text{B}_k^+\text{-LEM}$ .

*Proof.* First,  $\text{HA} + \text{B}_k^+\text{-LEM} \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  is trivial since  $\Sigma_k \subseteq \text{E}_k^+$ . We show the converse direction. By Remark 3.10, inside  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ , one may assume that  $\varphi \in \text{B}_k^+$  is constructed from formulas in  $\Sigma_k \cup \Pi_k$  by using logical connectives  $\wedge, \vee$  and  $\rightarrow$ . Then we have  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \text{B}_k^+\text{-LEM}$  in a straightforward way.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.10.**  $\text{B}_k^+ = \text{F}_k$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\text{F}_k^+ = \text{F}_k$  (cf. Remark 3.8), it suffices to show  $\text{B}_k^+ = \text{F}_k^+$ .

First,  $\text{B}_k^+ \subseteq \text{F}_k^+$  is trivial since  $\text{E}_k^+ \subseteq \text{F}_k^+$ ,  $\text{U}_k^+ \subseteq \text{F}_k^+$  and the fact that  $\text{F}_k^+$  is closed under  $\wedge, \vee$  and  $\rightarrow$ .

We show that  $\varphi \in \text{F}_k^+$  implies  $\varphi \in \text{B}_k^+$  for all HA-formulas  $\varphi$  by induction on the structure of formulas. If  $\varphi$  is prime, since  $\varphi \in \text{B}_k^+$ , then we are done. For the induction step, assume that it holds for  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$ . If  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \text{F}_k^+$ , then  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \text{F}_k^+$  follows. By the induction hypothesis, we have  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \text{B}_k^+$ , and hence,  $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in \text{B}_k^+$ . The cases of  $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$  and  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$  are similar. If  $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \text{F}_k^+$ , by the definition, we have  $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \text{U}_k^+$ , and hence,  $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \text{B}_k^+$ . The case of  $\exists x\varphi_1 \in \text{F}_k^+$  is similar.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.11** (cf. [1, Corollary 2.8.(i)]).  $\text{HA} \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \leftrightarrow \text{F}_k\text{-LEM}$ .

*Proof.* Immediate from Propositions 6.9 and 6.10.  $\square$

*Remark 6.12.* By using Proposition 6.10 and Theorem 3.9, one can show the following: If  $\varphi \in \text{F}_k$ , then  $\text{HA}^{\text{s}} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^{\text{s}} \leftrightarrow \varphi \vee \text{\$}$ . This is an extension of Lemma 3.5.

**Lemma 6.13.** *For all  $\varphi \in B_k^+$ , there exist  $\varphi'$  and  $\varphi''$  which are constructed from formulas in  $\text{E}\Pi_k \cup \Sigma_k$  by using  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  only, and satisfy  $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'') = \text{FV}(\varphi)$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\varphi'' \rightarrow \neg\varphi$ , and  $\text{PA}$  proves  $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$  and  $\neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi''$ .*

*Proof.* By induction on the construction of  $B_k^+$ .

For the base case, first assume  $\varphi \in U_k^+$ . By Lemma 5.14, there exists  $\varphi' \in \text{E}\Pi_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ . By Corollary 6.6, there exists  $\varphi'' \in \Sigma_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi'')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi'' \rightarrow \neg\varphi$  (cf. Remark 3.10) and  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi''$ . Next assume  $\varphi \in E_k^+$ . By Corollary 6.6, there exists  $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ . By Lemma 5.14, there exists  $\varphi'' \in \text{E}\Pi_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi'')$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi'' \rightarrow \neg\varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi''$ .

For the induction step, let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in B_k^+$  and  $\varphi'_1, \varphi''_1, \varphi'_2, \varphi''_2$  constructed from formulas in  $\text{E}\Pi_k \cup \Sigma_k$  by using  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  only satisfy the following:  $\text{FV}(\varphi'_1) = \text{FV}(\varphi''_1) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1)$ ,  $\text{FV}(\varphi'_2) = \text{FV}(\varphi''_2) = \text{FV}(\varphi_2)$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi'_1 \rightarrow \varphi_1$ ,  $\varphi'_2 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ ,  $\varphi''_1 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_1$ ,  $\varphi''_2 \rightarrow \neg\varphi_2$  and  $\text{PA}$  proves  $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi'_1$ ,  $\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi'_2$ ,  $\neg\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi''_1$ ,  $\neg\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi''_2$ . For  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ , take  $\varphi' := \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$  and  $\varphi'' := \varphi''_1 \vee \varphi''_2$ . For  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ , take  $\varphi' := \varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2$  and  $\varphi'' := \varphi''_1 \wedge \varphi''_2$ . For  $\varphi := \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ , take  $\varphi' := \varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2$  and  $\varphi'' := \varphi''_1 \wedge \varphi''_2$ . We leave the routine verification for the reader.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.14.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic and  $X$  be a set of  $\text{HA}$ -sentences. Then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{F}_k$ -conservative over  $T + X$  if and only if  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $(\underline{\Sigma}_k \vee \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k)$ -conservative over  $T + X$ .*

*Proof.* The “only if” direction is trivial since  $\underline{\Sigma}_k \vee \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k \subseteq \underline{F}_k$ . We show the converse direction. Let  $\varphi \in \underline{F}_k$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi$ . By Lemma 6.13 and Proposition 6.10, there exist  $\varphi'$  which is constructed from formulas in  $\underline{\Sigma}_k \cup \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k$  by using  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  only, and satisfy  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi' \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ . Without loss of generality, one may assume that  $\varphi'$  is of conjunctive normal form such that each conjunct is a disjunction of sentences in  $\underline{\Sigma}_k \cup \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k$ . Since disjunction of sentences in  $\underline{\Sigma}_k$  is equivalent to a sentence in  $\underline{\Sigma}_k$  over  $\text{HA}$  and  $\underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k$  is closed under  $\vee$ , each conjunct can be assumed to be of the form  $\psi \vee \xi$  where  $\psi \in \underline{\Sigma}_k$  and  $\xi \in \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k$ . Let  $\varphi' := \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\psi_i \vee \xi_i)$  where  $\psi_i \in \underline{\Sigma}_k$  and  $\xi_i \in \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k$ . Since  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi'$ , by the  $(\underline{\Sigma}_k \vee \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k)$ -conservativity, we have that  $T + X$  proves  $\psi_i \vee \xi_i$  for each  $i$ . Then we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi'$ . Since  $\text{PA} + X$  is now  $\underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k$ -conservative over  $T + X$  (cf. Proposition 6.1), as in the proof of Lemma 5.5, we have  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ . Then  $T + X \vdash \varphi$  follows.  $\square$

In what follows, by further investigating the  $(\underline{\Sigma}_k \vee \underline{\text{E}\Pi}_k)$ -conservativity in Theorem 6.14, we give a characterization of the  $\underline{F}_k$ -conservativity by axiom schemata.



**Definition 6.15.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a class of HA-formulas. We introduce the following axiom schemata:

- $\Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNE}} : \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \rightarrow \widetilde{\varphi}$ ;
- $\Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNS}} : \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \rightarrow \neg\neg\widetilde{\varphi}$ ;

where  $\varphi \in \Gamma$  and  $\widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi}$  and  $\widetilde{\varphi}$  are universal closures of  $\neg\neg\varphi$  and  $\varphi$  respectively.

**Proposition 6.16.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a class of HA-formulas such that  $\Gamma$  is closed under taking a universal closure. Then  $\Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNE}}$  is equivalent to  $\Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNS}} + \underline{\Gamma}\text{-DNE}$  over HA.*

*Proof.* It is trivial that  $\Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNE}}$  implies  $\Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNS}}$  and also  $\underline{\Gamma}\text{-DNE}$ . We show  $\text{HA} + \Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNS}} + \underline{\Gamma}\text{-DNE} \vdash \Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNE}}$ . Let  $\varphi \in \Gamma$ . By  $\underline{\Gamma}\text{-DNS}$ ,  $\widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi}$  implies  $\neg\neg\widetilde{\varphi}$ . Since  $\widetilde{\varphi}$  is now in  $\underline{\Gamma}$ , by  $\underline{\Gamma}\text{-DNE}$ ,  $\neg\neg\widetilde{\varphi}$  implies  $\widetilde{\varphi}$ . Thus we have  $\text{HA} + \Gamma\text{-}\underline{\text{DNS}} + \underline{\Gamma}\text{-DNE} \vdash \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \rightarrow \widetilde{\varphi}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.17.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing HA and satisfying the deduction theorem, and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . If  $T + X$  proves  $\underline{\Sigma}_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k\text{-DNE-R}$  with assumptions of sentences in  $\underline{\Pi}_k$ :*

*$T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$  implies  $T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$  for all  $\psi \in \underline{\Pi}_k$  and  $\varphi \in \text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k$ ,*

*then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $(\underline{\Sigma}_k \vee \text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k)$ -conservative over  $T + X$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi \in \underline{\Sigma}_k$  and  $\psi \in \text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi \vee \psi$ . Since  $T$  satisfies the deduction theorem and  $\varphi^\perp \in \underline{\Pi}_k$ , by our second assumption, we have that  $T + X + \varphi^\perp$  is closed under  $\text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k\text{-DNE-R}$ . Since  $\varphi^\perp \in \mathcal{Q}_k$ , by Theorem 5.16, we have that  $\text{PA} + X + \varphi^\perp$  is  $\text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k$ -conservative over  $T + X + \varphi^\perp$ . Since  $\text{PA} + X + \varphi^\perp \vdash \psi$ , we have  $T + X + \varphi^\perp \vdash \psi$ , and hence,

$$T + X \vdash \varphi^\perp \rightarrow \psi \tag{3}$$

by the deduction theorem. In addition, by our second assumption and Theorem 5.16, we have that  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k\text{-CD-R}$ , and hence,  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  by Lemma 5.7. Then, by Remark 5.3, we have  $T + X \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \varphi^\perp$ , and hence,  $T + X \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \psi$  by (3). On the other hand, by our first assumption, we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ . Then  $T + X \vdash \varphi \vee \psi$  follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.18.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic satisfying the deduction theorem and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . Then the following are pairwise equivalent:*

1.  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{\text{F}}_k$ -conservative over  $T + X$ ;
2.  $T + X$  proves  $\underline{\text{F}}_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $\underline{\text{U}}_k\text{-}\underline{\text{DNS}}$ ;
3.  $T + X$  proves  $\underline{\Sigma}_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $\underline{\text{U}}_k\text{-}\underline{\text{DNE}}$ ;
4.  $T + X$  proves  $\underline{\Sigma}_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $\text{E}\underline{\Pi}_k\text{-}\underline{\text{DNE}}$ .

*Proof.* (1  $\rightarrow$  2) : Let  $\varphi \in \underline{F}_k$ . Then  $\varphi \vee \neg\varphi \in \underline{F}_k$ . Since  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \varphi \vee \neg\varphi$  by (1). Let  $\psi \in \underline{U}_k$ . Then  $\neg\neg\psi \rightarrow \neg\neg\tilde{\psi} \in \underline{F}_k$ . Since  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\neg\psi \rightarrow \neg\neg\tilde{\psi}$ , we have  $T + X \vdash \neg\neg\psi \rightarrow \neg\neg\tilde{\psi}$  by (1).

(2  $\rightarrow$  3) : It suffices to show  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNE}$  by using  $\underline{F}_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNS}$ . Since  $\underline{U}_k \subseteq \underline{F}_k$  and  $\underline{U}_k\text{-LEM}$  implies  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNE}$ , by Proposition 6.16, we are done.

(3  $\rightarrow$  4) : Trivial.

(4  $\rightarrow$  1) : By Theorem 6.14 and Lemma 6.17, it suffices for (1) to show that  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{E}\Pi_k\text{-DNE-R}$  with assumptions of  $\Pi_k$  sentences. Let  $\psi \in \underline{\Pi}_k$  and  $\varphi \in \text{E}\Pi_k$ . Assume  $T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$ . Then  $T + X + \psi \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$ . Since  $T + X$  proves  $\text{E}\Pi_k\text{-DNE}$  now, we have  $T + X + \psi \vdash \tilde{\varphi}$ , and hence,  $T + X + \psi \vdash \varphi$ . Since  $T$  satisfies the deduction theorem,  $T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$  follows.  $\square$

*Remark 6.19.*  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNS}$  in Theorem 6.18.(2) is equivalent over  $\text{HA}$  to the closed fragment of  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNS}$ :

$$\neg\neg\forall x\varphi \rightarrow \forall x\neg\neg\varphi,$$

where  $\varphi \in \underline{U}_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \{x\}$ .

In the following, we show that  $\underline{F}_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNS}$  in Theorem 6.18.(2) are independent over  $\text{HA}$ .

**Proposition 6.20.**  $\text{HA} + \underline{\Gamma}\text{-LEM} \not\vdash (\Pi_1 \vee \Pi_1)\text{-DNS}$  for any class  $\Gamma$  of HA-formulas.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\text{HA} + \underline{\Gamma}\text{-LEM} \vdash (\Pi_1 \vee \Pi_1)\text{-DNS}$ . As in the proof of Proposition 5.10, let  $\Psi(x) \in \Pi_1 \vee \Pi_1$  be the formula (2). Since  $\text{HA} \vdash \forall x\neg\neg\Psi(x)$ , we have  $\text{HA} + \underline{\Gamma}\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg\neg\forall x\Psi(x)$ . Since the double negation of each instance of  $\underline{\Gamma}\text{-LEM}$  is provable in  $\text{HA}$ , by (the proof of) [6, Lemma 4.1], we have  $\text{HA} \vdash \neg\neg\forall x\Psi(x)$ . This is a contradiction as shown in the proof of Proposition 5.10.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.21.**  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS} \not\vdash \underline{\Sigma}_1\text{-LEM}$  where  $\text{DNS}$  is the axiom scheme of the double-negation-shift  $\forall x(\forall y\neg\neg\varphi(x, y) \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall y\varphi(x, y))$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi$  be a sentence in  $\Pi_1$  such that  $\text{PA} \not\vdash \varphi$  and  $\text{PA} \not\vdash \neg\varphi$  (e.g. the Gödel sentence for Gödel's first incompleteness theorem). Since each instance of  $\text{DNS}$  is intuitionistically equivalent to a negated sentence (cf. [6, Remark 2.8]), by [12, Theorem 3.1.4 and Lemma 3.1.6], we have that  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS}$  has the disjunction property. Suppose  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS} \vdash \varphi^\perp \vee \neg\varphi^\perp$  (where  $\varphi^\perp \in \underline{\Sigma}_1$ ). Then, by the disjunction property, we have  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS} \vdash \varphi^\perp$  or  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS} \vdash \neg\varphi^\perp$ , and hence,  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\varphi$  or  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi$ . This is a contradiction.  $\square$

*Remark 6.22.* By using the disjunction property of  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS}$  as in the proof of Proposition 6.21, one can extend Proposition 5.10 to that  $\text{PA}$  is not  $(\Pi_1 \vee \Pi_1)$ -conservative over  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS}$ : Suppose that  $\text{PA}$  is  $(\Pi_1 \vee \Pi_1)$ -conservative over  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS}$ . Then, by (the proof of) Theorem 5.19,  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS}$  is closed under  $\underline{\Sigma}_1\text{-DML}^\perp\text{-R}$ . Let  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  be sentences in  $\underline{\Sigma}_1$  such that  $\text{HA}$  proves

$$\varphi \leftrightarrow \exists x (\text{Pf}(x, \ulcorner\varphi^\perp\urcorner) \wedge \forall y \leq x \neg\text{Pf}(y, \ulcorner\psi^\perp\urcorner))$$

and

$$\psi \leftrightarrow \exists y (\text{Pf}(y, \ulcorner \psi^\perp \urcorner) \wedge \forall x < y \neg \text{Pf}(x, \ulcorner \psi^\perp \urcorner))$$

where  $\text{Pf}(z, \ulcorner \xi \urcorner)$  denotes a proof predicate asserting that  $z$  is a code of the proof  $\xi$  in  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS}$  (cf. [2, Chapter 2]). Since  $\text{HA} \vdash \neg(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ , by using  $\Sigma_1\text{-DML}^\perp\text{-R}$ , we have  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS} \vdash \varphi^\perp \vee \psi^\perp$ . Since  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS}$  has the disjunction property, we have that  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS} \vdash \varphi^\perp$  or  $\text{HA} + \text{DNS} \vdash \psi^\perp$ . However, in both cases, we have a contradiction by our choice of  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ .

Next, we show that  $\text{U}_k\text{-DNE}$ ,  $\text{E}\Pi_k\text{-DNE}$  in Theorem 6.18 and the rule in Lemma 6.17 are pairwise equivalent.

**Proposition 6.23.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic satisfying the deduction theorem and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . Then the following are pairwise equivalent:*

1.  $T + X \vdash \text{U}_k\text{-DNE}$ ;
2.  $T + X \vdash \text{E}\Pi_k\text{-DNE}$ ;
3.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{E}\Pi_k\text{-DNE-R}$  with assumptions of sentences in  $\Pi_k$ ;
4. For any  $\psi \in \Pi_k$ ,  $\text{PA} + X + \psi$  is  $\text{U}_k$ -conservative over  $T + X + \psi$ ;
5.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{U}_k\text{-DNE-R}$  with assumptions of sentences in  $\text{U}_k$ ;
6.  $T + X$  is closed under  $\text{U}_k\text{-DNE-R}$  with assumptions of any sentences.

*Proof.* The implications (1  $\rightarrow$  2) and (6  $\rightarrow$  5) are trivial.

(2  $\rightarrow$  3) : By the proof of (4  $\rightarrow$  1) in Theorem 6.18.

(3  $\rightarrow$  4) : Fix  $\psi \in \Pi_k$ . Let  $\varphi \in \text{U}_k$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X + \psi \vdash \varphi$ . Since  $X \cup \{\psi\} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_k$ , by Theorem 5.16, we have  $T + X + \psi \vdash \varphi$ .

(4  $\rightarrow$  5) : Assume  $T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$  where  $\psi \in \text{U}_k$  and  $\varphi \in \text{U}_k$ . By Corollary 6.6.(1), there exists  $\psi' \in \Sigma_k$  such that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi' \rightarrow \neg\psi$  (cf. Remark 3.10) and  $\text{PA} \vdash \neg\psi \rightarrow \psi'$ . Let  $\psi'' := (\psi')^\perp$ . By Remark 5.3, we have  $\psi'' \in \Pi_k$ ,  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg\neg\psi \rightarrow \psi''$  and  $\text{PA} \vdash \psi'' \rightarrow \psi$ . Then we have now  $\text{PA} + X + \psi'' \vdash \varphi$ . By our assumption,  $T + X + \psi'' \vdash \varphi$  follows. Since  $T$  satisfies the deduction theorem, we have  $T + X \vdash \psi'' \rightarrow \varphi$ . On the other hand, by (the proof of) Lemma 5.5 and our assumption, we have  $T + X \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ . Then  $T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$  follows.

(5  $\rightarrow$  1) : Let  $\varphi \in \text{U}_k$ . Note that  $\widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \in \text{U}_k$ . Since  $T + X + \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$ , by the deduction theorem, we have  $T + X \vdash \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$ . By our assumption, we have  $T + X \vdash \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \rightarrow \varphi$ , and hence,  $T + X \vdash \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi} \rightarrow \widetilde{\varphi}$ .

(1  $\rightarrow$  6) : Assume  $T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$  where  $\psi$  is a sentence and  $\varphi \in \text{U}_k$ . Then we have  $T + X + \psi \vdash \widetilde{\neg\neg\varphi}$ . By our assumption, we have  $T + X + \psi \vdash \widetilde{\varphi}$ , and hence,  $T + X + \psi \vdash \varphi$ . Since  $T$  satisfies the deduction theorem,  $T + X \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$  follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.24.** *Let  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\text{U}_k$ -conservative over  $\text{HA} + X + \text{U}_k\text{-DNE}$ .*

## 7 Interrelations between conservation theorems and logical principles

The  $\underline{E}_{k+1}$ -conservativity implies both of  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservativity and  $\underline{F}_k$ -conservativity. In what follows, we investigate the relation among them.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences. If  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$  and  $T + X$  proves  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE, then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{E}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 6.7, it suffices to show  $\underline{E}\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservativity instead of the  $\underline{E}_{k+1}$ -conservativity. Let  $\varphi := \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \psi \in \underline{E}\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$  with  $\psi \in \underline{E}\Pi_k$ . Assume  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \varphi$ . By Theorem 3.9.(2), there exists  $\psi' \in \underline{\Pi}_k$  such that  $\text{FV}(\psi) = \text{FV}(\psi')$  and  $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \psi' \leftrightarrow \psi$ . Now we have  $\text{PA} + X \vdash \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \psi'$ . Since  $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \psi' \in \underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ , by our first assumption, we have that  $T + X \vdash \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \psi'$ . By our second assumption,  $T + X \vdash \varphi$  follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.2.** *Let  $T$  be a theory containing HA. If  $\text{PA}$  is  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T$ , then  $T$  proves  $\underline{\Sigma}_k$ -LEM and also  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k-2}$ -LEM.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\text{PA}$  is  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T$ . Then  $\text{PA}$  is  $\underline{\Pi}_k$ -conservative over  $T$  (cf. Proposition 6.1), and hence,  $T$  proves  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k-2}$ -LEM by (the proof of) Theorem 5.9. Let  $\varphi \in \underline{\Sigma}_k$ . Then  $\varphi^\perp \in \underline{\Pi}_k$ . Since  $\underline{\Sigma}_k$  and  $\underline{\Pi}_k$  can be seen as sub-classes of  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$  and  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$  is closed under  $\vee$  (in the sense of [6, Lemma 4.4]), one may assume  $\varphi \vee \varphi^\perp \in \underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ . Since  $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi \vee \varphi^\perp$ , by our assumption, we have  $T \vdash \varphi \vee \varphi^\perp$ , and hence,  $T \vdash \varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.3.** *Let  $T$  be semi-classical arithmetic satisfying the deduction theorem and  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . If  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $T + X$  and  $T$  proves  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNE}$ , then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{F}_k$ -conservative over  $T + X$ .*

*Proof.* Immediate by Theorem 6.18 and Proposition 7.2.  $\square$

*Remark 7.4.* By using Theorem 3.9.(2), one can show that  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  implies  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNE}$  in a straightforward way. On the other hand,  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNE}$  implies the  $\underline{U}_k$ -conservativity by Corollary 6.24. In contrast,  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  does not imply  $\underline{F}_k$ -conservativity since the latter is characterized by  $\underline{\Sigma}_k\text{-LEM} + \underline{U}_k\text{-DNE}$  (cf. Theorem 6.18) and  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  does not imply  $\underline{\Sigma}_k\text{-LEM}$  (see [4]).

*Remark 7.5.* It is straightforward to see that if a theory  $T$  containing HA proves  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ , then  $T$  is closed under  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE-R}$ . Thus  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  implies the  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -conservativity (cf. Theorem 5.19). On the other hand,  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  is a fragment of  $\underline{U}_k\text{-DNE}$ .

**Proposition 7.6.** *Let  $X$  be a set of HA-sentences in  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . Then  $\text{PA} + X$  is  $\underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}$ -conservative over  $\text{HA} + X + \underline{\Sigma}_{k+1}\text{-DNE} + \underline{\Sigma}_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\text{HA} + X + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  contains  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  and is closed under  $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE-R}$ , by Proposition 6.3, we are done.  $\square$

*Remark 7.7.* Propositions 7.6 and 7.2 reveal that the  $\Sigma_{k+1}$ -conservativity lies between  $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  and  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM} + \Sigma_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$ . This seems to be another view of the status of the  $\Sigma_{k+1}$ -conservativity.

Our results on the relation between conservation theorems and logical principles are summarized in Figure 1 where  $\Gamma\text{-CONS}$  denotes the  $\Gamma$ -conservativity for class  $\Gamma$  of HA-formulas. Figure 1 reveals that the logical principle  $\text{U}_k\text{-DNE}$ , which has been first studied in the current paper (cf. Definition 6.15), is closely related to the conservation theorems. For the comprehensive information on the arithmetical hierarchy of logical principles including  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  and  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ , we refer the reader to [5]. For the underivability, we know only that  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  does not imply  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-CONS}$  (cf. Proposition 5.10) and that  $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$  does not imply  $\text{F}_k\text{-CONS}$  (cf. Remark 7.4). In addition, for  $\Gamma \in \{\Sigma_k, \Pi_k, \Pi_k \vee \Pi_k, \text{E}_k, \text{F}_k, \text{U}_k, \Sigma_k\}$ , we have characterized  $\Gamma\text{-CONS}$  by some fragment of the double-negation-elimination rule DNE-R. On the other hand, we have not achieved that for  $\text{E}_k$  and  $\text{F}_k$ .




Figure 1: Conservation theorems in the arithmetical hierarchy of logical principles

## 8 Appendix: A relativized soundness theorem of the Friedman A-translation for $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$

We provide a detailed proof of a relativized soundness theorem of the Friedman A-translation [3] for  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  (see Theorem 8.3). In fact, this result was suggested already in [7, Section 4.4] and the detailed proof for  $k = 1$  can be found in [11, Lemma 3.1]. The authors, however, couldn't find the proof for arbitrary natural number  $k$  anywhere, which is the reason why we present the detailed proof here. For the relativized soundness theorem, we use a variant of Lemma 3.5 with respect to the Friedman A-translation.

We first recall the definition of the Friedman A-translation. In this section, we use symbol  $*$  for place holder instead of  $\$$  in the previous sections.

**Definition 8.1** (A-translation [3]). For a HA-formula  $\varphi$ , we define  $\varphi^*$  as a formula obtained from  $\varphi$  by replacing all the prime formulas  $\varphi_p$  in  $\varphi$  with  $\varphi_p \vee *$  (of course,  $\varphi^*$  is officially defined by induction on the logical structure of  $\varphi$ ). In particular,  $\perp^* := (\perp \vee *)$ , which is equivalent to  $*$  over  $\text{HA}^*$  (HA in the language with a place holder  $*$ ). In what follows,  $\neg_* \varphi$  denotes  $\varphi \rightarrow *$ . Note that  $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi^*)$  for all HA-formulas  $\varphi$ .

The following is a variant of Lemma 3.5 with respect to the Friedman A-translation.

**Lemma 8.2.** *For a formula  $\varphi$  of HA, the following hold:*

1. *If  $\varphi \in \Pi_k$ ,  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^* \leftrightarrow \varphi \vee *$ ;*
2. *If  $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$ ,  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^* \leftrightarrow \varphi \vee *$ .*

*Proof.* By simultaneous induction on  $k$ . The base case is verified by a routine inspection. Assume items 1 and 2 for  $k$  to show those for  $k + 1$ . The first item for  $k + 1$  is shown by using the second item for  $k$  as in the proof of Lemma 3.5. For the second item, let  $\varphi := \exists x \varphi_1$  where  $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_k$ . Then we have that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\varphi^* \equiv \exists x (\varphi_1^*) \underset{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}}{\longleftrightarrow} \exists x (\varphi_1 \vee *) \longleftrightarrow \varphi \vee *.$$

□

**Theorem 8.3.** *If  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi$ , then  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^*$ .*

*Proof.* By induction on the length of the proof of  $\varphi$  in  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ . By (the proof of) [3, Lemma 2], it suffices to show  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi^*$  for each instance  $\varphi$  of  $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ . Fix  $\varphi := \exists x \varphi_1 \vee \neg \exists x \varphi_1$  with  $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_{k-1}$ . By Lemma 8.2.(1),  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  proves

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \varphi^* & \longleftrightarrow & \exists x (\varphi_1^*) \vee \neg_* \exists x (\varphi_1^*) \\ & \underset{\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}}{\longleftrightarrow} & \exists x (\varphi_1 \vee *) \vee \neg_* \exists x (\varphi_1 \vee *) \\ & \longleftrightarrow & \exists x (\varphi_1 \vee *) \vee \neg_* \exists x \varphi_1, \end{array}$$

which is derived from  $\exists x\varphi_1 \vee \neg\exists x\varphi_1$  over  $\text{HA}^*$ . Thus  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\varphi^*$ .  $\square$

By the relativized soundness theorem of the Friedman A-translation combined with the usual negative translation, one can show Proposition 1.1 as follows:

*Proof Sketch of Proposition 1.1.* Assume  $\text{PA} \vdash \forall x\exists y\varphi$  where  $\varphi \in \Pi_k$ . By using Kuroda's negative translation (cf. [6, Proposition 6.4]), we have  $\text{HA} \vdash \forall x\neg\neg\exists y\varphi_N$  where  $\varphi_N$  is defined as in [6, Definition 6.1]. Since  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$ , we have  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg\neg\exists y\varphi$  (cf. [6, Lemma 6.5.(2)]). By Theorem 8.3, we have  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg_*\neg_*\exists y\varphi^*$ , and hence,  $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg_*\neg_*\exists y\varphi$  by Lemma 8.2.(1). By substituting  $*$  with  $\exists y\varphi$  (cf. Lemma 3.16), we have that  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  proves  $\exists y\varphi$ , and hence,  $\forall x\exists y\varphi$ .  $\square$

The proof of [13, Theorem 3.5.5] (due to Visser) shows that any theory  $T$  which contains  $\text{HA}$  and is sound for the Friedman A-translation is closed under the independence-of-premise rule:

$$T \vdash \neg\varphi \rightarrow \exists x\psi \text{ implies } T \vdash \exists x(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$$

where  $x \notin \text{FV}(\neg\varphi)$ . Then, by using Theorem 8.3, we also have the following:

**Theorem 8.4.**  $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$  is closed under the independence-of-premise rule.

## Acknowledgements

The first author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP19J01239 and JP20K14354, and the second author by JP19K14586.

## References

- [1] Y. Akama, S. Berardi, S. Hayashi, and U. Kohlenbach. An arithmetical hierarchy of the law of excluded middle and related principles. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS'04)*, pages 192–301. 2004.
- [2] G. Boolos. *The logic of provability*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [3] H. Friedman. Classically and intuitionistically provably recursive functions. In G. H. Müller and D. S. Scott, editors, *Higher Set Theory*, pages 21–27, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1978. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [4] M. Fujiwara, H. Ishihara, T. Nemoto, N.-Y. Suzuki, and K. Yokoyama. Extended frames and separations of logical principles. <https://researchmap.jp/makotofujiwara/misc/30348506>, 2021. submitted.

- [5] M. Fujiwara and T. Kurahashi. Refining the arithmetical hierarchy of classical principles. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.11527>, 2020. submitted.
- [6] M. Fujiwara and T. Kurahashi. Prenex normal form theorems in semi-classical arithmetic. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 86(3):1124–1153, 2021.
- [7] S. Hayashi and M. Nakata. Towards limit computable mathematics. In P. Callaghan, Z. Luo, J. McKinna, R. Pollack, and R. Pollack, editors, *Types for Proofs and Programs*, pages 125–144, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [8] H. Ishihara. A note on the Gödel-Gentzen translation. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 46(1):135–137, 2000.
- [9] H. Ishihara. Some conservative extension results on classical and intuitionistic sequent calculi. In U. Berger, H. Diener, P. Schuster, and S. Monika, editors, *Logic, Construction, Computation*, Ontos mathematical logic, pages 289 – 304. De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston, 2012.
- [10] R. Kaye, J. Paris, and C. Dimitracopoulos. On parameter free induction schemas. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 53(4):1082–1097, 1988.
- [11] U. Kohlenbach and P. Safarik. Fluctuations, effective learnability and metastability in analysis. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165(1):266 – 304, 2014.
- [12] A. S. Troelstra, editor. *Metamathematical investigation of intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis*, volume 344 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1973.
- [13] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen. *Constructivism in mathematics, An introduction, Vol. I*, volume 121 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.
- [14] D. van Dalen. *Logic and Structure*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag London, fifth edition, 2013.