

Prenex normal form theorems in semi-classical arithmetic

Makoto Fujiwara^{*†} and Taishi Kurahashi^{‡§}

September 9, 2020

Abstract

Akama et al. [1] systematically studied an arithmetical hierarchy of the law of excluded middle and related principles in the context of first-order arithmetic. In that paper, they first provide a prenex normal form theorem as a justification of their semi-classical principles restricted to prenex formulas. However, there are some errors in their proof. In this paper, we provide a simple counterexample of their prenex normal form theorem [1, Theorem 2.7], then modify it in an appropriate way. In addition, we characterize several prenex normal form theorems with respect to semi-classical arithmetic.

1 Introduction

Prenex normal form theorem is one of the most basic theorems on theories based on classical first-order predicate logic. In contrast, it does not hold for intuitionistic theories in general. Therefore it does not make sense to consider an arithmetical hierarchy in an intuitionistic theory. On the other hand, if one reasons in some semi-classical arithmetic which lies in-between classical arithmetic and intuitionistic arithmetic, one can take an equivalent formula of the prenex normal form for any formula with low complexity. Akama et al. [1] introduces the classes of formulas E_k and U_k which corresponds to the classes of classical Σ_k and Π_k formulas respectively, and showed that the former is equivalent to the class of formulas of Σ_k form and the latter is so for Π_k over some semi-classical arithmetic respectively. This prenex normal form theorem justifies their investigation on the arithmetical

^{*}Email: makotofujiwara@meiji.ac.jp

[†]School of Science and Technology, Meiji University, 1-1-1 Higashi-Mita, Tama-ku, Kawasaki-shi, Kanagawa 214-8571, Japan.

[‡]Email: kurahashi@people.kobe-u.ac.jp

[§]Graduate School of System Informatics, Kobe University, 1-1 Rokkodai, Nada, Kobe 657-8501, Japan.

hierarchy in the context of intuitionistic first-order arithmetic. Unfortunately, however, there are some crucial errors in their proof of the prenex normal form theorem [1, Theorem 2.7]. In this paper, we revisit their formulation and modify their prenex normal form theorem in an appropriate way.

In Section 2, we recall the definitions and basic properties. In Section 3, we provide a simple counterexample of [1, Theorem 2.7]. In Section 5, we show the corrected version of the prenex normal form theorem (see Theorem 5.3). In addition, we also present the simplified version of the prenex normal form theorem for formulas which do not contain the disjunction (see Theorem 5.7). In Section 6, we carry out some generalization of a well-known result that classical arithmetic is Π_2 -conservative over intuitionistic arithmetic with respect to semi-classical arithmetic. In Section 7, using the generalized conservation result in Section 6, we characterize several prenex normal form theorems with respect to semi-classical arithmetic. In particular, among other things, we show that for any theory T in-between intuitionistic arithmetic and classical arithmetic, T proves a semi-classical principle $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE if and only if T satisfies the prenex normal form theorem for $U_{k'}$ and $\Pi_{k'}$ for all $k' \leq k$ (see Theorem 7.3).

Throughout this paper, we work basically over intuitionistic arithmetic. When we use some principle (including induction hypothesis [I.H.]) which is not available in intuitionistic arithmetic, it will be exhibited explicitly. As regards basic reasoning over intuitionistic first-order logic, we refer the reader to see [9, Section 6.2].

2 Preparation

Throughout this paper, we work with a standard formulation of intuitionistic arithmetic HA described e.g. in [7, Section 1.3], which has function symbols for all primitive recursive functions. We work in the language containing all the logical constants $\forall, \exists, \rightarrow, \wedge, \vee, \perp$. Let T denote a theory (e.g. HA), and P and Q denote schemata (e.g. logical principles). Then $T + P$ denotes the theory obtained from T by adding P into the axioms. In particular, the classical variant PA is defined as $HA + \text{LEM}$, where LEM is the axiom scheme of the law of excluded middle. We write $T \vdash Q$ (or T proves Q) if any instance of Q is provable in T . We write $T \vdash P + Q$ if $T \vdash P$ and $T \vdash Q$.

Notation 1. For a formula φ , $\text{FV}(\varphi)$ denotes the set of free variables in φ . Quantifier-free formulas are denoted with subscript “qf” as φ_{qf} . In addition, a list of variables is denoted with an over-line as \overline{x} . In particular, a list of quantifiers of the same kind is denoted as $\exists \overline{x}$ and $\forall \overline{x}$ respectively.

Definition 2.1. The classes Σ_k and Π_k of formulas are defined as follows:

- Σ_0 , as well as Π_0 , is the class of all quantifier-free formulas;

- Π_{k+1} is the class of all formulas of form $Q_1 \overline{x_1} \cdots Q_{k+1} \overline{x_{k+1}} \varphi_{\text{qf}}$;
- Σ_{k+1} is the class of all formulas of form $Q'_1 \overline{x_1} \cdots Q'_{k+1} \overline{x_{k+1}} \varphi_{\text{qf}}$;

where Q_i represents \forall for odd i and \exists for even i and Q'_i represents \exists for odd i and \forall for even i . Following [1], we define the classes Σ_k and Π_k in the non-cumulative manner (namely, each $Q_i \overline{x_i}$ and $Q'_i \overline{x_i}$ must not be empty). A formula φ is of **prenex normal form** if $\varphi \in \Sigma_k \cup \Pi_k$ for some k .

Remark 2.2. Since the list of variables can be contracted into one variable in HA by using a fixed primitive recursive pairing function (see e.g. [7, 1.3.9]), one may assume that for each natural number $k > 0$, a formula in Σ_k is of form $\exists x \varphi(x)$ with some $\varphi(x) \in \Pi_{k-1}$ and a formula in Π_k is of form $\forall x \psi(x)$ with some $\psi(x) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ without loss of generality.

Lemma 2.3. *Let k be a natural number. Let φ be in Π_k and ψ be in Σ_k . Then, for all natural numbers i, j , there exist $\varphi', \psi' \in \Pi_{k+i}$ and $\varphi'', \psi'' \in \Sigma_{k+j}$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'')$, $\text{FV}(\psi) = \text{FV}(\psi') = \text{FV}(\psi'')$, $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi''$ and $\text{HA} \vdash \psi \leftrightarrow \psi' \leftrightarrow \psi''$.*

Proof. Straightforward by the fact that

$$\text{HA} \vdash \xi \leftrightarrow \forall z \xi \leftrightarrow \exists z \xi$$

for any $z \notin \text{FV}(\xi)$. □

Definition 2.4. For a class Γ of formulas, $\Gamma(\overline{x})$ denotes the class of formulas φ in Γ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) \subseteq \{\overline{x}\}$.

Remark 2.5. In the light of Lemma 2.3, throughout this paper, we identify the classes Σ_k and Π_k with the classes defined as in Definition 2.1 with allowing the quantifiers Q_i and Q'_i to be empty. Under this identification, for all k and k' such that $k < k'$, $\Pi_k(\overline{x})$ and $\Sigma_k(\overline{x})$ are considered to be sub-classes of $\Sigma_{k'}(\overline{x}) \cap \Pi_{k'}(\overline{x})$. We frequently use this property in what follows.

Recall the logical principles from [1] and related principles:

Definition 2.6. Let Γ and Γ' be classes of formulas.

- $\Gamma\text{-LEM}$: $\forall x (\varphi(x) \vee \neg \varphi(x))$ where $\varphi(x) \in \Gamma(x)$.
- $\Gamma\text{-DML}$: $\forall x (\neg(\varphi(x) \wedge \psi(x)) \rightarrow \neg \varphi(x) \vee \neg \psi(x))$ where $\varphi(x), \psi(x) \in \Gamma(x)$.
- $\Gamma\text{-DNE}$: $\forall x (\neg \neg \varphi(x) \rightarrow \varphi(x))$ where $\varphi(x) \in \Gamma(x)$.
- $(\Gamma \vee \Gamma')\text{-DNE}$: $\forall x (\neg \neg (\varphi(x) \vee \psi(x)) \rightarrow \varphi(x) \vee \psi(x))$ where $\varphi(x) \in \Gamma(x)$ and $\psi(x) \in \Gamma'(x)$.

- Γ -DNS : $\forall x (\forall y \neg \neg \varphi(x, y) \rightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \varphi(x, y))$ where $\varphi(x, y) \in \Gamma(x, y)$.
- Let $P \in \{\Gamma\text{-LEM}, \Gamma\text{-DML}, \Gamma\text{-DNE}, (\Gamma \vee \Gamma')\text{-DNE}, \Gamma\text{-DNS}\}$.
 $\neg \neg P : \neg \neg \xi$ where ξ is an instance of P .

Note that our logical principles are equivalent also to those defined with lists of quantifiers of the same kind (cf. Remark 2.2).

Remark 2.7. One has to care about the formulation of the double negated variants. That is, one has to take the double negations of the universal closure of the original logical principles as in Definition 2.6. The double negated variants defined as such are not provable in **HA**, which has been overlooked in the proof of [1, Theorem 2.7] (see also Section 3). In fact, one may think of the double negated versions as variants of the double negation shift principle (see [3]). In addition, our double negated versions are equivalent to (the universal closures of) those with allowing free variables (cf. [3, Remark 2.5]).

Remark 2.8. For any class Γ of formulas, Γ -DNS is intuitionistically equivalent to $\neg \neg \Gamma$ -DNS since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall x (\forall y \neg \neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \varphi) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \forall x \neg \neg (\forall y \neg \neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \varphi) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \neg \neg \forall x \neg \neg (\forall y \neg \neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \varphi) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \neg \neg \forall x (\forall y \neg \neg \varphi \rightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

Next we reformulate the classes of formulas studied in [1]. The classes F_k , U_k and E_k in Definition 2.11 below were dealt with in [1] informally. Here we shall introduce them and two additional classes U_k^+ and E_k^+ in a formal manner.

Definition 2.9. 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 an alternation path which is obtained by switching $+$ and $-$ in s , and let $l(s)$ denote the length of s .

Definition 2.10. For a formula φ , the set of alternation paths $Alt(\varphi)$ of φ is defined as follows:

- If φ is quantifier-free, then $Alt(\varphi) := \{\langle \rangle\}$;
- Otherwise, $Alt(\varphi)$ is defined inductively by the following rule:
 - If $\varphi \equiv \neg \varphi_1$, then $Alt(\varphi) := \{s^\perp \mid s \in Alt(\varphi_1)\}$;
 - 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 φ , the degree $deg(\varphi)$ of φ is defined as

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

Definition 2.11. The classes F_k, U_k, E_k (from [1, Definition 2.4]), U_k^+ and E_k^+ of formulas are defined as follows:

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

Remark 2.12. A similar property as Lemma 2.3 also holds for U_k^+ and E_k^+ : 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 $HA \vdash \psi \leftrightarrow \psi'$.

Note $F_0 = \Sigma_0 = \Pi_0$. For each formula $\varphi \in E_k$ (resp. $\psi \in U_k$) of PA, one can take a formula $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$ (resp. $\psi' \in \Pi_k$) of PA which is equivalent to φ (resp. ψ) over PA. On the other hand, this is not the case for HA. In what follows, we study what kind of semi-classical arithmetic in-between PA and HA captures this property for each k . In fact, Akama et al. [1] has already undertaken this. In particular, [1, Theorem 2.7] asserts the following:

1. For any $\varphi \in E_k$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$ such that

$$HA + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'.$$

2. For any $\varphi \in U_k$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that

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

However, the first assertion is wrong as we show in Section 3.

3 A counter example

Recall that [1, Theorem 2.7] asserts that for any $\varphi \in E_k$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$ such that

$$\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'.$$

However, there are some errors in the proof. In particular, in [1, page 5, lines 15-17], it is written that “ Since the double negations of DNE is intuitionistically provable, $\vdash_{\mathbf{HA}} \neg\neg A_0 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\exists x_0.C_0$ (which means $\mathbf{HA} \vdash \neg\neg A_0 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\exists x_0.C_0$ in our notation) ”. As studied in [3], however, the double negations of (the universal closure of) DNE is not provable in \mathbf{HA} , and hence, their proof actually uses some double negated logical principles in the sense of Definition 2.6. Our counterexample below shows that such a use of some additional principle is unavoidable.

Recall the arithmetical form of Church’s thesis from [7, 3.2.14]:

$$\mathbf{CT}_0 : \forall x \exists y \varphi(x, y) \rightarrow \exists e \forall x \exists v (T(e, x, v) \wedge \varphi(x, U(v))) ,$$

where T and U are the standard primitive recursive predicate and function from the Kleene normal form theorem. Note that \mathbf{CT}_0 is a sort of combination of so-called Church’s thesis stating that every function is recursive and the countable choice principle (see [8, 4.3.2]).

Proposition 3.1. *The following sentence*

$$\varphi_0 := \neg \forall x (\neg \exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) = 0) \vee \neg \exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) \neq 0))$$

is not equivalent to any sentence $\varphi'_0 \in \Sigma_1$ over $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DNE}$.

Proof. We first claim that $\mathbf{HA} + \mathbf{CT}_0$ proves φ_0 . For the sake of contradiction, assume

$$\forall x (\neg \exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) = 0) \vee \neg \exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) \neq 0)) \quad (1)$$

and reason in $\mathbf{HA} + \mathbf{CT}_0$. Since $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \exists k ((k = 0 \rightarrow \varphi_1) \wedge (k \neq 0 \rightarrow \varphi_2))$ (see [7, 1.3.7]), by \mathbf{CT}_0 , there exists e such that

$$\forall x \exists v \left(\begin{array}{l} T(e, x, v) \\ \wedge (U(v) = 0 \rightarrow \neg \exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) = 0)) \\ \wedge (U(v) \neq 0 \rightarrow \neg \exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) \neq 0)) \end{array} \right).$$

In particular, for that e , there exists v_e such that $T(e, e, v_e)$,

$$U(v_e) = 0 \rightarrow \neg \exists u (T(e, e, u) \wedge U(u) = 0)$$

and

$$U(v_e) \neq 0 \rightarrow \neg \exists u (T(e, e, u) \wedge U(u) \neq 0).$$

Since $U(v_e) = 0 \vee U(v_e) \neq 0$, we obtain a contradiction straightforwardly.

If φ_0 is equivalent to some sentence $\varphi'_0 \in \Sigma_1$ over $\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DNE}$, we have $\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DNE} + \text{CT}_0 \vdash \varphi'_0$ from the above claim. Since $\varphi'_0 \in \Sigma_1$, by the soundness of Kleene realizability (see [7, 3.2.22]), we have that

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi'_0,$$

and hence, $\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi_0$. On the other hand, since

$$\forall x (\neg (\exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) = 0) \wedge \exists u (T(x, x, u) \wedge U(u) \neq 0)))$$

is provable in HA , we have $\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DML} \vdash (1)$. Therefore we have

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DNE} + \Sigma_1\text{-DML} \vdash \perp,$$

and hence, $\text{PA} \vdash \perp$, which is a contradiction. \square

Remark 3.2. One can easily see that φ_0 in Proposition 3.1 is in E_1 . Thus Proposition 3.1 shows that φ_0 is a counterexample of [1, Theorem 2.7] for $k = 1$.

4 Basic lemmata

In this section, we show several lemmata which we use in the proofs of our prenex normal form theorems.

Lemma 4.1. *For any logical principle P in Definition 2.6 and any formula φ (possibly containing free variables), if $\text{HA} + P \vdash \varphi$, then $\text{HA} + \neg\neg P \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$.*

Proof. Assume $\text{HA} + P \vdash \varphi$. Then there exists finite instances ψ_1, \dots, ψ_k of P such that $\text{HA} + \psi_1 + \dots + \psi_k \vdash \varphi$. Since HA satisfies the deduction theorem, we have that HA proves $\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_k \rightarrow \varphi$, and hence, $\neg\neg(\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_k \rightarrow \varphi)$, which is equivalent to $\neg\neg\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg\neg\psi_k \rightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$. Then we have $\text{HA} + \neg\neg P \vdash \neg\neg\varphi$. \square

Corollary 4.2. *For any logical principle P in Definition 2.6 and any formulas φ_1 and φ_2 (possibly containing free variables), if $\text{HA} + P \vdash \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2$, then $\text{HA} + \neg\neg P \vdash \neg\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi_2$.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 4.1 and the fact that $\neg\neg(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)$ is intuitionistically equivalent to $\neg\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi_2$. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let k be a natural number. Let φ_1 and φ_2 be formulas in Σ_k , and let φ_3 and φ_4 be formulas in Π_k . Then the following hold:*

1. *There exists a formula $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi_2)$ and $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$;*

2. There exists a formula $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi_3) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi_4)$ and $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi_3 \wedge \varphi_4$.

Proof. Straightforward by simultaneous induction on k . \square

Lemma 4.4. For any formulas φ_1 and φ_2 in Σ_k , there exists a formula $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi_2)$ and $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$.

Proof. Note that $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ is equivalent to

$$\exists k((k = 0 \rightarrow \varphi_1) \wedge (k \neq 0 \rightarrow \varphi_2))$$

over HA (see [7, 1.3.7]). Since $\varphi_{\text{qf}} \rightarrow \exists x\psi(x)$ and $\varphi_{\text{qf}} \rightarrow \forall x\psi(x)$ are equivalent to $\exists x(\varphi_{\text{qf}} \rightarrow \psi(x))$ and $\forall x(\varphi_{\text{qf}} \rightarrow \psi(x))$ respectively over HA when $x \notin \text{FV}(\varphi_{\text{qf}})$, our assertion follows from Lemma 4.3 straightforwardly. \square

Lemma 4.5. Let k be a natural number greater than 0.

1. If $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ is in U_k^+ (resp. E_k^+) if and only if both of φ_1 and φ_2 are in U_k^+ (resp. E_k^+).
2. $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ is in U_k^+ (resp. E_k^+) if and only if both of φ_1 and φ_2 are in U_k^+ (resp. E_k^+).
3. $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ is in U_k^+ (resp. E_k^+) if and only if φ_1 is in E_k^+ (resp. U_k^+) and φ_2 is in U_k^+ (resp. E_k^+).
4. $\forall x\varphi_1$ is in U_k^+ if and only if φ_1 is in U_k^+ .
5. $\exists x\varphi_1$ is in E_k^+ if and only if φ_1 is in E_k^+ .
6. $\forall x\varphi_1$ is in E_{k+1}^+ if and only if it is in U_k^+ .
7. $\exists x\varphi_1$ is in U_{k+1}^+ if and only if it is in E_k^+ .

Proof. (1): Assume $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. Then $l(s) \leq k$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) = \text{Alt}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{Alt}(\varphi_2)$.

- If $l(s) < k$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$, then φ_1 is in $\bigcup_{i < k} F_i \subseteq U_k^+$.
- Otherwise, there is $s_0 \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$ such that $l(s_0) = k$. Then, since $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \notin \bigcup_{i < k} F_i$, we have $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in U_k$. Then, for each $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$ such that $l(s) = k$, we have $i(s) \equiv -$ since $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$. Thus $\varphi_1 \in U_k \subseteq U_k^+$.

We also have $\varphi_2 \in U_k^+$ in the same manner.

For the converse direction, assume that φ_1 and φ_2 are in U_k^+ . Then, for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$, since $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$ or $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_2)$, we have $l(s) \leq k$, in particular, $i(s) \equiv -$ if $l(s) = k$. Thus $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ is in U_k^+ .

As for the case of E_k^+ , an analogous proof works.

(2): Analogous to (1).

(3): Assume $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. Let s be in $\text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$. By the definition of $\text{Alt}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)$, we have $s^\perp \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)$ and $l(s) \leq k$.

- If $l(s) < k$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$, then φ_1 is in $\bigcup_{i < k} F_i \subseteq E_k^+$.
- Otherwise, there is $s_0 \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$ such that $l(s_0) = k$. Since $s_0^\perp \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)$, we have $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in U_k$. Then, for each $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$ such that $l(s) = k$, we have $i(s^\perp) \equiv -$, and hence, $i(s) \equiv +$. Thus $\varphi_1 \in E_k \subseteq E_k^+$.

We also have $\varphi_2 \in U_k^+$ in the same manner.

For the converse direction, assume $\varphi_1 \in E_k^+$ and $\varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. Since $\deg(\varphi_1) \leq k$ and $\deg(\varphi_2) \leq k$, we have $\deg(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \leq k$.

- If $\deg(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) < k$, then $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \bigcup_{i < k} F_i \subseteq U_k^+$.
- If $\deg(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) = k$, for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)$ such that $l(s) = k$, we have $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_2)$ or $s \equiv s_0^\perp$ for some $s_0 \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$. In the former case, we have $i(s) \equiv -$ by $\varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. In the latter case, we have $i(s_0) \equiv +$ by $\varphi_1 \in E_k^+$, and hence, $i(s) \equiv -$.

One can also show that $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$ is in E_k^+ if and only if φ_1 is in U_k^+ and φ_2 is in E_k^+ analogously.

(4): Assume $\forall x \varphi_1 \in U_k^+$.

- If $\forall x \varphi_1 \notin U_k$, then $\forall x \varphi_1 \in \bigcup_{i < k} F_i$. Since $\deg(\varphi_1) \leq \deg(\forall x \varphi_1) < k$, we have $\varphi_1 \in \bigcup_{i < k} F_i \subseteq U_k^+$.
- Otherwise, $\deg(\varphi_1) \leq \deg(\forall x \varphi_1) = k$. If $\deg(\varphi_1) < k$, then we have $\varphi_1 \in \bigcup_{i < k} F_i \subseteq U_k^+$. Assume $\deg(\varphi_1) = k$. Let s be an alternation path of φ_1 such that $l(s) = k$. If $i(s) \not\equiv -$, by the definition of $\text{Alt}(\forall x \varphi_1)$, we have $-s \in \text{Alt}(\forall x \varphi_1)$, which contradicts $\deg(\forall x \varphi_1) = k$ since $l(-s) = k + 1$. Then we have $i(s) \equiv -$. Thus we have $\varphi_1 \in U_k \subseteq U_k^+$.

For the converse direction, assume $\varphi_1 \in U_k^+$.

- If $\varphi_1 \notin U_k$, then $\varphi_1 \in \bigcup_{i < k} F_i$. Thus $\deg(\varphi_1) < k$, and hence, $\deg(\forall x\varphi_1) \leq k$. If $\deg(\forall x\varphi_1) < k$, then $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \bigcup_{i < k} F_i \subseteq U_k^+$. If $\deg(\forall x\varphi_1) = k$, since $i(s) \equiv -$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\forall x\varphi_1)$, we have $\forall x\varphi_1 \in U_k \subseteq U_k^+$.
- Otherwise, $\deg(\varphi_1) = k$ and $i(s) \equiv -$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\varphi_1)$ such that $l(s) = k$. By the definition of $\text{Alt}(\forall x\varphi_1)$, for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\forall x\varphi_1)$, we have $l(s) \leq k$, and hence, $\deg(\forall x\varphi_1) = k$. In addition, again by the definition of $\text{Alt}(\forall x\varphi_1)$, we have $i(s) = -$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\forall x\varphi_1)$ such that $l(s) = k$. Thus $\forall x\varphi_1 \in U_k \subseteq U_k^+$.

(5): Analogous to (4).

(6): Assume $\forall x\varphi_1 \in E_{k+1}^+$. Since $i(s) \equiv -$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\forall x\varphi_1)$, $\forall x\varphi_1$ is not in E_{k+1} . Then $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \bigcup_{i \leq k} F_i$, and hence, $\deg(\forall x\varphi_1) \leq k$.

- If $\deg(\forall x\varphi_1) < k$, then $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \bigcup_{i < k} F_i \subseteq U_k^+$.
- If $\deg(\forall x\varphi_1) = k$, since $i(s) \equiv -$ for all $s \in \text{Alt}(\forall x\varphi_1)$, we have $\forall x\varphi_1 \in U_k \subseteq U_k^+$.

The converse direction is trivial since $U_k^+ \subseteq \bigcup_{i < k+1} F_i \subseteq E_{k+1}^+$.

(7): Analogous to (6). □

Lemma 4.6. *Let k be a natural number. For all φ_1 and φ_2 in Π_k , there exists $\varphi \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi_2)$ and $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$ (HA if $k = 0$) proves $\neg\neg(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $k > 0$, $\varphi_1 := \forall x\rho_1(x)$ and $\varphi_2 := \forall y\rho_2(y)$ where $\rho_1(x), \rho_2(y) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ (see Remark 2.2). By Lemma 4.4, it suffices to show

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\neg(\forall x\rho_1(x) \vee \forall y\rho_2(y)) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\forall x, y(\rho_1(x) \vee \rho_2(y)).$$

The implication from the left to the right is straightforward. The converse implication is shown as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
& \neg\neg\forall x, y(\rho_1(x) \vee \rho_2(y)) \\
\begin{array}{l} \longleftarrow \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & \neg\neg\forall x, y(\neg\neg\rho_1(x) \vee \neg\neg\rho_2(y)) \\
\longrightarrow & \forall x, y\neg\neg(\neg\neg\rho_1(x) \vee \neg\neg\rho_2(y)) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \neg\exists x, y\neg(\neg\neg\rho_1(x) \vee \neg\neg\rho_2(y)) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \neg\exists x, y(\neg\rho_1(x) \wedge \neg\rho_2(y)) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \neg(\neg\neg\exists x\neg\rho_1(x) \wedge \neg\neg\exists y\neg\rho_2(y)) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \neg(\neg\forall x\neg\neg\rho_1(x) \wedge \neg\forall y\neg\neg\rho_2(y)) \\
\longleftrightarrow & \neg\neg(\forall x\neg\neg\rho_1(x) \vee \forall y\neg\neg\rho_2(y)) \\
\begin{array}{l} \longleftarrow \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & \neg\neg(\forall x\rho_1(x) \vee \forall y\rho_2(y)).
\end{array}$$

□

Lemma 4.7. *Let k be a natural number.*

1. *For all $\varphi \in \Pi_k$, there exists $\psi \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\psi)$ and $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ proves $\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$.*
2. *For all $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$, there exists $\psi \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\psi)$ and $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$ (HA if $k = 0$) proves $\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$.*

Proof. By simultaneous induction on k . The base case is trivial. In what follows, we show the induction step for $k + 1$.

Let $\varphi := \forall x\rho(x)$ where $\rho(x) \in \Sigma_k$. By induction hypothesis, there exists $\rho'(x) \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\rho(x)) = \text{FV}(\rho'(x))$ and

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\rho(x) \leftrightarrow \rho'(x).$$

Then $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \neg\forall x\rho(x) \\ & \longleftrightarrow & \neg\forall x\neg\neg\rho(x) \\ \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} & & \\ & \longleftrightarrow & \neg\neg\exists x\neg\rho(x) \\ & \longleftrightarrow & \neg\neg\exists x\rho'(x) \\ \text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & & \\ & \longleftrightarrow & \exists x\rho'(x), \\ \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE} & & \end{array}$$

which is in Σ_{k+1} .

Next, let $\varphi := \exists x\rho(x)$ where $\rho(x) \in \Pi_k$. By induction hypothesis, there exists $\rho'(x) \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\rho(x)) = \text{FV}(\rho'(x))$ and

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\rho(x) \leftrightarrow \rho'(x).$$

Then $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ proves

$$\neg\exists x\rho(x) \leftrightarrow \forall x\neg\rho(x) \xrightarrow{\text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}} \forall x\rho'(x),$$

which is in Π_{k+1} . □

Lemma 4.8. *Let k be a natural number. For all $\varphi \in \Pi_k$, there exists $\psi \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\psi)$ and $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\psi$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \Pi_k$. By Lemma 4.7.(1), there exists $\psi \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\psi)$ and $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$. By Corollary 4.2, we have $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\psi$. □

Lemma 4.9. $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ for each natural number $k > 0$.

Proof. Fix an instance of $\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}$ -LEM

$$\varphi := \neg\neg\forall x (\varphi_1(x) \vee \neg\varphi_1(x)),$$

where $\varphi_1(x) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$. Note $(\varphi_1(x) \vee \neg\varphi_1(x)) \in F_{k-1} \subseteq U_k^+$. Since HA proves $\forall x \neg\neg(\varphi_1(x) \vee \neg\varphi_1(x))$, we have that HA+ U_k^+ -DNS proves $\neg\neg\forall x (\varphi_1(x) \vee \neg\varphi_1(x))$, namely, φ . \square

Corollary 4.10. HA + U_k^+ -DNS \vdash $\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}$ -DNE for each natural number $k > 0$.

Proof. Immediate from Remark 2.8, Lemma 4.9 and the fact that Σ_{k-1} -LEM implies Σ_{k-1} -DNE. \square

Remark 4.11. By Remark 2.12, U_k^+ -DNS is equivalent to U_k -DNS over HA. Then U_k^+ -DNS can be replaced by U_k -DNS throughout the paper.

5 Prenex normal form theorems

In this section, we show the modified version of [1, Theorem 2.7]. Prior to that, we first show a variant of the prenex normal form theorem:

Lemma 5.1. For each natural number k and a formula φ (possibly containing free variables), if $\varphi \in U_k^+$, then there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $FV(\varphi) = FV(\varphi')$ and

$$HA + U_k^+ \text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

Proof. By simultaneous induction on k , we show the following two statements (which are in fact equivalent):

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

$$HA + U_k^+ \text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi';$$

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

$$HA + U_k^+ \text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

The base case is trivial (one can take φ' as φ itself). In what follows, we show the induction step.

For the induction step, assume the items 1 and 2 for $k-1$. We show the items 1 and 2 for k simultaneously by induction on the structure of formulas. When φ is a prime formula, by Lemma 2.3, we have φ' which satisfies the requirement. For the induction step, assume that the items 1 and 2 hold for φ_1 and φ_2 . When it is clear from the context, we suppress the argument on free variables.

The case of $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$: First, assume $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash (\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1) \wedge (\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_2)$. By Lemma 4.6, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$ and

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

By Corollary 4.10, $\text{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{lcl} & & \neg(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg(\neg\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg(\neg\varphi'_1 \wedge \neg\varphi'_2) \\ \text{[I.H.] } U_k^+\text{-DNS} & & \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \vee \neg\varphi'_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi'. \\ \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & & \end{array}$$

Next, assume $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash (\neg\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1) \wedge (\neg\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_2)$. By Lemma 4.3, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$ and $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$. Then $\text{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\neg\neg(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi_2 \xleftrightarrow{\text{[I.H.] } U_k^+\text{-DNS}} \neg\neg\varphi'_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi'_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

The case of $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$: First, assume $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash (\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1) \wedge (\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_2)$. By Lemma 4.3, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$ and $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$. Then $\text{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{lcl} & & \neg(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2 \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi'_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi'_2 \\ \text{[I.H.] } U_k^+\text{-DNS} & & \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi'. \end{array}$$

Next, assume $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash (\neg\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1) \wedge (\neg\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_2)$. By Lemma 4.6, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$ and

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

By Corollary 4.10, $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
& & \neg\neg(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg(\neg\neg\varphi_1 \vee \neg\neg\varphi_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg(\neg\neg\varphi'_1 \vee \neg\neg\varphi'_2) \\
[\text{I.H.}] \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS} & & \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi'. \\
\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & &
\end{array}$$

The case of $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$: First, assume $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \text{E}_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1 \in \text{U}_k^+$ and $\varphi_2 \in \text{E}_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves $\neg\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1$ and $\neg\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_2$. By Lemma 4.3, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$ and $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$. Then $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
& & \neg(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi_2 \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi'_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi'_2 \\
[\text{I.H.}] \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS} & & \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi'.
\end{array}$$

Next, assume $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in \text{U}_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1 \in \text{E}_k^+$ and $\varphi_2 \in \text{U}_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves $\neg\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1$ and $\neg\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_2$. By Lemma 4.6, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'_1) \cup \text{FV}(\varphi'_2)$ and

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

By Corollary 4.10, $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
& & \neg\neg(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg(\neg\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg(\neg\neg\varphi'_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi'_2) \\
[\text{I.H.}] \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS} & & \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg(\varphi'_1 \vee \varphi'_2) \\
\longleftrightarrow & & \neg\neg\varphi'. \\
\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & &
\end{array}$$

The case of $\forall x\varphi_1(x)$: First, assume $\forall x\varphi_1(x) \in \text{E}_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\forall x\varphi_1(x) \in \text{U}_{k-1}^+$. By the item 2 for $k-1$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that

$$\text{HA} + \text{U}_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\neg\forall x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

By Lemma 4.8, there exists $\varphi'' \in \Sigma_{k-1} \subseteq \Pi_k$ (see Remark 2.5) such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'')$ and

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi' \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''.$$

By Corollary 4.10, $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\neg\forall x\varphi_1(x) \xleftrightarrow[\text{[I.H.]}]{\text{U}_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS}} \neg\varphi' \xleftrightarrow[\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}]{\text{U}_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS}} \neg\neg\varphi''.$$

Next, assume $\forall x\varphi_1(x) \in \text{U}_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1(x) \in \text{U}_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exists $\varphi'_1(x) \in \Pi_k$ such that

$$\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\neg\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1(x).$$

Then $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\neg\neg\forall x\varphi_1(x) \xleftrightarrow[\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}]{\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}} \forall x\neg\neg\varphi_1(x) \xleftrightarrow[\text{[I.H.]}]{\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}} \forall x\neg\neg\varphi'_1(x) \xleftrightarrow[\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}]{\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}} \neg\neg\forall x\varphi'_1(x).$$

The case of $\exists x\varphi_1(x)$: First, assume $\exists x\varphi_1(x) \in \text{E}_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1(x) \in \text{E}_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exists $\varphi'_1(x) \in \Pi_k$ such that

$$\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'_1(x).$$

Then $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\neg\exists x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \forall x\neg\varphi_1(x) \xleftrightarrow[\text{[I.H.]}]{\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}} \forall x\neg\neg\varphi'_1(x) \xleftrightarrow[\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}]{\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}} \neg\neg\forall x\varphi'_1(x).$$

Next, assume that $\exists x\varphi_1(x) \in \text{U}_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\exists x\varphi_1(x) \in \text{E}_{k-1}^+$. By the item 1 for $k-1$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that

$$\text{HA} + \text{U}_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \neg\exists x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

By Lemma 4.8, there exists $\varphi'' \in \Sigma_{k-1} \subseteq \Pi_k$ (see Remark 2.5) such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'')$ and

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi' \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''.$$

By Corollary 4.10, $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\neg\neg\exists x\varphi_1(x) \xleftrightarrow[\text{[I.H.]}]{\text{U}_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS}} \neg\varphi' \xleftrightarrow[\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}]{\text{U}_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS}} \neg\neg\varphi''.$$

□

The following lemma is used a lot of times implicitly in the proof of our prenex normal form theorem (Theorem 5.3).

Lemma 5.2 (cf. Fact 2.2 in [1]). *Let k be a natural number.*

1. $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE} \vdash (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}.$
2. $\text{HA} + (\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})\text{-DNE} \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}.$

3. $\text{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\neg\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$.

4. $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \Pi_{k+1}\text{-DNE}$.

Proof. (1): For formulas φ_1 and φ_2 in Π_k , $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ is equivalent (over HA) to

$$\exists k ((k = 0 \rightarrow \varphi_1) \wedge (k \neq 0 \rightarrow \varphi_2)),$$

which is equivalent to some $\varphi \in \Sigma_{k+1}$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)$ over HA by Lemma 4.3.(2). Therefore any instance of $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ is derived from some instance of $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE}$.

(2): Any instance of $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ is derived from some instance of $(\Pi_{k+1} \vee \Pi_{k+1})\text{-DNE}$ since $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$ is equivalent to $\forall y \varphi \in \Pi_{k+1}$ with a variable y not occurring freely in φ (cf. Lemma 2.3).

(3): Immediate from (2) and Corollary 4.2.

(4): Note that $\neg\neg\forall x\varphi(x)$ implies $\neg\neg\forall x\neg\neg\varphi(x)$, which is intuitionistically equivalent to $\forall x\neg\neg\varphi(x)$. Then any instance of $\Pi_{k+1}\text{-DNE}$ is derived from some instance of $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$. \square

We are now ready to show the modified version of [1, Theorem 2.7].

Theorem 5.3. *For each natural number k and a formula φ (possibly containing free variables), the following hold:*

1. if $\varphi \in E_k^+$, then there exists $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and

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

2. if $\varphi \in U_k^+$, then there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and

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

Proof. For the proof, we prepare the following auxiliary assertion (which is in fact a consequence from the item 2):

3. if $\varphi \in E_k^+$, then there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and

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

We show the items 1, 2 and 3 by induction on k simultaneously. The base case is trivial (one can take φ' as φ itself). In what follows, we show the induction step.

Assume the items 1, 2 and 3 for $k - 1$. Since $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \Pi_{k-1}\text{-DNS}$, by the item 2 for $k - 1$, we have

$$\text{HA} + (\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})\text{-DNE} \vdash U_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS}. \quad (2)$$

We show the items 1, 2 and 3 simultaneously by induction on the structure of formulas. When φ is a prime formula, by Lemma 2.3, we have φ' which satisfies the requirement. For the induction step, assume that the items 1, 2 and 3 hold for φ_1 and φ_2 . When it is clear from the context, we suppress the argument on free variables.

The case of $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$: For the second item, assume $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1$ and $\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \varphi'_2$. By Lemma 4.3, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} \vdash \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2$. Then $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

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

For the first and third items, assume $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. Then we have $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \varphi'$ as in the second item. On the other hand, by induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi''_1, \varphi''_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves $\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''_1$ and $\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''_2$. In addition, by Lemma 4.6, there exists $\varphi'' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\neg\varphi'' \leftrightarrow \neg\neg(\varphi''_1 \vee \varphi''_2)$. Then, by Lemma 5.2, we have that $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

$$\begin{array}{ll} & \neg(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & \neg(\neg\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\neg\varphi_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & \neg\neg(\neg\varphi_1 \vee \neg\varphi_2) \\ \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}} & \neg\neg(\neg\neg\varphi''_1 \vee \neg\neg\varphi''_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & \neg(\neg\varphi''_1 \wedge \neg\varphi''_2) \\ \longleftrightarrow & \neg\neg(\varphi''_1 \vee \varphi''_2) \\ \xrightarrow{\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}} & \neg\neg\varphi''. \end{array}$$

The case of $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$: For the second item, assume $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. Then, by induction hypothesis, there exist $\rho_1(x_1), \rho_2(x_2) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1)$ and $\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$. By Lemma 5.2, $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

$$\begin{array}{ll} & \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \vee \forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ \longrightarrow & \forall x_1, x_2 (\rho_1(x_1) \vee \rho_2(x_2)) \\ \longrightarrow & \neg(\exists x_1 \neg\rho_1(x_1) \wedge \exists x_2 \neg\rho_2(x_2)) \\ \longleftrightarrow & \neg(\neg\neg\exists x_1 \neg\rho_1(x_1) \wedge \neg\neg\exists x_2 \neg\rho_2(x_2)) \\ \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}} & \neg(\neg\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \wedge \neg\forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2)) \\ \longleftrightarrow & \neg\neg(\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \vee \forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2)) \\ \longrightarrow & \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \vee \forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2). \\ (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} & \end{array}$$

By Lemma 4.4, there exists $\xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ such that $\mathbf{HA} \vdash \xi(x_1, x_2) \leftrightarrow \rho_1(x_1) \vee \rho_2(x_2)$. Then we have that $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \longleftrightarrow & \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \\ \text{[I.H.] } (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} & \longleftrightarrow & \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \vee \forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ & \longleftrightarrow & \forall x_1, x_2 (\rho_1(x_1) \vee \rho_2(x_2)) \\ (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} & \longleftrightarrow & \forall x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Pi_k. \end{array}$$

For the first and third items, assume $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\rho_1(x_1), \rho_2(x_2) \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \exists x_1 \rho_1(x_1)$ and $\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$. By the item 2 for $k-1$, there exists $\xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that

$$\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})\text{-DNE} \vdash \xi(x_1, x_2) \leftrightarrow \rho_1(x_1) \vee \rho_2(x_2).$$

By Lemma 5.2, we have that $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \longleftrightarrow & \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \\ \text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_k\text{-DNE, } U_k^+\text{-DNS} & \longleftrightarrow & \exists x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \vee \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ & \longleftrightarrow & \exists x_1, x_2 (\rho_1(x_1) \vee \rho_2(x_2)) \\ \text{[I.H.] } (\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})\text{-DNE} & \longleftrightarrow & \exists x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2). \end{array}$$

Thus we are done for the first item. For the third item, by induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi_1'', \varphi_2'' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves $\neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi_1''$ and $\neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi_2''$. In addition, by Lemma 4.3, there exists $\varphi'' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} \vdash \varphi'' \leftrightarrow \varphi_1'' \wedge \varphi_2''$. Then $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

$$\neg(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2 \xrightarrow{\text{[I.H.] } \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}} \neg\neg\varphi_1'' \wedge \neg\neg\varphi_2'' \leftrightarrow \neg\neg(\varphi_1'' \wedge \varphi_2'') \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''.$$

The case of $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$: For the second item, assume $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1 \in E_k^+$ and $\varphi_2 \in U_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\rho_1(x_1), \rho_2(x_2) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE $\vdash \neg\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1)$ and $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE $\vdash \varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$. By Lemma 4.5, we have that $\neg\rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \rho_2(x_2)$ is in E_{k-1}^+ . Then, by the item 1 for $k-1$, there exists $\xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ such that

$$\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} + U_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \xi(x_1, x_2) \leftrightarrow (\neg\rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \rho_2(x_2)).$$

Then, using Lemma 5.2 and (2), we have that $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ proves

$\begin{array}{c} \longleftrightarrow \\ \text{[I.H.] } (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \Pi_k\text{-DNE} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \text{[I.H.] } \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE, } \mathbf{U}_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \Pi_k\text{-DNE} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \\ \varphi_1 \rightarrow \forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ \neg\neg\varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ \neg\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ \neg\neg\exists x_1 \neg\rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\ \neg\neg\forall x_1, x_2 (\neg\rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \rho_2(x_2)) \\ \neg\neg\forall x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2) \\ \forall x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Pi_k. \end{array}$
--	--

For the first and third items, assume $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1 \in U_k^+$ and $\varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exists $\rho_2(x_2) \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$. In addition, by Lemma 5.1, there exists $\rho_1(x_1) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \neg \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \neg \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1)$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \rho_1(x_1)$ is in U_{k-1}^+ . Then, by the item 2 for $k - 1$, there exists $\xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that

$$\text{HA} + (\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})\text{-DNE} \vdash \xi(x_1, x_2) \leftrightarrow (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \rho_1(x_1)).$$

Then, using Lemma 5.2, we have that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ proves

	\longleftrightarrow	$\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$
[I.H.] Σ_k -DNE, U_k^+ -DNS		$\varphi_1 \rightarrow \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$
	\longleftrightarrow	
Σ_k -DNE		$\varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$
	\longleftrightarrow	
		$\neg \neg \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$
	\longleftrightarrow	
U_k^+ -DNS		$\neg \neg \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$
	\longleftrightarrow	
		$\neg \neg \exists x_2 (\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \rho_2(x_2))$
	\longleftrightarrow	
Π_{k-1} -DNE		$\neg \neg \exists x_2 (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1))$
	\longleftrightarrow	
Σ_{k-1} -DNE		$\neg \neg \exists x_2 (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_1 \neg \rho_1(x_1))$
	\longleftrightarrow	
		$\neg \neg \exists x_2 \neg \neg \exists x_1 (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \rho_1(x_1))$
	\longleftrightarrow	
[I.H.] $(\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})$ -DNE		$\neg \neg \exists x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2)$
	\longleftrightarrow	
Σ_k -DNE		$\exists x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Sigma_k.$

Thus we are done for the first item. For the third item, by induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1, \varphi'_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1$ and $\text{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi'_2$. On the other hand, by

Lemma 4.3, there exists $\xi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} \vdash \varphi'_1 \wedge \varphi'_2 \leftrightarrow \xi'$. Then $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

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

The case of $\forall x\varphi_1(x)$: For the second item, assume $\forall x\varphi_1(x) \in U_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1(x) \in U_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exists $\varphi'_1(x) \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE $\vdash \varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1(x)$. Then $\forall x\varphi_1(x)$ is equivalent to $\forall x\varphi'_1(x) \in \Pi_k$ over $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE.

For the first and third items, assume $\forall x\varphi_1(x) \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\forall x\varphi_1(x) \in U_{k-1}^+$. Then, by the item 2 for $k-1$, there exists $\xi \in \Pi_{k-1} \subseteq \Sigma_k$ (see Remark 2.5) such that

$$\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})\text{-DNE} \vdash \forall x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \xi. \quad (3)$$

By Lemma 5.2, we are done for the first item. For the third item, by Lemma 4.7, there exists $\xi' \in \Sigma_{k-1} \subseteq \Pi_k$ (see Remark 2.5) such that $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\xi \leftrightarrow \xi'$. By Corollary 4.2, we have $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\xi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\xi'$. In addition,

$$\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\neg\forall x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\xi$$

follows from (3). Then, by Lemma 5.2, we have that $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

$$\neg\forall x\varphi_1(x) \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \neg\neg(\Pi_{k-1} \vee \Pi_{k-1})\text{-DNE}} \neg\xi \xrightarrow{\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}} \neg\neg\xi'.$$

Thus we have shown the third item.

The case of $\exists x\varphi_1(x)$: For the second item, assume $\exists x\varphi_1(x) \in U_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\exists x\varphi_1(x) \in E_{k-1}^+$. Then, by the item 1 for $k-1$, there exists $\xi \in \Sigma_{k-1} \subseteq \Pi_k$ (see Remark 2.5) such that $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} + U_{k-1}^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \exists x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \xi$. By Lemma 5.2 and (2), we have $\mathbf{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE $\vdash \exists x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \xi$.

For the first and third items, assume $\exists x\varphi_1(x) \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1(x) \in E_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exist $\varphi'_1(x) \in \Sigma_k$ and $\varphi''_1(x) \in \Pi_k$ such that $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS} \vdash \varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1(x)$ and $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''_1(x)$. Then $\exists x\varphi_1(x)$ is equivalent to $\exists x\varphi'_1(x) \in \Sigma_k$ over $\mathbf{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$. Thus we are done for the first item. For the third item, since $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

$$\neg\exists x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \forall x\neg\varphi_1(x) \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}} \forall x\neg\neg\varphi''_1(x),$$

we have that $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE proves

$$\neg\exists x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\forall x\neg\neg\varphi''_1(x).$$

On the other hand, the latter is equivalent to $\neg\neg\forall x\varphi''_1(x)$ in the presence of $\neg\neg\Pi_k\text{-DNE}$. Thus we have $\mathbf{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\exists x\varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\forall x\varphi''_1(x)$. \square

Corollary 5.4. $\text{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$.

Proof. Since $\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ is intuitionistically equivalent to $\neg\neg\text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ (see Remark 2.8), it suffices to show $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$. By Theorem 5.3.(2), any formulas $\varphi \in \text{U}_k^+$ is equivalent to some $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ over $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$. Since $\text{HA} + \Pi_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \Pi_k\text{-DNS}$, we have $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE} \vdash \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$. \square

Remark 5.5. Corollary 5.4 shows that Lemma 5.1 (equivalent to item 1 in the proof of Lemma 5.1) is a stronger statement of the item 3 in the proof of Theorem 5.3. On the other hand, it is still open whether $\text{HA} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ is a proper subsystem of $\text{HA} + \neg\neg(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$.

Remark 5.6. It follows from Theorem 5.3 and the results in Section 3 that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-DNE}$ does not prove $\text{U}_1^+\text{-DNS}$.

At the end of this section, we study the prenex normal form theorem for formulas which do not contain the disjunction \vee . In fact, the proof of Theorem 5.3 suggests that the unusual form $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ of the double negation elimination is caused from the argument especially in the case of $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$. On the other hand, if a formula φ does not contain \vee , one can intuitionistically derive the original formula φ from a formula of the prenex normal form which is classically equivalent to φ (cf. [9, Lemma 6.2.1]). Then the proof of the prenex normal form theorem for those formulas becomes to be fairly simple.

Theorem 5.7. *For each natural number k and a formula φ (possibly containing free variables) which does not contain \vee , the following hold:*

1. *if $\varphi \in \text{E}_k^+$, then there exists $\varphi' \in \Sigma_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and*

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

2. *if $\varphi \in \text{U}_k^+$, then there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and*

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \text{ (HA if } k = 0) \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'.$$

Proof. We mimic the proof of Theorem 5.3. Thus we first prepare the following auxiliary assertion (which is in fact a consequence from the item 2):

3. *if $\varphi \in \text{E}_k^+$, then there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and*

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi'.$$

Then we show the items 1, 2 and 3 by induction on k simultaneously. The base case is trivial. Most of the parts for the induction step is the same as those for Theorem 5.3. The same proof works since the logical principle in

the items 1 and 2 implies both of them for $k - 1$ and the logical principle in the item 3 is the double negation of the logical principle in the item 2 as in Theorem 5.3.

Only the difference with the proof of Theorem 5.3 is in proving the item 1 for $\varphi \equiv \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$, where we use Lemma 5.1. Here one can use the item 2 instead of Lemma 5.1. This is because Σ_k -DNE includes Σ_{k-1} -DNE while the verification theory of the item 1 in Theorem 5.3 contains the verification theory of Lemma 5.1. To be absolutely clear, we present the proof of this part: Let $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\varphi_1 \in U_k^+$ and $\varphi_2 \in E_k^+$. By induction hypothesis, there exists $\rho_1(x_1) \in \Sigma_{k-1}$ and $\rho_2(x_2) \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1)$ and $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)$. By Lemma 4.5, we have $\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \rho_1(x_1)$ is in U_{k-1}^+ . Then, by the item 2 for $k - 1$, there exists $\xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Pi_{k-1}$ such that

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-2}\text{-DNE} \vdash \xi(x_1, x_2) \leftrightarrow (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \rho_1(x_1)).$$

Then $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{ll}
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \\
\text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} & \varphi_1 \rightarrow \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\
\Sigma_k\text{-DNE} & \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2) \\
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 (\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)) \\
\text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 (\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)) \\
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 (\forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1) \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \rho_2(x_2)) \\
\Pi_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \forall x_1 \rho_1(x_1)) \\
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_1 \neg \rho_1(x_1)) \\
\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} & \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_1 \neg \rho_1(x_1)) \\
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_2 \neg \neg \exists x_1 (\neg \rho_2(x_2) \rightarrow \neg \rho_1(x_1)) \\
& \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2) \\
\text{[I.H.] } \Sigma_{k-2}\text{-DNE} & \varphi_1 \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2) \\
\Sigma_k\text{-DNE} & \exists x_1, x_2 \xi(x_1, x_2) \in \Sigma_k.
\end{array}$$

□

Remark 5.8. It follows from Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4 that E_k^+ -LEM, U_k^+ -LEM and U_k^+ -DNE are equivalent to Σ_k -LEM, Π_k -LEM and $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE respectively over HA (cf. [1, Corollary 2.9]). This may not be the case for E_k^+ -DNE and Σ_k -DNE. On the other hand, Theorem 5.7 implies that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ proves the double negation elimination for all formulas in E_k^+ which do not contain \vee .

6 A conservation result

In this section, we generalize a well-known fact that PA is Π_2 -conservative over HA in the context of semi-classical arithmetic (see Theorem 6.14). The

fact is normally shown by applying the negative translation followed by the Friedman A-translation (see e.g. [5, Chapter 14]). As for the negative translation, there are several equivalent forms (see [7, Section 1.10.1]). Here we employ Kuroda's negative translation among them.

Definition 6.1 (cf. Definition 10.1 in [5]). Let φ be a HA-formula. Then its negative translation φ^N is defined as $\varphi^N := \neg\neg\varphi_N$, where φ_N is defined by induction on the logical structure of φ as follows:

- $(\varphi_p)_N := \varphi_p$ if φ_p is a prime formula;
- $(\varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2)_N := (\varphi_1)_N \circ (\varphi_2)_N$, where $\circ \in \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$;
- $(\exists x\varphi_1)_N := \exists x(\varphi_1)_N$;
- $(\forall x\varphi_1)_N := \forall x\neg\neg(\varphi_1)_N$.

Remark 6.2. By induction on the structure of formulas, one can show $FV(\varphi) = FV(\varphi_N) = FV(\varphi^N)$ for all formulas φ . When it is clear from the context, we suppress the argument on free variables.

Lemma 6.3. *For any HA-formula φ of the prenex normal form, HA proves $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi_N$.*

Proof. By induction on the structure of formulas of the prenex normal form. \square

Proposition 6.4. *For any HA-formula φ , if $PA \vdash \varphi$, then $HA \vdash \varphi^N$.*

Proof. By induction on the length of the derivations (see the proof of [5, Proposition 10.3]). \square

Lemma 6.5. *Let k be a natural number.*

1. *For any HA-formula $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$, $HA + \Sigma_k$ -DNE proves $\varphi^N \leftrightarrow \varphi$.*
2. *For any HA-formula $\varphi \in \Pi_k$, $HA + \Sigma_{k-1}$ -DNE (HA if $k = 0$) proves $\varphi^N \leftrightarrow \varphi$.*

Proof. By simultaneous induction on k . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, assume the items 1 and 2 for k to show those for $k+1$. For the first item, let $\exists x\varphi_1 \in \Sigma_{k+1}$ where $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_k$. We have that $HA + \Sigma_{k+1}$ -DNE proves

$$(\exists x\varphi_1)^N \equiv \neg\neg\exists x(\varphi_1)_N \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\exists x\neg\neg(\varphi_1)_N \xrightarrow{[I.H.] \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}} \neg\neg\exists x\varphi_1 \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE}} \exists x\varphi_1.$$

For the second item, let $\forall x\varphi_1 \in \Pi_{k+1}$ where $\varphi_1 \in \Sigma_k$. Since Π_{k+1} -DNE is derived from Σ_k -DNE (see Lemma 5.2.(4)), we have that $HA + \Sigma_k$ -DNE proves

$$(\forall x\varphi_1)^N \equiv \neg\neg\forall x\neg\neg(\varphi_1)_N \xrightarrow{[I.H.] \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}} \neg\neg\forall x\varphi_1 \xrightarrow{\Pi_{k+1}\text{-DNE}} \forall x\varphi_1.$$

\square

Let HA^* denote HA in the extended language where a predicate symbol $*$ of arity 0, which behaves as a place holder, is added. In particular, HA^* has $\perp \rightarrow *$ as an axiom. To make our arguments absolutely clear, we prefer to add the distinguished new predicate $*$ rather than discussing about A-translation inside the original language as done in [2, 5].

Definition 6.6 (A-translation [2]). For a HA -formula φ , we define φ^* as a formula obtained from φ by replacing all the prime formulas φ_p in φ with $\varphi_p \vee *$. Officially, φ^* is defined by induction on the logical structure of φ as in Definition 6.1. In particular, $\perp^* \equiv (\perp \vee *)$, which is equivalent to $*$ over HA^* . In what follows, $\neg_* \varphi$ denotes $\varphi \rightarrow *$.

Remark 6.7. By induction on the structure of formulas, one can show $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi^*)$ for all HA -formulas φ .

Proposition 6.8 (Cf. Lemma 2 in [2]). *For any HA -formula φ , if $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi$, then $\text{HA}^* \vdash \varphi^*$.*

Proof. By induction on the length of the derivations. \square

Remark 6.9. An analogous assertion of Proposition 6.8 holds for $\text{HA} + \Sigma_1\text{-LEM}$ and $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_1\text{-LEM}$ instead of HA and HA^* respectively (see [6, Lemma 3.1]).

The following substitution result is important in the application of the A-translation:

Lemma 6.10 (Cf. Theorem 6.2.4 in [9]). *Let X be a set of HA -sentences and φ be a HA^* -formula. If $\text{HA}^* + X \vdash \varphi$, then $\text{HA} + X \vdash \varphi[\psi/*]$ for any HA -formula ψ such that the free variables of ψ are not bounded in φ , where $\varphi[\psi/*]$ is the HA -formula obtained from φ by replacing all the occurrences of $*$ in φ with ψ .*

Proof. Fix a set X of HA -sentences. By induction on k , one can show straightforwardly that for any k and any HA^* -formula φ , if $\text{HA}^* + X \vdash \varphi$ with the proof of length k , then $\text{HA} + X \vdash \varphi[\psi/*]$ for any HA -formula ψ such that the free variables of ψ is not bounded in φ . The variable condition is used to verify the case of axioms and rules for quantifiers. \square

The following lemma is a key for our generalized conservation results.

Lemma 6.11. *Let k be a natural number.*

1. *For any HA -formula $\varphi \in \Sigma_k$, $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ (HA^* if $k = 0$) proves $(\varphi_N)^* \leftrightarrow \varphi_N \vee *$.*
2. *For any HA -formula $\varphi \in \Pi_k$, $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ proves $(\varphi_N)^* \leftrightarrow \varphi_N \vee *$.*

Proof. We show the items 1 and 2 simultaneously by induction on k .

The base case: Since every quantifier-free formula φ_{qf} such that $\text{FV}(\varphi_{\text{qf}}) = \{\overline{x}\}$ is equivalent to a prime formula $t(\overline{x}) = 0$ for some closed term t (see e.g. [5, Proposition 3.8]), by Proposition 6.8, it suffices to show the assertions only for prime formulas. Since $((\varphi_p)_N)^* \equiv \varphi_p^* \equiv \varphi_p \vee * \equiv (\varphi_p)_N \vee *$, we are done.

The induction step: Assume that the items 1 and 2 hold for k . We first show the item 1 for $k+1$. Let $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_k$. Since

$$((\exists x \varphi_1)_N)^* \equiv (\exists x (\varphi_1)_N)^* \equiv \exists x ((\varphi_1)_N)^*,$$

by induction hypothesis, we have

$$\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash ((\exists x \varphi_1)_N)^* \leftrightarrow \exists x ((\varphi_1)_N \vee *).$$

Since HA^* proves $\exists x ((\varphi_1)_N \vee *) \leftrightarrow (\exists x (\varphi_1)_N \vee *) \equiv ((\exists x \varphi_1)_N \vee *)$, we have

$$\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash ((\exists x \varphi_1)_N)^* \leftrightarrow ((\exists x \varphi_1)_N \vee *).$$

Thus we have shown the item 1 for $k+1$.

Next, we show the item 2 for $k+1$. Let $\varphi_2 \in \Sigma_k$. We shall show that $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ (and hence, $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$) proves $(\forall x \varphi_2)_N \vee * \rightarrow ((\forall x \varphi_2)_N)^*$. By Lemma 6.5.(1), we have

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} \vdash \varphi_2 \leftrightarrow (\varphi_2)^N \equiv \neg\neg(\varphi_2)_N. \quad (4)$$

Then we have that $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ proves

$$(\forall x \varphi_2)_N \vee * \equiv (\forall x \neg\neg(\varphi_2)_N \vee *) \leftrightarrow \forall x \varphi_2 \vee *.$$

By Lemma 6.3, HA proves $\varphi_2 \rightarrow (\varphi_2)_N$. Then, using induction hypothesis and the fact that $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ derives $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$, we have that $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ proves

$$\begin{array}{lll} (\forall x \varphi_2)_N \vee * & \begin{array}{l} \xleftrightarrow{\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}} \\ \longrightarrow \\ \longrightarrow \\ \xleftrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}] \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}} \\ \longrightarrow \\ \xleftrightarrow{\quad} \end{array} & \begin{array}{l} \forall x \varphi_2 \vee * \\ \forall x (\varphi_2)_N \vee * \\ \forall x ((\varphi_2)_N \vee *) \\ \forall x ((\varphi_2)_N)^* \\ \forall x (((\varphi_2)_N)^* \rightarrow *) \rightarrow *) \\ ((\forall x \varphi_2)_N)^* \end{array} \end{array}$$

In the following, we show the converse direction:

$$\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM} \vdash ((\forall x \varphi_2)_N)^* \rightarrow (\forall x \varphi_2)_N \vee *. \quad (5)$$

Reason in $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_{k+1}\text{-LEM}$. Suppose $((\forall x \varphi_2)_N)^*$, equivalently,

$$\forall x (((\varphi_2)_N)^* \rightarrow *) \rightarrow *. \quad (6)$$

By induction hypothesis, (6) is equivalent to $\forall x (((\varphi_2)_N \vee * \rightarrow *) \rightarrow *)$, which is intuitionistically equivalent to

$$\forall x (((\varphi_2)_N \rightarrow *) \rightarrow *).$$

Then we have

$$\exists x \neg(\varphi_2)_N \rightarrow *. \quad (7)$$

By Lemma 4.7.(2), there exists $\psi_2 \in \Pi_k$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi_2) = \text{FV}(\psi_2)$ and $\neg\varphi_2$ is equivalent to ψ_2 . Since $\exists x\psi_2 \in \Sigma_{k+1}$, by Σ_{k+1} -LEM, we have $\exists x\psi_2 \vee \neg\exists x\psi_2$, and hence,

$$\exists x \neg\varphi_2 \vee \forall x \neg\neg\varphi_2.$$

Then, by (4), we obtain

$$\exists x \neg(\varphi_2)_N \vee \forall x \neg\neg(\varphi_2)_N.$$

In the former case, we have $*$ by (7). In the latter case, we have $(\forall x\varphi_2)_N$. Thus we have shown (5). \square

Lemma 6.12. *Let φ be a HA^* -formula.*

1. $\text{HA}^* \vdash \varphi \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \varphi$.
2. $\text{HA}^* \vdash \forall x \neg_* \varphi \leftrightarrow \neg_* \exists x \varphi$.
3. $\text{HA}^* \vdash \neg_* \neg_* \neg_* \varphi \rightarrow \neg_* \varphi$.
4. $\text{HA}^* \vdash \exists x \neg_* \neg_* \varphi \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \exists x \varphi$.

Proof. (1), (2) and (3) are immediate from the definition of \neg_* (see Definition 6.6). (4) follows from (1), (2) and (3). \square

Lemma 6.13. *For any HA -formula φ of the prenex normal form, $\text{HA}^* \vdash \varphi \rightarrow (\varphi^N)^*$.*

Proof. Since there exists a closed term t such that $\text{HA} \vdash \varphi_{\text{qf}}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \leftrightarrow t(x_1, \dots, x_k) = 0$ for each quantifier-free formula φ_{qf} such that $\text{FV}(\varphi_{\text{qf}}) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ (see e.g. [5, Proposition 3.8]), by Proposition 6.4 and Proposition 6.8, one can assume that formulas of the prenex normal form consist of the formulas of form $Q_1 x_1 \dots Q_k x_k \varphi_p$ where Q_i s are quantifiers and φ_p is prime. We show our assertion by induction on the structure of formulas of this form.

For a prime formula φ_p , it is trivial to see that HA^* proves

$$\varphi_p \rightarrow \varphi_p \vee * \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* (\varphi_p \vee *) \leftrightarrow ((\varphi_p)^N)^*.$$

Assume the assertion for φ . Then, using Lemma 6.12, HA^* proves

$$\begin{aligned} \exists x \varphi \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}]} \exists x (\varphi^N)^* &\equiv \exists x (\neg \neg \varphi_N)^* \leftrightarrow \exists x \neg_* \neg_* (\varphi_N)^* \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \exists x (\varphi_N)^* \\ &\leftrightarrow ((\exists x \varphi)^N)^* \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x \varphi \xrightarrow{[\text{I.H.}]} \forall x (\varphi^N)^* &\equiv \forall x (\neg \neg \varphi_N)^* \leftrightarrow \forall x \neg_* \neg_* (\varphi_N)^* \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \forall x \neg_* \neg_* (\varphi_N)^* \\ &\leftrightarrow ((\forall x \varphi)^N)^*. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 6.14. *Let k be a natural number. For any formulas $\varphi \in \Pi_{k+2}$ and ψ of the prenex normal form, if $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$, then $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \varphi$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi := \forall x \exists y \varphi_1$ where $\varphi_1 \in \Pi_k$. Since one can freely replace the bound variables, assume that the free variables of $\exists y \varphi_1$ are not bounded in ψ and x does not occur in ψ without loss of generality.

Suppose $\text{PA} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \forall x \exists y \varphi_1$. By Proposition 6.4, we have that HA proves $\neg \neg (\psi_N \rightarrow \forall x \neg \neg \exists y (\varphi_1)_N)$, which is intuitionistically equivalent to $\neg \neg \psi_N \rightarrow \forall x \neg \neg \exists y (\varphi_1)_N$, namely, $\psi^N \rightarrow \forall x \neg \neg \exists y (\varphi_1)_N$. Then we have

$$\text{HA} \vdash \psi^N \rightarrow \neg \neg \exists y (\varphi_1)_N.$$

By Proposition 6.8, we have

$$\text{HA}^* \vdash (\psi^N)^* \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \exists y ((\varphi_1)_N)^*,$$

and hence,

$$\text{HA}^* \vdash \psi \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \exists y ((\varphi_1)_N)^*$$

by Lemma 6.13. Then, by Lemma 6.11.(2), we have that $\text{HA}^* + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ proves

$$\psi \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \exists y ((\varphi_1)_N \vee *),$$

which is intuitionistically equivalent to

$$\psi \rightarrow \neg_* \neg_* \exists y (\varphi_1)_N.$$

Since the free variables of $\exists y \varphi_1$ are not bounded in ψ , using Lemma 6.10 with Remark 6.2, we have

$$\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow ((\exists y (\varphi_1)_N \rightarrow \exists y \varphi_1) \rightarrow \exists y \varphi_1). \quad (8)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 6.5.(2) and the fact that $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ derives $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$, we have that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ proves

$$(\varphi_1)_N \rightarrow \neg \neg (\varphi_1)_N \equiv (\varphi_1)^N \xleftrightarrow{\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}} \varphi_1.$$

and hence, $\exists y (\varphi_1)_N \rightarrow \exists y \varphi_1$. Then, by (8), we have $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \exists y \varphi_1$. By our assumption, x does not occur in ψ , and hence, $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM} \vdash \psi \rightarrow \forall x \exists y \varphi_1$ follows. □

We have shown Theorem 6.14 in order to prove the optimality of our prenex normal form theorems in Section 5 (see Section 7). On the other hand, the conservation result on semi-classical arithmetic itself is interesting. This will be studied comprehensively in [4].

7 Characterizations

Notation 2. Let T be an extension of HA. Let Γ and Γ' be classes of HA-formulas. Then $\text{PNFT}_T(\Gamma, \Gamma')$ denotes the following statement: for any $\varphi \in \Gamma$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Gamma'$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and $T \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'$.

Under this notation, Theorem 5.3 asserts (modulo Remark 2.2) that for a semi-classical theory T containing $\text{HA} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$, $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{U}_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ holds for all $k' \leq k$ as well as the analogous assertion for E_k and Σ_k . It is natural to ask whether the verification theories are optimal. In this section, among other things (see Table 1), we show that this is exactly the case:

1. For a theory T in-between HA and PA, $T \vdash (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{U}_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$. (Theorem 7.3)
2. For a theory T in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k = 0$) and PA, $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{E}_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$. (Theorem 7.11)

Lemma 7.1. *Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k < 2$) and PA. If $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{U}_k, \Pi_k)$, then $T \vdash (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$.*

Proof. Fix an instance of $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$

$$\varphi := \forall x (\neg\neg(\varphi_1(x) \vee \varphi_2(x)) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x) \vee \varphi_2(x)),$$

where $\varphi_1(x), \varphi_2(x) \in \Pi_k(x)$. Since $\neg\neg(\varphi_1(x) \vee \varphi_2(x))$ and $\varphi_1(x) \vee \varphi_2(x)$ are in U_k , by our assumption, there exist $\rho(x)$ and $\rho'(x)$ in $\Pi_k(x)$ such that T proves $\rho(x) \leftrightarrow \varphi_1(x) \vee \varphi_2(x)$ and $\rho'(x) \leftrightarrow \neg\neg(\varphi_1(x) \vee \varphi_2(x))$. Since $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi$ and PA is an extension of T , we have $\text{PA} \vdash \rho'(x) \rightarrow \rho(x)$. By Theorem 6.14, we have that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$ proves $\rho'(x) \rightarrow \rho(x)$, and hence, $\forall x (\rho'(x) \rightarrow \rho(x))$. Since T is an extension of $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$, we have $T \vdash \forall x (\rho'(x) \rightarrow \rho(x))$, and hence, $T \vdash \varphi$. \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let T be a theory in-between HA and PA. If $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{U}_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$, then $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$.*

Proof. By induction on k . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, assume $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{U}_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k+1$. Then, by induction hypothesis, we have $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$. Fix an instance of $\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$

$$\varphi := \forall x (\varphi_1(x) \vee \neg\varphi_1(x)),$$

where $\varphi_1(x) \in \Sigma_k(x)$. Since $\varphi \in U_{k+2}$, by our assumption, there exists a sentence $\varphi' \in \Pi_{k+1}$ such that $T \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'$. Since $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi$, we have $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi'$. Then, by Theorem 6.14, we have $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi'$, and hence, $T \vdash \varphi'$. Thus we have $T \vdash \varphi$. \square

Theorem 7.3. *Let T be a theory in-between HA and PA . Then $T \vdash (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$.*

Proof. The “only if” direction is immediate from Theorem 5.3.(2) and Lemma 2.3. We show the converse direction. Assume $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$. Let $k > 0$ without loss of generality. By Lemma 7.2, $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$. Then, by Lemma 7.1, we have $T \vdash (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$. \square

Definition 7.4. Let Γ be a class of formulas. Then Γ^{dn} denotes the class of HA -formulas $\neg\neg\varphi$ where $\varphi \in \Gamma$, and Γ^{n} denotes that for $\neg\varphi$ where $\varphi \in \Gamma$.

Lemma 7.5. *Let T be a theory in-between HA and PA . If $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$, then $T \vdash \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$.*

Proof. By induction on k . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, assume $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k+1$. Then, by induction hypothesis, T proves $\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$. Fix an instance of $\neg\neg\Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$

$$\varphi := \neg\neg\forall x(\varphi_1(x) \vee \neg\varphi_1(x)),$$

where $\varphi_1(x) \in \Sigma_k(x)$. Since $\varphi \in U_{k+1}^{\text{dn}}$, by our assumption, there exists a sentence $\varphi' \in \Pi_{k+1}$ such that $T \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'$. Since $\text{PA} \vdash \forall x(\varphi_1(x) \vee \neg\varphi_1(x))$, we have $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi'$. Then, by Theorem 6.14, we have $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi'$, and hence, $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg\neg\varphi'$ by Lemma 4.1. Then $T \vdash \varphi$. \square

Theorem 7.6. *Let T be a theory in-between HA and PA . The following are pairwise equivalent:*

1. $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}^{\text{n}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$;
2. $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$;
3. $T \vdash U_k^+\text{-DNS}$.

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is trivial (cf. the proof of Lemma 5.1). In addition, (3 \rightarrow 2) is immediate from Lemma 5.1. In what follows, we show (2 \rightarrow 3). Assume $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$. Since $U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ is intuitionistically equivalent to $\neg\neg U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ (See Remark 2.8), it suffices to show $T \vdash \neg\neg U_k^+\text{-DNS}$. Let $k > 0$ without loss of generality. Fix an instance of $\neg\neg U_k^+\text{-DNS}$

$$\varphi := \neg\neg\forall x(\forall y\neg\neg\varphi_1(x, y) \rightarrow \neg\neg\forall y\varphi_1(x, y))$$

where $\varphi_1(x, y) \in U_k^+(x, y)$. By Lemma 4.5, we have that $\forall y \neg \neg \varphi_1(x, y)$ and $\forall y \varphi_1(x, y)$ are in $U_k^+(x)$. Since $i(s) \equiv -$ for all alternation paths s of $\forall y \neg \neg \varphi_1(x, y)$ and $\forall y \varphi_1(x, y)$, it is straightforward to show that there exists $k' \leq k$ such that $\forall y \neg \neg \varphi_1(x, y)$ and $\forall y \varphi_1(x, y)$ are in $U_{k'}(x)$. Then, by $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$, there exist $\rho(x), \rho'(x) \in \Pi_{k'}(x)$ such that T proves $\neg \neg \rho(x) \leftrightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \varphi_1(x, y)$ and $\neg \neg \rho'(x) \leftrightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \neg \neg \varphi_1(x, y)$. Since PA is an extension of T and $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi$, we have $\text{PA} \vdash \rho'(x) \rightarrow \rho(x)$. Then, by Theorem 6.14, we have that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k'-2}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k' < 2$) proves $\rho'(x) \rightarrow \rho(x)$, and hence, $\forall x (\neg \neg \rho'(x) \rightarrow \neg \neg \rho(x))$. By Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\text{HA} + \neg \neg \Sigma_{k'-2}\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg \neg \forall x (\neg \neg \rho'(x) \rightarrow \neg \neg \rho(x)).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 7.5 and our assumption, we have $T \vdash \neg \neg \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$. Then we have

$$T \vdash \neg \neg \forall x (\neg \neg \forall y \neg \neg \varphi_1(x, y) \rightarrow \neg \neg \forall y \varphi_1(x, y)),$$

and hence, $T \vdash \varphi$. \square

Remark 7.7. Theorem 7.6 shows that the verification theory for Lemma 5.1 is optimal.

Definition 7.8. Let Γ be a class of HA -formulas. Γ^{df} denotes the class of formulas in Γ which do not contain \vee .

Lemma 7.9. Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k = 0$) and PA . If $\text{PNFT}_T(E_k^{\text{df}}, \Sigma_k')$ for all $k' \leq k$, then $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$.

Proof. By induction on k . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, assume the assertion for k and let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_k\text{-LEM}$ and PA . Assume also that $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}^{\text{df}}, \Sigma_{k'})$ holds for all $k' \leq k+1$. Then, by induction hypothesis, T proves $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$. Since T contains $\text{HA} + \Pi_k\text{-LEM}$, we have $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ by [1, Theorem 3.1(ii)]. Fix an instance of $\Sigma_{k+1}\text{-DNE}$

$$\varphi := \forall x (\neg \neg \varphi_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)),$$

where $\varphi_1(x) \in \Sigma_{k+1}(x)$. Without loss of generality, one can assume that $\varphi_1(x)$ does not contain \vee (cf. [5, Proposition 3.8]). Since $\neg \neg \varphi_1(x) \in E_{k+1}^{\text{df}}$, By $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k+1}^{\text{df}}, \Sigma_{k+1})$, there exists $\varphi'_1(x) \in \Sigma_{k+1}(x)$ such that $T \vdash \neg \neg \varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1(x)$. Since PA is an extension of T and $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi$, we have $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi'_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)$. Then, by Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 6.14, we have that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$ proves $\varphi'_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)$, and hence, $\forall x (\varphi'_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x))$. Since T is an extension of $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-LEM}$, we have $T \vdash \varphi$. \square

Lemma 7.10. Let T be an extension of $\text{HA} + \neg \neg \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$ (HA if $k = 0$). If $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$, then $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}^{\text{n}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$.

Proof. Assume $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$. Fix $k' \leq k$ and $\varphi \in E_{k'}$. By $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Sigma_{k'}$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and $T \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'$. Then

$$T \vdash \neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\varphi'.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.7.(2), there exists $\varphi'' \in \Pi_{k'}$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi') = \text{FV}(\varphi'')$ and $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k'-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi''$. Then, by Corollary 4.2, we have

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k'-1}\text{-DNE} \vdash \neg\varphi' \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''.$$

Then $\text{FV}(\neg\varphi) = \text{FV}(\neg\neg\varphi'')$ and $T \vdash \neg\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi''$. Thus we have shown $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}^{\text{n}}, \Sigma_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$. \square

Theorem 7.11. *Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k = 0$) and PA . Then $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$.*

Proof. The “only if” direction is immediate from Theorem 5.3.(1) and Lemma 2.3. We show the converse direction. Assume $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$. Let $k > 0$ without loss of generality. By Lemma 7.9, we have $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$. In addition, by Lemma 7.10 and Theorem 7.6, we have $T \vdash \text{U}_k^+\text{-DNS}$. \square

Remark 7.12. It is still open whether the assumption that T contains $\Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ can be omitted in Theorem 7.11.

Remark 7.13. Akama et al. [1] shows that $\Pi_k\text{-LEM}$ does not derive $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ and $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ does not derive $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$. Theorem 7.11 reveals that the prenex normal form theorem for E_k and Σ_k does not hold in $\text{HA} + \Pi_k\text{-LEM}$, and Theorem 7.3 reveals that the prenex normal form theorem for U_k and Π_k does not hold in $\text{HA} + \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$.

Corollary 7.14. *Let T be a theory in-between HA and PA . Then $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE} + (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$ and $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{U}_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$.*

Proof. Let T be a theory in-between HA and PA . The “only if” direction follows from Theorem 5.3, Corollary 5.4 and Lemma 2.3.

For the converse direction, assume that $\text{PNFT}_T(E_{k'}, \Sigma_{k'})$ and $\text{PNFT}_T(\text{U}_{k'}, \Pi_{k'})$ hold for all $k' \leq k$. By Theorems 7.3, we have $T \vdash (\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$. Since $\Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ is derived from $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)\text{-DNE}$ (cf. [1, Theorem 3.1(1)]), by Theorem 7.11, we also have $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$. \square

In the following, we show the optimality of Theorem 5.7 (see Theorem 7.16).

Lemma 7.15. *Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k < 2$) and PA . If $\text{PNFT}_T((\text{U}_{k'}^{\text{dn}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$, then $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$.*

Proof. By induction on k . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, assume the assertion for k and let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ and PA . Assume also that $\text{PNFT}_T \left((U_{k'}^{\text{dn}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k'} \right)$ holds for all $k' \leq k + 1$. Then, by induction hypothesis, T proves $\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$. Since T contains $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$, we have $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ by [1, Theorem 3.1(ii)]. Fix an instance of $\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$

$$\varphi := \forall x (\neg \neg \varphi_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)),$$

where $\varphi_1(x) \in \Sigma_k(x)$. Without loss of generality, one can assume that $\varphi_1(x)$ does not contain \vee (cf. [5, Proposition 3.8]). From the perspective of Remark 2.5, $\varphi_1(x)$ is in $\Pi_{k+1}(x)$. Then, by $\text{PNFT}_T \left((U_{k+1}^{\text{dn}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k+1} \right)$, there exists $\varphi'_1(x) \in \Pi_k(x)$ such that $T \vdash \neg \neg \varphi_1(x) \leftrightarrow \varphi'_1(x)$. Since PA is an extension of T and $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi$, we have $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi'_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)$. By Theorem 6.14, we have that $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ proves $\varphi'_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)$, and hence, $\forall x (\varphi'_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x))$. Since T is an extension of $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$, we have $T \vdash \varphi$. \square

Theorem 7.16.

1. Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k = 0$) and PA . Then $T \vdash \Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T (E_{k'}^{\text{df}}, \Sigma_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$.
2. Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k < 2$) and PA . Then $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T (U_{k'}^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$.

Proof. (1): The “only if” direction is by Theorem 5.7.(1). The converse direction is by Lemma 7.9.

(2): The “only if” direction is by Theorem 5.7.(2). Note that any formula in $(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}})^{\text{df}}$ is in $U_{k'}^{\text{df}}$. Then the converse direction follows from Lemma 7.15. \square

At the end of this section, we characterize some variants of prenex normal form theorems.

Theorem 7.17. Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \Pi_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k < 2$) and PA . Then $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T (U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'})$ for all $k' \leq k$.

Proof. We first show the “only if” direction. Let $k > 0$ without loss of generality. Assume $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE} + U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ and fix $k' \leq k$. Since $T \vdash U_{k'}^+\text{-DNS}$, by Lemma 5.1, for any $\varphi \in U_{k'}^+$, there exists $\varphi' \in \Pi_{k'}$ such that $\text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\varphi')$ and

$$T \vdash \neg \neg \varphi \leftrightarrow \neg \neg \varphi'.$$

Since $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$, by Lemma 5.2.(4), we have $T \vdash \neg \neg \varphi' \leftrightarrow \varphi'$, and hence, $T \vdash \neg \neg \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi'$. Thus we have $\text{PNFT}_T (U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'})$.

Next, we show the converse direction. Assume that $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'})$ holds for all $k' \leq k$. By Lemma 7.15, we have $T \vdash \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$. On the other hand, by the assumption, we have $\text{PNFT}_T(U_{k'}^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$, and hence, $T \vdash U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ by Theorem 7.6. \square

Theorem 7.18. *Let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Pi_{k-2}\text{-LEM}$ (HA if $k < 2$) and PA . The following are pairwise equivalent:*

1. $\text{PNFT}_T((E_{k'}^{\text{n}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$;
2. $\text{PNFT}_T((U_{k'}^{\text{dn}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ for all $k' \leq k$;
3. $T \vdash \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$.

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is trivial (cf. the proof of Lemma 5.1). In addition, (3 \rightarrow 1) is immediate from the item 3 in the proof of Theorem 5.7. Then it suffices to show (1 \rightarrow 3). We show this by induction on k . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, assume the assertion for k and let T be a theory in-between $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ and PA . Assume also that $\text{PNFT}_T((E_{k'}^{\text{n}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k'}^{\text{dn}})$ holds for all $k' \leq k+1$. Then, by induction hypothesis, we have $T \vdash \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-DNE}$. Since T contains $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Pi_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$, we have $T \vdash \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$ by [1, Theorem 3.1(ii)]. Fix an instance of $\neg\neg\Sigma_k\text{-DNE}$

$$\varphi \equiv \neg\neg\forall x(\neg\neg\varphi_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)),$$

where $\varphi_1(x) \in \Sigma_k(x)$. Without loss of generality, one can assume that $\varphi_1(x)$ does not contain \vee (cf. [5, Proposition 3.8]). Note $\forall x(\neg\neg\varphi_1(x) \rightarrow \varphi_1(x)) \in U_{k+1}^{\text{df}}$, and hence, $\varphi \in (E_{k+1}^{\text{n}})^{\text{df}}$. By $\text{PNFT}_T((E_{k+1}^{\text{n}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_{k+1}^{\text{dn}})$, there exists a sentence $\varphi' \in \Pi_{k+1}$ such that $T \vdash \varphi \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\varphi'$. Since PA is an extension of T and $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi$, we have $\text{PA} \vdash \varphi'$. By Theorem 6.14, we have $\text{HA} + \Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \varphi'$. Then, by Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM} \vdash \neg\neg\varphi'.$$

Since T is an extension of $\text{HA} + \neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}\text{-LEM}$, we have $T \vdash \varphi$. \square

All of our characterization results are of the following form: For any theory T in-between $\text{HA} + \text{Q}_k$ and PA , $T \vdash \text{P}_k$ if and only if $\text{PNFT}_T(\Gamma_{k'}, \Delta_{k'})$ holds for all $k' \leq k$, where P_k, Q_k are logical principles and $\Gamma_{k'}, \Delta_{k'}$ are classes of formulas. Based on this representation, our results are summarized in Table 1, where it is also possible to replace $U_k^+\text{-DNS}$ by $U_k\text{-DNS}$ (see Remark 4.11).

P_k	(Γ_k, Δ_k)	Q_k	
$\neg\neg\Sigma_{k-1}$ -DNE	$((U_k^{\text{dn}})^{\text{df}}, \Pi_k^{\text{dn}})$	$\neg\neg\Pi_{k-2}$ -LEM	Theorem 7.18
U_k^+ -DNS	$(U_k^{\text{dn}}, \Pi_k^{\text{dn}})$	\emptyset	Theorem 7.6
Σ_{k-1} -DNE	(U_k^{df}, Π_k)	Π_{k-2} -LEM	Theorem 7.16.(2)
Σ_{k-1} -DNE + U_k^+ -DNS	(U_k^{dn}, Π_k)	Π_{k-2} -LEM	Theorem 7.17
Σ_k -DNE	$(E_k^{\text{df}}, \Sigma_k)$	Π_{k-1} -LEM	Theorem 7.16.(1)
Σ_k -DNE + U_k^+ -DNS	(E_k, Σ_k)	Π_{k-1} -LEM	Theorem 7.11
$(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE	(U_k, Π_k)	\emptyset	Theorem 7.3
Σ_k -DNE + $(\Pi_k \vee \Pi_k)$ -DNE	$(U_k, \Pi_k) \& (E_k, \Sigma_k)$	\emptyset	Corollary 7.14

Table 1: Characterizations of the prenex normal form theorems

Acknowledgements

The authors thank to Ulrich Kohlenbach for his helpful comments. The first author was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP18K13450 and JP19J01239, 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] 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.
- [3] M. Fujiwara and U. Kohlenbach. Interrelation between weak fragments of double negation shift and related principles. *J. Symb. Log.*, 83(3):991–1012, 2018.
- [4] M. Fujiwara and T. Kurahashi. Conservation results on semi-classical arithmetic. *preprint*.
- [5] U. Kohlenbach. *Applied proof theory: proof interpretations and their use in mathematics*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.

- [6] U. Kohlenbach and P. Safarik. Fluctuations, effective learnability and metastability in analysis. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165(1):266 – 304, 2014. The Constructive in Logic and Applications.
- [7] A. S. Troelstra, editor. *Metamathematical investigation of intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis*, volume 344 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1973.
- [8] 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.
- [9] D. van Dalen. *Logic and Structure*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag London, fifth edition, 2013.