

An Arithmetic Theory for the Poly-Time Random Functions

M. Antonelli, U. Dal Lago, D. Davoli, I. Oitavem, P. Pistone

February 8, 2023

We introduce a new bounded theory \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , and show that the functions which are Σ_1^b -representable in it are precisely random functions which can be computed in polynomial time. Concretely, we pass through the class of oracle functions over strings \mathcal{POR} , which is introduced in Section 2, together with \mathbf{RS}_2^1 . Then, we show that functions computed by poly-time PTMs are *arithmetically* characterized by a class of probabilistic bounded formulas: in Section 3.2, we prove that the class of poly-time oracle functions is equivalent to that of functions which are Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , and in Section 4 we establish the converse.

1 Overview

Usual characterizations of poly-time (deterministic) functions in bounded arithmetic are obtained by two “macro” results [1, 7]. Some Cobham-style algebra for poly-time functions is introduced and shown equivalent to (1) that of functions computed by TMs running in polynomial time, and (2) that of functions which are Σ_1^b -representable in the proper bounded theory. The global structure of our proof follows a similar path, with an algebra of oracle recursive function, called \mathcal{POR} , playing the role of our Cobham-style function algebra. In our case, functions are poly-time computable by PTMs and the theory is randomized \mathbf{RS}_2^1 . After introducing these classes, we show that the random functions which are Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 are precisely those in \mathcal{POR} , and that \mathcal{POR} is equivalent (in a very specific sense) to the class of functions computed by PTMs running in polynomial time. While the first part is established due to standard arguments [7, 3], the presence of randomness introduced a delicate ingredient to be dealt with in the second part. Indeed, functions in \mathcal{POR} access randomness in a rather different way with respect to PTMs, and relating these models requires some effort, that involves long chains of intermediate simulations.

Concretely, we start by defining the class of oracle functions over strings, the new theory \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , strongly inspired by [8], but over a “probabilistic word language”, and considering a slightly modified notion of Σ_i^b -representability, fitting the domain of our peculiar oracle functions. Then, we prove that the class of random functions computable in polynomial time, called \mathbf{RFP} , is precisely the class of functions which are Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 in three steps:




Figure 1: Proof Schema

1. We prove that functions in \mathcal{PQR} are Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by induction on the structure of oracle functions (and relying on the encoding machinery presented in [1, 7]).
2. We show that all functions which are Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 are in \mathcal{PQR} by realizability techniques similar to Cook and Urquhart's one [3].
3. We generalize Cobham's result to probabilistic models, showing that functions in \mathcal{PQR} are precisely those in \mathbf{RFP} .




Figure 2: Our Proof in a Nutshell

2 Introducing \mathcal{PQR} and \mathbf{RS}_2^1

In this section, we introduce a Cobham-style function algebra for poly-time oracle recursive functions \mathcal{PQR} , and a randomized bounded arithmetic \mathbf{RS}_2^1 . As Ferreira's ones [6, 7], these classes are both associated with binary strings rather than natural positive integer: \mathcal{PQR} is a class of oracle functions over sequences of bits, while \mathbf{RS}_2^1 is defined in a probabilistic word language \mathcal{RL} . Strings support a natural notion of term-size and make it easier to deal with bounds and time-complexity. Observe that working with strings is not crucial and all results below could be spelled out in terms of natural numbers. Indeed, theories have been introduced in both formulations – Ferreira's Σ_1^b -NIA and Buss' \mathbf{S}_2^1 – and proved equivalent [8].

2.1 The Function Algebra \mathcal{POR}

We introduce a function algebra for poly-time *oracle* recursive functions inspired by Ferreira's \mathcal{PTCA} [6, 7], and defined over strings.

Notation 2.1. Let $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$, $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{B}^*$ be the set of binary strings of finite length, and $\mathbb{O} = \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{S}}$ be the set of binary strings of infinite length. Metavariables η', η'', \dots are used to denote the elements of \mathbb{O} .

Let $|\cdot|$ denote the length-map string, so that for any string x , $|x|$ indicates the length of x . Given two binary strings x, y we use $x \subseteq y$ to express that x is an *initial* or *prefix substring* of y , $x \frown y$ (abbreviated as xy) for concatenation, and $x \times y$ obtained by self-concatenating x for $|y|$ -times. Given an infinite string of bits η , and a finite string x , $\eta(x)$ denotes *one* specific bit of η , the so-called x -th bit of x .

A fundamental difference between oracle functions and those of \mathcal{PTCA} is that the latter ones are of the form $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, carrying an additional argument to be interpreted as the underlying source of random bits. Furthermore, \mathcal{PR} includes the basic function *query*, $Q(x, \eta) = \eta(x)$, which can be used to observe any bit in η .

Definition 2.1 (The Class \mathcal{POR}). The class \mathcal{POR} is the smallest class of functions $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, containing:

- The *empty (string) function* $E(x, \eta) = \epsilon$
- The *projection (string) functions* $P_i^n(x_1, \dots, x_n, \eta) = x_i$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$
- The *word-successor* $S_b(x, \eta) = x\mathbb{b}$, where $b = 0$ if $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{0}$ and $b = 1$ if $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{1}$
- The *conditional (string) function*

$$\begin{aligned} C(\epsilon, y, z_0, z_1, \eta) &= y \\ C(x\mathbb{b}, y, z_0, z_1, \eta) &= z_b, \end{aligned}$$

where $b = 0$ if $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{0}$ and $b = 1$ if $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{1}$

- The *query (string) function* $Q(x, \eta) = \eta(x)$

and closed under the following schemas:

- *Composition*, where f is defined from g, h_1, \dots, h_k as

$$f(\vec{x}, \eta) = g(h_1(\vec{x}, \eta), \dots, h_k(\vec{x}, \eta), \eta)$$

- *Bounded recursion on notation*, where f is defined from g, h_0 , and h_1 as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\vec{x}, \epsilon, \eta) &= g(\vec{x}, \eta) \\ f(\vec{x}, y\mathbb{0}, \eta) &= h_0(\vec{x}, y, f(\vec{x}, y, \eta), \eta)|_{t(\vec{x}, y)} \\ f(\vec{x}, y\mathbb{1}, \eta) &= h_1(\vec{x}, y, f(\vec{x}, y, \eta), \eta)|_{t(\vec{x}, y)} \end{aligned}$$

and t is obtained from $\epsilon, \mathbb{1}, \mathbb{0}, \frown$, and \times by explicit definition, that is t can be obtained applying \frown and \times on the constants $\epsilon, \mathbb{0}, \mathbb{1}$, and the variables \bar{x} and y .¹

Actually, the conditional function C could be defined by bounded recursion.

Remark 2.1. *Neither the query function or the conditional function appear in Ferreira’s characterization [7], which instead contains the “substring-conditional” function:*

$$S(x, y, \eta) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1} & \text{if } x \subseteq y \\ \mathbb{0} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which can be defined in \mathcal{POR} by bounded recursion.

2.2 Randomized Bounded Arithmetics

First, we introduce a probabilistic word language for our bounded arithmetic, together with its quantitative interpretation.

The Language \mathcal{RL} . Following [8], we consider a first-order signature for natural numbers in binary notation endowed with a special predicate symbol $\text{Flip}(\cdot)$. Consequently, formulas are interpreted over \mathbb{S} rather than \mathbb{N} .

Definition 2.2 (Terms and Formulas of \mathcal{RL}). *Terms and formulas of \mathcal{RL} are defined by the grammar below:*

$$\begin{aligned} t &:= x \mid \epsilon \mid \mathbb{0} \mid \mathbb{1} \mid t \frown t \mid t \times t \\ F &:= \text{Flip}(t) \mid t = s \mid \neg F \mid F \wedge F \mid F \vee F \mid (\exists x)F \mid (\forall x)F. \end{aligned}$$

Notation 2.2 (Truncation). *For readability, we adopt the following abbreviations: ts for $t \frown s$, 1^t for $1 \times t$, and $t \preceq s$ for $1^t \subseteq 1^s$, expressing that the length of t is smaller than that of s . Given three terms t, r , and s , the abbreviation $t|_r = s$ denotes the following formula,*

$$(1^r \subseteq 1^t \wedge s \subseteq t \wedge 1^r = 1^s) \vee (1^t \subseteq 1^r \wedge s = t),$$

saying that s is the truncation of t at the length of r .

Every string $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ can be seen as a term of \mathcal{RL} $\bar{\sigma}$, such that $\bar{\epsilon} = \epsilon$, $\overline{\sigma\mathbb{b}} = \bar{\sigma}\mathbb{b}$, where $\mathbb{b} \in \mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{b} \in \{0, 1\}$, e.g. $\overline{001} = 001$.

A central feature of bounded arithmetic is the presence of bounded quantification.

Notation 2.3 (Bounded Quantifiers). *In \mathcal{RL} , bounded quantified expressions are expressions of either the form $(\forall x)(1^x \subseteq 1^t \rightarrow F)$ or $(\exists x)(1^x \subseteq 1^t \wedge F)$, usually abbreviated as $(\forall x \preceq t)F$ and $(\exists x \preceq t)F$ respectively.*

¹Notice that there is a clear correspondence with the grammar for terms in \mathcal{RL} , Definition 2.5.

Notation 2.4. We call subword quantifications, *quantifications of the form* $(\forall x \subseteq^* t)F$ and $(\exists x \subseteq^* t)F$, abbreviating $(\forall x)((\exists w \subseteq t)(wx \subseteq t) \rightarrow F)$ and $(\exists x)(\exists w \subseteq t)(wx \subseteq t \wedge F)$. Furthermore, we abbreviate so-called initial subword quantification $(\forall x)(x \subseteq t \rightarrow F)$ as $(\forall x \subseteq t)F$ and $(\exists x)(x \subseteq t \wedge F)$ as $(\exists x \subseteq t)F$.

The distinction between bounded and subword quantification is important for complexity reasons. If $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ is a string of length k , the witness of a subword existentially quantified formula $(\exists x \subseteq^* \bar{\sigma})F$ is to be looked for among all possible sub-strings of σ , that is within a space of size $\mathcal{O}(k)$. On the contrary, the witness of a bounded formula $(\exists x \preceq \bar{\sigma})F$ is to be looked for among all possible strings of length k , namely within a space of size $\mathcal{O}(2^k)$.

Remark 2.2. In order to avoid misunderstanding let us briefly sum up the different notions and symbols used for subword relations. We uses \subseteq to express a relation between strings, that is $x \subseteq y$ expresses that x is an initial or prefix substring of y . We use \subseteq as a relation symbol in the language \mathcal{RL} . We use \preceq as an auxiliary symbol in the language \mathcal{RL} ; in particular, as seen, $t \preceq s$ is syntactic sugar for $1^t \subseteq 1^s$. We use \subseteq^* as an auxiliary symbol in the language \mathcal{RL} to denote subword quantification. We also use $(\exists w \subseteq t)F$ as an abbreviation of $(\exists w)(w \subseteq t \wedge F)$ and similarly for $(\forall w \subseteq t)$.

Definition 2.3 (Σ_1^b -Formulas). A Σ_0^b -formula is a subword quantified formula, i.e. a formula belonging to the smallest class of \mathcal{RL} containing atomic formulas and closed under Boolean operations and subword quantification. A formula is said to be a Σ_1^b -formula, if it is of the form $(\exists x_1 \preceq t) \dots (\exists x_n \preceq t_n)F$, where the only quantifications in F are subword ones. We call Σ_1^b the class containing all and only the Σ_1^b -formulas.

An *extended Σ_1^b -formula* is any formula of \mathcal{RL} that can be constructed in a finite number of steps, starting with subword quantifications and bounded existential quantifications and bounded existential quantifications.

The Bounded Theory \mathbf{RS}_2^1 . We introduce the bounded theory \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , which can be seen as a probabilistic version to Ferreira's Σ_1^b -NIA [6]. It is expressed in the language \mathcal{RL} .

Definition 2.4 (Theory \mathbf{RS}_2^1). The theory \mathbf{RS}_2^1 is defined by axioms belonging to two classes:

- *Basic axioms:*

1. $x\epsilon = x$
2. $x(y\mathbf{b}) = (xy)\mathbf{b}$
3. $x \times \epsilon = \epsilon$
4. $x \times x\mathbf{b} = (x \times y)x$
5. $x \subseteq \epsilon \leftrightarrow x = \epsilon$
6. $x \subseteq y\mathbf{b} \leftrightarrow x \subseteq y \vee x = y\mathbf{b}$

7. $x\mathbf{b} = y\mathbf{b} \rightarrow x = y$
8. $x\mathbf{0} \neq y\mathbf{1}$,
9. $x\mathbf{b} \neq \epsilon$

with $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$

- *Axiom schema for induction on notation,*

$$B(\epsilon) \wedge (\forall x)(B(x) \rightarrow B(x\mathbf{0}) \wedge B(x\mathbf{1})) \rightarrow (\forall x)B(x),$$

where B is a Σ_1^b -formula in \mathcal{RL} .

Induction on notation adapts the usual induction schema of **PA** to the binary representation. Of course, as in Buss' and Ferreira's approach, the restriction of this schema to Σ_1^b -formulas is essential to characterize algorithms computed *with bounded resources*. Indeed, more general instances of the schema would extend representability to random functions which are not poly-time (probabilistic) computable.

Proposition 2.1 ([6]). *In \mathbf{RS}_2^1 any extended Σ_1^b -formula is logically equivalent to a Σ_1^b -formula.*²

Semantics for Formulas in \mathcal{RL} . We introduce a *quantitative* semantics for formulas of \mathcal{RL} , which is strongly inspired by that for **MQPA**. In particular, function symbols of \mathcal{RL} as well as the predicate symbols “=” and “ \subseteq ” have a standard interpretation as relations over \mathbb{S} in the canonical model $\mathcal{W} = (\mathbb{S}, \frown, \times)$, while, as we shall see, $\text{Flip}(t)$ can be interpreted either in a standard way or following Definition ??.

Definition 2.5 (Semantics for Terms in \mathcal{RL}). Given a set of term variables \mathcal{G} , an environment $\xi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ is a mapping that assigns to each variable a string. Given a term t in \mathcal{RL} and an environment ξ , the *interpretation of t in ξ* is the string $\llbracket t \rrbracket_\xi \in \mathbb{S}$ inductively defined as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \llbracket \epsilon \rrbracket_\xi := \epsilon & \llbracket x \rrbracket_\xi := \xi(x) \in \mathbb{S} \\ \llbracket \mathbf{0} \rrbracket_\xi := \mathbf{0} & \llbracket t \frown s \rrbracket_\xi := \llbracket t \rrbracket_\xi \llbracket s \rrbracket_\xi \\ \llbracket \mathbf{1} \rrbracket_\xi := \mathbf{1} & \llbracket t \times s \rrbracket_\xi := \llbracket t \rrbracket_\xi \times \llbracket s \rrbracket_\xi. \end{array}$$

As in Chapter ??, we extend the canonical model \mathcal{W} with the probability probability space $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{W}} = (\mathbb{0}, \sigma(\mathcal{C}), \mu_{\mathcal{C}})$, where $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{0})$ is the Borel σ -algebra generated by cylinders $\mathbf{C}_\sigma^{\mathbf{b}} = \{\eta \mid \eta(\sigma) = \mathbf{b}\}$, for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{B}$, and such that $\mu_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{C}_\sigma^{\mathbf{b}}) = \frac{1}{2}$. To formally define cylinders over $\mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{S}}$, we slightly modify Billingsley's notion of *cylinder of rank n* .

²Actually, Ferreira proved this result for the theory Σ_1^b -NIA [6, pp. 148-149], but it clearly holds for \mathcal{RL} as well.

Definition 2.6 (Cylinder over S). For any countable set S , finite $K \subset S$ and $H \subseteq \mathbb{B}^K$,

$$\mathbf{C}(H) = \{\eta \in \mathbb{B}^S \mid \eta|_K \in H\},$$

is a *cylinder* over S .

Then, \mathcal{C} and $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ are defined in the standard way and the probability measure over it is defined as follows:³

Definition 2.7 (Cylinder Measure). For any countable set S , $K \subseteq S$ and $H \subseteq \mathbb{B}^K$ such that $\mathbf{C}(H) = \{\eta \in \mathbb{B}^S \mid \eta|_K \in H\}$,

$$\mu_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{C}(H)) = \frac{|H|}{2^{|K|}}.$$

This is a measure over $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$.

Then, formulas of \mathcal{RL} are interpreted as sets *measurable* sets.

Definition 2.8 (Semantics for Formulas in \mathcal{RL}). Given a term t , a formula F , and an environment $\xi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, where \mathcal{G} is the set of term variables, the *interpretation of F under ξ* is the measurable set of sequences $\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\xi} \in \sigma(\mathcal{C})$ inductively defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \mathbf{Flip}(t) \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \{\eta \mid \eta(\llbracket t \rrbracket_{\xi}) = \mathbb{1}\} & \llbracket \neg G \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \mathbb{0} - \llbracket G \rrbracket_{\xi} \\ \llbracket t = s \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \begin{cases} \mathbb{0} & \text{if } \llbracket t \rrbracket_{\xi} = \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\xi} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \llbracket G \vee H \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \llbracket G \rrbracket_{\xi} \cup \llbracket H \rrbracket_{\xi} \\ \llbracket t \subseteq s \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \begin{cases} \mathbb{0} & \text{if } \llbracket t \rrbracket_{\xi} \subseteq \llbracket s \rrbracket_{\xi} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \llbracket G \wedge H \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \llbracket G \rrbracket_{\xi} \cap \llbracket H \rrbracket_{\xi} \\ & & \llbracket G \rightarrow H \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= (\mathbb{0} - \llbracket G \rrbracket_{\xi}) \cup \llbracket H \rrbracket_{\xi} \\ & & \llbracket (\exists x)G \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{S}} \llbracket G \rrbracket_{\xi\{x \leftarrow i\}} \\ & & \llbracket (\forall x)G \rrbracket_{\xi} &:= \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{S}} \llbracket G \rrbracket_{\xi\{x \leftarrow i\}}. \end{aligned}$$

As anticipated, this semantics is well-defined. Indeed, the sets $\llbracket \mathbf{Flip}(t) \rrbracket_{\xi}$, $\llbracket t = s \rrbracket_{\xi}$ and $\llbracket t \subseteq s \rrbracket_{\xi}$ are measurable and measurability is preserved by all the logical operators.

A interpretation of the language \mathcal{RL} in the usual sense is given due to an environment ξ plus the choice of an interpretation η for $\mathbf{Flip}(x)$.

Definition 2.9 (Standard Semantics for Formulas in \mathcal{RL}). Given a \mathcal{RL} -formula F , and an interpretation $\rho = (\xi, \eta^{\mathbf{FLIP}})$, where $\xi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta^{\mathbf{FLIP}} \subseteq \mathbb{0}$, the *interpretation of F in ρ* $\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\rho}$, is inductively defined as follows:

³For further details, see [5].

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \text{Flip}(t) \rrbracket_\rho &:= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \eta^{\text{FLIP}}(\llbracket t \rrbracket_\rho) = \mathbb{1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \llbracket \neg G \rrbracket_\rho &:= 1 - \llbracket G \rrbracket_\rho \\
\llbracket t = s \rrbracket_\rho &:= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \llbracket t \rrbracket_\rho = \llbracket s \rrbracket_\rho \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} & \llbracket G \wedge H \rrbracket_\rho &:= \min\{\llbracket G \rrbracket_\rho, \llbracket H \rrbracket_\rho\} \\
\llbracket t \subseteq s \rrbracket_\rho &:= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \llbracket t \rrbracket_\rho \subseteq \llbracket s \rrbracket_\rho \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} & \llbracket G \vee H \rrbracket_\rho &:= \max\{\llbracket G \rrbracket_\rho, \llbracket H \rrbracket_\rho\} \\
& & \llbracket G \rightarrow H \rrbracket_\rho &:= \max\{1 - \llbracket G \rrbracket_\rho, \llbracket H \rrbracket_\rho\} \\
& & \llbracket (\forall x)G \rrbracket_\rho &:= \min\{\llbracket G \rrbracket_{\rho\{x \leftarrow \sigma\}} \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}\} \\
& & \llbracket (\exists x)G \rrbracket_\rho &:= \max\{\llbracket G \rrbracket_{\rho\{x \leftarrow \sigma\}} \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notation 2.5. For readability's sake, we abbreviate $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\rho$ simply as $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\eta$, and $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_\xi$ as $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$.

Observe that *quantitative* and *qualitative* semantics for \mathcal{RL} are mutually related, as can be proved by induction on the structure of formulas [5].

Proposition 2.2. For any formula F in \mathcal{RL} , environment ξ , function $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$ and $\rho = (\eta, \xi)$,

$$\llbracket F \rrbracket_{\xi, \eta} = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad \eta \in \llbracket F \rrbracket_\rho.$$

3 \mathbf{RS}_2^1 characterizes \mathcal{POR}

As said, our proof follows a so-to-say standard path [1, 6]. The first step consists in showing that functions in \mathcal{POR} are precisely those which are Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 . To do so, we extend Buss' representability conditions by adding a constraint to link the quantitative semantics of formulas in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 with the additional functional parameter η of oracle recursive functions.

Definition 3.1 (Σ_1^b -Representability). A function $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 if there is a Σ_1^b -formula $F(\vec{x}, y)$ of \mathcal{RL} such that:

1. $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\exists y)F(\vec{x}, y)$
2. $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\forall y)(\forall z)(F(\vec{x}, y) \wedge F(\vec{x}, z) \rightarrow y = z)$
3. for all $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_j, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$,

$$f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_j, \eta) = \tau \quad \text{iff} \quad \eta \in \llbracket F(\overline{\sigma}_1, \dots, \overline{\sigma}_j, \overline{\tau}) \rrbracket.$$

We recall that the language \mathcal{RL} allows us to associate the formula F with both a *qualitative* – namely, when dealing with 1. and 2. – and a *quantitative* interpretation – namely, in 3. Then, in Section 3.1, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 (\mathcal{POR} and \mathbf{RS}_2^1). For any function $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, f is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 when $f \in \mathcal{POR}$.

In particular, that any function in \mathcal{POR} is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 is proved in Section 3.1 by a straightforward induction on the structure of probabilistic oracle functions. The other direction is established in Section 3.2 by a realizability argument very close to the one offered in [3].




Figure 3: Relating \mathcal{POR} and \mathbf{RS}_2^1

3.1 Functions in \mathcal{POR} are Σ_1^b -Representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1

We prove that any function in \mathcal{POR} is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by constructing the desired formula by induction on the structure of oracle functions. Preliminarily notice that, for example, the formula $(\forall \vec{x})(\exists y)G(\vec{x}, y)$ occurring in condition 1. is *not* in Σ_1^b , since its existential quantifier is not bounded. Hence, in order to prove the inductive steps of Theorem 3.3 – namely, composition and bounded recursion on notation – we need to adapt Parikh’s theorem [10] to \mathbf{RS}_2^1 .⁴

Proposition 3.2 (“Parikh” [10]). *Let $F(\vec{x}, y)$ be a bounded formula in \mathcal{RL} such that $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\exists y)F(\vec{x}, y)$. Then, there is a term t such that,*

$$\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\exists y \leq t(\vec{x}))F(\vec{x}, y).$$

Theorem 3.3. *Every $f \in \mathcal{POR}$ is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 .*

Proof Sketch. The proof is by induction on the structure of functions in \mathcal{POR} .⁵

Base Case. Each basic function is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 . There are five possible sub-cases:

- *Empty (String) Function.* $f = E$ is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula:

$$F_E(x, y) : x = x \wedge y = \epsilon.$$

1. Existence is proved considering $y = \epsilon$. For the reflexivity of identity both $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash x = x$ and $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash \epsilon = \epsilon$ hold. So, by rules for conjunction, we obtain $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash x = x \wedge \epsilon = \epsilon$, and conclude:

$$\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)(x = x \wedge y = \epsilon).$$

⁴The theorem is usually presented in the context of Buss’ bounded theories, as stating that given a bounded formula F in \mathcal{L}_{\aleph} such that $\mathbf{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\exists y)F$, then there is a term $t(\vec{x})$ such that also $\mathbf{S}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\exists y \leq t(\vec{x}))F(\vec{x}, y)$ [1, 2]. Furthermore, due to [8], Buss’ syntactic proof can be adapted to Σ_1^b -NIA in a natural way. The same result holds for \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , which does not contain any specific rule concerning $\text{Flip}(\cdot)$.

⁵For further details, see Appendix [?].

2. Uniqueness is proved assuming $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash x = x \wedge z = \epsilon$. By rules for conjunction, in particular $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash z = \epsilon$, and since $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash y = \epsilon$, by the transitivity of identity, we conclude

$$\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash y = z.$$

3. Assume $E(\sigma, \eta^*) = \tau$. If $\tau = \epsilon$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} \wedge \bar{\tau} = \epsilon \rrbracket &= \llbracket \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \bar{\tau} = \epsilon \rrbracket \\ &= \mathbb{0} \cap \mathbb{0} \\ &= \mathbb{0}. \end{aligned}$$

So, in this case, for any $\eta^*, \eta^* \in \llbracket \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} \wedge \bar{\tau} = \epsilon \rrbracket$, as clearly $\eta^* \in \mathbb{0}$.

If $\tau \neq \epsilon$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} \wedge \bar{\tau} = \epsilon \rrbracket &= \llbracket \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \bar{\tau} = \epsilon \rrbracket \\ &= \mathbb{0} \cap \emptyset \\ &= \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

So, for any $\eta^*, \eta^* \notin \llbracket \bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma} \wedge \bar{\tau} = \epsilon \rrbracket$, as clearly $\eta^* \notin \emptyset$.

- *Projection (String) Function.* $f = P_i^n$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula:

$$F_{P_i^n}(x, y) : \bigwedge_{j \in J} (x_j = x_j) \wedge y = x_i,$$

where $J = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\}$.

- *Word-Successor Function.* $f = S_b$ is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula:

$$F_{S_b}(x, y) : y = x\mathbf{b}$$

where $\mathbf{b} = 0$ if $b = 0$ and $\mathbf{b} = 1$ if $b = 1$.

- *Conditional (String) Function.* $f = C$ is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula:

$$\begin{aligned} F_C(x, v, z_0, z_1, y) : & (x = \epsilon \wedge y = v) \vee (\exists x' \preceq x)(x = x'0 \wedge y = z_0) \\ & \vee (\exists x' \preceq x)(x = x'1 \wedge y = z_1). \end{aligned}$$

- *Query (String) Function.* $f = Q$ is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula:

$$F_Q(x, y) : (\mathbf{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg \mathbf{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 0).$$

Notice that, in this case, the proof crucially relies on the fact that oracle functions invoke *exactly one* oracle.

- Existence is proved by cases. If $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash \text{Flip}(x)$, let $y = 1$. By the reflexivity of identity, $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash 1 = 1$ holds, so also $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash \text{Flip}(x) \wedge 1 = 1$. By rules for disjunction, we conclude $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\text{Flip}(x) \wedge 1 = 1) \vee (\neg\text{Flip}(x) \wedge 1 = 0)$ and so,

$$\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\exists y)((\text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg\text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 0)).$$

If $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash \neg\text{Flip}(x)$, let $y = 0$. By the reflexivity of identity $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash 0 = 0$ holds. Thus, by the rules for conjunction, $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash \neg\text{Flip}(x) \wedge 0 = 0$ and for disjunction, we conclude $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\text{Flip}(x) \wedge 0 = 1) \vee (\neg\text{Flip}(x) \wedge 0 = 0)$ and so,

$$\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\exists y)((\text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg\text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 0)).$$

- Uniqueness is established relying on the transitivity of identity.
- Finally, it is shown that for every $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta^* \in \mathbb{O}$, $Q(\sigma, \eta^*) = \tau$ when $\eta^* \in \llbracket F_Q(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}) \rrbracket$. Assume $Q(\sigma, \eta^*) = \mathbb{1}$, which is $\eta^*(\sigma) = \mathbb{1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket F_Q(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}) \rrbracket &= \llbracket \text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \wedge \bar{\tau} = \mathbb{1} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \neg\text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \wedge \bar{\tau} = 0 \rrbracket \\ &= (\llbracket \text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1} \rrbracket) \cup (\llbracket \neg\text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \mathbb{1} = 0 \rrbracket) \\ &= (\llbracket \text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \rrbracket \cap \mathbb{O}) \cup (\llbracket \neg\text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \rrbracket \cap \emptyset) \\ &= \llbracket \text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \rrbracket \\ &= \{\eta \mid \eta(\sigma) = \mathbb{1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\eta^* \in \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \wedge \bar{\tau} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg\text{Flip}(\bar{\sigma}) \wedge \bar{\tau} = 0) \rrbracket$.

The case $Q(\sigma, \eta^*) = \mathbb{0}$ and the opposite direction are proved in a similar way.

Inductive Case. If f is defined by composition or bounded recursion from Σ_1^b -representable functions, then f is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 :

- Composition.* Assume that f is defined by composition from functions g, h_1, \dots, h_k so that

$$f(\vec{x}, \eta) = g(h_1(\vec{x}, \eta), \dots, h_k(\vec{x}, \eta), \eta)$$

and that g, h_1, \dots, h_k are represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the Σ_1^b -formulas $F_g, F_{h_1}, \dots, F_{h_k}$, respectively. By Proposition 3.2, there exist suitable terms $t_g, t_{h_1}, \dots, t_{h_k}$ such that condition 1. of Definition 3.1 can be strengthened to $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\exists y \preceq t_i) F_i(\vec{x}, y)$ for each $i \in \{g, h_1, \dots, h_k\}$. We conclude that $f(\vec{x}, \eta)$ is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the following formula:

$$F_f(x, y) : (\exists z_1 \preceq t_{h_1}(\vec{x})) \dots (\exists z_k \preceq t_{h_k}(\vec{x})) (F_{h_1}(\vec{x}, z_1) \wedge \dots \wedge F_{h_k}(\vec{x}, z_k) \wedge F_g(z_1, \dots, z_k, y)).$$

Indeed, by IH, $F_g, F_{h_1}, \dots, F_{h_k}$ are Σ_1^b -formulas. Then, also F_f is in Σ_1^b . Conditions 1.-3. are proved to hold by slightly modifying standard proofs.

- *Bounded Recursion.* Assume that f is defined by bounded recursion from g, h_0 , and h_1 so that:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\vec{x}, \epsilon, \eta) &= g(\vec{x}, \eta) \\ f(\vec{x}, y\mathbf{b}, \eta) &= h_i(\vec{x}, y, f(\vec{x}, y, \eta), \eta)|_{t(\vec{x}, y)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathbf{b} = 0$ when $i = 0$ while and $\mathbf{b} = 1$ when $i = 1$. Let g, h_0, h_1 be represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by, respectively, the Σ_1^b -formulas F_g, F_{h_0} , and F_{h_1} . Moreover, by Proposition 3.2, there exist suitable terms t_g, t_{h_0} , and t_{h_1} such that condition 1. of Definition 3.1 can be strengthened to its “bounded version”. Then, it can be proved that $f(\vec{x}, y)$ is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula below:

$$\begin{aligned} F_f(x, y) : & (\exists v \preceq t_g(\vec{x})t_f(\vec{x})(y \times t(\vec{x}, y)t(\vec{x}, y)\mathbf{1})) (F_{lh}(v, \mathbf{1} \times y\mathbf{1}) \\ & \wedge (\exists z \preceq t_g(\vec{x}))(F_{eval}(v, \epsilon, z) \wedge F_g(\vec{x}, z)) \\ & \wedge (\forall u \subseteq y)(\exists z)(\tilde{z} \preceq t(\vec{x}, y))(F_{eval}(v, \mathbf{1} \times u, z) \wedge F_{eval}(v, \mathbf{1} \times u\mathbf{1}, \tilde{z})) \\ & \wedge (u\mathbf{0} \subseteq y \rightarrow (\exists z_0 \preceq t_{h_0}(\vec{x}, u, z))(F_{h_0}(\vec{x}, u, z, z_0) \wedge z_0|_{t(\vec{x}, u)} = \tilde{z})) \\ & \wedge (u\mathbf{1} \subseteq y \rightarrow (\exists z_1 \preceq t_{h_1}(\vec{x}, u, z))(F_{h_1}(\vec{x}, u, z, z_1) \wedge z_1|_{t(\vec{x}, u)} = \tilde{z}))), \end{aligned}$$

where F_{lh} and F_{eval} are Σ_1^b -formulas defined as in [7]. Intuitively, $F_{lh}(x, y)$ states that the number of 1s in the encoding of x is yy , while $F_{eval}(x, y, z)$ is a “decoding” formula (strongly resembling Gödel’s β -formula), expressing that the “bit” encoded in x as its y -th bit is z . Moreover $x \subseteq y$ is an abbreviation for $x \subseteq y \wedge x \neq y$. Then, this formula F_f satisfies all the requirements to Σ_1^b -represent in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 the function f , obtained by bounded recursion from g, h_0 , and h_1 . In particular, conditions 1. and 2. concerning existence and uniqueness, have already been proved to hold by Ferreira [7]. Furthermore, F_f expresses that, given the desired encoding sequence v : (i.) the ϵ -th bit of v is (the encoding of) z' such that $F_g(\vec{x}, z')$ holds, where (for IH) F_g is the Σ_1^b -formula representing the function g , and (ii.) given that for each $u \subseteq y$, z denotes the “bit” encoded in v at position $\mathbf{1} \times u$ and, similarly, \tilde{z} is the next “bit”, encoded in v at position $\mathbf{1} \times u\mathbf{1}$, then if $u\mathbf{b} \subseteq y$ (that is, if we are considering the initial substring of y the last bit of which corresponds to \mathbf{b}), then there is a z_b such that $F_{h_b}(\vec{x}, y, z, z_b)$, where F_{h_b} Σ_1^b -represents the function f_{h_b} and the truncation of z_b at $t(\vec{x}, u)$ is precisely \tilde{z} , with $b = 0$ when $\mathbf{b} = 0$ and $b = 1$ when $\mathbf{b} = 1$.⁶

□

⁶Otherwise said, if $u\mathbf{0} \subseteq y$, there is a z_0 such that the Σ_1^b -formula $F_{h_0}(\vec{x}, u, z, z_0)$ represents the function h_0 and, in this case, \tilde{z} corresponds to the truncation of z_0 at $t(\vec{x}, u)$, that is the “bit” encoded by v at the position $\mathbf{1} \times u\mathbf{1}$ (i.e. corresponding to $u\mathbf{0} \subseteq y$) is precisely such \tilde{z} . Equally, if $u\mathbf{1} \subseteq y$, there is a z_0 such that the Σ_1^b -formula $F_{h_1}(\vec{x}, u, z, z_1)$ represents now the function h_1 and \tilde{z} corresponds to the truncation of z_1 at $t(\vec{x}, u)$, that is the “bit” encoded by v at position $\mathbf{1} \times u\mathbf{1}$ (i.e. corresponding to $u\mathbf{1} \subseteq y$) is precisely such \tilde{z} . For further details, see Appendix [?].

3.2 The functions which are Σ_1^b -Representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 are in \mathcal{POR}

Here, we consider the opposite direction. Our proof is obtained by adapting that by Cook and Urquhart for IPV^ω [3]. It passes through a *realizability interpretation* of the intuitionistic version of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , called \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 and is structured as follows:

1. First, we define \mathcal{POR}^λ a basic equational theory for a simply typed λ -calculus endowed with primitives corresponding to functions of \mathcal{POR} .
2. Second, we introduce a first-order *intuitionistic* theory \mathcal{IPOR}^λ , which extends \mathcal{POR}^λ with the usual predicate calculus as well as an **NP**-induction schema. It is shown that \mathcal{IPOR}^λ is strong enough to prove all theorems of \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 , the intuitionistic version of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 .
3. Then, we develop a realizability interpretation of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ (inside itself), showing that from any derivation of $(\forall x)(\exists y)F(x, y)$ (where F is a Σ_0^b -formula) one can extract a λ -term t of \mathcal{POR}^λ , such that $(\forall x)F(x, tx)$ is provable in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . From this we deduce that every function which is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 is in \mathcal{POR} .
4. Finally, we extend this result to classical \mathbf{RS}_2^1 showing that any Σ_1^b -formula provable in $\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda + \text{Excluded Middle (EM, for short)}$ is already provable in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ .

3.2.1 The System \mathcal{POR}^λ

We define an equational theory for a simply typed λ -calculus augmented with primitives for functions of \mathcal{POR} . Actually, these do not exactly correspond to the ones of \mathcal{POR} , although the resulting function algebra is proved equivalent.⁷

The Syntax of \mathcal{POR}^λ . We start by considering the syntax of \mathcal{POR}^λ .

Definition 3.2 (Types of \mathcal{POR}^λ). *Types of \mathcal{POR}^λ* are defined by the grammar below:

$$\sigma := s \quad | \quad \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma.$$

Definition 3.3 (Terms of \mathcal{POR}^λ). *Terms of \mathcal{POR}^λ* are standard, simply typed

⁷Our choice follows the principle that the defining equations for the functions different from the recursion operator should not depend on it.

λ -terms plus the constants below:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, \epsilon : s \\
& \circ : s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s \\
& \mathbf{Tail} : s \Rightarrow s \\
& \mathbf{Trunc} : s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s \\
& \mathbf{Cond} : s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s \\
& \mathbf{Flipcoin} : s \Rightarrow s \\
& \mathbf{Red} : s \Rightarrow (s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s) \Rightarrow (s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s) \Rightarrow (s \Rightarrow s) \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s.
\end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, $\mathbf{Tail}(x)$ computes the string obtained by deleting the first digit of x ; $\mathbf{Trunc}(x, y)$ computes the string obtained by truncating x at the length of y ; $\mathbf{Cond}(x, y, z, w)$ computes the function that yields y when $x = \epsilon$, z when $x = x'\mathbf{0}$, and w when $x = x'\mathbf{1}$; $\mathbf{Flipcoin}(x)$ indicates a random $\mathbf{0}/\mathbf{1}$ generator; \mathbf{Rec} is the operator for bounded recursion on notation.

Notation 3.1. We usually abbreviate $x \circ y$ as xy . Moreover, for readability's sake, being \mathbf{T} any constant \mathbf{Tail} , \mathbf{Trunc} , \mathbf{Cond} , $\mathbf{Flipcoin}$, \mathbf{Rec} of arity n , we indicate $\mathbf{T}u_1, \dots, u_n$ as $\mathbf{T}(u_1, \dots, u_n)$.

\mathcal{POR}^λ is reminiscent of \mathbf{PV}^ω by Cook and Urquhart [3] without the induction rule (R5) that we do not need. The main difference being the constant $\mathbf{Flipcoin}$, which, as said, intuitively denotes a function which randomly generates either $\mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{1}$ when reads a string.⁸

Remark 3.1. In the following, we often define terms implicitly using bounded recursion on notation. Otherwise said, we define new terms, say $\mathbf{F} : s \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow s$, by equations of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{F}\vec{x}\epsilon & := \mathbf{G}\vec{x} \\
\mathbf{F}\vec{x}(y\mathbf{0}) & := \mathbf{H}_0\vec{x}y(\mathbf{F}\vec{x}y) \\
\mathbf{F}\vec{x}(y\mathbf{1}) & := \mathbf{H}_1\vec{x}y(\mathbf{F}\vec{x}y),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}_0, \mathbf{H}_1$ are already-defined terms, and the second and third equations satisfy a length bound given by some term \mathbf{K} (which is usually $\lambda\vec{x}\lambda y.\mathbf{0}$). The term \mathbf{F} can be explicitly defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{F} := \lambda\vec{x}.\lambda y.\mathbf{Rec}(\mathbf{G}\vec{x}, \lambda yy'.\mathbf{H}_0\vec{x}yy', \lambda yy'.\mathbf{H}_1\vec{x}yy', \mathbf{K}\vec{x}, y).$$

We also introduce the following abbreviations for composed functions:

- $\mathbf{B}(x) := \mathbf{Cond}(x, \epsilon, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1})$ denotes the function that computes the last digit of x , i.e. coerces x to a Boolean value
- $\mathbf{BNeg}(x) := \mathbf{Cond}(x, \epsilon, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{0})$ denotes the function that computes the Boolean negation of $\mathbf{B}(x)$

⁸These interpretations will be made clear by Definition 3.6 below.

- $\text{BOr}(x, y) := \text{Cond}(\text{B}(x), \text{B}(y), \text{B}(y), 1)$ denotes the function that coerces x and y to Booleans and then performs the OR operation
- $\text{BAnd}(x, y) := \text{Cond}(\text{B}(x), \epsilon, 0, \text{B}(y))$ denotes the function that coerces x and y to Booleans and then performs the AND operation
- $\text{Eps}(x) := \text{Cond}(x, 1, 0, 0)$ denotes the characteristic function of the predicate “ $x = \epsilon$ ”
- $\text{Bool}(x) := \text{BAnd}(\text{Eps}(\text{Tail}(x)), \text{BNeg}(\text{Eps}(x)))$ denotes the characteristic function of the predicate “ $x = 0 \vee x = 1$ ”
- $\text{Zero}(x) := \text{Cond}(\text{Bool}(x), 0, \text{Cond}(x, 0, 0, 1), 0)$ denotes the characteristic function of the predicate “ $x = 0$ ”
- $\text{Conc}(x, y)$ denotes the concatenation function defined by the equations below:

$$\text{Conc}(x, \epsilon) := x \quad \text{Conc}(x, y\mathbf{b}) := \text{Conc}(x, y)\mathbf{b},$$

with $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$.

- $\text{Eq}(x, y)$ denotes the characteristic function of the predicate “ $x = y$ ” and is defined by double recursion by the equation below:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Eq}(\epsilon, \epsilon) &:= 1 & \text{Eq}(\epsilon, y\mathbf{b}) &:= 0 \\ \text{Eq}(x\mathbf{b}, \epsilon) &= \text{Eq}(x0, y1) = \text{Eq}(x1, y0) := 0 & \text{Eq}(x\mathbf{b}, y\mathbf{b}) &:= \text{Eq}(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$

- $\text{Times}(x, y)$ denotes the function for self-concatenation, $x, y \mapsto x \times y$, and is defined by the equations below:

$$\text{Times}(x, \epsilon) := \epsilon \quad \text{Times}(x, y\mathbf{b}) := \text{Conc}(\text{Times}(x, y), x),$$

with $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$.

- $\text{Sub}(x, y)$ denotes the initial-substring functions, $x, y \mapsto S(x, y)$, and is defined by bounded recursion as follows:

$$\text{Sub}(x, \epsilon) := \text{Eps}(x) \quad \text{Sub}(x, y\mathbf{b}) := \text{BOr}(\text{Sub}(x, y), \text{Eq}(x, y\mathbf{b})),$$

with $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$.

Definition 3.4 (Formulas of \mathcal{POR}^λ). *Formulas of \mathcal{POR}^λ are equations $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$, where \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} are terms of type s .*

The Theory \mathcal{POR}^λ . We now introduce the theory \mathcal{POR}^λ .

Definition 3.5 (Theory \mathcal{POR}^λ). Axioms of \mathcal{POR}^λ are the following ones:

- Defining equations for the constants of \mathcal{POR}^λ :

$$\epsilon x = x\epsilon = x \quad x(y\mathbf{b}) = (xy)\mathbf{b}$$

$$\text{Tail}(\epsilon) = \epsilon \quad \text{Tail}(x\mathbf{b}) = x$$

$$\text{Trunc}(x, \epsilon) = \text{Trunc}(\epsilon, x) = \epsilon$$

$$\text{Trunc}(x\mathbf{b}, y\mathbf{0}) = \text{Trunc}(x\mathbf{b}, y\mathbf{1}) = \text{Trunc}(x, y)\mathbf{b}$$

$$\text{Cond}(\epsilon, y, z, w) = y \quad \text{Cond}(x\mathbf{0}, y, z, w) = z \quad \text{Cond}(x\mathbf{1}, y, z, w) = w$$

$$\text{Bool}(\text{Flipcoin}(x)) = \mathbf{1}$$

$$\text{Rec}(x, h_0, h_1, k, \epsilon) = x$$

$$\text{Rec}(x, h_0, h_1, k, y\mathbf{b}) = \text{Trunc}(h_b y(\text{Rec}(x, h_0, h_1, k, y)), k y),$$

where $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $b \in \{0, 1\}$.⁹

- The (β) - and (ν) -axioms:

$$\mathbf{C}[(\lambda x.t)\mathbf{u}] = \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{t}\{\mathbf{u}/x\}] \quad (\beta)$$

$$\mathbf{C}[\lambda x.tx] = \mathbf{C}[\mathbf{t}]. \quad (\nu)$$

where $\mathbf{C}[\cdot]$ indicates a context with a unique occurrence of the hole $[\]$, so that $\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{t}]$ denotes the variable capturing replacement of $[\]$ by \mathbf{t} in $\mathbf{C}[\]$.

The inference rules of \mathcal{POR}^λ are the following ones:

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u} \vdash \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{t} \quad (\text{R1})$$

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} \vdash \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{v} \quad (\text{R2})$$

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u} \vdash \mathbf{v}\{\mathbf{t}/x\} = \mathbf{v}\{\mathbf{u}/x\} \quad (\text{R3})$$

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u} \vdash \mathbf{t}\{\mathbf{v}/x\} = \mathbf{u}\{\mathbf{v}/x\}. \quad (\text{R4})$$

As predictable, $\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$ expresses that the equation $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$ is deducible using instances of the axioms above plus inference rules (R1)-(R4). Similarly, given any set T of equations, $T \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$ expresses that the equation $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$ is deducible using instances of the quoted axioms and rules together with equations from T .

Relating \mathcal{POR} and \mathcal{POR}^λ . For any string $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$, let $\overline{\sigma} : s$ denote the term of \mathcal{POR}^λ corresponding to it, that is:

$$\overline{\epsilon} = \epsilon \quad \overline{\sigma\mathbf{0}} = \overline{\sigma}\mathbf{0} \quad \overline{\sigma\mathbf{1}} = \overline{\sigma}\mathbf{1}.$$

⁹When if $\mathbf{b} = 0$, then $b = 0$ and $\mathbf{b} = 1$, then $b = 1$.

For any $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, let T_η be the set of all equations of the form $\text{Flipcoin}(\overline{\sigma}) = \overline{\eta(\sigma)}$.

Definition 3.6 (Provable Representability). Let $f : \mathbb{O} \times \mathbb{S}^j \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$. A term $t : s \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow s$ of \mathcal{POR}^λ provably represents f when for all strings $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_j, \sigma \in \mathbb{S}$, and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$,

$$f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_j, \eta) = \sigma \quad \text{iff} \quad T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} t\overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_j} = \overline{\sigma}.$$

Example 3.1. The term $\text{Flipcoin} : s \Rightarrow s$ provably represents the query function $Q(x, \eta) = \eta(x)$ of \mathcal{POR} , since for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$,

$$\text{Flipcoin}(\overline{\sigma}) = \overline{\eta(\sigma)} \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \text{Flipcoin}(\overline{\sigma}) = \overline{Q(\sigma, \eta)}.$$

We now consider some of the terms described above and show them to provably represent the intended functions. Let $\text{Tail}(\sigma, \eta)$ indicate the string obtained by chopping the first digit of σ , and $\text{Trunc}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \eta) = \sigma_1|_{\sigma_2}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Terms Tail, Trunc and Cond provably represent the functions Tail, Trunc, and C, respectively.*

Proof Sketch. For **Tail** and **Cond**, the claim follows immediately from the defining axioms of the corresponding constants. For example, if $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2\mathbb{0}$, then $\text{Tail}(\sigma_1, \eta) = \sigma_2$ (and $\overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_2\mathbb{0}} = \overline{\sigma_2}\mathbb{0}$). Using the defining axioms of **Tail**,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \text{Tail}(\overline{\sigma_1}) = \text{Tail}(\overline{\sigma_2\mathbb{0}}) = \overline{\sigma_2}.$$

For **Trunc** by double induction on $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{S}$ we conclude:

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \text{Trunc}(\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2}) = \overline{\sigma_1|_{\sigma_2}}.$$

□

We generalize this result by Theorem 3.5 below.

Theorem 3.5. 1. Any function $f \in \mathcal{POR}$ is provably represented by a term $t \in \mathcal{POR}^\lambda$.

2. For any term $t \in \mathcal{POR}^\lambda$, there is a function $f \in \mathcal{POR}$ such that f is provably represented by t .

Proof Sketch. 1. The proof is by induction on the structure of $f \in \mathcal{POR}$:

Base Case. Each base function is provably representable. Let us consider two examples only:

- *Empty Function.* $f = E$ is provably represented by the term $\lambda x. \epsilon$. For any string $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$, $\overline{E(\sigma, \eta)} = \overline{\epsilon} = \epsilon$ holds. Moreover, $\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} (\lambda x. \epsilon)\overline{\sigma} = \epsilon$ is an instance of the (β) -axiom. So, we conclude:

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} (\lambda x. \epsilon)\overline{\sigma} = \overline{E(\sigma, \eta)}.$$

- *Query Function.* $f = Q$ is provably represented by the term `Flipcoin`, as observed in Example 3.1 above.

Inductive case. Each function defined by composition or bounded recursion from provably represented functions is provably represented as well. We consider the case of bounded recursion. Let f be defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \epsilon, \eta) &= g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \eta) \\ f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma \mathbb{0}, \eta) &= h_0(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma, f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma, \eta), \eta) |_{k(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma)} \\ f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma \mathbb{1}, \eta) &= h_1(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma, f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma, \eta), \eta) |_{k(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma)}. \end{aligned}$$

By IH, g, h_0, h_1 , and k are provably represented by the corresponding terms $\mathbf{t}_g, \mathbf{t}_{h_0}, \mathbf{t}_{h_1}, \mathbf{t}_k$, respectively. So, for any $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+2}, \sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{0}$, we derive:

$$\begin{aligned} T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_g \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n}} &= \overline{\overline{g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \eta)}} & (\mathbf{t}_g) \\ T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_{h_0} \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_{n+2}}} &= \overline{\overline{h_0(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+2}, \eta)}} & (\mathbf{t}_{h_0}) \\ T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_{h_1} \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_{n+2}}} &= \overline{\overline{h_1(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n+2}, \eta)}} & (\mathbf{t}_{h_1}) \\ T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_k \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n}} &= \overline{\overline{k(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \eta)}}. & (\mathbf{t}_k) \end{aligned}$$

We can prove by induction on σ that,

$$T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_f \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n \sigma}} = \overline{\overline{f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \eta)}},$$

where

$$\mathbf{t}_f : \lambda x_1 \dots \lambda x_n. \lambda x. \text{Rec}(\mathbf{t}_g x_1 \dots x_n, \mathbf{t}_{h_0} x_1 \dots x_n, \mathbf{t}_{h_1} x_1 \dots x_n, \mathbf{t}_k x_1 \dots x_n, x).$$

Then,

- if $\sigma = \epsilon$, then $f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma, \eta) = g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \eta)$. Using the (β) -axiom, we deduce,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_f \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n \sigma}} = \text{Rec}(\mathbf{t}_g \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n}}, \mathbf{t}_{h_0} \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n}}, \mathbf{t}_{h_1} \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n}}, \mathbf{t}_k \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n}}, \overline{\overline{\sigma}})$$

and using the axiom $\text{Rec}(\mathbf{t}_g x_1 \dots x_n, \mathbf{t}_{h_0} x_1 \dots x_n, \mathbf{t}_{h_1} x_1 \dots x_n, \mathbf{t}_k x_1 \dots x_n, \epsilon) = \mathbf{t}_g x_1 \dots x_n$, we obtain,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_f \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n \sigma}} = \mathbf{t}_g \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n}},$$

by (R2) and (R3). We conclude using (\mathbf{t}_g) together with (R2).

- if $\sigma = \sigma_m \mathbb{0}$, then $f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma, \eta) = h_0(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_m, f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma, \eta), \eta) |_{k(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_m)}$. By IH, we suppose,

$$T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_f \overline{\overline{\sigma_1}} \dots \overline{\overline{\sigma_n \sigma_m}} = \overline{\overline{f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma', \eta)}}.$$

Then, using the (β) -axiom $\mathbf{t}_{f\overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n} \overline{\sigma}} = \text{Rec}(\mathbf{t}_g \overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n}, \mathbf{t}_{h_0} \overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n}, \mathbf{t}_{h_1} \overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n}, \mathbf{t}_k \overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n}, \overline{\sigma})$ the axiom $\text{Rec}(g, h_0, h_1, k, x0) = \text{Trunc}(h_0 x (\text{Rec}(g, h_0, h_1, k, 0)), kx)$ and IH we deduce,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_{f\overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n} \overline{\sigma}} = \text{Trunc}(\mathbf{t}_{h_0} \overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n} \overline{\sigma_m} \overline{f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_m, \eta)}, \mathbf{t}_k \overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n})$$

by (R2) and (R3). Using (\mathbf{t}_{h_0}) and (\mathbf{t}_k) we conclude using (R3) and (R2):

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}_{f\overline{\sigma_1} \dots \overline{\sigma_n} \overline{\sigma}} = \overline{\overline{h_0(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_m, f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_m, \eta)) |_{k(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_m)}}}$$

- the case $\sigma = \sigma_m \mathbb{1}$ is proved in a similar way.

2. It is a consequence of the normalization property for the simply typed λ -calculus: a β -normal term $\mathbf{t} : s \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow s$ cannot contain variables of higher types. By exhaustively inspecting possible normal forms one can check that these all represent functions in \mathcal{POR} . \square

Corollary 3.1. *For any function $f : \mathbb{S}^j \times \mathbb{0} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, $f \in \mathcal{POR}$ when f is provably represented by some term $\mathbf{t} : s \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow s \in \mathcal{POR}^\lambda$.*

3.2.2 The Theory \mathcal{IPOR}^λ

We introduce a first-order *intuitionistic* theory, called \mathcal{IPOR}^λ , which extends \mathcal{POR}^λ with basic predicate calculus and a restricted induction principle. We also define \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 as a variant of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 having the intuitionistic – rather than classical – predicate calculus as its logical basis. All theorems of \mathcal{POR}^λ and \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 are provable in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . In fact, \mathcal{IPOR}^λ can be seen as an extension of \mathcal{POR}^λ , and provides a language to associate derivations in \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 with poly-time computable functions (corresponding to terms of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ).

The Syntax of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . The equational theory \mathcal{POR}^λ is rather weak. In particular, even simple equations, such as $x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{B}(x)$, cannot be proved in it. Indeed, induction is needed:

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} \epsilon &= \epsilon\epsilon = \text{Tail}(\epsilon)\mathbf{B}(\epsilon) \\ x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{B}(x) &\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} x0 = \text{Tail}(x0)\mathbf{B}(x0) \\ x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{B}(x) &\vdash_{\mathcal{POR}^\lambda} x1 = \text{Tail}(x1)\mathbf{B}(x1). \end{aligned}$$

From this we would like to deduce, by induction, that $x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{B}(x)$. Thus, we introduce \mathcal{IPOR}^λ , the language of which extends that of \mathcal{POR}^λ with (a translation for) all expressions of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 . In particular, the grammar for terms of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ is precisely the same as that of Definition 3.3, while that for formulas is defined below.

Definition 3.7 (Formulas of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ). *Formulas of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ are defined as follows: (i.) all equations of \mathcal{POR}^λ $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{u}$, are formulas of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ ; (ii.) for any (possibly open) term of \mathcal{POR}^λ , say \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{u} , $\mathbf{t} \subseteq \mathbf{u}$ and $\text{Flip}(\mathbf{t})$ are formulas of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ ; (iii.) formulas of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ are closed under $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \forall, \exists$.*

Notation 3.2. We adopt the standard conventions: $\perp := 0 = 1$ and $\neg F := F \rightarrow \perp$.

The notions of Σ_0^b - and Σ_1^b -formula of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ are precisely those for \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , as introduced in Definition 2.3.

Remark 3.2. Any formula of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 can be seen as a formula of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ , where each occurrence of the symbol 0 is replaced by $\mathbf{0}$, of 1 by $\mathbf{1}$, of \neg by \circ (usually omitted), of \times by Times. In the following, we assume that any formula of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 is a formula of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ , modulo the substitutions defined above.

Definition 3.8 (The Theory \mathcal{IPOR}^λ). The axioms of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ include standard rules of the intuitionistic first-order predicate calculus, usual rules for the equality symbol, and axioms below:

1. All axioms of \mathcal{POR}^λ
2. $x \subseteq y \leftrightarrow \text{Sub}(x, y) = 1$
3. $x = \epsilon \vee x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{0} \vee x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{1}$
4. $\mathbf{0} = 1 \rightarrow x = \epsilon$
5. $\text{Cond}(x, y, z, w) = w' \leftrightarrow (x = \epsilon \wedge w' = y) \vee (x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{0} \wedge w' = z) \vee (x = \text{Tail}(x)\mathbf{1} \wedge w' = w)$
6. $\text{Flip}(x) \leftrightarrow \text{Flipcoin}(x) = 1$
7. Any formula of the form,

$$(F(\epsilon) \wedge (\forall x)(F(x) \rightarrow F(x\mathbf{0})) \wedge (\forall x)(F(x) \rightarrow F(x\mathbf{1}))) \rightarrow (\forall y)F(y),$$

where F is of the form $(\exists z \preceq \mathbf{t})\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$, with \mathbf{t} containing only first-order open variables.

Notation 3.3 (NP-Predicate). We refer to a formula of the form $(\exists z \preceq \mathbf{t})\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$, with \mathbf{t} containing only first-order open variables, as an **NP**-predicate.

Relating \mathcal{IPOR}^λ with \mathcal{POR}^λ and \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 . Now that \mathcal{IPOR}^λ has been introduced we show that theorems of both \mathcal{POR}^λ and the intuitionistic version of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 are derived in it. First, Proposition 3.6 is easily established by inspecting all rules of \mathcal{POR}^λ .

Proposition 3.6. Any theorem of \mathcal{POR}^λ is a theorem of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ .

Then, we consider \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 and establish that every theorem in it is derivable in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . To do so, we prove a few properties concerning \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . In particular, its recursion schema differs from that of \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 as dealing with formulas of the form $(\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$ and not with all the Σ_1^b -ones. The two schemas are related by Proposition 3.7, proved by induction on the structure of formulas.¹⁰

¹⁰For further details, see Appendix [?].

Proposition 3.7. *For any Σ_0^b -formula $F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in \mathcal{RL} , there exists a term $t_F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of \mathcal{POR}^λ such that:*

1. $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F \leftrightarrow t_F = 0$
2. $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} t_F = 0 \vee t_F = 1$.

This leads us to the following corollary and allows us to prove Theorem 3.8 relating \mathcal{IPOR}^λ and \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 .

Corollary 3.2. *i. For any Σ_0^b -formula F , $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F \vee \neg F$.
ii. For any closed Σ_0^b -formula of \mathcal{RL} F and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, either $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$ or $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \neg F$.*

Theorem 3.8. *Any theorem of \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 is a theorem of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ .*

Proof. First, observe that, as a consequence of Proposition 3.7, for any Σ_1^b -formula $F = (\exists x_1 \preceq t_1) \dots (\exists x_n \preceq t_n)G$ in \mathcal{RL} ,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F \leftrightarrow (\exists x_1 \preceq t_1) \dots (\exists x_n \preceq t_n)t_G = 0,$$

any instance of the Σ_1^b -recursion schema of \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 is derivable in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ from the **NP**-induction schema. Then, it suffices to check that all basic axioms of \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 are provable in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . \square

This result also leads to the following straightforward consequences.

Corollary 3.3. *For any closed Σ_0^b -formula F and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, either $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$ or $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \neg F$.*

Due to Corollary 3.3, we can even establish the following Lemma 3.9.

Lemma 3.9. *Let F be a closed Σ_0^b -formula of \mathcal{RL} and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, then:*

$$T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F \quad \text{iff} \quad \eta \in \llbracket F \rrbracket.$$

Proof. (\Rightarrow) This soundness result is established by induction on the structure of rules for \mathcal{IPOR}^λ .

(\Leftarrow) For Corollary 3.3, we know that either $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$ or $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \neg F$. Hence, if $\eta \in \llbracket F \rrbracket$, then it cannot be $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \neg F$ (by soundness). So, we conclude $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$. \square

3.2.3 Realizability

Here, we introduce realizability as internal to \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . As a corollary, we obtain that from any derivation in \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 – actually, in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ – of a formula in the form $(\forall x)(\exists y)F(x, y)$, one can extract a functional term of \mathcal{POR}^λ $f : s \Rightarrow s$, such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, fx)$. This allows us to conclude that if a function f is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 , then $f \in \mathcal{POR}$.

Notation 3.4. Let \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} denote finite sequences of term variables, (resp.) x_1, \dots, x_n and y_1, \dots, y_k , and $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{y})$ be an abbreviation for $y_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, y_k(\mathbf{x})$. Let Λ be a shorthand for the empty sequence and $y(\Lambda) := y$.

Definition 3.9. Formulas $x \textcircled{R} F$ are defined by induction as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda \textcircled{R} F &:= F \\ \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \textcircled{R} (G \wedge H) &:= (\mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} G) \wedge (\mathbf{y} \textcircled{R} H) \\ z, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \textcircled{R} (G \vee H) &:= (z = 0 \wedge \mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} G) \vee (z \neq 0 \wedge \mathbf{y} \textcircled{R} H) \\ \mathbf{y} \textcircled{R} (G \rightarrow H) &:= (\forall \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} G \rightarrow \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) \textcircled{R} H) \wedge (G \rightarrow H) \\ z, \mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} (\exists y)G &:= \mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} G\{z/y\} \\ \mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} (\forall y)G &:= (\forall y)(\mathbf{x}(y) \textcircled{R} G), \end{aligned}$$

where no variable in \mathbf{x} occurs free in F . Given terms $\mathbf{t} = t_1, \dots, t_n$, we let:

$$\mathbf{t} \textcircled{R} F := (\mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} F)\{\mathbf{t}/\mathbf{x}\}.$$

We relate the derivability of these new formulas with that of formulas of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ . Proofs below are by induction, respectively, on the structure of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ -formulas and on the height of derivations.

Theorem 3.10 (Soundness). *If $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t} \textcircled{R} F$, then $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$.*

Notation 3.5. Given $\Gamma = F_1, \dots, F_n$, let $\mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} \Gamma$ be a shorthand for $\mathbf{x}_1 \textcircled{R} F_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n \textcircled{R} F_n$.

Theorem 3.11 (Completeness). *If $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$, then there exist terms \mathbf{t} , such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t} \textcircled{R} F$.*

Proof Sketch. We prove that if $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$, then there exist terms \mathbf{t} such that $\mathbf{x} \textcircled{R} \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_n \textcircled{R} F$. The proof is by induction on the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F$. Let us consider just the case of rule $\vee R_1$ as an example:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \Gamma \vdash G \end{array}}{\Gamma \vdash G \vee H} \vee R_1$$

By IH, there exist terms \mathbf{u} , such that $\mathbf{t} \textcircled{R} \Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}\mathbf{u} \textcircled{R} G$. Since $x, y \textcircled{R} G \vee H$ is defined as $(x = 0 \wedge y \textcircled{R} G) \vee (x \neq 0 \wedge y \textcircled{R} H)$, we can take $\mathbf{t} = 0, \mathbf{u}$. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let $(\forall x)(\exists y)F(x, y)$ be a closed theorem of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ , where F is a Σ_1^b -formula. Then, there exists a closed term $\mathbf{t} : s \Rightarrow s$ of \mathcal{POR}^λ such that:*

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, \mathbf{t}x).$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.11, there exist $\mathbf{t} = t, w$ such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \mathbf{t} \textcircled{R} (\forall x)(\exists y)F(x, y)$. So, by Definition 3.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{t} \textcircled{R} (\forall x)(\exists y)F(x, y) &\equiv (\forall x)(\mathbf{t}(x) \textcircled{R} (\exists y)F(x, y)) \\ &\equiv (\forall x)(w(x) \textcircled{R} F(x, \mathbf{t}x)). \end{aligned}$$

From this, by Theorem 3.10, we deduce,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, tx).$$

□

Functions which are Σ_1^b -Representable in \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 are in \mathcal{POR} . Now, we have all the ingredients to prove that if a function is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 , in the sense of Definition 3.1, then it is in \mathcal{POR} .

Corollary 3.5. *For any function $f : \mathbb{O} \times \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, if there is a closed Σ_1^b -formula in \mathcal{RL} $F(x, y)$, such that:*

1. $\mathbf{IRS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall x)(\exists! y)F(x, y)$
2. $\llbracket F(\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2}) \rrbracket = \{\eta \mid f(\sigma_1, \eta) = \sigma_2\}$,

then $f \in \mathcal{POR}$.

Proof. Since $\vdash_{\mathbf{IRS}_2^1} (\forall x)(\exists! y)F(x, y)$, by Theorem 3.8 $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)(\exists! y)F(x, y)$. Then, from $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)(\exists y)F(x, y)$ we deduce $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, gx)$ for some closed term $g \in \mathcal{POR}^\lambda$, by Corollary 3.4. Furthermore, by Theorem 3.5.2, there is a $g \in \mathcal{POR}$ such that for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, $g(\sigma_1, \eta) = \sigma_2$ when $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} g\overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_2}$. So, by Proposition 3.6, for any $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$ if $g(\sigma_1, \eta) = \sigma_2$, then $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} g\overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_2}$ and so $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F(\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2})$. By Lemma 3.9, $T_\eta \vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} F(\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2})$ when $\eta \in \llbracket F(\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2}) \rrbracket$, that is $f(\sigma_1, \eta) = \sigma_2$. But then $f = g$, so since $g \in \mathcal{POR}$ also $f \in \mathcal{POR}$. □

3.2.4 $\forall\text{NP}$ -Conservativity of $\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda + \mathbf{EM}$ over \mathcal{IPOR}^λ

Corollary 3.5 is already very close to the result we are looking for. The remaining step to conclude our proof is its extension from intuitionistic \mathbf{IRS}_2^1 to classical \mathbf{RS}_2^1 , showing that any function which is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 is also in \mathcal{POR} . The proof is obtained by adapting the method from [3]. We start by considering an extension of \mathcal{IPOR}^λ via \mathbf{EM} and show that the realizability interpretation extends to it so that for any of its closed theorems $(\forall x)(\exists y \preceq t)F(x, y)$, being F a Σ_1^b -formula, there is a closed term $t : s \Rightarrow s$ of \mathcal{POR}^λ such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, tx)$.

From \mathcal{IPOR}^λ to $\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda + (\mathbf{Markov})$ Let \mathbf{EM} be the excluded-middle schema, $F \vee \neg F$, and *Markov's principle* be defined as follows,

$$\neg\neg(\exists x)F \rightarrow (\exists x)F, \quad (\mathbf{Markov})$$

where F is a Σ_1^b -formula.

Proposition 3.12. *For any Σ_1^b -formula F , if $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda + \mathbf{EM}} F$, then $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda + (\mathbf{Markov})} F$.*




Figure 4: Proof Schema of Corollary 3.5

Proof Sketch. The claim is proved by applying the double negation translation, with the following two remarks: (1) for any Σ_0^b -formula F , $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \neg\neg F \rightarrow F$; (2) using **(Markov)**, the double negation of an instance of the **NP**-induction can be shown equivalent to an instance of the **NP**-induction schema. \square

We conclude by showing that the realizability interpretation defined above extends to $\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda + \mathbf{(Markov)}$, that is for any closed theorem $(\forall x)(\exists y \preceq t)F(x, y)$ with F Σ_1^b -formula, of $\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda + \mathbf{(Markov)}$, there is a closed term of \mathcal{POR}^λ $t : s \Rightarrow s$, such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, tx)$.

From \mathcal{IPOR}^λ to $(\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda)^*$. Let us assume given a subjective encoding $\sharp : (s \Rightarrow s) \Rightarrow s$ in \mathcal{IPOR}^λ of first-order unary functions as strings, together with a “decoding” function $\mathbf{app} : s \Rightarrow s \Rightarrow s$ satisfying:

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} \mathbf{app}(\sharp f, x) = fx.$$

Moreover, let

$$x * y := \sharp(\lambda z. \mathbf{BAnd}(\mathbf{app}(x, z), \mathbf{app}(y, z)))$$

and

$$T(x) := (\exists y)(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{app}(x, y)) = 0).$$

There is a *meet semi-lattice* structure on the set of terms of type s defined by $t \sqsubseteq u$ when $\vdash_{\mathcal{IPOR}^\lambda} T(u) \rightarrow T(t)$ with top element $\mathbf{1} := \sharp(\lambda x.1)$ and meet given by $x * y$. Indeed, from $T(x * \mathbf{1}) \leftrightarrow T(x)$, $x \sqsubseteq \mathbf{1}$ follows. Moreover, from $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{app}(x, u)) = 0$, we obtain $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{app}(x * y, u)) = \mathbf{BAnd}(\mathbf{app}(x, u), \mathbf{app}(y, u)) = 0$,

whence $T(x) \rightarrow T(x * y)$, i.e. $x * y \sqsubseteq x$. One can similarly prove $x * y \sqsubseteq y$. Finally, from $T(x) \rightarrow T(v)$ and $T(y) \rightarrow T(v)$, we deduce $T(x * y) \rightarrow T(v)$, by observing that $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} T(x * y) \rightarrow T(y)$. Notice that the formula $T(x)$ is *not* a Σ_1^b -one, as its existential quantifier is not bounded.

Definition 3.10. For any formula of $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$ F , and fresh variable x , we define formulas $x \Vdash F$ inductively:

$$\begin{aligned} x \Vdash F &:= F \vee T(x) \quad (F \text{ atomic}) \\ x \Vdash G \wedge H &:= x \Vdash G \wedge x \Vdash H \\ x \Vdash G \vee H &:= x \Vdash G \vee x \Vdash H \\ x \Vdash G \rightarrow H &:= (\forall y)(y \Vdash G \rightarrow x * y \Vdash H) \\ x \Vdash (\exists y)G &:= (\exists y)x \Vdash G \\ x \Vdash (\forall y)G &:= (\forall y)x \Vdash G. \end{aligned}$$

The following Lemma 3.13 is established by induction on the structure of formulas in $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$, as in [4].

Lemma 3.13. *If F is provable in $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$ without using **NP**-induction, then $x \Vdash F$ is provable in $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$.*

Lemma 3.14. *Let $F = (\exists x \preceq t)G$, where G is a Σ_0^b -formula. Then, there exists a term $u_F : s$ with $FV(u_F) = FV(G)$ such that:*

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} F \leftrightarrow T(u_F).$$

Proof. Since $G(x)$ is a Σ_0^b -formula, for all terms $v : s$, $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} G(x) \leftrightarrow \mathbf{t}_{x \preceq t \wedge G}(x) = 0$, where $\mathbf{t}_{x \preceq t \wedge G}$ has the free variables of t and G . Let $H(x)$ be a Σ_0^b -formula, it is show by induction on its structure that for any term $v : s$, $\mathbf{t}_{H(v)} = \mathbf{t}_H(v)$. Then,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} F \leftrightarrow (\exists x)\mathbf{t}_{x \preceq t \wedge G}(x) = 0 \leftrightarrow (\exists x)T(\#(\lambda x.\mathbf{t}_{x \preceq t \wedge G}(x))).$$

So, we let $u_F = \#(\lambda x.\mathbf{t}_{x \preceq t \wedge G}(x))$. □

From which we also deduce the following three properties:

- i. $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} (x \Vdash F) \leftrightarrow (F \vee T(x))$
- ii. $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} (x \Vdash \neg F) \leftrightarrow (F \rightarrow T(x))$
- iii. $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} (x \Vdash \neg\neg F) \leftrightarrow (F \vee T(x))$,

where F is a Σ_1^b -formula.

Corollary 3.6 (Markov's Principle). *If F is a Σ_1^b -formula, then*

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} x \Vdash \neg\neg F \rightarrow F.$$

To define the extension $(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*$ of $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$, we introduce PIND in a formal way.

Definition 3.11 (PIND). Let $\text{PIND}(F)$ indicate the formula:

$$(F(\epsilon) \wedge ((\forall x)(F(x) \rightarrow F(x0)) \wedge (\forall x)(F(x) \rightarrow F(x1)))) \rightarrow (\forall x)F(x).$$

Observe that if $F(x)$ is a formula of the form $(\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})u = v$, then $z \Vdash \text{PIND}(F)$ is of the form $\text{PIND}(F(x) \vee T(z))$, which is *not* an instance of the **NP**-induction schema (as the formula $T(z) = (\exists x)\mathbf{B}(\text{app}(z, x)) = 0$ is not bounded).

Definition 3.12 (The Theory $(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*$). Let $(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*$ indicate the theory extending $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$ with all instances of the induction schema $\text{PIND}(F(x) \vee G)$, where $F(x)$ is of the form $(\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})u = v$, and G is an arbitrary formula with $x \notin FV(G)$.

We then deduce the following Proposition relating derivability in $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$ and in $(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*$.

Proposition 3.15. *For any Σ_1^b -formula F , if $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} F$, then $\vdash_{(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*} x \Vdash F$.*

Finally, we extend realizability to $(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*$ by constructing a realizer for $\text{PIND}(F(x) \vee G)$.

Lemma 3.16. *Let $F(x) : (\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})u = 0$ and G be any formula not containing free occurrences of x . Then, there exist terms \mathbf{t} such that:*

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} \mathbf{t} \textcircled{\text{R}} \text{PIND}(F(x) \vee G).$$

So, by Theorem 3.10, we obtain that for any Σ_1^b -formula F and formula G , with $x \notin FV(F)$,

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} \text{PIND}(F(x) \vee G).$$

Proposition 3.17. *For any Σ_1^b -formula F and G with $x \notin FV(F)$, $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} \text{PIND}(F(x) \vee G)$.*

Corollary 3.7 ($\forall \mathbf{NP}$ -Conservativity of $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda + \mathbf{EM}$ over $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$). *Let F be a Σ_1^b -formula, if $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda + \mathbf{EM}} (\forall x)(\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})F(x, y)$, then $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} (\forall x)(\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})F(x, y)$.*

Concluding the Proof. We conclude our proof establishing Proposition 3.18.

Proposition 3.18. *Let $(\forall x)(\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})F(x, y)$ be a closed term of $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda + (\mathbf{Markov})$, where F is a Σ_1^b -formula. Then, there exists a closed term of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda$ $\mathbf{t} : s \Rightarrow s$, such that:*

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, \mathbf{t}x).$$

Proof. If $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda + (\mathbf{Markov})} (\forall x)(\exists y)F(x, y)$, then by Parikh's Proposition 3.2, also $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda + (\mathbf{Markov})} (\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})F(x, y)$. Moreover, $\vdash_{(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*} z \Vdash (\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})F(x, y)$. Then, let us consider $G = (\exists y \preceq \mathbf{t})F(x, y)$. By taking $v = u_G$, using Lemma 3.14, we deduce $\vdash_{(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda)^*} G$ and, thus, by Lemma 3.13 and 3.16, we conclude that there exist \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \textcircled{\text{R}} G$, which implies $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} F(x, \mathbf{t}x)$, and so $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} (\forall x)(F(x), \mathbf{t}x)$. \square

So, by Proposition 3.12, if $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda + \mathbf{EM}} (\forall x)(\exists y \preceq t)F(x, y)$, being F a closed Σ_1^b -formula, then there is a closed term of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}$ $\mathbf{t} : s \Rightarrow s$, such that $\vdash_{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^\lambda} (\forall x)F(x, \mathbf{t}x)$. Finally, we conclude the desired Corollary 3.8 for classical \mathbf{RS}_2^1 arguing as above.

Corollary 3.8. *Let $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall x)(\exists y \preceq t)F(x, y)$, where F is a Σ_1^b -formula with only x and y free. For any function $f : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, if $(\forall x)(\exists y \preceq t)F(x, y)$ represents f so that:*

1. $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall x)(\exists! y)F(x, y)$
2. $\llbracket F(\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2}) \rrbracket = \{\eta \mid f(\sigma_1, \eta) = \sigma_2\}$,

then $f \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}$.

Now, putting Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.8 together, we conclude that Theorem 3.1 holds and that \mathbf{RS}_2^1 provides an *arithmetical* characterization of functions in $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}$.

4 Relating $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}$ and Poly-Time PTMs

Theorem 3.1 is still not enough to characterize probabilistic classes, which are defined in terms of functions computed by PTMs, and, as observed, there is a crucial difference between the ways in which these machines and oracle functions access randomness. So, our next goal consists in filling this gap, by relating these two classes in a precise way.¹¹

4.1 Preliminaries

We start by defining (or re-defining) the classes of functions (over strings) computed by poly-time PTMs and of functions computed by poly-time stream machines, that is TMs with an extra oracle tape.

4.1.1 The Class \mathbf{RFP}

We start by (re-)defining the class of functions computed by poly-time PTMs.¹²

Definition 4.1 (Class \mathbf{RFP}). Let $\mathbb{D}(\mathbb{S})$ denote the set of functions $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}} f(\sigma) = 1$. The *class \mathbf{RFP}* is made of all functions $f : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{S})$ such that, for some PTM $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}$ running in polynomial time, and every $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$, $f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)(\tau)$ coincides with the probability that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}(\sigma_1 \# \dots \# \sigma_k) \Downarrow \tau$.

¹¹Actually, this proof is particularly convoluted so, for simplicity's sake, we present here just its skeleton. The interested reader can however found further details in [?], and the full proof was presented in [5].

¹²Clearly, there is a strong affinity with the standard definition of random functions [11] presented for example in Section ???. Here, pseudo-distributions and functions are over strings rather than numbers. Furthermore, we are now considering machines explicitly associated with a (polynomial-)time resource bound.

So – similarly to $\langle \mathcal{M}_\varphi \rangle$ by [11, 9] – the function computed by this machine associates each possible output with a probability corresponding to the actual probability that a run of the machine actually produces that output, and we need to adapt the notion of Σ_1^b -representability accordingly.

Definition 4.2. A function $f : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{S})$ is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 if there is a Σ_1^b -formula of \mathcal{RL} $F(x_1, \dots, x_k, y)$, such that:

1. $\mathbf{RS}_2^1 \vdash (\forall \vec{x})(\exists! y)F(\vec{x}, y)$,
2. for all $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$, $f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau) = \mu(\llbracket F(\overline{\sigma_1}, \dots, \overline{\sigma_k}, \tau) \rrbracket)$.

The central result of this chapter can be re-stated as follows:

Theorem 4.1. For any function $f : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{S})$, f is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 when $f \in \mathbf{RFP}$.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 relies on Theorem 3.1, once we relate the function algebra \mathcal{POR} with the class \mathbf{RFP} by the Lemma 4.2 below.

Lemma 4.2. For any functions $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{0} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ in \mathcal{POR} , there exists $g : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{S})$ in \mathbf{RFP} such that for all $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\mu(\{\omega \mid f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \eta) = \tau\}) = g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau)$$

and viceversa.

However, the proof of Lemma 4.2 is convoluted, as it is based on a chain of language simulations.

4.1.2 Introducing the Class \mathbf{SFP}

The core idea to relate \mathcal{POR} and \mathbf{RFP} is to introduce an intermediate class, called \mathbf{SFP} . This is the class of functions computed by a poly-time *stream Turing machine* (STM, for short), where an STM is a deterministic TM with one extra (read-only) tape intuitively accounting for probabilistic choices: at the beginning the extra-tape is sampled from $\mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$; then, at each computation step, the machine reads one new bit from this tape, always moving to the right.

Definition 4.3 (Class \mathbf{SFP}). The class \mathbf{SFP} is made of functions $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, such that there is an STM $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{S}$ running in polynomial time such that for any $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$,¹³ $f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \omega) = \tau$ when for inputs $\sigma_1 \# \dots \# \sigma_k$ and tape ω , the machine $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{S}$ outputs τ .

¹³By a slight abuse of notation, we use $\omega, \omega', \omega'', \dots$ as meta-variables for sequences in $\mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Indeed, as said in Section ??, the sets $\{0, 1\}$ and $\{0, \mathbb{1}\}$ are basically equivalent.

4.2 Relating RFP and SFP

The global behavior of STMs and PTMs is similar, but the former access to randomness in an explicit way: instead of flipping a coin at each step, the machine samples a stream of bits once, and then reads one new bit at each step. So, to prove the equivalence of the two models, we pass through the following Proposition 4.3.

Proposition 4.3 (Equivalence of PTMs and STMs). *For any poly-time STM \mathcal{M}_S , there is a poly-time PTM \mathcal{M}_S^* such that for all strings $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$,*

$$\mu(\{\omega \mid \mathcal{M}_S(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\}) = \Pr[\mathcal{M}_S^*(\sigma) = \tau],$$

and viceversa.


Corollary 4.1 (Equivalence of RFP and SFP). *For any $f : \mathbb{S}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{S})$ in RFP, there is a $g : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ in SFP, such that for all $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$,*

$$f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau) = \mu(\{\omega \mid g(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \omega) = \tau\}),$$

and viceversa.

4.3 Relating SFP and POR

Finally, we need to prove the equivalence between POR and SFP:



Moving from PTMs to STMs, we obtain a machine model which accesses randomness in a way which is similar to that of functions in POR: as seen, at the beginning of the computation an oracle is sampled, and computation proceeds querying it. Yet, there are still relevant differences in the way in which these families of machines treat randomness. While functions of POR access an oracle in the form of a function $\eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{S}}$, the oracle for an STM is a stream of bits $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Otherwise said, a function in POR is of the form $f_{\text{POR}} : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, whereas one in SFP is $f_{\text{SFP}} : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$. Then, we cannot compare them *directly*, and provide an indirect comparison in two main steps.

4.3.1 From SFP to POR

First, we show that any function computable by a poly-time STM is in POR.

Proposition 4.4 (From SFP to POR). *For any $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ in SFP, there is a function $f^* : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ in POR such that for all $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$,*

$$\mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \omega) = \tau\}) = \mu(\{\eta \in \mathbb{O} \mid f^*(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \eta) = \tau\}).$$

The fundamental observation is that, given an input $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ and the extra tape $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$, an STM running in polynomial time can access a *finite* portion of ω only, the length of which can be bounded by some polynomial $p(|\sigma|)$. Using this fact, we construct f^* as follows:

1. We introduce the new class **PTF**, made of functions $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ computed by a *finite stream Turing machine* (FSTM, for short), the extra tape of which is a finite string.
2. We define a function $h \in \mathbf{PTF}$ such that for any $f : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ with polynomial bound $p(x)$,

$$f(n, \omega) = h(x, \omega_{p(|x|)}).$$

3. We define $h' : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ such that,

$$h'(x, y, \eta) = h(x, y).$$

By an encoding of FSTMs we show that $h' \in \mathcal{POR}$. Moreover h' can be defined *without* using the query function, since the computation of h' never looks at η .

4. Finally, we define an *extractor function* $e : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{POR}$, which mimics the prefix extractor $\omega_{p(|x|)}$, having its outputs *the same distributions* of all possible ω 's prefixes, even though within a different space.¹⁴ This is obtained by exploiting a bijection $dyad : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, ensuring that for each $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$, there is an $\eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{S}}$ such that any prefix of ω is an output of $e(y, \eta)$, for some y . Since \mathcal{POR} is closed under composition, we finally define

$$f^*(x, \eta) := h'(x, e(x, \eta), \eta).$$

4.3.2 From \mathcal{POR} to **SFP**

In order to simulate functions of \mathcal{POR} via STMs we observe not only that these two models invoke oracles of different shape, but also that the former can manipulate such oracles in a more liberal way:

- STMs query the oracle before each step is produced. By contrast functions of \mathcal{POR} may invoke the query function $Q(x, \eta)$ freely during computation. We call this access policy *on demand*.
- STMs query a new bit of the oracle at each step of computation, and cannot access previously observed bits. We call this access policy *linear*. By contrast, functions of \mathcal{POR} can query the same bits as many times as needed.

Consequently, a direct simulation of \mathcal{POR} via STMs is challenging even for a basic function like $Q(x, \eta)$. So, again, we follow an indirect path: we pass through a chain of simulations, dealing with each of these differences separately.

¹⁴Recall that $\eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$, while the second argument of e is in \mathbb{O} .

1. First, we translate \mathcal{POR} into an imperative language SIFP_{RA} inspired by Winskel's IMP [12], with the same access policy as \mathcal{POR} . SIFP_{RA} is endowed with assignments, a **while** construct, and a command $\text{Flip}(e)$, which first evaluates e to a string σ and then stores the value $\eta(\sigma)$ in a register. The encoding of oracle functions in SIFP_{RA} is easily obtained by induction on the function algebra.
2. Then, we translate SIFP_{RA} into another imperative language, called SIFP_{LA} , associated with a *linear* policy of access. SIFP_{LA} is defined like SIFP_{RA} except for $\text{Flip}(e)$, which is replaced by the new command $\text{RandBit}()$ generating a random bit and storing it in a register. A weak simulation from SIFP_{RA} into SIFP_{LA} is defined by progressively constructing an *associative table* containing pairs in the form (string, bit) of past observations. Each time $\text{Flip}(e)$ is invoked, the simulation checks whether a pair (e, b) had already been observed. Otherwise increments the table by producing a new pair $(e, \text{RandBit}())$. This is by far the most complex step of the whole simulation.
3. The language SIFP_{LA} can be translated into STMs. Observe that the access policy of SIFP_{LA} is still on-demand: $\text{RandBit}()$ may be invoked or not before executing the instruction. So, we first consider a translation from SIFP_{LA} into a variant of STMs admitting an on-demand access policy – that is, a computation step may or may not access a bit from the extrape. Then, the resulting program is encoded into a regular STM. Observe that we cannot expect that the machine \mathcal{M}_S^\dagger simulating an on-demand machine \mathcal{M}_S will produce *the same* output and oracle. Rather, as in many other cases, we show that \mathcal{M}_S^\dagger can be defined so that, for any $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$, the sets $\{\omega \mid \mathcal{M}_S^\dagger(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\}$ and $\{\omega \mid \mathcal{M}_S(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\}$ have the same measure.




Figure 5: Equivalence between \mathcal{POR} and **SFP** 4.1

4.3.3 Concluding the Proof.

These ingredients are enough to conclude the proof as outlined in Figure 4.3.3, and to relate poly-time random functions and Σ_1^b -formulas of \mathbf{RS}_2^1 .




Figure 6: Proof Sketch of Theorem 4.1

References

- [1] S.R. Buss. *Bounded Arithmetic*. PhD thesis, Princeton University, 1986.
- [2] S.R. Buss. First-Order Proof Theory of Arithmetic. In Elsavier, editor, *Handbook of Proof Theory*. Buss, S.R., 1998.
- [3] S. Cook and A. Urquhart. Functional Interpretations of Feasibly Constructive Arithmetic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 63:103–200, 1993.
- [4] T. Coquand and M. Hofmann. A New Method for Establishing Conservativity of Classical Systems over Their Intuitionistic Version. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 9(4):323–333, 1999.
- [5] D. Davoli. Bounded Arithmetic and Randomized Computation. Master Thesis, <http://amslaurea.unibo.it/26234/>, 2022.
- [6] F. Ferreira. Polynomial time computable arithmetic and conservative extensions. Ph.D. Dissertation, December 1988.
- [7] F. Ferreira. Polynomial-time computable arithmetic. In W. Sieg, editor, *Logic and Computation*, volume 106 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 137–156. AMS, 1990.
- [8] G. Ferreira and I. Oitavem. An Interpretation of S_2^1 in Σ_1^b -NIA. *Portugaliae Mathematica*, 63:427–450, 2006.
- [9] J.T. Gill. Computational complexity of probabilistic Turing machines. *J. Comput.*, 6(4):675–695, 1977.
- [10] R.J. Parikh. Language Generating Devices. *Quart. Prog. Rep.*, 60:199–212, 1961.
- [11] E.S. Santos. Probabilistic Turing machines and computability. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 22(3):704–710, 1969.

- [12] G. Winskel. *The Formal Semantics of Programming Languages*. The MIT Press, 1993.

A Proofs from Section 3

A.1 Further details on Theorem 3.3

Proof of Theorem 3.3. The proof is by induction on the structure of $f \in \mathcal{POR}$.

Base case. If f is a basic function, then there are five possible sub-cases:

- $f = E$ is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula $F_E(x, y) : x = x \wedge y = \epsilon$. The existence condition is derived as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{z = z \vdash (\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon), z = z}{\vdash (\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon), z = z} Ax}{Ref} \quad \frac{\frac{\epsilon = \epsilon \vdash (\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon), \epsilon = \epsilon}{\vdash (\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon), \epsilon = \epsilon} Ax}{Ref}}{\frac{\vdash (\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon), z = z \wedge \epsilon = \epsilon}{\vdash (\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon)} \wedge R} \exists R$$

$$\frac{(\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon)}{\vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)(x = x \wedge y = \epsilon)} \forall R$$

Uniqueness condition is derived below:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{x_2 = x_3, x_1 = x_1, x_2 = \epsilon, x_3 = \epsilon \vdash x_2 = x_3}{x_1 = x_1, x_2 = \epsilon, x_1 = x_1, x_3 = \epsilon \vdash x_2 = x_3} Ax}{Repl}}{\frac{x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon, x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\vdash (\exists y)(z = z \wedge y = \epsilon), z = z} \wedge Ls}}{\frac{(x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon) \wedge (x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon) \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\vdash (x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon) \wedge (x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon) \rightarrow x_2 = x_3} \wedge L}}{\frac{\vdash (x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon) \wedge (x_1 = x_1 \wedge x_2 = \epsilon) \rightarrow x_2 = x_3}{\vdash (\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)((x = x \wedge y = \epsilon) \wedge (x = x \wedge z = \epsilon) \rightarrow y = z)} \rightarrow R} \forall Rs$$

The semantic condition is proved showing that for all $n, m \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta^* \in \mathbb{O}$, $E(\sigma_1, \eta^*) = \sigma_2$ when $\eta \in \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \wedge \overline{\sigma_2} = \epsilon \rrbracket$.

\Rightarrow Assume $\sigma_2 = \epsilon$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \wedge \overline{\sigma_2} = \epsilon \rrbracket &= \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \wedge \overline{\epsilon} = \epsilon \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \wedge \epsilon = \epsilon \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \epsilon = \epsilon \rrbracket \\ &= \mathbb{O} \cap \mathbb{O} \\ &= \mathbb{O}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for any $\eta^*, \eta^* \in \mathbb{O}$, that is $\eta^* \in \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \wedge \overline{m} = \epsilon \rrbracket$.

\Leftarrow Assume (by contraposition) $m \neq \epsilon$. so,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \wedge \overline{\sigma_2} = \epsilon \rrbracket &= \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \overline{\sigma_2} = \epsilon \rrbracket \\ &= \mathbb{O} \cap \emptyset \\ &= \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for any $\eta^*, \eta^* \notin \emptyset$, so $\eta^* \notin \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1} = \overline{\sigma_1} \wedge \overline{\sigma_2} = \epsilon \rrbracket$.

- $f = P_i^n$, for $1 \leq i \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$. The function is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula: $\bigwedge_{j \in J} (x_j = x_j) \wedge y = x_i$, where $J = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus i$. The proof is similar to the one above.
- $f = S_b$. The function is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula: $y = x\mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathbf{b} = 0$ when $b = 0$ and $\mathbf{b} = 1$ when $b = 1$. The existence condition is derived as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{z\mathbf{b} = z\mathbf{b} \vdash (\exists y)(y = z\mathbf{b}), z\mathbf{b} = z\mathbf{b}}{\vdash (\exists y)(y = z\mathbf{b}), z\mathbf{b} = z\mathbf{b}} \text{Ax}}{\vdash (\exists y)(y = z\mathbf{b})} \text{Ref}}{\vdash (\exists y)(y = z\mathbf{b})} \exists R}{\vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)(y = x\mathbf{b})} \forall R$$

Uniqueness is derived below:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{x_2 = x_3, x_2 = x_1\mathbf{b}, x_3 = x_1\mathbf{b} \vdash x_2 = x_3}{x_2 = x_1\mathbf{b}, x_3 = x_1\mathbf{b} \vdash x_2 = x_3} \text{Ax}}{x_2 = x_1\mathbf{b} \wedge x_3 = x_1\mathbf{b} \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L}}{\vdash (x_2 = x_1\mathbf{b}) \wedge (x_3 = x_1\mathbf{b}) \rightarrow x_2 = x_3} \rightarrow R}{\vdash (\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)((y = x\mathbf{b}) \wedge (z = x\mathbf{b}) \rightarrow y = z)} \forall Rs$$

The semantic condition is proved showing that for all $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta^* \in \mathbb{O}$, $S_b(\sigma_1, \eta^*) = \sigma_2$ when $\eta^* \in \llbracket \overline{\sigma_2} = \overline{\sigma_1\mathbf{b}} \rrbracket$.

\Rightarrow Assume $b = 0$. So, $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1\mathbb{0}$ (and $\mathbf{b} = 0$). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \overline{\sigma_2} = \overline{\sigma_1\mathbb{0}} \rrbracket &= \llbracket \overline{\sigma_1\mathbb{0}} = \overline{n\mathbb{0}} \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket \overline{n\mathbb{0}} = \overline{n\mathbb{0}} \rrbracket \\ &= \mathbb{O}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\eta^*, \eta^* \in \mathbb{O}$, that is $\eta^* \in \llbracket \overline{\sigma_2} = \overline{\sigma_1\mathbb{0}} \rrbracket$. Similarly, if $b = 1$ and $\sigma_2 = \sigma_1\mathbb{1}$ (and $\mathbf{b} = 1$). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \overline{\sigma_2} = \overline{\sigma_1\mathbb{1}} \rrbracket &= \llbracket \overline{n\mathbb{1}} = \overline{n\mathbb{1}} \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket \overline{n\mathbb{1}} = \overline{n\mathbb{1}} \rrbracket \\ &= \mathbb{O}. \end{aligned}$$

\Leftarrow Assume (by contraposition) $b = 0$ and $\sigma_2 \neq \sigma_1\mathbb{0}$ (and $\mathbf{b} = 1$). Then, clearly $\llbracket \overline{\sigma_2} = \overline{\sigma_1\mathbb{1}} \rrbracket = \emptyset$. So, for any $\eta^* \in \mathbb{O}$, $\eta^* \notin \emptyset$. The case of $b = 0$ and $m \neq n\mathbb{1}$ (and $\mathbf{b} = 0$) is equivalent.

- $f = C$. The function is Σ_1^b -representable in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by the formula $F_C(x, v, z_0, z_1, y) : (x = \epsilon \wedge y = v) \vee (\exists x' \preceq x)(x = x'\mathbb{0} \wedge y = z_0) \vee (\exists x' \preceq x)(x = x'\mathbb{1} \wedge y = z_1)$.
- $f = Q$. The function is Σ_1^b -represented in \mathbf{RS}_2^1 by $F_Q : (\text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 0)$. The existence condition is proved as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\text{Flip}(x) \vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), \text{Flip}(z)}{\vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), \text{Flip}(z), \neg \text{Flip}(z)} \neg R \quad Ax \quad \mathcal{D}_{\exists Q}}{\vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), \text{Flip}(z), \neg \text{Flip}(z), 1 = 0} \wedge R \quad \frac{1 = 1 \vdash \dots, 1 = 1}{\vdash \dots, 1 = 1} Ax}{\vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), \text{Flip}(z), \neg \text{Flip}(z) \wedge 1 = 0} \wedge R} \text{Ref} \\
\frac{\vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), (\text{Flip}(z) \wedge 1 = 1), (\neg \text{Flip}(z) \wedge 1 = 0)}{\vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), (\text{Flip}(z) \wedge 1 = 1) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(z) \wedge 1 = 0)} \vee R \\
\frac{\vdash (\exists y)((\text{Flip}(z) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(z) \wedge y = 0))}{\vdash (\exists y)((\text{Flip}(z) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(z) \wedge y = 0))} \exists R \\
\frac{\vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)((\text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 0))}{\vdash (\forall x)(\exists y)((\text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 1) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(x) \wedge y = 0))} \forall R
\end{array}$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{\exists Q}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\text{Flip}(z) \vdash \dots, \text{Flip}(z)}{\vdash \dots \text{Flip}(z), \neg \text{Flip}(z)} \neg R \quad Ax \quad \frac{0 = 0 \vdash \dots, \text{Flip}(z), 0 = 0}{\vdash \dots, \text{Flip}(z), 0 = 0} Ax}{\vdash \dots, \text{Flip}(z), \text{Flip}(z) \wedge 0 = 1, \neg \text{Flip}(z) \wedge 0 = 0} \wedge R} \text{Ref} \\
\frac{\vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), 1 = 0, \text{Flip}(z), F_Q(z, 0)}{\vdash (\exists y)F_Q(z, y), \text{Flip}(z), 1 = 0} \vee R \\
\exists R$$

Uniqueness is shown as below:

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}_{\forall Q1} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\forall Q2}}{\frac{\text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge x_2 = 1, F_Q(x_1, x_2) \vdash x_2 = x_3 \quad \neg \text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge x_2 = 0, F_Q(x_1, x_3) \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\frac{F_Q(x_1, x_2), F_Q(x_1, x_3) \vdash x_2 = x_3}{F_Q(x_1, x_2) \wedge F_Q(x_1, x_3) \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L} \vee L} \\
\frac{\vdash F_Q(x_1, x_2) \wedge F_Q(x_1, x_3) \rightarrow x_2 = x_3}{\vdash (\forall x)(\forall y)(\forall z)(F_Q(x, y) \wedge F_Q(x, z) \rightarrow y = z)} \rightarrow R \\
\forall Rs$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{\forall Q1}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{x_2 = x_3, \text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, x_3 = 1 \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, \text{Flip}(x_1), x_3 = 1 \vdash x_2 = x_3} Ax \quad \frac{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3, \text{Flip}(x_1)}{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, \neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3} Ax}{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, \text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge x_3 = 1 \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L \quad \frac{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, \neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, \neg \text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L} \text{Repl} \\
\frac{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 1, F_Q(x_1, x_3) \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge x_2 = 1, F_Q(x_1, x_3) \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L} \vee L$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\forall Q2}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\text{Flip}(x_1), x_3 = 1, y = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3, \text{Flip}(x_1)}{\neg \text{Flip}(x_1), y = 0, \text{Flip}(x_1), x_3 = 1 \vdash x_2 = x_3} Ax \quad \frac{x_2 = x_3, \neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 0, x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 0, \neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3} Ax}{\neg \text{Flip}(x_1), y = 0, \text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge x_3 = 1 \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L \quad \frac{\neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 0, \neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\neg \text{Flip}(x_1), x_2 = 0, \neg \text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge x_3 = 0 \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L} \text{Repl} \\
\frac{\neg \text{Flip}(x_1), y = 0, F_Q(x_1, x_3) \vdash x_2 = x_3}{\neg \text{Flip}(x_1) \wedge y = 0, F_Q(x_1, x_3) \vdash x_2 = x_3} \wedge L} \vee L$$

The semantic condition is proved considering that for all σ_1, σ_2 and $\eta^* \in \mathbb{O}$, $Q(\sigma_1, \eta^*) = \sigma_2$ when $\eta^* \in \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma_1}) \wedge \overline{\sigma_2} = 1) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma_1}) \wedge \overline{\sigma_2} = 0) \rrbracket$.

\Rightarrow Assume $Q(\sigma_1, \eta^*) = \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_2 = \mathbb{1}$, that is $\eta^*(\sigma_1) = \mathbb{1}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket F_Q(\overline{\sigma}_1, \overline{\sigma}_2) \rrbracket &= \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = 0) \rrbracket \\
&= \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \mathbb{1} = 0) \rrbracket \\
&= \llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \mathbb{1} = 0 \rrbracket \\
&= (\llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1} \rrbracket) \cup (\llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket \mathbb{1} = 0 \rrbracket) \\
&= (\llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \emptyset) \cup (\llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \emptyset) \\
&= \llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cup \emptyset \\
&= \llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \\
&= \{\eta \mid \eta(\sigma_1) = \mathbb{1}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

As seen $\eta^*(\sigma_1) = \mathbb{1}$, so $\eta^* \in \{\eta \mid \eta(n) = \mathbb{1}\} = \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = 0) \rrbracket$.

Assume $Q(\sigma_1, \eta^*) = \sigma_2$ and $\sigma_2 = 0$, that is $\eta^*(\sigma_1) = 0$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket F_Q(\overline{\sigma}_1, \overline{\sigma}_2) \rrbracket &= \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = 0) \rrbracket \\
&= \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge 0 = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge 0 = 0) \rrbracket \\
&= \llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge 0 = \mathbb{1} \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge 0 = 0 \rrbracket \\
&= (\llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket 0 = \mathbb{1} \rrbracket) \cup (\llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket 0 = 0 \rrbracket) \\
&= (\llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \emptyset) \cup (\llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \cap \emptyset) \\
&= \emptyset \cup \llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \\
&= \llbracket \neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \\
&= 0 - \llbracket \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \rrbracket \\
&= \{\eta \mid \eta(n) = 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

As seen, $\eta^*(n) =$

zero, so clearly $\eta^* \in \{\eta \mid \eta(n) = 0\} = \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{0} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{0} = 0) \rrbracket$.

\Leftarrow Assume (by contraposition) $\eta^*(\sigma_1) = \mathbb{1}$, so $Q(\sigma_1, \eta^*) = \mathbb{1}$ and $m = 0$. As shown above, in this case $\llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{0} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{0} = 0) \rrbracket = \{\eta \mid \eta(\sigma_1) = 0\}$. For assumption, η^* is such that $\eta^*(\sigma_1) = \mathbb{1}$, so $\eta^* \notin \{\eta \mid \eta(\sigma_1) = 0\}$, that is $\eta^* \notin \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{0} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{0} = 0) \rrbracket$.

Assume (by contraposition) $\eta^*(\sigma_1) = 0$, so $Q(\sigma_1, \eta^*) = 0$ and $m = \mathbb{1}$.

As shown above, in the case $\llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = 0) \rrbracket = \{\eta \mid \eta(\sigma_1) = \mathbb{1}\}$. For assumption, η^* is such that $\eta^*(\sigma_1) = 0$, so $\eta^* \notin \{\eta \mid \eta(\sigma_1) = \mathbb{1}\}$, that is $\eta^* \notin \llbracket (\text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = \mathbb{1}) \vee (\neg \text{Flip}(\overline{\sigma}_1) \wedge \overline{\mathbb{1}} = 0) \rrbracket$.

Inductive Case. If $f \in \mathcal{POR}$ is obtained from Σ_1^b -representable functions by either composition or bounded recursion, then f is Σ_1^b -representable as well. \square

B Proofs from Section 4

B.1 Relating RFP and SFP

B.1.1 On Stream Turing Machine

We define stream Turing machines in a formal way.

Definition B.1 (Stream Turing Machine). A *stream Turing machine* is a quadruple $\mathcal{M}_S = \langle \mathbf{Q}, q_0, \Sigma, \delta \rangle$, where:

- \mathbf{Q} is a finite set of states ranged over by q_1, q_2, \dots
- $q_0 \in \mathbf{Q}$ is an initial state
- Σ is a finite set of characters ranged over by c_1, c_2, \dots
- $\delta : \hat{\Sigma} \times \mathbf{Q} \times \hat{\Sigma} \times \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \hat{\Sigma} \times \{\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{R}\}$ is a transition function describing the new configuration reached by the machine.

\mathbf{L} and \mathbf{R} are two fixed and distinct symbols (e.g. $\mathbb{1}$ and 0), $\hat{\Sigma} = \Sigma \cup \{\otimes\}$ and $\otimes \notin \Sigma$ is the *blank character*.

Definition B.2 (Configuration of STM). The *configuration of an STM* is a quadruple $\langle \sigma, q, \tau, \omega \rangle$, where:

- $\sigma \in \{0, \mathbb{1}, \otimes\}^*$ is the portion of the work tape on the left of the head
- $q \in \mathbf{Q}$ is the current state of the machine
- $\tau \in \{0, \mathbb{1}, \otimes\}^*$ is the portion of the work tape on the right of the head
- $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is the portion of the oracle tape that has not been read yet.

We can now give the definition of family of reachability relations for an STM.

Definition B.3 (Reachability function for STM). Given an STM \mathcal{M}_S with transition function δ , we use \vdash_δ to denote its standard step function and $\{\triangleright_{\mathcal{M}_S}^n\}_n$ the smallest family of relations such that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \sigma, q, \tau, \omega \rangle \triangleright_{\mathcal{M}_S}^0 \langle \sigma, q, \tau, \omega \rangle \\ & \left(\langle \sigma, q, \tau, \omega \rangle \triangleright_{\mathcal{M}_S}^n \langle \sigma', q, \tau', \omega' \rangle \right) \wedge \\ & \left(\langle \sigma', q', \tau', \omega' \rangle \vdash_\delta \langle \sigma'', q', \tau'', \omega'' \rangle \right) \rightarrow \left(\langle \sigma, q, \tau, \omega \rangle \triangleright_{\mathcal{M}_S}^{n+1} \langle \sigma'', q', \tau'', \omega'' \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

Definition B.4 (STM Computation). Given an STM $\mathcal{M}_S = \langle \mathbf{Q}, q_0, \Sigma, \delta \rangle$, oracle tape $\omega : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and a function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, we say that \mathcal{M}_S *computes* g , $f_{\mathcal{M}_S} = g$, when for every string $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$, and oracle tape $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$, there are $n \in \mathbb{N}, \tau \in \mathbb{S}, q' \in \mathbf{Q}$, and a function $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ such that

$$\langle \epsilon, q_0, \sigma, \omega \rangle \triangleright_{\mathcal{M}_S}^n \langle \gamma, q', \tau, \psi \rangle,$$

and $\langle \gamma, q', \tau, \psi \rangle$ is a final configuration for \mathcal{M}_S with $f_{\mathcal{M}_S}(\sigma, \omega)$ being the longest suffix of γ not including \otimes .

B.1.2 Proof of Proposition 4.3

We need to extend this definition to probability distributions over \mathbb{S} , so to deal with PTMs.

Definition B.5. Given a PTM $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}$, a configuration $\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle$, we define the following sequence of random variables:

$$X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},0}^{\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle} := \omega \rightarrow \langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle$$

$$X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},n+1}^{\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle} := \omega \rightarrow \begin{cases} \delta_{\mathbb{b}}(X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},n}^{\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle}(\omega)) & \text{if } \omega(n) = \mathbb{b} \text{ and for some } \langle \sigma', q', \tau' \rangle, \\ & \delta_{\mathbb{b}}(X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},n}^{\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle}(\omega)) = \langle \sigma', q', \tau' \rangle \\ X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},n}^{\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle}(\omega) & \text{if } \omega(n) = \mathbb{b} \text{ and for no } \langle \sigma', q', \tau' \rangle, \\ & \delta_{\mathbb{b}}(X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},n}^{\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle}(\omega)) = \langle \sigma', q', \tau' \rangle. \end{cases}$$

for any $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Intuitively, the variable $X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},n}^{\langle \sigma, q, \tau \rangle}$ describes the configuration reached by the machine after exactly n transitions. We say that a PTM $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}$ computes $Y_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},\sigma}$ when there is an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$, $X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},m}^{\langle \sigma, q_0, \tau \rangle}$ is final. In this case, $Y_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},\sigma}$ is the longest suffix of $\pi_1\left(X_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}},m}^{\langle \sigma, q_0, \epsilon \rangle}\right)$, which does not contain \otimes .

We now prove Proposition 4.3, which establishes the equivalence between STMs and PTMs.

Proof Sketch of Proposition 4.3. We show that for any $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\}) &= \mu(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)^{-1}(\tau)) \\ \mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\}) &= \mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid Y_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}},\sigma}(\omega) = \tau\}). \end{aligned}$$

We actually show a stronger result, namely that there is a bijection $I : \text{STMs} \rightarrow \text{PTM}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \langle \sigma, q_0, \tau, \omega \rangle \triangleright_{\delta}^n \langle \tau, q, \psi, n \rangle\} = \{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid X_{I(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}),n}^{\langle \epsilon, q_0, \sigma \rangle}(\omega) = \langle \tau, q, \psi \rangle\}. \quad (\text{I.})$$

This entails,

$$\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\} = \{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid Y_{I(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}),\sigma}(\omega) = \tau\}. \quad (\text{II.})$$

The bijection I splits the function δ of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ so that if the corresponding character on the oracle tape is $\mathbb{0}$, then the transition is defined by δ_0 ; if the character is $\mathbb{1}$, it is defined by δ_1 . We prove (I.) by induction on the number of steps required by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ to compute its input value. \square

B.2 From SFP to POR

To prove Proposition 4.4 we show the correspondence between functions computable by an STM and those computable by a *finite-stream* STM.

Lemma B.1. *For all $f \in \mathbf{SFP}$ with polynomial time-bound p there is an $h \in \mathbf{PTF}$ such that, for any $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$,*

$$f(\sigma, \eta) = h(\sigma, \omega_{p(|\sigma|)}).$$

Proof. Since $f \in \mathbf{SFP}$, there is poly-time STM $\mathcal{M}_S = \langle \mathbf{Q}, q_0, \Sigma, \delta \rangle$ such that $f = f_{\mathcal{M}_S}$. Let us consider the FSTM \mathcal{M}_S' , which is defined as \mathcal{M}_S but is finite. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sigma', \tau', \tau'', \tau''' \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\langle \epsilon, q'_0, \sigma, \sigma' \rangle \triangleright_{\mathcal{M}_S}^k \langle \tau, q, \tau', \tau'' \rangle \quad \text{iff} \quad \langle \epsilon, q'_0, \sigma, \sigma' \eta \rangle \triangleright_{\mathcal{M}_S'}^k \langle \tau, q, \tau'', \tau''' \eta \rangle.$$

Furthermore, \mathcal{M}_S' requires the same number of steps as those required by \mathcal{M}_S , so is in \mathbf{PTF} too. We conclude the proof defining $h = f_{\mathcal{M}_S'}$. \square

The next step consists in showing that each function $f \in \mathbf{PTF}$ corresponds to a function which can be defined without recurring to Q .

Lemma B.2. *For any $f \in \mathbf{PTF}$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$, there is a $g \in \mathcal{POR}$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, $f(x, y) = g(x, y, \eta)$. Furthermore, if f is defined without recurring to Q , g do not include Q as well.*

Proof Sketch. Let us outline the main steps of the proof:

1. We define encodings using strings for configuration and transition functions – called e_c and e_t , respectively – for FSTM. Moreover, there is a function $step \in \mathcal{POR}$, which satisfies the simulation schema in Figure 7. Observe that e_c, e_t and $step$ are correct with respect to the given simulation.




Figure 7: Behavior of $step$.

2. For any $f \in \mathcal{POR}$ and $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$, if there is an \mathcal{RL} -term $t(x)$, which bounds the size of $f(\sigma, \eta)$ for any possible input, then $f_m = \lambda z, x, \eta. |z| \cdot f(\sigma, \eta) \in \mathcal{POR}$.¹⁵

¹⁵Observe that if f is defined without recurring to Q , also f_m can be defined without using it.

3. Given a machine \mathcal{M}_S , if $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ is a correct encoding for a configuration of \mathcal{M}_S , then for any $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$ $|step(\sigma, \eta)|$ is $\mathcal{O}(|\sigma|)$.
4. For any $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, if $c = e_c(\sigma, q, \tau, y, \eta)$, then there is a function *dectape* such that *dectape*(x, η) is the longest suffix without occurrences of \otimes .

□

Then, as a consequence of Lemma B.2, each function $f \in \mathbf{SFP}$ can be simulated by a function $g \in \mathcal{POR}$ using a polynomial prefix of the oracle for f as an additional input.

Corollary B.1. *For any $f \in \mathbf{SFP}$ and polynomial p , there is a function $f \in \mathcal{POR}$, such that for any $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$ and $x \in \mathbb{S}$,*

$$f(x, \omega) = g(x, \omega_{p(|x|), \eta}).$$

Proof. Assume $f \in \mathbf{SFP}$ and $y = \eta_{p(|x|)}$. By Lemma B.1, there is a function $h \in \mathbf{PTF}$ such that for any $\eta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and $x \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$f(x, \eta) = h(x, \eta_{p(|x|)}).$$

Moreover, due to Lemma B.2, there is a $g \in \mathcal{POR}$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{S}, \omega \in \mathbb{O}$,

$$g(x, y, \omega) = h(x, y).$$

Then g is the desired function. □

We now establish that there is a function $e \in \mathcal{POR}$, which produces strings with the same distribution of the prefixes of the functions in $\mathbb{S}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Intuitively, this function extracts $|x| + 1$ bits from η and concatenates them in the output. The definition of e passes through a dyadic representation of a number, *dyad* : $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$. Therefore, the function e creates strings $\mathbb{1}^0, \mathbb{1}^1, \dots, \mathbb{1}^k$, and samples the function η on the given coordinates – namely $dy(\mathbb{1}^0), dy(\mathbb{1}^1), \dots, dy(\mathbb{1}^k)$ – concatenating the result in a string.

Definition B.6 (Function *dyad*). The function *dyad* : $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ associates each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ to the string obtained by stripping the left-most bit from the binary representation of $n + 1$.

In order to define *dy*(\cdot, \cdot), some auxiliary functions are introduced, namely *binsucc* : $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned} binsucc(\epsilon, \eta) &:= \mathbb{1} \\ binsucc(x\mathbb{0}, \eta) &:= x\mathbb{1}|_{x\mathbb{0}\mathbb{0}} \\ binsucc(x\mathbb{1}, \eta) &:= binsucc(x, \eta)\mathbb{0}|_{x\mathbb{0}\mathbb{0}}. \end{aligned}$$

and *bin* : $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned} bin(\epsilon, \eta) &:= \mathbb{0} \\ bin(x\mathbb{b}, \eta) &:= binsucc(bin(x, \eta), \eta)|_{x\mathbb{b}}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition B.7 (Function dy). The function $dy : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ is defined as follows:

$$dy(x, \eta) := lrs(bin(x, \eta), \eta),$$

where lrs is a string manipulator, which removes the left-most bit from a string if it exists; otherwise returns ϵ .¹⁶

The function $dyad(n)$ is easily shown bijective and the following proposition is proved by induction.

Proposition B.3. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}, \sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$, if $|\sigma| = n + 1$, then

$$dy(\sigma, \eta) = dyad(n).$$

We also introduce the function e and prove its correctness (by induction on the structure of strings).

Definition B.8 (Function e). Let $e : \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} e(\epsilon, \eta) &:= \epsilon \\ e(x\mathbb{b}, \eta) &:= e(x, \omega)Q(dy(x, \eta), \eta)|_{x\mathbb{b}}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma B.4 (Correctness of e). For any $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, if $|\sigma| = i + 1$, for each $j \leq i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$:

- i. $e(\sigma, \eta)(i) = \eta(dy(\mathbb{1}^j, \eta))$,
- ii. the length of $e(\sigma, \eta)$ is exactly $i + 1$.

We also introduce a relation \sim_{dy} , which is again a bijection.

Definition B.9. We define \sim_{dy} as the smallest relation in $\mathbb{O} \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that:

$$\eta \sim_{dy} \omega \text{ iff for any } n \in \mathbb{N}, \omega(n) = \eta(dy(\mathbb{1}^{n+1}, \omega)).$$

Lemma B.5. If $\omega \sim_{dy} \eta$ then, there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$e(\underline{n}_{\mathbb{N}}, \eta).$$

Proof. The proof is by contraposition. Suppose $\omega_n \neq e(\underline{n}_{\mathbb{N}}, \eta)$. As a consequence of Lemma B.4, there is an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\omega(m) \neq \eta(dy(\underline{m}_{\mathbb{N}}, \eta))$, which is a contradiction. \square

We can finally prove Proposition 4.4.

Proof of Proposition 4.4. By Corollary B.1, there is a function $f' \in \mathcal{POR}$ and a polynomial p such that for any $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}, \omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{O}$,

$$\sigma = \omega_{p(x)} \rightarrow f(\sigma, \omega) = f'(\sigma, \tau, \eta). \quad (*)$$

¹⁶Full details can be found in [5].

Let us fix $\bar{\omega} \in \{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid f(\sigma, \omega) = y\}$, its image with respect to sim_{dy} is in $\{\eta \in \mathbb{O} \mid f'(x, e(p'(s(x, \eta), \eta), \eta), \eta) = \tau)\}$, where s is the function of \mathcal{POR} computing $\mathbb{1}^{|x|+1}$. By Lemma B.5,

$$\bar{\omega}_{p(x)} = e(p(size(x, \eta), \eta),$$

where $p' \in \mathcal{POR}$ computes the polynomial p , defined without recurring to Q . Furthermore, given a fixed $\bar{\eta} \in \{\eta \in \mathbb{O} \mid f'(\sigma, e(p'(size(\sigma, \eta), \eta), \eta), \eta) = \tau)\}$, its pre-image with respect to $\sim_{dy} \in \{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid f(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\}$. The proof is analogous to the one above. Since \sim_{dy} is a bijection between

$$\mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid f(\sigma, \omega) = \tau\}) = \mu(\{\eta \in \mathbb{O} \mid f'(x, e(p(size(x, \eta), \eta), \eta), \eta) = \tau\}),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

B.3 From \mathcal{POR} to SFP

First, we define the imperative language $SIFP_{RA}$ together with its big-step semantics, and prove its poly-time programs equivalent to \mathcal{POR} .

Definition B.10 (Programs of $SIFP_{RA}$). The language of programs of $SIFP_{RA}$ $\mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{RA})$ – i.e. the set of strings produced by non-terminal symbol Stm_{RA} – is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ld} &:= X_i \mid Y_i \mid S_i \mid R \mid Q \mid Z \mid T \\ \text{Exp} &:= \epsilon \mid \text{Exp}.0 \mid \text{Exp}.1 \mid \text{ld} \mid \text{Exp} \sqsubseteq \text{ld} \mid \text{Exp} \wedge \text{ld} \mid \neg \text{Exp} \\ \text{Stm}_{RA} &:= \text{ld} \leftarrow \text{Exp} \mid \text{Stm}_{RA}; \text{Stm}_{RA} \mid \text{while}(\text{Exp})\{\text{Stm}\}_{RA} \mid \text{Flip}(\text{Exp}), \end{aligned}$$

with $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

The big-step semantics associated with the language of $SIFP_{RA}$ programs relies on the notion of *store*.

Definition B.11 (Store). A *store* is a function $\Sigma : \text{ld} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$. An *empty* store is a store which is total and constant on ϵ . We represent such object as $[\]$. We define the updating of a store Σ with a mapping from $y \in \text{ld}$ to $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}$ as:

$$\Sigma[y \leftarrow \sigma](x) := \begin{cases} \sigma & \text{if } x = y \\ \Sigma(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition B.12 (Semantics of Expressions in $SIFP_{RA}$). The semantics of an expression $E \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Exp})$ is the smallest relation \dashv : $\mathcal{L}(\text{Exp}) \times (\text{ld} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}) \times \mathbb{O} \times \mathbb{S}$ closed under the following rules:

$$\frac{}{\langle \epsilon, \Sigma \rangle \dashv \epsilon} \qquad \frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \dashv \sigma}{\langle e.\mathbf{b}, \Sigma \rangle \dashv \sigma \frown \mathbb{b}} \qquad \frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \dashv \sigma \quad \Sigma(\text{ld}) = \tau \quad \sigma \not\sqsubseteq \tau}{\langle e \sqsubseteq \text{ld}, \Sigma \rangle \dashv \mathbb{1}} \qquad \frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \dashv \sigma \quad \Sigma(\text{ld}) = \tau \quad \sigma \not\sqsubseteq \tau}{\langle e \sqsubseteq \text{ld}, \Sigma \rangle \dashv \mathbb{0}}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Sigma(\text{ld}) = \sigma}{\langle \text{ld}, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma} \\
\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow 0}{\langle \neg e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{1}} \\
\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{1} \quad \Sigma(\text{ld}) = \mathbb{1}}{\langle e \wedge \text{ld}, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{1}}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\text{ld} \notin \text{dom}(\Sigma)}{\langle \text{ld}, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \epsilon} \\
\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma \quad \sigma \neq 0}{\langle \neg e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow 0} \\
\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma \quad \Sigma(\text{ld}) = \tau \quad \sigma \neq \mathbb{1} \wedge \tau \neq \mathbb{1}}{\langle e \wedge \text{ld}, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow 0}
\end{array}$$

where $\mathbf{b} \in \{0, 1\}$.¹⁷

Definition B.13 (Big-Step Operational Semantics). The semantics of a program $P \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{RA}})$ is the smallest relation $\triangleright \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{RA}}) \times (\text{ld} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}) \times \mathbb{O} \times (\text{ld} \rightarrow \mathbb{S})$ closed under the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma}{\langle \text{ld} \rightarrow e, \Sigma, \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma[\text{ld} \leftarrow \sigma]} \qquad \frac{\langle s, \Sigma, \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma' \quad \langle t, \Sigma', \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma''}{\langle s; t, \Sigma, \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma''} \\
\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{1} \quad \langle s, \Sigma, \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma' \quad \langle \text{while}(e)\{s\}, \Sigma', \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma''}{\langle \text{while}(e)\{s\}, \Sigma, \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma''} \\
\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma \quad \sigma \neq \mathbb{1}}{\langle \text{while}(e)\{s\}, \Sigma, \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma} \qquad \frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma \quad \eta(\sigma) = \mathbf{b}}{\langle \text{Flip}(e), \Sigma, \eta \rangle \triangleright \Sigma[R \leftarrow \mathbf{b}]}
\end{array}$$

The semantics allows us to associate each program of SIFP_{RA} to the function it evaluates:

Definition B.14. Function evaluation by a correct SIFP_{RA} program P is $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{RA}}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{S}^n \times \mathbb{O} \rightarrow \mathbb{S})$ defined as below:¹⁸

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket := \lambda x_1, \dots, x_n, \eta \triangleright (\langle P, [[X_1 \leftarrow x_1], \dots, [X_n \leftarrow x_n], \eta \rangle \rangle)(R).$$

Observe that, among the different registers, the register R is meant to contain the value computed by the program at the end of its execution. Similarly, the $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ registers are used to store the inputs of the function. We now establish the correspondence between \mathcal{POR} and SIFP_{RA} .

Lemma B.6. *For any function $f \in \mathcal{POR}$, there is a poly-time SIFP_{RA} program P such that for all x_1, \dots, x_n ,*

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket(x_1, \dots, x_n, \omega) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n, \omega).$$

Moreover, if $f \in \mathcal{POR}$, then P does not contain any $\text{Flip}(e)$ statement.

¹⁷We assume that if $\mathbf{b} = 1$, then $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{1}$, and if $\mathbf{b} = 0$, then $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{0}$.

¹⁸Instead of the infix notation for \triangleright , we use its prefixed notation. So, the notation express the store associated to the P , Σ and ω by \triangleright . Moreover, we employ the same function symbol \triangleright to denote two distinct functions: the big-step operational semantics of SIFP_{RA} and the big-step operational semantics of programs in SIFP_{LA} .

Proof Sketch. The proof is quite simple under a technical viewpoint, relying on the fact that it is possible to associate to any function of \mathcal{POR} an equivalent poly-time program, and on the possibility to compose them and implement bounded recursion on notation in SIFP_{RA} with a polynomial overhead. Concretely, for any function $f \in \mathcal{POR}$, we define a program \mathcal{L}_f such that $\llbracket \mathcal{L}_f \rrbracket(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. The correctness of \mathcal{L}_f is given by the following invariant properties:

- the result of the computation is stored in R
- inputs are stored in the registers of the group X
- the function \mathcal{L} does not change the values it accesses as input.

We define \mathcal{L}_f as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_E &= R \leftarrow \epsilon \\ \mathcal{L}_{S_0} &= R \leftarrow X_0.0 \\ \mathcal{L}_{S_1} &= R \leftarrow X_0.1 \\ \mathcal{L}_{P_i^n} &= R \leftarrow X_i \\ \mathcal{L}_C &= R \leftarrow X_1 \sqsubseteq X_2 \\ \mathcal{L}_Q &= \text{Flip}(X_1).\end{aligned}$$

The correctness of base cases is trivial to prove and the only translation containing $\text{Flip}(e)$ for some $e \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Exp})$ is that of Q . The encoding of composition and bounded recursion are more convoluted.¹⁹ \square

B.3.1 From SIFP_{RA} to SIFP_{LA}

We now show that every program in SIFP_{RA} is equivalent to one in SIFP_{LA} . First, we need to define the language and semantics for SIFP_{LA} .

Definition B.15 (Language of SIFP_{LA}). The language of SIFP_{LA} $\mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{LA}})$, that is the set of strings produced by non-terminal symbols Stm_{LA} , is defined as follows:

$$\text{Stm}_{\text{LA}} := \text{Id} \leftarrow \text{Exp} \mid \text{Stm}_{\text{LA}}; \text{Stm}_{\text{LA}} \mid \text{while}(\text{Exp})\{\text{Stm}\}_{\text{LA}} \mid \text{RandBit}().$$

Definition B.16 (Big-Step Semantics of SIFP_{LA}). The semantics of a program $P \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{LA}})$ is the smallest relation $\triangleright \subseteq (\mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{LA}}) \times (\text{Id} \rightarrow \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}})) \times ((\text{Id} \rightarrow \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}))$ closed under the following rules:

$$\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma}{\langle \text{Id} \leftarrow e, \Sigma, \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma[\text{Id} \leftarrow \sigma], \omega \rangle} \quad \frac{\langle s, \Sigma, \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma', \omega' \rangle \quad \langle t, \Sigma', \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma'', \omega'' \rangle}{\langle s; t, \Sigma, \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma'', \omega'' \rangle}$$

$$\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{1} \quad \langle s, \Sigma, \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma', \omega' \rangle \quad \langle \text{while}(e)\{s\}, \Sigma', \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma'', \omega'' \rangle}{\langle \text{while}(e)\{s\}, \Sigma, \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma', \omega' \rangle}$$

¹⁹The proof of their correctness requires a conspicuous amount of low-level definitions and technical results. For an extensive presentation, see [5].

$$\frac{\langle e, \Sigma \rangle \rightarrow \sigma \quad \sigma \neq \mathbb{1}}{\langle \text{while}(e)\{s\}, \Sigma, \omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma, \omega \rangle} \quad \frac{}{\langle \text{RandBit}(), \Sigma, \mathbb{b}\omega \rangle \triangleright \langle \Sigma[R \leftarrow \mathbb{b}], \omega \rangle}$$

Lemma B.7. *For each total program $P \in \text{SIFP}_{\text{RA}}$, there is a $Q \in \text{SIFP}_{\text{LA}}$ such that, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{O} \mid \llbracket P \rrbracket(x, \eta) = y\}) = \mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \llbracket Q \rrbracket(x, \eta) = y\}).$$

Moreover, if P is poly-time Q , too.

Proof Sketch. We prove Lemma B.7 showing that SIFP_{RA} can be simulated in SIFP_{LA} given two novel *small-step* semantic relations ($\rightsquigarrow_{\text{LA}}, \rightsquigarrow_{\text{RA}}$) obtained by splitting the corresponding big-step semantics into smallest transitions, one per each $\cdot ; \cdot$ instruction. The intuitive idea behind this novel semantics is to enrich big-step operational semantics with some piece of information, which are needed to build an induction proof of the reduction from SIFP_{RA} to SIFP_{LA} . In particular, we employ a list Ψ containing pairs (x, \mathbb{b}) , to keep track of the previous call to the primitive $\text{Flip}(x)$ for SIFP_{RA} , and to the result of the x -th call of primitive $\text{RandBit}()$ for SIFP_{LA} .

The main issue consists in the simulation of the access to the random tape. Then, we define the translation so that it stores in a specific and fresh register an associative table recording all queries σ within a $\text{Flip}(\sigma)$ instruction and the result \mathbb{b} picked from η and returned. The addition of the map Ψ allows to replicate the content of the associative table Ψ explicitly in the semantics of program. This simulation requires a translation of $\text{Flip}(e)$ into an equivalent procedure.

- at each simulated query $\text{Flip}(e)$, the destination program looks up the associative table
- if it finds the queried coordinate e within a pair (e, \mathbb{b}) , it returns \mathbb{b} . Otherwise, (i) it reduced $\text{Flip}(e)$ to a call of $\text{RandBit}()$ which outputs either $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{0}$ or $\mathbb{b} = \mathbb{1}$, (ii) it records the couple $\langle e, \mathbb{b} \rangle$ in the associative table and returns \mathbb{b} .

The construction is convoluted. This kind of simulation preserves the distributions of strings computed by the original program:

1. we show that the big-step and small-step semantics for SIFP_{RA} and SIFP_{LA} are equally expressive.
2. we define a relation Θ between configurations of the small-step semantics of SIFP_{RA} and SIFP_{LA} :
 - * first, we define a function $\alpha : \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{RA}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{LA}})$ mapping the program $P_{\text{RA}} \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{RA}})$ into the corresponding $P_{\text{LA}} \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{LA}})$, translating $\text{Flip}(e)$ as described above.
 - * we define a relation β between a triple $\langle P_{\text{RA}}, \Sigma, \Psi \rangle$ and a single store Γ , which is meant to capture the configuration-to-store dependencies

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\langle P_{\text{RA}}; Q_{\text{RA}}, \Sigma, \Psi \rangle & \dashrightarrow & \langle Q_{\text{RA}}, \Sigma', \Psi' \rangle \\
\Theta \downarrow & & \downarrow \Theta \\
\langle P_{\text{LA}}; Q_{\text{LA}}, \Gamma, \Phi \rangle & \dashrightarrow & * \langle Q_{\text{LA}}, \Gamma', \Phi' \rangle
\end{array}$$

Figure 8: Commutation schema between SIFP_{RA} and SIFP_{LA}

between the configuration of P_{RA} running with store Σ and computed associative table Ψ and the store Γ of simulating P_{LA} . So, Γ stores a representation of Ψ into a dedicated register.

- * a function γ which transforms the constraints on the oracle gathered by $\rightsquigarrow_{\text{RA}}$ to the information collected by $\rightsquigarrow_{\text{LA}}$. Then, Θ is so defined that $\Theta(\langle P, \Sigma_1, \Psi \rangle, \langle Q, \Sigma_2, \Theta \rangle)$ holds when: (i.) $\alpha(P) = Q$, (ii.) $\beta(\langle P, \Sigma_1, \Psi \rangle, \Sigma_2)$, (iii.) $\gamma(\Psi) = \Phi$, (iv.) $\mu(\Psi) = \mu(\Phi)$.

3. we show that Θ associates to each triple $\langle P_{\text{RA}}, \Sigma, \Psi \rangle$ other triples $\langle P_{\text{LA}}, \Gamma, \Phi \rangle$ which weakly simulate the relation $\rightsquigarrow_{\text{RA}}$ with respect to $\rightsquigarrow_{\text{LA}}$. This is displayed by Figure 8.

□

B.3.2 From SIFP_{LA} to SFP_{OD}

We introduce SFP_{OD} , the class corresponding to SFP defined on a variation of STMs which can read characters from the oracle *on-demand*, and show that SIFP_{LA} can be reduced to it. For readability's sake, we avoid cumbersome details, focussing on an informal (but exhaustive) description of how to build the on-demand STM.

Proposition B.8. *For every $P \in \mathcal{L}(\text{Stm}_{\text{LA}})$, there is a $\mathcal{M}_s^P \in \text{SFP}$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}}$,*

$$P(x, \omega) = \mathcal{M}_s^P(x, \omega).$$

Moreover, if P is poly-time, then \mathcal{M}_s^P is also poly-time.

Proof Sketch. The construction relies on the implementation of a program in SIFP_{LA} by a multi-tape on-demand STM which uses a tape to store the values of each register, plus an additional tape containing the partial results obtained during the evaluation of the expressions and another tape containing ω . We denote the tape used for storing the result coming from the evaluation of the expression with e . The following invariant properties holds:

- on each tape, values are stored to the immediate right of the head,
- the result of the last expression evaluated is stored on tape e to the immediate right of the head.

The value of expressions of SIFP can be computed using the tape e .²⁰ All operations can be implemented without consuming any character on the oracle tape and with linear time with respect to the size of the value of the expression. We assign a sequence of machine states, $q_{s_1}^I, q_{s_1}^1, \dots, q_{s_i}^F$, to each statement s_i . In particular, the statement `RandBit()` is implemented consuming a character on the tape and copying its value on the tape which corresponds to the register R .

Furthermore, if we assume P to be poly-time, after the simulation of each statement, it holds that:

- the length of the non-blank portion of the first tapes corresponding to the register is polynomially bounded as their contents are precisely the contents of P 's registers, which are polynomially bounded as a consequence of the hypotheses of their poly-time complexity,
- the head of all the tapes corresponding to the registers point to the leftmost symbol of the string thereby contained.

It is well-known that the reduction of the number of tapes on a poly-time TM comes with a polynomial overhead in time. For this reason, we conclude that the poly-time multi-tape on-demand STM can be reduced to a poly-time canonical on-demand STM. This concludes our proof. \square

It remains to show that each on-demand STM can be reduced to an equivalent STM.

Lemma B.9. *For every $\mathcal{M}_S = \langle \mathbf{Q}, \Sigma, \delta, q_0 \rangle \in \mathbf{SFP}_{OD}$, the machine $\mathcal{M}_S' = \langle \mathbf{Q}, \Sigma, H(\delta), q_0 \rangle \in \mathbf{SFP}$ is such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and configuration of $\mathcal{M}_S \langle \sigma, q, \tau, \eta \rangle$, and for every $\sigma', \tau' \in \mathbb{S}, q \in \mathbf{Q}, \mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid (\exists \omega') \langle \sigma, q, \tau, \omega \rangle \triangleright_{\delta}^n \langle \sigma', q', \tau', \omega' \rangle\}) = \mu(\{\xi \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid (\exists \xi') \langle \sigma, q, \tau, \xi \rangle \triangleright_{H(\delta)}^n \langle \sigma', q', \tau', \xi' \rangle\})$.*

Proof Sketch. Even in this case, the proof relies on a reduction. In particular, we show that given an on-demand STM, it is possible to build an STM, which is equivalent to the former. Intuitively, the encoding from an on-demand STM to an ordinary STM takes the transition function δ of the STM and substitutes each transition not causing the oracle tape to shift – i.e. tagged with \natural – with two distinct transitions, where \natural is substituted by $\mathbb{0}$ and $\mathbb{1}$, respectively. This causes the resulting machine to produce an identical transition but shifting the head on the oracle tape on the right. We also define an encoding from an on-demand STM to a canonical STM as follows:

$$H := \langle \mathbf{Q}, \Sigma, \delta, q_0 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{Q}, \Sigma, \bigcup \Delta_H(\delta), q_0 \rangle.$$

²⁰In particular we prove this by induction on the syntax of expressions. (1) each access to the value stored in a register consists in a copy of the content of the corresponding tape to e , which is a simple operation (due to the invariant properties above) (2) concatenations – namely $f.0$ and $f.1$ – are implemented by the addition of a character at the end of e , which contains the value of f . (3) the binary expressions are non-trivial. Since one of the two operands is a register identifier, the machine can directly compare e with the tape, corresponding to the identifier, and to replace the content of e with the result of the comparison, which in all cases is $\mathbb{0}$ or $\mathbb{1}$. Further details can be found in [5].

where Δ_H is,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_H(\langle p, c_r, \mathbb{0}, q, c_w, d \rangle) &:= \{\langle p, c_r, \mathbb{0}, q, c_w, d \rangle\} \\ \Delta_H(\langle p, c_r, \mathbb{1}, q, c_w, d \rangle) &:= \{\langle p, c_r, \mathbb{1}, q, c_w, d \rangle\} \\ \Delta_H(\langle p, c_r, \mathbb{1}, q, c_w, d \rangle) &:= \{\langle p, c_r, \mathbb{0}, q, c_w, d \rangle, \langle p, c_r, \mathbb{1}, q, c_w, d \rangle\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

B.3.3 From \mathcal{POR} to \mathbf{SFP}

We then conclude the proof relating \mathcal{POR} and \mathbf{SFP} .

Proposition B.10 (From \mathcal{POR} to \mathbf{SFP}). *For any $f : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{0} \rightarrow \mathbb{S} \in \mathcal{POR}$, there is a function $f^* : \mathbb{S}^k \times \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$ such that for all $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \tau \in \mathbb{S}$,*

$$\mu(\{\omega \in \mathbb{B}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid f(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \omega) = \tau\}) = \mu(\{\eta \in \mathbb{0} \mid f^*(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k, \eta) = \tau\}).$$

Proof. It is a straightforward consequence of Lemma B.6, Lemma B.7, Proposition B.8, and Lemma B.9. □