

The equational theory of the Weihrauch lattice with multiplication

Eike Neumann

Department of Computer Science
Swansea University, Swansea, UK
e.f.neumann@swansea.ac.uk

Arno Pauly

Department of Computer Science
Swansea University, Swansea, UK
Arno.M.Pauly@gmail.com

Cécilia Pradic

Department of Computer Science
Swansea University, Swansea, UK
c.pradic@swansea.ac.uk

We study the equational theory of the Weihrauch lattice with multiplication, meaning the collection of equations between terms built from variables, the lattice operations \sqcup, \sqcap , the product \times , and the finite parallelization $*$ which are true however we substitute Weihrauch degrees for the variables. We provide a combinatorial description of these in terms of a reducibility between finite graphs, and moreover, show that deciding which equations are true in this sense is complete for the third level of the polynomial hierarchy.

Erratum

The first version of this preprint claimed that our theory was not complete because $a \times (b \sqcap c) \leq a \times (b \sqcap (c \times a))$ was not derivable without the pointedness axiom. This is false. We have removed the erroneous statement and added a proof that the axiomatization we propose is complete for Weihrauch degrees if and only if it is complete for pointed degrees if $1 \leq a$ is added (Theorem 15).

1 Introduction

The Weihrauch degrees \mathfrak{W} come with a rich algebraic structure. Here, we consider the lattice operations \sqcup, \sqcap , the product \times and the finite parallelization $*$. They were the first operations on Weihrauch degrees studied in the literature [2, 1, 13]. In order to better understand the structure of the Weihrauch degrees, we would like to characterize its equational theory, i.e. we want to identify which equations between terms over the signature $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \sqcup, \times, 1, (-)^*)$ are true for every instantiation of the variables by Weihrauch degrees. It was already observed in [4] that the equational theory of $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ is the theory of distributive lattices, as $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ is a distributive lattice itself, and every countable distributive lattice embeds into $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \sqcup)$ (via the Medvedev degrees).

Context

Shortly after the precise definition of Weihrauch reducibility was proposed in [8], Brattka and Gherardi raised the question whether the Weihrauch degrees \mathfrak{W} form a Heyting or Brouwer algebra, in line with the overall idea that the structure of the Weihrauch degrees should be some kind of structure of constructive truth values. The question was answered in the negative in [11]; in particular, the Weihrauch degrees are not complete.

The broader question to what extent the Weihrauch degrees form an instance of already studied classes of structures linked to (constructive) logics remains an active area of research. While similarities and tentative connections are easy to find, a satisfactory answer is still eluding

the community. A better understanding of the structure of the Weihrauch degrees seems integral to further progress, in particular for the hope to find the Weihrauch degrees to even be universal for some such logic.

Our contributions

We start by investigating the equational theory of $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times)$. While we only conjecture that the axiomatization we propose for it is complete, we provide a combinatorial characterization in terms of reductions between finite graphs. This in turn will allow us to show that determining universal validity of equations in $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times)$ is Σ_2^p -complete. Since we only work with substructures that include \sqcap , we can write inequalities instead of equations by treating $t \leq u$ as an abbreviation for $t = t \sqcap u$.

A Weihrauch degree is called *pointed* if its representatives have some computable instance. We denote by $\mathfrak{W}_\bullet \subset \mathfrak{W}$ the subset of pointed degrees and write \leq_\bullet and $=_\bullet$ instead of \leq and $=$ when we mean inequalities and equations that are only meant to be valid for pointed degrees. One easy observation is that if an (in)equality holds in \mathfrak{W} , it also holds in \mathfrak{W}_\bullet .

Occasionally a variant of Weihrauch reducibility called *strong* Weihrauch reducibility is studied. Our operations are also operations on strong Weihrauch degrees, which we shall denote by \mathfrak{W}^s , and it turns out that the equational theory of $(\mathfrak{W}^s, \sqcap, \times)$ and $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times)$ coincide. However, as the strong Weihrauch degrees are not distributive as a lattice [7], this does not extend to signatures including \sqcap and \sqcup .

Other work on the structure of the Weihrauch degrees

Another investigation into the structure of the Weihrauch degrees is [12]. A key result there is that 1 is definable in just (\mathfrak{W}, \leq_W) – but this involves multiple quantifiers, and thus is not directly relevant to the equational theory we study here.

At first glance, [10] seems to have a similar approach to our work. Hertling and Selivanov consider the complexity of a combinatorial reducibility which earlier work by Hertling [9] tied to continuous Weihrauch reducibility. However, nothing seems to be known about definability of the fragment of the continuous Weihrauch degrees which is characterized by the combinatorial reducibility.

Related work in proof theory

We are not aware of axioms systems matching exactly those we provided for $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times)$ in the literature. Despite of this, there are tentative connections to be made between notions of correctness in substructural logics being phrased in terms of graphs and our notion of reduction in terms of graphs. In particular, [5] has a strikingly similar notion of reducibility between graphs generalizing boolean formulas. This seems to indicate casting our axioms or our general notion of graph reducibility in a deep inference system might be of relevance in uncovering a complete axiomatization for the theories we consider.

2 Introducing the operations

A general reference on Weihrauch degrees is the survey article [3]. Here, we will recap briefly the operations we study. As we are interested in only the structure of the Weihrauch degrees,

we can avoid introducing represented spaces, and instead work with the following:

Definition 1. Let $f, g : \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be multivalued functions. We write $f \leq_W g$ and say that f is *Weihrauch reducible* to g if there are computable $H : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow \text{dom}(g)$ and (partial) $K : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that for all $x \in \text{dom}(f)$ and $y \in g(H(x))$ we have that $K(x, y)$ is defined and $K(x, y) \in f(x)$.

The Weihrauch degrees are the equivalence classes for \leq_W . We denote them by \mathfrak{W} . If K does not depend on its first input, we have a strong Weihrauch reduction $f \leq_{sW} g$. The strong Weihrauch degrees are denoted by \mathfrak{W}^s .

Let $\langle \cdot \rangle : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a standard pairing function. The operations we investigate are the following:

Definition 2. Given multivalued functions $f, g : \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we define

- $f \sqcap g$ by $0p \in (f \sqcap g)(\langle q_0, q_1 \rangle)$ if $p \in f(q_0)$ and $1p \in (f \sqcap g)(\langle q_0, q_1 \rangle)$ if $p \in g(q_1)$;
- $f \sqcup g$ by $0p \in (f \sqcup g)(0q)$ if $p \in f(q)$ and $1p \in (f \sqcup g)(1q)$ if $p \in g(q)$;
- $f \times g$ by $\langle p_0, p_1 \rangle \in (f \times g)(\langle q_0, q_1 \rangle)$ if $p_0 \in f(q_0)$ and $p_1 \in g(q_1)$.

These operations on multivalued functions induce operations on Weihrauch degrees. Moreover, the operations are monotone. The Weihrauch degrees are a lattice, with \sqcap as meet and \sqcup as join.

We also make use of the constant 1, which is the Weihrauch degree of $\text{id} : \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. The representatives of 1 are exactly the computable multivalued functions whose domain contains a computable point. The upper cone of 1 (i.e. $\{f \mid 1 \leq_W f\}$) is the class of pointed Weihrauch degrees \mathfrak{W}_\bullet .

Definition 3. Given a multivalued function $f : \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightrightarrows \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we define f^* by $0^\omega \in f^*(1p)$ and $\langle p_0, p_1 \rangle \in f^*(0^{n+1}1\langle q_0, q_1 \rangle)$ if $p_0 \in f(q_0)$ and $p_1 \in f^*(0^n 1q_1)$.

Plainly spoken, f^* receives a number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ together with n inputs for f and outputs n corresponding solutions.

At first, we investigate the structures $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ and $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1)$. A partial axiomatization for these is provided in Figure 1. We do not explicitly list monotonicity of the operations and transitivity of \leq . To express the axioms, we will only need Horn clauses, that is formulas of the shape $\bigwedge_i t_i \leq u_i \Rightarrow t' \leq u'$. Our partial axiomatization essentially states that \sqcap does behave like a greatest lower bound, that \times and 1 equip \mathfrak{W} with a relevant commutative ordered monoid structure and that \times *half-distributes* over \sqcap . Proofs that they hold in \mathfrak{W} are not difficult and can be found in [4].

We were unable to find a true inequality in $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ that does not follow from the stated axioms, and thus offer up the following:

Conjecture 4. $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ is fully axiomatized by Figure 1.

We also show later that the axiomatization is complete for \mathfrak{W} if and only if it the pointed version is complete for \mathfrak{W}_\bullet (Theorem 15).

3 A combinatorial notion of reducibility for terms

The goal of this section is to give a combinatorial criterion to check the validity of an inequality. Along the way we will see that the validity of an inequality where the semantics of the variables

Basic properties of $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$		
$a \times (b \times c) = (a \times b) \times c$	$a \times 1 = a$	monoid structure
$a \times b = b \times a$		commutativity
$a \leq a \times a$		relevance
$a \sqcap b \leq a$	$a \sqcap b \leq b$	\sqcap is a lower bound
$a \leq b \wedge a \leq c \Rightarrow a \leq b \sqcap c$		\sqcap is the greatest lb
$(a \times b) \sqcap c \leq a \times (b \sqcap c)$		half-distributivity
Additional axiom for the pointed case $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1)$		
$1 \leq_\bullet a$ bottom element		

Figure 1: Our set of axioms for the systems under consideration, where we implicitly assume that equality is an equivalence relation, that all operators are monotone in each of their arguments and that inequalities are transitive. Every axiom we state holds when substituting \leq_\bullet for \leq everywhere, and we take this as axioms for \leq_\bullet alongside the specific \leq_\bullet axioms.

may range over all possible degrees can be reduced to the validity of the inequality where the variables are interpreted as sufficiently independent degrees. Let us first formally state the notion we investigate:

Definition 5. Let u and v be terms constructed from variables, the constant 1 and the binary connectives \sqcap, \times . We say that an inequality $t \leq u$ (respectively $t \leq_\bullet u$) is *universally valid* when for every interpretation of the variable as Weihrauch degrees (respectively pointed Weihrauch degrees), there is a corresponding Weihrauch reduction.

Clearly, if $t \leq u$ is universally valid, then so is $t \leq_\bullet u$. Conversely, if $t \leq_\bullet u$ is universally valid, then $t \leq u$ is universally valid if and only if every variable occurring in u also occurs in t . The reason for this is that the only difference between a Weihrauch reduction to f and a Weihrauch reduction to $f \sqcup 1$ is that for the latter we do not necessarily need access to an instance for f . If every variable in u appears also in t , then for every instantiation of the variables, we have available to us valid inputs for all Weihrauch degrees.


Now we prepare to define a combinatorial reduction between terms. To do so, we first need to introduce an interpretation of terms as graphs.

Definition 6. A (finite coloured undirected) graph is a triple (V, E, c) where V is a finite set of vertices, $E \subseteq [V]^2$ is a set of edges and $c : V \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ a colouring of the vertices by variables.

Definition 7. Write $G + H$ for the disjoint union of two graphs and G^\perp for $(V, [V]^2 \setminus E, c)$ when $G = (V, E, c)$. The interpretation $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ of terms t as graphs is defined by induction as follows:

- for a variable v , $\llbracket v \rrbracket$ is a graph with a single vertex with colour v
- $\llbracket t \sqcap u \rrbracket = \llbracket t \rrbracket + \llbracket u \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket t \times u \rrbracket = (\llbracket t \rrbracket^\perp + \llbracket u \rrbracket^\perp)^\perp$

The graphs that arise as $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ for some term u are known as *cographs*. They can also be characterized as those graphs that do not have an induced subgraph forming a line of length 3 [6]. Below we give some examples of terms and corresponding cographs.




The intuition is that a coloured graph (V, E, c) can be read as the following Weihrauch problem, assuming the colours correspond themselves to Weihrauch problems: given for each vertex $v \in V$ an input i_v to $c(v)$, output a maximal clique C of (V, E) together with solutions for every i_v s with $v \in C$. Under this interpretation, the problems denoted $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ and t are Weihrauch-equivalent. This leads naturally to the following notion of combinatorial reduction between coloured graphs.

Definition 8. Given two graphs $G = (V_G, E_g, c_G)$ and $H = (V_H, E_H, c_H)$, call a partial function $f : V_H \rightarrow V_G$ a \bullet -reduction of G to H if it respects colours (i.e., $c_H(v) = c_G(f(v))$ for all $v \in V_H$) and the image of every maximal clique in H under f contains a maximal clique of G . If f is total, it is a *reduction*.

An inequality $t \leq u$ (respectively $t \leq_\bullet u$) is said to be *combinatorially valid* if there is a reduction of $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ into $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ (respectively a \bullet -reduction).

Let us illustrate the notion of combinatorial reduction on our examples.



In the two examples above, we have a strict reduction. We do not specify the total maps between vertices as they are uniquely determined by the colors in these particular cases. The shaded areas correspond to maximal cliques in the graphs and they have matching colors when the reductions relate them. There are no reductions the other ways around: for the first scenario, this is because the clique $\{a, c\}$ on the left can only be mapped to a strict subclique of the triangular clique on the right by a color-preserving map. For the second case, where we have a unique color preserving-map, it is because $\{a, b\}$ does not contain a maximal clique in the rightmost graph.

We are now ready to state the main theorem of this section:

Theorem 9. Let t and u be terms constructed from variables and the binary connectives \square, \times . Then inequalities $t \leq u$ and $t \leq_\bullet u$ are universally valid if and only if they are combinatorially valid.

To prove the theorem, we shall introduce a third notion of validity. Assume that we have a countable enumeration $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{V}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of all the variables that we may ever want to use in our terms. We pick a countable strong antichain $(a_{n,m})_{(n,m) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ of elements of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ in the Turing degrees.

Definition 10. We say that an inequality $t \leq u$ is *generically valid* if it holds when we instantiate the n -th variable by the function $(a_{n,0}, k) \mapsto a_{n,k+1} : \{a_{n,0}\} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. We say that $u \leq_\bullet v$ is *generically valid* if it holds when we instantiate the n -th variable by the function $k \mapsto a_{n,k} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Lemma 11. A generically valid inequality $t \leq u$ or $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ is also combinatorially valid.

Proof. That $t \leq u$ or $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ respectively is generically valid is stating that there exists a Weihrauch reduction $f_t \leq_W g_u$ between particular multivalued functions constructed from the terms. We fix an input to f_t where different occurrences of the same variable receive different integer inputs. The valid solutions for f are certain combinations of values $a_{i,j}$ from our chosen strong antichain. Following the construction of $\llbracket t \rrbracket$, we see that the sufficient combinations of $a_{i,j}$ correspond to the maximal cliques in $\llbracket t \rrbracket$.

Since the reduction cannot obtain one of the $a_{i,j}$ unless the value is returned by g_u , we can obtain the reduction from $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ by observing which values provided by g_u are the ones demanded by f_t .

If we are considering $t \leq_{\bullet} u$, we are done. For $t \leq u$ we observe that the presence of $a_{n,0}$ in the domains means that $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ cannot have any colours which are absent from $\llbracket t \rrbracket$. We can thus make the partial reduction total by assigning some arbitrary vertex of the correct colour for any undefined output. \square

Lemma 12. A combinatorially valid inequality $t \leq u$ or $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ is also universally valid.

Proof. The forward reduction is entirely determined by the combinatorial one, and the backwards strong reduction can be obtained by taking a choice function between maximal cliques corresponding to the correctness criterion for the combinatorial reduction. \square

Proof of Theorem 9. It is relatively straightforward to prove

$$\text{universal} \xrightarrow{(1)} \text{generic} \xrightarrow{(2)} \text{combinatorial} \xrightarrow{(3)} \text{universal}$$

(1) is trivial. (2) is the statement of Lemma 11. (3) is the statement of Lemma 12. \square

Extending the picture to strong Weihrauch reducibility

The proof of Lemma 12 proceeded by observing that a combinatorial reduction between terms translates to a Weihrauch reduction between the Weihrauch degrees obtained by substituting some arbitrary multivalued functions for the variables. The Weihrauch reductions we get are even strong Weihrauch reductions. Thus, the results of Theorem 9 still hold when we replace universally valid by its counterpart for strong Weihrauch reducibility. This yields:

Corollary 13. $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times)$ and $(\mathfrak{W}^s, \sqcap, \times)$ have the same equational theory.

On the constant 1

Extending our results for inequalities $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ built from \sqcap, \times to terms also including the constant 1 is straightforward, as our axioms for the pointed degrees allow us to simplify any term over $(\sqcap, \times, 1)$ to produce either just 1 or a term over (\sqcap, \times) .

For inequalities $t \leq u$, this is less straightforward. We can extend our interpretations of terms as coloured cographs to include 1 by mapping 1 to an uncoloured vertex. In the definition of a reduction map the uncoloured vertices are ignored other than in defining what the maximal cliques are. This means that the reduction map does not have to be defined on the uncoloured vertices, and the image of a maximal clique in $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ has to contain – up to some uncoloured vertices – a maximal clique in $\llbracket t \rrbracket$.

While having 1 available to us makes it trivial to reduce universal validity of terms $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ to universal validity of terms $t' \leq u'$, this is possible even without 1:

Proposition 14. Let t, u be terms built using the variables x_0, \dots, x_n . The term $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ is universally valid iff $t \times x_0 \times \dots \times x_n \leq u \times x_0 \times \dots \times x_n$ is universally valid.

Proof. Write (V_t, E_t, c_t) and (V_u, E_u, c_u) for $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ respectively, and assume that we have that the vertices of $\llbracket x_0 \times \dots \times x_n \rrbracket$ being $\{0, \dots, n\}$ and disjoint from V_t and V_u . For both directions, we use the combinatorial validity of the reductions, which we know to be equivalent to universal validity.

If we have a pointed combinatorial reduction $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ witnessed by a partial map $f : V_u \rightarrow V_t$, then it can be extended to a non-pointed one witnessed by $\hat{f} : V_u \cup \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow V_t \cup \{0, \dots, n\}$ extending f by setting $\hat{f}(i) = i$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\hat{f}(v) = i$ when $v \in V_u \setminus \text{dom}(f)$ and $c_t(v) = x_i$. It is easily checked to map maximal cliques to sets containing maximal cliques.

Conversely, if we have a combinatorial reduction $t \times x_0 \times \dots \times x_n \leq u \times x_0 \times \dots \times x_n$ witnessed by $g : V_u \cup \{0, \dots, n\} \rightarrow V_t \cup \{0, \dots, n\}$, we may massage it into a partial map $\hat{g} : V_u \rightarrow V_t$ witnessing a combinatorial reduction $t \leq_{\bullet} u$. \hat{g} is defined as follows for $v \in V_u$:

- If $g(v) \in V_t$, we take $\hat{g}(v) = g(v)$
- If $g(v) = i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and $g(i) \in V_t$, we take $\hat{g}(v) = g(i)$
- Otherwise $v \notin \text{dom}(\hat{g})$

If we have a maximal clique M in $\llbracket u \rrbracket$, then $M \cup \{0, \dots, n\}$ is a maximal clique in $\llbracket u \times x_0 \times \dots \times x_n \rrbracket$ and thus gets mapped by g to a set S containing a maximal clique in $\llbracket t \times x_0 \times \dots \times x_n \rrbracket$ by g . Writing S' for $S \cap V_t$, we clearly have that $S = S' \cup \{0, \dots, n\}$ and that S' contains a maximal clique of $\llbracket t \rrbracket$. But then we also have \hat{g} maps M to S' : let us prove this by contradiction. If an element e of S' is not in $\hat{g}(M)$, it means that there is no $v \in V_u$ such that $g(v) = e$ but there is some $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $g(i) = e$ by the first clause in the definition of \hat{g} . But since $i \in S$, there must be some v' in M such that $g(v') = i$. But then that would mean that $\hat{g}(v') = e$ by the second clause, a contradiction. \square

4 Completeness does not depend on pointedness

Theorem 15. The axioms of Figure 1 are complete for $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ if and only if they are complete for $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ when adding $1 \leq_{\bullet} a$

To prove this theorem, we first establish some results for derivability that allows us to relate the pointed and non-pointed theories. For any finite set X of variables, call i_X the formula $1 \sqcap \prod_{x \in X} x$. The intuition is that the corresponding Weihrauch problem requires at least an input for every x to be provided, but does not answer any of the corresponding questions.

Lemma 16. For any finite sets of variables X and Y , we can derive $i_X \times i_Y = i_{X \cup Y}$.

Proof. Firstly we can show that we have $i_X \times i_X = i_X$. This is because we have the relevance axiom and $i_X \times i_X \leq i_X \times 1 = i_X$, since $i_X \leq 1$ by definition. Then, note that $i_{X'} \leq i_X$ whenever $X \subseteq X'$. So we have $i_{X \cup Y} = i_{X \cup Y} \times i_{X \cup Y} \leq i_X \times i_Y$. For the converse direction, it suffices to show that $i_X \times i_Y \leq 1$, $i_X \times i_Y \leq x$ for all $x \in X$ and, symmetrically, $i_X \times i_Y \leq y$ for all $y \in Y$. This is straightforward as $i_X \leq 1$ and $i_X \leq x$ for every $x \in X$. \square

Lemma 17. For any term t whose set of free variables is X , we can derive $i_X \times t = t$.

Proof. Deriving $t \leq i_X \times t$ is easy since $1 \leq i_X$. For the converse, we proceed by induction over t . If $t = 1$, this amounts to $1 \times 1 = 1$. If $t = t_1 \times t_2$, call X_1 and X_2 the free variables of t_1 and t_2 respectively. In this case we have $X = X_1 \cup X_2$, so we can derive $i_X \times t \leq i_{X_1} \times t_1 \times i_{X_2} \times t_2$ using Lemma 16 and then conclude using the inductive hypotheses and the monotonicity axiom for \times . If we have $t = t_1 \sqcap t_2$, adopting similar naming conventions, we also have $i_X \times t \leq (i_{X_1} \times t_1) \sqcap (i_{X_2} \times t_2)$ using the fact that $i_X \leq i_Y$ for any $Y \subseteq X$, and we similarly use monotonicity of \sqcap . \square

Lemma 18. For any terms t and u such that all the free variables of t and u are contained in a finite set X , then we have that $i_X \times t \leq u$ is derivable if and only if $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ is derivable.

Proof. The left-to-right direction is straightforward, as we have $1 \leq_{\bullet} x$ for all $x \in X$ and therefore $1 \leq_{\bullet} i_X$. For the right-to-left direction, we need to reason by induction on the size of a derivation $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ and make a case analysis on the last axiom applied.

- If the last axiom applied is reflexivity and $t = u$, we can simply apply Lemma 17 since X is a superset of the free variables of t .
- If the last axiom applied is transitivity, i.e. we have two subderivations of $t \leq_{\bullet} v$ and $v \leq_{\bullet} u$ for some v , we can assume, without loss of generality, that all variables occurring in v occur in X . Because if we had such a variable a in v , we could get derivations of the same size of $t = t[1/a] \leq_{\bullet} v[1/a]$ and $v[1/a] \leq_{\bullet} u[1/a] = u$. Therefore, we can apply the induction hypothesis to get derivations of $i_X \times u \leq v$ and $i_X \times v \leq u$ which we can chain as follows

$$i_X \times t \leq i_X \times (i_X \times t) \leq i_X \times v \leq u$$

- If the last axiom applied is monotonicity of \times , i.e. we have derivations $t_1 \leq_{\bullet} u_1$, $t_2 \leq_{\bullet} u_2$ and $t = t_1 \times t_2$ and $u = u_1 \times u_2$, then we can apply the inductive hypotheses to obtain $i_X \times t_j \leq u_j$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and conclude by

$$i_X \times t_1 \times t_2 \leq i_X \times t_1 \times i_X \times t_2 \leq u_1 \times u_2$$

- Monotonicity of \sqcap is handled similarly.
- All of the other axioms shared between the pointed and non-pointed cases are handled trivially. So only $1 \leq_{\bullet} t$ remains, for which it suffices to prove that $i_X \leq t$. This is done via an easy induction over t .

\square

Proof of Theorem 15. First let us assume that our theory is complete for \mathfrak{W}_{\bullet} and that we have that $t \leq u$ combinatorially valid in \mathfrak{W} . In particular, our theory derives $t \leq_{\bullet} u$. Via combinatorial validity, we also know that means that the free variables of u are also free variables of t ; call X the set of free variables of t . By Lemma 18, we have that our theory derives $i_X \times t \leq u$, but we also have by Lemma 17 that $t \leq i_X \times t$, so we can conclude that the theory is also complete for \mathfrak{W} .

Conversely, if the theory is complete for \mathfrak{W} and $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ is combinatorially valid in \mathfrak{W}_{\bullet} , then, if X is the set of free variables of u , $i_X \times t \leq u$ is easily seen to be combinatorially valid; the partial map given by the pointed reduction can be made total by mapping unmapped vertices to those in $\llbracket i_X \rrbracket$. Then, by completeness we have $i_X \times t \leq u$ derivable, and since $1 \leq_{\bullet} i_X$, we a fortiori have $t = 1 \times t \leq_{\bullet} i_X \times t \leq u$ derivable. \square

Joins		
$a \leq a \sqcup b$	$b \leq a \sqcup b$	\sqcup is an upper bound
$b \leq a \wedge c \leq a \Rightarrow b \sqcup c \leq a$		\sqcup is the least ub
$a \sqcap (b \sqcup c) = a \sqcap b \sqcup a \sqcap c$	distributivity of \sqcap	
$a \times (b \sqcup c) = a \times b \sqcup a \times c$	distributivity of \times	

Parallelization		
$a \leq a^*$	$(a^*)^* \leq a^*$	closure operator
$a^* \times a^* \leq a^*$		duplicable
$(a \sqcup b)^* = a^* \times b^*$	interaction with \sqcup	
$(a \sqcap b)^* = a^* \sqcap b^*$	interaction with \sqcap	
$(a \times b)^* = 1 \sqcup a \times a^* \times b \times b^*$	interaction with \times	
$1^* = 1$	interaction with 1	

Figure 2: Axioms for \sqcup and $(-)^*$

5 Introducing joins and parallelization

We extend our axiomatization of $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ to an axiomatization of $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup, (-)^*)$ as shown in Figure 2. This list of axioms is not free of redundancy. For example, duplicability of $(-)^*$ follows from $a = a \sqcup a$ and the interaction of $(-)^*$ with \sqcup . We will show that a complete axiomatization of $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ yields a complete axiomatization of $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup, (-)^*)$.

Observe that the distributivity rules for \sqcap , \times , and $(-)^*$ in Figure 2 allow us to rewrite every term t as a join $t = \bigsqcup_i t_i$ where the t_i s are \sqcup -free terms such that parallelization is only applied to variables. Distributing \sqcap and \times over \sqcup can increase the size of the term exponentially.

However, we can re-write any term in linear time into one where parallelization is applied only to variables. This is obvious in the pointed case, since the rule $(a \times b)^* = 1 \sqcup a \times a^* \times b \times b^*$ together with pointedness yields $(a \times b)^* = a^* \times b^*$. In general, an easy induction shows that any term of the form $t = (\times_{i=1}^n t_i)^*$ is derivably equivalent to $1 \sqcup \times_{i=1}^n (t_i \times t_i^*)$ via a linear-size derivation.

First, we extend the combinatorial criterion to terms with the additional connectives. With our axioms, we can without loss of generality assume that parallelizations are only applied to variables; terms that do not satisfy this can be rewritten to terms that do so in linear time to terms that are provably equivalent. We make this assumption below when defining the notion of combinatorial reduction for those terms.

A (coloured undirected) graph *with parallelization information* is a tuple (V, E, c, p) such that (V, E, c) is a graph as before and $p : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is an additional colour information, meant to convey whether a particular vertex v denotes the variable $c(v)$ or the term $c(v)^*$. There is an obvious extension of $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ that converts \sqcup -free terms to graphs with parallelization information.

For a term t over $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, \sqcup, (-)^*)$, we define the set $\text{Slice}(t)$ of *slices of t* by induction as follows:

- If t is \sqcup -free, then $\text{Slice}(t) = \{t\}$.
- $\text{Slice}(t \sqcup u) = \text{Slice}(t) \cup \text{Slice}(u)$.

- For $\otimes \in \{\sqcap, \times\}$, let

$$\text{Slice}(t \otimes u) = \text{Slice}(t) \otimes \text{Slice}(u) := \{t' \otimes u' \mid t' \in \text{Slice}(t), u' \in \text{Slice}(u)\}.$$

Any term $t' \in \text{Slice}(t)$ is \sqcup -free and can hence be associated with a graph with parallelization information $\llbracket t' \rrbracket$.

Definition 19. Let t and u be terms over $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, \sqcup, (-)^*)$. A *combinatorial reduction from t to u* is given by a map $s: \text{Slice}(t) \rightarrow \text{Slice}(u)$ and a family of relations $f_{t'} \subseteq V_{s(t')} \times V_{t'}$ indexed over the slices t' of t , such that the following conditions are satisfied:

1. For all $t' \in \text{Slice}(t)$, if $p_{s(t')}(x) = 0$ then $(x, y), (x, y') \in f_{t'}$ implies $y = y'$ ($f_{t'}$ is single-valued on non-parallelized variables).
2. For all $t' \in \text{Slice}(t)$, if $(x, y) \in f_{t'}$ then $c_{t'}(y) = c_{s(t')}(x)$ ($f_{t'}$ respects colours).
3. For all $t' \in \text{Slice}(t)$, if $(x, y) \in f_{t'}$ then $p_{t'}(y) \leq p_{s(t')}(x)$ ($f_{t'}$ respects parallelization information).
4. For all $t' \in \text{Slice}(t)$ and all maximal cliques M in $\llbracket s(t') \rrbracket$ the image of M under $f_{t'}$ contains a maximal clique of t' .

We say that a pointed inequality $t \leq_\bullet u$ is *combinatorially valid* if there exists a corresponding combinatorial reduction between the two terms.

Lemma 20. Combinatorial and universal validity coincide for terms over $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \sqcup, \times, (-)^*)$.

Proof. The structure of the proof is identical to that of the proof of Lemma 9.

We introduce generic validity of formulas just as we did for formulas over $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times)$. It is clear that universal validity implies generic validity.

To show that that generic validity implies combinatorial validity one starts with a Weihrauch reduction $g_t \leq_W g_u$ where g_t and g_u are “generic interpretations” of terms t and u respectively. By a straightforward induction on the definitions of \times , \sqcap , \sqcup , and Slice , one obtains that the forward Weihrauch reduction yields a combinatorial reduction from t to u , whose correctness is witnessed by the backwards reduction. To prove the latter part, one queries in g_t the generic Weihrauch degrees associated with different occurrences of non-parallelized variables for pairwise distinct integers. The parallelized degrees associated with occurrences of parallelized variables are queried for pairwise distinct integers that are also pairwise distinct from all the queries to non-parallelized variables. Further, one ensures that every parallelized degree associated with an occurrence of a parallelized variable is queried for a number of inputs that is strictly larger than the number of occurrences of variables in u .

Finally, it is fairly straightforward to construct a Weihrauch reduction from a combinatorial reduction, analogously to Lemma 9. \square

Lemma 20 allows us to extend a complete axiomatization for $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1)$ to a complete axiomatization for $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup, (-)^*)$ by adding the axioms in Figure 2:

Proposition 21. Let Γ be a complete set of axioms for $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1)$. Let Δ denote the set of axioms from Figure 2. Then $\Gamma \cup \Delta$ is a complete set of axioms for $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup, (-)^*)$.

Proof. We proceed in stages, starting from the complete axiomatization of $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times)$ and improving to a complete axiomatization of $(\mathfrak{W}_\bullet, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup, (-)^*)$ by claiming that $\Gamma \cup \Delta$ is a complete axiomatization of the substructures obtained by adding the connectives $(-)^*$, \sqcup and 1 successively.

Adding parallelization: Assume we have $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ universally valid in $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, (-)^*)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $(-)^*$ is only applied to variables in t and u . Then, by Lemma 20, there exists a combinatorial reduction from t to u . Since both terms are \sqcup -free, this reduction is given by a single relation $f_t \subseteq V_u \times V_t$ as in Definition 19. Consider those vertices $x \in V_u$ that are related by f_t to a set of vertices $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ in t with $m > 1$. Such vertices necessarily correspond to subterms of u of the form a^* , where a is a variable. Construct a new graph G' from $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ by replacing all such vertices x in $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ by a clique of m vertices x_1, \dots, x_m , where m is the size of the image of $\{x\}$ under f_t , all coloured with the same colour as x and with $p(x_i) = 1$ for all i . We have $G' = \llbracket u' \rrbracket$, where u' is obtained from u by replacing certain subterms of the form a^* with subterms of the form $a^* \times \dots \times a^*$. The equality $u =_{\bullet} u'$ is derivable in $\Gamma \cup \Delta$ by employing relevance of \times and the duplication axiom from Figure 2. By construction, the combinatorial reduction f_t from t to u can be made into a single-valued combinatorial reduction g from t to u' . Fix a mapping $P: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ between variables, sending the variables that occur in u or t to fresh distinct variables, not occurring in either term. Let \hat{t} denote the term which is obtained from t by replacing all subterms of t of the form a^* for a variable a with the variable $P(a)$. Let \hat{u} denote the term which is obtained from u' by replacing all subterms of u' of the form a^* for a variable a as follows: If the vertex in $\llbracket u' \rrbracket$ corresponding to the subterm gets mapped by g to a vertex which corresponds to a term of the form a^* , replace the subterm with the variable $P(a)$. If the vertex $\llbracket u' \rrbracket$ corresponding to the subterm gets mapped by g to a vertex which corresponds to a term of the form a , replace the term with the variable a . By construction, the terms \hat{u} and \hat{t} belong to the language of the fragment $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$, and we have a combinatorial reduction from \hat{t} to \hat{u} . By assumption, this yields a derivation over Γ of the inequality $\hat{t} \leq_{\bullet} \hat{u}$. By reversing the substitution we have performed everywhere in the derivation, we obtain a derivation of the inequality $t \leq_{\bullet} u'$. Since $u' =_{\bullet} u$ is derivable, so is $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ as required.

Adding joins: Now, consider the full fragment $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, \sqcup, (-)^*)$. Suppose that an inequality $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ in this fragment is universally valid. Then by the above considerations we obtain a derivably equivalent formula of the form $\bigsqcup_i t_i \leq_{\bullet} \bigsqcup_j u_j$ where the t_i s and u_j s are \sqcup -free and finite parallelizations are applied only to variables. By the axiom stating that \sqcup is the least upper bound, this further reduces to deriving the universally valid formula $t_i \leq_{\bullet} \bigsqcup_j u_j$ for all i .

Now, observe that $t \leq_{\bullet} u \sqcup v$ is universally valid for a \sqcup -free term t as above if and only if $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ or $t \leq_{\bullet} v$ is universally valid. Indeed, by Lemma 20, universal validity of an inequality is equivalent to the existence of a combinatorial reduction. By definition, a combinatorial reduction from t to $u \sqcup v$ for \sqcup -free t immediately yields a combinatorial reduction from t to u or from t to v , since we have $\text{Slice}(t) = \{t\}$ and $\text{Slice}(u \sqcup v) = \text{Slice}(u) \cup \text{Slice}(v)$.

Hence, from the universal validity of $t_i \leq_{\bullet} \bigsqcup_j u_j$ we obtain the universal validity of $t_i \leq_{\bullet} u_j$ for some j , which is over $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, (-)^*)$ and thus derivable from $\Gamma \cup \Delta$.

Adding 1: Given a term t over the full signature, it is easy to check whether it is equivalent to 1 and then prove from $\Gamma \cup \Delta$ that it is equivalent to it if need be, or to derive $t =_{\bullet} t'$ with t' free of 1. Then if we are to prove a universally valid inequality $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ we have three cases:

- both t and u are equivalent to 1-free terms hence we derive $t =_{\bullet} t' \leq_{\bullet} u' =_{\bullet} u$ using our previous point

- if $t =_{\bullet} 1$, then we can then derive $t =_{\bullet} 1 \leq_{\bullet} u$ where the latter is derived by recurring over u
- if $u =_{\bullet} 1$, then it is also the case that $t =_{\bullet} 1$ since 1 is the bottom element of \mathfrak{W}_{\bullet} , and we can derive $u =_{\bullet} 1 =_{\bullet} t$.

□

Finally, we observe that we can extend our notion of combinatorial validity to non-pointed terms over $(\mathfrak{W}, \sqcap, \times, (-)^*, 1)$ by requiring that the relations f_t be left-total and handling 1 as indicated at the end of Section 3. Using this, we obtain an analogous result to Proposition 21 for the non-pointed case. The proof is almost identical, so we will not spell it out in detail.

6 Complexity of deciding validity

We turn to the problem of determining the validity of an inequality over $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1, (-)^*)$ or $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup, (-)^*)$. We first consider the \sqcup -free case:

Theorem 22. The problem “is the inequality $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ valid?” in the structure $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times)$ is Σ_2^p -complete.

Proof. In view of Lemma 20 we can consider the equivalent problem of deciding the existence of a combinatorial reduction from t to u , i.e. a \bullet -reduction from $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket u \rrbracket$.

For containment in Σ_2^p , note that the existence of a reduction can be essentially written as

$$\exists f : V_u \rightarrow V_t. \underbrace{\forall C \text{ max. clique of } \llbracket u \rrbracket. \overbrace{f(C) \text{ contains a max. clique of } \llbracket u \rrbracket}^{\text{polytime}}}_{\text{coNP}}.$$

In the above, all quantifiers involve polynomial-sized objects relative to G and H . It hence suffices to count quantifiers and argue that we may indeed check the inner condition in polynomial time.

In general, checking whether a set of vertices contains a maximal clique may be hard. However, in our case, since we are working with denotations of terms, we are not working with general graphs, but cographs. In this case, there is a straightforward algorithm for deciding this problem. For a term t , let the predicate $\text{MClique}_t(s, V)$ for subterms s of t and sets V of occurrences of variables in t be defined as follows:

1. For an occurrence v of a variable, $\text{MClique}_t(v, V)$ holds true if and only if $v \in V$.
2. $\text{MClique}_t(s \sqcap u, V) = \text{MClique}_t(s, V) \vee \text{MClique}_t(u, V)$.
3. $\text{MClique}_t(s \times u, V) = \text{MClique}_t(s, V) \wedge \text{MClique}_t(u, V)$.

If we represent the set V appropriately, the predicate $\text{MClique}_t(s, V)$ can be evaluated in essentially linear time. It is clear that $\text{MClique}_t(s, V)$ holds true if and only if the set V contains a maximal clique in $\llbracket t \rrbracket$.

To show Σ_2^p -hardness, we reduce in polynomial time TQBF restricted to Σ_2 formulas to our problem. Given a quantified boolean formula

$$\exists x_1, \dots, x_k \forall y_1, \dots, y_n \bigwedge_{i \in I} \bigvee_{j \in J_i} \ell_j,$$

with the ℓ_j s being literals generated from $\{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_n\}$, define $K = 1 + \sum_{i \in I} |J_i|$. We may then produce in polynomial time the following terms whose variables are literals (where powers are to be understood as iterated \times):

- $E_L = \bigtimes_{m=1}^k x_m^K \sqcap \overline{x_m}^K$ and $E_R = \bigtimes_{m=1}^k x_m^K \times \overline{x_m}^K$
- $A = \bigtimes_{m=1}^n y_m^K \sqcap \overline{y_m}^K$
- $F = \bigtimes_{i \in I} \prod_{j \in J_i} \ell_j$

To conclude, we only need to argue that the formula is satisfiable if and only if the inequality

$$E_L \times F \leq \bullet E_R \times A$$

is valid.

Assume that the formula is satisfiable. Then there exists a valuation $\rho: \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ of the x_i s such that for all valuations $\theta: \{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ of the y_j s, the combined valuation (ρ, θ) renders the formula true.

Pick any ρ as above. Then there exists a partial mapping $f: E_R \times A \rightarrow E_L \times F$ with the following properties:

1. If $\rho(x_i) = 1$, the map f sends all occurrences of $\overline{x_i}$ in E_R to an occurrence of $\overline{x_i}$ in E_L , such that the clique $\overline{x_i}^K$ in E_L is contained in the image of f under the clique $\overline{x_i}^K$ in E_R . Further, the image of the clique x_i^K in E_R covers all occurrences of x_i in F .
2. If $\rho(x_i) = 0$, the map f has the same properties, with the roles of x_i and $\overline{x_i}$ reversed.
3. The image of the clique y_m^K covers all occurrences of y_m in F .
4. The image of the clique $\overline{y_m}^k$ covers all occurrences of $\overline{y_m}$ in F .

The mapping f exists essentially because K is chosen large enough to ensure that we can cover all occurrences of variables in F as described above.

Now, we claim that f is a combinatorial reduction from $E_L \times F$ to $E_R \times A$. Let C be maximal clique in $E_R \times A$. Then C is of the form $C = E_R \times C'$, where C' is a maximal clique in A . Further, C' is of the form

$$C' = \bigtimes_{m=1}^n z_m^K$$

where $z_m \in \{y_m, \overline{y_m}\}$. Let $\theta: \{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the valuation that sends y_j to 1 if $z_j = y_j$ and to 0 if $z_j = \overline{y_j}$. Then, by assumption, some conjunction of literals $\bigwedge_{i \in I} \ell_{j(i)}$ holds true under the valuations ρ and θ . Consider the corresponding maximal clique $\bigtimes_{i \in I} \ell_{j(i)}$ in F . Let E'_L be the maximal clique $\bigtimes_{m=1}^k w_m^K$ of E_L where $w_m \in \{x_m, \overline{x_m}\}$ and $w_m = x_m$ if and only if $\rho(x_m) = 0$. Then $E'_L \times \bigtimes_{i \in I} \ell_{j(i)}$ is a maximal clique in $E_L \times F$. By construction, every vertex in E_L is the image of a vertex in E_R under f .

Now, by assumption, $\ell_{j(i)}$ is consistent with ρ and θ in the sense that if $\ell_{j(i)} \in \{x_m, \overline{x_m}\}$, then $\ell_{j(i)} = x_m$ if and only if $\rho(x_m) = 1$ and similarly for θ and $\ell_{j(i)} \in \{y_m, \overline{y_m}\}$. But this implies by construction that every $\ell_{j(i)} \in \{y_m, \overline{y_m}\}$ is the image of a vertex in C' under f and every $\ell_{j(i)} \in \{x_m, \overline{x_m}\}$ is the image of a vertex in E_R under f . This shows that f is a combinatorial reduction.

Conversely, assume that a combinatorial reduction exists between $E_L \times F$ and $E_R \times A$, witnessed by a partial map

$$f: \llbracket E_R \times A \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket E_L \times F \rrbracket.$$

Observe that for all $m \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, either f maps the clique x_m^K of $\llbracket E_R \rrbracket$ into $\llbracket E_L \rrbracket$, or it maps the clique $\overline{x_m^K}$ of $\llbracket E_R \rrbracket$ into $\llbracket E_L \rrbracket$.

Hence, we can define a valuation $\rho: \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by letting $\rho(x_i) = 1$ if and only if the clique $\overline{x_m^K}$ of $\llbracket E_R \rrbracket$ is mapped into $\llbracket E_L \rrbracket$. It is now quite straightforward to check that ρ is a satisfying assignment for the formula. \square

Our argument for containment in Σ_2^p can easily be adapted to formulas with parallelization applied to variables. Using the observation that any formula with parallelization can be re-written in this shape in linear time, we obtain:

Corollary 23. The problem “is the inequality $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ valid?” in the structure $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, (-)^*)$ is Σ_2^p -complete.

The proof of Theorem 22 (together with the observation underlying Corollary 23) yields that validity of inequalities in $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup, (-)^*)$ is contained in Π_3^p — the additional universal quantifier being used to quantify over the slices. This additional quantifier alternation cannot be avoided:

Theorem 24. The problem “is the inequality $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ valid?” in the structure $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1, \sqcup)$ is Π_3^p -complete.

Proof idea. Inclusion in Π_3^p is straightforward, following the proof of Theorem 22. For the hardness part, we employ a similar construction to that in the proof of Theorem 22. Given a quantified boolean formula

$$\forall z_1, \dots, z_l \exists x_1, \dots, x_k \forall y_1, \dots, y_n \bigwedge_{i \in I} \bigvee_{j \in J_i} l_j$$

we construct the inequality

$$Z_L \times E_L \times F \leq_{\bullet} Z_R \times E_R \times A$$

where E_L , F , E_R and A are taken as in the proof of Theorem 22 (F might contain literals z_i and $\overline{z_i}$), and where

$$Z_L = \bigtimes_{i=1}^l (z_i \sqcup \overline{z_i}) \quad \text{and} \quad Z_R = \bigtimes_{i=1}^l (z_i^K \sqcup \overline{z_i^K}).$$

\square

7 Towards a proof of completeness

We do not know whether our axiom system yields a complete axiomatization of $(\mathfrak{W}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$. As a first possible step towards a potential completeness proof, we show that we can restrict our attention to inequalities $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ where t and u each have pairwise distinct variables and the combinatorial reduction witness is a total bijective map.

We use this to show that our axioms allow us to derive all inequalities of the form $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ where u is *square-free*. Call a term square-free¹ if, up to associativity and commutativity, it can be rewritten in the following grammar, where x ranges over variables:

$$t, t' ::= x \mid t \times x \mid 1 \mid t \sqcap t'$$

Proposition 25. Let t and u be terms over $(\mathfrak{M}_{\bullet}, \sqcap, \times, 1)$. Assume that $t \leq_{\bullet} u$. Then there exist terms t' and u' such that $t \leq_{\bullet} t' \leq_{\bullet} u' \leq_{\bullet} u$, the inequalities $t \leq_{\bullet} t'$ and $u' \leq_{\bullet} u$ are derivable from the axioms in Figure 1, and such that there exists a (total) bijective combinatorial reduction from t' to u' .

Proof. As argued at the end of Section 3, we can assume without limitation of generality that t and u are either 1 or do not contain a 1. If either term is 1, the claim is trivial. Otherwise, there exists a combinatorial reduction $f: V_u \rightarrow V_t$.

Consider a vertex v in $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ not in the range of f . Consider the path $\langle o_1, \dots, o_m, v \rangle$ in the (tree associated with the) term t leading to v . If $o_1 = \dots = o_m = \times$, then every maximal clique in $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ contains v , contradicting the assumption that f is a combinatorial reduction. Hence, there exists a maximal $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $o_j = \sqcap$. Let t' be the term which is obtained from t by removing the sub-tree with root o_{j+1} (letting $o_{m+1} = v$). Then we can derive $t \leq_{\bullet} t'$ since meets are lower bounds. The maximal cliques of $\llbracket t' \rrbracket$ are the maximal cliques of t that do not contain v . Since no maximal clique that contains v contributes to f being a combinatorial reduction, the co-restriction of f to V_t remains a combinatorial reduction. We can apply the above construction to remove all vertices outside the range of f to ensure that f is a surjective partial map – potentially with smaller domain.

If f is not injective, say $f^{-1}(\{v\}) = \{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$, we can replace v in $\llbracket t \rrbracket$ with the m -fold meet $v \sqcap \dots \sqcap v$ (coloured with the same colour as v) and send each w_i to a separate occurrence of v . It is straightforward to check that this yields a combinatorial reduction from u to a term t' which is derivably equivalent to t .

In the case where f is not total with $v \in V_u \setminus \text{dom}(f)$, we consider the path $\langle o_1, \dots, o_m, v \rangle$ in the (tree associated with the) term u leading to v . There must exist a maximal $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $o_j = \times$. Removing in u the the sub-tree with root o_{j+1} (letting $o_{m+1} = v$) yields a derivably smaller term w such that f is still a combinatorial reduction from $\llbracket w \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket t \rrbracket$. Applying this construction to all vertices outside $\text{dom}(f)$, we obtain a term u' as claimed. \square

Proposition 25 implies that a complete axiomatization for formulas of the form $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ where t and u both have pairwise distinct variables yields a complete axiomatization of the whole theory: if t and u are arbitrary terms such that $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ is universally valid, there exists without loss of generality a bijective combinatorial reduction from u to t . This allows us to transport an injective colouring of the vertices of $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ to an injective colouring of the vertices of $\llbracket t \rrbracket$, yielding a valid and hence derivable inequality $t' \leq_{\bullet} u'$ between terms with pairwise distinct variables. Substituting back the original variable names in the derivation of $t' \leq_{\bullet} u'$ yields a derivation of $t \leq_{\bullet} u$.

Proposition 26. Our axiom system is complete for inequalities $t \leq_{\bullet} u$ where u is square-free.

Proof. By the remark following Proposition 25 we may assume that the variables are pairwise distinct in both t and u . We show the claim by induction over u . If u is a variable, the constant 1, or of the form $u_0 \sqcap u_1$, this is obvious.

¹The name comes from the fact that the graph induced by $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ has no induced subgraph which is a square.

The remaining case is $u = u' \times x$. An easy induction over t shows that we can derive $t \leq_{\bullet} t[1/x] \times x$. Since x does not appear in u' , we must have $t[1/x] \leq_{\bullet} u'$. By the induction hypothesis, this last inequality is derivable from our axioms. Now, combining this derivation with monotonicity of \times yields a derivation of $t[1/x] \times x \leq_{\bullet} u' \times u$ which in total yields a derivation of $t \leq_{\bullet} u$. \square

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Manlio Valenti and Lê Thành Dũng Nguyễn for discussions, and also to Matteo Acclavio for some pointers to the literature.

References

- [1] Vasco Brattka & Guido Gherardi (2011): *Effective Choice and Boundedness Principles in Computable Analysis*. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* 17, pp. 73 – 117, doi:10.2178/bsl/1294186663. ArXiv:0905.4685.
- [2] Vasco Brattka & Guido Gherardi (2011): *Weihrauch Degrees, Omniscience Principles and Weak Computability*. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 76, pp. 143 – 176. ArXiv:0905.4679.
- [3] Vasco Brattka, Guido Gherardi & Arno Pauly (2021): *Weihrauch Complexity in Computable Analysis*, pp. 367–417. Springer International Publishing, Cham, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-59234-9_11.
- [4] Vasco Brattka & Arno Pauly (2018): *On the algebraic structure of Weihrauch degrees*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 14(4), doi:10.23638/LMCS-14(4:4)2018.
- [5] Cameron Calk, Anupam Das & Tim Waring (2020): *Beyond formulas-as-cographs: an extension of Boolean logic to arbitrary graphs*. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.12941>.
- [6] D.G. Corneil, H. Lerchs & L.Stewart Burlingham (1981): *Complement reducible graphs*. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 3(3), pp. 163–174, doi:0166-218X(81)90013-5. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0166218X81900135>.
- [7] Damir Dzhafarov (2017): *Joins in the strong Weihrauch degrees*. arXiv 1704.01494.
- [8] Guido Gherardi & Alberto Marcone (2009): *How incomputable is the separable Hahn-Banach theorem?* *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 50(4), pp. 393–425, doi:10.1215/00294527-2009-018.
- [9] Peter Hertling (1996): *Unstetigkeitsgrade von Funktionen in der effektiven Analysis*. Ph.D. thesis, Fernuniversität, Gesamthochschule in Hagen.
- [10] Peter Hertling & Victor Selivanov (2014): *Complexity issues for Preorders on finite labeled forests*, pp. 165–190. De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston, doi:doi:10.1515/9781614518044.165.
- [11] Kojiro Higuchi & Arno Pauly (2013): *The degree-structure of Weihrauch-reducibility*. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 9(2), doi:10.2168/LMCS-9(2:2)2013.
- [12] Steffen Lempp, Joseph S. Miller, Arno Pauly, Mariya Ivanova Soskova & Manlio Valenti (2023): *Minimal covers in the Weihrauch degrees*. arXiv : 2311.12676.
- [13] Arno Pauly (2010): *On the (semi)lattices induced by continuous reducibilities*. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 56(5), pp. 488–502, doi:10.1002/malq.200910104.