

The Benefits of Diligence

Victor Arrial¹, Giulio Guerrieri², and Delia Kesner¹

¹ Université Paris Cité, CNRS, IRIF, France

² University of Sussex, Department of Informatics, Brighton, UK

Abstract. This paper studies the strength of embedding Call-by-Name (dCBN) and Call-by-Value (dCBV) into a unifying framework called the Bang Calculus (dBANG). These embeddings enable establishing (static and dynamic) properties of dCBN and dCBV through their respective counterparts in dBANG. While some specific static properties have been already successfully studied in the literature, the dynamic ones are more challenging and have been left unexplored. We accomplish that by using a standard embedding for the (easy) dCBN case, while a novel one must be introduced for the (difficult) dCBV case. Moreover, a key point of our approach is the identification of dBANG diligent reduction sequences, which eases the preservation of dynamic properties from dBANG to dCBN/dCBV. We illustrate our methodology through two concrete applications: confluence/factorization for both dCBN and dCBV are respectively derived from confluence/factorization for dBANG.

1 Introduction

Call-by-Name (CBN) and Call-by-Value (CBV) stand as two foundational evaluation strategies inspiring distinct techniques and models of computation in the theory of programming languages and proof assistants [43]. Notably, most theoretical studies in the λ -calculus still continues to focus on its CBN variant, while CBV, the cornerstone of operational semantics for most programming languages and proof assistants, has been less extensively explored. This is due in particular to the CBV stipulation that an argument can be passed to a function only when it is a *value* (*i.e.* variable or abstraction), making the reasoning notably challenging to grasp. Consequently, some fundamental concepts in the theory of the λ -calculus (e.g. denotational semantics, contextual equivalence, solvability, Böhm trees) make subtle—and not entirely understood—distinctions between CBN and CBV, sometimes resulting in completely ad-hoc scenarios for CBV, not being uniform with the corresponding notion in CBN. This is for example the case of CBV Böhm trees [30] or the notion of substitution in [47].

Unifying Frameworks. Reynolds [44] (quoted by Levy [34]) advocated for a unifying framework for CBN and CBV. This not only minimizes their arbitrariness, but also avoids developing and proving distinct and independent concepts and properties for them from scratch. Indeed, both paradigms can be encompassed into broader foundational frameworks [35,1,16,15,45,37,34,20,22] that explicitly

differentiate values by marking them with a distinguished constructor. While multiple such frameworks exist, our focus lies on the Bang Calculus [21,27,17]. Inspired by Girard’s Linear Logic (LL) [25] and Ehrhard’s interpretation [20] of Levy’s Call-by-Push-Value [34] into LL, the Bang Calculus is obtained by enriching the λ -calculus with two distinguished modalities $!$ and der . The modality $!$ plays a twofold role: it marks what can be duplicated or erased during evaluation (*i.e.* copied an arbitrary number of times, including zero), and it freezes the evaluation of subterms (called *thunks*). The modality der annihilates the effect of $!$. Embedding CBN or CBV into the Bang Calculus just consists in decorating λ -terms with $!$ and der , thus forcing one model of computation or the other one. Thanks to these two modalities, the Bang Calculus eases the identification of shared behaviors and properties of CBN and CBV, encompassing both syntactic and semantic aspects of them, within a unifying and simple framework.

Adequate Models of Computation. Both CBN and CBV were originally defined on *closed* terms (without occurrences of free variables), that are enough to model execution of programs. However, evaluation in proof assistants must be performed on possibly *open* terms, that is, with free variables. While open terms are harmless to CBN, the theory of the CBV λ -calculus on open terms turns out to be much more subtle and trickier (see [6,7,8] for a detailed discussion). In particular, Plotkin’s original CBV [43] is not *adequate* for open terms, as there exist terms that may be both *irreducible* and *meaningless/unsolvable*. The non-adequacy problem in Plotkin’s CBV calculus can be repaired by introducing a form of sharing implemented by *explicit substitutions (ES)*, together with a notion of *reduction at a distance* [9,10], like in the Value Substitution Calculus [11] (here called **dCBV**), a CBV variant of Accattoli and Kesner’s linear substitution calculus [2,3] (generalizing in turn Milner’s calculus [38,32]). Adequacy also fails for the version of the Bang Calculus studied in [27,23], for the same reasons as in CBV. It can be repaired again via ES and distance, resulting in the Distant Bang Calculus **dBANG** [17,18]. It is then natural to also integrate ES and distance in the CBN specification: this gives rise to CBN substitution calculi at a distance [9,10], here we call **dCBN** the one in [2], which is adequate as the usual CBN. In summary, we focus in this paper on a CBN calculus **dCBN**, an adequate CBV calculus **dCBV**, and the adequate unifying Distant Bang Calculus **dBANG**.

Static and dynamic. The literature has shown that some *static* properties of CBN and CBV, including normal forms [33], quantitative typing [17], tight typing [33,18], inhabitation [12], and denotational semantics [27], can be inferred from their corresponding counterparts in the (Distant) Bang Calculus by exploiting suitable CBN and CBV encodings. However, retrieving *dynamic* properties from the Bang Calculus into CBN or CBV turns out to be a more intricate task, especially in their *adequate* (distant) variant [27,17,23,18]. Indeed, it is easy to obtain *simulation* (a CBN or CBV reduction sequence is always embedded into a **dBANG** reduction sequence), *but* the converse, known as *reverse simulation*, fails: a **dBANG** reduction sequence from a term in the image of the CBN or CBV embedding may not correspond to a valid reduction sequence in CBN or CBV

(counterexample in Fig. 1). Up to these days, there are no embeddings in the literature enjoying reverse simulation for an adequate CBV calculus, so that it is not possible to export dynamic properties from \mathbf{dBANG} to both \mathbf{dCBN} and \mathbf{dCBV} .

Contributions. We first revisit and *extend* the existing static and dynamic preservation results relating \mathbf{dCBN} and \mathbf{dBANG} , including simulation and reverse simulation, exploiting the embedding used in [17,18]. However, our primary and most significant contribution is a new *methodology* to deal with the (adequate) calculus \mathbf{dCBV} . Indeed, we define a *novel embedding* from \mathbf{dCBV} into \mathbf{dBANG} , *refining* the one of [17,18], that finely decorates terms with the modalities $!$ and \mathbf{der} . To avoid redundant decorations, as $!$ and \mathbf{der} annihilate each other, a dedicated $\mathbf{d}!$ -reduction step is then applied *on the fly* by the embedding, as in [17,18]. But our new \mathbf{dCBV} embedding not only preserves static and dynamic properties, but also satisfies *reverse simulation*, an essential property that was previously lacking. This achievement is realized by the second ingredient of our new methodology, given by the notion of *diligent sequence* in \mathbf{dBANG} , a concept standing independently of the embeddings. Indeed, a challenge at this point is to prove that the earlier mentioned $\mathbf{d}!$ -reductions have a purely *administrative* nature, and additionally, that they can be treated *diligently*, by executing all of them as soon as possible. We call this method *diligent administration*: we consistently address all administrative steps before proceeding with any other *computational* steps. A further challenge is then to establish that working with administrative diligence does not alter the CBN or CBV nature of evaluation.

As explained above, reverse simulation is crucial to derive properties for \mathbf{dCBN} and \mathbf{dCBV} from their respective properties in \mathbf{dBANG} . We provide two main illustrative *applications* of this by studying the cases of *confluence* and *factorization*. Confluence is a well known property, and factorization is crucial to prove important results in rewriting [39,14,48,50,2,4,5,29,26,24]: we say that a reduction enjoys factorization when every reduction sequence can be rearranged so that some specific relevant steps are performed first. In the two last sections, we use confluence/factorization for \mathbf{dBANG} as a basis to easily deduce confluence/factorization for \mathbf{dCBN} and \mathbf{dCBV} . This is done by exploiting the CBN and CBV embeddings back and forth, via reduction simulation and reverse simulation. Just one proof is enough for three confluence/factorization results: it's a three-for-one deal! The fact that \mathbf{dCBN} and \mathbf{dCBV} confluence/factorizations can be *easily* derived from \mathbf{dBANG} confluence/factorization in essentially the *same* way is another achievement, attained thanks to having introduced good tools, such as diligence and the new \mathbf{dCBV} embedding.

We actually provide a first proof of factorization for \mathbf{dBANG} , another major contribution of this paper. Factorizations in \mathbf{dCBN} and \mathbf{dCBV} were already proved in [2] and [11], respectively, but their proofs are not trivial, even when applying some abstract approach [2].

Road Map. Sec. 2 recalls \mathbf{dBANG} and introduces diligence. The $\mathbf{dCBN}/\mathbf{dCBV}$ calculi and their embeddings are presented in Sec. 3, together with their corresponding (static and dynamic) preservation results. Sec. 4 derives $\mathbf{dCBN}/\mathbf{dCBV}$ confluence

from that of dBANG. Sec. 5 proves a factorization result for dBANG, and deduces factorization for dCBN and dCBV by projection. Sec. 6 discusses future and related work and concludes. Proofs can be found in the appendix.

1.1 Basic Notions Used all along the Paper.

An **abstract rewriting system** (ARS) \mathcal{E} is a set E with a binary relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ on E , called **reduction**. We write $u \leftarrow_{\mathcal{E}} t$ if $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} u$, and we denote by $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^+$ (resp. $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^*$) the transitive (resp. reflexive-transitive) closure of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$. Given $t \in E$, t is an **\mathcal{E} -normal form** (\mathcal{E} -NF) if there is no $u \in E$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} u$; t is **\mathcal{E} -terminating** if there is no infinite $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ reduction sequence starting at t . Reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ is **terminating** if every $t \in E$ is \mathcal{E} -terminating; $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ is **diamond** if for any $t, u_1, u_2 \in E$ such that $u_1 \leftarrow_{\mathcal{E}} t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} u_2$ and $u_1 \neq u_2$, there is $s \in E$ such that $u_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}} s \leftarrow_{\mathcal{E}} u_2$; $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ is **confluent** if $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^*$ is diamond.

All reductions in this paper will be defined by a set of rewrite rules \mathbb{R} , closed by a set of contexts \mathbb{E} . A term being an instance of the left-hand side of a rewrite rule $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}$ is called a **\mathcal{R} -redex**. Given a rule $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}$, and a context $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{E}$, we use $\rightarrow_{\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{R})}$ to denote the reduction of the \mathcal{R} -redex under the context \mathbf{E} . The reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{R})}$ is the union of reductions $\rightarrow_{\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{R})}$ over *all* contexts $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{E}$. In other words, $\rightarrow_{\mathbf{E}(\mathcal{R})}$ is the closure of the rule \mathcal{R} under all the contexts in \mathbb{E} .

2 The Distant Bang Calculus dBANG

We introduce the term syntax of dBANG [17]. Given a countably infinite set \mathcal{X} of variables x, y, z, \dots , the set $\Lambda_!$ of terms is defined inductively as follows:

$$\text{(Terms)} \quad t, u, s ::= x \in \mathcal{X} \mid tu \mid \lambda x.t \mid !t \mid \text{der}(t) \mid t[x \setminus u]$$

The set $\Lambda_!$ includes **variables** x , **abstractions** $\lambda x.t$, **applications** tu , **closures** $t[x \setminus u]$ representing a pending **explicit substitution** (ES) $[x \setminus u]$ on t , **bangs** $!t$ and **derelictions** $\text{der}(t)$ (their operational meaning is explained below).

Abstractions $\lambda x.t$ and closures $t[x \setminus u]$ bind the variable x in their body t . The set of **free variables** $\text{fv}(t)$ of a term t is defined as expected, in particular $\text{fv}(\lambda x.t) := \text{fv}(t) \setminus \{x\}$ and $\text{fv}(t[x \setminus u]) := \text{fv}(u) \cup (\text{fv}(t) \setminus \{x\})$. The usual notion of α -conversion [14] is extended to the whole set $\Lambda_!$, and terms are identified up to α -conversion, *e.g.* $y[y \setminus \lambda x.x] = z[z \setminus \lambda y.y]$. We denote by $t\{x \setminus u\}$ the usual (capture avoiding) meta-level substitution of u for all free occurrences of x in t .

Full contexts ($\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{F}$), **surface contexts** ($\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{S}$) and **list contexts** ($\mathbf{L} \in \mathbb{L}$), which can be seen as terms with exactly one **hole** \diamond , are inductively defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Full Contexts)} \quad \mathbf{F} &::= \diamond \mid \mathbf{F}t \mid t\mathbf{F} \mid \lambda x.\mathbf{F} \mid !\mathbf{F} \mid \text{der}(\mathbf{F}) \mid \mathbf{F}[x \setminus t] \mid t[x \setminus \mathbf{F}] \\ \text{(Surface Contexts)} \quad \mathbf{S} &::= \diamond \mid \mathbf{S}t \mid t\mathbf{S} \mid \lambda x.\mathbf{S} \mid \text{der}(\mathbf{S}) \mid \mathbf{S}[x \setminus t] \mid t[x \setminus \mathbf{S}] \\ \text{(List Contexts)} \quad \mathbf{L} &::= \diamond \mid \mathbf{L}[x \setminus t] \end{aligned}$$

\mathbf{L} and \mathbf{S} are special cases of \mathbf{F} : the hole may occur everywhere in \mathbf{F} , while in \mathbf{S} it cannot appear under a $!$. List contexts \mathbf{L} are arbitrary lists of ES, used to

implement reduction at a distance [9,10]. We write $F\langle t \rangle$ for the term obtained by replacing the hole in F with the term t (possibly capturing the free variables of t).

The following **rewrite rules** are the base components of our reductions.

$$L\langle \lambda x.t \rangle u \mapsto_{\text{dB}} L\langle t[x\backslash u] \rangle \quad t[x\backslash L\langle !u \rangle] \mapsto_{\text{s}!} L\langle t\{x\backslash u\} \rangle \quad \text{der}(L\langle !t \rangle) \mapsto_{\text{d}!} L\langle t \rangle$$

Rule **dB** (resp. **s!**) is assumed to be capture-free, so no free variable of u (resp. t) is captured by the context L . The rule **dB** fires a β -redex, generating an ES. The rule **s!** fires an ES provided that its argument is duplicable, *i.e.* is a bang. The rule **d!** uses **der** to erase a $!$. In all of these rewrite rules, the reduction acts *at a distance* [9,10]: the main constructors involved in the rule can be separated by a finite —possibly empty— list L of ES. This mechanism unblocks desired computations that otherwise would be stuck, *e.g.* $(\lambda x.x)[y\backslash w]!z \mapsto_{\text{dB}} x[x\backslash!z][y\backslash w]$.

Reductions are defined, as specified in Sec. 1.1, by taking the set of rewrite rules $\{\text{dB}, \text{s}!, \text{d}!\}$ and the sets of contexts \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{F} . **Surface reduction** is the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} := \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s}!)} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d}!)}$, while **full reduction** is the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}} := \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{dB})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{s}!)} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)}$. For example, for $\mathbb{S}_1 = \diamond \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbb{F}_1 = !\diamond \in \mathbb{F} \setminus \mathbb{S}$: $(\lambda x.!\text{der}(!x))!y \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_1(\text{dB})} (!\text{der}(!x))[x\backslash!y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_1(\text{s}!)} !\text{der}(!y) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_1(\text{d}!)} !y$. The first two steps are $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}$ - and also $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}$ -steps, while the last one is a $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}$ -step but not a $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}$ -step. More generally, $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} \subsetneq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}$. For instance, $!(\text{der}(!y))$ is a \mathbb{S} -NF but not a \mathbb{F} -NF since $!(\text{der}(!y)) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}} !y$, while $!y$ is a \mathbb{F} -NF (and hence a \mathbb{S} -NF too).

The $!$ modality plays a twofold role. First, it marks the only subterms that can be substituted (*i.e.* erased or arbitrarily copied): the **s!**-rule fires an ES only if there is a $!$ in its argument (up to a list context). Second, it freezes (surface) evaluation of the term under the scope of $!$: surface reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}$ does not reduce under $!$. In full reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}$, the $!$ modality looses its freezing behavior.

Diligent Administration. While reductions $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{dB})}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{s}!)}$ are actual *computational* steps, reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)}$ is rather *administrative* in nature. As we use **dBANG** to simulate other calculi, we need to align with the *implicit nature* of these administrative steps: this can be achieved by executing them as soon as possible. We thus introduce a *diligent process* that reorders some reduction steps to ensure that administrative steps are always performed as soon as there is a **d!**-redex.

To begin, we formally introduce the concept of **diligent administrative** reduction sequence, characterizing sequences where each *computational* step (**dB** or **s!**) can be performed only *after* all *administrative* steps (**d!**) have been executed.

Definition 1 (Diligent Administrative Reduction). *The diligent administrative surface (resp. full) reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\text{ad}}$ (resp. $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\text{ad}}$) is a subset of the surface (resp. full) reduction obtained by restricting **dB**- and **s!**-steps to $\mathbb{S}(\text{d}!)$ -normal forms (resp. $\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)$ -normal forms). More precisely, it is defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\text{ad}} &:= (\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} \cap \mathbb{S}(\text{d}!)\text{-NF} \times \Lambda_1) \cup (\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s}!)} \cap \mathbb{S}(\text{d}!)\text{-NF} \times \Lambda_1) \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d}!)} \\ \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\text{ad}} &:= (\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{dB})} \cap \mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)\text{-NF} \times \Lambda_1) \cup (\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{s}!)} \cap \mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)\text{-NF} \times \Lambda_1) \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} \end{aligned}$$

Example 2. Consider the two surface reduction sequences $\text{der}(!x)[x!y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(s!)} \text{der}(!y) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(d!)} y$ and $\text{der}(!x)[x!y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(d!)} x[x!y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(s!)} y$. The first one is not diligent administrative, as the step $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(s!)}$ is performed in a term that is not $\mathbb{S}(d!)\text{-NF}$. But the second one is diligent administrative: $\text{der}(!x)[x!y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\text{ad}} x[x!y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\text{ad}} y$.

To show that every reduction sequence can be transformed into a diligent one (Lem. 3), we first observe that it is possible to perform *all* administrative steps from any term: indeed, reductions $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(d!)}$ are *terminating*, because each administrative step erase two constructors, der and $!$, so the term size decreases.

Some reduction sequences can be made diligent, as in Ex. 2, but this is not the case for all reduction sequences. For instance $\text{der}(!x)[x!y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} \text{der}(!y)$ but $\text{der}(!x)[x!y] \not\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\text{ad}} \text{der}(!y)$. Therefore, we focus solely on reduction sequences reaching terms that are normal for $d!$. Under these conditions and by commuting computational steps with administrative ones, we obtain the following results:

Lemma 3 (Diligence Process). \Downarrow *Let $t, u \in \Lambda_!$ be terms.*

- **(Surface)** *If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u$ and u is a $\mathbb{S}(d!)\text{-NF}$, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\text{ad}}^* u$.*
- **(Full)** *If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u$ and u is a $\mathbb{F}(d!)\text{-NF}$, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\text{ad}}^* u$.*

3 Call-by-Name and Call-by-Value Embeddings

In this section we present the call-by-name dCBN (Sec. 3.1) and call-by-value dCBV (Sec. 3.2) calculi, as well as their embeddings into dBANG , which preserve static properties (Corollaries 7.2 and 9.2 for dCBN , 13.2 and 14.2 for dCBV) and dynamic ones (Corollaries 7.3 and 9.3 for dCBN , 13.3 and 14.3 for dCBV).

Both dCBN [9,10,2] and dCBV [11] are specified using ES and action at a distance, as explained in Sec. 1, and they share the same term syntax. The sets Λ of **terms** and \mathcal{V} of **values** are inductively defined below.

$$\text{(Terms)} \quad t, u ::= v \mid tu \mid t[x!u] \quad \text{(Values)} \quad v ::= x \mid \lambda x.t$$

Note that the syntax contains neither der nor $!$. The distinction between terms and values is irrelevant in dCBN but crucial in dCBV . The two calculi also share the same **full contexts** \mathbb{F} and **list contexts** \mathbb{L} , which can be seen as terms with exactly one **hole** \diamond and are inductively defined below. The differences between dCBN and dCBV are in the definitions of *surface contexts* and *rewrite rules*.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(List Contexts)} \quad & \mathbb{L} ::= \diamond \mid \mathbb{L}[x!t] \\ \text{(Full Contexts)} \quad & \mathbb{F} ::= \diamond \mid \mathbb{F}t \mid t\mathbb{F} \mid \lambda x.\mathbb{F} \mid \mathbb{F}[x!t] \mid t[x!\mathbb{F}] \end{aligned}$$

3.1 The Call-by-Name Calculus dCBN and its embedding to dBANG

In dCBN , **surface contexts** $\mathbb{S}_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$ are defined below: the hole cannot be in the argument of an application or ES. To align the notations, in dCBN full contexts are denoted by $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ and list contexts by $\mathbb{L}_N \in \mathbb{L}_N$.

$$\text{(dCBN Surface Contexts)} \quad \mathbb{S}_N ::= \diamond \mid \mathbb{S}_N t \mid \lambda x.\mathbb{S}_N \mid \mathbb{S}_N[x!t]$$

As explained in Sec. 1.1, reductions in dCBN are defined by taking the set of rewrite rules $\{\mathbf{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$ defined below and the sets of contexts \mathbb{S}_N and \mathbb{F}_N .

$$\mathbb{L}_N \langle \lambda x.t \rangle u \mapsto_{\mathbf{dB}} \mathbb{L}_N \langle t[x \setminus u] \rangle \qquad t[x \setminus u] \mapsto_{\mathbf{s}} t\{x \setminus u\}$$

Rule \mathbf{dB} is capture-free: no free variable of u is captured by the context \mathbb{L}_N . The dCBN **surface reduction** is the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N} := \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N(\mathbf{dB})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N(\mathbf{s})}$, while the dCBN **full reduction** is the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N} := \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathbf{dB})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathbf{s})}$. *E.g.*, for $\mathbb{F}_N = \lambda z.\diamond$, $t_0 = \lambda z.((\lambda x.yxx)(zz)) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathbf{dB})} t_1 = \lambda z.((yxx)[x \setminus zz]) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathbf{s})} t_2 = \lambda z.(y(zz)(zz))$.

The dCBN surface reduction is nothing but (a non-deterministic but diamond variant of) the well-known *head* reduction.

Embedding dCBN into dBANG. The dCBN **embedding** $\cdot^n: \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda!$ from dCBN to dBANG, introduced in [17,18] and presented below, extends Girard's one [21] to ES.

$$x^n := x \quad (\lambda x.t)^n := \lambda x.t^n \quad (tu)^n := t^n !u^n \quad (t[x \setminus u])^n := t^n [x \setminus !u^n].$$

As an example, $(yx)[y \setminus z]^n = (y!x)[y \setminus !z]$. Note that \cdot^n never introduces *der*, hence t^n , and every term it reduces to, are always a $\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle\text{-NF}$ (this does not hold for the dCBV embedding, Sec. 3.2). In every application and ES, \cdot^n puts a $!$ in front of their argument, which shows the two roles—called *duplicability* and *accessibility*—played by $!$ in this embedding: dCBN duplicability means that any argument can be duplicated (or erased), dCBN accessibility means that surface reduction cannot take place inside arguments. Indeed, the $!$ seals all subterms in argument position.

The embedding is trivially extended to dCBN contexts by setting $\diamond^n = \diamond$.

The static properties of this embedding have already been partially discussed in [17,18]. We will revisit and refine them (Cors. 7, 9 and 23), but our main focus lies in the preservation of the dynamics of dCBN within dBANG. For that, we first extend the embedding to rule names, by defining $\mathbf{dB}^n := \mathbf{dB}$ and $\mathbf{s}^n := \mathbf{s}!$.

The reduction of a dCBN redex can be effectively simulated in dBANG by reducing the corresponding redex occurring at the translated location/context.

Lemma 4 (dCBN One-Step Simulation). *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ and $\mathcal{R} \in \{\mathbf{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$. If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathcal{R})} u$ then $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N^n(\mathcal{R}^n)} u^n$.*

Example 5. Consider the dCBN reductions $t_0 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathbf{dB})} t_1$ and $t_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathbf{s})} t_2$ seen above with $\mathbb{F}_N = \lambda z.\diamond$. Since $\mathbb{F}_N^n = \lambda z.\diamond$, we have $t_0^n = \lambda z.((\lambda x.y!x!x)!(z!z)) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N^n(\mathbf{dB})} \lambda z.((y!x!x)[x \setminus !(z!z)]) = t_1^n$ and $t_1^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N^n(\mathbf{s}!)} \lambda z.(y!(z!z)!(z!z)) = t_2^n$.

So, every dCBN reduction step is simulated by the corresponding dBANG reduction step, without the need for any administrative step. Simulation of dCBV (Lem. 11) is instead more involved, requiring some further administrative steps.

The following property, which effectively reverses the simulation process, extends the one holding for the original Bang Calculus (without distance) [27].

Lemma 6 (dCBN One-Step Reverse Simulation). *Let $t \in \Lambda$, $u' \in \Lambda!$, $\mathbb{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathcal{R}' \in \{\mathbf{dB}, \mathbf{s}!, \mathbf{d}!\}$.*

$$t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R}')} u' \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \exists u \in \Lambda, \quad u^n = u' \\ \exists \mathcal{R} \in \{\mathbf{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}, \quad \mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}' \\ \exists \mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N, \quad \mathbb{F}_N^n = \mathbb{F} \end{array} \right\} \text{ such that } t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N(\mathcal{R})} u.$$

Lem. 6 states that any dBANG step from the image t^n of a dCBN term t (which is necessarily diligent, because t^n is a $F(d!)\text{-NF}$) actually simulates a dCBN step from t . In Ex. 5, t_0^n dB-reduces in the context $F = \lambda z.\diamond$ to $\lambda z.((y!x!x)[x!(z!z)])$, which is indeed equal to t_1^n , and $t_0 \rightarrow_{F_N(dB)} t_1$ in the context $F_N = \lambda z.\diamond$ as well, with $F_N^n = F$. Note that Lem. 6 is vacuously true for $\mathcal{R} = d!$, since there is no term t such that der occurs in t^n . Lems. 4 and 6 have some significant consequences:

Corollary 7. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.*

1. (**Stability**): *if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* s'$ then there is $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$.*
2. (**Normal Forms**): *t is a $\mathbb{F}_N\text{-NF}$ if and only if t^n is a $\mathbb{F}\text{-NF}$.*
3. (**Simulations**): *$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N}^* u$ if and only if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u^n$. Moreover, the number of dB/s-steps on the left matches the number dB/s!-steps on the right.*

These results deserve some comments. Point 1 states that the image of the dCBN embedding is *stable under reduction*. However, it is not stable under expansion. For instance, $\text{der}(!x) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} x = x^n$, although $\text{der}(!x)$ does not belong to the embedding's image, which only contains terms without der . Point 2 guarantees the *preservation of normal forms* in both directions. Finally, Point 3 concerns the *preservation of reduction sequences*. It is worth highlighting that this is an equivalence, enabling to inject reduction sequences from dCBN into dBANG and project them back from dBANG into dCBN. This is a key property allowing in particular to infer confluence and factorization for dCBN from that for dBANG.

The reader may wonder whether similar preservation results hold for surface reduction. Since it is a subreduction of full reduction, Cor. 7.1 already implies stability for surface reduction. However, it does not imply preservation of surface normal forms, and only yields back and forth simulation of surface reduction via full reduction, which is not exactly what we want: $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u^n$ if $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N}^* u$, and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N}^* u$ if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u^n$. So let us come back to analyze the situation for the *one-step* simulation and reverse simulation. Since surface contexts are special cases of full contexts, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N(\mathcal{R})} u$ implies $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N^n(\mathcal{R}^n)} u^n$ by Lem. 4. To prove that this simulating step is actually a surface step, we need an additional property: that dCBN surface contexts are translated into dBANG surface contexts (Lem. 8.1). A more subtle analysis will be required for surface reverse simulation: positions of dBANG surface *redexes* are always in the image of dCBN surface contexts:

Lemma 8.

1. (dCBN \rightarrow dBANG) *If $\mathbb{S}_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$, then $\mathbb{S}_N^n \in \mathbb{S}$.*
2. (dBANG \rightarrow dCBN) *If $\mathbb{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $\mathbb{F}_N^n = \mathbb{S}$, then $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$.*

Thanks to Lem. 8, one-step simulation and reverse simulation (Lems. 4 and 6) can be iterated to obtain the following results about *surface* reduction.

Corollary 9. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.*

1. (**Stability**): *if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* s'$ then there is $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$.*
2. (**Normal Forms**): *t is a $\mathbb{S}_N\text{-NF}$ if and only if t^n is a $\mathbb{S}\text{-NF}$.*

3. (**Simulations**): $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N}^* u$ if and only if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u^n$. Moreover, the number of dB/s -steps on the left matches the number of dB/s! -steps on the right.

Our results for dCBN notably extend the ones in [17,18], where it was only shown that $\mathbb{S}_N\text{-NF}$ translates to $\mathbb{S}\text{-NF}$, and that dCBN surface reduction is simulated by dBANG surface reduction: we went further by encompassing their converses.

3.2 The Call-by-Value Calculus dCBV and its embedding into dBANG

In dCBV , **surface contexts** $\mathbb{S}_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ are defined below: the hole cannot be under an abstraction. To align the notations, in dCBV full contexts are denoted by $\mathbb{F}_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ and list contexts by $\mathbb{L}_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$.

$$(\text{dCBV Surface Contexts}) \quad \mathbb{S}_v ::= \diamond \mid \mathbb{S}_v t \mid t \mathbb{S}_v \mid \mathbb{S}_v[x \setminus t] \mid t[x \setminus \mathbb{S}_v]$$

As explained in Sec. 1.1, reductions in dCBV are defined by taking the set of rewrite rules $\{\text{dB}, \text{sV}\}$ defined below and the sets of contexts \mathbb{S}_v and \mathbb{F}_v .

$$\mathbb{L}_v \langle \lambda x.t \rangle u \mapsto_{\text{dB}} \mathbb{L}_v \langle t[x \setminus u] \rangle \qquad t[x \setminus \mathbb{L}_v \langle v \rangle] \mapsto_{\text{sV}} \mathbb{L}_v \langle t\{x \setminus v\} \rangle$$

Rule dB (resp. sV) is capture-free: no free variable of u (resp. t) is captured by context \mathbb{L}_v . The dCBV **surface reduction** is the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v} := \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v \langle \text{dB} \rangle} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v \langle \text{sV} \rangle}$, while the dCBV **full reduction** is the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_v} := \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_v \langle \text{dB} \rangle} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_v \langle \text{sV} \rangle}$.

The calculi dCBN and dCBV differ in that dCBN can always fire an ES (rule s), while dCBV only does when the ES argument is a value, possibly wrapped by a finite list of ES (rule sV). So *e.g.*, for $\mathbb{S}_v = (yxx)[x \setminus \diamond]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} u_0 &= (\lambda x.yxx)((\lambda z.z)y) \rightarrow_{\diamond \langle \text{dB} \rangle} u_1 = (yxx)[x \setminus (\lambda z.z)y] \\ &\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v \langle \text{dB} \rangle} u'_1 = (yxx)[x \setminus z[z \setminus y]] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v \langle \text{sV} \rangle} u_2 = (yxx)[x \setminus y] \rightarrow_{\diamond \langle \text{sV} \rangle} u_3 = yyy \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Notice how reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v}$ unblocks redexes: given $\delta := \lambda z.zz$, the term $t := (\lambda y.\delta)(xx)\delta$, which is a normal form in Plotkin's CBV [43], is now non-terminating $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v} \delta[y \setminus xx]\delta \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v} (zz)[z \setminus \delta][y \setminus xx] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v} (\delta\delta)[y \setminus xx] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v}^* (\delta\delta)[y \setminus xx]$, as one would expect, since t is semantically equivalent to the diverging term $\delta\delta$ [41,42,19,6,8].

The dCBV surface reduction is nothing but the well-known *weak* reduction that does not evaluate under abstractions.

Embedding dCBV into dBANG . Values (*i.e.*, variables and abstractions) are the duplicable elements of dCBV . Girard's Call-by-Value encoding (used in [21,27] and noted $(\cdot)^{v_1}$ here) is built upon this insight, placing a bang in front of each variable $x^{v_1} = !x$ and abstraction $(\lambda x.t)^{v_1} = !\lambda x.t^{v_1}$. The encoding of an application is $(tu)^{v_1} = \text{der}(t^{v_1})u^{v_1}$, where the der is used to enable a d! -step if t (the left-hand side of the application) is a value, so as to restore its functional role. However, as highlighted in [17,18], such a definition fails normal forms preservation: a dCBV normal form is not necessarily encoded by a dBANG normal form, for example given the normal term $t_0 = xy$ we have $t_0^{v_1} = \text{der}(!x)!y$ which is not normal.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(\lambda x. (\lambda y. y) z) z & \not\rightarrow_{\mathfrak{sV}} & (\lambda x. y[y \setminus z]) z \\
\downarrow \cdot^{v_2} & & \downarrow \cdot^{v_2} \\
(\lambda x. (\lambda y. !y) !z) !z & \rightarrow_{\mathfrak{s}} & (\lambda x. (!y)[y \setminus !z]) !z
\end{array}$$

Fig. 1: Counterexample to dCBV reverse simulation using the embedding \cdot^{v_2}

Consequently, [17,18] proposed an alternative encoding (noted $(\cdot)^{v_2}$ here, whose details are omitted for lack of space), based on the same principle, but with an additional *super-development*: all $\mathfrak{d}!$ -redexes appearing during the encoding on the left of an application are eliminated *on the fly*, so that the embedding $(\cdot)^{v_2}$ preserves normal forms (e.g., $t_0^{v_2} = x!y$, which is normal in dBANG). But, as shown in Fig. 1, $(\cdot)^{v_2}$ breaks reverse simulation with respect to surface reduction.

We introduce a *new* dCBV embedding that preserves normal forms and fulfills simulation *and* reverse simulation (this is one of our main contributions).

Definition 10. *The dCBV embedding $\cdot^v : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_!$ is defined as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{l}
x^v := !x \\
(\lambda x. t)^v := !\lambda x. !t^v \\
(t[x \setminus u])^v := t^v[x \setminus u^v].
\end{array}
\quad (tu)^v := \begin{cases} \text{der}(\mathbb{L}(s) u^v) & \text{if } t^v = \mathbb{L}(!s) \\ \text{der}(\text{der}(t^v) u^v) & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

Note in particular that, thanks to super-development, t^v is always a $\mathbb{F}\langle \mathfrak{d}! \rangle$ -NF. For instance, $(\lambda z. z)^v = !\lambda z. !!z$ and $(yxx)^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(\text{der}(y!x))!x)$, whereas $((\lambda x. yxx)(II))^v = \text{der}((\lambda x. !\text{der}(\text{der}(\text{der}(y!x))!x)) \text{der}((\lambda z. !!z)! \lambda z. !!z))$.

As in the dCBN embedding, the modality $!$ plays a *twofold* role in our new dCBV embedding. First, \cdot^v marks with $!$ subterms to be considered as values, *i.e.* potentially *erasable* or *duplicable*. This induces the use of super-developments in the case of applications to avoid some administrative steps that would otherwise affect preservation of normal forms. Second, \cdot^v marks the positions where surface reduction must not occur: inside values; thus it introduces a *second* (internal) $!$ in the encoding of abstractions to encapsulate its body and shield it from surface computation. Additionally, to restore access to the abstraction's body when it is applied, a second (external) der is added to the encoding of applications. These two principles highlights the dual role of $!$ in dBANG: enabling duplication (and erasure) as well as isolating subterms from surface computation processes.

The dCBV embedding is extended to rule names, by defining $\text{dB}^v := \text{dB}$ and $\text{sV}^v := \text{s}!$. Similarly to dCBN, we have the fundamental simulation result below.

Lemma 11 (dCBV One-Step Simulation). *Let $t, u \in \Lambda_!$, and $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{sV}\}$. If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u$ then there is $\mathbb{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathfrak{d}! \rangle}^* u^v$, where \mathbb{F} and all contexts used for the steps in $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathfrak{d}! \rangle}^*$ can be specified using $\mathbb{F}_v^v, \mathcal{R}$ and t .*

Let us see how \mathbb{F} and the contexts used in the steps $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathfrak{d}! \rangle}^*$ are constructed: it highlights the difference between Lem. 11 for dCBV and Lem. 4 for dCBN.

- Additional administrative steps ($\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}^*$) may be needed at the end. For example, for the dCBV steps $u_0 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle dB \rangle} u_1$ and $u_2 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle sV \rangle} u_3$ seen in (1), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_0^v &= \text{der}((\lambda x.! \text{der}(\text{der}(\text{der}(y!x))!x)) \text{der}((\lambda z.!z)!y)) \\
&\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle dB \rangle} \text{der}(! \text{der}(\text{der}(\text{der}(y!x))!x) [x \setminus \text{der}((\lambda z.!z)!y)]) = s' \quad (2) \\
&\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle} \text{der}(\text{der}(\text{der}(y!x))!x) [x \setminus \text{der}((\lambda z.!z)!y)] = u_1^v \\
u_2^v &= \text{der}(\text{der}(\text{der}(y!x))!x) [x \setminus !y] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle s! \rangle} \text{der}(\text{der}(\text{der}(y!y))!y) = u_3^v
\end{aligned}$$

- In dCBN one-step simulation the rule name and context are independently translated. It is slightly more subtle in dCBV: the rule name translates to the corresponding one in dBANG without any ambiguity, yet the translation of the context F_v depends not only on the initial context F_v but also on the rule name \mathcal{R} and the initial term t . Two distinct situations can emerge:
- dB-steps require to add a dereliction to the translated context: for example, the dB-redex position \diamond in $t = (\lambda x.x)y$ needs to be translated to the redex position $\text{der}(\diamond)$ in $t^v = \text{der}((\lambda x.!x)!y)$.
 - sV-steps may need to remove a dereliction from the translated context: for instance, the sV-redex position $\diamond y$ in $t = (\lambda z.x)[x \setminus y]y$ is translated to the redex position $\text{der}(\diamond !y)$ in $t^v = \text{der}((\lambda z.!x)[x \setminus !y](!y))$. The context translation anticipates the super-development used in t^v .

Note that both situations can be detected by case-analysis on \mathcal{R} and t , where the target context translation is a slight variation over the original one.

While the dCBV embedding \cdot^v used in [17,18] successfully enables the simulation of dCBV into dBANG, it falls short when it comes to reverse simulation, as shown in Fig. 1. Therefore, \cdot^v cannot be used to transfer dynamic properties from dBANG back to dCBV, thus failing in particular to derive dCBV factorization from dBANG (Sec. 5). Our new embedding instead satisfies reverse simulation.

Lemma 12 (dCBV One-Step Reverse Simulation). *Let $t \in \Lambda$, $u' \in \Lambda_1$, $F \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathcal{R}' \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s!}, \text{d!}\}$. If u' is a $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF, then*

$$t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R}' \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}^* u' \implies \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \exists u \in \Lambda, \quad u^v = u' \\ \exists \mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{sV}\}, \mathcal{R}^v = \mathcal{R}' \\ \exists F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, \end{array} \right\} \text{ such that } t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u.$$

Lem. 12 states that any dBANG diligent step from the image t^v of a dCBV term t actually simulates a dCBV step from t . As expected, the same subtleties encountered in the dCBV one-step simulation (Lem. 11) apply in this last result, in particular regarding the construction of F_v . In the dCBN case, the absence of administrative steps renders all sequences from images of dCBN terms diligent, making stability, normal form preservation and simulations direct consequences of one-step simulation (Lem. 4) and reverse simulation (Lem. 6). This is not the case for dCBV, due to the presence of administrative steps in the simulation process. Indeed, when simulating dCBV reduction within dBANG (Lem. 11), administrative steps are performed as soon as they become available, thus constructing a diligent sequence. Conversely, projecting a reduction step from dBANG

to dCBV (Lem. 12) requires a diligent step. However, in the case of sequences, in contrast to one-steps, there is no requirement for administrative steps to be correctly synchronized, and this may lead to deviations from the embedding’s image, significantly complicating reverse simulation. Fortunately, the diligence presented in dBANG (Lem. 3) resynchronizes administrative steps yielding sequences that are easy to project.

Corollary 13. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.*

1. (**Stability**): *if $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* s'$ and s' is a $\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then $s' = s^v$ for some $s \in \Lambda$.*
2. (**Normal Forms**): *t is a \mathbb{F}_v -NF if and only if t^v is a \mathbb{F} -NF.*
3. (**Simulations**): *$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_v}^* u$ if and only if $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u^v$. Moreover, the number of dB/sV-steps on the left matches the number dB/s!-steps on the right.*

As in dCBN, we may wonder whether similar preservation results hold for surface reductions. Such results cannot be entirely derived out from Cor. 13 alone. Still, as with dCBN, the dCBV one-step simulation and reverse simulation properties (Lems. 11 and 12) already encompass the surface case. However, even though surface redexes positions are mutually mapped by the embedding, it does not yet imply surface stability, preservation of normal forms, and simulations. As previously explained, diligence is required to deal with administrative steps. Fortunately, the surface fragment admits a diligence process, as illustrated in Lem. 3, which can then be leveraged to obtain the following results.

Corollary 14. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.*

1. (**Stability**): *if $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* s'$ and s' is a $\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then $s' = s^v$ for some $s \in \Lambda$.*
2. (**Normal Forms**): *t is a \mathbb{S}_v -NF if and only if t^v is a \mathbb{S} -NF.*
3. (**Simulations**): *$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v}^* u$ if and only if $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u^v$. Moreover, the number of dB/sV-steps on the left matches the number of dB/s!-steps on the right.*

Stability statements in dCBV (Cor. 13.1 and 14.1) require the reached term s' to be normal for $d!$, otherwise stability does not hold (*e.g.*, s' in (2) before is not in the image of \cdot^v). This is not required in the dCBN stability statements (Cor. 7.1 and 9.1) since every term to which t^v reduces is der -free and so normal for $d!$.

Proving simulation and reverse simulation requires a considerable effort. However, this initial investment lays the groundwork for numerous benefits without extra costs. For example, in Secs. 4 and 5, we demonstrate that typically challenging tasks like proving confluence and factorization can be easily achieved through simulations. This approach not only unifies the proofs but also minimizes the workload for future proofs.

4 Confluence

Confluence is a crucial property in the λ -calculus, ensuring that expressions consistently produce a single result, regardless of the chosen reduction path. In this section, we examine confluence across different reduction relations (surface

and full) and within various calculus frameworks: dCBN, dCBV, and dBANG. We specifically leverage simulation and reverse simulation properties to seamlessly project these results from dBANG to dCBN and dCBV, providing a comprehensive solution across three contexts.

Surface confluence is usually proved by showing that surface reduction is diamond, as for example in [17,18]. Full confluence is more complex, as the full reduction relation is not diamond, as one can easily notice with the term $(\lambda x.y)!\Omega$. Alternative techniques [49,40] can establish full reduction's confluence, albeit often requiring numerous commutation diagrams and potentially non-trivial bounding measures.

Theorem 15 (dBANG Confluence).

1. **(Surface)** *The reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}$ is confluent.
Moreover, any two different surface reduction paths to a \mathbb{S} -normal form have the same length and number of dB, s! and d!-steps.*
2. **(Full)** *The reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}$ is confluent.*

Proof. **(Surface)** See [17,18] **(Full)** See [31].

These proofs are typically highly technical, requiring a significant amount of time to write and verify, and are prone to errors. Therefore, it is extremely beneficial to have a method to streamline them, especially when mecanising proofs. With the robust preservation of dCBN reductions in the dBANG, we can actually project dCBN confluences directly from that of dBANG.

Corollary 16 (dCBN Confluence).

1. **(Surface)** *The reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N}$ is confluent.
Moreover, any two different surface reduction paths to a \mathbb{S}_N -normal form have the same length and same number of dB and s-steps.*
2. **(Full)** *The reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N}$ is confluent.*

Proof. **(Surface)** See Fig.2. **(Full)** Following the same reasoning as Fig.3.

The same technic can be used for dCBV, with the additional help of diligence. Thus, we get the following results for free.

Corollary 17 (dCBV Confluence).

1. **(Surface)** *The reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_V}$ is confluent.
Moreover, any two different surface reduction paths to a \mathbb{S}_V -normal form have the same length and same number of dB and sV-steps.*
2. **(Full)** *The reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_V}$ is confluent.*

Proof. **(Surface)** Following the same reasoning as Fig.2. **(Full)** See Fig.3.




Fig. 2: Schematic proof of Cor. 16.1




Fig. 3: Schematic proof of Cor. 17.2

5 Factorization

In λ -calculi, reduction is a relation, so different reduction steps are possible starting from the same term. Some steps (*e.g.* head steps) are more significant than others, and they may occur in the middle of a reduction sequence. Factorization is the process of disentangling the significant steps from the “superfluous” ones, bringing the former forward and leaving the start and end terms unchanged.

This section is devoted to the factorization property for **dBANG**, **dCBN** and **dCBV**. We start by revisiting an abstract factorization theorem [2]. We first apply this abstract method to **dBANG**, thus obtaining a new result of factorization not previously appearing in the literature. Then, we use the properties of simulation and reverse simulation proved in Sec. 3 to project the factorization result for **dBANG** into **dCBN** and **dCBV**. Although these two results can be directly derived from the abstract factorization theorem [2], our approach circumvents the numerous commutation properties required by the abstract approach. Also, it provides a tangible illustration of how the simulation and reverse simulation properties discussed in Secs. 3.1 and 3.2 can be applied in concrete cases.

Abstract Factorization. We recall an abstract factorization method from [2] that relies on local rewrite conditions given by the notion of *square factorization system* (SFS). While its original presentation concerns only two subreductions, we (straightforwardly) extend the notion of SFS to a *family* of subreductions, as in **dBANG** the reduction consists of more than two subreductions.

Definition 18. Let $\mathcal{R} = (R, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}})$ be an abstract rewriting system. The family $(\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k}^{\circ}, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k}^{\bullet})_{k \in K}$ of paired reduction relations is a **square factorization system (SFS)** for \mathcal{R} if it covers the reduction relation (*i.e.* $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} = \bigcup_{k \in K} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k}$) where $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k} := \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k}^{\circ} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k}^{\bullet}$) and satisfies the following conditions:

1. **Termination:** $\forall k \in K, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\circ}$ is terminating.
2. **Row-swaps:** $\forall k \in K, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\bullet} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\circ} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\circ}^+ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\bullet}^*$.
3. **Diagonal-swaps:** $\forall k_1, k_2 \in K, k_1 \neq k_2, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_{k_1}^\bullet} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_{k_2}^\circ} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_{k_2}^\circ} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_{k_1}^\bullet}^*$.

The symbol \circ tags *significant* (also called *external*) steps, while \bullet is used for *irrelevant* (also called *internal*) ones. The commutations required in an SFS are sufficient to achieve factorization, which consists in rearranging a reduction sequence to prioritize significant steps $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^\circ}$ over irrelevant steps $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^\bullet}$.

Proposition 19 ([2]). *Let $\mathcal{R} = (R, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}})$ be an abstract rewriting system and $(\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\circ}, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\bullet})_{k \in K}$ be an SFS for \mathcal{R} . Then the reduction relation factorizes, that is, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \subseteq \rightarrow_{\circ}^* \rightarrow_{\bullet}^*$ where $\rightarrow_{\circ} := \bigcup_{k \in K} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\circ}$ and $\rightarrow_{\bullet} := \bigcup_{k \in K} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}_k^\bullet}$.*

Factorization in dBANG. In dBANG we claim that surface reduction is the significant part of full reduction, and our goal is to factor it out. To exploit the abstract method, we first formally identify the irrelevant subreduction of full reduction, called here *internal*, as reduction under the scope of a $!$. **Internal contexts** $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$ are full contexts \mathbb{F} for which the hole is placed under a bang. Formally,

$$\text{(dBANG Internal Contexts)} \quad \mathbb{I} ::= !\mathbb{F} \mid \mathbb{S}^* \langle \mathbb{I} \rangle \quad \text{with } \mathbb{S}^* \in \mathbb{S} \setminus \{\diamond\}$$

Clearly, $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{F} \setminus \mathbb{S}$. As usual, $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{R})}$ is the closure of the rewrite rules $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s!}, \text{d!}\}$ over all contexts $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. The **dBANG internal reduction** is the relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}} := \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{d!})}$. For example, $(\lambda x. !\diamond) y$ is an internal context while \diamond is not. Thus, $(\lambda x. !(z[z \setminus x])) y \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} (\lambda x. !x) y \not\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}} (!x)[x y]$. We can now show that surface and internal reductions enjoy the abstract properties of an SFS.

Lemma 20. *The family $(\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})}, \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{R})})_{\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s!}, \text{d!}\}}$ is an SFS for $(A!, \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}})$.*

This immediately gives the following novel factorization result for the Distant Bang Calculus, by applying Prop. 19 and Lem. 20.

Corollary 21 (dBANG Factorization). *We have that $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* = \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^*$.*

Example 22. Take $t = (xy)[y \setminus !(I!(Iw))]$ where $I = \lambda z.z$. Then, the factorization of the first sequence starting at t below, is given by the second one:

$$\begin{aligned} t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}} (xy)[y \setminus !(z[z \setminus !(Iw)])] &\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} x(z[z \setminus !(Iw)]) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}} x(z[z \setminus !(z[z \setminus w])]) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} x!(z[z \setminus w]) \\ t &\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} x(I!(Iw)) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} x(z[z \setminus !(Iw)]) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}} x!(Iw) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}} x!(z[z \setminus w]) \end{aligned}$$

Factorizations in dCBN and dCBV. To achieve factorization in dCBN and dCBV via the abstract method, we need to establish the existence of an SFS in each case. This requires validating multiple commutations. We bypass these lengthy proofs by adopting a simpler projection approach from dBANG.

As in dBANG, we claim that surface reduction is the significant part of full reduction in dCBN/dCBV, and we consequently identify the irrelevant subreduction, called here *internal*. The dCBN (resp. dCBV) internal contexts $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{N}}$ (resp.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
t & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{F}_N} u \\
t^n & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{F}} u^n \\
t^n & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{I}} u^n \\
t & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{I}_N} u
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
\downarrow \text{(Cor. 7)} \\
\downarrow \text{(Cor. 21)} \\
\downarrow \text{(Cor. 9)} \quad \downarrow \text{(Cor. 23)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 4: dCBN factorization (with $s' = s^n$)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
t & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{F}_V} u \\
t^v & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{F}} u^v \\
t^v & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{I}} u^v \\
t & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathbb{I}_V} u
\end{array}
\begin{array}{l}
\downarrow \text{(Cor. 13)} \\
\downarrow \text{(Cor. 21)} \\
\downarrow \text{(Cor. 14)} \quad \downarrow \text{(Cor. 23)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5: dCBV factorization (with $s' = s^v$)

$\mathbb{I}_v \in \mathbb{I}_v$) are full contexts whose hole is in an argument (resp. under a λ). Formally,

$$\begin{array}{l}
\text{(dCBN Internal Contexts)} \quad \mathbb{I}_N ::= t F_N \mid t[x \setminus F_N] \mid \mathbb{S}_N^* \langle \mathbb{I}_N \rangle \quad \text{with } \mathbb{S}_N^* \in \mathbb{S}_N \setminus \{\diamond\} \\
\text{(dCBV Internal Contexts)} \quad \mathbb{I}_V ::= \lambda x. F_V \mid \mathbb{S}_V^* \langle \mathbb{I}_V \rangle \quad \text{with } \mathbb{S}_V^* \in \mathbb{S}_V \setminus \{\diamond\}
\end{array}$$

The dCBN (resp. dCBV) **internal reduction** $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_N}$ (resp. $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_V}$) is the closure over all internal contexts $\mathbb{I}_N \in \mathbb{I}_N$ (resp. $\mathbb{I}_V \in \mathbb{I}_V$) of the rewrite rules **dB** and **s** (resp. **dB** and **sV**). For example, $(\lambda x.x)\diamond$ is a dCBN internal context, while \diamond is not, thus $(\lambda x.x)((\lambda y.z)t) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_N} (\lambda x.x)z \not\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_N} z$. And $(\lambda x.\diamond)z$ is a dCBV internal context while \diamond is not, thus $(\lambda x.(\lambda y.y)z)z \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_V} (\lambda x.y[y \setminus z])z \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_V} (\lambda x.z)z \not\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_V} z[x \setminus z]$.

As in the surface case, the one-step simulation and reverse simulation (Lems. 4 and 6 for dCBN, Lems. 11 and 12 for dCBV) can be specialized to the internal case. This allows us to show in particular the following property.

Corollary 23. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.*

- **(Stability)**: *if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* s'$ (resp. $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* s'$ and s' is a $\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbf{d!} \rangle$ -NF) then there is $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$ (resp. $s^v = s'$).*
- **(Normal Forms)**: *t is a \mathbb{I}_N -NF (resp. \mathbb{I}_V -NF) iff t^n (resp. t^v) is a \mathbb{I} -NF.*
- **(Simulations)**: *$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_N}^* u$ (resp. $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_V}^* u$) iff $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u^n$ (resp. $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u^v$). Moreover, the number of **dB/s**-steps (resp. **dB/sV**-steps) on the left matches the number of **dB/s!**-steps on the right.*

Via Cors. 9, 14 and 23, we can project factorization from dBANG back to dCBN/dCBV.

Theorem 24 (dCBN/dCBV Factorizations). $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N}^* = \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N}^* \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_N}^*$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_V}^* = \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_V}^* \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_V}^*$.

Proof. The proof for dCBN is depicted in Fig. 4. In particular, since $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* s'$, one deduces using Cor. 9 that there exists $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$.

The proof for dCBV is depicted in Fig. 5. In particular, by construction u^v is a $\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d!} \rangle$ -NF and by induction on the length of $s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u^v$, one has that s' is a $\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbf{d!} \rangle$ -NF. Using Cor. 14, one deduces that there exists $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^v = s'$. \square

6 Conclusion and Related Work

Our first contribution is to revisit and extend several properties concerning the encoding of dCBN into dBANG. The second contribution, more significant, consists

in introducing a new embedding from dCBV to dBANG , which is conservative with respect to previous results in the literature [17,18], but also (and this is a novelty) allows us to establish the essential reverse simulation property, achieved through the non-trivial concept of diligent sequence. We illustrate the strength of our methodology by means of an example, namely factorization. For that, we first prove a factorization theorem for dBANG , another major contribution of the paper, and we then deduce factorization for dCBN and dCBV by projecting that for dBANG .

In [23], factorization for the (non-distant) Bang Calculus has been proved and from that, factorizations results for standard (non distant) CBN λ -calculus and Plotkin’s original CBV λ -calculus has been deduced. But the (non-distant) Bang Calculus and Plotkin’s CBV are *not adequate*, in the sense explained in Sec. 1, thus decreasing the significance of those preliminary results.

When taking *adequate* versions of the Bang Calculus, by adding ES and distance, or σ -reduction [21,28], the CBV encodings in the literature [21,27,17,23,18] fail to enjoy reverse simulation, thus preventing one deducing dynamic properties from the Bang Calculus into CBV . Other CBN and CBV encodings into a unifying framework appear in [13], but there is no reverse simulation property, so that no concrete application of the proposed encoding to export properties into CBN and CBV . The same occurs in [22]. The only exceptions are [12,33]—where only *static* properties are obtained—, and [27,23]—where the Bang and CBV calculi are not adequate in the sense explained in Sec. 1.

Sabry and Wadler [46] showed that simulation and reverse simulation between two calculi are for free when their back and forth translations give rise to an adjoint. One of the difficulties to achieve our results is that our CBN and CBV embeddings, as well as the ones used in [21,27,17,23,18], do not form an adjoint. This is basically due to the fact that a CBN/CBV term can be decorated by $!$ and der so as that administrative steps performed in the (Distant) Bang Calculus do not correspond to anything in CBN or CBV . Our contribution is precisely to achieve simulation and reverse simulation without the need for any adjoint.

As discussed at the end of Sec. 3, proving simulation and reverse simulation requires a considerable initial effort. However, this investment lays the groundwork for numerous benefits without extra costs, as we showed in Secs. 4 and 5.

In addition to the tangible contributions presented in this paper, we believe our methodology enhances the understanding of the semantic aspects of CBV , especially concerning untyped and typed approximants. This remains a topic that, while gradually gaining attention in the literature [36,30,12], is yet to be thoroughly explored. Our novel CBV embedding would also suggest a logical counterpart (a new encoding of intuitionistic logic into linear logic), which remains to be investigated. Moreover, we aim to further leverage our technique to explore other crucial dynamic properties of dCBN and dCBV , such as standardization, normalization, genericity as well as some specific deterministic strategies.

References

1. Abramsky, S.: Computational interpretations of linear logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* **111**(1), 3–57 (1993). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(93\)90181-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(93)90181-R)

2. Accattoli, B.: An Abstract Factorization Theorem for Explicit Substitutions. In: 23rd International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications (RTA'12). Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), vol. 15, pp. 6–21. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik (2012). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.RTA.2012.6>
3. Accattoli, B., Bonelli, E., Kesner, D., Lombardi, C.: A nonstandard standardization theorem. In: Jagannathan, S., Sewell, P. (eds.) The 41st Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL '14, January 20–21, 2014. pp. 659–670. ACM Press, San Diego, CA, USA (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2535838.2535886>
4. Accattoli, B., Faggian, C., Guerrieri, G.: Factorization and Normalization, Essentially. In: Programming Languages and Systems - 17th Asian Symposium, APLAS 2019, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11893, pp. 159–180. Springer, Cham (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-34175-6_9
5. Accattoli, B., Faggian, C., Guerrieri, G.: Factorize factorization. In: 29th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2021. LIPIcs, vol. 183, pp. 6:1–6:25. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2021). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2021.6>
6. Accattoli, B., Guerrieri, G.: Open call-by-value. In: Programming Languages and Systems - 14th Asian Symposium, APLAS 2016, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10017, pp. 206–226 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47958-3_12
7. Accattoli, B., Guerrieri, G.: Abstract machines for open call-by-value. *Science of Computer Programming* **184** (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2019.03.002>
8. Accattoli, B., Guerrieri, G.: The theory of call-by-value solvability. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **6**(ICFP), 855–885 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3547652>
9. Accattoli, B., Kesner, D.: The structural *lambda*-calculus. In: Computer Science Logic, 24th International Workshop, CSL 2010, 19th Annual Conference of the EACSL, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6247, pp. 381–395. Springer (2010). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15205-4_30
10. Accattoli, B., Kesner, D.: Preservation of strong normalisation modulo permutations for the structural lambda-calculus. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* **8**(1) (2012). [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8\(1:28\)2012](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-8(1:28)2012)
11. Accattoli, B., Paolini, L.: Call-by-value solvability, revisited. In: Functional and Logic Programming - 11th International Symposium, FLOPS 2012, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7294, pp. 4–16. Springer (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-29822-6_4
12. Arrial, V., Guerrieri, G., Kesner, D.: Quantitative inhabitation for different lambda calculi in a unifying framework. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **7**(POPL), 1483–1513 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571244>
13. Steffen van Bakel, Emma Tye, N.W.: A calculus of delayed reductions. In: PPDP 2023: 25th International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming, Cascais, Lisbon, Portugal, October 22 - 23, 2022. ACM (2023)
14. Barendregt, H.P.: *The Lambda Calculus: Its Syntax and Semantics*, Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics, vol. 103. North-Holland (1984)
15. Benton, N., Wadler, P.: Linear logic, monads and the lambda calculus. In: Proceedings 11th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '96). pp. 420–431. IEEE (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1996.561458>

16. Benton, P.N., Bierman, G.M., de Paiva, V., Hyland, M.: A term calculus for intuitionistic linear logic. In: *Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, TLCA '93, Proceedings*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 664, pp. 75–90. Springer (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0037099>
17. Bucciarelli, A., Kesner, D., Ríos, A., Viso, A.: The Bang Calculus Revisited. In: *Functional and Logic Programming*, vol. 12073, pp. 13–32. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59025-3_2
18. Bucciarelli, A., Kesner, D., Ríos, A., Viso, A.: The bang calculus revisited. *Information and Computation* **293**, 105047 (Aug 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2023.105047>
19. Carraro, A., Guerrieri, G.: A semantical and operational account of call-by-value solvability. In: *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 17th International Conference, FOSSACS 2014, Proceedings*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 8412, pp. 103–118. Springer (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-54830-7_7
20. Ehrhard, T.: Call-by-push-value from a linear logic point of view. In: *Programming Languages and Systems - 25th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2016, Proceedings*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9632, pp. 202–228. Springer (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-49498-1_9
21. Ehrhard, T., Guerrieri, G.: The Bang Calculus: An untyped lambda-calculus generalizing call-by-name and call-by-value. In: *Proceedings of the 18th International Symposium on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming, PPDP'16*. pp. 174–187. ACM (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2967973.2968608>
22. Espírito Santo, J., Pinto, L., Uustalu, T.: Modal embeddings and calling paradigms. In: *4th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction, FSCD 2019, LIPIcs*, vol. 131, pp. 18:1–18:20. Schloss Dagstuhl (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSCD.2019.18>
23. Faggian, C., Guerrieri, G.: Factorization in call-by-name and call-by-value calculi via linear logic. In: *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 24th International Conference, FOSSACS 2021, Proceedings*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12650, pp. 205–225. Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71995-1_11
24. Faggian, C., Guerrieri, G., de'Liguoro, U., Treglia, R.: On reduction and normalization in the computational core. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.* **32**(7), 934–981 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129522000433>, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129522000433>
25. Girard, J.: Linear logic. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **50**, 1–102 (1987). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(87\)90045-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(87)90045-4)
26. Guerrieri, G.: Head reduction and normalization in a call-by-value lambda-calculus. In: Chiba, Y., Escobar, S., Nishida, N., Sabel, D., Schmidt-Schauß, M. (eds.) *2nd International Workshop on Rewriting Techniques for Program Transformations and Evaluation, WPTE@RDP 2015, July 2, 2015, Warsaw, Poland. OASICS*, vol. 46, pp. 3–17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2015). <https://doi.org/10.4230/OASICS.WPTE.2015.3>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/OASICS.WPTE.2015.3>
27. Guerrieri, G., Manzonetto, G.: The Bang Calculus and the Two Girard's Translations. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* **292**, 15–30 (Apr 2019). <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.292.2>

28. Guerrieri, G., Olimpieri, F.: Categorifying non-idempotent intersection types. In: 29th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2021. LIPIcs, vol. 183, pp. 25:1–25:24. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2021). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2021.25>
29. Guerrieri, G., Paolini, L., Rocca, S.R.D.: Standardization and conservativity of a refined call-by-value lambda-calculus. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **13**(4) (2017). [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13\(4:29\)2017](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13(4:29)2017), [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13\(4:29\)2017](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-13(4:29)2017)
30. Kerinec, A., Manzonetto, G., Pagani, M.: Revisiting call-by-value böhm trees in light of their taylor expansion. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* **16**(3) (2020), <https://lmcs.episciences.org/6638>
31. Kesner, D., Arrial, V., Guerrieri, G.: Meaningfulness and genericity in a subsuming framework (2024)
32. Kesner, D., Conchúir, S.O.: Fundamental properties of milner’s non-local explicit substitution calculus, available on <http://www.pps.jussieu.fr/~kesner/papers/>
33. Kesner, D., Viso, A.: Encoding tight typing in a unified framework. In: 30th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2022. LIPIcs, vol. 216, pp. 27:1–27:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2022). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2022.27>
34. Levy, P.B.: Call-by-push-value: A subsuming paradigm. In: Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, 4th International Conference, TLCA’99, L’Aquila, Italy, April 7-9, 1999, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 1581, pp. 228–242. Springer (1999). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48959-2_17
35. Lincoln, P., Mitchell, J.C.: Operational aspects of linear lambda calculus. In: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS ’92). pp. 235–246 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.1992.185536>
36. Manzonetto, G., Pagani, M., Ronchi Della Rocca, S.: New semantical insights into call-by-value λ -calculus. *Fundamenta Informaticae* **170**(1-3), 241–265 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.3233/FI-2019-1862>
37. Maraist, J., Odersky, M., Turner, D.N., Wadler, P.: Call-by-name, call-by-value, call-by-need and the linear lambda calculus. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **228**(1-2), 175–210 (1999). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975\(98\)00358-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3975(98)00358-2)
38. Milner, R.: Local bigraphs and confluence: two conjectures. In: Amadio, R., Phillips, I. (eds.) Proceedings of the 13th Int. Workshop on Expressiveness in Concurrency (EXPRESS). vol. 175, pp. 65–73. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science (2006)
39. Mitschke, G.: The standardization theorem for λ -calculus. *Math. Log. Q.* **25**(1-2), 29–31 (1979). <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.19790250104>
40. van Oostrom, V.: Confluence by decreasing diagrams. In: Voronkov, A. (ed.) Rewriting Techniques and Applications, 19th International Conference, RTA 2008, Hagenberg, Austria, July 15-17, 2008, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 5117, pp. 306–320. Springer (2008). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70590-1_21, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70590-1_21
41. Paolini, L., Ronchi Della Rocca, S.: Call-by-value Solvability. *RAIRO - Theoretical Informatics and Applications* **33**(6), 507–534 (1999). <https://doi.org/10.1051/ita:1999130>
42. Paolini, L., Ronchi Della Rocca, S.: Parametric parameter passing lambda-calculus. *Information and Computation* **189**(1), 87–106 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2003.08.003>

43. Plotkin, G.D.: Call-by-name, call-by-value and the λ -calculus. *Theoretical Computer Science* **1**(2), 125–159 (Dec 1975). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(75\)90017-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(75)90017-1)
44. Reynolds, J.C.: Where theory and practice meet: Popl past and future (1998), <http://www.luca.demon.co.uk/POPL98/InvitedTalks.html>, invited talk at POPL '98: The 25th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages
45. Ronchi Della Rocca, S., Roversi, L.: Lambda calculus and intuitionistic linear logic. *Stud Logica* **59**(3), 417–448 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1005092630115>
46. Sabry, A., Wadler, P.: A reflection on call-by-value. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **19**(6), 916–941 (1997). <https://doi.org/10.1145/267959.269968>
47. Santo, J.E.: The call-by-value lambda-calculus with generalized applications. In: Fernández, M., Muscholl, A. (eds.) 28th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2020, January 13–16, 2020, Barcelona, Spain. *LIPICs*, vol. 152, pp. 35:1–35:12. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CSL.2020.35>, <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CSL.2020.35>
48. Takahashi, M.: Parallel reductions in lambda-calculus. *Information and Computation* **118**(1), 120–127 (1995). <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1995.1057>
49. Terese: *Term Rewriting Systems*, Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 55. Cambridge University Press (2003)
50. Wadsworth, C.P.: The relation between computational and denotational properties for scott's d_{infty} -models of the lambda-calculus. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **5**(3), 488–521 (1976). <https://doi.org/10.1137/0205036>

A Appendix: Proofs of Sec. 2

A.1 Basic Properties

We introduce the following measure, which counts the number of constructors contained within a term.

Definition 25 (Term Full Size).

$$\begin{array}{ll} |x|_{\mathbb{F}} := 0 & |t[x \setminus u]|_{\mathbb{F}} := 1 + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ |tu|_{\mathbb{F}} := 1 + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} & |\text{der}(t)|_{\mathbb{F}} := 1 + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ |\lambda x.t|_{\mathbb{F}} := 1 + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} & |!t|_{\mathbb{F}} := 1 + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{array}$$

It is extended to all contexts by taking $|\diamond|_{\mathbb{F}} = 0$ and show that full term size is compatible with contexts.

Lemma 26. *Let $t \in \Lambda$, then for any context \mathbf{F} , $|\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}}$.*

Proof. By induction on \mathbf{F} . Cases:

- $\mathbf{F} = \diamond$: Then $\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle = t$ thus $|\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = 0 + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}}$.
- $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}'u$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} &= |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle u|_{\mathbb{F}} = 1 + |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{i.h.}{=} 1 + |\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}'u|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathbf{F} = u\mathbf{F}'$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} &= |u\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = 1 + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} + |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{i.h.}{=} 1 + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} + |\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |u\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}'[x \setminus u]$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} &= |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle [x \setminus u]|_{\mathbb{F}} = 1 + |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{i.h.}{=} 1 + |\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}'[x \setminus u]|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathbf{F} = u[x \setminus \mathbf{F}']$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} &= |u[x \setminus \mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle]|_{\mathbb{F}} = 1 + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} + |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{i.h.}{=} 1 + |u|_{\mathbb{F}} + |\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |u[x \setminus \mathbf{F}']|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathbf{F} = \lambda x.\mathbf{F}'$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} &= |\lambda x.\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = 1 + |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{i.h.}{=} 1 + |\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\lambda x.\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathbf{F} = \text{der}(\mathbf{F}')$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} &= |\text{der}(\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle)|_{\mathbb{F}} = 1 + |\mathbf{F}'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{i.h.}{=} 1 + |\mathbf{F}'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\text{der}(\mathbf{F}')|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\mathbf{F}|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

– $F = !F'$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} |F\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} &= !|F'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = 1 + |F'\langle t \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{i.h.}{=} 1 + |F'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |!F'|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |F|_{\mathbb{F}} + |t|_{\mathbb{F}} \end{aligned}$$

□

We now use this measure to prove the termination of reductions $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}, \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}$.

Lemma 27. *Reductions $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}$ are terminating.*

Proof. To prove that $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}$ is terminating, it is enough to show that $|t|_{\mathbb{F}} > |u|_{\mathbb{F}}$ for any $t, u \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle} u$. By definition, there are $t', u' \in \Lambda_!$ and a context F such that $t = F\langle t' \rangle, u = F\langle u' \rangle$ with $t' \mapsto_{d!} u'$. So, $t' = \text{der}(L\langle !s \rangle)$ and $u' = L\langle s \rangle$ for some $s \in \Lambda_!$ and list context L . Using Lem. 26, one deduces that $|t'|_{\mathbb{F}} = |\text{der}(L\langle !s \rangle)|_{\mathbb{F}} = 2 + |s|_{\mathbb{F}} + |L|_{\mathbb{F}} > |s|_{\mathbb{F}} + |L|_{\mathbb{F}} = |L\langle s \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = |u'|_{\mathbb{F}}$, and using Lem. 26 again we conclude that $|t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |F\langle t' \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} > |F\langle u' \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = |u|_{\mathbb{F}}$.

As $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}$, termination of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}$ implies termination of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}$. □

Lemma 28. *Reductions $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle}$ are terminating.*

Proof. To prove that $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle}$ is terminating, it is enough to show that $|t|_{\mathbb{F}} > |u|_{\mathbb{F}}$ for any $t, u \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle} u$. By definition, there are $t', u' \in \Lambda_!$ and a context F such that $t = F\langle t' \rangle, u = F\langle u' \rangle$ with $t' \mapsto_{d\mathbb{B}} u'$. So, $t' = L\langle \lambda x.s \rangle r$ and $u' = L\langle s[x\backslash r] \rangle$ for some $s, r \in \Lambda_!$ and list context L . By Lem. 26, one has $|t'|_{\mathbb{F}} = |L\langle \lambda x.s \rangle r|_{\mathbb{F}} = 2 + |s|_{\mathbb{F}} + |r|_{\mathbb{F}} + |L|_{\mathbb{F}} > 1 + |s|_{\mathbb{F}} + |r|_{\mathbb{F}} + |L|_{\mathbb{F}} = |L\langle s[x\backslash r] \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = |u'|_{\mathbb{F}}$, and using Lem. 26 again we conclude that $|t|_{\mathbb{F}} = |F\langle t' \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} > |F\langle u' \rangle|_{\mathbb{F}} = |u|_{\mathbb{F}}$.

As $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle}$, termination of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle}$ implies termination of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle}$. □

A.2 Abstract Diligence for dBANG

In this subsection we introduce an abstract proof of diligence process. The proof is parametrized using a family \mathbb{E} of dBANG contexts.

We first introduce a parametric definition of administrative diligent reduction.

Definition 29 (Administrative Diligent Reduction). *The administrative diligent reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}$ associated with a family $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ of contexts is a subset of the reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}$ obtained by restricting dB and s!-steps to $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -normal forms. More precisely, it is defined as follows:*

$$\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}} := (\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d\mathbb{B} \rangle} \cap \mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle\text{-NF} \times \Lambda_!) \cup (\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle s! \rangle} \cap \mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle\text{-NF} \times \Lambda_!) \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}$$

We say that the reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}$ admits a diligence process if $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^ u$ whenever $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u$ with u a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF.*

Lemma 30 ($\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -Head Steps Extraction). *Let $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$ or there is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF $s \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* s$ and $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$.*

Proof. By induction on the length of the reduction sequence $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$. Cases:

- $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^0 u$: Then $t = u$ thus in particular $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$ concluding this case.
- $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}} s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^n u$: We distinguish 2 cases:
 - t is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF: Thus taking $s = t$ concludes this case since by reflexivity $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* s$ and by hypothesis $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$.
 - t is not a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF: Then necessarily $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^n u$. By *i.h.* on $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^n u$, two cases can be distinguished:
 - $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$: Then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$ concluding this case.
 - $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* s$ and $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$ for some $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF $s \in \Lambda!$: Then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* s$ and $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$ concluding this case. \square

Lemma 31. *Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s!}\}$. Suppose that for any $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} u_2$, there is $s \in \Lambda!$ making the diagram below commute.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & u_1 \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} & & * \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} \\
 u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & s
 \end{array}$$

Then, for any $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^ u_2$, there exists $s \in \Lambda!$ such that the following diagram also commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & u_1 \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 * \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} & & * \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} \\
 u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & s
 \end{array}$$

Proof. By induction on the length of the derivation $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_2$. Cases:

- $t = u_2$: One trivially concludes by taking $s = u_1$.
- $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} u'_2 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_2$: We consider the diagram below. By hypothesis, there is $u'_1 \in \Lambda!$ such that the top square commutes. By *i.h.*, there is $s \in \Lambda!$ such that the bottom square commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & u_1 \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} \\
 u'_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & u'_1 \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 * \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} & & * \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} \\
 u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & s
 \end{array}$$

\square

Lemma 32 (One Step Abstract Diligence). *Let $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ be a family of contexts such that:*

- *the reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}$ is confluent;*
- *for any $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}!\}$ and any $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} u_2$, there exists $s \in \Lambda_!$ making the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & u_1 \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* \\
 u_2 & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & s
 \end{array}$$

If $t, u \in \Lambda_!$ where u is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF and such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^ u$, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$.*

Proof. Let $t, u, s \in \Lambda_!$ with $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$ where u is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF. Two cases:

- $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} s$ with $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}!\}$. Consider the diagram below. Since $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}$ terminates (Lem. 27), there is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF $t' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* t'$. Using Lem. 31 there is $s' \in \Lambda_!$ such that the left square commutes. By confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}$ there is $u' \in \Lambda_!$ such that the right square commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 t & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & s & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^*} & u \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* \\
 t' & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & s' & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^*} & u'
 \end{array}$$

- As u is $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, necessarily $u = u'$. As $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^*$, one has $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* t'$ and $s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$. Since t' is $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then $t' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* s'$ and so $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$ by transitivity.
- $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$: Then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$, and so $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$, since $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^*$. \square

Lemma 33. *Let \mathbb{E} be a family of contexts such that:*

- *The reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}$ is confluent.*
- *For any $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}!\}$ and any $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} u_2$, there exists $s \in \Lambda_!$ making the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & u_1 \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* \\
 u_2 & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & s
 \end{array}$$

Then the reduction relation $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}$ admits a diligence process.

Proof. Let $t, u \in \Lambda_!$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u$ such that u is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF. We show that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$. We proceed by induction on the length of the derivation $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u$:

- $t = u$: Then by reflexivity $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$.
- $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^n u$ for some $s \in \Lambda_1$: By *i.h.* on $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^n u$, one obtains $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$. Using Lem. 30, two cases can be distinguished:
 - $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$: Then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u$ and hence, by Lem. 32, $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$.
 - $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$ for some $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF $s' \in \Lambda_1$: Then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* s'$ and so $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* s'$ by Lem. 32, hence $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\text{ad}}^* u$ by transitivity. \square

Lemma 3 (Diligence Process). \uparrow Let $t, u \in \Lambda_1$ be terms.

- (**Surface**) If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u$ and u is a $\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\text{ad}}^* u$.
- (**Full**) If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u$ and u is a $\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\text{ad}}^* u$.

Proof.

- (**Surface**) See App. A.3, in particular Lem. 37.
- (**Full**) See App. A.4, in particular Lem. 43. \square

A.3 Surface Diligence for dBANG

Lemma 34. Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s!}\}$ and $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_1$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} u_2$. Then the diagram below commutes, for some $s \in \Lambda_1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & u_1 \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} \\
 u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} & s
 \end{array}$$

Proof. See [18, Lemma 2.4]. \square

Lemma 35 (Diamond of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}$). Let $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_1$ with $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} u_1$, $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} u_2$ and $u_1 \neq u_2$. Then there is $s \in \Lambda_1$ such that the diagram below commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} & u_1 \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} \\
 u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} & s
 \end{array}$$

Proof. See [18, Lemma 2.4], taking $p_1 = p_2 = d!$. \square

Corollary 36 (Confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}$). Let $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_1$ with $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_2$. Then there exists $s \in \Lambda_1$ such that the diagram below commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}^* & u_1 \\
 \downarrow_{*\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{*\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle} \\
 u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle d! \rangle}^* & s
 \end{array}$$

Proof. Immediate consequence of the diamond for $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle}$ (Lem. 35). \square

Lemma 37 (Surface Diligence). *Let $t, u \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u$. If u is a $\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle}^* u$.*

Proof. Just apply Lem. 33 to $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}$, since its hypotheses are fulfilled (Cor. 36 and Lem. 34). \square

A.4 Full Diligence for dBANG

Definition 38. Full reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}$ is extended to contexts as expected:

- either the redex occurs in a subterm of some context,
- or the redex occurs in a subcontext, where, in particular, $\mathbf{s}!$ -redexes are only defined as $t[x \setminus (!u)[x_1 \setminus u_1] \dots [x_i \setminus \mathbf{F}_i] \dots [x_n \setminus u_n]]$, but not as $t[x \setminus \mathbf{L}\langle \mathbf{F} \rangle]$ or $\mathbf{F}[x \setminus \mathbf{L}\langle !u \rangle]$.

Examples of the first case are $\diamond[x \setminus (\lambda w.w)z] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{dB} \rangle} \diamond[x \setminus w[w \setminus z]]$, $\diamond \mathbf{der}(!t) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle} \diamond t$ and $!(x[x \setminus !y]) \diamond \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{s}! \rangle} !(y) \diamond$, while examples of the second case are $(\lambda x.x) \diamond \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{dB} \rangle} x[x \setminus \diamond]$ and $\mathbf{der}(!\diamond) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle} \diamond$ but $\diamond[x \setminus z]$ but $x[x \setminus !\diamond]$ are $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}$ -irreducible.

Lemma 39. *If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} t'$ and $\mathbf{F} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \mathbf{F}'$, then*

1. $t\{x \setminus u\} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} t'\{x \setminus u\}$;
2. $u\{x \setminus t\} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}^* u\{x \setminus t'\}$;
3. $\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \mathbf{F}\langle t' \rangle$;
4. $\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle$.

Proof. 1. By straightforward induction on the definition of $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} t'$.

2. By straightforward induction on u .

3. Since $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} t'$, there is a full context \mathbf{F}' and $r, r' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t = \mathbf{F}'\langle r \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \mathbf{F}'\langle r' \rangle = t'$ with $r \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} r'$. As $\mathbf{F}\langle \mathbf{F}' \rangle$ is a full context, $\mathbf{F}\langle t \rangle = \mathbf{F}\langle \mathbf{F}'\langle r \rangle \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \mathbf{F}\langle \mathbf{F}'\langle r' \rangle \rangle = \mathbf{F}\langle t' \rangle$.

4. By straightforward induction on $\mathbf{F} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \mathbf{F}'$. \square

Lemma 40. *Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{\mathbf{dB}, \mathbf{s}!\}$ and $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle} u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u_2$. Then there exists $s \in \Lambda_!$ such that the diagram below commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & u_2 \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle}^* \\
 u_1 & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}} & s
 \end{array}$$

Proof. We analyze different (potentially overlapping) situations that at the end cover all possible cases. To close the diagrams we use Lem. 39.

1. $t = F\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle$ and $u_1 = F\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle$ and the step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} u_2$ occurs inside F , L , or s_1 . We analyze all the possible cases.

– If $F \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} F'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} & F'\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle \\ \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle & & \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle \\ F\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} & F'\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

– If $L \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} L'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} & F\langle \text{der}(L'\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle \\ \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle & & \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle \\ F\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} & F\langle L'\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

– If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} & F\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s'_1 \rangle) \rangle \\ \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle & & \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle \\ F\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} & F\langle L\langle s'_1 \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

2. $t = F\langle L\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$ and $u_2 = F\langle L\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle$ and the step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} u_1$ occurs inside F , L , s_1 , or s_2 . We analyze all the possible cases.

– If $F \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} F'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\langle L\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} & F\langle L\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle & & \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle \\ F'\langle L\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} & F'\langle L\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

– If $L \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} L'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F\langle L\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} & F\langle L\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle & & \downarrow \mathbb{F}\langle \text{d}! \rangle \\ F\langle L'\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{d}!)} & F\langle L'\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

– If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(dB)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x]s_2 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(dB)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s'_1[x]s_2 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

– If $s_2 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} s'_2$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(dB)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x]s_2 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(dB)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x]s'_2 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

3. $t = \mathbb{F}\langle s_1[x]\mathbb{L}\langle !s_2 \rangle \rangle$ and $u_2 = \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1\{x\}s_2 \rangle \rangle$ and the step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} u_1$ occurs inside \mathbb{F} , \mathbb{L} , s_1 or s_2 . We analyze all the possible cases.

– If $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \mathbb{F}'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle s_1[x]\mathbb{L}\langle !s_2 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1\{x\}s_2 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}'\langle s_1[x]\mathbb{L}\langle !s_2 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)} & \mathbb{F}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1\{x\}s_2 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

– If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle s_1[x]\mathbb{L}\langle !s_2 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1\{x\}s_2 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}\langle s'_1[x]\mathbb{L}\langle !s_2 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s'_1\{x\}s_2 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

– If $\mathbb{L} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \mathbb{L}'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle s_1[x]\mathbb{L}\langle !s_2 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1\{x\}s_2 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}\langle s_1[x]\mathbb{L}'\langle !s_2 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)} & \mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle s_1\{x\}s_2 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

– If $s_2 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} s'_2$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)}} & \mathbb{F}\langle L\langle s_1 \{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(s!)}} & \mathbb{F}\langle L\langle s_1 \{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

□

Lemma 41 (Diamond of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}$). *Let $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_!$. If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} u_1$, $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} u_2$ and $u_1 \neq u_2$, then there is $s \in \Lambda_!$ such that the diagram below commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & u_2 \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 u_1 & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & s
 \end{array}$$

Proof. As $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} u_2$, then $t = \mathbb{F}\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle$ and $u_2 = \mathbb{F}\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle$. Different cases have to be distinguished, since the reduction step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} u_1$ may occur inside \mathbb{F} , L , or s_1 ; in all these cases we use Lem. 39 to conclude:

– If $\mathbb{F} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \mathbb{F}'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & \mathbb{F}\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}'\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & \mathbb{F}'\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

– If $L \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} L'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & \mathbb{F}\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}\langle \text{der}(L'\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & \mathbb{F}\langle L'\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

– If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{F}\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & \mathbb{F}\langle L\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \\
 \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} & & \downarrow \downarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} \\
 \mathbb{F}\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s'_1 \rangle) \rangle & \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)}} & \mathbb{F}\langle L\langle s'_1 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

Corollary 42 (Confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}$). *Let $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_2$. Then there is $s \in \Lambda!$ such that the diagram below commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}^* & u_1 \\ \downarrow_{*\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{*\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle} \\ u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}^* & s \end{array}$$

Proof. Immediate consequence of the diamond for $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}$ (Lem. 41). \square

Lemma 43 (Full Diligence). *Let $t, u \in \Lambda!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u$. If u is a $\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{ad} \rangle}^* u$.*

Proof. Just apply Lem. 33 to $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}$, since its hypotheses are fulfilled (Cor. 42 and Lem. 40). \square

B Appendix: Proofs of Sec. 3

B.1 The Call-by-Name Calculus dCBN

Lemma 44. *Let $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ and $t \in \Lambda$, then $(F_N(t))^n = F_N^n(t^n)$.*

Proof. By straightforward induction on F_N . \square

Lemma 4 (dCBN One-Step Simulation). *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ and $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}\}$. If $t \rightarrow_{F_N(\mathcal{R})} u$ then $t^n \rightarrow_{F_N^n(\mathcal{R}^n)} u^n$.*

Proof. By definition, there exist $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ and $t', u' \in \Lambda$ such that $t = F_N\langle t' \rangle$, $u = F_N\langle u' \rangle$ and $t' \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} u'$ for some $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}\}$. We distinguish two cases on \mathcal{R} :

- $\mathcal{R} = \text{dB}$: Then there are $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ and $L_N \in \mathbb{L}_N$ such that $t' = L_N\langle \lambda x. s_1 \rangle s_2$ and $s' = L_N\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle$. By Lem. 44, $t'^n = L_N^n\langle \lambda x. s_1^n \rangle !s_2^n \mapsto_{\text{dB}^n} L_N^n\langle s_1^n[x \setminus !s_2^n] \rangle = u'^n$ so that using Lem. 44 again, $t^n = F_N^n\langle t'^n \rangle \rightarrow_{F_N^n(\text{dB}^n)} F_N^n\langle u'^n \rangle = u^n$.
- $\mathcal{R} = \text{s}$: Then there are $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t' = s_1[x \setminus s_2]$ and $s' = s_1\{x \setminus s_2\}$. By induction on s_1 , one has that $u'^n = s_1^n\{x \setminus s_2^n\}$ thus $t'^n = s_1^n[x \setminus !s_2^n] \mapsto_{\text{s}^n} s_1^n\{x \setminus s_2^n\} = u'^n$ so that $t^n = F_N^n\langle t'^n \rangle \rightarrow_{F_N^n(\text{s}^n)} F_N^n\langle u'^n \rangle = u^n$ by Lem. 44. \square

Lemma 45. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$, then $(t\{x \setminus u\})^n = t^n\{x \setminus u^n\}$.*

Proof. By induction on $t \in \Lambda$.

Lemma 6 (dCBN One-Step Reverse Simulation). *Let $t \in \Lambda$, $u' \in \Lambda!$, $F \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathcal{R}' \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}!, \text{d}!\}$.*

$$t^n \rightarrow_{F(\mathcal{R}')} u' \implies \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \exists u \in \Lambda, \quad u^n = u' \\ \exists \mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}\}, \quad \mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}' \\ \exists F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N, \quad F_N^n = F \end{array} \right\} \text{ such that } t \rightarrow_{F_N(\mathcal{R})} u.$$

Proof. Let $t \in \Lambda$, $s'_t, s'_u \in \Lambda_!$ and $\mathcal{R}' \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}!, \mathbf{d}!\}$. Let us show the following property by induction on $F \in \mathbb{F}$:

« For all $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $t^n = F\langle s'_t \rangle$ and $s'_t \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}'} s'_u$, there exist $s_t, s_u \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$ and $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s_t^n = s'_t$, $s_u^n = s'_u$, $s_t \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} s_u$, $\mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}'$ and $F_N^n = F$. »

- $F = \diamond$: Let $F_N = \diamond$, then $F_N^n = F$. We distinguish three cases on \mathcal{R}' :
 - $\mathcal{R} = \text{dB}$: Then $s'_t = L\langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2$ and $s'_u = L\langle s'_1[x \setminus s'_2] \rangle$ for some $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $s'_1, s'_2 \in \Lambda_!$. Since $t^n = s'_t$, then there exists $L_N \in \mathbb{L}_N$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $L_N^n = L$, $s_1^n = s'_1$ and $!s_2^n = s'_2$. Taking $s_t = L_N\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2$, $s_u = L_N\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle$ and $\mathcal{R} = \text{dB}$ concludes this case since using Lem. 44:

$$\begin{aligned} s_t^n &= L_N^n\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle !s_2^n = L\langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 = s'_t \\ s_u^n &= L_N^n\langle s_1[x \setminus !s_2^n] \rangle = L\langle s'_1[x \setminus s'_2] \rangle = s'_u \\ s_t &= L_N\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} L_N\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle = s_u \\ \mathcal{R}^n &= \text{dB}^n = \text{dB} = \mathcal{R}' \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{s}!$: Then $s'_t = s'_1[x \setminus s'_2]$ and $s'_u = s'_1\{x \setminus s'_2\}$ for some $s'_1, s'_2 \in \Lambda_!$. Since $t^n = s'_t$, then there exists $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $s_1^n = s'_1$ and $!s_2^n = s'_2$. Taking $s_t = s_1[x \setminus s_2]$, $s_u = s_1\{x \setminus s_2\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{s}$ concludes this case since:

$$\begin{aligned} s_t^n &= s_1^n[x \setminus !s_2^n] = s'_1[x \setminus s'_2] = s'_t \\ s_u^n &\stackrel{\text{Lem.45}}{=} s_1^n\{x \setminus !s_2^n\} = s'_1\{x \setminus s'_2\} = s'_u \\ s_t &= s_1[x \setminus s_2] \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} = s_u \\ \mathcal{R}^n &= \mathbf{s}^n = \mathbf{s}! = \mathcal{R}' \end{aligned}$$

- $\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{d}!$: Then $t^n = s'_t = \text{der}(L\langle !s \rangle)$ for some $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $s \in \Lambda_!$ which is impossible by definition of the embedding.
- $F = \lambda x.F'$: Then $t^n = \lambda x.F'\langle s'_t \rangle$ thus necessarily $t = \lambda x.t'$ for some $t' \in \Lambda$ such that $t^n = F'\langle s'_t \rangle$. By induction on F' , there exist $s_t, s_u \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$ and $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s_t^n = s'_t$, $s_u^n = s'_u$, $s_t \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} s_u$, $\mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}'$ and $F'^n_N = F'$. Taking $F_N = \lambda x.F'_N$ concludes this case since $F_N^n = \lambda x.F'^n_N = \lambda x.F' = F$.
- $F = F's'$: Then $t^n = F'\langle s'_t \rangle s'$ thus necessarily $t = t's$ for some $t', s \in \Lambda$ such that $t^n = F'\langle s'_t \rangle$ and $!s^n = s'$. By induction on F' , there exist $s_t, s_u \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$ and $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s_t^n = s'_t$, $s_u^n = s'_u$, $s_t \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} s_u$, $\mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}'$ and $F'^n_N = F'$. Taking $F_N = F'_N s$ concludes this case since $F_N^n = F'^n_N !s^n = F's' = F$.
- $F = s'F'$: Then $t^n = s'F'\langle s'_t \rangle$ thus necessarily $t = s't'$ for some $s, t' \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$ and $!t'^n = F'\langle s'_t \rangle$. Therefore $F'' = !F''$ for some $F'' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t'^n = F''\langle s'_t \rangle$. By induction on F'' , there exist $s_t, s_u \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$ and $F''_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s_t^n = s'_t$, $s_u^n = s'_u$, $s_t \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} s_u$, $\mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}'$ and $F''^n_N = F''$. Taking $F_N = sF''_N$ concludes this case since $F_N^n = s^n !F''^n_N = s' !F'' = s'F' = F$.
- $F = F'[x \setminus s']$: Then $t^n = F'\langle s'_t \rangle [x \setminus s']$ thus necessarily $t = t'[x \setminus s]$ for some $t', s \in \Lambda$ such that $t'^n = F'\langle s'_t \rangle$ and $!s^n = s'$. By induction on F' , there exist $s_t, s_u \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$ and $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s_t^n = s'_t$, $s_u^n = s'_u$, $s_t \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} s_u$, $\mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}'$ and $F'^n_N = F'$. Taking $F_N = F'_N[x \setminus s]$ concludes this case since $F_N^n = F'^n_N [x \setminus !s^n] = F'[x \setminus s'] = F$.

- $F = s'[x \setminus F']$: Then $t^n = s'[x \setminus F' \langle s'_t \rangle]$ thus necessarily $t = s[x \setminus t']$ for some $s, t' \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$ and $!t'^n = F' \langle s'_t \rangle$. Therefore $F'' = !F''$ for some $F'' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t'^n = F'' \langle s'_t \rangle$. By induction on F'' , there exist $s_t, s_u \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$ and $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s_t^n = s'_t$, $s_u^n = s'_u$, $s_t \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} s_u$, $\mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}'$ and $F_N^n = F''$. Taking $F_N = s[x \setminus F'_N]$ concludes this case since $F_N^n = s^n[x \setminus !F_N^n] = s'[x \setminus !F''] = s'[x \setminus F'] = F$.
- $F = \text{der}(F')$: Then $t^n = \text{der}(F' \langle s'_t \rangle)$ which is impossible by definition of \cdot^n .
- $F = !F'$: Then $t^n = !F' \langle s'_t \rangle$ which is impossible by definition of \cdot^n .

Lemma 46. *Let $\mathbb{E}_N \subseteq \mathbb{F}_N$, $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ be two families of contexts such that:*

1. *Let $E_N \in \mathbb{E}_N$, then $E_N^n \in \mathbb{E}$.*
2. *Let $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$, if there exists $E \in \mathbb{E}$ such that $F_N^n = E$, then $F_N \in \mathbb{E}_N$.*

Then, the following properties hold:

- **(Normal Forms)**: $\forall t \in \Lambda$,

$$t \text{ is a } \mathbb{E}_N\text{-NF} \iff t^n \text{ is a } \mathbb{E}\text{-NF}$$

- **(Stability)**: $\forall t, \in \Lambda, \forall u \in \Lambda!$,

$$t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u' \implies \exists u \in \Lambda, u^n = u'$$

- **(Simulation and Reverse Simulation)**: $\forall t, u \in \Lambda$,

$$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u \iff t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$$

Moreover, the number of dB/s-steps matches the number dB/s!-steps.

Proof. Let us first show that the following two properties hold:

- **(One Step Simulation)**: $\forall t, u \in \Lambda$,

$$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N} u \implies t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u^n$$

- **(One Step Reverse Simulation)**: $\forall t, \in \Lambda, \forall u' \in \Lambda!$,

$$t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u' \implies \exists u \in \Lambda, t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N} u \text{ and } u^n = u'$$

In particular, dB-steps (resp. s-steps) are simulated by dB-steps (resp. s!-steps).

We distinguish the two cases:

- **(One Step Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N} u$. Thus $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u$ for some $E_N \in \mathbb{E}_N$ and $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \mathbf{s}\}$. Since $\mathbb{E}_N \subseteq \mathbb{F}_N$, then $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N \langle \mathcal{R}^n \rangle} u^n$ using one step full simulation (Lem. 4). Since $E_N \in \mathbb{E}_N$, then by hypothesis $E_N^n \in \mathbb{E}$ and one finally concludes that $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u^n$.

- **(One Step Reverse Simulation)**: Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_1$ such that $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u'$. Then $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{R}')} u'$ for some $\mathbb{E} \in \mathbb{E}$ and $\mathcal{R}' \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}!\}$. Since $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, then using one step full reverse simulation (Lem. 6) there exists $u \in \Lambda$ such that $u^n = u'$, $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ with $\mathbb{F}_N^n = \mathbb{E}$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}\}$, $\mathcal{R}^n = \mathcal{R}'$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N(\mathcal{R})} u$. Since $\mathbb{F}_N^n \in \mathbb{E}$, then by hypothesis $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{E}_N$ so that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N} u$.

Using these, let us now prove the three expected properties:

- **(Normal Forms)**: Direct consequence of simulation and reverse simulation.
- **(Stability)**: Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_1$ such that $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u'$. Let us proceed by induction on the length of the derivation $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u'$. Cases:
 - $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^0 u'$: Then $u' = t^n$ and taking $u = t$ trivially concludes this case.
 - $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u'$: Using one step reverse simulation, there exists $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$ and thus by *i.h.* on $s^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u'$, one concludes that there exists $u \in \Lambda$ such that $u^n = u'$.
- **(Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u$. We proceed by induction on the length of the derivation $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u$. Cases:
 - $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^0 u$: Then $t = u$ thus $t^n = u^n$ and by reflexivity $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$.
 - $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N} s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u$: On one hand $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N} s^n$ using one step simulation. On the other hand, by *i.h.* on $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u$, one has that $s^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$. Finally, one concludes by transitivity that $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$.
- **(Reverse Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$. We proceed by induction on the length of the derivation $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$. Cases:
 - $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^0 u^n$: Then $t^n = u^n$ thus by injectivity of $(\cdot)^n$ $t = u$ and by reflexivity $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u$.
 - $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$: On one hand, using one step reverse simulation, there exists $s \in \Lambda$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N} s$ with $s^n = s'$. On the other hand, by *i.h.* on $s^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^n$, one has that $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u$. Finally, one concludes by transitivity that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_N}^* u$. \square

Lemma 47. *Let $t \in \Lambda$, then:*

1. $(\text{dCBN} \rightarrow \text{dBANG})$ Let $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$, then $\mathbb{F}_N^n \in \mathbb{F}$.
2. $(\text{dBANG} \rightarrow \text{dCBN})$ Let $\mathbb{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $\mathbb{F}_N^n = \mathbb{F}$, then $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$.

Proof.

1. $(\text{dCBN} \rightarrow \text{dBANG})$ By definition of \cdot^n .
2. $(\text{dBANG} \rightarrow \text{dCBN})$ By hypothesis.

Corollary 7. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.*

1. **(Stability)**: *if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* s'$ then there is $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$.*
2. **(Normal Forms)**: *t is a \mathbb{F}_N -NF if and only if t^n is a \mathbb{F} -NF.*
3. **(Simulations)**: *$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_N}^* u$ if and only if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u^n$. Moreover, the number of dB/s-steps on the left matches the number dB/s!-steps on the right.*

Proof. Using Lem. 46 and Lem. 47.

Lemma 8.

1. (dCBN \rightarrow dBANG) If $S_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$, then $S_N^n \in \mathbb{S}$.
2. (dBANG \rightarrow dCBN) If $S \in \mathbb{S}$ and $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $F_N^n = S$, then $F_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$.

Proof. 1. (dCBN \rightarrow dBANG) By induction on $S_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$:

- $S_N = \diamond$: Then $S_N^n = \diamond^n = \diamond \in \mathbb{S}$.
 - $S_N = \lambda x.S'_N$: By *i.h.*, $S'_N \in \mathbb{S}$ thus $S_N^n = \lambda x.S'^n_N \in \lambda x.\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - $S_N = S'_N s$: By *i.h.* on S'_N , one has that $S'^n_N \in \mathbb{S}$ which concludes this case since $S_N^n = S'^n_N !s^n \in \mathbb{S} !s^n \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - $S_N = S'_N[x \setminus s]$: By *i.h.* on S'_N , one has that $S'^n_N \in \mathbb{S}$ which concludes this case since $S_N^n = S'^n_N[x \setminus !s^n] \in \mathbb{S}[x \setminus !s^n] \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
2. (dBANG \rightarrow dCBN) Let $S \in \mathbb{S}$ and $F_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $F_N^n = S$. By induction on $S \in \mathbb{S}$:
- $S = \diamond$: Then necessarily $F_N = \diamond$ thus $F_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$.
 - $S = \lambda x.S'$: Then necessarily $F_N = \lambda x.F'_N$ for some $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $F'^n_N = S'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$ so that $F_N = \lambda x.F'_N \in \lambda x.\mathbb{S}_N \subseteq \mathbb{S}_N$.
 - $S = S' s$: Then necessarily $F_N = F'_N s$ for some $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ and $s \in \Lambda$ such that $F'^n_N = S'$ and $!s^n = s'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$ so that $F_N = F'_N s \in \mathbb{S}_N s \subseteq \mathbb{S}_N$.
 - $S = s' S$: Then necessarily $F_N = s F'_N$ for some $s \in \Lambda$ and $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s^n = s'$ and $!F'^n_N = S$ which is impossible since no $S \in \mathbb{S}$ can have a hole under a bang.
 - $S = S'[x \setminus s']$: Then necessarily $F_N = F'_N[x \setminus s]$ for some $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ and $s \in \Lambda$ such that $F'^n_N = S'$ and $!s^n = s'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_N \in \mathbb{S}_N$ so that $F_N = F'_N[x \setminus s] \in \mathbb{S}_N[x \setminus s] \subseteq \mathbb{S}_N$.
 - $S = s'[x \setminus S']$: Then necessarily $F_N = s[x \setminus F'_N]$ for some $s \in \Lambda$ and $F'_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $s^n = s'$ and $!F'^n_N = S$ which is impossible since no $S \in \mathbb{S}$ can have a hole under a bang.
 - $S = \text{der}(S')$: Impossible since one cannot have $F_N^n = \text{der}(S)$ by definition of the dCBN embedding on contexts. \square

Corollary 9. Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.

1. (**Stability**): if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* s'$ then there is $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$.
2. (**Normal Forms**): t is a \mathbb{S}_N -NF if and only if t^n is a \mathbb{S} -NF.
3. (**Simulations**): $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_N}^* u$ if and only if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u^n$. Moreover, the number of dB/s-steps on the left matches the number of dB/s!-steps on the right.

Proof. Immediate consequence of Lems. 8 and 46. \square

B.2 The Call-by-Value Calculus dCBV

We use here an equivalent presentation of the dCBV **embedding** (Def. 10) to improve readability within the proofs:

$$\begin{aligned}
x^\vee &:= !x \\
(\lambda x.t)^\vee &:= !\lambda x.!t^\vee \\
(tu)^\vee &:= \begin{cases} \text{der}(\text{strip}(t^\vee) u^\vee) & \text{if } \text{Bang}(t^\vee) \\ \text{der}(\text{der}(t^\vee) u^\vee) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
(t[x \setminus u])^\vee &:= t^\vee[x \setminus u^\vee].
\end{aligned}$$

where the predicate $\mathbf{Bang}(t)$ holds if $t = L\langle !u \rangle$, and $\mathbf{strip}(t) := \begin{cases} L\langle u \rangle & \text{if } t = L\langle !u \rangle \\ t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

In order to properly extend the dCBV embedding to contexts, we introduce a refined "super-developped" embedding. We first extend the $\mathbf{Bang}(\cdot)$ predicate and $\mathbf{strip}(\cdot)$ function.

Definition 48. Let $F \in \mathbb{F}$.

The context predicate $\mathbf{Bang}(F)$ holds if $F = L\langle !F' \rangle$ or $F = L_1\langle L_2\langle !t \rangle [x \setminus F'] \rangle$.

The context function $\mathbf{strip}(F)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{strip}(F) := \begin{cases} L\langle F' \rangle & \text{if } F = L\langle !F' \rangle \\ L_1\langle L_2\langle t \rangle [x \setminus F'] \rangle & \text{if } F = L_1\langle L_2\langle !t \rangle [x \setminus F'] \rangle \end{cases}$$

Let us also introduce the $\mathbf{func}(\cdot)$ context predicate which captures contexts with holes placed directly to the left of an application.

Definition 49. Let $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$. The functional predicate $\mathbf{func}(F_v)$ holds if $F_v = F'_v\langle L_v t \rangle$ for some $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $t \in \Lambda$. Similarly for $F \in \mathbb{F}$, $\mathbf{func}(F)$ holds if $F = F'\langle L t \rangle$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$, $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $t \in \Lambda_1$.

This predicates is used to detecte places where super-development must be used. We now introduce the dCBV super-developped embedding for contexts.

Definition 50. The super-developped dCBV *context embedding* $\cdot^{v*}: \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda_1$ is defined on contexts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \diamond^{v*} &:= \diamond \\ (\lambda x. F_v)^{v*} &:= !\lambda x. !F_v^{v*} \\ (F_v t)^{v*} &:= \begin{cases} \mathbf{der}(F_v^v u^v) & \text{if } F_v \in \mathbb{L}_v \\ \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{strip}(F_v^{v*}) u^v) & \text{if } \mathbf{Bang}(F_v^v) \\ \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(F_v^{v*}) u^v) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ (t F_v)^{v*} &:= \begin{cases} \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{strip}(t^v) F_v^{v*}) & \text{if } \mathbf{Bang}(t^v) \\ \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(t^v) F_v^{v*}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ (F_v[x \setminus t])^{v*} &:= F_v^{v*}[x \setminus t^v] \\ (t[x \setminus F_v])^{v*} &:= t^v[x \setminus F_v^{v*}] \end{aligned}$$

For example, $(\diamond y z)^{v*} = \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(\diamond !y)) !z)$ whereas $(\diamond y z)^v = \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(\diamond) !y)) !z)$. This allows to work with embedding in a contextual manner.

Lemma 51. Let $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ and $t \in \Lambda$. Then:

$$(F_v \langle t \rangle)^v = \begin{cases} F_v^{v*} \langle \mathbf{strip}(t^v) \rangle & \text{if } \mathbf{func}(F_v) \text{ and } \mathbf{Bang}(t^v) \\ F_v^v \langle t^v \rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By induction on F_v .

Definition 52. Let $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, then $\text{rmDst}(F_v)$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rmDst}(\diamond) &:= \diamond \\ \text{rmDst}(\lambda x.F_v) &:= \lambda x.\text{rmDst}(F_v) \\ \text{rmDst}(F_v t) &:= \text{rmDst}(F_v) t \\ \text{rmDst}(t F_v) &:= t \text{rmDst}(F_v) \\ \text{rmDst}(F_v[x \setminus t]) &:= \begin{cases} \diamond & \text{if } \text{rmDst}(F_v) = \diamond \\ \text{rmDst}(F_v)[x \setminus t] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \text{rmDst}(t[x \setminus F_v]) &:= t[x \setminus \text{rmDst}(F_v)] \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 53. Let $t \in A$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then $\text{Bang}(t^v)$ if and only if $\text{Bang}((t\{x \setminus v\})^v)$.

Proof. By induction on $t \in A$:

- $t = y$: Then $t^v = !y$ thus $\text{Bang}(t^v)$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $x = y$: Then $t\{x \setminus v\} = v$ thus $\text{Bang}(t\{x \setminus v\}^v)$.
 - $x \neq y$: Then $t\{x \setminus v\} = y$ thus $(t\{x \setminus v\})^v = !y$ and therefore $\text{Bang}((t\{x \setminus v\})^v)$.
- $t = \lambda y.t'$: Then $t^v = !\lambda y.t'^v$ thus $\text{Bang}(t^v)$. Moreover, $t\{x \setminus v\} = \lambda y.(t'\{x \setminus v\})$ thus $(t\{x \setminus v\})^v = !\lambda y.(t'\{x \setminus v\})^v$ and therefore $\text{Bang}((t\{x \setminus v\})^v)$.
- $t = t_1 t_2$: We distinguish two cases:
 - $\text{Bang}(t_1^v)$: Then $t^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) t_2^v)$ thus $\neg \text{Bang}(t^v)$ and by *i.h.* on t_1 , $\text{Bang}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^v)$. Moreover, $t\{x \setminus v\} = (t_1\{x \setminus v\})(t_2\{x \setminus v\})$ thus $t^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^v)(t_2\{x \setminus v\})^v)$ and therefore $\neg \text{Bang}((t\{x \setminus v\})^v)$.
 - $\neg \text{Bang}(t_1^v)$: Then $t^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(t_1^v) t_2^v)$ thus $\neg \text{Bang}(t^v)$ and by *i.h.* on t_1 , $\neg \text{Bang}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^v)$. Moreover, $t\{x \setminus v\} = (t_1\{x \setminus v\})(t_2\{x \setminus v\})$ thus $t^v = \text{der}(\text{der}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^v)(t_2\{x \setminus v\})^v)$ and therefore $\neg \text{Bang}((t\{x \setminus v\})^v)$.
- $t = t_1[y \setminus t_2]$: Then $t^v = t_1^v[y \setminus t_2^v]$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $\text{Bang}(t_1^v)$: By *i.h.* on t_1 , one has that $\text{Bang}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^v)$ thus $\text{Bang}((t\{x \setminus v\})^v)$.
 - $\neg \text{Bang}(t_1^v)$: By *i.h.* on t_1 , one has that $\neg \text{Bang}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^v)$ thus $\neg \text{Bang}((t\{x \setminus v\})^v)$.

Lemma 54. Let $t, u \in A$, such that $\text{Bang}(t)$, then $\text{strip}(t\{x \setminus u\}) = \text{strip}(t)\{x \setminus u\}$.

Proof. By induction on $t \in A$:

- $t = !t'$: Then $\text{strip}(t\{x \setminus u\}) = \text{strip}(!t'\{x \setminus u\}) = t'\{x \setminus u\} = \text{strip}(!t')\{x \setminus u\} = \text{strip}(t)\{x \setminus u\}$.
- $t = t_1[y \setminus t_2]$: Then necessarily $\text{Bang}(t_1)$ and by *i.h.* on t_1 , one has that $\text{strip}(t_1\{x \setminus u\}) = \text{strip}(t_1)\{x \setminus u\}$ thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{strip}(t\{x \setminus u\}) &= \text{strip}((t_1\{x \setminus u\})[y \setminus t_2\{x \setminus u\}]) \\ &= \text{strip}(t_1\{x \setminus u\})[y \setminus t_2\{x \setminus u\}] \\ &= (\text{strip}(t_1)\{x \setminus u\})[y \setminus t_2\{x \setminus u\}] \\ &= (\text{strip}(t_1)[y \setminus t_2])\{x \setminus u\} \\ &= \text{strip}(t)\{x \setminus u\} \end{aligned}$$

- Otherwise: Impossible since it contradicts the hypothesis $\text{Bang}(t)$.

Lemma 55. *Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then $(t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}$.*

Proof. By induction on $t \in \Lambda$:

- $t = y$: Then $t^\nu = !y$ and we distinguish two cases:
 - $x = y$: Then $t\{x \setminus v\} = v$ and we distinguish two cases:
 - $v = z$: Then $(t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = z^\nu = !z$ and $t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} = (!x)\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(!z)\} = (!x)\{x \setminus z\} = !z$.
 - $v = \lambda z.t'$: Then $(t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = (\lambda z.t')^\nu = !\lambda z.!t'^\nu$ and $t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} = (!x)\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(!\lambda z.!t'^\nu)\} = (!x)\{x \setminus \lambda z.!t'^\nu\} = !\lambda z.!t'^\nu$.
 - $x \neq y$: Then $t\{x \setminus v\} = y$ thus $(t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = !y$ and $t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} = (!y)\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} = !y$.
- $t = \lambda y.t'$: By *i.h.* on t' , one has that $(t'\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = t'^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}$ thus

$$\begin{aligned} (t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu &= \lambda y.(t'\{x \setminus v\})^\nu \\ &= !\lambda y.!(t'\{x \setminus v\})^\nu \\ &= !\lambda y.!(t'^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}) \\ &= (!\lambda y.!t'^\nu)\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \\ &= t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \end{aligned}$$

- $t = t_1 t_2$: By *i.h.* on t_1 and t_2 , one has that $(t_1\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = t_1^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}$ and $(t_2\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = t_2^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $\mathbf{Bang}(t_1^\nu)$: Then $\mathbf{Bang}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^\nu)$ using Lem. 53, thus:

$$\begin{aligned} (t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu &= ((t_1\{x \setminus v\})(t_2\{x \setminus v\}))^\nu \\ &= \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{strip}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^\nu)(t_2\{x \setminus v\})^\nu) \\ &= \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{strip}(t_1^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\})(t_2^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\})) \quad (\text{Lem. 54}) \\ &= (\mathbf{der}(\mathbf{strip}(t_1^\nu) t_2^\nu))\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \\ &= t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \end{aligned}$$

- $\neg\mathbf{Bang}(t_1^\nu)$: Then $\neg\mathbf{Bang}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^\nu)$ using Lem. 53, thus:

$$\begin{aligned} (t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu &= ((t_1\{x \setminus v\})(t_2\{x \setminus v\}))^\nu \\ &= \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}((t_1\{x \setminus v\})^\nu)(t_2\{x \setminus v\})^\nu) \\ &= \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(t_1^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\})(t_2^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\})) \\ &= (\mathbf{der}(\mathbf{der}(t_1^\nu) t_2^\nu))\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \\ &= t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \end{aligned}$$

- $t = t_1[y \setminus t_2]$: By *i.h.* on t_1 and t_2 , one has that $(t_1\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = t_1^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}$ and $(t_2\{x \setminus v\})^\nu = t_2^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} (t\{x \setminus v\})^\nu &= ((t_1\{x \setminus v\})[y \setminus (t_2\{x \setminus v\})])^\nu \\ &= (t_1\{x \setminus v\})^\nu[y \setminus (t_2\{x \setminus v\})^\nu] \\ &= t_1^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}[y \setminus t_2^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\}] \\ &= (t_1^\nu[y \setminus t_2^\nu])\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \\ &= t^\nu\{x \setminus \mathbf{strip}(v^\nu)\} \end{aligned}$$

We rephrase the dCBV one-step simulation lemma by specializing the resulting dCBV as follows:

Lemma 56 (dCEV One-Step Simulation). *Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{sV}\}$. Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $F_v \langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{F_v \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} F_v \langle u \rangle$. Then:*

- When $\mathcal{R} = \text{dB}$:
 - If $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(u^v)$: $(F_v \langle t \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{F_1 \langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} \rightarrow_{F_2 \langle \text{d!} \rangle} \rightarrow_{F_3 \langle \text{d!} \rangle} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v$
with $F_1 = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$, $F_2 = F_v^v$ and $F_3 = \text{rmDst}(F_v)^{v*}$.
 - Otherwise: $(F_v \langle t \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{F_1 \langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} \rightarrow_{F_2 \langle \text{d!} \rangle} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v$
with $F_1 = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$ and $F_2 = F_v^v$.
- When $\mathcal{R} = \text{sV}$:
 - $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(u^v)$: $(F_v \langle t \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{F \langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v$ with $F = F_v^{v*}$.
 - Otherwise: $(F_v \langle t \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{F \langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v$ with $F = F_v^v$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{sV}\}$, $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ and $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $F_v \langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{F_v \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} F_v \langle u \rangle$. We distinguish two cases:

- $\mathcal{R} = \text{dB}$: Then $t = L_v \langle \lambda x. s_1 \rangle s_2$ and $u = L_v \langle s_1 [x] s_2 \rangle$ for some $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ and thus $t^v = \text{der}(L_v^v \langle \lambda x. !s_1^v \rangle s_2^v)$ and $u^v = L_v^v \langle s_1^v [x] s_2^v \rangle$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(u^v)$: Then $F_v = F'_v \langle L'_v s \rangle$ for some $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L'_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s \in \Lambda$ and thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (F_v \langle t \rangle)^v &= (F'_v \langle L'_v \langle t \rangle s \rangle)^v \\
 &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} F_v^v \langle (L'_v \langle t \rangle s)^v \rangle \\
 &= F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\text{der}(L_v^v \langle t^v \rangle) s^v) \rangle \\
 &= F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\text{der}(L_v^v \langle \text{der}(L_v^v \langle \lambda x. !s_1^v \rangle s_2^v) \rangle) s^v) \rangle \\
 &\rightarrow_{F_1 \langle \text{dB} \rangle} F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\text{der}(L_v^v \langle \text{der}(L_v^v \langle (!s_1^v) [x] s_2^v \rangle) \rangle) s^v) \rangle \\
 &\rightarrow_{F_2 \langle \text{d!} \rangle} F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\text{der}(L_v^v \langle L_v^v \langle s_1^v [x] s_2^v \rangle \rangle) s^v) \rangle \\
 &\rightarrow_{F_3 \langle \text{d!} \rangle} F_v^v \langle \text{der}(L_v^v \langle \text{strip}(L_v^v \langle s_1^v [x] s_2^v \rangle) \rangle) s^v \rangle \\
 &= F_v^v \langle \text{der}(L_v^v \langle \text{strip}(u^v) \rangle) s^v \rangle \\
 &= F_v^{v*} \langle \text{strip}(u^v) \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v
 \end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_1 &= F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\text{der}(L_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle) s^v) \rangle = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle \\
 F_2 &= F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\text{der}(L_v^v \langle s^v \rangle) s^v) \rangle = F_v^v \\
 F_3 &= F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond s^v) \rangle = F_v^v \langle (\diamond s)^{v*} \rangle = F_v^v \langle \text{rmDst}(L'_v s)^{v*} \rangle = \text{rmDst}(F_v)^{v*}
 \end{aligned}$$

- Otherwise:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (F_v \langle t \rangle)^v &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} F_v^v \langle t^v \rangle \\
 &= F_v^v \langle \text{der}(L_v^v \langle \lambda x. !s_1^v \rangle s_2^v) \rangle \\
 &\rightarrow_{F_1 \langle \text{dB} \rangle} F_v^v \langle \text{der}(L_v^v \langle (!s_1^v) [x] s_2^v \rangle) \rangle \\
 &\rightarrow_{F_2 \langle \text{d!} \rangle} F_v^v \langle L_v^v \langle s_1^v [x] s_2^v \rangle \rangle \\
 &= F_v^v \langle u^v \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v
 \end{aligned}$$

where $F_1 = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$ and $F_2 = F_v^v$.

- $\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{sV}$: Then $t = s_1[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle]$ and $u = L_v \langle s_1 \{x \setminus v\} \rangle$ for some value v , thus $t^v = s_1^v[x \setminus L_v^v \langle v^v \rangle]$. Since v is value then $v^v = !s'_2$ for some $s'_2 \in \Lambda!$ and by induction on s_1 , one has that $u^v = s_1^v \{x \setminus s'_2\}$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $\mathbf{func}(F_v)$ and $\mathbf{Bang}(u^v)$: Since $u^v = s_1^v \{x \setminus s'_2\}$ then, by induction on s_1 , necessarily $\mathbf{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $\mathbf{Bang}(t^v)$. Finally, since $s_1^v[x \setminus L_v^v \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \mapsto_{s!} L_v^v \langle s_1^v \{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle$, then by induction on s_1 and L_v , one deduces that $\mathbf{strip}(s_1^v[x \setminus L_v^v \langle !s'_2 \rangle]) \mapsto_{s!} \mathbf{strip}(L_v^v \langle s_1^v \{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle)$ thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (F_v \langle \mathbf{strip}(t) \rangle)^v &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} F_v^{v*} \langle \mathbf{strip}(t^v) \rangle \\
 &= F_v^{v*} \langle \mathbf{strip}(s_1^v[x \setminus L_v^v \langle !s'_2 \rangle]) \rangle \\
 &\rightarrow_{F_v^v \langle s! \rangle} F_v^{v*} \langle \mathbf{strip}(L_v^v \langle s_1^v \{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle) \rangle \\
 &= F_v^{v*} \langle \mathbf{strip}(u^v) \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v
 \end{aligned}$$

- Otherwise:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (F_v \langle t \rangle)^v &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} F_v^v \langle t^v \rangle \\
 &= F_v^v \langle s_1^v[x \setminus L_v^v \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle \\
 &\rightarrow_{F_v^v \langle s! \rangle} F_v^v \langle L_v^v \langle s_1^v \{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle \rangle \\
 &= F_v^v \langle u^v \rangle \\
 &\stackrel{\text{Lem.51}}{=} (F_v \langle u \rangle)^v
 \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 57. *Let $t^v = F \langle L \langle \lambda x. s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$ for some $F \in \mathbb{F}$, $L \in \mathbb{L}$, $t \in \Lambda$, $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda!$. Then there exist $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t = F_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x. s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$, $F = F_v^v \langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$.*

Proof. We strengthen the induction hypothesis as follows:

1. Let $t^v = F \langle L \langle \lambda x. s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$ for some $F \in \mathbb{F}$, $L \in \mathbb{L}$, $t \in \Lambda$, $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda!$. Then there exist $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t = F_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x. s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$, $F = F_v^v \langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$.
2. Let $\mathbf{Bang}(t^v)$ and $\mathbf{strip}(t^v) = F \langle L \langle \lambda x. s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$ for some $F \in \mathbb{F}$, $L \in \mathbb{L}$, $t \in \Lambda$, $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda!$. Then there exist $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t = F_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x. s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$, $\mathbf{Bang}(F_v^v)$, $F = \mathbf{strip}(F_v^v \langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle)$, $L = L_v^v$, $s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$.

1. By induction on t :

- $t = y$: Then $t^v = !y$ which contradicts the hypothesis.
- $t = \lambda y. t'$: Then $t^v = !\lambda x. !t'^v$ and since $t^v = F \langle L \langle \lambda x. s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$ then necessarily $F = \lambda y. F'$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t'^v = F' \langle L \langle \lambda x. s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$. By *i.h.* on t' , there exist $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t' = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x. s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$, $F = F_v^v \langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$. We set $F_v = \lambda y. F'_v$ concluding this cases since $F_v^v = !\lambda y. !F_v^v = !\lambda y. !F' \langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle = F \langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle$.
- $t = t_1 t_2$: Let us distinguish two cases:
 - $\mathbf{Bang}(t_1^v)$: Then $t^v = \mathbf{der}(\mathbf{strip}(t_1^v) t_2^v)$ and $t_1^v = L \langle !s' \rangle$. Thus, by induction on t_1 , necessarily $t_1 = L'_v \langle v \rangle$ for some $L'_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $v \in \Upsilon$. We distinguish three cases:

- $F = \text{der}(\diamond), L = L_v^v, v = \lambda x.t'_1, s'_1 = !t_1^v, s'_2 = t_2^v$: We set $F_v = \diamond, L_v = L_v^v, s_1 = t'_1$ and $s_2 = t_2$. Then $t = t_1 t_2 = L_v^v \langle v \rangle t_2 = L_v^v \langle \lambda x.t'_1 \rangle t_2 = L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 = F_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$ and $F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = \diamond^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = \text{der}(\diamond) = F$.
- $F = \text{der}(F' t_2^v)$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\text{strip}(t_1^v) = F' \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$:
By *i.h.* on t_1 , there exist $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t_1 = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle, \text{Bang}(F_v^v), F' = \text{strip}(F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle), L = L_v^v, s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$. We set $F_v = F'_v t_2$ then $t = t_1 t_2 = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle t_2 = (F'_v t_2) \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle = F_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$ and $F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = (F'_v t_2)^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = \text{der}(\text{strip}(F_v^v t_2^v) \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle) = \text{der}(\text{strip}(F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle) t_2^v) = \text{der}(F' t_2^v) = F$.
- $F = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F')$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\text{strip}(t_2^v) = F' \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$:
By *i.h.* on t_2 , there exist $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t_2 = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle, F = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, L = L_v^v, s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$. We set $F_v = t_1 F'_v$ so that $t = t_1 t_2 = t_1 F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle = (t_1 F'_v) \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle = F_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$ and $(F_v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle)^v = (t_1 F'_v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle)^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F'_v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle)^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F') = F$.
- $\neg \text{Bang}(t_1^v)$: Thus $t^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(t_1^v) t_2^v)$ and since $t^v = F \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$ then either:
 - $F = \text{der}(\text{der}(F') t_2^v)$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_1^v = F' \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$:
By *i.h.* on t_1 , there exist $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t_1 = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle, F = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, L = L_v^v, s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$. We set $F_v = \text{der}(\text{der}(F'_v) t_2)$ concluding this cases since $F_v^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(F_v^v) t_2^v) = \text{der}(\text{der}(F' \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle) t_2^v) = F \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$.
 - $F = \text{der}(\text{der}(t_1^v) F')$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_2^v = F' \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$:
By *i.h.* on t_2 , there exist $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t_2 = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle, F = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, L = L_v^v, s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$. We set $F_v = \text{der}(\text{der}(t_1^v) F'_v)$ concluding this cases since $F_v^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(t_1^v) F_v^v) = \text{der}(\text{der}(t_1^v) F' \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle) = F \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$.
- $t = t_1 [y \setminus t_2]$: Then $t^v = t_1^v [y \setminus t_2^v]$ and since $t^v = F \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$ either:
 - $F = F' [y \setminus t_2^v]$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_1^v = F' \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$. By *i.h.* on t_1 , there exist $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t_1 = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle, F = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, L = L_v^v, s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$. We set $F_v = F'_v [y \setminus t_2]$ concluding this cases since $F_v^v = F_v^v [y \setminus t_2^v] = F' \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle [y \setminus t_2^v] = F \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$.
 - $F = t_1^v [y \setminus F']$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_2^v = F' \langle L \langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$. By *i.h.* on t_2 , there exist $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $t_2 = F'_v \langle L_v \langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle, F = F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, L = L_v^v, s'_1 = !s_1^v$ and $s'_2 = s_2^v$. We set $F_v = t_1 [y \setminus F'_v]$ concluding this cases since $F_v^v = F_v^v [y \setminus t_2^v] = F' \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle [y \setminus t_2^v] = F \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$.

2. Same principle as Point 1.

Lemma 58. *Let $t^v = F \langle s'_1 [x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ for some $F \in \mathbb{F}, L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $s'_1, s'_2 \in \Lambda_1$. Then there exists $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v, s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $t = F_v \langle s [x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle, L = L_v^v, !s'_2 = v^v$ and either:*

- $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F = F_v^*$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$.
- $\neg \text{func}(F_v)$ or $\neg \text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F = F_v^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$.

Proof. We strengthen the induction hypothesis as follows:

1. Let $t^v = F\langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ for some $F \in \mathbb{F}$, $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $s'_1, s'_2 \in \Lambda!$. Then there exists $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $t = F_v\langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F = F_v^{v*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$.
 - $\neg \text{func}(F_v)$ or $\neg \text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F = F_v^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$.
2. Let $\text{Bang}(t^v)$ and $\text{strip}(t^v) = F\langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ for some $F \in \mathbb{F}$, $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and $s'_1, s'_2 \in \Lambda!$. Then there exists $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $t = F_v\langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ with two possible subcases:
 - $\text{Bang}(F_v^v)$, with two possible subcases:
 - $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F = \text{strip}(F_v^{v*})$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$.
 - $\neg \text{func}(F_v)$ or $\neg \text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F = \text{strip}(F_v^v)$ and $s'_1 = s^v$.
 - $\neg \text{Bang}(F_v^v)$, thus $F_v = L_v^v$ (in particular $\neg \text{func}(F_v)$) and $\text{Bang}(s^v)$ so that $F = F_v^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$.

1. By induction on t :

- $t = x$: Then $t^v = !x$ which contradicts the hypothesis.
- $t = \lambda y.t'$: Then $t^v = !\lambda y.!t'^v$ and since $t^v = F\langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ then necessarily $F = !\lambda y.!F'$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t'^v = F'\langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$. By *i.h.* on t' , there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $t' = F'_v\langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F'_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v'^{v*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$. We set $F_v := \lambda y.F'_v$ which concludes this case since from $\text{func}(F'_v)$ one deduces that $\text{func}(F_v)$ thus $F_v^{v*} = !\lambda y.!F_v'^{v*} = !\lambda y.!F' = F$.
 - $\neg \text{func}(F'_v)$ or $\neg \text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v'^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$. We set $F_v := \lambda y.F'_v$ which concludes this case since from $\neg \text{func}(F'_v)$ one deduces that $\neg \text{func}(F_v)$ thus $F_v^v = !\lambda y.!F_v'^v = !\lambda y.!F' = F$.

Moreover $t = \lambda y.t' = \lambda y.F'_v\langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle = (\lambda y.F'_v)\langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle = F_v\langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$

- $t = t_1 t_2$: We distinguish two cases:
 - $\text{Bang}(t_1^v)$: Then $t^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) t_2^v)$ and since $t^v = F\langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ then either:
 - $F = \text{der}(F' t_2^v)$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\text{strip}(t_1^v) = F'\langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$: By *i.h.* on t_2 , there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $t_1 = F'_v\langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{Bang}(F_v'^v)$ and either:
 - * $\text{func}(F'_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = \text{strip}(F_v'^{v*})$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$: We set $F_v := F'_v t_2$. From $\text{func}(F'_v)$ one then deduces that $\text{func}(F_v)$. Since $\text{Bang}(F_v'^v)$ then necessarily $F'_v \notin \mathbb{L}_v$ thus $F_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\text{strip}(F_v'^{v*}) t_2^v) = \text{der}(F' t_2^v) = F$.
 - * $\neg \text{func}(F'_v)$ or $\neg \text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = \text{strip}(F_v'^v)$ and $s'_1 = s^v$: We set $F_v := F'_v t_2$ thus $F_v^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(F_v'^v) t_2^v) = \text{der}(F' t_2^v) = F$. We distinguish two cases:
 - * $\neg \text{func}(F'_v)$: Since $\text{Bang}(F_v'^v)$ then necessarily $F'_v \notin \mathbb{L}_v$ thus from $\neg \text{func}(F'_v)$ one then finally deduce that $\neg \text{func}(F_v)$.
 - * $\neg \text{Bang}(s_1^v)$: Thus concluding this case.

- $F'_v = L'_v$, $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ and $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$ so that $F' = F_v^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$:
We set $F_v := F'_v t_2$ and since $F'_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, then $\text{func}(F_v)$. Finally, since $F'_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, then $\neg\text{Bang}(F_v^v)$ thus $F_v^{v*} = \text{der}(F_v^v t_2^v) = \text{der}(F' t_2^v) = F$.
Moreover, $t = t_1 t_2 = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle t_2 = (F'_v t_2) \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle = F_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$.
 - $F = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F')$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_2^v = F' \langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$:
By *i.h.* on t_2 , there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \Upsilon$ such that $t_2 = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F'_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v^{v*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$.
From $\text{func}(F'_v)$ one deduces that $\text{func}(F_v)$. We set $F_v := t_1 F'_v$ which concludes this case since $F_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F_v^{v*}) = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F') = F$.
 - $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$ or $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$. We set $F_v := t_1 F'_v$ thus $F_v^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F_v^v) = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t_1^v) F') = F$.
We distinguish two cases:
 - * $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$: One then deduces that $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ concluding this case.
 - * $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$: Thus concluding this case.
- Moreover, $t = t_1 t_2 = t_1 F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle = t_1 F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle = F_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$
- $\neg\text{Bang}(t_1^v)$: Then $t^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(t_1^v) t_2^v)$ and since $t^v = F \langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ then either:
 - $F = \text{der}(\text{der}(F') t_2^v)$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_1^v = F' \langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$:
By *i.h.* on t_1 , there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \Upsilon$ such that $t_1 = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F'_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v^{v*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$.
From $\text{func}(F'_v)$ one deduces that $\text{func}(F_v)$. We set $F_v := F'_v t_2$ which concludes this case since $\text{func}(F'_v)$ then $F'_v \notin \mathbb{L}_v$ thus $F_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\text{der}(F_v^{v*}) t_2^v) = \text{der}(\text{der}(F') t_2^v) = F$.
 - $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$ or $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$. We set $F_v := F'_v t_2$ thus $F_v^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(F_v^v) t_2^v) = \text{der}(\text{der}(F') t_2^v) = F$.
Finally, we distinguish two cases:
 - * $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$: Thus concluding this case.
 - * $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$: Without loss of generality, one can suppose that $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$. Suppose by absurd that $F'_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, then $\text{Bang}((F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle)^v)$ contradicting $\neg\text{Bang}(t_1^v)$. Thus $F'_v \notin \mathbb{L}_v$ and therefore $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ concluding this case.
- Moreover $t = t_1 t_2 = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle t_2 = (F'_v t_2) \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle = F_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$.
- $F = s_1^v[y \setminus F']$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_2^v = F' \langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$: By *i.h.* on t_2 , there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \Upsilon$ such that $t_2 = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F'_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v^{v*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$.
From $\text{func}(F'_v)$ one deduces that $\text{func}(F_v)$. We set $F_v := F'_v[y \setminus t_2]$ which concludes this case since $F_v^{v*} = t_1^v[y \setminus F_v^{v*}] = t_1^v[y \setminus F'] = F$.
 - $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$ or $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$. We set $F_v := F'_v[y \setminus t_2]$ thus $F_v^v = t_1^v[y \setminus F_v^v] = t_1^v[y \setminus F'] = F$. We distinguish two cases:

- * $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$: One then deduces that $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ concluding this case.
 - * $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$: Thus concluding this case.
- Moreover, $t = t_1[y \setminus t_2] = t_1[y \setminus F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle] = t_1[y \setminus F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle] = F_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$
- $t = t_1[y \setminus t_2]$: Then $t^v = t_1^v[y \setminus t_2^v]$ and since $t^v = F \langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ then either:
 - $F = \diamond$, $x = y$, $t_1^v = s'_1$ and $t_2^v = L \langle !s'_2 \rangle$: By induction on t_2 , one has that $t_2 = L_v \langle v \rangle$ for some $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $v^v = !s'_2$ and $L_v^v = L$. Taking $F_v = \diamond$ concludes this case since $t = s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] = F_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ and $F_v^v = \diamond = F_v$.
 - $F = F'[y \setminus t_2^v]$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_1^v = F' \langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$: By *i.h.* on t_1 , there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $t_1 = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F'_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v'^{v*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$. From $\text{func}(F'_v)$ one deduces that $\text{func}(F_v)$. We set $F_v := F'_v[y \setminus t_2^v]$ which concludes this case since $F_v^{v*} = F_v'^{v*}[y \setminus t_2^v] = F'[y \setminus t_2^v] = F$.
 - $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$ or $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v'^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$. We set $F_v := F'_v[y \setminus t_2^v]$ thus $F_v^v = F_v'^v[y \setminus t_2^v] = F'[y \setminus t_2^v] = F$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$: One then deduces that $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ concluding this case.
 - $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$: Thus concluding this case.

Moreover, $t = t_1[y \setminus t_2] = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle [y \setminus t_2] = (F'_v[y \setminus t_2]) \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle = F_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$.

 - $F = s_1^v[y \setminus F']$ for some $F' \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $t_2^v = F' \langle s'_1[x \setminus L \langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$: By *i.h.* on t_2 , there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $t_2 = F'_v \langle s[x \setminus L_v \langle v \rangle] \rangle$, $L = L_v^v$, $!s'_2 = v^v$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F'_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v'^{v*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^v)$. From $\text{func}(F'_v)$ one deduces that $\text{func}(F_v)$. We set $F_v := F'_v[y \setminus t_2^v]$ which concludes this case since $F_v^{v*} = t_1^v[y \setminus F_v'^{v*}] = t_1^v[y \setminus F'] = F$.
 - $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$ or $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$ so that $F' = F_v'^v$ and $s'_1 = s^v$. We set $F_v := F'_v[y \setminus t_2^v]$ thus $F_v^v = t_1^v[y \setminus F_v'^v] = t_1^v[y \setminus F'] = F$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $\neg\text{func}(F'_v)$: One then deduces that $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ concluding this case.
 - $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^v)$: Thus concluding this case.

2. Same principle as Point 1.

And similarly for the dCBV one-step reverse simulation property:

Lemma 59 (dCBV One-Step Reverse Simulation). *Let $t \in \Lambda$, $u' \in \Lambda_!$ and $\mathcal{R}' \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s!}, \text{d!}\}$ where u' is a $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF, then*

$$t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R}' \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}^* u' \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \exists u \in \Lambda, \quad u^v = u' \\ \exists \mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{sV}\}, \mathcal{R}^v = \mathcal{R}' \\ \exists F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v, \end{array} \right\} \text{ such that } t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u$$

Moreover, F is either F_v^v , F_v^{v*} or $F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$.

Proof. Let $t \in \Lambda$ such that t^\vee is not a \mathbb{F} -normal form. We distinguish three cases:

- $t^\vee = F\langle L\langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle$ thus $t^\vee \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{dB} \rangle} F\langle L\langle s'_1[x \setminus s'_2] \rangle \rangle =: s'$. By Lem. 57, one has that $t = F_v\langle L_v\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$ for some $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$ and $s_1, s_2 \in \Lambda$ such that $F = F_v^\vee\langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$, $L = L_v^\vee$, $s'_1 = !s_1^\vee$ and $s'_2 = s_2^\vee$. We set $u := F_v\langle L_v\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle$ so that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_v\langle \text{dB} \rangle} u$. Suppose $s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}^* u'$ for some $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle\text{-NF } u' \in \Lambda_!$. We distinguish the following two cases.
 - $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s_1^\vee)$: Then $s_1^\vee = !\text{strip}(s_1^\vee)$ thus $s' = F_v^\vee\langle \text{der}(L_v^\vee\langle !\text{strip}(s_1^\vee)[x \setminus s_2^\vee] \rangle) \rangle$. One has that $s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}^* F_v^{\vee*}\langle L_v^\vee\langle \text{strip}(s_1^\vee)[x \setminus s_2^\vee] \rangle \rangle = u^\vee$ using Lem. 51 thus being a $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -normal form. By confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}$ (Cor. 42), one finally concludes that $u^\vee = u'$.
 - $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ or $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^\vee)$: Then $s' = F_v^\vee\langle \text{der}(L_v^\vee\langle !s_1^\vee[x \setminus s_2^\vee] \rangle) \rangle$. One has that $s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}^* F_v^\vee\langle L_v^\vee\langle s_1^\vee[x \setminus s_2^\vee] \rangle \rangle = u^\vee$ using Lem. 51 thus being a $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -normal form. By confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}$ (Cor. 42), one finally concludes that $u^\vee = u'$.
- $t^\vee = F\langle s'_1[x \setminus L\langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle$ thus $t^\vee \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}} F\langle L\langle s'_1\{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle \rangle =: s'$. By Lem. 58, $t = F_v\langle s[x \setminus L_v\langle v \rangle] \rangle$ for some $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, $L_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$, $s \in \Lambda$ and $v \in \mathcal{T}$ with $L = L_v^\vee$, $!s'_2 = v^\vee$ and either:
 - $\text{func}(F_v)$ and $\text{Bang}(s^\vee)$ so that $F = F_v^{\vee*}$ and $s'_1 = \text{strip}(s^\vee)$. We set $u := F_v\langle L_v\langle s_1\{x \setminus v\} \rangle \rangle$ so that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_v\langle \text{sv} \rangle} u$. Suppose $s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle} u'$ for some $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle\text{-NF } u' \in \Lambda_!$. Since $\text{Bang}(s_1^\vee)$ then by Lems. 51 and 53, one deduces that $\text{Bang}((L_v\langle s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle)^\vee)$ thus $u^\vee = F_v^{\vee*}\langle \text{strip}((L_v\langle s_1\{x \setminus v\} \rangle)^\vee) \rangle$ using Lem. 51. Using Lems. 54 and 55, one has that $u^\vee = F\langle L\langle s'_1\{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle \rangle = u'$ thus u' is a $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -normal form. By confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle}$ (Cor. 42), one deduces that $u' = s'$ thus concluding this case.
 - $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$ or $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^\vee)$ so that $F = F_v^\vee$ and $s'_1 = s^\vee$. We set $u := F_v\langle L_v\langle s_1\{x \setminus v\} \rangle \rangle$ so that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_v\langle \text{sv} \rangle} u$. Suppose $s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle} u'$ for some $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle\text{-NF } u' \in \Lambda_!$. We distinguish two cases:
 - $\neg\text{func}(F_v)$: Then using Lem. 51, one has that $u^\vee = F_v^\vee\langle (L_v\langle s_1\{x \setminus v\} \rangle)^\vee \rangle$ hence $u^\vee = u'$ using Lems. 51 and 55 thus u' is a $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -normal form. Using Cor. 42, one deduces that $u' = s'$ thus concluding this case.
 - $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^\vee)$: Since $\neg\text{Bang}(s_1^\vee)$ one deduces that $\neg\text{Bang}((s_1\{x \setminus v\})^\vee)$ using Lem. 53. Thus, $u^\vee = F_v^\vee\langle (L_v\langle s_1\{x \setminus v\} \rangle)^\vee \rangle$ and therefore $u^\vee = u'$ using Lems. 51 and 55. One deduces that u' is a $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -normal form and using Cor. 42, one concludes that $u' = s'$ closing this case.
- $t^\vee = F\langle \text{der}(L\langle !s \rangle) \rangle$ which is impossible by since the translation produces term in $\mathbb{F}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -normal form.

This detailed simulation can be used to get iterated preservations that

Lemma 60. *Let $\mathbb{E}_v \subseteq \mathbb{F}_v$, $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ be two families of contexts such that:*

1. *Let $E_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$, then $E_v^\vee, E_v^\vee\langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, E_v^{\vee*}, \text{rdDst}(E_v)^{\vee*} \in \mathbb{E}$.*
2. *Let $E \in \mathbb{E}$ and $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that either $F_v^\vee = E$ or $F_v^{\vee*} = E$ or $F_v^\vee\langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = E$, then $F_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$.*
3. *\mathbb{E} admits a diligence process.*

4. Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u'$ where u' is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then it is also a $\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF.

Then, the following properties hold:

- **(Normal Forms)**: Let $t \in \Lambda$, then:

$$t \text{ is a } \mathbb{E}_v\text{-NF} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad t^v \text{ is a } \mathbb{E}\text{-NF}$$

- **(Stability)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $u \in \Lambda_!$ where u is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then:

$$t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u' \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists u \in \Lambda, u^v = u'$$

- **(Simulation and Reverse Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$, then:

$$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$$

Moreover, the number of \mathbf{dB}/\mathbf{sV} -steps matches the number $\mathbf{dB}/\mathbf{s!}$ -steps.

Proof. Let us first show that the following two properties hold:

- **(One-Step Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$, then:

$$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v} u \quad \Rightarrow \quad t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$$

- **(One-Step Reverse Simulation)**: Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_!$ where u' is a $\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then:

$$t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle}^* u' \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists u \in \Lambda, u^v = u' \text{ and } t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u$$

In particular, \mathbf{dB} -steps (resp. \mathbf{sV} -steps) are simulated by \mathbf{dB} -steps (resp. $\mathbf{s!}$ -steps) with possible administrative steps.

We distinguish the two cases:

- **(One-Step Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v} u$. Thus $t = \mathbb{E}_v\langle t' \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \mathbb{E}_v\langle u' \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{E}_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\mathbf{dB}, \mathbf{sV}\}$ and $t', u' \in \Lambda$. Since $\mathbb{E}_v \subseteq \mathbb{F}_v$ then using \mathbf{dCBV} one-step simulation (Lem. 56), we distinguish the following cases:
 - When $\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{dB}$:
 - If $\mathbf{func}(\mathbb{E}_v)$ and $\mathbf{Bang}(u'^v)$: $(\mathbb{E}_v\langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_1\langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_2\langle d! \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_3\langle d! \rangle} (\mathbb{E}_v\langle u' \rangle)^v$ with $\mathbb{F}_1 = \mathbb{E}_v^v\langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle$, $\mathbb{F}_2 = \mathbb{E}_v^v$ and $\mathbb{F}_3 = \mathbf{rmDst}(\mathbb{E}_v)^{v*}$. Since $\mathbb{E}_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$, then by hypothesis, $\mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{F}_2, \mathbb{F}_3 \in \mathbb{E}$ so that $(\mathbb{E}_v\langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} (\mathbb{E}_v\langle u' \rangle)^v$ and by transitivity $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$.
 - Otherwise: $(\mathbb{E}_v\langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_1\langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}_2\langle d! \rangle} (\mathbb{E}_v\langle u' \rangle)^v$ with $\mathbb{F}_1 = \mathbb{E}_v^v\langle \mathbf{der}(\diamond) \rangle$ and $\mathbb{F}_2 = \mathbb{E}_v^v$. Since $\mathbb{E}_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$, then by hypothesis, $\mathbb{F}_1, \mathbb{F}_2 \in \mathbb{E}$ so that $(\mathbb{E}_v\langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle d! \rangle} (\mathbb{E}_v\langle u' \rangle)^v$ and by transitivity $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$.
 - When $\mathcal{R} = \mathbf{sV}$:
 - If $\mathbf{func}(\mathbb{E}_v)$ and $\mathbf{Bang}(u'^v)$: $(\mathbb{E}_v\langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} (\mathbb{E}_v\langle u' \rangle)^v$ with $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{E}_v^{v*}$. Since $\mathbb{E}_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$, then by hypothesis, $\mathbb{F} \in \mathbb{E}$ so that $(\mathbb{E}_v\langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} (\mathbb{E}_v\langle u' \rangle)^v$ thus $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u^v$.

- Otherwise: $(E_v \langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{F \langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} (E_v \langle u' \rangle)^v$ with $F = E_v^v$. Since $E_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$, then by hypothesis, $F \in \mathbb{E}$ so that $(E_v \langle t' \rangle)^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{R}^v \rangle} (E_v \langle u' \rangle)^v$ thus $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u^v$.
- **(One-Step Reverse Simulation)**: Let $t \in \Lambda$, $u' \in \Lambda_!$ and $\mathcal{R}' \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s!}, \text{d!}\}$ where u' is a $\mathbb{E} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF and $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}} u'$. By hypothesis, one deduces that u' is a $\mathbb{F} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF. By definition, $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{R}' \rangle} u'$ for some $\mathbb{E} \in \mathbb{E}$. Since $\mathbb{E} \subseteq \mathbb{F}$, then using dCBV one-step reverse simulation (Lem. 59), there exists $u \in \Lambda_!$, $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{sV}\}$ and $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that $t \rightarrow_{F_v \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} u$ with $u^v = u'$ and $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}^v$. Moreover, \mathbb{E} is either F_v^v , F_v^{v*} or $F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle$ thus by hypothesis $F_v \in \mathbb{E}_v$ and therefore $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v} u$ which concludes this case.

Using these, let us now prove the three expected properties:

- **(Normal Forms)**: Direct consequence of simulation and reverse simulation.
- **(Stability)**: Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_!$ where u' is a $\mathbb{E} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF and $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u'$. Then by hypothesis, one has that u' is a $\mathbb{F} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF and since \mathbb{E} admits a diligence process, we deduce that $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^* u'$. Let us proceed by induction on the length of $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^* u'$:
 - $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^0 u'$: Then $u' = t^v$ and taking $u = t$ trivially concludes this case.
 - $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \langle \text{d!} \rangle}^* s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^* u'$ with $s' \in \Lambda_!$ where s' is a $\mathbb{E} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF: Using one-step reverse simulation, there exists $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^v = s'$ and thus by *i.h.* on $s^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u'$, one concludes that there exists $u \in \Lambda$ such that $u^v = u'$.
- **(Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u$. By induction on the length of $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u$:
 - $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^0 u$: Then $t = u$ thus $t^v = u^v$ and by reflexivity $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$.
 - $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v} s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u$: On one hand $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* s^v$ using one-step simulation. On the other hand, by *i.h.* on $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u$, one has that $s^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$. Finally, one concludes by transitivity that $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$.
- **(Reverse Simulation)**: Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ such that $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}}^* u^v$. By construction, one has that u is a $\mathbb{F} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF and by diligence $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^* u^v$. By induction on the length of $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^* u^v$:
 - $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^0 u^v$: Then $t^v = u^v$ thus by injectivity $t = u$ and by reflexivity $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u$.
 - $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \langle \text{d!} \rangle}^* s' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^* u^v$ for some $s' \in \Lambda_!$ where s' is a $\mathbb{E} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF: On one hand, using one-step reverse simulation, there exists $s \in \Lambda$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v} s$ with $s^v = s'$. On the other hand, by *i.h.* on $s^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E} \text{ad}}^* u^v$, one has that $s \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u$. Finally, one concludes by transitivity that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{E}_v}^* u$.

Lemma 61. *The following property hold:*

1. Let $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$, then $F_v^v, F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, F_v^{v*}, \text{rmDst}(F_v)^{v*} \in \mathbb{F}$.
2. Let $F \in \mathbb{F}$ and $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that either $F_v^v = F$ or $F_v^{v*} = F$ or $F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = F$, then $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$.
3. Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}}^* u'$ where u' is a $\mathbb{F} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF, then it is also a $\mathbb{F} \langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF.

Proof.

1. By definition of \cdot^v, \cdot^{v*} and $\text{rmDst}(\cdot)$.
2. By hypothesis.
3. By hypothesis.

Corollary 13. *Let $t, u \in A$ and $s' \in A_1$.*

1. (**Stability**): *if $t^v \xrightarrow{\mathbb{F}}^* s'$ and s' is a $\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbf{d!} \rangle$ -NF, then $s' = s^v$ for some $s \in A$.*
2. (**Normal Forms**): *t is a \mathbb{F}_v -NF if and only if t^v is a \mathbb{F} -NF.*
3. (**Simulations**): *$t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{F}_v}^* u$ if and only if $t^v \xrightarrow{\mathbb{F}}^* u^v$. Moreover, the number of dB/sV -steps on the left matches the number dB/s! -steps on the right.*

Proof. Using Lem. 60 with Lem. 61 and Lem. 3. □

Lemma 62. *The following property hold:*

1. Let $\mathbf{S}_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$, then $\mathbf{S}_v^v, \mathbf{S}_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, \mathbf{S}_v^{v*}, \text{rmDst}(\mathbf{S}_v)^{v*} \in \mathbb{S}$.
2. Let $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{F}_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that either $\mathbf{F}_v^v = \mathbf{S}$ or $\mathbf{F}_v^{v*} = \mathbf{S}$ or $\mathbf{F}_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = \mathbf{S}$, then $\mathbf{F}_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$.

Proof.

1. Notice that if $\mathbf{S}_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ then $\text{rmDst}(\mathbf{S}_v) \in \mathbb{S}_v$, and that if $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ then $\mathbf{S} \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle \in \mathbb{S}$. Thanks to these observations, it becomes sufficient to show that if $\mathbf{S}_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$, then $\mathbf{S}_v^v \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} \in \mathbb{S}$.
By induction on $\mathbf{S}_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$:
 - $\mathbf{S}_v = \diamond$: Then $\mathbf{S}_v^v = \diamond \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = \diamond \in \mathbb{S}$.
 - $\mathbf{S}_v = \mathbf{S}'_v t$: By *i.h.* on \mathbf{S}'_v , one has that $\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v, \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*} \in \mathbb{S}$. Let us distinguish cases:
 - $\mathbf{S}'_v \in \mathbb{L}_v$: Then $\mathbf{S}_v^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v) t^v) \in \text{der}(\text{der}(\mathbb{S}) t^v) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*} t^v) \in \text{der}(\mathbb{S} t^v) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - $\text{Bang}(\mathbf{S}'_v)$: By induction on \mathbf{S}'_v , one has that $\text{strip}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v), \text{strip}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*}) \in \mathbb{S}$ thus $\mathbf{S}_v^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v) t^v) \in \text{der}(\mathbb{S} t^v) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\text{strip}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*}) t^v) \in \text{der}(\mathbb{S} t^v) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - Otherwise: Then $\mathbf{S}_v^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v) t^v) \in \text{der}(\text{der}(\mathbb{S}) t^v) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\text{der}(\mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*}) t^v) \in \text{der}(\text{der}(\mathbb{S}) t^v) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - $\mathbf{S}_v = t \mathbf{S}'_v$: By *i.h.* on \mathbf{S}'_v , one has that $\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v, \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*} \in \mathbb{S}$. Let us distinguish cases:
 - $\text{Bang}(t^v)$: Then $\mathbf{S}_v^v = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t^v) \mathbf{S}'_v{}^v) \in \text{der}(\text{strip}(t^v) \mathbb{S}) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\text{strip}(t^v) \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*}) \in \text{der}(\text{strip}(t^v) \mathbb{S}) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - Otherwise: Then $\mathbf{S}_v^v = \text{der}(\text{der}(t^v) \mathbf{S}'_v{}^v) \in \text{der}(\text{der}(t^v) \mathbb{S}) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = \text{der}(\text{der}(t^v) \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*}) \in \text{der}(\text{der}(t^v) \mathbb{S}) \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - $\mathbf{S}_v = \mathbf{S}'_v[x t]$: By *i.h.* on \mathbf{S}'_v , one has that $\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v, \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*} \in \mathbb{S}$ so that $\mathbf{S}_v^v = \mathbf{S}'_v{}^v[x t^v] \in \mathbb{S}[x t^v] \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*}[x t^v] \in \mathbb{S}[x t^v] \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
 - $\mathbf{S}_v = t[x \mathbf{S}'_v]$: By *i.h.* on \mathbf{S}'_v , one has that $\mathbf{S}'_v{}^v, \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*} \in \mathbb{S}$ so that $\mathbf{S}_v^v = t^v[x \mathbf{S}'_v{}^v] \in t^v[x \mathbb{S}] \subseteq \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{S}_v^{v*} = t^v[x \mathbf{S}'_v{}^{v*}] \in t^v[x \mathbb{S}] \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.
2. Let $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbf{F}_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that either $\mathbf{F}_v^v = \mathbf{S}$, $\mathbf{F}_v^{v*} = \mathbf{S}$ or $\mathbf{F}_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = \mathbf{S}$. By induction on $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{S}$:
 - $\mathbf{S} = \diamond$: We distinguish three cases:

- $F_v^v = \diamond$: Then necessarily $F_v = \diamond$ and thus $F_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$.
- $F_v^{v*} = \diamond$: Same as the previous case.
- $F_v^v(\text{der}(\diamond)) = \diamond$: Impossible.
- $S = \lambda x.S'$: Impossible by definition of \cdot^v and \cdot^{v*} .
- $S = S' t'$: Impossible by definition of \cdot^v and \cdot^{v*} .
- $S = t' S'$: Impossible by definition of \cdot^v and \cdot^{v*} .
- $S = S'[x \setminus t']$: We distinguish three cases:
 - $F_v^v = S'[x \setminus t']$: Then necessarily $F_v = F'_v[x \setminus t]$ for some $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ and $t \in \Lambda$ such that $F_v^{v*} = S'$ and $!t^v = t'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ so that $F_v = F'_v[x \setminus t] \in \mathbb{S}_v[x \setminus t] \subseteq \mathbb{S}_v$.
 - $F_v^{v*} = S'[x \setminus t']$ or $F_v^v(\text{der}(\diamond)) = S'[x \setminus t']$: Similar to the previous case.
- $S = t'[x \setminus S']$: We distinguish three cases:
 - $F_v^v = t'[x \setminus S']$: Then necessarily $F_v = t[x \setminus F'_v]$ for some $t \in \Lambda$ and $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that $t^v = t'$ and $F_v^{v*} = S'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ so that $F_v = t[x \setminus F'_v] \in t[x \setminus \mathbb{S}_v] \subseteq \mathbb{S}_v$.
 - $F_v^{v*} = t'[x \setminus S']$ or $F_v^v(\text{der}(\diamond)) = t'[x \setminus S']$: Similar to the previous case.
- $S = \text{der}(S')$: We distinguish three cases:
 - $F_v^v = \text{der}(S')$: Then F_v is necessarily an application and there exists $F'_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ and $t \in \Lambda$ such that either:
 - $F_v = F'_v t$: Then necessarily $S' = S' t'$ for some $S' \in \mathbb{S}$ and $t' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t^v = t'$. Two cases must be distinguished on F'_v :
 - $\text{Bang}(F_v^{v*})$ and $\text{strip}(F_v^{v*}) = S'$: (See (*) below).
 - $\neg \text{Bang}(F_v^{v*})$ and $\text{der}(F_v^{v*}) = S'$: Thus $S' = \text{der}(S'')$ for some $S'' \in \mathbb{S}$ such that $F_v^{v*} = S''$. By *i.h.* on S'' , one has that $F'_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ so that $F_v = F'_v t \in \mathbb{S}_v t \subseteq \mathbb{S}_v$.
 - $F_v = t F'_v$: Then necessarily $S' = t' S'$ for some $S' \in \mathbb{S}$ and $t' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $F_v^{v*} = S'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ so that $F_v = t F'_v \in t \mathbb{S}_v \subseteq \mathbb{S}_v$.
 - $F_v^{v*} = \text{der}(S')$: Same as the previous case (with one additional trivial subsubcase)
 - $F_v^v(\text{der}(\diamond)) = \text{der}(S')$: Then either $F_v = \diamond$ thus $F_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ or F_v is an application an the case is similar to the first case.

(*) We distinguish two cases on $\text{Bang}(F_v^{v*})$:

- $F_v^{v*} = L \langle !S'' \rangle$ for some $L \in \mathbb{L}$ and some $S'' \in \mathbb{S}$. Let us show by induction on L that this cases is impossible:
 - $L = \diamond$: Then $F_v^{v*} = !S''$ thus necessarily $F_v^{v*} = \lambda x.F_v''$ for some $F_v'' \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that $\lambda x.F_v^{v*} = S''$ which is impossible since no $S'' \in \mathbb{S}$ can have a hole under a bang.
 - $L = L'[x \setminus s']$ for some $L' \in \mathbb{L}$ and $s' \in \Lambda_!$: Then $F_v^{v*} = L' \langle !S'' \rangle [x \setminus s']$ thus necessarily $F_v^{v*} = F_v'' [x \setminus s]$ for some $F_v'' \in \mathbb{F}_v$ and $s \in \Lambda$ such that $F_v^{v*} = L' \langle !S'' \rangle$ which is impossible by *i.h.*.
- $F_v^{v*} = L_1 \langle L_2 \langle !u' \rangle [x \setminus S''] \rangle$ for some $L_1, L_2 \in \mathbb{L}$, $S'' \in \mathbb{S}$ and $u' \in \Lambda_!$. By induction on L_1 :
 - $L_1 = \diamond$: Then $F_v^{v*} = L_2 \langle !u' \rangle [x \setminus S'']$ thus necessarily $F_v^{v*} = u[x \setminus F_v'']$ for some $u \in \Lambda$ and $F_v'' \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that $u^v = L_2 \langle !u' \rangle$ and $F_v^{v*} = S''$. By *i.h.* on S'' , one has that $F_v^{v*} \in \mathbb{S}_v$ so that $F_v = F_v' t = u[x \setminus F_v''] t \in u[x \setminus \mathbb{S}] t \subseteq \mathbb{S}$.

- $L_1 = L'_1[y \setminus s']$ for some $L'_1 \in \mathbb{L}$ and $s' \in \Lambda_!$. Then $F_v^{\nu} = L'_1 \langle L_2 \langle !u' \rangle [x \setminus S''] \rangle [y \setminus s']$ thus necessarily $F_v' = F_v''[y \setminus s]$ for some $F_v'' \in \mathbb{F}_v$ and $s \in \Lambda$ such that $F_v^{\nu} = L'_1 \langle L_2 \langle !u' \rangle [x \setminus S''] \rangle$ and $s^\nu = s'$. By *i.h.* on L'_1 , one has that $F_v'' \in \mathbb{S}$ so that $F_v = F_v' t = F_v'' [y \setminus s] t \in \mathbb{S}_v [y \setminus s] t \subseteq \mathbb{S}_v$. \square

Lemma 63. *Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t^\nu \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u'$ where u' is a $\mathbb{S} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF, then it is also a $\mathbb{F} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF.*

Proof. From the observation that t^ν is a $\mathbb{I} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF, we show by induction on the length of the derivation $t^\nu \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u'$ that u' is a $\mathbb{I} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF which concludes this case since u' is a $\mathbb{F} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF if and only if it is both a $\mathbb{S} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF and $\mathbb{I} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF. \square

Lemma 64. *Let $t \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t^\nu \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u'$ where u' is a $\mathbb{S} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF, then it is also a $\mathbb{F} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF.*

Proof. From the observation that t^ν is a $\mathbb{S} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF, we show by induction on the length of the derivation $t^\nu \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u'$ that u' is a $\mathbb{S} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF which concludes this case since u' is a $\mathbb{F} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF if and only if it is both a $\mathbb{S} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF and $\mathbb{I} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF.

Corollary 14. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_!$.*

1. (**Stability**): *if $t^\nu \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* s'$ and s' is a $\mathbb{S} \langle \mathbf{d}! \rangle$ -NF, then $s' = s^\nu$ for some $s \in \Lambda$.*
2. (**Normal Forms**): *t is a \mathbb{S}_v -NF if and only if t^ν is a \mathbb{S} -NF.*
3. (**Simulations**): *$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}_v}^* u$ if and only if $t^\nu \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}}^* u^\nu$. Moreover, the number of dB/sV -steps on the left matches the number of $\text{dB}/\text{s}!$ -steps on the right.*

Proof. Apply Lem. 60 with Lems. 3, 62 and 64. \square

C Appendix: Proofs of Sec. 5

C.1 Internal Diligence for dBANG

Definition 65. Internal reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}$ is extended to contexts as expected:

- either the redex occurs in a subterm of some internal context,
- or the redex occurs in an internal subcontext, where, in particular, $\mathbf{s}!$ -redexes are only defined as $t[x \setminus (!u)[x_1 \setminus u_1] \dots [x_i \setminus F_i] \dots [x_n \setminus u_n]]$, but not as $t[x \setminus \mathbb{L} \langle !F \rangle]$ or $F[x \setminus \mathbb{L} \langle !u \rangle]$.

Examples of the first case are $\diamond[x \setminus !((\lambda w.w)z)] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \text{dB} \rangle} \diamond[x \setminus !(w[w \setminus z])]$, $\diamond !\text{der}(!z) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \text{d}! \rangle} \diamond !z$, and $\diamond[x \setminus !(z[z \setminus !w])] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \text{s}! \rangle} \diamond[x \setminus !w]$ while examples of the second case are $!((\lambda x.x)\diamond) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \text{dB} \rangle} ![x[x \setminus \diamond]]$, $!\text{der}(!\diamond) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \text{dB} \rangle} !\diamond$, and $![x[x \setminus !(z[z \setminus \diamond])] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \text{s}! \rangle} ![z[z \setminus \diamond]]$ but $!((xx)[x \setminus !\diamond]z)$ and $!\diamond[x \setminus !y]$ are $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle}$ -irreducible.

Lemma 66. *Let $t \in \Lambda_!$.*

1. *For every $I \in \mathbb{I}$, if $I \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} F$ then $F \in \mathbb{I}$.*
2. *For every $I \in \mathbb{I}$, if $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} t'$ then $I \langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} I \langle t' \rangle$.*
3. *For every $F \in \mathbb{F}$, if $F \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} F'$ then $F \langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I} \langle \mathcal{R} \rangle} F' \langle t \rangle$.*

Proof.

1. By induction on the definition of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})}$ on contexts.
2. Since $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} t'$, there is a full context \mathbf{F} and $r, r' \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t = \mathbf{F}\langle r \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} \mathbf{F}\langle r' \rangle = t'$ with $r \mapsto_{\mathcal{R}} r'$. As $\mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{F} \rangle$ is an internal context, $\mathbf{I}\langle t \rangle = \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{F}\langle r \rangle \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{F}\langle r' \rangle \rangle = \mathbf{I}\langle t' \rangle$.
3. By induction on the definition of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})}$ on contexts. \square

Lemma 67. *Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{\text{dB}, \text{s}!\}$ and $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} u_2$. Then there exists $s \in \Lambda_!$ such that the diagram below commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & u_2 \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} \\
 u_1 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & s
 \end{array}$$

Proof. We analyze different (potentially overlapping) situations that at the end cover all possible cases. To close the diagrams we use Lem. 39 and Lem. 66.

1. $t = \mathbf{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbf{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle$ and $u_1 = \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle$ and the step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} u_2$ occurs internally inside \mathbf{I} , or fully inside \mathbf{L} , or s_1 . We analyze all the possible cases.
 - If $\mathbf{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} \mathbf{F}$, then we know by Lem. 66.1 that there exist $\mathbf{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$ such that $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I}'$. Then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbf{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & \mathbf{I}'\langle \text{der}(\mathbf{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} \\
 \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & \mathbf{I}'\langle \mathbf{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

- If $\mathbf{L} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} \mathbf{L}'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbf{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & \mathbf{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbf{L}'\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} \\
 \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{L}'\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

- If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{R})} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbf{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & \mathbf{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbf{L}\langle !s'_1 \rangle) \rangle \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\text{d}!)} \\
 \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{R})} & \mathbf{I}\langle \mathbf{L}\langle s'_1 \rangle \rangle
 \end{array}$$

2. $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle$ and $u_2 = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle$ and the step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} u_1$ occurs internally inside \mathbb{I} , or fully inside \mathbb{L} , s_1 , or s_2 . We analyze all the possible cases.

– If $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \mathbb{F}$, then we know from Lem. 66.1 that there exist $\mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$ such that $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{I}'$. Then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

– If $\mathbb{L} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \mathbb{L}'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

– If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s'_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s'_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

– If $s_2 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} s'_2$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.s_1 \rangle s'_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}\mathbb{B} \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s'_2] \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

3. $t = \mathbb{I}\langle s_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle$ and $u_2 = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1[x \setminus s_2] \rangle \rangle$ and the step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} u_1$ occurs internally inside \mathbb{I} , or fully inside \mathbb{L} , s_1 or s_2 . We analyze all the possible cases.

- If $I \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} F$, then we know from Lem. 66.1 that there exist $I' \in \mathbb{I}$ such that $F = I'$. Then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I\langle L\langle s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} \\ I'\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I'\langle L\langle s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

- If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I\langle L\langle s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} \\ I\langle s'_1[x \setminus L\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I\langle L\langle s'_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

- If $L \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} L'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I\langle L\langle s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} \\ I\langle s_1[x \setminus L'\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I\langle L'\langle s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

- If $s_2 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(d!)} s'_2$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I\langle L\langle s_1\{x \setminus s_2\} \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)}^* \\ I\langle s_1[x \setminus L\langle !s'_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(s!)} & I\langle L\langle s_1\{x \setminus s'_2\} \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

□

Lemma 68 (Diamond of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)}$). *Let $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda!$. If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} u_1$, $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} u_2$ and $u_1 \neq u_2$, then there is $s \in \Lambda!$ such that the diagram below commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} & u_2 \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} \\ u_1 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(d!)} & s \end{array}$$

Proof. As $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} u_2$, then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle$ and $u_2 = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle$. Different cases have to be distinguished, since the reduction step $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} u_1$ may occur internally inside \mathbb{I} , or fully inside \mathbb{L} , or s_1 ; in all these cases we use Lems. 39 and 66 to conclude.

- If $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} \mathbb{F}$, then we know from Lem. 66.1 that there exist $\mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$ such that $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{I}'$. Then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}'\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

- If $\mathbb{L} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle} \mathbb{L}'$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}'\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

- If $s_1 \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle} s'_1$, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !s_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s_1 \rangle \rangle \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !s'_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle s'_1 \rangle \rangle \end{array}$$

□

Corollary 69 (Confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}$). *Let $t, u_1, u_2 \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}^* u_2$. Then there is $s \in \Lambda_!$ such that the diagram below commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}^* & u_1 \\ \downarrow_{*\downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}} & & \downarrow_{*\downarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}} \\ u_2 & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}^* & s \end{array}$$

Proof. Immediate consequence of the diamond for $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle}$ (Lem. 68). □

Lemma 70 (Internal Diligence). *Let $t, u \in \Lambda_!$ such that $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u$. If u is a $\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle$ -NF, then $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\text{ad}}^* u$.*

Proof. Just apply Lem. 33 to $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}$, since its hypotheses are fulfilled (Cor. 69 and Lem. 67). □

C.2 Bang Factorization

Definition 71. Surface reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})}$ is extended to contexts as expected:

- either the redex occurs in a subterm of some surface context,
- or the redex occurs in a surface subcontext, where, in particular, $\mathbf{s!}$ -redexes are only defined as $t[x \setminus (!u)[x_1 \setminus u_1] \dots [x_i \setminus F_i] \dots [x_n \setminus u_n]]$, but not as $t[x \setminus L \langle !F \rangle]$ or $F[x \setminus L \langle !u \rangle]$.

Remark that in particular $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})}$ reduction cannot make the bang affecting the substituted subcontext disappear. Examples of the first case are $\diamond[x \setminus (\lambda w.w)z] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} \diamond[x \setminus w[w \setminus z]]$, $\diamond \mathbf{der}(!z) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \diamond z$ and $\lambda x. \diamond z[z \setminus !x] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})} \lambda x. \diamond x$, while examples of the second case are $(\lambda x.x) \diamond \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} x[x \setminus \diamond]$ and $\diamond(x[x \setminus !y]) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})} \diamond y$, but $(xx)[x \setminus !\diamond]$ and $(\diamond x)[x \setminus !y]$ are $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})}$ -irreducible.

Lemma 72. Let $t \in A_1$. Then,

1. For every $I \in \mathbb{I}$, if $I \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} F$ then $F \in \mathbb{I}$.
2. For every $S \in \mathbb{S}$, if $S \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})} F$ then $F \in \mathbb{S}$.
3. If $F \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})} F'$, then $F \langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})} F' \langle t \rangle$.
4. If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})} t'$, then $S \langle t \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})} S \langle t' \rangle$.

Proof. All the points are by straightforward induction on $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})}$. \square

Lemma 20. The family $(\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})}, \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{R})})_{\mathcal{R} \in \{\mathbf{dB}, \mathbf{s!}, \mathbf{d!}\}}$ is an SFS for (A_1, \rightarrow_F) .

Proof. We prove the following properties:

1. **(Termination)** The reductions $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})}$, $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})}$ are terminating.
2. **(Row-swaps)**
 - (a) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{dB})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{dB})}$;
 - (b) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})}^+ \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s!})}^*$;
 - (c) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{d!})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})}$.
3. **(Diagonal-swaps)**
 - (a) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{dB})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{dB})}^*$;
 - (b) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{dB})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{dB})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})}$;
 - (c) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s!})}$;
 - (d) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s!})} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})}$;
 - (e) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{d!})}$;
 - (f) $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{d!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{d!})}^*$.

thus deducing that $(A_1, \{\mathbf{F} \langle \mathbf{dB} \rangle, \mathbf{F} \langle \mathbf{s!} \rangle, \mathbf{F} \langle \mathbf{d!} \rangle\})$ is an SFS.

1. **(Termination)** Reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{d!})}$ is terminating by Lem. 27. Reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{dB})}$ is terminating by Lem. 28. The proof that reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\mathbf{s!})}$ is terminating is an easy adaptation of the proof in [10, Lemma 2.9] to \mathbf{dBANG} .
2. **(Row-swaps)** Let $t, u, s \in A_1$.

- (a) If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} s$ can only occur inside \mathbb{I} so that $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} \mathbb{F}$ and $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$ by Lem. 72.1. Thus $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle$. Using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle = u \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} \\
 \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle = s
 \end{array}$$

- (b) If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} s$ can occur in two different ways:

- either inside \mathbb{I} so that $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$; thus $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t = \mathbb{I}\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle = u \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} \\
 \mathbb{I}'\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle = s
 \end{array}$$

- $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s' \rangle] \rangle$ with $\mathbb{S}, s' \in \mathbb{S}$; so $u = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s' \rangle \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle] \rangle$ and $s = \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle r\{y \setminus s' \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 t = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s' \langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \rangle] \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} & \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s' \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle] \rangle = u \\
 \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} \\
 u' = \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle r\{y \setminus s' \langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{s!})}^* & \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle r\{y \setminus s' \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle = s
 \end{array}$$

We conclude by observing that the reduction sequence $u' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{F}(\text{s!})}^* s$ can be rearranged so that $u' \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})}^* \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})}^* s$ because all s! -redexes $t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle]$ occurring in $r\{y \setminus s' \langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \}$ are not overlapping (as they replace different occurrences of y in r), hence they can be fired independently, first the surface ones and then the internal ones.

- $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{I}'[y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s' \rangle] \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$: Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 t &= \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{I}'\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle [y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s' \rangle] \rangle \\
 u &= \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \mathbb{I}'\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle [y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !s' \rangle] \rangle \\
 s &= \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle y \setminus s' \rangle \langle \mathbb{I}'\langle y \setminus s' \rangle \langle t_1\{y \setminus s' \} \{x \setminus t_2\} \{y \setminus s' \} \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle
 \end{aligned}$$

Then, by taking $u' = \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{I}'\{y \setminus s'\} \langle t_1 \{y \setminus s'\} [x \setminus \mathbb{L}\{y \setminus s'\} \langle t_2 \{y \setminus s'\} \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle$, one has:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & u \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ u' & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & s \end{array}$$

- (c) If $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t' \rangle) \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t' \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} s$ can occur inside \mathbb{I} in two different ways:
- either $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$; thus, $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t' \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t = \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t' \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t' \rangle \rangle = u \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}'\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t' \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t' \rangle \rangle = s \end{array}$$

- or $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !S' \rangle) \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle S' \rangle \rangle \in \mathbb{S}$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t = \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}'\langle !\mathbb{S}'\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t' \rangle) \rangle \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}'\langle !\mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t' \rangle \rangle) \rangle = u \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t' \rangle) \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t' \rangle \rangle \rangle = s \end{array}$$

3. (Diagonal-swaps) Let $t, u, s \in \Lambda_1$.

- (a) Let $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}B \rangle} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} s$ can occur in two different ways:
- either $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$; thus, $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}B \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle = u \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle = s \end{array}$$

- or $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \rangle] \rangle$ with $\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{S}' \in \mathbb{S}$; so, $u = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle$ and $s = \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle r\{y \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \} \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}B \rangle} & \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle = u \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{d}! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle r\{y \setminus \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle \} \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{d}B \rangle}^* & \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle r\{y \setminus \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle \} \rangle \rangle = s \end{array}$$

- (b) Let $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d!})} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d!})} s$ can occur in two different ways:
- either $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})} \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$; thus, $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$t = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})}} \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle = u$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) & & \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) \end{array}$$

$$\mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})}} \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle = s$$

- or $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle \mathbb{S}' \rangle) \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d!})} \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \mathbb{S}' \rangle \rangle \in \mathbb{S}$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$t = \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle \rangle) \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{dB})}} \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle) \rangle \rangle = u$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) & & \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) \end{array}$$

$$\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \lambda x.t_1 \rangle t_2 \rangle \rangle \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})}} \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1[x \setminus t_2] \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle = s$$

- (c) Let $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} s$ can only occur inside \mathbb{I} , thus $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{dB})} \mathbb{F}$ and by Lem. 72.1 $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$. Thus, $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle$. Using Lem. 72.3:

$$t = \mathbb{I}\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})}} \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle = u$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{S}(\text{dB}) & & \mathbb{S}(\text{dB}) \end{array}$$

$$\mathbb{I}'\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})}} \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle = s$$

- (d) Let $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d!})} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d!})} s$ can occur inside \mathbb{I} in two different ways:

- either $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d!})} \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$; thus, $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$t = \mathbb{I}\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})}} \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle = u$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) & & \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) \end{array}$$

$$\mathbb{I}'\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})}} \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle = s$$

- or $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle \mathbb{S}' \rangle) \rangle \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{d!})} \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle \mathbb{S}' \rangle \rangle \in \mathbb{S}$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$t = \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \rangle) \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}(\text{s!})}} \mathbb{S}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle) \rangle \rangle = u$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) & & \mathbb{S}(\text{d!}) \end{array}$$

$$\mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle t_1[x \setminus \mathbb{L}\langle !t_2 \rangle] \rangle \rangle \rangle \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}(\text{s!})}} \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle \mathbb{S}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1\{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle \rangle \rangle = s$$

- (e) Let $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle dB \rangle} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle dB \rangle} s$ can only occur inside \mathbb{I} , so $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle dB \rangle} \mathbb{F}$, and by Lem. 72.1 $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$. Thus, $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle$. Using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t = \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle = u \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle dB \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle dB \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}'\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle = s \end{array}$$

- (f) Let $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle s! \rangle} s$ then $t = \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle$ and $u = \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$. Note that the step $u \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle s! \rangle} s$ can occur in two different ways:
 – either $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle s! \rangle} \mathbb{I}' \in \mathbb{I}$; thus, $s = \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \{x \setminus t_2\} \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} t = \mathbb{I}\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle = u \\ \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle s! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle s! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{I}'\langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} & \mathbb{I}'\langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle = s \end{array}$$

- or $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \rangle] \rangle$ with $\mathbb{S}, S' \in \mathbb{S}$; so $u = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \rangle \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle] \rangle$ and $s = \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle r\{y \setminus S' \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle \} \rangle \rangle$; using Lem. 72.3:
 $t = \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle] \rangle \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{I}\langle d! \rangle} \mathbb{S}\langle r[y \setminus \mathbb{L}'\langle !S' \rangle \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle] \rangle = u$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle s! \rangle} & & \downarrow_{\mathbb{S}\langle s! \rangle} \\ \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle r\{y \setminus S' \langle \text{der}(\mathbb{L}\langle !t_1 \rangle) \rangle \} \rangle \rangle & \longrightarrow_{\mathbb{F}\langle d! \rangle}^* & \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{L}'\langle r\{y \setminus S' \rangle \langle \mathbb{L}\langle t_1 \rangle \rangle \} \rangle \rangle = s \end{array}$$

C.3 Call-by-Name Factorization

Lemma 73. *The following two properties hold:*

1. (dCBN \rightarrow dBANG) *Let $\mathbb{I}_N \in \mathbb{I}_N$, then $\mathbb{I}_N^n \in \mathbb{I}$.*
2. (dBANG \rightarrow dCBN) *Let $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{I}$ and $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$ such that $\mathbb{F}_N^n = \mathbb{I}$, then $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{I}_N$.*

Proof.

1. (dCBN \rightarrow dBANG) By induction on $\mathbb{I}_N \in \mathbb{I}_N$:
 - $\mathbb{I}_N = s \mathbb{F}_N$ for some $s \in \Lambda$ and $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$, then $\mathbb{I}_N^n = (s \mathbb{F}_N)^n = s^n !\mathbb{F}_N^n = (s^n \diamond) \langle !\mathbb{F}_N^n \rangle \in \mathbb{S} \langle !\mathbb{F} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}$.
 - $\mathbb{I}_N = s[x \setminus \mathbb{F}_N]$ for some $s \in \Lambda$ and $\mathbb{F}_N \in \mathbb{F}_N$, then $\mathbb{I}_N^n = (s[x \setminus \mathbb{F}_N])^n = s^n [x \setminus !\mathbb{F}_N^n] = (s^n [x \setminus \diamond]) \langle !\mathbb{F}_N^n \rangle \in \mathbb{S} \langle !\mathbb{F} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}$.
 - $\mathbb{I}_N = \mathbb{S}_N \langle \mathbb{I}'_N \rangle$ for some $\mathbb{S}_N \in \mathbb{S}_N \setminus \{\diamond\}$ and $\mathbb{I}'_N \in \mathbb{I}_N$: By induction on \mathbb{S}_N :
 - $\mathbb{S}_N = \diamond$: Then by *i.h.* on \mathbb{I}'_N , one has that $\mathbb{I}'_N^n \in \mathbb{I}$ which concludes this case since $\mathbb{I}_N = \mathbb{S}_N \langle \mathbb{I}'_N \rangle = \mathbb{I}'_N$.

- $S_n = \lambda x.S'_n$: Then by *i.h.* on S'_n , one has that $(S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n \in \mathbb{I}$ and thus $I_n^n = (\lambda x.S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n = \lambda x.(S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n = (\lambda x.\diamond)\langle (S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n \rangle \in \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{I} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}$.
 - $S_n = S'_n t$: Then by *i.h.* on S'_n , one has that $(S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n \in \mathbb{I}$ and thus $I_n^n = (S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle t)^n = (S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n !t^n = (\diamond !t^n)\langle (S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n \rangle \in \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{I} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}$.
 - $S_n = S'_n[x \setminus t]$: Then by *i.h.* on S'_n , one has that $(S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n \in \mathbb{I}$ and thus $I_n^n = (S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle[x \setminus t])^n = (S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n[x \setminus !t^n] = (\diamond[x \setminus !t^n])\langle (S'_n\langle I'_n \rangle)^n \rangle \in \mathbb{S}\langle \mathbb{I} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}$.
2. (dBANG \rightarrow dCBN) Let $I \in \mathbb{I}$ and $F_n \in \mathbb{F}_n$ such that $F_n^n = I$. By induction on $I \in \mathbb{I}$:
- $I = !F$ for some $F \in \mathbb{F}$. Impossible since one cannot have $F_n^n = !F$ by definition of the dCBN embedding on contexts.
 - $I = S\langle I' \rangle$ for some $S \in \mathbb{S}\{\diamond\}$: By induction on $S \in \mathbb{S}$:
 - $S = \diamond$: Then $F_n^n = S\langle I' \rangle = I'$ and by *i.h.* on I' , one concludes that $F_n \in \mathbb{I}_n$.
 - $S = \lambda x.S'$: Then $S\langle I' \rangle = \lambda x.S'\langle I' \rangle$ thus necessarily $F_n = \lambda x.F'_n$ for some $F'_n \in \mathbb{F}_n$ such that $F_n^n = S'\langle I' \rangle$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_n \in \mathbb{I}_n$ so that $F_n = \lambda x.F'_n = (\lambda x.\diamond)\langle F'_n \rangle \in \mathbb{S}_n\langle \mathbb{I}_n \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}_n$.
 - $S = S's'$: Then $S\langle I' \rangle = S'\langle I' \rangle s'$ thus necessarily $F_n = F'_n s$ for some $F'_n \in \mathbb{F}_n$ and $s \in \Lambda$ such that $F_n^n = S'\langle I' \rangle$ and $!s^n = s'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_n \in \mathbb{I}_n$ so that $F_n = F'_n s = (\diamond s)\langle F'_n \rangle \in \mathbb{S}_n\langle \mathbb{I}_n \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}_n$.
 - $S = s'S'$: Then $S\langle I' \rangle = s'S'\langle I' \rangle$ thus necessarily $F_n = sF'_n$ for some $s \in \Lambda$ and $F'_n \in \mathbb{F}_n$ such that $s^n = s'$ and $!F_n^n = S'\langle I' \rangle$, which concludes this case since $F_n = sF'_n \in s\mathbb{F}_n \subseteq \mathbb{I}_n$.
 - $S = S'[x \setminus s']$: Then $S\langle I' \rangle = S'\langle I' \rangle[x \setminus s']$ thus necessarily $F_n = F'_n[x \setminus s]$ for some $F'_n \in \mathbb{F}_n$ and $s \in \Lambda$ such that $F_n^n = S'\langle I' \rangle$ and $!s^n = s'$. By *i.h.* on S' , one has that $F'_n \in \mathbb{I}_n$ so that $F_n = F'_n[x \setminus s] = (\diamond[x \setminus s])\langle F'_n \rangle \in \mathbb{S}_n\langle \mathbb{I}_n \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I}_n$.
 - $S = s'[x \setminus S']$: Then $S\langle I' \rangle = s'[x \setminus S'\langle I' \rangle]$ thus necessarily $F_n = s[x \setminus F'_n]$ for some $s \in \Lambda$ and $F'_n \in \mathbb{F}_n$ such that $s^n = s'$ and $!F_n^n = S'\langle I' \rangle$, which concludes this case since $F_n = s[x \setminus F'_n] \in s[x \setminus \mathbb{F}_n] \subseteq \mathbb{I}_n$.
 - $S = \text{der}(S')$: Impossible since one cannot have $F_n^n = \text{der}(S)$ by definition of the dCBN embedding on contexts. \square

Corollary 23. *Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $s' \in \Lambda_1$.*

- (**Stability**): *if $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* s'$ (resp. $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* s'$ and s' is a $\mathbb{I}\langle \text{d!} \rangle$ -NF) then there is $s \in \Lambda$ such that $s^n = s'$ (resp. $s^v = s'$).*
- (**Normal Forms**): *t is a \mathbb{I}_n -NF (resp. \mathbb{I}_v -NF) iff t^n (resp. t^v) is a \mathbb{I} -NF.*
- (**Simulations**): *$t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_n}^* u$ (resp. $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_v}^* u$) iff $t^n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u^n$ (resp. $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u^v$). Moreover, the number of dB/s-steps (resp. dB/sV-steps) on the left matches the number of dB/s!-steps on the right.*

Proof. Immediate consequence of Lems. 46 and 73. \square

C.4 Call-by-Value Factorization

Lemma 74. *The following property hold:*

1. Let $I_v \in \mathbb{I}_v$, then $I_v^v, I_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle, I_v^{v*}, \text{rmDst}(I_v)^{v*} \in \mathbb{I}$.
2. Let $I \in \mathbb{I}$ and $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$ such that either $F_v^v = I$ or $F_v^{v*} = I$ or $F_v^v \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle = I$, then $F_v \in \mathbb{I}_v$.

Proof.

1. Notice that if $I_v \in \mathbb{I}_v$ then $\text{rmDst}(I_v) \in \mathbb{I}_v$, and that if $I \in \mathbb{I}$ then $I \langle \text{der}(\diamond) \rangle \in \mathbb{I}$. Thanks to these observations, it becomes sufficient to show that if $I_v \in \mathbb{I}_v$, then $I_v^v \in \mathbb{I}$ and $I_v^{v*} \in \mathbb{I}$.

Let $I_v \in \mathbb{I}_v$, then by construction $I_v = S_v \langle \lambda x. F_v \rangle$ for some $S_v \in \mathbb{S}_v$ and $F_v \in \mathbb{F}_v$.

We distinguish two cases:

- **func**(S_v): Using Lems. 51 and 62:

$$\begin{aligned} I_v^v &= S_v^{v*} \langle \text{strip}((\lambda x. F_v)^v) \rangle \\ &= S_v^{v*} \langle \text{strip}(!\lambda x. !F_v^v) \rangle \\ &= S_v^{v*} \langle \lambda x. !F_v^v \rangle \in \mathbb{S} \langle \lambda x. !F \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{S} \langle !F \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I} \end{aligned}$$

- **-func**(S_v): Using Lems. 51 and 62:

$$\begin{aligned} I_v^v &= S_v^v \langle (\lambda x. F_v)^v \rangle \\ &= S_v^v \langle !\lambda x. !F_v^v \rangle \in \mathbb{S} \langle !\lambda x. !F \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{S} \langle !F \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{I} \end{aligned}$$

2. By straightforward induction on $I \in \mathbb{I}$. □

Corollary 75. Let $t, u \in \Lambda$ and $u' \in \Lambda!$ such that $\text{NF}_{\mathbb{I}(d!)}(u')$. Then,

- **(Stability)**: $t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u' \Rightarrow \exists u \in \Lambda, u^v = u'$
- **(Normal Forms)**: t is a \mathbb{I}_v -NF $\Leftrightarrow t^v$ is a \mathbb{I} -NF
- **(Simulations)**: $t \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}_v}^* u \Leftrightarrow t^v \rightarrow_{\mathbb{I}}^* u^v$

Moreover, the number of dB/sV-steps on the left matches the number dB/s!-steps on the right.

Proof. Using Lem. 60 with Lems. 64, 70 and 74. □