

Taking Bi-Intuitionistic Logic First-Order: A Proof-Theoretic Investigation via Polytree Sequents

Tim S. Lyon
Technische Universität Dresden
Dresden, Germany
timothy_stephen.lyon@tu-dresden.de

Ian Shillito
Alwen Tiu
ian.shillito@anu.edu.au
alwen.tiu@anu.edu.au
Australian National University
Canberra, Australia

ABSTRACT

It is well-known that extending the Hilbert axiomatic system for first-order intuitionistic logic with an exclusion operator, that is dual to implication, collapses the domains in the model into a constant domain. This makes it a very challenging problem to find a sound and complete proof system for first-order bi-intuitionistic logic with non-constant domains, that is also conservative over first-order intuitionistic logic. We solve this problem by presenting the first sound and complete proof system for first-order bi-intuitionistic logic with increasing domains. We formalize our proof system in a labeled polytree sequent calculus (a notational variant of nested sequents), and prove that it enjoys cut-elimination and is conservative over first-order intuitionistic logic. A key feature of our calculus is an explicit eigenvariable context, which allows us to control precisely the scope of free variables in a polytree structure. Semantically this context can be seen as encoding a notion of Scott’s existence predicate for intuitionistic logic. This turns out to be crucial to avoid the collapse of domains and to prove the completeness of our proof system. The explicit consideration of the variable context in a formula sheds light on a previously overlooked dependency between the residuation principle and the existence predicate in the first-order setting, that may help explain the difficulty in obtaining a complete proof system for first-order bi-intuitionistic logic.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Theory of computation** → **Proof theory**; **Modal and temporal logics**; **Constructive mathematics**; **Automated reasoning**.

KEYWORDS

Bi-intuitionistic, Cut-elimination, Conservativity, Domain, First-order, Labeled polytree, Proof theory, Reachability, Sequent

ACM Reference Format:

Tim S. Lyon, Ian Shillito, and Alwen Tiu. 2018. Taking Bi-Intuitionistic Logic First-Order: A Proof-Theoretic Investigation via Polytree Sequents. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your*

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or to publish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](https://www.acm.org).
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 27 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Propositional bi-intuitionistic logic (BIP), also referred to as *Heyting-Brouwer logic* [30], is a conservative extension of propositional intuitionistic logic (IP), obtained by adding the binary connective \multimap (referred to as *exclusion*)¹ among the traditional intuitionistic connectives. This logic has proven relevant in computer science, having a formulae-as-types interpretation in terms of first-class coroutines [7] and where modal extensions have found import in image processing [35]. While in intuitionistic logic the connectives \wedge and \rightarrow form a residuated pair, i.e. $(\varphi \wedge \psi) \rightarrow \chi$ is valid iff $\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \chi)$ is valid iff $\psi \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow \chi)$ is valid, in bi-intuitionistic logic the connectives \vee and \multimap also form a residuated pair, i.e. $\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \vee \chi)$ is valid iff $(\varphi \multimap \psi) \rightarrow \chi$ is valid iff $(\varphi \multimap \chi) \rightarrow \psi$ is valid.² To put it succinctly, BIP is a bi-intuitionistic extension of IP that is (1) conservative and (2) has the residuation property, i.e. (\wedge, \rightarrow) and (\multimap, \vee) form residuated pairs.

When extending first-order intuitionistic logic (IQ) to its bi-intuitionistic counterpart, a ‘natural’ axiomatization seems to be one obtained by adding the universal axioms (Ax1) $\forall x \varphi \rightarrow \varphi(t/x)$, (Ax2) $\forall x(\psi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow (\psi \rightarrow \forall x \varphi)$ (where x is not free in ψ), and the rule (Gen) $\varphi / \forall x \varphi$ to the axioms of BIP. This extension, which we refer to as the logic BIQ(\mathcal{CD}), turns out not to be conservative over first-order intuitionistic logic IQ, as it allows one to prove the *quantifier shift axiom* $\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow \forall x \varphi \vee \psi$ (where x is not free in ψ), which is not valid intuitionistically. A proof of the quantifier shift axiom is given below, where MP stands for modus ponens, Res stands for the residuation property described above, and $\delta := \forall x((\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \multimap \psi) \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow ((\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \multimap \psi) \rightarrow \forall x \varphi)$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)}}{\text{Ax1}}}{(\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \multimap \psi) \rightarrow \varphi}}{\text{Res}}}{\forall x((\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \multimap \psi) \rightarrow \varphi)}}{\text{Gen}} \quad \frac{\frac{}{\delta}}{\text{Ax2}}}{\text{MP}}$$

$$\frac{(\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \multimap \psi) \rightarrow \forall x \varphi}{\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow \forall x \varphi \vee \psi} \text{Res}$$

It is well-known that the quantifier shift axiom characterizes the class of first-order intuitionistic Kripke models with *constant domains* [11, 17], thus forcing the models for BIQ(\mathcal{CD}) to satisfy this constraint. Indeed, various works in the literature (e.g., [29, 31]) have shown that completeness for BIQ(\mathcal{CD}) requires the domain to be constant. These works and the above example strongly

¹Also referred to as *pseudo-difference* [30], *subtraction*, and *co-implication* [14].

²However, they are not logically equivalent, e.g., $[\varphi \rightarrow (\psi \vee \chi)] \rightarrow [(\varphi \multimap \psi) \rightarrow \chi]$ is not valid.

suggest that it might not be possible to have a sound and complete proof system for a bi-intuitionistic logic with non-constant domains, at least not as a traditional Hilbert system. As far as we know, there have been no prior successful attempts at solving this problem.

In this paper, we provide the first sound and complete proof system for first-order bi-intuitionistic logic with increasing domains, which we refer to here as $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$. With some minor modifications, the proof system for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ can be converted into a proof system for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$. A key insight in avoiding the collapse of domains in $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ is to consider the universal quantifier as implicitly carrying an assumption about the existence of the quantified variable. Proof theoretically, this could be done by introducing a notion of an *existence predicate*, first studied by Scott [32]. An existence predicate such as $E(x)$ postulates that x exists in the domain under consideration. By insisting that all universally quantified variables be guarded by an existence predicate, i.e. universally quantified formulae would have the form $\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow \varphi(x))$, the quantifier shift axiom can be rewritten as: $\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)) \rightarrow (\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow \varphi) \vee \psi)$. Attempting a bottom-up construction of a derivation similar to our earlier example for this rewritten axiom, we get stuck at the the top-most residuation rule, which is in fact not a valid instance of Res:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{E(x) \rightarrow [\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi))] \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)}{E(x) \rightarrow [(\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)) \rightarrow \psi)] \rightarrow \varphi} \text{Res}}{\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow [\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)) \rightarrow \psi]} \text{Gen} \quad \dots}{\frac{[\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)) \rightarrow \psi] \rightarrow \forall x(E(x) \rightarrow \varphi)}{\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow (\varphi \vee \psi)) \rightarrow (\forall x(E(x) \rightarrow \varphi) \vee \psi)} \text{MP}} \text{Res}$$

For the proof construction to proceed, we would have to somehow discharge the assumption $E(x)$ in the premise of Gen, before applying the residuation rule. In the logic of constant domains $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$, $E(x)$ is equivalent to \top (i.e. the interpretation of any term in the logic is an object that exists in all worlds in the underlying Kripke model). So the version of the quantifier shift axiom with the existence predicate is provably equivalent to the original one in $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$. This is not the case, however, in the logic of increasing domains $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$, since the assumption $E(x)$ cannot always be discharged. What this example highlights is that a typical proof-theoretical argument used to show the provability of the quantifier shift axiom (and hence the collapse of domains), like the one we have seen earlier, implicitly depends on an existence assumption on objects in the domains in the underlying Kripke model. What we show here is that by making this dependency explicit and by carefully managing the use of the existence assumptions in proofs, we are able to obtain a sound and complete proof system for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$.

One issue with the existence predicate is that it is not clear how it should interact with the exclusion operator. Semantically, a formula such as $\forall x[E(x) \rightarrow ((p(x) \rightarrow \exists y(E(y) \wedge p(y))) \rightarrow \perp)]$ asserts that, if an object x exists in the current domain, then postulating that $p(x)$ holds in a predecessor world should imply that x exists as well in that predecessor world. This is valid in our semantics but as it turned out, it was not obvious at all how a proof system that admits this tautology, that does not also degenerate into a logic with constant domains, should be designed. We shall come back to this example later in Section 3. Additionally, the existence predicate poses a problem when proving conservativity over first-order intuitionistic logic that does not feature this predicate.

We overcome this remaining hurdle by enriching sequents with an explicit variable context, which can be seen as essentially encoding the existence predicate, while avoiding introducing it explicitly in the language of formulas.

The proof systems for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$ are both formalized using *labeled polytree sequents* [5], which are connected binary graphs whose vertices are traditional Gentzen sequents and which are free of (un)directed cycles. Labeled polytree sequents are a restriction of traditional labeled sequents [34, 38] and are notational variants of nested sequents [2, 3, 19]. (NB. For details on the relationship between labeled polytree and nested sequents, see [5].) Nested sequents were introduced independently by Bull [3] and Kashima [19] and employ trees of Gentzen sequents in proofs. Both labeled polytree sequents and nested sequents allow for simple formulations of proof systems for various non-classical logics and for important proof theoretical properties, such as cut-elimination, subformula properties, and have found a range of applications, being used in knowledge integration algorithms [23], serving as a basis for constructive interpolation and decidability techniques [10, 22, 37], and even being used to solve open questions about axiomatizability [18]. We make use of labeled polytree sequents in our work as they admit a formula interpretation (at least in the intuitionistic case), which can be leveraged for direct translations of proofs into sequent calculus proofs or proofs in a Hilbert system.

The calculi for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$ are based on these richly structured sequents, which internalize the existence predicate into syntactic components, called *domain atoms*, present in each node of the sequent. The rich structure of these sequents is exploited by special rules within our calculi called *reachability rules*, which traverse paths in a labeled polytree sequent, propagating and/or consuming data. We demonstrate that our calculi enjoy the height-preserving invertibility of every rule, and show that a wide range of novel and useful structural rules are height-preserving admissible, culminating in a non-trivial proof of cut-elimination.

Outline of Paper. In Section 2, we define a semantics for first-order bi-intuitionistic with increasing domains $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and constant domains $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$. In the subsequent section (Section 3), we define our labeled polytree sequent calculi showing them sound and complete relative to the provided semantics. In Section 4, we establish height-preserving admissibility and invertibility results as well as prove a non-trivial syntactic cut-elimination theorem. We conclude and discuss future work in Section 5. Due to space constraints, we defer most proofs to the appendix.

2 LOGICAL PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce the language, models, and semantics for first-order bi-intuitionistic logic with increasing domains, dubbed $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$, and with constant domains, dubbed $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$.

Let $\text{Var} := \{x, y, z, \dots\}$ be a countably infinite set of *variables* and $\text{Fun} = \{f, g, h, \dots\}$ be a countably infinite set of *function symbols* containing denumerably many function symbols of each arity $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We let $\text{ar}(f) = n$ denote that the arity of the function symbol f is n and let a, b, c, \dots denote *constants*, which are function symbols of arity 0. For a set $X \subseteq \text{Var}$, we define the set $\text{Ter}(X)$ of X -terms to be the smallest set satisfying the following two constraints: (1) $X \subseteq \text{Ter}(X)$, and (2) if $f \in \text{Fun}$, f is of arity n , and

$t_1, \dots, t_n \in \text{Ter}(X)$, then $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \text{Ter}(X)$. The complete set of terms Ter is defined to be $\text{Ter}(\text{Var})$. We use t, s, \dots (potentially annotated) to denote (X) -terms and let $VT(t)$ denote the set of variables occurring in the term t . We will often write a list t_1, \dots, t_n of terms as \vec{t} , and define $VT(\vec{t}) = VT(t_1) \cup \dots \cup VT(t_n)$.

We let $\Phi := \{p, q, \dots\}$ be a countably infinite set of predicates containing denumerably many predicates of each arity $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote the arity of a predicate p as $ar(p)$ and refer to predicates of arity 0 as *propositional atoms*. An *atomic formula* is a formula of the form $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, obtained by prefixing a predicate p of arity $ar(p) = n$ to a tuple of terms of length n . We will often write atomic formulae $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ as $p(\vec{t})$. Our language is defined accordingly:

Definition 2.1 (The Language \mathcal{L}). The *language \mathcal{L}* is defined to be the set of formulae generated by the following grammar in BNF:

$$\varphi ::= p(\vec{t}) \mid \perp \mid \top \mid (\varphi \circ \varphi) \mid (\exists x\varphi) \mid (\forall x\varphi)$$

where $\circ \in \{\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \rightarrow\}$, p ranges over Φ , the terms $\vec{t} = t_1, \dots, t_n$ range over Ter , and x ranges over the set Var . We use $\varphi, \psi, \chi, \dots$ to denote formulae.

The occurrence of a variable x in φ is defined to be *free* given that x does not occur within the scope of a quantifier. We let $FV(\varphi)$ denote the set of all free variables occurring in the formula φ and use $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to denote that $FV(\varphi) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We let $\varphi(t/x)$ denote the formula obtained by replacing each free occurrence of the variable x in φ by t , potentially renaming bound variables to avoid unwanted variable capture; e.g. $(\forall y p(x, y))(y/x) = \forall z p(y, z)$. The *complexity* of a formula φ , written $|\varphi|$, is recursively defined as follows: (1) $|p(t_1, \dots, t_n)| = |\perp| = |\top| := 0$, (2) $|Qx\varphi| := |\varphi| + 1$ for $Q \in \{\forall, \exists\}$, and (3) $|\varphi \circ \psi| := |\varphi| + |\psi| + 1$ for $\circ \in \{\vee, \wedge, \rightarrow, \rightarrow\}$.

Following [29], we give a Kripke-style semantics for BIQ(\mathcal{ID}), defining the models used first, and explaining how formulae are evaluated over them second.

Definition 2.2 (ID-Frame). An *ID-frame* (or, *frame*) is a tuple $F = (W, \leq, U, D)$ such that:

- W is a non-empty set $\{w, u, v, \dots\}$ of *worlds*;
- $\leq \subseteq W \times W$ is a reflexive and transitive binary relation;
- U is a non-empty set referred to as the *universe*;
- $D : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(U)$ is a *domain function* mapping each $w \in W$ to a non-empty set $D(w) \subseteq U$ with $U = \bigcup_{w \in W} D(w)$, which satisfies the *increasing domain condition*: (ID) If $w \leq u$, then $D(w) \subseteq D(u)$.

Definition 2.3 (ID-Model). We define an *ID-Model* (or, *model*) M to be an ordered triple (F, I_F, I_P) such that:

- $F = (W, \leq, U, D)$ is a frame;
- I_F is a function interpreting each function symbol $f \in \text{Fun}$ such that $ar(f) = n$ by a function $I_F(f) : U^n \rightarrow U$, satisfying the following conditions:
 - (E) For each $w \in W$ and constant a , $I_F(a) \in D(w)$.
 - (F) For each $w \in W$, $\vec{a} \in D(w)^n$ iff $I_F(f)(\vec{a}) \in D(w)$.
- I_P is a function interpreting, in each $w \in W$, each predicate $p \in \Phi$ such that $ar(p) = n$ by a set $I_P(w, p) \subseteq D(w)^n$, satisfying the following *monotonicity condition*:
 - (M) If $w \leq u$, then $I_P(w, p) \subseteq I_P(u, p)$.

Definition 2.4 (M-assignment). Let $M = (F, I_F, I_P)$ be a model. We define an *M-assignment* to be a function $\alpha : \text{Var} \rightarrow U$. We note

$\alpha[a/x]$ is the function α modified in x such that $\alpha[a/x](x) = a$ and $\alpha[a/x](y) = \alpha(y)$ if $y \neq x$. Given an M -assignment α , we define the interpretation of t in M given α , noted $\bar{\alpha}(t)$, inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha}(x) &= \alpha(x) \\ \bar{\alpha}(f(t_1, \dots, t_n)) &= I_F(f)(\bar{\alpha}(t_1), \dots, \bar{\alpha}(t_n)) \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.5 (Semantics). Let $M = (W, \leq, U, D, I_F, I_P)$ be a model with $w \in W$ and α an M -assignment. The satisfaction relation \Vdash is defined as follows:

- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ iff $(\bar{\alpha}(t_1), \dots, \bar{\alpha}(t_n)) \in I_P(w, p)$;
- $M, w, \alpha \not\Vdash \perp$;
- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \top$;
- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi \vee \psi$ iff $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$ or $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \psi$;
- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi \wedge \psi$ iff $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$ and $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \psi$;
- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ iff there exists a $u \in W$ such that $u \leq w$, $M, u, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$, and $M, u, \alpha \not\Vdash \psi$;
- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ iff for all $u \in W$, if $w \leq u$ and $M, u, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$, then $M, u, \alpha \Vdash \psi$;
- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \exists x\varphi$ iff there exists an $a \in D(w)$ such that $M, w, \alpha[a/x] \Vdash \varphi$;
- $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \forall x\varphi$ iff for all $u \in W$ and all $a \in D(u)$, if $w \leq u$, then $M, u, \alpha[a/x] \Vdash \varphi$;

For a set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ of formulae, we write $\Gamma \models \varphi$ iff for all models M , M -assignments α , and worlds w in M , if $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \psi$ for each $\psi \in \Gamma$, then $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$. A formula φ is *valid* iff $\emptyset \models \varphi$. Finally, we define the logic BIQ(\mathcal{ID}) to be the set $\{\varphi \mid \emptyset \models \varphi\}$ of all valid formulae.

Note that here we define logics as *sets of theorems*, and not *consequence relations*. While this is fit for our purpose, the reader should be warned that historical confusions emerged around this distinction in the case of propositional bi-intuitionistic [16, 33], notably pertaining to the deduction theorem.

PROPOSITION 2.6. Let $M = (W, \leq, U, D, I_F, I_P)$ be a model with α an M -assignment. For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, if $M, w, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$ and $w \leq u$, then $M, u, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$.

Remark 2.7. We define a *CD-model* to be an model satisfying the *constant domain condition*: (CD) If $w, u \in W$, then $D(w) = D(u)$. If we impose the (CD) condition on models, then first-order bi-intuitionistic logic with *constant domains*, dubbed BIQ(\mathcal{CD}), can be defined as the set of all valid formulae over the class of CD-models. In what follows, we let \mathcal{ID} denote the class of ID-models and \mathcal{CD} denote the class of CD-models.

Example 2.8. Consider the formula $\forall x((p(x) \rightarrow \exists y p(y)) \rightarrow \perp)$, which was discussed in the introduction, but with the existence predicate removed. In the semantics with increasing domains, this formula is valid. To see this, suppose otherwise, i.e. that there exists a world w such that the formula is false. This means that there is a successor $w \leq u$ such that $\bar{\alpha}(x) \in D(u)$ and $p(x) \rightarrow \exists y p(y)$ is true, for some assignment α . The latter implies that for some u' such that $u' \leq u$, $p(x)$ is true (i.e. $\alpha(x) \in I_P(u', p)$), but $\exists y p(y)$ is false. The former implies that $\alpha(x) \in D(u')$, so by the semantic clause for the \exists quantifier, $\exists y p(y)$ must be true – contradiction.

3 LABELED POLYTREE SEQUENTS


Let $\text{Lab} = \{w, u, v, \dots\}$ be a countably infinite set of labels. For a formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ and label $w \in \text{Lab}$, we define $w : \varphi$ to be a *labeled formula*. We use $\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, \dots$ to denote finite multisets of labeled formulae, and let $w : \Gamma$ denote a multiset of labeled formulae such that every formula is labeled with w . A *relational atom* is an expression of the form wRu such that $w, u \in \text{Lab}$ and a *domain atom* is an expression of the form $w : x$ such that $w \in \text{Lab}$ and $x \in \text{Var}$. Intuitively, the domain atom formalizes an existence predicate: $w : x$ can be interpreted as saying that the interpretation of x exists at world w . We use \mathcal{R} and annotated versions thereof to denote multisets of relational atoms and \mathcal{T} and annotated versions thereof to denote multisets of domain atoms. Also, we define $w : VT(t) = w : x_1, \dots, w : x_n$ with $VT(t) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, define $w : VT(\vec{t}) = w : VT(t_1), \dots, w : VT(t_n)$ with $\vec{t} = t_1, \dots, t_n$, and let $w : \vec{x} = w : x_1, \dots, w : x_n$ for $\vec{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$. For multisets X and Y of labeled formulae, relational atoms, and/or domain atoms, we let X, Y denote the multiset union of X and Y , and $\text{Lab}(X)$ denote the set of labels occurring in X .

Definition 3.1 (Labeled Polytree Sequent). We define a *labeled polytree sequent* to be an expression of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ such that (1) if $\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$, then $\text{Lab}(\mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta) \subseteq \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R})$ and if $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$, then $|\text{Lab}(\mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta)| = 1$, and (2) \mathcal{R} forms a *polytree*, i.e. the graph $G = (V, E)$ such that $V = \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R})$ and $E = \{(w, u) \mid wRu \in \mathcal{R}\}$ is connected and free of (un)directed cycles. We refer to $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma$ as the *antecedent* and Δ as the *consequent* of a labeled polytree sequent. We will often times refer to *labeled polytree sequents* as *sequents*, more simply.

We sometimes use S, S_0, S_1, \dots to denote sequents, and for $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, we define $\text{Lab}(S) = \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta)$. A *flat sequent* is an expression of the form $\mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ such that $|\text{Lab}(\mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta)| = 1$, i.e. all labeled formulae and domain atoms share the same label. Labeled polytree sequents encode certain binary graphs whose nodes are flat sequents and such that if you ignore the orientation of the edges, the graph is a tree (cf. [5]). For example, the labeled polytree sequent

$$S = \overbrace{u'Rw, uRw, wRv, vRv'}^{\mathcal{R}}, \overbrace{u' : x, u : x, u : y, w : z, v : y, u' : \tau, w : \varphi, w : \psi, v : \theta, v' : \zeta \vdash u' : \tau, u : \chi, v : \xi, v' : \psi}^{\mathcal{T}}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$$

can be graphically depicted as the polytree $pt(S)$, shown below:



Remark 3.2. To simplify the proofs of our results in Section 4, we assume w.l.o.g. that sequents with isomorphic polytree representations are mutually derivable from one another.

3.1 Semantics and Proof Systems

The following definition specifies how to interpret sequents. In essence, we lift the semantics of \mathcal{L} to sequents by means of ‘ M -interpretations’, mapping sequents into models.

Definition 3.3 (Sequent Semantics). Let $M = (W, \leq, U, D, I_F, I_P)$ be a model and α an M -assignment. We define an M -interpretation to be a function ι mapping every label $w \in \text{Lab}$ to a world $\iota(w) \in W$. The *satisfaction* of multisets \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T} , and Γ are defined accordingly:

- $M, \iota, \alpha \models \mathcal{R}$ iff for all $wRu \in \mathcal{R}$, $\iota(w) \leq \iota(u)$;
- $M, \iota, \alpha \models \mathcal{T}$ iff for all $w : x \in \mathcal{T}$, $\alpha(x) \in D(\iota(w))$;
- $M, \iota, \alpha \models \Gamma$ iff for all $w : \varphi \in \Gamma$, $M, \iota(w), \alpha \Vdash \varphi$.

We define a sequent $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ to be *satisfied* on M with ι and α , written $M, \iota, \alpha \models S$, iff if $M, \iota, \alpha \models \mathcal{R}$, and $M, \iota, \alpha \models \mathcal{T}$, as well as $M, \iota, \alpha \models \Gamma$, then there exists a $w : \psi \in \Delta$ such that $M, \iota, \alpha \models w : \psi$. We write $M, \iota, \alpha \not\models S$ when a sequent S is not satisfied on M with ι and α . A sequent S is defined to be valid iff for every model M , every M -interpretation ι , and every M -assignment α , we have $M, \iota, \alpha \models S$; otherwise, we say that S is invalid and write $M, \iota, \alpha \not\models S$.

Given a sequent $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, we define the *term substitution* $S(t/x)$ to be the sequent obtained by replacing (1) every labeled formula $w : \varphi$ in Γ, Δ by $w : \varphi(t/x)$ and (2) \mathcal{T} by $\mathcal{T}(t/x)$:=

$$(\mathcal{T} \setminus \{w : x \mid w : x \in \mathcal{T}\}) \cup \{w : y \mid w : x \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } y \in VT(t)\}.$$

For example, if $S = wRu, w : x, u : x, u : y, w : p(x) \vdash u : \forall yq(x, y)$, then $S(f(y, z)/x) = wRu, \mathcal{T}, w : p(f(y, z)) \vdash u : \forall x'q(f(y, z), x')$, where $\mathcal{T} = w : y, w : z, u : y, u : z, u : y$ and the bound variable y in $\forall yq(x, y)$ was renamed to x' to avoid capture. We now define two *reachability relations* $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^+$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ as well as the notion of *availability* [9, 21]—all of which are required to properly formulate certain inference rules in/for our calculi.

Definition 3.4 ($\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^+, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$). Let \mathcal{R} be a finite multiset of relational atoms such that $w, u \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R})$. We say that u is *strictly reachable* from w , written $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^+ u$, iff there exist $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R})$ such that $wRv_1, \dots, v_nRu \in \mathcal{R}$. We say that u is *reachable* from w , written $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, iff $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^+ u$ or $w = u$. We write $w \not\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ if $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ does not hold.

Definition 3.5 (Available). Let $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ be a sequent with $w \in \text{Lab}(S)$. We define a term t to be *available* for w in \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T} , written $A(t, X_w, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T})$, iff $t \in \text{Ter}(X_w)$ such that

$$X_w = \{x \mid u : x \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w \text{ for some } u \in \text{Lab}(S)\}.$$

Our labeled polytree calculus $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ is shown in Figure 1. The (ax) , $(\perp L)$, and $(\top R)$ rules serve as the *initial rules*, the *domain shift rule* (ds) encodes the fact that $I_P(p, w) \subseteq D(w)^n$ in any model. We define the *principal formula* in an inference rule to be the one explicitly mentioned in the conclusion, the *auxiliary formulae* to be the non-principal formulae explicitly mentioned in the premises, and we define an *active formula* to be either a principal or auxiliary formula. For example, $w : \exists x\varphi$ is principal, $w : \varphi(t/x)$ is auxiliary, and both are active in $(\exists R)$. Note that all rules of our calculus preserve the representability of sequents as polytrees.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, u : p(\vec{t})} (ax)^{\dagger_1} \quad \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \perp \vdash \Delta} (\perp L) \quad \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \top} (\top R) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} (ds) \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi, w : \psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \Delta} (\wedge L) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi \wedge \psi} (\wedge R) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \vee \psi \vdash \Delta} (\vee L) \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi, w : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi \vee \psi} (\vee R) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, uRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \multimap \psi \vdash \Delta} (\multimap L)^{\dagger_2} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi} (\rightarrow R)^{\dagger_2} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, u : \psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} (\rightarrow L)^{\dagger_1} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \varphi(y/x) \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \exists x \varphi \vdash \Delta} (\exists L)^{\dagger_3} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \multimap \psi, w : \varphi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \multimap \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \multimap \psi} (\multimap R)^{\dagger_1} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \exists x \varphi, w : \varphi(t/x)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \exists x \varphi} (\exists R)^{\dagger_4} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \forall x \varphi, u : \varphi(t/x) \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \forall x \varphi \vdash \Delta} (\forall L)^{\dagger_5} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi(y/x)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \forall x \varphi} (\forall R)^{\dagger_6}
\end{array}$$

Side Conditions:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\dagger_1 := w \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}^* u \\
\dagger_2 := u \text{ is fresh}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
\dagger_3 := y \text{ is fresh} \\
\dagger_4 := A(t, X_w, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T})
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
\dagger_5 := w \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}^* u \text{ and } A(t, X_u, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}) \\
\dagger_6 := u \text{ and } y \text{ are fresh}
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: The System LBIQ(\mathcal{ID}).

We inductively define a *proof* in the usual way: (1) any application of an initial rule is a proof, (2) applying any rule to the conclusion of a proof, or between conclusions of proofs, gives a proof. The *height* of a proof is also defined as usual as the number of sequents occurring along a maximal path in a proof starting from the conclusion and ending at an initial rule; cf. [36]. Two unique features of our calculi are the inclusion of *reachability rules* and the *domain shift rule* (*ds*). We elaborate on each next.


3.2 Reachability Rules

A unique feature of our calculi is the inclusion of *reachability rules* (introduced in [21]), a generalization of *propagation rules* (cf. [4, 8, 15]), which are not only permitted to propagate formulae throughout a labeled polytree sequent when applied bottom-up, but may also check to see if data exists along certain paths. The rules (*ax*), (\rightarrow L), (\multimap R), (\exists R), and (\forall L) serve as our reachability rules. The side conditions of our reachability rules are listed in the latter section of Figure 1. Moreover, we define a label *u* or a variable *y* to be *fresh* in a rule application (as in the (\exists L) and (\forall R) rules) *iff* it does not occur in the conclusion of the rule.

Remark 3.6. If we set $\dagger_4 := 't \in \text{Ter}'$, $\dagger_5 := 'w \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $t \in \text{Ter}'$, and remove the (*ds*) rule, then we obtain a labeled polytree calculus, dubbed LBIQ(\mathcal{CD}), for the constant domain version of the logic BIQ(\mathcal{CD}). We also note that in the constant domain setting, domain atoms are unnecessary and can be omitted from sequents.

To provide intuition, we give an example showing the operation of a reachability rule.

Example 3.7. Let $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ such that $\mathcal{R} = uRw, wRv$, $\mathcal{T} = w : x, u : y, v : z$, $\Gamma = w : \forall x p(x), w : p(f(y)), w : p(z)$, and $\Delta = u : q(x) \multimap q(x), v : r(y)$. A pictorial representation of the polytree it encodes is shown below. We explain (in)valid applications of the (\forall L) reachability rule.



The term $f(y)$ is available for w in S since $u \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}^* w$, namely there is an edge from u to w , and $f(y) \in \text{Ter}(X_w)$ since $X_w = \{x, y\}$. Therefore, we may (top-down) apply the (\forall L) rule to delete $w : p(f(y))$ and derive the sequent $S' = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta$ with $\Gamma' = w : \forall x p(x), w : p(z)$. By contrast, $w : p(z)$ cannot be deleted via an application of (\forall L) because the term z is *not* available for w in S (observe that w is not reachable from v) meaning $z \notin \text{Ter}(X_w)$.

Remark 3.8. We note that for any set $X \subseteq \text{Var}$, $\text{Ter}(X) \neq \emptyset$ since all constants are contained in $\text{Ter}(X)$ by definition. This means that bottom-up applications of (\exists R) and (\forall L) may instantiate existential and universal formulae with any constant.

The reachability rules (*ax*), (\rightarrow L) and (\multimap R) are important to ensure completeness for both LBIQ(\mathcal{CD}) and LBIQ(\mathcal{ID}). The reachability rules for (\exists R) and (\forall L) are relevant only for LBIQ(\mathcal{ID}), to ensure that the domains in the model do not collapse into a constant domain. We illustrate the importance of these reachability rules with a couple of examples.

Example 3.9 (An intuitionistic formula valid in constant domain models). Let us consider the intuitionistic formula: $\forall x (p \vee B(x)) \rightarrow (p \vee (q \rightarrow \forall x B(x)))$. This formula was adapted from an example in [24], which was used to illustrate the difficulty of obtaining a sound and complete sequent system for intuitionistic logic with constant domains. A proof of this formula in LBIQ(\mathcal{CD}), shown in Figure 2, crucially relies on reachability rules. In the figure, the relational atoms $\mathcal{R} = \{w_1Rw_2, w_2Rw_3, w_3Rw_4\}$ in the instances of

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{R}, w_4 : x, w_2 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)), w_2 : p, w_3 : q \vdash w_2 : p, w_4 : B(x)}{(ax)} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, w_4 : x, w_2 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)), w_2 : B(x), w_3 : q \vdash w_2 : p, w_4 : B(x)}{(ax)} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{w_1 R w_2, w_2 R w_3, w_3 R w_4, w_4 : x, w_2 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)), w_2 : p \vee B(x), w_3 : q \vdash w_2 : p, w_4 : B(x)}{(\forall L)}}{w_1 R w_2, w_2 R w_3, w_3 R w_4, w_4 : x, w_2 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)), w_3 : q \vdash w_2 : p, w_4 : B(x)}{(\forall R)}}{w_1 R w_2, w_2 R w_3, w_2 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)), w_3 : q \vdash w_2 : p, w_3 : \forall x B(x)}{(\rightarrow R)}}{w_1 R w_2, w_2 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)) \vdash w_2 : p, w_2 : q \rightarrow \forall x B(x)}{(\forall R)}}{w_1 R w_2, w_2 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)) \vdash w_2 : p \vee (q \rightarrow \forall x B(x))}{(\rightarrow R)}}{\vdash w_1 : \forall x(p \vee B(x)) \rightarrow (p \vee (q \rightarrow \forall x B(x)))}
\end{array}$$

Figure 2: An example derivation in the proof system LBIQ(CD) for bi-intuitionistic logic of constant domain.

(ax) allows us to conclude that $w_2 \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathcal{R}} w_2$, justifying the left instance of (ax), and $w_2 \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathcal{R}} w_4$, justifying the right instance of (ax).

Example 3.10 (Non-provability of the quantifier shift axiom in the increasing domain setting). Consider again the quantifier shift axiom $\forall x(\varphi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\forall x\varphi \vee \psi)$ and an attempt to construct for one of its instances a proof (bottom-up) in LBIQ(ID) shown below:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{w_1 R w_2, w_2 R w_3, w_3 : x, w_2 : \forall x(p(x) \vee q) \vdash w_3 : p(x), w_2 : q}{(\forall R)} \\
\frac{\frac{w_1 R w_2, w_2 : \forall x(p(x) \vee q) \vdash w_2 : \forall x p(x), w_2 : q}{(\forall R)}}{w_1 R w_2, w_2 : \forall x(p(x) \vee q) \vdash w_2 : \forall x p(x) \vee q}{(\rightarrow R)} \\
\vdash w_1 : \forall x(p(x) \vee q) \rightarrow (\forall x p(x) \vee q)
\end{array}$$

It is obvious that to finish this proof, we would need to instantiate the $\forall x$ quantifier in the labeled formula $w_2 : \forall x(p(x) \vee q)$ with x by applying the ($\forall L$) rule. However, to do so, we would need to demonstrate that the world w_2 is reachable from w_3 where the domain atom $w_3 : x$ resides. However w_2 is not reachable from w_3 , so x is not available at w_2 to be used by ($\forall L$) in this case.

3.3 The Domain Shift Rule (ds)

Although the reachability rules for the quantifiers prevent the quantifier shift axiom from being proved, it turns out that they are not sufficient to ensure the completeness of LBIQ(ID) with respect to the sequent semantics for the logic BIQ(ID). Interestingly, this incompleteness only arises when the exclusion connective is involved – if one considers only the intuitionistic fragment of LBIQ(ID), these reachability rules are sufficient to prove completeness (see Lemma 3.17 in Section 3.5). To see the issue with incompleteness, consider the formula in Example 2.8, which is semantically valid, and the following attempt at a (bottom-up) construction of a proof:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{w R u, u R v, u' R v, u : x, u' : p(x) \vdash u' : \exists y.p(y), v : \perp}{(\rightarrow L)} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{w R u, u R v, u : x, v : p(x) \rightarrow \exists y.p(y) \vdash v : \perp}{(\rightarrow R)}}{w R u, u : x \vdash u : (p(x) \rightarrow \exists y.p(y)) \rightarrow \perp}{(\forall R)}}{\vdash w : \forall x((p(x) \rightarrow \exists y.p(y)) \rightarrow \perp)}
\end{array}$$

We have so far applied only invertible rules,³ so the original sequent is provable *iff* the top sequent in the above derivation is provable. To proceed with the proof construction, one would need to instantiate the existential quantifier $\exists y$ with x . However, the only domain atom containing x is located at world u , which is not available to the world u' where the existential formula is located.

It was not so obvious how the reachability rules for quantifiers could be amended to allow the above example to be proved. Looking at the above derivation, it might be tempting to augment the calculus with a rule that allows a backward reachability condition

for domain atoms, e.g., making $u : x$ available to u' for when $u' \xrightarrow{*}_{\mathcal{R}} u$ under certain admissibility conditions, but this could easily lead to a collapse of the domains if one is not careful. Instead, our approach here is motivated by the semantic clause for predicates: when $p(x)$ holds in a world, its interpretation requires that x is also defined in that world. Proof theoretically, we could think of this as postulating an axiom such as $\forall x(p(x) \rightarrow E(x))$ where $E(x)$ is an existence predicate (which, as we recall, was behind the semantics of the domain atoms). Translated into our calculus, this gives us the (ds) rule as shown in Figure 1. Using the (ds) rule, the above derivation can now be completed to a proof:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{R}, u : x, u' : x, u' : p(x) \vdash u' : p(x), u' : \exists y.p(y), v : \perp}{(\rightarrow R)} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, u : x, u' : x, u' : p(x) \vdash u' : \exists y.p(y), v : \perp}{(\exists R)}}{w R u, u R v, u' R v, u : x, u' : p(x) \vdash u' : \exists y.p(y), v : \perp}{(ds)}}
\end{array}$$

Note that the (ds) rule can be applied only to atomic predicates, but not arbitrary formulas. This rules out an unsound instance, e.g., allowing the domain atom $u : x$ to be introduced when $u : p(x) \rightarrow \perp$, which is clearly semantically not valid. It may be possible to relax the restriction to atomic predicates by, e.g., imposing some positivity conditions on the occurrences of x , but we did not find this necessary – neither for the completeness, nor for cut-elimination.

Remark 3.11. The (ds) rule can be removed without affecting the cut-elimination result for LBIQ(ID). This raises the possibility of defining a first-order bi-intuitionistic logic that is strictly weaker than BIQ(ID). It is unclear at this stage what the semantics for such a logic would look like.

3.4 Soundness and Completeness

THEOREM 3.12 (SOUNDNESS). *Let S be a sequent. If S is derivable in LBIQ(ID) (LBIQ(CD)), then S is (CD)-valid.*

PROOF. By induction on the height of the given derivation; see Appendix A for details. \square

We prove the cut-free completeness of LBIQ(ID) by showing that if a sequent of the form $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is not provable, then a counter-model can be constructed witnessing the invalidity of the sequent. We focus on the proof for LBIQ(ID) as it is more involved than the similar proof for LBIQ(CD). Our proof makes use of various new notions, which we now define. A *pseudo-derivation* is defined to be a (potentially infinite) tree whose nodes are sequents and where every parent node corresponds to the conclusion of a rule in LBIQ(ID) with the children nodes corresponding to the premises. We remark that a proof in LBIQ(ID) is a finite pseudo-derivation where all top sequents are instances of (ax),

³We remark that invertibility is formally defined in Section 4.

(\perp L), or (\top R). A *branch* \mathcal{B} is defined to be a maximal path of sequents through a pseudo-derivation, starting from the conclusion. The following lemma is useful in our proof of completeness.

LEMMA 3.13. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, let $S_i = \mathcal{R}_i, \mathcal{T}_i, \Gamma_i \vdash \Delta_i$ be a sequent.*

- (1) *If $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ holds for the conclusion of a rule (r) in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$, then $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ holds for the premises of (r);*
- (2) *If $w : p(\vec{t}) \in \Gamma_0, \Delta_0$ and S_0 is the conclusion of a rule (r) in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$ with S_1 (and S_2) the premise(s) of (r), then $w : p(\vec{t}) \in \Gamma_1, \Delta_1$ (and $w : p(\vec{t}) \in \Gamma_2, \Delta_2$, resp.);*
- (3) *If $w : x \in \mathcal{T}_0$ and S_0 is the conclusion of a rule (r) in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$ with S_1 (and S_2) the premise(s) of (r), then $w : x \in \mathcal{T}_1$ (and $w : x \in \mathcal{T}_2$, resp.).*

The lemma tells us that propagation paths, the position of atomic formulae, and the position of terms are bottom-up preserved in rule applications.

THEOREM 3.14 (COMPLETENESS). *If $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is (CD-)valid, then $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ ($\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$).*

PROOF. *Outline.* We assume that $S = w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is not derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and show that a model M can be defined which witnesses that S is invalid. To prove this, we first define a proof-search procedure *Prove* that bottom-up applies rules from $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ to $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$. Second, we show how a model M can be extracted from failed proof-search. We now describe the proof-search procedure *Prove* and let $<$ be a well-founded, strict linear order over the set Ter of terms.

Prove. Let us take $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ as input and continue to the next step. We show here some key selected steps; the complete *Prove* procedure can be found in Appendix A.

(ax), (\perp L), and (\top R). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we halt the computation of *Prove* on each branch \mathcal{B}_i where S_i is of the form (ax), (\perp L), or (\top R). If *Prove* is halted on each branch \mathcal{B}_i , then *Prove* returns *True* because a proof of the input has been constructed. However, if *Prove* did not halt on each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, then let $\mathcal{B}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{j_k}$ be the remaining branches for which *Prove* did not halt. For each such branch, copy the top sequent above itself, and continue to the next step.

(ds). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (ds) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w_1 : p_1(\vec{t}_1), \dots, w_\ell : p_\ell(\vec{t}_\ell) \vdash \Delta$$

where all atomic input formulae are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We successively consider each atomic input formula and bottom-up apply (ds), yielding a branch extending \mathcal{B}_{k+1} with a top sequent saturated under (ds) applications. After these operations have been

performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

(\exists L). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (\exists L) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w_1 : \exists x_1 \varphi_1, \dots, w_m : \exists x_m \varphi_m \vdash \Delta$$

where all existential input formulae $w_i : \exists x_i \varphi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each formula $w_i : \exists x_i \varphi_i$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the (\exists L) rule. These rule applications extend \mathcal{B}_{k+1} such that

$$\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}', \Gamma, w_1 : \varphi_1(y_1/x_1), \dots, w_n : \varphi_m(y_m/x_m) \vdash \Delta$$

is now the top sequent of the branch with y_1, \dots, y_m fresh variables and $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}, w_1 : y_1, \dots, w_m : y_m$. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

(\exists R). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (\exists R) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash w_1 : \exists x_1 \varphi_1, \dots, w_m : \exists x_m \varphi_m, \Delta$$

where all existential formulae $w_i : \exists x_i \varphi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each labeled formula $w_m : \exists x_m \varphi_m$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the (\exists R) rule. Let $w_{\ell+1} : \exists x_{\ell+1} \varphi_{\ell+1}$ be the current formula under consideration, and assume that $w_1 : \exists x_1 \varphi_1, \dots, w_\ell : \exists x_\ell \varphi_\ell$ have already been considered. Recall that $<$ is a well-founded, strict linear order over the set Ter of terms. Choose the $<$ -minimal term $t \in \text{Ter}(X_{w_{\ell+1}})$ that has yet to be picked to instantiate $w_{\ell+1} : \exists x_{\ell+1} \varphi_{\ell+1}$ and bottom-up apply the (\exists R) rule, thus adding $w_{\ell+1} : \varphi_{\ell+1}(t/x_{\ell+1})$. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

The remaining rules are processed in a similar fashion, and thus, this completes our outline of *Prove*. Next, we aim to show that if *Prove* does not return *True*, then a model M , M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment α can be defined such that $M, \iota, \alpha \not\models S$. If *Prove* halts, i.e. *Prove* returns *True*, then a proof of S may be obtained by ‘contracting’ all redundant inferences from the ‘(ax), (\perp L), and (\top R)’ step of *Prove*. Therefore, in this case, since a proof exists, we have obtained a contradiction to our assumption. As a consequence, we have that *Prove* does not halt, that is, *Prove* generates an infinite tree with finite branching. By König’s lemma, an infinite branch must exist in this infinite tree, which we denote by \mathcal{B} . We define a model $M = (W, \leq, U, D, I_F, I_P)$ by means of this branch as follows: Let us define the following (multi)sets, all of which are obtained by taking the union of each (multi)set of relational atoms, domain atoms, antecedent labeled formulae, and

consequent labeled formulae (resp.) occurring within a sequent in \mathcal{B} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}} &= \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{R} & \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}} &= \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{T} \\ \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}} &= \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \Gamma & \Delta^{\mathcal{B}} &= \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \Delta \end{aligned}$$

We now define: (1) $u \in W$ iff $u \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$, (2) $\leq = \{(u, v) \mid uRv \in \mathcal{R}\}^*$ where $*$ denotes the reflexive-transitive closure, (3) $t \in U$ iff there exists a label $u \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$ such that $t \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$, (4) $t \in D(u)$ iff $t \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$, and (5) $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in I_P(u, p)$ iff $v, u \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$, $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* u$, and $v : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$.

It can be shown that M is indeed a model (see Appendix A). Let us define α to be the M -assignment mapping every variable in U to itself and every variable in $\text{Var} \setminus U$ arbitrarily. To finish the proof of completeness, we now argue the following by mutual induction on the complexity of ψ : (1) if $u : \psi \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$, then $M, u, \alpha \Vdash \psi$, and (2) if $u : \psi \in \Delta^{\mathcal{B}}$, then $M, u, \alpha \nVdash \psi$. Let ι to be the M -interpretation such that $\iota(u) = u$ for $u \in W$ and $\iota(v) \in W$ for $v \notin W$. By the proof above, $M, \iota, \alpha \nVdash w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$, showing that if a sequent of the form $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is not derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$, then it is invalid, that is, every valid sequent of the form $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is provable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$. \square

3.5 Intuitionistic Subsystems

We end this section by discussing two subsystems of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D})$ arising from restricting the connectives to the intuitionistic fragment. In the former case, we obtain a proof system for the usual first-order intuitionistic logic (with non-constant domains), and in the latter, we obtain a new proof system for intuitionistic logic with constant domains.

COROLLARY 3.15 (CONSERVATIVITY). *Let φ be an intuitionistic formula (i.e. a formula with no occurrences of \rightarrow). Then φ is valid in IQ (IQC) iff $\vdash w : \varphi$ is provable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ (respectively, $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D})$).*

The proof of Corollary 3.15 is straightforward from the definition of the semantics of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ (resp. $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D})$) in Definition 3.3. However, both $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{C}\mathcal{D})$ do not have a direct interpretation in the semantics in Definition 2.5, which does not feature domain atoms. We shall show next how we can extract a purely intuitionistic fragment out of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$, where every sequent in the fragment is interpretable in the semantics without the existence predicate. We shall prove this via syntactic means, by showing how we can translate intuitionistic proofs in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ to proofs in Gentzen's LJ [12, 13]. A key idea is to first define a formula interpretation of a labeled polytree sequent, and then show that every inference rule corresponds to a valid implication in LJ. We start by defining a notion of intuitionistic (labeled polytree) sequent.

Definition 3.16. A sequent $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is an *intuitionistic sequent* iff \mathcal{R} is a tree rooted at node u such that

- every formula in S is an intuitionistic formula (i.e. it contains no occurrences of \rightarrow),

- for every labeled formula $w : \varphi$ in S and for every variable $x \in \text{VT}(\varphi)$, x is available for w , and
- if $w : x$ and $z : x$ are in \mathcal{T} , then $w = z$.

Let $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ denote the proof system $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ without the (ds) rule, and where the sequents are restricted to intuitionistic sequents. The following lemma states an important property of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$, called the *separation property*, which was first discussed in the context of tense logics [15].

LEMMA 3.17 (SEPARATION). *An intuitionistic sequent S is provable in $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ iff it is provable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$.*

PROOF. One direction, from $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ to $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ is trivial. For the other direction, suppose π is a proof of S in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$. By induction on the structure of π , it can be shown that there is a proof π' in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ in which every sequent in π' is “almost” intuitionistic – it satisfies all the requirements in Definition 3.16 except possibly the last condition (due to the possible use of the (ds) rule). Then, from π' we can construct another derivation π'' of S that does not use (ds) , by showing that one can always permute the rule (ds) up until it disappears. Since all the rules of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$, other than (ds) , preserve the property of being an intuitionistic sequent, it then follows that π'' is a proof in $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$. \square

To translate a proof in $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ to LJ, we need to interpret a labeled polytree sequent as a formula. In the general case, this turns out to be quite difficult, due to the difficulty in interpreting the scopes of eigenvariables in domain atoms, when interpreting them as universally quantified variables. Fortunately, in the case of intuitionistic sequents, the scopes of such variables follow a straightforward lexical scoping (i.e. their scopes are over formulas in the subtrees). To define the translation, we first relax the requirement on the domain atoms in intuitionistic sequents: a *quasi-intuitionistic sequent* is defined as in Definition 3.16, except that in the second clause, x is either available for w , or it does not occur in \mathcal{T} . Obviously an intuitionistic sequent is also a quasi-intuitionistic sequent. Given a quasi-intuitionistic sequent S and a label w , we write S_w to denote the quasi-intuitionistic sub-sequent of S that is rooted in w , i.e. the sequent obtained from S by removing any relational atoms, domain atoms, and labeled formulae that mention a world v that is not reachable from w . Given a multiset of labeled formulae Γ , we denote with Γ_u the labeled formulae in Γ that are labeled with u .

Definition 3.18. Given a quasi-intuitionistic sequent $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, we define its formula interpretation $F(S)$ by induction on the height of the sequent tree as follows: suppose S is rooted at u .

- If S is a flat sequent, then $F(S) = \forall \vec{x} (\bigwedge \Gamma \rightarrow \bigvee \Delta)$ where \vec{x} are all the variables in \mathcal{T} .
- Otherwise, suppose u has n successors: w_1, \dots, w_n . Then:

$$F(S) = \forall \vec{x} \left(\bigwedge \Gamma_u \rightarrow \left(\bigvee \Delta_u \vee F(S_{w_1}) \vee \dots \vee F(S_{w_n}) \right) \right).$$

PROPOSITION 3.19. *Let S be an intuitionistic sequent. S is provable in $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$ iff $F(S)$ is provable in LJ.*

PROOF. *Outline.* The proof is tedious, but not difficult and follows a general strategy to translate nested sequent proofs (which, recall, are notational variants of labeled polytree sequent proofs) to traditional sequent proofs (with cuts) from the literature, see e.g., the translation from nested sequents to traditional sequent proofs

for full intuitionistic linear logic [6]. For every inference rule in $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ of the form:

$$\frac{S_1 \cdots S_n}{S}$$

we show that the formula $F(S_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge F(S_n) \rightarrow F(S)$ is provable in LJ . Then given any proof in $\text{NIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$, we simulate every inference step with its corresponding implication, followed by a cut. A more detailed proof will be made available in a forthcoming extended version of this paper. \square

For intuitionistic logic with constant domains IQC, as far as we know there is no formalization in the traditional Gentzen sequent calculus that admits cut-elimination. There is, however, a formalization in prefixed tableaux by Fitting [9], which happens to be a syntactic variant of the intuitionistic fragment $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$ (see [20]).

4 CUT-ELIMINATION

In this section, we show that $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$ satisfy a sizable number of favorable properties culminating in syntactic cut-elimination, most of which necessitate non-trivial proofs. We explain here some key steps; the full details are available in Appendix B.

$\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$ can be seen as first-order extensions of Postniece's deep-nested sequent calculus for bi-intuitionistic logic DBiInt [14, 28]. Cut-elimination for DBiInt [14] was proven in two stages. First, cut-elimination was proven for a "shallow" version of the nested sequent calculus LBIInt , which can be seen as a variant of a display calculus [1]. The cut-elimination proof for this shallow calculus follows from Belnap's generic cut-elimination for display calculi [1]. Second, it is shown that cut-free proofs in the shallow calculus can be translated to proofs in the deep-nested calculus. We do not have the corresponding shallow versions of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$, so we cannot rely on Belnap's generic cut-elimination. It may be possible to define shallow versions of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$, and then follow the same methodology outlined in [14] to prove cut-elimination, but we found that a direct cut-elimination proof is simpler, e.g., avoiding the need for proving admissibility of certain structural rules called the display postulates [1] that is needed as one transition from shallow to deep inference systems.

Since our labeled polytree sequents are a restriction of ordinary labeled sequents, another possible approach to cut-elimination would be to apply the methodology for proving cut-elimination for labeled sequent calculi [25]. A main issue in adapting this methodology is ensuring that the proof transformations needed in cut-elimination preserve the polytree structure of sequents. A key proof transformation in a typical cut-elimination proof for labeled calculi is label substitution, i.e., given a proof π_1 and labels u and w , one can construct another proof π_2 by replacing u with w everywhere in the proof and adjusting the inference rules accordingly. This is typically needed in showing the reduction of a cut where the last rules in both branches of the cut apply to the cut formula, and where one of the rules introduces (reading the rule bottom up) a new label and a new relational atom (e.g., $(\rightarrow R)$). Such a substitution operation may not always preserve polytree structures.

Another notable difference between our calculi and traditional labeled calculi is the absence of structural rules that manipulate relational atoms: the only changes to the relation atoms are through introduction rules. These differences mean that the cut-elimination techniques for labeled sequent calculi cannot be immediately applied in our setting.

Our cut-elimination proof builds on an approach by Pinto and Uustalu [26, 27], which deals with a polytree labeled sequent calculus for *propositional* bi-intuitionistic logic. We thus provide a series of proof transformations, culminating in the elimination of cuts, which shares similarities with their work in the propositional case and expands in the first-order direction. These transformations are captured in proofs of the admissibility of rules shown in Figure 3. We illustrate some key transformations and why they are needed, through an example of a cut where $(\rightarrow L)$ and $(\rightarrow R)$ are applied to the cut formula. The formal details are available in the proof of Theorem 4.17. Suppose we have the following instance of cut:

$$\frac{\frac{\pi_1}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \vdash w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, \Delta} \quad \frac{\pi_2}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta}}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{ cut}$$

where π_1 is

$$\frac{\frac{\pi'_1}{\mathcal{R}, wRw', \Gamma, w' : \varphi \vdash w' : \psi, \Delta}}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \vdash w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, \Delta} (\rightarrow R)$$

and π_2 is

$$\frac{\frac{\pi_3}{\mathcal{R}, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi} \quad \frac{\pi_4}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, u : \psi \vdash \Delta}}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} (\rightarrow L)$$

and $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$. A typical cut reduction strategy would be to cut π'_1 with π_4 (with cut formula ψ), producing a derivation π_5 , and then cut π_3 with π_5 (with cut formula φ). There are a couple of issues with this strategy:

- The cut formulas in both instances of cuts have mismatched labels, i.e., w' on one side and u on the other.
- The label w' and the relational atom wRw' are not present in either π_3 or π_4 , so the contexts of the premises of the cuts do not match.

To fix these issues, we would need to first transform π'_1 to remove the label w' and its associated relational atom. Simply substituting w' with u may break the polytree shape of the sequent, e.g., if there is an v such that wRv and vRu are in \mathcal{R} , then replacing w' with u in wRw' would break the polytree shape of the sequent. So the relational atoms in the sequent also need to be modified. As we shall see later in the cut-elimination proof, a transformation that we use in this case is one that is represented by the rule (mrg_f):

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\pi'_1}{\mathcal{R}, wRw', \Gamma, w' : \varphi \vdash w' : \psi, \Delta}}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \vdash w : \psi, \Delta} (\text{mrg}_f)}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta} (iw)$$

To allow cut to be applied to this derivation and π_4 , we relax the cut rule to allow mismatched labels in the cut formula, as long as $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, yielding a derivation π_5 of $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta$. To complete the reduction, we also have to apply cut to π_5 and π_3 . Here, however, we run into a problem:

$$\frac{\frac{\pi_3}{\mathcal{R}, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi} \quad \frac{\pi_5}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta}}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} \text{ cut}$$

This cut is not a valid instance, as the condition $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w$ does not hold. We would need another transformation to “lower” the label formula $u : \varphi$ in π_3 to $w : \varphi$, using the (lwr) rule (which has the side condition $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$). This gives us a valid proof π_6 :

$$\frac{\frac{\pi_3}{\mathcal{R}, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi} \quad (lwr) \quad \frac{\pi_5}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta}}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} \text{ cut}$$

We can then finally cut π_6 with π_2 to obtain a derivation of $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$. Here we gloss over the termination arguments, but the details are available in the proof of Theorem 4.17.

The above example illustrates one among several proof transformations needed in cut-elimination. These transformations make use of the auxiliary rules in Figure 3. The bulk of the cut-elimination proof is really in showing that these auxiliary rules are (*height-preserving (hp)*) admissible, meaning if the premises of the rule have proofs (of heights h_1, \dots, h_n), then the conclusion of the rule has a proof (of height $h \leq \max\{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$). If we let (r^{-1}) be the inverse of the rule (r) whose premise is the conclusion of (r) and conclusion is the premises of (r) , then we say that (r) is (*height-preserving invertible*), i.e. (*hp*-invertible iff (r^{-1}) is (*hp*-admissible).

Whenever a rule is (*hp*-admissible in both calculi, we only focus on the $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ case and we note that all admissible rules are assumed to preserve the polytree structure of sequents. With the exception of (*cut*), all rules in Figure 3 are shown to be *hp*-admissible.

The first rule we focus on extends the (ax) rule to all formulae.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. For every $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, any sequent of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi$ with $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ is derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

For some labels w, u and v , assume wRv and $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $v \not\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ in some \mathcal{R} . Then we know that (1) u and v are on two different paths passing through w of the polytree generated from \mathcal{R} , and (2) there is no vertex between v and w else we would be in presence of a cycle. In this scenario, the rule (br_f) (for *branch forward*) allows to move the branch rooted in v upward by connecting it to u instead of w . Similarly, with vRw instead of wRv , the rule (br_b) (for *branch backward*) expresses the possibility to move the branch rooted in v downward from u to w . These rules preserve the representability of sequents as polytrees, provability and height.

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules (br_f) and (br_b) are *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

An acceptable operation on our sequents consists in the merging of two directly connected labels w and u , i.e. if wRu or uRw . Obviously, this merging preserves the representability of sequents as polytrees, and does not impact the availability, freshness or reachability conditions. The rules of our calculus corresponding to these operations, i.e. (mrg_f) and (mrg_b) , are the rules *nodemergeD* and *nodemergeU* of Pinto and Uustalu [26].

LEMMA 4.3. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules (mrg_f) and (mrg_b) are *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

As domains atoms are essentially used via availability, we can show the redundancy of a variable labeled by two labels such that

one is reachable by the other: it suffices to keep the “lowest” label. A special case of importance is when the two labels are identical: then, the following rule is a contraction on domain atoms (as $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w$ always holds).

LEMMA 4.4. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (id) rule is *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

Fortunately, term substitution is *hp*-admissible in our calculi. This result comes in handy in various places.

LEMMA 4.5. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (t/x) rule is *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

The next lemma shows the admissibility of the weakening of labeled formulae, both on the left and right of a sequent.

LEMMA 4.6. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (iw) rule is *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

Now, in the case of the calculus $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$, all the conditions on availability have disappeared from rules. So, the entirety of the labeled terms become unnecessary in this context. This point is captured by the following lemma, which is straightforwardly proved by induction on the height of proofs.

LEMMA 4.7. *The (cd) rule is *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$.*

Weakening of labeled variables is also *hp*-admissible.

LEMMA 4.8. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (wv) rule is *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

As one would expect, the presence of \perp (resp. \top) on the right (resp. left) is unnecessary. This is the essence of the next lemma.

LEMMA 4.9. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules $(\perp R)$ and $(\top L)$ are *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

Then, we proceed to show that we can modify the labels of formulae in a labeled sequent by looking at the polytree underlying it. More precisely, if $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ we can both *lower* the label of $u : \Delta$ on the right of the sequent to w , and *lift* the label of $w : \Gamma$ on the left of the sequent to u . This is the spirit of the rules (lwr) and (lft) , which we prove *hp*-admissible.

LEMMA 4.10. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (lwr) rule is *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

LEMMA 4.11. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (lft) rule is *hp*-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

For each of the rules in the following lemma, we obtain a proof via an usual induction on the height of proofs.

LEMMA 4.12. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules $(\wedge L)$, $(\wedge R)$, $(\vee L)$, $(\vee R)$ are *hp*-invertible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

The invertibility of the rules mentioned below essentially relies on the *hp*-admissibility of the weakening rule (iw) .

LEMMA 4.13. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules $(\rightarrow L)$, $(\rightarrow R)$, $(\exists R)$, $(\forall L)$ are *hp*-invertible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

The invertibility of the rules $(\rightarrow R)$ and $(\rightarrow L)$ is proved by induction on the height of proofs. In some places, we need to use isomorphic labeled sequents to ensure the freshness of the label introduced by the rule.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : x, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (wv) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : x, w : x, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : x, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (cv) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : x, u : x, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : x, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (id)^{\dagger_2} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : x, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (cd) \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, wRv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, uRv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (br_f)^{\dagger_3} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, vRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, vRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (br_b)^{\dagger_3} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}(w/u), \mathcal{T}(w/u), \Gamma(w/u) \vdash \Delta(w/u)} (mrg_b) \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, uRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}(w/u), \mathcal{T}(w/u), \Gamma(w/u) \vdash \Delta(w/u)} (mrg_f) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma(t/x) \vdash \Delta(t/x)} (t/x) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \perp}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (\perp R) \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \top \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (\top L) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta, \Delta'} (iw) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \Delta'}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \Delta'} (lwr)^{\dagger_2} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \Gamma' \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \Gamma' \vdash \Delta} (lft)^{\dagger_2} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \vdash \Delta} (ctr_l) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi} (ctr_r) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (cut)^{\dagger_2}
\end{array}$$

Side Conditions:

$\dagger_1 := x$ is fresh

$\dagger_2 := w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$

$\dagger_3 := w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $u \not\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v$

Figure 3: Admissible rules.

LEMMA 4.14. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules $(\rightarrow R)$ and $(\leftarrow L)$ are hp-invertible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

When a rule crucially involves a freshness condition, we can use the Lemma 4.5 to rename variables and ensure freshness of variables through some modifications. This is what we do in parts of the proofs of the next invertibility lemma.

LEMMA 4.15. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules $(\exists L)$ and $(\forall R)$ are hp-invertible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

LEMMA 4.16. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules (ctr_l) and (ctr_r) are hp-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

Finally, we can prove the admissibility of the (cut) rule. As our proof proceeds via local transformations of proofs, we are in fact obtaining a cut-elimination procedure from it.

THEOREM 4.17 (CUT-ELIMINATION). *The (cut) rule is admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$.*

PROOF. We proceed by primary induction (PIH) on the structure of the cut formula, and secondary induction (SIH) on the sum of the height of proofs of the premises of the cut. Assume that we have proofs of the following form, with $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$.

$$\frac{\pi_1}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi} r_1 \quad \frac{\pi_2}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta} r_2$$

We prove that there is a derivation of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ by case distinction on r_1 and r_2 , the last rules applied in the above proofs. We focus on the most interesting cases – see Appendix B for other cases.

(I) $r_1 = (ax)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta_0, v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ where $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$. If $v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ is $w : \varphi$, then we have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}), u : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$ where $\Gamma = \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t})$. Given that $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$ and $v_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, we can apply Lemma 4.11 on the latter to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}), v_0 : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$. Consequently, we obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$, i.e. of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, using Lemma 4.16. If $v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ is not $w : \varphi$, then we have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 :$

$p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta_0, v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ where $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$. The latter is easily provable using the rule (ax) .

(IV) $r_1 = (ds)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$. Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}), u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$. We can apply Lemma 4.8 repetitively on the proof of the latter to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}), u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ which we call S , while preserving height. Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} (ds) \quad S}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH}$$

Note that the instance of SIH is justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of its premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(XI) $r_1 = (\leftarrow L)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ and we have proof of $\mathcal{R}, v_0 Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : \psi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi, v_0 : \chi$. Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$. We apply Lemma 4.14 on the proof of the latter sequent to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, v_0 Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : \psi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta, v_0 : \chi$, which we call S . Thus, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, v_0 Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : \psi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi, v_0 : \chi}{\mathcal{R}, v_0 Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : \psi \vdash \Delta, v_0 : \chi} (ds) \quad S}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi \vdash \Delta} (\leftarrow L) \text{SIH}$$

Note that the instance of SIH is justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of the premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(XII) $r_1 = (\rightarrow R)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi$ and we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi, v_0 : \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \chi \vdash \Delta_0, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi$ where $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v$.

If $w : \varphi$ is not $v : \psi \leftarrow \chi$, then we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi, v_0 : \psi, w : \varphi$, which we call S_0 , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \chi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \leftarrow \chi, w : \varphi$, which we call S_1 , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form

$\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi$. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof displayed.

$$\frac{\frac{S_0 \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi, v_0 : \psi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi, v_0 : \psi} \text{SIH}}{\frac{S_1 \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \chi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \multimap \chi} (\multimap R)} \pi$$

If $w : \varphi$ is $v : \psi \multimap \chi$, then we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi \multimap \chi, v_0 : \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \chi \vdash \Delta, v : \psi \multimap \chi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi \multimap \chi \vdash \Delta$. In this case, we need to consider the shape of r_2 . If $u : \psi \multimap \chi$ is not principal in r_2 , then we use the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi \multimap \chi$ with SIH to cut $u : \psi \multimap \chi$ from the premises of r_2 , and then reapply r_2 to reach our goal. If $u : \psi \multimap \chi$ is principal in r_2 , then the premise of r_2 is of the shape $\mathcal{R}, v_1 R u, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1 : \psi \vdash \Delta, v_1 : \chi$. Then, we proceed as follows where π_0 and π_1 are (in this order) the first proofs given.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi \multimap \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_0 : \psi, v : \psi \multimap \chi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_0 : \psi} \text{SIH}}{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi \multimap \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \chi \vdash \Delta, v : \psi \multimap \chi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \psi, v_0 : \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, v_1 R u, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1 : \psi \vdash \Delta, v_1 : \chi}{\mathcal{R}, v_1 R v_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1 : \psi \vdash \Delta, v_1 : \chi} \text{Lem.4.2}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \psi \vdash \Delta, v_0 : \chi} \text{Lem.4.3}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0 : \psi \vdash \Delta} \text{PIH}} \pi_0 \quad \pi_1 \text{PIH}$$

(XIV) $r_1 = (\exists R)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \exists x \psi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \exists x \psi, v : \psi(t/x)$ where t is available for v .

If $w : \varphi$ is not $v : \exists x \psi$, then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \exists x \psi, v : \psi(t/x)$, $w : \varphi$, which we call S , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \exists x \psi$. Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{S \quad \frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \exists x \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \exists x \psi, v : \psi(t/x)} \text{Lem.4.13}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \exists x \psi, v : \psi(t/x)} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \exists x \psi} (\exists R)$$

If $w : \varphi$ is $v : \exists x \psi$, then we have proof a of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \exists x \psi, v : \psi(t/x)$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \exists x \psi \vdash \Delta$. In this case, we need to consider the shape of r_2 . If $u : \exists x \psi$ is not principal in r_2 , then we use the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \exists x \psi$ with SIH to cut $u : \exists x \psi$ from the premises of r_2 , and then reapply r_2 to reach our goal. If $u : \exists x \psi$ is principal in r_2 , then the premise of r_2 is of the shape $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : y, \Gamma, v : \psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta$ where y is fresh. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof given and x_0, \dots, x_n are all the variables appearing in t .

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \exists x \psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \exists x \psi \vdash \Delta, v : \psi(t/x)} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \exists x \psi, v : \psi(t/x)} \text{SIH}}{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : y, \Gamma, v : \psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : x_0, \dots, v : x_n, \Gamma, v : \psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.5}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v : \psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.4}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{PIH}} \pi$$

Note that the step involving Lemma 4.4 is justified as t is available for v , which implies that we can push all its variables to the original labels making t available for v . \square

5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have provided a proof-theoretical analysis of two extensions of propositional bi-intuitionistic logic to the first-order setting: the logic of constant domains $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$ and the logic of increasing domains $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$. While obtaining a sound and complete proof system for the former is relatively straightforward, the same cannot be said for the latter. As we have shown in the introduction, there is an inherent difficulty in formalizing a Hilbert system for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ without collapsing the domains into a constant domain, since the natural and obvious formalization must necessarily entail the quantifier shift axiom, which in turn implies a constant domain model. This may explain why the proof theory for bi-intuitionistic logic with non-constant domains has not been previously studied and remained an open problem until now.

The design of our proof system for $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ started with the analysis of a typical proof of the quantifier shift axiom, and uncovered a previously overlooked dependency between the residuation principle (that is core to bi-intuitionistic logic) and the existence assumption on quantified variables. This led us to the introduction of the existence predicates into our formalization of the proof system $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ for the logic $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$. The proof system $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ is formalized as a labeled polytree sequent calculus, extended with an implicit notion of existence predicate (i.e. domain atoms). We proved cut-elimination, soundness, and completeness of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ with respect to $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$. Completeness was unexpectedly tricky, due to the rather intricate interaction between the exclusion operator and the existence predicate. The use of a labeled polytree sequent calculus allows one to interpret a labeled polytree sequent as a formula. We have used this property to prove, syntactically, that $\text{BIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ is conservative over first-order intuitionistic logic.

Future work. Our initial analysis indicates that there may be two other interesting and possibly distinct first-order extensions of bi-intuitionistic logic that may be worth exploring. The first is to consider a logic with decreasing domains, i.e., if $w \leq u$ then $D(u) \leq D(w)$ in the Kripke model. Semantically, this logic is easy to define, but its proof theory is not at all obvious. We are looking into the possibility of formalizing a notion of “non-existence predicate,” that is dual to the existence predicate, suggested by Restall [31]. This non-existence predicate may play a similar (but dual) role to the existence predicate in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$. The other extension is motivated from the proof theoretical perspective. As

mentioned in Remark 3.11, it seems that one can obtain a subsystem of LBIQ(\mathcal{ID}) without the domain-shift rule (ds) that satisfies cut-elimination. As we discussed in Section 3, the (ds) rule is crucial to ensure the completeness of BIQ(\mathcal{ID}) in the presence of the exclusion operator, and so, a natural question to ask is what the semantics of such a logic would look like.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nuel D Belpap. 1982. Display logic. *Journal of philosophical logic* 11, 4 (1982), 375–417.
- [2] Kai Brännler. 2009. Deep sequent systems for modal logic. *Arch. Math. Log.* 48, 6 (2009), 551–577. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00153-009-0137-3>
- [3] Robert A. Bull. 1992. Cut elimination for propositional dynamic logic without *. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math.* 38, 2 (1992), 85–100.
- [4] Marcos A Castilho, Luis Farinas del Cerro, Olivier Gasquet, and Andreas Herzig. 1997. Modal tableaux with propagation rules and structural rules. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 32, 3, 4 (1997), 281–297.
- [5] Agata Ciabattoni, Tim Lyon, Revantha Ramanayake, and Alwen Tiu. 2021. Display to Labelled Proofs and Back Again for Tense Logics. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 22, 3 (2021), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3460492>
- [6] Ranald Clouston, Jeremy E. Dawson, Rajeev Goré, and Alwen Tiu. 2013. Annotation-Free Sequent Calculi for Full Intuitionistic Linear Logic - Extended Version. *CoRR* abs/1307.0289 (2013). arXiv:1307.0289 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.0289>
- [7] Tristan Crolard. 2004. A Formulae-as-Types Interpretation of Subtractive Logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 14, 4 (2004), 529–570. <https://doi.org/10.1093/logcom/14.4.529>
- [8] Melvin Fitting. 1972. Tableau methods of proof for modal logics. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 13, 2 (1972), 237–247.
- [9] Melvin Fitting. 2014. Nested Sequents for Intuitionistic Logics. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 55, 1 (2014), 41–61.
- [10] Melvin Fitting and Roman Kuznets. 2015. Modal interpolation via nested sequents. *Annals of pure and applied logic* 166, 3 (2015), 274–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2014.11.002>
- [11] D. Gabbay, V. Shehtman, and D. Skvortsov. 2009. *Quantification in Non-classical Logics*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, London.
- [12] Gerhard Gentzen. 1935. Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen. I. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 39, 1 (1935), 176–210.
- [13] Gerhard Gentzen. 1935. Untersuchungen über das logische Schließen. II. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 39, 1 (1935), 405–431.
- [14] Rajeev Goré, Linda Postniece, and Alwen Tiu. 2008. Cut-elimination and proof-search for bi-intuitionistic logic using nested sequents. In *Advances in Modal Logic 7, papers from the seventh conference on "Advances in Modal Logic", 2008*, Carlos Areces and Robert Goldblatt (Eds.). College Publications, Nancy, France, 43–66.
- [15] Rajeev Goré, Linda Postniece, and Alwen Tiu. 2011. On the Correspondence between Display Postulates and Deep Inference in Nested Sequent Calculi for Tense Logics. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 7, 2 (2011), 1–38. [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-7\(2:3\)2011](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-7(2:3)2011)
- [16] Rajeev Goré and Ian Shillito. 2020. Bi-Intuitionistic Logics: A New Instance of an Old Problem. In *Advances in Modal Logic 13, papers from the thirteenth conference on "Advances in Modal Logic"*. College Publications, Helsinki, Finland, 269–288.
- [17] Andrzej Grzegorzczak. 1964. A philosophically plausible formal interpretation of intuitionistic logic. *Indagationes Mathematicae* 26, 5 (1964), 596–601.
- [18] Ryo Ishigaki and Kentaro Kikuchi. 2007. Tree-Sequent Methods for Subintuitionistic Predicate Logics. In *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 4548)*, Nicola Olivetti (Ed.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 149–164.
- [19] Ryo Kashima. 1994. Cut-free sequent calculi for some tense logics. *Studia Logica* 53, 1 (1994), 119–135.
- [20] Tim Lyon. 2020. On the correspondence between nested calculi and semantic systems for intuitionistic logics. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 31, 1 (12 2020), 213–265. <https://doi.org/10.1093/logcom/exaa078>
- [21] Tim Lyon. 2021. *Refining Labelled Systems for Modal and Constructive Logics with Applications*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Technische Universität Wien.
- [22] Tim Lyon, Alwen Tiu, Rajeev Goré, and Ranald Clouston. 2020. Syntactic Interpolation for Tense Logics and Bi-Intuitionistic Logic via Nested Sequents. In *28th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2020 (LIPIcs, Vol. 152)*, Maribel Fernández and Anca Muscholl (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 28:1–28:16. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2020.28>
- [23] Tim S. Lyon and Lucía Gómez Álvarez. 2022. Automating Reasoning with Standpoint Logic via Nested Sequents. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*. 257–266. <https://doi.org/10.24963/kr.2022/26>
- [24] E. G. K. López-Escobar. 1981. On the interpolation theorem for the logic of constant domains. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 46, 1 (1981), 87–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2273260>
- [25] Sara Negri. 2005. Proof analysis in modal logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 34, 5-6 (2005), 507.
- [26] Luis Pinto and Tarmo Uustalu. 2010. Relating Sequent Calculi for Bi-intuitionistic Propositional Logic. In *Proceedings Third International Workshop on Classical Logic and Computation, CL&C 2010, Brno, Czech Republic, 21-22 August 2010 (EPTCS, Vol. 47)*, Steffen van Bakel, Stefano Berardi, and Ulrich Berger (Eds.), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.47.7>
- [27] Luis Pinto and Tarmo Uustalu. 2018. A proof-theoretic study of bi-intuitionistic propositional sequent calculus. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 28, 1 (2018), 165–202.
- [28] Linda Postniece. 2009. Deep Inference in Bi-intuitionistic Logic. In *Logic, Language, Information and Computation*, Hiroakira Ono, Makoto Kanazawa, and Ruy de Queiroz (Eds.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 320–334.
- [29] Cecylia Rauszer. 1977. Applications of Kripke models to Heyting-Brouwer logic. *Studia Logica* 36, 1 (1977), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02121115>
- [30] Cecylia Rauszer. 1980. An algebraic and Kripke-style approach to a certain extension of intuitionistic logic, *Dissertationes Mathematicae*.
- [31] Greg Restall. 2005. Constant Domain Quantified Modal Logics Without Boolean Negation. *Australasian Journal of Logic* 3 (2005), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.26686/ajl.v3i0.1772>
- [32] Dana Scott. 2006. Identity and existence in intuitionistic logic. In *Applications of Sheaves: Proceedings of the Research Symposium on Applications of Sheaf Theory to Logic, Algebra, and Analysis, Durham, July 9–21, 1977*. Springer, 660–696.
- [33] Ian Shillito. 2023. *New Foundations for the Proof Theory of Bi-Intuitionistic and Provability Logics Mechanized in Coq*. Ph. D. Dissertation. Australian National University, Canberra.
- [34] Alex K Simpson. 1994. *The proof theory and semantics of intuitionistic modal logic*. Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Edinburgh. College of Science and Engineering. School of Informatics.
- [35] John G. Stell, Renate A. Schmidt, and David Rydeheard. 2016. A bi-intuitionistic modal logic: Foundations and automation. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* 85, 4 (2016), 500–519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2015.11.003> Relational and algebraic methods in computer science.
- [36] Gaisi Takeuti. 2013. *Proof theory*. Vol. 81. Courier Corporation.
- [37] Alwen Tiu, Egor Ivanovski, and Rajeev Goré. 2012. Grammar Logics in Nested Sequent Calculus: Proof Theory and Decision Procedures. In *Advances in Modal Logic 9, papers from the ninth conference on "Advances in Modal Logic"*, Thomas Bolander, Torben Braüner, Silvio Ghilardi, and Lawrence S. Moss (Eds.). College Publications, 516–537.
- [38] Luca Viganò. 2000. *Labelled Non-Classical Logics*. Springer Science & Business Media.

A SOUNDNESS AND COMPLETENESS PROOFS

A.1 Soundness

THEOREM 3.12 (SOUNDNESS). *Let S be a sequent. If S is derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ ($\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$), then S is (CD)-valid.*

PROOF. We argue the claim by induction on the height of the given derivation and consider the $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ case as the $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$ case is similar.

Base case. It is straightforward to show that any instance of $(\perp\text{L})$ or $(\top\text{R})$ is valid; hence, we focus on (ax) and show that any instance thereof is valid. Let us consider the following instance of (ax) , where $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ due to the side condition imposed on (ax) , that is, there exist $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R})$ such that $wRv_1, \dots, v_nRu \in \mathcal{R}$.

$$\frac{}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, u : p(\vec{t})} (ax)$$

Let us suppose $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, u : p(\vec{t})$ is invalid; in other words, a model $M = (W, \leq, U, D, I_F, I_P)$, M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment α exist such that the following hold: $\iota(w) \leq \iota(v_1), \dots, \iota(v_n) \leq \iota(u)$, $M, \iota(w), \alpha \Vdash p(\vec{t})$, and $M, \iota(u), \alpha \not\Vdash p(\vec{t})$. By the monotonicity condition (M) (see Definition 2.3), it must be that $M, \iota(u), \alpha \Vdash p(\vec{t})$, giving a contradiction. Thus, every instance of (ax) must be valid.

Inductive step. We prove the inductive step by contraposition, showing that if the conclusion of the last inference in the given proof is invalid, then at least one premise of the final inference must be invalid. We make a case distinction based on the last rule applied in the given derivation.

(ds). Suppose $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$ is invalid with $\vec{t} = t_1, \dots, t_n$. Then, there exists a model M , M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment α such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash p(\vec{t})$. Therefore, $(\vec{\alpha}(t_1), \dots, \vec{\alpha}(t_n)) \in I_P(w, p)$, and since $I_P(w, p) \subseteq D(w)^n$, we have that $\vec{\alpha}(t_i) \in D(\iota(w))$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. By the (C) and (F) conditions, we know that $M, \iota, \alpha \models w : VT(\vec{t})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$ is invalid as well.

($\wedge\text{L}$). If we assume that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \Delta$ is invalid, then there exists a model M , M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment α such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi \wedge \psi$, implying that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi$ and $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \psi$, showing that the premise $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi, w : \psi \vdash \Delta$ is invalid as well.

($\wedge\text{R}$). Let us suppose that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi \wedge \psi$ is invalid. Then, there exists an model M , M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment α such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi \wedge \psi$. Hence, either $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi$ or $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \psi$. In the first case, the left premise of $(\wedge\text{R})$ is invalid, and in the second case, the right premise of $(\wedge\text{R})$ is invalid.

($\vee\text{L}$). Similar to the $(\wedge\text{R})$ case.

($\vee\text{R}$). Similar to the $(\wedge\text{L})$ case.

($\rightarrow\text{L}$). Assume $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta$ is invalid and $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, i.e. a sequence wRv_1, \dots, v_nRu of relational atoms exist in \mathcal{R} . By our assumption, there exists a model M , M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment such that $\iota(w) \leq \iota(v_1), \dots, \iota(v_n) \leq \iota(u)$ and $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$. Because $M, \iota(w), \alpha \Vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ and \leq is transitive, we know that either $M, \iota(u), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi$ or $M, \iota(u), \alpha \Vdash \psi$. In the first case, the left premise of $(\rightarrow\text{L})$ is invalid, and in the second case, the right premise of $(\rightarrow\text{L})$ is invalid.

($\rightarrow\text{R}$). Assume that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ is invalid. Then, there exists a model M , an M -interpretation ι , and an M -assignment α such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$. Hence, there exists a world u such that $\iota(w) \leq u$, $M, u, \alpha \Vdash \varphi$, and $M, u, \alpha \not\Vdash \psi$. Let $\iota'(v) = \iota(v)$ for all labels $v \neq u$ and $\iota'(u) = u$ otherwise. Then, M, ι' , and α falsify the premise of $(\rightarrow\text{R})$, showing it invalid.

($\leftarrow\text{L}$). Similar to the $(\rightarrow\text{R})$ case above.

($\leftarrow\text{R}$). Similar to the $(\rightarrow\text{L})$ case above.

($\exists\text{L}$). Suppose that $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \exists x\varphi \vdash \Delta$ is invalid. Then, there exists a model M , an M -interpretation ι , and an M -assignment α such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \exists x\varphi$. Therefore, there exists an $a \in D(\iota(w))$ such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha[a/y] \not\Vdash \varphi(y/x)$ with y not occurring in S . Then, as y is fresh, M, ι , and $\alpha[a/y]$ falsify the premise of $(\exists\text{L})$, showing it invalid.

($\exists\text{R}$). Suppose that $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \exists x\varphi$ is invalid. Then, there exists a model M , and M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \exists x\varphi$. By the side condition on $(\exists\text{R})$, we know that $A(t, X_w, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T})$, meaning there exist labels $u_1, \dots, u_n \in \text{Lab}(S)$ such that $u_1 : x_1, \dots, u_n : x_n \in \mathcal{T}$, $VT(t) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, and $u_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w, \dots, u_n \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w$. It follows that $\iota(u_1) \leq \iota(w), \dots, \iota(u_n) \leq \iota(w)$ and $\vec{\alpha}(x_1) \in D(\iota(u_1)), \dots, \vec{\alpha}(x_n) \in D(\iota(u_n))$. By the increasing domain condition (ID), we have that $\vec{\alpha}(x_1) \in D(\iota(w)), \dots, \vec{\alpha}(x_n) \in D(\iota(w))$. Therefore, by the (C) and (F) conditions, we know that $\vec{\alpha}(t) \in D(\iota(w))$, showing that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi(t/x)$, and thus, the premise is invalid.

($\forall\text{L}$). Suppose that $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \forall x\varphi \vdash \Delta$ is invalid. Then, there exists a model M , and M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment α such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \forall x\varphi$. By the side condition on $(\forall\text{L})$, we know that $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $A(t, X_w, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T})$. By the latter fact, there exist labels $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \text{Lab}(S)$ such that $v_1 : x_1, \dots, v_n : x_n \in \mathcal{T}$, $VT(t) = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, and $v_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w, \dots, v_n \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w$. It follows that $\iota(v_1) \leq \iota(w), \dots, \iota(v_n) \leq \iota(w)$ and $\vec{\alpha}(x_1) \in D(\iota(v_1)), \dots, \vec{\alpha}(x_n) \in D(\iota(v_n))$. By the increasing domain condition (ID), we have that $\vec{\alpha}(x_1) \in D(\iota(w)), \dots, \vec{\alpha}(x_n) \in D(\iota(w))$. Therefore, by the (C) and (F) conditions and our assumption, we know that $\vec{\alpha}(t) \in D(\iota(w))$, showing that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \varphi(t/x)$. By the fact that $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, we know $\iota(w) \leq \iota(u)$ and $\vec{\alpha}(t) \in D(\iota(u))$, showing that $M, \iota(u), \alpha \Vdash \varphi(t/x)$ by Proposition 2.6. Thus, the premise is invalid.

($\forall\text{R}$). Let us assume that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \forall x\varphi$ is invalid. Then, there exists a model M , an M -interpretation ι , and an M -assignment α such that $M, \iota(w), \alpha \not\Vdash \forall x\varphi$. Thus, there exists a world $u \in W$ such that $\iota(w) \leq u$, $a \in D(u)$, and $M, u, \alpha[a/y] \not\Vdash \varphi(y/x)$. We define $\iota'(v) = \iota(v)$ if $v \neq u$ and $\iota'(u) = u$. Then, M, ι' , and $\alpha[a/y]$ falsify the premise $\mathcal{R}, w \leq u, \mathcal{T}, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi(y/x)$, showing it invalid. \square

A.2 Completeness

We prove the cut-free completeness of $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ by showing that if a sequent of the form $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is not provable, then a counter-model can be constructed witnessing the invalidity of the sequent. We focus on the proof for $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ as it is more involved than the similar proof for $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$. Our proof makes use of various new notions, which we now define. A *pseudo-derivation* is defined to be a (potentially infinite) tree whose nodes are sequents and where every parent node corresponds to the conclusion of a rule in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ with the children nodes corresponding to the premises. We remark that a proof in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ is a finite pseudo-derivation where all top sequents are instances of (ax) , $(\perp L)$, or $(\top R)$. A *branch* \mathcal{B} is defined to be a maximal path of sequents through a pseudo-derivation, starting from the conclusion. The following lemma is useful in our proof of completeness.

LEMMA 3.13. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. For each $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, let $S_i = \mathcal{R}_i, \mathcal{T}_i, \Gamma_i \vdash \Delta_i$ be a sequent.*

- (1) *If $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ holds for the conclusion of a rule (r) in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$, then $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ holds for the premises of (r) ;*
- (2) *If $w : p(\vec{t}) \in \Gamma_0, \Delta_0$ and S_0 is the conclusion of a rule (r) in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$ with S_1 (and S_2) the premise(s) of (r) , then $w : p(\vec{t}) \in \Gamma_1, \Delta_1$ (and $w : p(\vec{t}) \in \Gamma_2, \Delta_2$, resp.);*
- (3) *If $w : x \in \mathcal{T}_0$ and S_0 is the conclusion of a rule (r) in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$ with S_1 (and S_2) the premise(s) of (r) , then $w : x \in \mathcal{T}_1$ (and $w : x \in \mathcal{T}_2$, resp.).*

PROOF. Each claim can be seen to hold by inspecting the rules of $\text{LBIQ}(C)$. □

The lemma tells us that propagation paths, the position of atomic formulae, and the position of terms are bottom-up preserved in rule applications.

THEOREM 3.14. *If $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is (CD-) valid, then $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ ($\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$).*

PROOF. We assume that $S = w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is not derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and show that a model M can be defined which witnesses that S is invalid. To prove this, we first define a proof-search procedure *Prove* that bottom-up applies rules from $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ to $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$. Second, we show how an M can be extracted from failed proof-search. We now describe the proof-search procedure *Prove* and let $<$ be a well-founded, strict linear order over the set Ter of terms.

Prove. Let us take $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ as input and continue to the next step.

(ax) , $(\perp L)$, and $(\top R)$. Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we halt the computation of *Prove* on each branch \mathcal{B}_i where S_i is of the form (ax) , $(\perp L)$, or $(\top R)$. If *Prove* is halted on each branch \mathcal{B}_i , then *Prove* returns True because a proof of the input has been constructed. However, if *Prove* did not halt on each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, then let $\mathcal{B}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{j_k}$ be the remaining branches for which *Prove* did not halt. For each such branch, copy the top sequent above itself, and continue to the next step.

(ds) . Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (ds) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w_1 : p_1(\vec{t}_1), \dots, w_\ell : p_\ell(\vec{t}_\ell) \vdash \Delta$$

where all atomic input formulae are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We successively consider each atomic input formula and bottom-up apply (ds) , yielding a branch extending \mathcal{B}_{k+1} with a top sequent saturated under (ds) applications. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

$(\vee L)$. Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of $(\vee L)$ rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w_1 : \varphi_1 \vee \psi_1, \dots, w_m : \varphi_m \vee \psi_m \vdash \Delta$$

where all disjunctive formulae $w_i : \varphi_i \vee \psi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each labeled formula $w_i : \varphi_i \vee \psi_i$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the $(\vee L)$ rule, which gives 2^m new branches extending \mathcal{B}_{k+1} such that each branch has a top sequent of the form $S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w_1 : \chi_1 \dots, w_m : \chi_m \vdash \Delta$ with $\chi_i \in \{\varphi_i, \psi_i\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

$(\vee R)$. Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of $(\vee R)$ rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash w_1 : \varphi_1 \vee \psi_1, \dots, w_m : \varphi_m \vee \psi_m, \Delta$$

where all disjunctive formulae $w_i : \varphi_i \vee \psi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each labeled formula $w_i : \varphi_i \vee \psi_i$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the (\vee R) rule. These (\vee R) rule applications extend \mathcal{B}_{k+1} such that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash w_1 : \varphi_1, w_1 : \psi_1, \dots, w_m : \varphi_m, w_m : \psi_m, \Delta$ is now the top sequent of the branch. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

(\wedge L). Similar to the (\vee R) case above.

(\wedge R). Similar to the (\vee L) case above.

(\rightarrow L). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (\rightarrow L) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w_1 : \varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi_1, \dots, w_m : \varphi_m \rightarrow \psi_m \vdash \Delta$$

where all implicational formulae $w_i : \varphi_i \rightarrow \psi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each formula $w_i : \varphi_i \rightarrow \psi_i$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the (\rightarrow L) rule. Let $w_{\ell+1} : \varphi_{\ell+1} \rightarrow \psi_{\ell+1}$ be the current formula under consideration, and assume that $w_1 : \varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi_1, \dots, w_\ell : \varphi_\ell \rightarrow \psi_\ell$ have already been considered. For every label u such that $w_{\ell+1} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, bottom-up apply the (\rightarrow L) rule. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

(\rightarrow R). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (\rightarrow R) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash w_1 : \varphi_1 \rightarrow \psi_1, \dots, w_m : \varphi_m \rightarrow \psi_m, \Delta$$

where all implicational formulae $w_i : \varphi_i \rightarrow \psi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each formula $w_i : \varphi_i \rightarrow \psi_i$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the (\rightarrow R) rule. These (\rightarrow R) rule applications extend \mathcal{B}_{k+1} such that

$$\mathcal{R}, w_1 R u_1, \dots, w_m R u_m, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u_1 : \varphi_1, \dots, u_m : \varphi_m \vdash u_1 : \psi_1, \dots, u_m : \psi_m, \Delta$$

is now the top sequent of the branch with u_1, \dots, u_m fresh. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

(\rightarrow L). Similar to the (\rightarrow R) case above.

(\rightarrow R). Similar to the (\rightarrow L) case above.

(\exists L). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (\exists L) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w_1 : \exists x_1 \varphi_1, \dots, w_m : \exists x_m \varphi_m \vdash \Delta$$

where all existential input formulae $w_i : \exists x_i \varphi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each formula $w_i : \exists x_i \varphi_i$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the (\exists L) rule. These (\exists L) rule applications extend \mathcal{B}_{k+1} such that

$$\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w_1 : y_1, \dots, w_m : y_m, \Gamma, w_1 : \varphi_1(y_1/x_1), \dots, w_m : \varphi_m(y_m/x_m) \vdash \Delta$$

is now the top sequent of the branch with y_1, \dots, y_m fresh variables. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

(\exists R). Suppose $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n$ are all branches occurring in the current pseudo-derivation and let S_1, \dots, S_n be the top sequents of each respective branch. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we consider \mathcal{B}_i and extend the branch with bottom-up applications of (\exists R) rules. Let \mathcal{B}_{k+1} be the current branch under consideration, and assume that $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_k$ have already been considered. We assume that the top sequent in \mathcal{B}_{k+1} is of the form

$$S_{k+1} = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash w_1 : \exists x_1 \varphi_1, \dots, w_m : \exists x_m \varphi_m, \Delta$$

where all existential formulae $w_i : \exists x_i \varphi_i$ are displayed in S_{k+1} above. We consider each labeled formula $w_m : \exists x_m \varphi_m$ in turn, and bottom-up apply the (\exists R) rule. Let $w_{\ell+1} : \exists x_{\ell+1} \varphi_{\ell+1}$ be the current formula under consideration, and assume that $w_1 : \exists x_1 \varphi_1, \dots, w_\ell : \exists x_\ell \varphi_\ell$ have already been considered. Recall that $<$ is a well-founded, strict linear order over the set Ter of terms. Choose the $<$ -minimal term $t \in \text{Ter}(X_{w_{\ell+1}})$ that has yet to be picked to instantiate $w_{\ell+1} : \exists x_{\ell+1} \varphi_{\ell+1}$ and bottom-up apply the (\exists R) rule, thus adding $w_{\ell+1} : \varphi_{\ell+1}(t/x_{\ell+1})$. After these operations have been performed for each branch \mathcal{B}_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we continue to the next step.

(\forall L). Similar to the (\exists R) case above.

(\forall R). Similar to the (\rightarrow R) and (\exists L) cases above.

This concludes the description of Prove.

We now argue that if Prove does not return True, then a model M , M -interpretation ι , and M -assignment α can be defined such that $M, \iota, \alpha \not\models S$. If Prove halts, i.e. Prove returns True, then a proof of S may be obtained by ‘contracting’ all redundant inferences from the ‘(ax), (\perp L), and (\top R)’ step of Prove, which contradicts our assumption. Therefore, Prove does not halt, that is, Prove generates an infinite tree with finite branching. By König’s lemma, an infinite branch must exist in this infinite tree, which we denote by \mathcal{B} . We define a model $M = (W, \leq, U, D, I_F, I_P)$ by means of this branch.

First, let us define the following (multi)sets, all of which are obtained by taking the union of each (multi)set of relational atoms, domain atoms, antecedent labeled formulae, and consequent labeled formulae (resp.) occurring within a sequent in \mathcal{B} :

$$\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{R} \quad \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \mathcal{T} \quad \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \Gamma \quad \Delta^{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta) \in \mathcal{B}} \Delta$$

- $u \in W$ iff $u \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$;
- $\leq = \{(u, v) \mid uRv \in \mathcal{R}\}^*$ where $*$ denotes the reflexive-transitive closure;
- $t \in U$ iff there exists a label $u \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$ such that $t \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$;
- $t \in D(u)$ iff $t \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$;
- $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in I_P(u, p)$ iff $v, u \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$, $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* u$, and $v : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$.

We now verify that M is indeed a model. Observe that $W \neq \emptyset$ since $w \in W$ by definition and the relation \leq is reflexive and transitive by definition. Furthermore, by definition, $D(u) \subseteq U$ for each $u \in W$ and $U = \bigcup_{u \in W} D(u)$. Also, since our language contains at least one constant symbol a (see Remark 3.8), we know that $a \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$ for each $u \in W$, i.e. for each $u \in W$, $D(u) \neq \emptyset$. Let us now argue that M satisfies the increasing domain condition (ID), and assume $u, v \in W$, $t \in D(u)$, and $u \leq v$. Since $t \in D(u)$, $t \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$, and since $u \leq v$, we know that $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* v$. It follows that $\text{Ter}(X_u) \subseteq \text{Ter}(X_v)$ by Definition 3.5, showing that $t \in \text{Ter}(X_v)$, and thus, $t \in D(v)$. It is simple to confirm that I_F satisfies the (C) and (F) conditions as $t \in D(u)$ iff $t \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$, and $\text{Ter}(X_u)$ contains every constant and is closed under the formation of terms by definition. For each n -ary predicate p and world $u \in W$, $I_P(p, u) \subseteq D(u)^n$. To show this, suppose that $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in I_P(p, u)$. Then, there exists a label $v \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$ such that $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* u$, and $v : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) = v : p(\vec{t}) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$. By the (ds) step of Prove, we know that $w : VT(\vec{t}) \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}$. It follows that $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$, implying that $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in D(u)^n$. Finally, we argue that M satisfies the monotonicity condition (M), and therefore, we assume $u, v \in W$, $u \leq v$, and $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in I_P(p, u)$. Since $u \leq v$, we know that there exist $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$ such that uRw_1, \dots, w_nRv , implying that $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* v$. Since $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in I_P(p, u)$, there exists a v' such that $v' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* u$ and $v' : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$. Hence, $v' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* v$ because $v' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* u$ and $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* v$, which shows that $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in I_P(p, v)$.

We have now confirmed that M is indeed a model. Let us define α to be the M -assignment mapping every variable in U to itself and every variable in $\text{Var} \setminus U$ arbitrarily. To finish the proof of completeness, we now argue the following by mutual induction on the complexity of ψ : (1) if $u : \psi \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$, then $M, u, \alpha \models \psi$, and (2) if $u : \psi \in \Delta^{\mathcal{B}}$, then $M, u, \alpha \not\models \psi$. We argue the cases where ψ is of the form $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ or $\forall x\chi$, and omit the remaining cases as they are straightforward or similar.


- $u : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$. In this case, $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in I_P(p, u)$ by the definition of I_P , implying that $M, u, \alpha \models p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.
- $u : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{B}}$. Observe that if a label $v \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$ exists such that $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* u$ and $v : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$, then due to the ‘(ax), (\perp L), and (\top R)’ step of Prove, \mathcal{B} would be finite. However, as this is not the case, it must be that no label $v \in \text{Lab}(\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{T}^{\mathcal{B}}, \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}, \Delta^{\mathcal{B}})$ exists such that $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* u$ and $v : p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$, showing that $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \notin I_P(p, u)$, i.e. $M, u, \alpha \not\models p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.
- $u : \forall x\chi \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$. Suppose $v \in W$, $t \in D(v)$, and $u \leq v$. By the assumption that $t \in D(v)$, we know that $A(t, X_u, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T})$ holds for some sequent $S = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ in \mathcal{B} . Let us suppose w.l.o.g. that S is the first such sequent in \mathcal{B} for which this holds. By Lemma 3.13, it follows that $A(t, X_w, \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{T}')$ holds for every sequent $S' = \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{T}', \Gamma' \vdash \Delta'$ above S in \mathcal{B} . By the assumption that $u \leq v$, we know that $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{B}}}^* v$. Hence, at some point the (\forall L) step of Prove will be applicable at or above S in \mathcal{B} , meaning $v : \chi(t/x) \in \Gamma^{\mathcal{B}}$. By IH, we have that $M, v, \alpha \models \chi(t/x)$, from which it follows that $M, w, \alpha \models \forall x\chi$ by our assumptions.
- $u : \forall x\chi \in \Delta^{\mathcal{B}}$. Due to the (\forall R) step of Prove, a sequent of the form $\mathcal{R}, uRv, \mathcal{T}, v : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \chi(y/x)$ with v and y fresh must occur in \mathcal{B} . By the definition of \leq and $D(v)$, as well as Lemma 3.13, it follows that $u \leq v$ and $y \in D(v)$. By IH and the definition of α , $M, v, \alpha \not\models \chi(y/x)$, and so, $M, u, \alpha \not\models \forall x\chi$.

Let ι to be the M -interpretation such that $\iota(u) = u$ for $u \in W$ and $\iota(v) \in W$ for $v \notin W$. By the proof above, $M, \iota, \alpha \not\models w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$, showing that if a sequent of the form $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is not derivable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$, then it is invalid, that is, every valid sequent of the form $w : \vec{x} \vdash w : \varphi(\vec{x})$ is provable in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D})$. \square

B ADMISSIBILITY AND INVERTIBILITY PROOFS


LEMMA 4.2. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{I}\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{C}\mathcal{D}\}$. The rules (br_f) and (br_b) are hp-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

PROOF. By changing wRv to uRv , we are effectively moving the branch rooted in v from w to u : we move from the left diagram to the right one below.



The crucial observation is that given that $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, this moving of the branch only extends the reachability relation: we have that for all w' and w'' , if $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w''$ in \mathcal{R} , wRv then $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w''$ in \mathcal{R} , uRv . Consequently, we can see that (br_f) only expands reachability, and thus does not violate the reachability or availability conditions of any of the rules. Freshness is also not impacted. So, in all cases we can simply apply the induction hypothesis on the premises, and then the rule.

A similar argument can be provided for (br_b) , where we move from the left diagram to the right one below.



□

LEMMA 4.3. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules (mrg_f) and (mrg_b) are hp-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

PROOF. Straightforward by induction on derivations. □

LEMMA 4.4. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (id) rule is hp-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

PROOF. This lemma is straightforwardly proved by induction on the height of proofs. To realize that we can simply apply the induction hypothesis on the premises of the rules, and then reapply the rule, it suffices to note that the deletion of $u : x$ does not impact reachability, freshness or even availability given that $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$. So, any rule is reapplicable once we use the induction hypothesis. □

LEMMA 4.5. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (t/x) rule is hp-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

PROOF. We reason by induction on the height of proofs, and consider the last rule applied.

Obviously, the propositional rules are not impacted by the substitution. So, for these rules we simply need to apply the induction hypothesis on the premises of the rule, and then reapply the rule.

The rule (ds) is treated straightforwardly: we apply the induction hypothesis on the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : VT(\vec{t}'), \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}') \vdash \Delta$ to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}', \Gamma(t/x), w : p(t'(\vec{t}/x)) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$ where $\mathcal{T}' = (\mathcal{T}, w : VT(\vec{t}'))(t/x)$. Note that \mathcal{T}' is such that any domain atom $u : x$ is replaced by $u : x_0, \dots, u : x_m$ where x_0, \dots, x_m are the variables appearing in t . Consequently, all the variables appearing in the terms $t'(\vec{t}/x)$ are labeled by w in \mathcal{T}' . Consequently, we can apply the rule (ds) to obtain a proof of our goal, i.e. $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma(t/x), w : p(t'(\vec{t}/x)) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$.

The cases of rules for quantifiers deserve more attention. We show the cases of $(\exists L)$ and $(\forall L)$, as the other rules can be treated in a similar way.

$(\exists L)$: we need to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}(t/x), \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma(t/x), w : (\exists z\varphi)(t/x) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$, where we can safely assume that z is different from x and any variable appearing in t . First, we apply the induction hypothesis on the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \varphi(y/z) \vdash \Delta$, the premise of the rule, to obtain a proof of no greater height of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(y'/y), w : y(y'/y), \Gamma(y'/y), w : \varphi(y/z)(y'/y) \vdash \Delta(y'/y)$ with y' fresh and not appearing in t or x . Given that y was fresh, we have a proof of no greater height of the sequent $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y', \Gamma, w : \varphi(y'/z) \vdash \Delta$. We can apply the induction hypothesis again here to obtain a proof of no greater height of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), w : y'(t/x), \Gamma(t/x), w : \varphi(y'/z)(t/x) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$. Because of our choice of y' , we have that the latter sequent is equal to $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), w : y', \Gamma(t/x), w : \varphi(t/x)(y'/z) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$. Thus, we can reapply the rule $(\exists L)$ on the latter to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}(t/x), \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma(t/x), w : (\exists z\varphi)(t/x) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$.

$(\forall L)$: we need a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma(t/x), w : (\forall z\varphi)(t/x) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$ of no greater height, where we can safely assume that z is different from x and any variable appearing in t . We apply the induction hypothesis on the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \forall z\varphi, u : \varphi(t'/z) \vdash \Delta$, the premise of the rule, to obtain a proof of no greater height of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma, w : (\forall z\varphi)(t/x), u : \varphi(t'/z)(t/x) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$. Note that the latter is equal to $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma, w : (\forall z\varphi)(t/x), u : \varphi(t'(t/x)/z) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$. Clearly, in this sequent we still have that $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$. In addition to that, we have that $t'(t/x)$ is available to u . We can argue this point by a case distinction on the presence or not of x in t' . If x does not appear in t' , then $t'(t/x) = t'$, which is available for u as initially given. If x does appear in t' , then we have that there must be a v such that $v : x \in \mathcal{T}$ and $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ else t' would not be available in u . Consequently, we have that $v : x$ is replaced by $\{v : x' \mid x' \text{ appears in } t\}$ in $\mathcal{T}(t/x)$. This makes $t'(t/x)$ available for u . So, as $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $t'(t/x)$ is available to u we can apply $(\forall L)$ to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}(t/x), \Gamma(t/x), w : (\forall z\varphi)(t/x) \vdash \Delta(t/x)$ of no greater height than the proof initially considered. □

LEMMA 4.6. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The (iw) rule is hp-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

PROOF. The only problems that the addition of labeled formulae to a sequent can create have to do with the condition of freshness of a variable or a label. To make sure that there is no violation of these conditions, we can use Lemma 4.5 and our view that isomorphic sequents are identical to avoid any overlap with these critical variables or labels. Thus, for all rules we can simply use these lemmas on the premises if needed, apply the induction hypothesis on the potentially modified premises and then reapply the rule. □

LEMMA 4.8. *Let $C \in \{ID, CD\}$. The (wv) rule is hp-admissible in $LBIQ(C)$.*

PROOF. The addition of a further labeled variable can only alter freshness of variable conditions. So, we only need to pay attention to the rules involving such conditions and apply Lemma 4.5 before applying the induction hypothesis. \square

LEMMA 4.9. *Let $C \in \{ID, CD\}$. The rules $(\perp R)$ and $(\top L)$ are hp-admissible in $LBIQ(C)$.*

PROOF. We focus on $(\perp R)$ as $(\top L)$ can be treated dually. By inspecting the rules, one can see that the deletion of $w:\perp$ in the consequent of a sequent impacts the application of no rule. In particular, this deletion does not alter the reachability, availability or freshness conditions. As a consequence, a straightforward induction on the structure of the proof is sufficient to prove this statement: in the inductive cases, apply the induction hypothesis on the last rule applied, and then the rule. \square

LEMMA 4.10. *Let $C \in \{ID, CD\}$. The (lwr) rule is hp-admissible in $LBIQ(C)$.*

PROOF. We reason by induction on the height of proofs, and consider the last rule applied.

Obviously, the "local" propositional rules (which do not involve a condition on reachability) and (ds) are not impacted by the modification of the label, whether the principal formula is labeled by one of the labels under focus or not. For $(\neg L)$ we easily reach our goal by applying the induction hypothesis on the premise and then the rule as the principal formula cannot be the one under focus. However, the other non-local rules require more care.

(ax) : then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : p(\bar{t}) \vdash \Delta, u' : p(\bar{t})$ where $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$. We proceed by case distinction on the equality between w and u' . If $w = u'$, then we need to prove $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : p(\bar{t}) \vdash \Delta, u : p(\bar{t})$. Now, note that we have $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$ and $u' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ by assumption as $w = u'$. Consequently, we have that $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ by transitivity. An application of the rule (ax) leads us to our goal. If $w \neq u'$, then we can simply reapply the rule as the two labeled formulae are not modified.

$(\rightarrow R)$: then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, w' Ru', \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u' : \varphi \vdash \Delta, u' : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w' : \varphi \rightarrow \psi} (\rightarrow R)$$

If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $w' = w$. As we have $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and not $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$ because of the freshness of u' , we can use Lemma 4.2 to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, uRu', \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u' : \varphi \vdash \Delta, u' : \psi$. Then, it suffices to apply the rule $(\rightarrow R)$ to reach a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \rightarrow \psi$ of the adequate height. If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule.

$(\neg R)$: then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u' : \varphi \neg \psi, w' : \varphi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \psi \vdash \Delta, u' : \varphi \neg \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u' : \varphi \neg \psi} (\neg R)$$

If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule. If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $w = u'$. As we have $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* w$ by the rule application, we get $w' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ by transitivity. This allows us to apply the induction hypothesis in both premises to obtain proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \neg \psi, w' : \varphi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \neg \psi$. Then, it suffices to reapply the rule to obtain a proof of adequate height of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi \neg \psi$.

Let us now turn to the first order rules. For all the rules for quantifiers where the modified labeled formula cannot be principal, i.e. for $(\exists L)$ and $(\forall L)$, it suffices to apply the induction hypothesis in the premise, and then reapply the rule. So, we are left with the rules $(\forall R)$ and $(\exists R)$.

$(\forall R)$: then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, w' Ru', \mathcal{T}, u' : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u' : \varphi(y/x)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w' : \forall x \varphi} (\forall R)$$

If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule. If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $w' = w$. As we have $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and not $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$ because of the freshness of u' , we can use Lemma 4.2 to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, uRu', \mathcal{T}, u' : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u' : \varphi(y/x)$. Then, it suffices to apply the rule $(\forall R)$ to reach a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \forall x \varphi$ of the adequate height.

$(\exists R)$: then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w' : \exists x \varphi, w' : \varphi(t/x)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w' : \exists x \varphi} (\exists R)$$

If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule. If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $w' = w$. Then, we can apply the induction hypothesis on the premise twice to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \exists x \varphi, u : \varphi(t/x)$. Note that in this case, we have that $t \in \text{Ter}(X_u)$ as $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$. So, we can apply the rule ($\exists R$) to reach our goal. \square

LEMMA 4.11. *Let $C \in \{ID, CD\}$. The (*lft*) rule is hp-admissible in LBIQ(C).*

PROOF. The proof of this lemma is very similar in spirit to the proof of Lemma 4.10. Dually, the problematic rules here are (ds), ($\rightarrow L$), ($\neg L$), ($\exists L$) and ($\forall L$).

(ds) : then the last rule has the following form where $u : p(\vec{t})$ is the principal formula.

$$\frac{\frac{\pi_1}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : p(\vec{t}), u : VT(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} (ds)}$$

Applying the induction hypothesis to π_1 , we get a proof π_2 of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}), u : VT(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$ with the same height, from which we can obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$ as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}), u : VT(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}), w : VT(\vec{t}), u : VT(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} (wv)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}), w : VT(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} (id)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} (ds)}$$

The instance of (*id*) above is applicable because $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$. The hp-admissibility of (*lft*) in this case then follows from Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.8.

($\rightarrow L$) : then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u' : \varphi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, u' : \psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} (\rightarrow L)}$$

If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule. If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $u = w'$. As we have $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$ by the rule application, we get $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$ by transitivity. This allows us to apply the induction hypothesis in both premises to obtain proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u' : \varphi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, u' : \psi \vdash \Delta$. Then, it suffices to reapply the rule to obtain a proof of adequate height of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta$.

($\neg L$) : then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, u' R w', \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u' : \varphi \vdash \Delta, u' : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \varphi \neg \psi \vdash \Delta} (\neg L)}$$

If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule. If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $u = w'$. As we have $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and not $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$ because of the freshness of u' , we can use Lemma 4.2 to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, u' R w, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u' : \varphi \vdash \Delta, u' : \psi$. Then, it suffices to apply the rule ($\neg L$) to reach a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \neg \psi \vdash \Delta$ of the adequate height.

($\exists L$) : then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w' : y, \Gamma, w' : \varphi(y/x) \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \exists x \varphi \vdash \Delta} (\exists L)}$$

If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule. If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $u = w'$. First, we can apply Lemma 4.8 on the premise to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, u : y, \Gamma, u : \varphi(y/x) \vdash \Delta$. Then, as $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ we apply Lemma 4.4 to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, u : \varphi(y/x) \vdash \Delta$. Finally, as all previous lemmas preserve height, it suffices to apply the induction hypothesis on this proof to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \varphi(y/x) \vdash \Delta$. A simple application of the rule ($\exists L$) reaches our goal.

($\forall L$) : then the last rule has the following form.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \forall x \varphi, u' : \varphi(t/x) \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w' : \forall x \varphi \vdash \Delta} (\forall L)}$$

If the principal formula is not the one we intend to modify, then we can use the induction hypothesis in the premise and reapply the rule. If the principal formula is the labeled formula we intend to modify, then we have that $u = w'$. Then, we can apply the induction hypothesis on the premise to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \forall x\varphi, u' : \varphi(t/x) \vdash \Delta$. Note that we have $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$ as $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u'$. So, we can apply the rule (\forall L) to reach our goal. \square

LEMMA 4.13. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules (\rightarrow L), (\rightarrow R), (\exists R), (\forall L) are hp-invertible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

PROOF. For (\rightarrow L): given a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta$, we can simply use height-preserving internal weakening (Lemma 4.6) to obtain proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \varphi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \varphi \rightarrow \psi, u : \psi \vdash \Delta$ of less or equal height.

For (\exists R): given a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \exists x\varphi$, we can simply use height-preserving internal weakening (Lemma 4.6) to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \exists x\varphi, w : \varphi(t/x)$ of less or equal height. \square

LEMMA 4.16. *Let $C \in \{\mathcal{ID}, \mathcal{CD}\}$. The rules (ctr_l) and (ctr_r) are hp-admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(C)$.*

PROOF. We simultaneously prove the hp-admissibility of the two rules. We reason by primary induction on the structure of φ (PIH) and secondary induction on the height of derivations (SIH). In each case, we consider the last rule applied, and whether φ is principal in that rule. We omit the cases of initial rules as they are straightforward.

We start by the rule (ctr_l). If φ is not principal in the last rule, then we proceed as usual by applying SIH on φ in the premises of the rule, and then the rule. Note that all rules which have their principal formula on the right fall in this category.

If φ is principal, then for the rules (\wedge L) and (\vee L) we use the invertibility lemmas proved previously, jointly with PIH. For the rules in which the principal formula is not deleted in the premises, i.e. (\rightarrow L) and (\forall L), we simply use SIH to contract the principal formula. We give the case of (\rightarrow L) as an example.

(\rightarrow L) : then the last rule has the following form, where $\varphi = \chi \rightarrow \psi$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \chi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi, u : \psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} (\rightarrow\text{L})$$

We can simply apply SIH on both premises to obtain proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \chi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi, u : \psi \vdash \Delta$. A simple application of the (\rightarrow R) gives us the desired result.

Finally, we are left with the rules (\rightarrow L) and (\exists L) which we treat individually.

(\rightarrow L) : then the last rule has the following form, where $\varphi = \chi \rightarrow \psi$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, uRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} (\rightarrow\text{L})$$

Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, uRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, uRw, vRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, v : \psi} \text{Lem.4.14}}{\mathcal{R}, uRw, vRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, v : \psi} \text{Lem.4.2}}{\mathcal{R}, uRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, u : \psi} \text{Lem.4.3}}{\mathcal{R}, uRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, u : \psi} \text{PIH}}{\mathcal{R}, uRw, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi} (\rightarrow\text{L})}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi \vdash \Delta} (\rightarrow\text{L})$$

First, we use the invertibility Lemma 4.14 on the initial premise. Second, we use Lemma 4.2 to push the branch vRw to u and obtain vRu . Third, we merge the points v and u using Lemma 4.3. Once this is done, we can apply the induction hypothesis PIH and reapply the rule.

(\exists L) : then the last rule has the following form, where $\varphi = \exists x\psi$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \psi(y/x), w : \exists x\psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \exists x\psi, w : \exists x\psi \vdash \Delta} (\exists\text{L})$$

Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \psi(y/x), w : \exists x\psi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, w : z, \Gamma, w : \psi(y/x), w : \psi(z/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.15}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, w : y, \Gamma, w : \psi(y/x), w : \psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.5}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \psi(y/x), w : \psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.4}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \psi(y/x), w : \psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{PIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, w : y, \Gamma, w : \psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta} (\exists\text{L})}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, w : \exists x\psi \vdash \Delta} (\exists\text{L})$$

First, we use the invertibility Lemma 4.15 on the initial premise. Second, we use Lemma 4.5 to rename the (fresh) variable z to y . Third, we contract the labeled variable $w : y$ using Lemma 4.4. Once this is done, we can apply the induction hypothesis PIH and reapply the rule.

Now, let us turn to the rule (ctr_r). If φ is not principal in the last rule, then we proceed as usual by applying SIH on φ in the premises of the rule, and then the rule. Note that this time, all rules which have their principal formula on the left fall in this category.

If φ is principal, then for the rules ($\wedge R$) and ($\vee R$) we use the invertibility lemmas proved previously, jointly with PIH. For the rules in which the principal formula is not deleted in the premises, i.e. (ds), ($\neg R$) and ($\exists R$), we simply use SIH to contract the principal formula. We give the case of ($\neg R$) as an example.

($\neg R$) : then the last rule has the following form, where $\varphi = \chi \neg \psi$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \chi \neg \psi, w : \chi \neg \psi, u : \chi \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi \vdash \Delta, w : \chi \neg \psi, w : \chi \neg \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \chi \neg \psi, w : \chi \neg \psi} (\neg R)$$

We can simply apply SIH on both premises to obtain proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \chi \neg \psi, u : \chi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi \vdash \Delta, w : \chi \neg \psi$. A simple application of the rule gives us the desired result.

Finally, we are left with the rules ($\rightarrow R$) and ($\forall R$) which we treat individually.

($\rightarrow R$) : then the last rule has the following form, where $\varphi = \chi \rightarrow \psi$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi} (\rightarrow R)$$

Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, wRv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, v : \psi} \text{Lem.4.14}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, uRv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, v : \psi} \text{Lem.4.2}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, u : \psi} \text{Lem.4.3}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi, u : \psi} \text{PIH}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \chi \vdash \Delta, u : \psi} (\rightarrow R)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \chi \rightarrow \psi} (\rightarrow R)$$

First, we use the invertibility Lemma 4.14 on the initial premise. Second, we use Lemma 4.2 to push the branch wRv to u and obtain uRv . Third, we merge the points v and u using Lemma 4.3. Once this is done, we can apply the induction hypothesis PIH and reapply the rule.

($\forall R$) : then the last rule has the following form, where $\varphi = \forall x\psi$.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x), w : \forall x\psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \forall x\psi, w : \forall x\psi} (\forall R)$$

Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x), w : \forall x\psi}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, wRv, \mathcal{T}, u : y, v : z, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x), v : \psi(z/x)} \text{Lem.4.15}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, uRv, \mathcal{T}, u : y, v : z, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x), v : \psi(z/x)} \text{Lem.4.2}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, u : z, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x), u : \psi(z/x)} \text{Lem.4.3}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x), u : \psi(y/x)} \text{Lem.4.5}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x), u : \psi(y/x)} \text{Lem.4.4}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x)} \text{PIH}}{\mathcal{R}, wRu, \mathcal{T}, u : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, u : \psi(y/x)} (\forall R)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \forall x\psi} (\forall R)$$

First, we use the invertibility Lemma 4.15 on the initial premise. Second, we use Lemma 4.2 to push the branch wRv to u and obtain uRv . Third, we merge the points v and u using Lemma 4.3. Fourth, we use Lemma 4.5 to rename the (fresh) variable z to y . Fifth, we contract the labeled variable $w : y$ using Lemma 4.4. Once this is done, we can apply the induction hypothesis PIH and reapply the rule. \square

THEOREM 4.17 (CUT-ELIMINATION). *The (cut) rule is admissible in $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{ID})$ and $\text{LBIQ}(\mathcal{CD})$.*

PROOF. We proceed by primary induction (PIH) on the structure of the cut formula, and secondary induction (SIH) on the sum of the height of proofs of the premises of the cut. Assume that we have proofs of the following form, with $w \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$.

$$\frac{\pi_1}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi} r_1 \quad \frac{\pi_2}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta} r_2$$

We prove that there is a derivation of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ by case distinction on r_1 and r_2 , the last rules applied in the above proofs.

(I) $r_1 = (\text{ax})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta_0, v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ where $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$. If $v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ is $w : \varphi$, then we have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}), u : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$ where $\Gamma = \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t})$. Given that $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$ and $v_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$, we can apply Lemma 4.11 on the latter to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}), v_0 : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$. Consequently, we obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$, i.e. of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$, using Lemma 4.16. If $v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ is not $w : \varphi$, then we have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0 : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta_0, v_1 : p(\vec{t})$ where $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$. The latter is easily provable using the rule (ax) .

(II) $r_1 = (\perp\text{L})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \perp \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ where $\Gamma = \Gamma_0, v : \perp$. Consequently, we know that that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \perp \vdash \Delta$. We straightforwardly prove the latter via a single application of $(\perp\text{L})$.

(III) $r_1 = (\top\text{R})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \top$. If $w : \varphi$ is $v : \top$, then we have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v : \top \vdash \Delta$. Thus, we obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ using Lemma 4.9. If $w : \varphi$ is not $v : \top$, then we have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \top$. A single application of $(\top\text{R})$ gets us to our goal.

(IV) $r_1 = (\text{ds})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$. Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}), u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$. We can apply Lemma 4.8 repetitively on the proof of the latter to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}), u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ which we call S , while preserving height. Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : VT(\vec{t}), \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} \text{ (ds)} \quad S}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : p(\vec{t}) \vdash \Delta} \text{ SIH}$$

Note that the instance of SIH is justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of its premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(V) $r_1 = (\wedge\text{L})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \wedge \chi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$. Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \wedge \chi \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \wedge \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$. We apply Lemma 4.12 on the proof of the latter sequent to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, v : \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ preserving height. Thus, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, v : \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, v : \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{ (}\wedge\text{L)}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \wedge \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{ SIH}$$

Note that the instance of SIH is justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of its premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(VI) $r_1 = (\wedge\text{R})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \psi \wedge \chi$ and we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v : \chi$. If $w : \varphi$ is $v : \psi \wedge \chi$, then we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \chi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi \wedge \chi \vdash \Delta$. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi \vdash \Delta, v : \chi} \text{ Lem.4.6} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi \wedge \chi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi, u : \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{ Lem.4.12}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \psi \vdash \Delta} \text{ PIH}}{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \quad \pi} \text{ PIH}$$

If $w : \varphi$ is not $v : \psi \wedge \chi$, then we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi, w : \varphi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \chi, w : \varphi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \wedge \chi$. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof displayed.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \wedge \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi} \text{ Lem.4.12}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi} \text{ SIH}}{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \chi, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \chi} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \wedge \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v : \chi} \text{ Lem.4.12}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \chi} \text{ SIH}}{\frac{\pi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v : \psi \wedge \chi} \text{ (}\wedge\text{R)}} \text{ SIH}$$

(VII) $r_1 = (\vee\text{L})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ and we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi$. Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \vee \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$. We apply Lemma 4.12 on the proof of the latter sequent to obtain proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta$ preserving height. Thus, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \chi \vdash \Delta, w : \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta} \text{ SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v : \psi \vee \chi, u : \varphi \vdash \Delta} \text{ SIH}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta} \pi \text{ (}\vee\text{L)}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta}$$

Note that both instances of SIH are justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of their premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(VIII) $r_1 = (\vee R)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v: \psi \vee \chi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v: \psi, v: \chi$. If $w: \varphi$ is $v: \psi \vee \chi$, then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi, v: \chi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta$. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof displayed.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.12} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta, v: \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \chi \vdash \Delta, v: \psi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi} \text{PIH} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \vee \chi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.12}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \pi \text{PIH}$$

If $w: \varphi$ is not $v: \psi \vee \chi$, then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi, v: \chi, w: \varphi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \vee \chi$. Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi, v: \chi, w: \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi, v: \chi} \text{SIH} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \vee \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi, v: \chi} \text{Lem.4.12}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \vee \chi} \text{(}\vee\text{R)}$$

(IX) $r_1 = (\rightarrow L)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ and we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi, v_0: \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ such that $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_0$. Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$. Given that $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v$, we apply Lemma 4.13 on the proof of the latter sequent to obtain proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta, v: \psi$, which we call S_0 , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v: \chi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$, which we call S_1 , preserving height. Thus, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof displayed.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi, v: \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, v: \psi} S_0 \text{SIH} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v: \chi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v: \chi \vdash \Delta} S_1 \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v: \chi \vdash \Delta} \pi \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{(}\rightarrow\text{L)}$$

Note that both instances of SIH are justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of their premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(X) $r_1 = (\rightarrow R)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta_0, v_0: \chi$.

If $w: \varphi$ is not $v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$, then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta_1, v_0: \chi, w: \varphi$, which we call S , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$. Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}{\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta_1, v_0: \chi} \text{Lem.4.14} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta_1, v_0: \chi}{\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta_1, v_0: \chi} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} S \text{(}\rightarrow\text{R)}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}$$

If $w: \varphi$ is $v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$, then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_0: \chi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta$. In this case, we need to consider the shape of r_2 . If $u: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ is not principal in r_2 , then we use the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ with SIH to cut $u: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ from the premises of r_2 , and then reapply r_2 to reach our goal. If $u: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ is principal in r_2 , then the premises of r_2 are of the shape $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, v_1: \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_1: \chi \vdash \Delta$ where $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$. Then, we proceed as follows where π_0 and π_1 are (in this order) the first proofs given.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_1: \psi, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} \text{Lem.4.6} \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, v_1: \psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_1: \psi} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_1: \psi}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1: \chi \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} \text{Lem.4.6} \quad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_1: \chi \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1: \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH} \\
\\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_0: \chi}{\mathcal{R}, v_1Rv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_0: \chi} \text{Lem.4.11}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_1: \chi} \text{Lem.4.3}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1: \psi \vdash \Delta} \pi_1 \text{PIH} \\
\frac{\pi_0}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{PIH}
\end{array}$$

(XI) $r_1 = (\neg\text{L})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ and we have proof of $\mathcal{R}, v_0Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi, v_0: \chi$. Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$. We apply Lemma 4.14 on the proof of the latter sequent to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, v_0Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0: \psi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta, v_0: \chi$, which we call S . Thus, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, v_0Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi, v_0: \chi}{\mathcal{R}, v_0Rv, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_0: \chi} S}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH} \quad (\neg\text{L})$$

Note that the instance of SIH is justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of the premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(XII) $r_1 = (\neg\text{R})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ and we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_0: \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta_0, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ where $v_0 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v$.

If $w: \varphi$ is not $v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$, then we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_0: \psi, w: \varphi$, which we call S_0 , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, w: \varphi$, which we call S_1 , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof displayed.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_0: \psi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_0: \psi} \text{SIH}}{S_0} \\
\\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} \text{SIH}}{S_1} \\
\frac{\pi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} (\neg\text{R})
\end{array}$$

If $w: \varphi$ is $v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$, then we have proofs of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi, v_0: \psi$ and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \chi \Delta$. In this case, we need to consider the shape of r_2 . If $u: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ is not principal in r_2 , then we use the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ with SIH to cut $u: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ from the premises of r_2 , and then reapply r_2 to reach our goal. If $u: \psi \rightarrow \chi$ is principal in r_2 , then the premise of r_2 is of the shape $\mathcal{R}, v_1Ru, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_1: \chi$. Then, we proceed as follows where π_0 and π_1 are (in this order) the first proofs given.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_0: \psi, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_0: \psi} \text{SIH} \\
\\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta, v: \psi \rightarrow \chi} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi, v_0: \chi \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH} \\
\\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, uRv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_1: \chi}{\mathcal{R}, v_1Rv_0, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_1: \chi} \text{Lem.4.10}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta, v_0: \chi} \text{Lem.4.3}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta} \pi_1 \text{PIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_0: \psi \vdash \Delta} \pi_0 \text{PIH} \\
\frac{\pi_0}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{PIH}
\end{array}$$

(XIII) $r_1 = (\exists\text{L})$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \exists x \psi \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$ and we have proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v: x, \Gamma_0, v: \psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta, w: \varphi$, which we call S . Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \exists \psi \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v: \exists x \psi, u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$. We apply Lemma 4.15 on the proof of the latter sequent to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v: z, \Gamma_0, v: \psi(z/x), u: \varphi \vdash \Delta$. Thus, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{S \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v:z, \Gamma_0, v:\psi(z/x), u:\varphi \vdash \Delta \quad \text{Lem.4.5}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v:y, \Gamma_0, v:\psi(y/x), u:\varphi \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v:y, \Gamma_0, v:\psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta} (\exists\text{L})}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\exists\psi \vdash \Delta}$$

Note that the instance of SIH is justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of the premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.
(XIV) $r_1 = (\exists R)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w:\varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v:\exists x\psi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v:\exists x\psi, v:\psi(t/x)$ where t is available for v .

If $w:\varphi$ is not $v:\exists x\psi$, then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v:\exists x\psi, v:\psi(t/x), w:\varphi$, which we call S , and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v:\exists x\psi$. Then, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{S \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v:\exists x\psi \quad \text{Lem.4.13}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v:\exists x\psi, v:\psi(t/x)} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v:\exists x\psi, v:\psi(t/x)} (\exists R)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v:\exists x\psi}$$

If $w:\varphi$ is $v:\exists x\psi$, then we have proof a of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v:\exists x\psi, v:\psi(t/x)$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\exists x\psi \vdash \Delta$. In this case, we need to consider the shape of r_2 . If $u:\exists x\psi$ is not principal in r_2 , then we use the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v:\exists x\psi$ with SIH to cut $u:\exists x\psi$ from the premises of r_2 , and then reapply r_2 to reach our goal. If $u:\exists x\psi$ is principal in r_2 , then the premise of r_2 is of the shape $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v:y, \Gamma, v:\psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta$ where y is fresh. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof given and x_0, \dots, x_n are all the variables appearing in t .

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v:\exists x\psi, v:\psi(t/x) \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\exists x\psi \vdash \Delta \quad \text{Lem.4.6}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\exists x\psi \vdash \Delta, v:\psi(t/x)} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v:\psi(t/x)}}{\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v:y, \Gamma, v:\psi(y/x) \vdash \Delta \quad \text{Lem.4.5}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v:x_0, \dots, v:x_n, \Gamma, v:\psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{Lem.4.4}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v:\psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{PIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \pi}$$

Note that the step involving Lemma 4.4 is justified as t is available for v , which implies that we can push all its variables to the original labels making t available for v .

(XV) $r_1 = (\forall L)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w:\varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall x\psi \vdash \Delta, w:\varphi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall x\psi, v_0:\psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta, w:\varphi$ where $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_0$ and t is available for v_0 . Consequently, we know that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall x\psi \vdash \Delta$. We also have that $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall x\psi, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta$. We apply Lemma 4.13 on the proof of the latter sequent to obtain a proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall x\psi, v_0:\psi(t/x), u:\varphi \vdash \Delta$, which we call S . Thus, we proceed as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall x\psi, v_0:\psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta, w:\varphi \quad S}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall x\psi, v_0:\psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma_0, v:\forall\psi \vdash \Delta} (\forall L)}$$

Note that the instance of SIH is justified as the sum of the heights of the proofs of the premises is smaller than the one of the initial cut.

(XVI) $r_1 = (\forall R)$: Then $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w:\varphi$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v:\forall x\psi$ and we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, v_0:y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_0, v_0:\psi(y/x)$, which we call S , where y is fresh.

If $w:\varphi$ is not $v:\forall x\psi$, then we have a proof of $\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, v_0:y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v_0:\psi(y/x), w:\varphi$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v:\forall x\psi$. Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof displayed.

$$\frac{S \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v:\forall x\psi \quad \text{Lem.4.15}}{\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, v_0:y, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta_1, v_0:\psi(y/x)} \text{SIH}}{\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, v_0:y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v_0:\psi(y/x)} (\forall R)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta_1, v:\forall x\psi} \pi$$

If $w:\varphi$ is $v:\forall x\psi$, then we have proof a of $\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, v_0:y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_0:\psi(y/x)$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\varphi \vdash \Delta$ is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\forall x\psi \vdash \Delta$. In this case, we need to consider the shape of r_2 . If $u:\forall x\psi$ is not principal in r_2 , then we use the proof of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v:\forall x\psi$ with SIH to cut $u:\forall x\psi$ from the premises of r_2 , and then reapply r_2 to reach our goal. If $u:\forall x\psi$ is principal in r_2 , then the premise of r_2 is of the shape $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, u:\forall x\psi, v_1:\psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta$, which we call S , where $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$ and t is available for v_1 . Then, we proceed as follows where π is the first proof given and x_0, \dots, x_n are all the variables appearing in t .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{R}, vRv_0, \mathcal{T}, v_0 : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v_0 : \psi(y/x)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi(y/x)} \text{Lem.4.3} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi(y/x)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : x_0, \dots, v : x_n, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi(t/x)} \text{Lem.4.5} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, v : x_0, \dots, v : x_n, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi(t/x)}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \psi(t/x)} \text{Lem.4.4} \\
\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, v : \forall x\psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1 : \psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta, v : \forall x\psi} \text{Lem.4.6} \\
\frac{\pi \quad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1 : \psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta, v : \forall x\psi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma, v_1 : \psi(t/x) \vdash \Delta} \text{PIH} \quad S}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{SIH}
\end{array}$$

Note that the step involving Lemma 4.4 is justified as t is available for v , which implies that we can push all its variables to the original labels making t available for v . In addition to that, the use of PIH is justified by the holding of $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$ which we infer from $v \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ and $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* v_1$. \square

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009