

Syntactic Cut-Elimination for Provability Logic **GL** via Nested Sequents

Akinori Maniwa

Tokyo Institute of Technology
Tokyo, Japan

maniwa.a.aa@m.titech.ac.jp

Ryo Kashima

Tokyo Institute of Technology
Tokyo, Japan

kashima@is.titech.ac.jp

The cut-elimination procedure for the provability logic is known to be problematic: a Löb-like rule keeps cut-formulae intact on reduction, even in the principal case, thereby complicating the proof of termination. In this paper, we present a syntactic cut-elimination proof based on nested sequents, a generalization of sequents that allows a sequent to contain other sequents as single elements. A similar calculus was developed by Poggiolesi (2009), but there are certain ambiguities in the proof. Adopting the idea of Kushida (2020) into nested sequents, our proof does not require an extra measure on cuts or error-prone, intricate rewriting on derivations, but only straightforward inductions, thus leading to less ambiguity and confusion.

Keywords: Cut-elimination · Provability logic · Nested sequents · Proof theory

1 Introduction

The provability logic **GL**, named after Gödel and Löb, is a modal logic extending **K** with the Löb axiom $\Box(\Box A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \Box A$, where $\Box A$ can be roughly read as “ A is provable in Peano arithmetic” (see, e.g., Boolos [2] for more details). Computationally, the Löb axiom represents a kind of recursion (e.g., [8, 12]), and indeed in Kripke semantics the axiom is interpreted as just an induction on its model. Therefore, **GL** exhibits a certain “recursiveness” as its nature.

From a proof-theoretical viewpoint, a sequent calculus for **GL** is obtained by the following single modal rule [10]:

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Box\Gamma, \Box A \Rightarrow A}{\Gamma', \Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Box A, \Delta} \text{ (GLR)}$$

where $\Box A$ is called *diagonal formula*. It is not difficult to prove the cut-elimination theorem using semantical arguments [16, 1], but syntactically, the diagonal formula is quite problematic: it appears in both the premise and the conclusion of (GLR), so the standard double induction on the cut-formula and height fails.

Valentini [18] proposed a proof using a third induction parameter, called the *width* of a cut, to justify the reduction involving the rule (GLR). Nevertheless, Valentini’s proof is very brief and only describes the principal cases for (GLR), which raised a question about its termination (see [6, 11]). In response, Goré and Ramanayake [6] confirmed the validity of Valentini’s arguments by carefully analyzing the notion of width, but also pointed out, overlooked by Valentini, that the width can be increased by reduction in some cases [6, Remark 21]. Although such an increase is certainly acceptable [6, Lemma 19], it makes their proof more complicated and non-trivial.

In this paper, we propose a more clarifying approach to syntactic cut-elimination for **GL**; unlike Valentini’s, our calculus is based on *nested sequents* [7, 4, 14]. A similar calculus was developed by

Poggiolesi [15], along with a syntactic cut-elimination proof using a third induction parameter specific to its sequent structure. This proof is rather simple and seemingly sound, but there are still certain ambiguities around the third parameter (see Section 3), and thus the termination is again imprecise. These matters suggest that while an additional measure on cuts could indeed resolve the problem, it would not necessarily lead to a straightforward triple-induction proof, but might require more careful checks, even where there seems less troublesome.

Instead of following the triple-induction approach, we adopt the idea presented in Kushida [9], also in Borga [3], of introducing a subprocedure, called *diagonal-formula-elimination* in this paper, that removes the diagonal formula in the premise prior to the reduction in question. This helps us avoid the problematic cut-reduction and recover the standard double induction proof of cut-elimination. The advantage of nested sequents in employing this method is that, thanks to their sequent structure, it is easier to talk about where the diagonal formula is used in a derivation. We take this advantage further by introducing *annotations*, demonstrating that the nested-sequent basis allows for much more concise and clear arguments, based solely on a series of straightforward inductions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 defines a nested sequent calculus for **GL**, and Section 3 illustrates the problem on the cut-reduction method and gives an overview of our approach. Section 4 introduces an auxiliary calculus with additional information on the use of the diagonal formula. Section 5 demonstrates the procedure for eliminating diagonal formulae, which leads to the cut-elimination theorem in Section 6. Finally, we conclude with some discussions in Section 7.

2 The Calculus

In this section, we introduce a nested sequent calculus for **GL** with a one-sided formulation. Our system is not very special as a nested sequent calculus, so we only give a brief description here. For a more detailed and general introduction to nested sequent calculus itself, see, e.g., Brünnler [4].

A *formula* is defined by the following grammar:

$$A, B ::= \alpha \mid \alpha^\perp \mid A \wedge B \mid A \vee B \mid \Box A \mid \Diamond A,$$


where α and α^\perp denote positive and negative atoms respectively, both taken from a certain countable set. The *negation* A^\perp of a formula A is defined inductively in the usual way of extending duality on atoms using De Morgan's laws. We may use $A \rightarrow B$ as an abbreviation for $A^\perp \vee B$.

A (*nested*) *sequent* is defined by the following grammar:

$$\Gamma, \Delta ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, A \mid \Gamma, [\Delta],$$

where “ \cdot ” denotes an empty sequent, and the notation $[\Delta]$ indicates that the sequent Δ is being placed as an element in another sequent (i.e., *nested*). We may apply exchange implicitly as usual, so for example, we identify $A, B, [C], [D, [E]]$ with $B, [C], A, [[E], D]$. The juxtaposition of two sequents Γ and Δ is written simply with a comma “ $,$ ” as Γ, Δ as usual.

Intuitively, a nested sequent represents a tree consisting of ordinary sequents (i.e., multisets of formulae) by means of the bracket $[-]$ nesting; for example, the sequent $A, [[B], [C, D]], [E, [F, G, H]]$ corresponds to the following tree structure:



$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Gamma\{\alpha^\perp, \alpha\}} \text{(id)} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{A\} \quad \Gamma\{B\}}{\Gamma\{A \wedge B\}} (\wedge) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{A, B\}}{\Gamma\{A \vee B\}} (\vee) \\
\frac{\Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\}}{\Gamma\{\Box A\}} (\Box) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{\Delta\{A\}, \diamond A\}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{\cdot\}, \diamond A\}} (\diamond) \text{ if } \text{depth}(\Delta\{-\}) > 0
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: Inference rules for **GL**.

By considering such a tree as a shape within a Kripke model, we can obtain modal rules directly from Kripke semantics. From the perspective of structural proof theory, on the other hand, $[-]$ is a structure corresponding to \Box , just as “,” is to \vee , allowing for modal reasoning in an analytic way.

Before getting into our proof system, we need to introduce the notion of *context*. A *unary context* is informally a sequent with a single *hole* $\{-\}$ as a placeholder, formally defined by the following grammar:

$$\Gamma\{-\} ::= \Delta, \{-\} \mid \Delta, [\Gamma\{-\}].$$

Given a unary context $\Gamma\{-\}$ and a sequent Δ , we write $\Gamma\{\Delta\}$ for the sequent obtained by replacing $\{-\}$ with Δ in $\Gamma\{-\}$. For instance, $\Gamma\{-\} \equiv A, [B, C], [D, \{-\}]$ is a unary context, and then $\Gamma\{E, [F, G]\}$ represents the sequent $A, [B, C], [D, E, [F, G]]$. When filling an empty sequent into a context, we omit its symbol “.” from the result; that is, $\Gamma\{\cdot\}$ means the sequent $\Gamma\{\cdot\}$, which is of course also distinguished from the context $\Gamma\{-\}$. A *binary context* $\Gamma\{-_1\}\{-_2\}$, a sequent with two distinct holes of $\{-_1\}$ and $\{-_2\}$, is formally defined and used in a similar way.

Definition 2.1 (Depth). The *depth* of a unary context is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{depth}(\Delta, \{-\}) &= 0; \\
\text{depth}(\Delta, [\Gamma\{-\}]) &= \text{depth}(\Gamma\{-\}) + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

It is, in short, the nesting depth of the bracket $[-]$ at the hole $\{-\}$ position.

Figure 1 shows the inference rules of our system. The non-modal rule are fairly standard, except for the form of sequents. The rule (\Box) is a kind of the Löb rule, as is the rule (GLR) , and is the only rule in the system that consumes a $[-]$. Reflecting the transitivity of **GL**-models, we can deduce $\diamond A$ by the rule (\diamond) from A at a deeper location within several $[-]$'s. A contraction for $\diamond A$ is incorporated into the rule (\diamond) to ensure the admissibility of contraction (Lemma 2.6).

This is indeed a complete proof system for **GL** in the following sense, but we omit the proof here.

Theorem 2.2 (Completeness). *A formula A is a theorem of **GL** if and only if the sequent A is provable in the calculus.*

Example (The Löb axiom). A proof of $\Box(\Box\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \Box\alpha \equiv \Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp) \vee \Box\alpha$ is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Box\alpha} \text{(id)} \\
\frac{\Box\alpha}{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \alpha^\perp]]} \text{(\Diamond)} \\
\frac{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \alpha^\perp]]}{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \Box\alpha]} \text{(\Box)} \quad \frac{}{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \alpha^\perp]} \text{(id)} \\
\frac{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \Box\alpha] \quad \Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \alpha^\perp]}{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp]} \text{(\wedge)} \\
\frac{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp]}{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]} \text{(\Diamond)} \\
\frac{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\Diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]}{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), \Box\alpha} \text{(\Box)} \\
\frac{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), \Box\alpha}{\Diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp) \vee \Box\alpha} \text{(\vee)} \quad \lrcorner
\end{array}$$

Remark. Poggiolesi [15] also developed a nested sequent calculus for **GL**, but under the name *tree-hypersequents*, with a two-sided representation. The main difference¹ is the rules for \Diamond (or, the left rules for \Box). Poggiolesi instead employed the following two rules (but in our notation):

$$\frac{\Gamma\{\Delta, \Box A^\perp\}, \Diamond A \quad \Gamma\{\Delta, A\}, \Diamond A}{\Gamma\{\Delta\}, \Diamond A} \quad \frac{\Gamma\{\Delta, \Diamond A\}, \Diamond A}{\Gamma\{\Delta\}, \Diamond A}$$

Nevertheless, there is no essential difference, especially as for provability. We shall discuss Poggiolesi's cut-elimination proof in Section 3. \lrcorner

Definition 2.3 (Cut). A *cut* in our calculus has the following form:

$$\frac{\Gamma\{A\} \quad \Gamma\{A^\perp\}}{\Gamma\{ \}} \text{(cut)}$$

The *height* of a derivation is defined in the standard manner, i.e., the maximum length of consecutive applications of inference rules in that derivation. Several common rules required for the cut-elimination procedure are shown to be (height-preserving) admissible:

Lemma 2.4 (Inversion). *The following rules are height-preserving admissible:*

$$\frac{\Gamma\{A \wedge B\}}{\Gamma\{A\}} \text{(\wedge)}^{-1} \quad \frac{\Gamma\{A \wedge B\}}{\Gamma\{B\}} \text{(\wedge)}^{-1} \quad \frac{\Gamma\{A \vee B\}}{\Gamma\{A, B\}} \text{(\vee)}^{-1} \quad \frac{\Gamma\{\Box A\}}{\Gamma\{\Diamond A^\perp, A\}} \text{(\Box)}^{-1}$$

Proof. By induction on derivation. \square

Lemma 2.5 (Identity). *The following rule is admissible:*

$$\frac{}{\Gamma\{A^\perp, A\}} \text{(id)}$$

Proof. By induction on A . \square

Lemma 2.6 (Structural rules). *The following rules are height-preserving admissible:*

$$\frac{\Gamma\{ \}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\}} \text{(weak)} \quad \frac{\Gamma\{A, A\}}{\Gamma\{A\}} \text{(contract)} \quad \frac{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, [\Delta']\}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{\Delta'\}\}} \text{(rebase) if } \text{depth}(\Delta\{ \}) > 0$$

Proof. By induction on derivation, along with Lemma 2.4. \square

Semantically, the rebasing rule is to instantiate an arbitrary transition denoted by $[-]$ into a more concrete one described by $\Delta\{ \}$, and its side-condition corresponds to the transitivity, as in the rule (\Diamond) .

¹ Another difference is a form of cut, which shall be discussed in Section 7.

3 Problem on Cut-Reduction

In this section, we explain why the standard cut-reduction method does not work as expected for **GL**, even in nested sequents, together with the problem with Poggiolesi's proof. We also give an overview of our approach with an informal description of our rewriting procedure.

The standard double induction fails in the principal case of \diamond and \square :

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \diamond A^\perp\} \end{array} \quad (\diamond) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \end{array} \quad (\square) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, \diamond A^\perp\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, \square A\} \quad (\text{cut}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \\
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}\} \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \end{array} \quad (\square) \\
 \hline
 \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \diamond A^\perp\} \end{array} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, \square A\} \quad (\text{weak}) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \square A\} \quad (\text{cut})^{*1} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp, A^\perp\}\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \quad (\text{weak}) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp, A^\perp\}\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \quad (\text{rebase}) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp, A^\perp\}\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp, A^\perp\}\} \quad (\text{cut})^{*2} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp\}\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \quad (\text{weak}) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp\}\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \quad (\text{rebase}) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp\}\} \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \quad (\text{cut})^{*3} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\Delta\{\}\}
 \end{array} \quad (3.1)$$

The first cut^{*1} is admissible because of the smaller derivation of the left premise, and so is the second cut^{*2} because of the smaller size of the cut-formula, but neither is small for the third cut.^{*3}

Naïve Attempt. Although the cut-formula stays the same, it can be seen that on the third cut, compared to the original, the cut-formula $\diamond A^\perp$ has moved by the depth of $\Delta\{-}$ toward the leaves of the tree represented by the sequent $\Gamma\{\Delta\{\}\}$. So one might think that the reduction could be justified by appealing to the remaining distance to the leaves, namely, by induction on the following lexicographic ordering:

- (i) The size of the cut-formula;
- (ii) The maximum number of steps required for the cut-formula to reach a leaf; and
- (iii) The total height of the premise derivations.

This approach, unfortunately, does not work as expected: the well-foundedness of the ordering requires that a tree not grow its branches due to the reductions admitted by condition (iii), which is in fact not true in the following case:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\{B\}\} \end{array} \quad (\square) \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \Gamma\{\square A\}\{B^\perp\} \end{array} \quad (\text{cut}) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\square A\}\{B\} \quad \Gamma\{\square A\}\{B^\perp\} \quad (\text{cut}) \quad \rightsquigarrow \\
 \Gamma\{\square A\}\{\} \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\{B\}\} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \Gamma\{\square A\}\{B^\perp\} \end{array} \quad (\square)^{-1} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\{B\}\} \quad \Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\{B^\perp\}\} \quad (\text{cut}) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\}\{\} \quad \Gamma\{\square A\}\{B^\perp\} \quad (\square)^{-1} \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\}\{\} \quad \Gamma\{\square A\}\{\} \quad (\square) \\
 \hline
 \Gamma\{\square A\}\{\}
 \end{array} \quad (3.2)$$

This permutation exposes the $[-]$ previously discharged by (\square) in the left premise, potentially increasing the measure (ii).² Even were we to address this case by considering the number of \square 's as well as of $[-]$'s in (ii), it would impose a strong restriction on weakening, thus breaking the argument in other cases.

Poggiolesi's Approach. Poggiolesi [15] proposed a similar triple-induction proof using the notion of *position* instead of the measure (ii). The position is, in brief, a variant of (ii) that estimates the maximum number of steps by considering not just the end-sequent but also all sequents appearing in a derivation, whereby the reduction (3.2) is no longer a problem. However, this rather causes trouble with the third cut mentioned above. More specifically, Poggiolesi's admissible rule $(\tilde{4})$ [15, Lemma 4.10], analogous to our the rule (rebase), is used to move a subtree upwards on reduction [15, Lemma 4.26-Case 3.2-4(a)], which can cause an increase in position since rewriting subderivations affects the position on the end-sequent. Such an operation is essential for the interaction between \diamond and \square , and the transitive property makes the trouble unavoidable.

Poggiolesi's approach basically follows the work by Negri [13], presented a proof based on *labeled sequents* with an additional parameter called *range*, similar to the position but defined in terms of labels. Both position and range attempt to capture the well-foundedness of **GL**-models by means of their sequent structures, but there are crucial differences. Negri used *label substitution* [13, Lemma 4.3] to achieve the required transformation without increasing range, which makes the triple-induction proof effective. Here, it takes advantage of the fact that a substitution yields a *graph* structure rather than a tree, and precisely for this reason, such an operation cannot be fully reproduced in nested sequents. Poggiolesi seems to have overlooked this point, and consequently, without filling this gap, the argument would be inadequate to simulate Negri's method.

Our Approach. As in the case of Valentini, a more detailed analysis might make up for this piece, but contrary to Poggiolesi's expectation, even in nested sequents it is not so obvious how to make triple induction work. In addition, adding a third induction parameter is annoying since it has a relatively broad impact on the overall induction, which induces oversights in some boring cases such as permutations. The triple-induction approach is not so ideal for these reasons, and a more reliable method based on more intuitive and purely syntactic concept is desirable.

The reason why the problematic third cut is necessary is to eliminate the diagonal formula $\diamond A^\perp$ in the premise of (\square) ; if we could do that in any other way, then the problem should be resolved. Kushida [9] showed that it is indeed possible by relying on cuts only on A (notice, not on $\diamond A^\perp$), motivated by a syntactic cut-elimination proof for provability logic **S** [17] in ordinary sequents.

Let us review the basic idea of Kushida [9], but in the form of nested sequents. Suppose $\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp, A\}\}$ is cut-free provable with a derivation \mathcal{D} , and consider dropping $\diamond A^\perp$ to obtain $\Gamma\{A\}$. If $\diamond A^\perp$ is not used in \mathcal{D} at all, then we can remove it from all initial sequents of \mathcal{D} to obtain a derivation of $\Gamma\{A\}$. Otherwise, there must be a pair of relevant applications of (\diamond) and (\square) in \mathcal{D} , as shown in Figure 2a. For simplicity, assume that the rule (\diamond) is not applied with the $\diamond A^\perp$ in \mathcal{D}_1 , \mathcal{D}_2 , and \mathcal{D}_3 . Then, to obtain $\Gamma\{A\}$, we need to erase the assumption A^\perp in the premise of (\diamond) ^{*4} without using (\diamond) .

Next, we consider how to erase A^\perp . This is done in the following steps. First, truncate \mathcal{D} above the application of (\square) ,^{*5} including the use of (\diamond) , by adding $\diamond B^\perp$ as an assumption (Figure 2b). Then return to the original \mathcal{D} and erase A^\perp by a cut (Figure 2c), where many applications of admissible rules are required to adjust the shape of sequents. The added $\diamond B^\perp$ is dealt with as a diagonal formula and does

² For instance, take $\Gamma\{-1\}\{-2\} \equiv \{-1\}, \{-2\}$. Then, on the left-hand side the cut-formula B is already on the leaf, but on the right-hand side it can go one step ahead.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \mathcal{D}_3 \\
\frac{\Gamma''\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Theta, A^\perp]\}]\}}{\Gamma''\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Theta]\}]\}} (\diamond)^{*4} \\
\vdots \mathcal{D}_2 \\
\frac{\Gamma'\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta\{[\diamond B^\perp, B]\}]\}}{\Gamma'\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta\{\square B\}]\}} (\square)^{*5} \\
\vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \\
\Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \\
\text{(a) Original derivation } \mathcal{D}.
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Delta\{[\diamond B^\perp, B, B^\perp]\}]\}}{\Gamma'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Delta\{[\diamond B^\perp, B]\}]\}} (\diamond) \\
\frac{\Gamma'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Delta\{[\diamond B^\perp, B]\}]\}}{\Gamma'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Delta\{\square B\}]\}} (\square) \\
\vdots \mathcal{D}'_1 \\
\Gamma\{[\diamond B^\perp, A]\} \\
\text{(b) First step: Truncate the derivation above the applica-} \\
\text{tion of } (\square) \text{ by adding } \diamond B^\perp \text{ as an assumption.}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\vdots \mathfrak{b} \\
\Gamma\{[\diamond B^\perp, A]\} \\
\frac{\Gamma\{[\diamond B^\perp, A], [\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\Theta]\}]\}}{\Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Theta, A]\}]\}} (\text{weak}) \\
\frac{\Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Theta, A]\}]\}}{\Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Theta]\}]\}} (\text{rebase}) \\
\frac{\Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Theta]\}]\}}{\Gamma'''\{[\diamond A^\perp, \Delta'\{[\diamond B^\perp, \Theta]\}]\}} (\text{cut}) \\
\vdots \mathcal{D}'_2 + (\square) + \mathcal{D}''_1 \\
\Gamma\{[\diamond A^\perp, A]\} \\
\text{(c) Second step: Displace the application of } (\diamond) \text{ with a cut on } A.
\end{array}$$

Here \mathcal{D}'_1 , \mathcal{D}''_1 , and \mathcal{D}'_2 denote minor modifications of \mathcal{D}_1 , \mathcal{D}_1 , and \mathcal{D}_2 with admissible rules applied several times, respectively.

Figure 2: Overview of the diagonal-formula-elimination subprocedure.

not remain in the conclusion. The resulting derivation no longer requires the $\diamond A^\perp$, allowing us to obtain $\Gamma\{[A]\}$.

This is the base case of our rewriting process, and in general, it can be done by repeating this as many times as necessary. However, it requires global manipulation of the derivation and several tweaks of sub-derivations by admissible rules, making precise discussion difficult. In addition, it may seem a bit counterintuitive that even if only *two* instances of the rule (\diamond) are involved, at most *three* cuts are needed. To avoid pitfalls, we introduce *annotations* in the next section to allow for more precise arguments.

4 Annotated System

In this section, we introduce an auxiliary calculus with tiny annotations, which keep track of the use of diagonal formulae in a derivation.

An *annotated sequent* is defined by the following grammar:

$$\Gamma, \Delta ::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, C \mid \Gamma, \diamond A_\Sigma \mid \Gamma, [\Delta]_B,$$

where C is a formula not of the form $\diamond A$, and B and Σ are a formula and a set of formulae, respectively. Accordingly, there are two sorts of annotations, each with the following roles:

- $[-]_B$ indicates that the $[-]$ is to be discharged by applying the rule (\square) to B :

$$\frac{\Gamma\{\{\diamond B^\perp, B\}_B\}}{\Gamma\{\square B\}} (\square)$$

- The set Σ of $\diamond A_\Sigma$ records the provenances of A . That is, $B \in \Sigma$ implies that we have used the rule (\diamond) to A directly contained inside some $[-]_B$, absorbing it into the $\diamond A$:

$$\frac{\Gamma\{\Delta\{\{[\Delta', A]_B\}, \diamond A_\Sigma\}}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{[\Delta']_B\}, \diamond A_{\Sigma \cup \{B\}}\}} (\diamond)$$

This is all our annotations do, and we shall see in the next section that they do indeed provide sufficient information for induction.

To put it a little more strictly, for annotations to make sense, we require the following conditions be placed on the inference rules:

- An initial sequent shall contain only emptysets as an annotation to \diamond -formulae, since the rule (\diamond) has not yet been applied here.

$$\checkmark \frac{}{\diamond A_\emptyset, [\alpha, \alpha^\perp, \{\diamond B \wedge C\}_\alpha]_\beta} (\text{id}) \qquad \times \frac{}{\diamond A_{\{\alpha\}}, [\alpha, \alpha^\perp, [A]_\alpha]_\beta} (\text{id})$$

- Even if A comes out of multiple $[-]$'s by the rule (\diamond) , only the innermost one is essential.

$$\checkmark \frac{[[\Delta, A]_\alpha]_\beta, \diamond A_\Sigma}{[[\Delta]_\alpha]_\beta, \diamond A_{\Sigma \cup \{\alpha\}}} (\diamond) \qquad \times \frac{[[\Delta, A]_\alpha]_\beta, \diamond A_\Sigma}{[[\Delta]_\alpha]_\beta, \diamond A_{\Sigma \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}}} (\diamond) \qquad \times \frac{[[\Delta, A]_\alpha]_\beta, \diamond A_\Sigma}{[[\Delta]_\alpha]_\beta, \diamond A_{\Sigma \cup \{\beta\}}} (\diamond)$$

- We never use annotations for subformulae,³ so whenever logical rules are applied to \diamond -formulae, their annotations are simply discarded.

$$\checkmark \frac{\diamond A_\Sigma, \diamond B_\Pi}{\diamond A \vee \diamond B} (\vee) \qquad \times \frac{\diamond A_\Sigma, \diamond B_\Pi}{\diamond A_\Sigma \vee \diamond B_\Pi} (\vee) \qquad \times \frac{\diamond A_\Sigma \quad \diamond B_\Pi}{(\diamond A \wedge \diamond B)_{\Sigma \cup \Pi}} (\wedge)$$

$$\checkmark \frac{[\Delta, \diamond A_\Sigma]_\alpha, \diamond \diamond A_\Pi}{[\Delta]_\alpha, \diamond \diamond A_{\Pi \cup \{\alpha\}}} (\diamond) \qquad \times \frac{[\Delta, \diamond A_\Sigma]_\alpha, \diamond \diamond A_\Pi}{[\Delta]_\alpha, \diamond \diamond A_{\Sigma \cup \Pi \cup \{\alpha\}}} (\diamond)$$

- For the two-premise rules (i.e., (\wedge) and (cut)):

³This is because in those cases the induction works just fine due to the smaller formula sizes.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\Gamma\{\alpha^\perp, \alpha\}} \text{(id)}^{*a} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{A\} \quad \Gamma\{B\}}{\Gamma\{A \wedge B\}} (\wedge)^{*b,*c} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{A, B\}}{\Gamma\{A \vee B\}} (\vee)^{*b} \\
\frac{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, A\}_A}{\Gamma\{\Box A\}} (\Box)^{*b} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{\Delta\{[\Delta', A]_B\}, \diamond A_\Sigma\}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{[\Delta']_B\}, \diamond A_{\Sigma \cup \{B\}}\}} (\diamond)^{*b} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{A\} \quad \Gamma\{A^\perp\}}{\Gamma\{\}} (\text{cut})^{*c}
\end{array}$$

- a) $\Gamma[-]$ must contain only \emptyset as annotation sets. b) Discard the annotation(s) of A (and B) if exist(s).
c) Each $[-]$ must have the same annotation for premises. For each \diamond -formula, annotation sets are merged in the conclusion.

Figure 3: Inference rules with annotations.

- For each $[-]$, its annotation formula shall be *shared* by both premises; whereas
- For each \diamond -formula, its annotation set may be *independent* on two premises, and in the conclusion two sets are to be merged by set union \cup .

$$\checkmark \frac{A, \diamond C_{\{E,F\}}, \diamond D^\perp_\emptyset \quad B, \diamond C_{\{E\}}, \diamond D^\perp_{\{G\}}}{A \wedge B, \diamond C_{\{E,F\}}, \diamond D^\perp_{\{G\}}} (\wedge)$$

Since exchange may be used implicitly, it is not always possible to uniquely determined which formula of each premise is paired, but in that case anything is ok.

We may omit annotations if not important, and note that a mere $\diamond A^\perp$ does not imply $\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset$, but rather $\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma$ for some (possibly empty) Σ .

Example (The axiom (K)). A proof of $\Box(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \rightarrow \Box\alpha \rightarrow \Box\beta \equiv \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp) \vee (\diamond\alpha^\perp \vee \Box\beta)$ is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)_\emptyset, \diamond\alpha^\perp_\emptyset, [\diamond\beta^\perp_\emptyset, \beta, \alpha^\perp, \alpha]_\beta} \text{(id)} \\
\frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)_\emptyset, \diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\beta\}}, [\diamond\beta^\perp_\emptyset, \beta, \alpha]_\beta} (\diamond) \qquad \frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)_\emptyset, \diamond\alpha^\perp_\emptyset, [\diamond\beta^\perp_\emptyset, \beta, \beta^\perp]_\beta} \text{(id)} \\
\frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)_\emptyset, \diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\beta\}}, [\diamond\beta^\perp_\emptyset, \beta, \alpha \wedge \beta^\perp]_\beta} (\wedge) \\
\frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)_{\{\beta\}}, \diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\beta\}}, [\diamond\beta^\perp_\emptyset, \beta]_\beta} (\diamond) \\
\frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)_{\{\beta\}}, \diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\beta\}}, \Box\beta} (\Box) \\
\frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp)_{\{\beta\}}, \diamond\alpha^\perp \vee \Box\beta} (\vee) \\
\frac{}{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta^\perp) \vee (\diamond\alpha^\perp \vee \Box\beta)} (\vee)
\end{array}$$

We summarize the annotated system in Figure 3. Observe that the rules in Figure 3, with all annotations dropped, are exactly the same as those in Figure 1 and Definition 2.3, including in particular the rule (\diamond) . Also note that annotations are not a restriction, but merely clues, because, given an unannotated derivation, we can always lift it straightforwardly to an annotated one; more precisely, this is done by the following two steps:

1. First, we need to annotate all $[-]$'s appropriately. Look at a given derivation from bottom to top, and if we find that the rule (\Box) is applied to some A , then annotate $[-]$ there with A . Taking the

derivation of the Löb axiom (p. 95) as an example, there are two instances, annotated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), \Box\alpha} (\Box)}{\vdots} & \rightsquigarrow & \frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]_\alpha} {\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), \Box\alpha} (\Box) \\
 \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]]_\alpha} {\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \Box\alpha]_\alpha} (\Box)}{\vdots} & \rightsquigarrow & \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]]_\alpha} {\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \Box\alpha]_\alpha} (\Box)}{\vdots} (\Box)
 \end{array}$$

If the end-sequent contains $[-]$'s, their annotations are not important and may be annotated in any way.

- Then, annotate all \diamond -formulae in an initial sequent with an emptyset and, from top to bottom, collect their usage. In the case of the example (p. 95):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, \alpha^\perp]_\alpha]}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha, [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]_\alpha} (\Box)}{\vdots} (\text{id})}{\vdots} & \rightsquigarrow & \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)_\emptyset}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp_\emptyset, \alpha, [\diamond\alpha^\perp_\emptyset, \alpha, \alpha^\perp]_\alpha]}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)_\emptyset, [\diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\alpha\}}, \alpha, [\diamond\alpha^\perp_\emptyset, \alpha]_\alpha} (\Box)}{\vdots} (\text{id})}{\vdots} (\Box) \\
 \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)_\emptyset}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\alpha\}}, \alpha, \Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp]_\alpha} {\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp), [\diamond\alpha^\perp, \alpha]_\alpha} (\Box)}{\vdots} & \rightsquigarrow & \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)_\emptyset}, [\diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\alpha\}}, \alpha, \Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp]_\alpha} {\diamond(\Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp)_\emptyset, [\diamond\alpha^\perp_{\{\alpha\}}, \alpha, \Box\alpha \wedge \alpha^\perp]_\alpha} (\Box)}{\vdots} (\Box)}{\vdots} (\Box)
 \end{array}$$

Remark. The use of *sets* to annotate \diamond -formulae is not essential in our proof. In fact, it is possible to use *multisets* instead, but using sets makes the proof a bit simpler since we can deal with identical formulae at once (see Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4). \lrcorner

Hereafter, we shall focus on a fixed $\diamond A^\perp$ and treat a cut on A as a rather first-class inference rule. We write $\vdash \Gamma$ if the sequent Γ is cut-free provable, and $\vdash^A \Gamma$ if provable with cuts on A admitted. It is easily checked that the admissible rules in Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 are still admissible under proper annotations, with or without cuts; in particular, the following forms are admissible:

$$\frac{}{\vdash^A \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset\}\{B^\perp, B\}} (\text{id}) \quad \frac{\vdash^A \Gamma\{\}}{\vdash^A \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset\}} (\text{weak}) \quad \frac{\vdash^A \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma'}\}}{\vdash^A \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma \cup \Sigma'}\}} (\text{contract})$$

Lemma 4.1. *The following rule is admissible:*

$$\frac{\vdash^A \Gamma\{\Delta\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma\}\}}{\vdash^A \Gamma\{\Delta\}, \diamond A^\perp_\Sigma} (\text{cherry-pick})$$

Proof. By induction on derivation. \square

5 Diagonal-Formula-Elimination

In this section, we prove the key lemma of this paper by fully using annotations. Our goal is to show the following:

Lemma 5.1 (Diagonal-formula-elimination). *If $\vdash \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp, A\}$, then $\vdash^A \Gamma\{A\}$.*

We first show that in exchange for adding an extra assumption, we can reduce annotated formulae from $\diamond A^\perp$. This is similar to the step shown in Figure 2b, but we process all $[-]$'s annotated with the same formula at once.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \Delta\}$, and let $B \in \Sigma$. If Δ contains no $[-]$ annotated with B , then $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma'}, \diamond B^\perp, \Delta\}$ for some $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma \setminus \{B\}$.*

Proof. By induction on derivation. Here we show only two cases.

Case 1. The most important case is where the rule (\square) is applied to B within Δ :

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D} \\ \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \Delta'\{\diamond B^\perp, B\}_B\} \end{array}}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \Delta'\{\square B\}\}} (\square)$$

We cannot then use the induction hypothesis because the newly appearing $[-]_B$ in the premise breaks the requirement of the claim. So instead, we derive the desired sequent without using \mathcal{D} as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset, \diamond B^\perp, \Delta'\{\diamond B^\perp, B, B^\perp\}_B\}}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset, \diamond B^\perp, \Delta'\{\diamond B^\perp, B\}_B\}} (\text{id})}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset, \diamond B^\perp, \Delta'\{\diamond B^\perp, B\}_B\}} (\diamond)}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset, \diamond B^\perp, \Delta'\{\square B\}\}} (\square)$$

Case 2. Suppose

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D} \\ \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \Delta'\{A^\perp\}\} \end{array}}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma \cup \{C\}}, \Delta'\{\}\}} (\diamond)$$

By assumption, we have $C \neq B$; otherwise, there exists a $[-]_B$ within $\Delta'\{-}$, a contradiction. Hence $B \in \Sigma$, and using the induction hypothesis we have the following:

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D} \\ \Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \Delta'\{A^\perp\}\} \end{array}}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma'}, \diamond B^\perp, \Delta'\{A^\perp\}\}} (\text{IH})}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma' \cup \{C\}}, \diamond B^\perp, \Delta'\{\}\}} (\diamond)$$

where $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma \setminus \{B\}$, and so $\Sigma' \cup \{C\} \subseteq (\Sigma \cup \{C\}) \setminus \{B\}$ as required.

The other cases are straightforward. □

Definition 5.3. Let Δ be an annotated sequent. Then, the sequent Δ^+ is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\cdot)^+ &\equiv \cdot; \\ (\Gamma, C)^+ &\equiv \Gamma^+, C; \\ (\Gamma, [\Delta]_C)^+ &\equiv \Gamma^+, [\Delta^+, \diamond C^\perp]_C. \end{aligned}$$

The weakened context $\Delta^+\{-\}$ for $\Delta\{-\}$ is defined in a similar way.

In short, Δ^+ is the sequent in which all subsequents of the form $[\Delta']_C$ within Δ are weakened to $[\Delta', \diamond C^\perp]_C$ with the diagonal formula $\diamond C^\perp$. For example, $(A, [[B]_B, [C, D]_E]_C)^+$ represents the sequent

$$A, [[B, \diamond B^\perp]_B, [C, D, \diamond E^\perp]_E, \diamond C^\perp]_C.$$

We next show that the extra assumption $\diamond B^\perp$ added in Lemma 5.2 can be moved to its ‘‘proper place,’’ namely, inside some $[-]_B$, where it should eventually be contracted with the diagonal formula. This corresponds to the step of Figure 2c, but again we handle multiple instances simultaneously.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose*

$$\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \diamond B^\perp, A\}\}. \quad (\dagger 1)$$

If

$$\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Pi, \Delta\}\}, \quad (\dagger 2)$$

then $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Pi'}, \Delta^+\}\}$ for some $\Pi' \subseteq \Sigma \cup (\Pi \setminus \{B\})$.

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $(\dagger 2)$. Here we show only two important cases.

Case 1. Suppose

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D} \\ \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Pi, \Delta'\{\{\Delta'', A^\perp\}_B\}\}\} \end{array}}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Pi \cup \{B\}}, \Delta'\{\{\Delta''\}_B\}\}\}} (\diamond)$$

To avoid B appended to $\diamond A^\perp$ again, we dispense with (\diamond) using a cut as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D} \\ \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Pi, \Delta'\{\{\Delta'', A^\perp\}_B\}\}\} \end{array}}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Pi'}, \Delta'^+\{\{\Delta''^+, \diamond B^\perp, A^\perp\}_B\}\}\}} (\text{IH}) \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma\{\{\Delta'^+\{\{\Delta''^+\}_B\}\}, [\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \diamond B^\perp, A]\}}{\Gamma\{\{\Delta'^+\{\{\Delta''^+, \diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \diamond B^\perp, A\}_B\}\}\}} (\text{cherry-pick})}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \Delta'^+\{\{\Delta''^+, \diamond B^\perp, A\}_B\}\}\}} (\text{rebase})}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, \diamond B^\perp, A\}\}} (\dagger 1) \quad (\text{weak})}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma \cup \Pi'}, \Delta'^+\{\{\Delta''^+, \diamond B^\perp\}_B\}\}\}} (\text{cut})$$

where $\Pi' \subseteq \Sigma \cup (\Pi \setminus \{B\})$, and so $\Sigma \cup \Pi' \subseteq \Sigma \cup (\Pi \setminus \{B\})$ as required. Observe that the $\diamond B^\perp$ in the left premise is due to the operation $(-)^+$ of the induction hypothesis, whereas that in the right comes from $(\dagger 1)$.

Case 2. Suppose

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \mathcal{D} \\ \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Pi, \Delta'\{\{\diamond C^\perp, C\}_C\}\}\} \end{array}}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Pi, \Delta'\{\{\square C\}\}\}\}} (\square)$$

Then we have

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}}{\Gamma\{\diamond A^\perp_\Pi, \Delta'\{\{\diamond C^\perp, C\}_C\}\}}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Pi'}, \Delta'^+\{\{\diamond C^\perp, \diamond C^\perp, C\}_C\}\}} \text{ (IH)}}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Pi'}, \Delta'^+\{\{\diamond C^\perp, C\}_C\}\}} \text{ (contract)}}}{\Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Pi'}, \Delta'^+\{\{\diamond C^\perp, C\}_C\}\}} \text{ (}\square\text{)}} \text{ (}\square\text{)}$$

for some $\Pi' \subseteq \Sigma \cup (\Pi \setminus \{B\})$. We notice that when $C \equiv B$ here, we have successfully canceled out that we added $\diamond B^\perp$ in Lemma 5.2.

The other cases are straightforward. \square

Repeated application of these two lemmas sweeps all the annotations away from $\diamond A^\perp$:

Lemma 5.5. *If*

$$\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\Sigma, A\}\}, \quad (\ddagger)$$

then $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset, A\}\}$.

Proof. By induction on the size of Σ . If $\Sigma = \emptyset$, the proof is complete; otherwise, let $B \in \Sigma$. From (\ddagger) , Lemma 5.2 yields $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma'}, \diamond B^\perp, A\}\}$ for some $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma \setminus \{B\}$. Then putting this into $(\dagger 1)$ and (\ddagger) into $(\dagger 2)$ in Lemma 5.4, we have $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_{\Sigma''}, A\}\}$ for some $\Sigma'' \subseteq \Sigma' \cup (\Sigma \setminus \{B\}) \subsetneq \Sigma$. Applying the induction hypothesis to Σ'' , we obtain the conclusion. \square

Now we may drop unused assumptions from a derived sequent, which can be restated formally in a specific form we need as follows:

Lemma 5.6 (Thinning). *If* $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\{\diamond A^\perp_\emptyset\}\}$, *then* $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\}$.

Proof. By induction on derivation. \square

Lemma 5.1 follows immediately from Lemmas 5.5 and 5.6.

6 Syntactic Cut-Elimination

We are now ready to prove the cut-elimination theorem. We use the standard double induction to show the reduction lemma:

Lemma 6.1 (Reduction). *Suppose*

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_1 \quad \vdots \mathcal{D}_2}{\Gamma\{A\} \quad \Gamma\{A^\perp\}} \text{ (cut)}}{\Gamma\{}} \text{ (cut)}$$

If \mathcal{D}_1 *and* \mathcal{D}_2 *are both cut-free derivations, then we have* $\vdash \Gamma\{\}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the following lexicographic ordering:

- (i) The size of A ; and
- (ii) The sum of the heights of \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2

and reduce the cut to lower ones.

We here show only the case in question:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_1}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \diamond A^\perp\}} (\diamond) \quad \frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_2}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\}} (\square)}{\frac{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, \diamond A^\perp\}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, \square A\}} (\text{cut})} \Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}$$

By Lemma 5.1 we have $\vdash^A \Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, [A]\}$, where all cuts are admissible by the induction hypothesis, and hence $\vdash \Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, [A]\}$. We can now reduce the cut above as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_1}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \diamond A^\perp\}} \quad \frac{\frac{\vdots \mathcal{D}_2}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, [\diamond A^\perp, A]\}} (\square)}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, \square A\}} (\text{weak})}{\frac{\Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \diamond A^\perp\}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \square A\}} (\text{cut})} \quad \frac{\vdots}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, [A]\}} (\text{rebase})}{\frac{\Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{A^\perp\}, \square A\}} (\text{cut}) \quad \Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}, [A]\}}{\Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}}} (\text{cut})} \Gamma\{\Delta\{ \}$$

Both of the cuts here are admissible by the induction hypothesis and, unlike the reduction (3.1), a third cut is no longer required thanks to the diagonal-formula-elimination subprocedure.

The other cases are standard and almost the same as for the **K** case of Brünnler [4], where no special consideration regarding well-foundedness is needed since we add no new induction parameters. \square

Theorem 6.2 (Cut-elimination). *The cut-rule is admissible.*

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 6.1. \square

7 Conclusion

We have presented a syntactic cut-elimination proof for **GL** by combining the following two ideas:

- The diagonal-formula-elimination subprocedure splits off the difficult part of **GL**'s cut-elimination, thereby allowing for the proof in a more modular way without any trouble on the termination of the entire procedure.
- The nested-sequent approach enables straightforward induction proofs, where we rely only on local assumptions and can perform rewriting without having to grasp the entire derivation with the help of annotations.

This allows for a more concise and clear proof than previous methods in a composable way.

We employed a context-sharing form of the cut-rule in this paper, but other forms can be considered. For example, Poggiolesi [15] adopted a context-independent one, and Brünnler [4] considered a special form of multicut called *Y-cut* for modal logics with the axiom (4). These variants have some impact on

cut-elimination, but do not seem to provide a fundamental solution in the **GL** case. Another possibility is to extend cut to be applicable to subsequents. Such a generalization has been developed for basic modal logics such as **K** and **S4** by Chaudhuri, Marin, and Straßburger [5], and seems to fit also well with **GL**, which is future work.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and suggestions.

References

- [1] Arnon Avron (1984): *On modal systems having arithmetical interpretations*. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 49(3), pp. 935–942, doi:10.2307/2274147.
- [2] George Boolos (1994): *The Logic of Provability*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511625183.
- [3] Marco Borga (1983): *On some proof theoretical properties of the modal logic GL*. *Studia Logica* 42(4), pp. 453–459, doi:10.1007/BF01371633.
- [4] Kai Brünnler (2009): *Deep sequent systems for modal logic*. *Archive for Mathematical Logic* 48(6), pp. 551–577, doi:10.1007/s00153-009-0137-3.
- [5] Kaustuv Chaudhuri, Sonia Marin & Lutz Straßburger (2016): *Focused and synthetic nested sequents*. In Bart Jacobs & Christof Löding, editors: *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, Springer, pp. 390–407, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-49630-5_23.
- [6] Rajeev Goré & Revantha Ramanayake (2012): *Valentini’s cut-elimination for provability logic resolved*. *The Review of Symbolic Logic* 5(2), pp. 212–238, doi:10.1017/S1755020311000323.
- [7] Ryo Kashima (1994): *Cut-free sequent calculi for some tense logics*. *Studia Logica* 53(1), pp. 119–135, doi:10.1007/BF01053026.
- [8] G Alex Kavvos (2021): *Intensionality, intensional recursion, and the Gödel–Löb axiom*. *IfCoLoG Journal of Logics and their Applications* 8(8), pp. 2287–2312. Available at <https://hdl.handle.net/1983/6a9e73f9-e55f-4b0c-925b-0a9099e30214>.
- [9] Hirohiko Kushida (2020): *A proof theory for the logic of provability in true arithmetic*. *Studia Logica* 108(4), pp. 857–875, doi:10.1007/s11225-019-09891-0.
- [10] Daniel Leivant (1981): *On the proof theory of the modal logic for arithmetic provability*. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 46(3), p. 531–538, doi:10.2307/2273755.
- [11] Anders Moen (2001): *The proposed algorithms for eliminating cuts in provability calculus GLS do not terminate*. The 13th Nordic Workshop in Programming Theory (NWPT’01). Available at <https://nr.no/en/publication/146681/>.
- [12] Hiroshi Nakano (2001): *Fixed-point logic with the approximation modality and its Kripke completeness*. In: *International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Software*, Springer, pp. 165–182, doi:10.1007/3-540-45500-0_8.
- [13] Sara Negri (2005): *Proof analysis in modal logic*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 34(5), pp. 507–544, doi:10.1007/s10992-005-2267-3.
- [14] Francesca Poggiolesi (2009): *The method of tree-hypersequents for modal propositional logic*. In: *Towards Mathematical Philosophy: Papers from the Studia Logica conference Trends in Logic IV*, Springer, pp. 31–51, doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-9084-4_3.
- [15] Francesca Poggiolesi (2009): *A purely syntactic and cut-free sequent calculus for the modal logic of provability*. *The Review of Symbolic Logic* 2(4), pp. 593–611, doi:10.1017/S1755020309990244.

- [16] Giovanni Sambin & Silvio Valentini (1982): *The modal logic of provability. The sequential approach*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 11(3), pp. 311–342, doi:10.1007/BF00293433.
- [17] Robert M Solovay (1976): *Provability interpretations of modal logic*. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 25(3), pp. 287–304, doi:10.1007/BF02757006.
- [18] Silvio Valentini (1983): *The modal logic of provability: Cut-elimination*. *Journal of Philosophical logic* 12(4), pp. 471–476, doi:10.1007/BF00249262.