

# A Proof Theoretic Analysis of Intruder Theories

Alwen Tiu and Rajeev Goré

Computer Sciences Laboratory  
Australian National University

## Abstract

We consider the decidability problem of intruder deduction in security protocol analysis, that is, deciding whether a given message  $M$  can be deduced from a set of messages  $\Sigma$ , under the class of convergent equational theories, modulo associativity and commutativity (AC) of certain binary operators. The traditional formulations of intruder deduction are usually given in natural-deduction-like systems. Proving decidability in these systems require significant efforts in showing that the rules are “local” in some sense. We recast the intruder deduction problem as proof search in sequent calculus, in which locality is immediate, making use of the well known translation between natural deduction and sequent calculus. Using standard proof theoretic methods, such as permutation of rules and cut elimination, we show that the intruder deduction problem can be reduced, in polynomial time, to a more elementary deduction problem, which amounts to solving certain equations in the underlying equational theories. We further show that this result extends to combination of disjoint AC-convergent theories. That is, decidability of intruder deduction under the combined theory reduces to decidability of elementary deduction problem in each constituent theory. Various researchers have reported similar results for individual cases but our work shows that they can all be obtained using a systematic and uniform methodology based on the sequent calculus.

## 1 Introduction

One of the fundamental aspects of the analysis of security protocols is the model of the intruder that seeks to compromise the protocol. In many situations, such a model can be described in terms of a deduction system which gives a formal account of the ability of the intruder to analyse and synthesize messages. As shown in many previous works (see, e.g., [3, 5, 8, 6]), finding attacks on protocols can often be framed as the problem of deciding whether a cer-

tain formal expression is derivable in the deduction system which models the intruder capability. The latter is sometimes called the *intruder deduction problem*, or the (ground) reachability problem. One of the most basic deductive accounts of the intruder’s capability is based on the so-called Dolev-Yao model, which assumes perfect encryption. While this model has been applied fruitfully to many situations, there are quite a few attacks on protocols, the discovery of which requires a stronger model of intruders. A recent survey [10] shows that attacks on several protocols used in real-world communication networks can be found by exploiting the algebraic properties of the underlying encryption functions.

The types of attacks mentioned in [10] have motivated many recent works [8, 6, 2, 12, 13, 9] in studying models of intruders in which the algebraic properties of the operators used in the protocols are taken into account. In most of these works, the intruder’s capability is usually given as a natural-deduction-like deductive system. As is common in natural deduction, the deduction rules for each constructor come in the form of a pair of introduction rule and elimination rule. The latter usually decomposes a term, reading the rule top-down, e.g., a typical elimination rule for a pair of terms, denoted with  $\langle M, N \rangle$ , is

$$\frac{\Sigma \vdash \langle M, N \rangle}{\Sigma \vdash M} .$$

Here,  $\Sigma$  denotes a set of terms, which represents the terms accumulated by the intruder over the course of its interaction with participants in a protocol. A natural deduction formulation of deductive systems, while seems “natural” and reflects the meaning of the (logical) operators, does not give us immediately a proof search strategy. As one can see in the above elimination rule, in searching for a proof (which means one has to apply the rule bottom up), one needs to come up with a term  $N$  which might seem arbitrary. In most of the works mentioned above, in order to show the decidability results for the natural deduction system, one needs to prove that a certain notion of locality holds for the system, e.g., in searching for a proof for  $\Sigma \vdash M$ , one needs only

to consider expressions which are made of subterms from  $\Sigma$  and  $M$ . In addition, one has to also deal with the complication that arises from the use of the algebraic properties of certain operators. The latter is usually given as a (decidable) equational theory.

In this work, we recast the intruder deduction problem as proof search in sequent calculus. Part of our motivation, apart from the obvious importance of this line of research in general, is to apply standard techniques, which have been well developed in the field of logic and proof theory, to the intruder deduction problem. In proof theory, sequent calculus is commonly considered a better calculus for studying proof search and decidability of logical systems, in comparison to natural deduction. This is partly due to the so-called “subformula” property, which in most cases entails the decidability of the deductive system. It is therefore rather curious to note that none of the existing works on intruder deduction so far makes use of sequent calculus as the calculus for expressing the intruder’s deductive capability.

We consider the ground intruder deduction problem (i.e., there are no variables in terms) under the class of *AC-convergent theories*. These are equational theories that can be turned into convergent rewrite systems, modulo associativity and commutativity of certain binary operators. Many important theories for intruder deduction fall into this category, among others, theories for exclusive-or [8, 6], Abelian groups [8], and more generally, monoidal theories [9]. Two main results of our current work: Firstly, we show that the decidability of intruder deduction under AC-convergent theories is reducible in PTIME to the decidability of the *elementary intruder deduction problem*, which involves only the equational theories under consideration. In other words, we reduce the general deduction problem into the problem of solving certain equations in the underlying equational theories. Secondly, we show that the intruder deduction problem for a combination of disjoint theories  $E_1, \dots, E_n$  can be reduced to the elementary deduction problem for each theory  $E_i$ . This means that if the elementary deduction problem is decidable for each  $E_i$ , then the intruder deduction problem under the combined theory is also decidable. However, we note that these results are not exactly new, although there are slight differences and improvements over the existing works (see Section 6 for a more detailed discussion). Our contribution is more of a methodological nature. We arrive at these results using rather standard proof theoretical techniques, e.g., *cut-elimination* and permutability of inference rules, in a uniform and systematic way. In particular, we obtain locality of proof systems for intruder deduction, which is one of the main ingredients to decidability results in [8, 6, 12, 11], for a wide range of theories that cover those studied in these works.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we give two systems for intruder theories, one

in natural deduction and the other in sequent calculus. We show that the two systems are equivalent, and moreover, the sequent system enjoys cut-elimination, which entails a notion of locality. In Section 3, we show that cut-free sequent derivations can be transformed into a certain normal form. Using this result, we obtain another “linear” sequent system, from which the polynomial reducibility result follows immediately. Section 4 discusses several example theories which can be found in the literature. Section 5 shows that the sequent system in Section 2 can be extended to cover any combination of disjoint AC-convergent theories. The same decidability results are proved for this extended system. Section 6 discusses related work and suggestions for future work.

## 2 Intruder deduction under AC convergent theories

We consider the following problem of formalising, given a set of messages  $\Sigma$  and a message  $M$ , whether  $M$  can be synthesized from the messages in  $\Sigma$ . We shall write this judgment as  $\Sigma \vdash M$ . This is sometimes called the ‘ground reachability’ problem or the ‘intruder deduction’ problem in the literature.

We assume an equational theory  $E$ , whose signature is denoted with  $Sig_E$ . There is a distinguished binary function symbol  $\oplus \in Sig_E$  which obeys the associative-commutative laws. We restrict ourselves to equational theories which can be represented by terminating and confluent rewrite systems, modulo the associativity and commutativity of  $\oplus$ .

We consider the set of messages generated by the following grammar

$$M, N := a \mid \langle M, N \rangle \mid \{M\}_N \mid f(M_1, \dots, M_k).$$

Here,  $a$  denotes a *name*;  $\langle M, N \rangle$  denotes a pair of messages consisting of  $M$  and  $N$ ;  $\{M\}_N$  denotes a message obtained by encrypting  $M$  with the key  $N$  (we consider only symmetric encryption here). The function symbol  $f$  is a function symbol from  $Sig_E$ .

### 2.1 Natural deduction system

The standard formulation of the judgment  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is usually given in terms of a natural-deduction style inference system, as shown in Figure 1. We shall refer to this proof system as  $\mathcal{N}$  and write  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{N}} M$  if  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable in  $\mathcal{N}$ .

Since we consider only convergent theories modulo AC, the equational theory  $E$  can be turned into a rewrite system, which we denote with  $\mathcal{R}$ . We write  $M \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} N$  when there is an instance of a rewrite rule in  $\mathcal{R}$  that relates  $M$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{M \in \Sigma}{\Sigma \vdash M} \textit{id} \quad \frac{\Sigma \vdash M \quad \Sigma \vdash N}{\Sigma \vdash \langle M, N \rangle} \textit{pI} \\
\frac{\Sigma \vdash \{M\}_N \quad \Sigma \vdash N}{\Sigma \vdash M} \textit{eE} \quad \frac{\Sigma \vdash M \quad \Sigma \vdash N}{\Sigma \vdash \{M\}_N} \textit{eI} \\
\frac{\Sigma \vdash \langle M, N \rangle}{\Sigma \vdash M} \textit{pE} \quad \frac{\Sigma \vdash \langle M, N \rangle}{\Sigma \vdash N} \textit{pE} \\
\frac{\Sigma \vdash M_1 \quad \dots \quad \Sigma \vdash M_n}{\Sigma \vdash f(M_1, \dots, M_n)} \textit{fI}, \text{ where } f \in \textit{Sig}_E \\
\frac{\Sigma \vdash N}{\Sigma \vdash M} =, \text{ where } M =_E N
\end{array}$$

**Figure 1. System  $\mathcal{N}$ : a natural deduction system for intruder deduction**

and  $N$ . We denote the reflexive-transitive closure of  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$  with  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ . A term  $M$  is in *normal form* if  $M \not\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} N$  for any  $N$ . We write  $M \downarrow$  to denote the normal form of  $M$  (modulo commutativity and associativity of  $\oplus$ ). This notation extends straightforwardly to sets, e.g.,  $\Sigma \downarrow$  denotes the set obtained by normalising all the elements of  $\Sigma$ . We write  $M \equiv N$  when  $M$  and  $N$  are equivalent modulo associativity and commutativity of  $\oplus$ . The notation  $M =_E N$  denotes that  $M$  and  $N$  are equivalent under the full equality theory  $E$ , i.e., when  $M \downarrow \equiv N \downarrow$ . We often drop the subscript  $E$  in  $M =_E N$  when the theory  $E$  can be inferred from context. A term  $A$  in normal form is said to be *guarded* if  $A$  is a name, a pair, or an encrypted message.

A *context* is a term with holes. We denote with  $C^k[\ ]$  a context with  $k$ -hole(s). When the number  $k$  is not important or can be inferred from context, we shall write  $C[\dots]$  instead. Viewing a context  $C^k[\ ]$  as a tree, each hole in the context occupies a unique position among the leaves of the tree. We say that a hole occurrence is the  $i$ -th hole of the context  $C^k[\ ]$  if it is the  $i$ -th hole encountered in an inorder traversal of the tree representing  $C^k[\ ]$ . An  $E$ -context is a context formed using only the function symbols in  $\textit{Sig}_E$ . We write  $C[M_1, \dots, M_k]$  to denote the term resulting from replacing the holes in the  $k$ -hole context  $C^k[\ ]$  with  $M_1, \dots, M_k$ , with  $M_i$  occupying the  $i$ -th hole in  $C^k[\ ]$ .

## 2.2 Sequent systems

A *well-formed sequent* is a sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$  where  $M$  and all the terms in  $\Sigma$  are in normal form. Unless stated otherwise, in the following we assume that sequents are in normal form. The sequent system for intruder deduction, under the equational theory  $E$ , is given in Figure 2. We refer to this sequent system as  $\mathcal{S}$  and write  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{S}} M$  to denote the fact that the sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

In proving cut elimination, we use some measures of

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{M = C[M_1, \dots, M_k] \quad C[\ ] \text{ an } E\text{-context, and } M_1, \dots, M_k \in \Sigma}{\Sigma \vdash M} \textit{id} \\
\frac{\Sigma \vdash M \quad \Sigma, M \vdash T}{\Sigma \vdash T} \textit{cut} \\
\frac{\Sigma, \langle M, N \rangle, M, N \vdash T}{\Sigma, \langle M, N \rangle \vdash T} \textit{pL} \quad \frac{\Sigma \vdash M \quad \Sigma \vdash N}{\Sigma \vdash \langle M, N \rangle} \textit{pR} \\
\frac{\Sigma, \{M\}_K \vdash K \quad \Sigma, \{M\}_K, M, K \vdash N}{\Sigma, \{M\}_K \vdash N} \textit{eL} \\
\frac{\Sigma \vdash M \quad \Sigma \vdash N}{\Sigma \vdash \{M\}_N} \textit{eR} \\
\frac{\Sigma, C[A] \vdash A \quad \Sigma, C[A], A \vdash M}{\Sigma, C[A] \vdash M} \textit{s}_1 \\
\frac{\Sigma \vdash A \quad \Sigma, A \vdash C[A]}{\Sigma \vdash C[A]} \textit{s}_2
\end{array}$$

**Figure 2. System  $\mathcal{S}$ : a sequent system for intruder deduction. In  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ ,  $A$  is a guarded term.**

derivations and formulas. In particular, we denote with  $|\Pi|$ , for a given derivation  $\Pi$ , the *height* of  $\Pi$ , i.e., the length of the longest branch in the derivation tree of  $\Pi$ . Given a normal term  $M$ , we denote with  $|M|$  the *size* of  $M$ , i.e., the number of operators and names appearing in  $M$ .

Provability in the natural deduction system and in the sequent system are related via the standard translation.

**Lemma 1** *Let  $\Pi$  be a derivation of  $\Sigma \vdash M$ . If  $\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma'$ , then there exists a derivation  $\Pi'$  of  $\Sigma' \vdash M$  such that  $|\Pi| = |\Pi'|$ .*

**Proof** By induction on  $|\Pi|$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2** *If the judgment  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable in natural deduction system  $\mathcal{N}$  then  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash M \downarrow$  is derivable in sequent system  $\mathcal{S}$ .*

**Proof** Let  $\Pi$  be a natural deduction derivation of  $\Sigma \vdash M$ . We construct a sequent derivation  $\Pi'$  of  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash M \downarrow$  by induction on  $|\Pi|$ . The *id* rule translates to the *id* rule in sequent calculus; the introduction rules for  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\{ \cdot \}$  translates to the right-rules for the same operators. If  $\Pi$  ends with the  $=$ -rule, then the premise and the conclusion of the rules translate to the same sequent, hence  $\Pi'$  is constructed by induction hypothesis. It remains to show the translations for elimination rules and rules concerning  $f \in \textit{Sig}_E$ .

- Suppose  $\Pi$  ends with  $f_I$ , for some  $f \in \textit{Sig}_E$ :

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash M_1} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\Pi_k}{\Sigma \vdash M_k}}{\Sigma \vdash f(M_1, \dots, M_k)} \textit{fI}$$

By induction hypothesis, we have sequent derivations  $\Pi'_i$  of  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash M_i \downarrow$ , for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Lemma 1, applied to the  $\Pi'_i$ , gives us another sequent derivation  $\Pi''_i$  of  $\Sigma \downarrow, M_1 \downarrow, \dots, M_{i-1} \downarrow \vdash M_i \downarrow$ . We note that the sequent

$$\Sigma \downarrow, M_1 \downarrow, \dots, M_k \downarrow \vdash f(M_1, \dots, M_k) \downarrow$$

is provable in the sequent system by an application of the *id*-rule. The derivation  $\Pi'$  is then constructed by successive applications of the cut rule to this sequent with  $\Pi''_1, \dots, \Pi''_k$ , where the  $i$ -th cut eliminates  $M_i \downarrow$ .

- Suppose  $\Pi$  ends with  $p_E$  :

$$\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash \langle M, N \rangle} p_E$$

Note that  $\langle M, N \rangle \downarrow \equiv \langle M \downarrow, N \downarrow \rangle$ . By induction hypothesis, we have a sequent derivation  $\Pi'_1$  of  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash \langle M \downarrow, N \downarrow \rangle$ , and since the sequent

$$\Sigma \downarrow, \langle M \downarrow, N \downarrow \rangle \vdash M \downarrow$$

is derivable in sequent calculus (using a  $p_L$ -rule followed by *id*), we can use the cut rule to get a sequent derivation of  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash M \downarrow$ .

- Suppose  $\Pi$  ends with  $e_E$  :

$$\frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{\Sigma \vdash \{M\}_N \quad \Sigma \vdash N} e_E$$

By induction hypothesis, we have a sequent derivation  $\Pi'_1$  of  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash \{M \downarrow\}_{N \downarrow}$  and a sequent derivation  $\Pi''_2$  of  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash N \downarrow$ . By Lemma 1, we have a derivation  $\Pi_3$  of  $\Sigma \downarrow, \{M \downarrow\}_{N \downarrow} \vdash N \downarrow$ . We construct a sequent derivation for the sequent

$$\Sigma \downarrow, \{M \downarrow\}_{N \downarrow}, N \downarrow \vdash M \downarrow.$$

This can be done by an application of  $e_L$ , followed by two applications of *id*. Then  $\Pi'$  is constructed by applying the cut rule to this sequent using  $\Pi'_1$  and  $\Pi_3$ .

□

**Lemma 3** *If  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable in sequent system  $\mathcal{S}$  then  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable in natural deduction system  $\mathcal{N}$ .*

**Proof** Let  $\Pi$  be a sequent derivation of  $\Sigma \vdash M$ . We construct a natural deduction  $\Pi'$  of  $\Sigma \vdash M$  by induction on  $\Pi$ .

- The right-introduction rules for  $\mathcal{S}$  maps to the same introduction rules in  $\mathcal{N}$ .  $\Pi'$  in this case is constructed straightforwardly from the induction hypothesis using the introduction rules of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

- If  $\Pi$  ends with an *id* rule, i.e.,  $M = C[M_1, \dots, M_k]$ , for some  $M_1, \dots, M_k \in \Sigma$ , we construct a derivation  $\Pi_1$  of  $\Sigma \vdash C[M_1, \dots, M_k]$  by induction on the context  $C[\dots]$ . This is easily done using the  $f_I$  introduction rule in  $\mathcal{N}$ . The derivation  $\Pi'$  is then constructed from  $\Pi_1$  by an application of the  $=$ -rule.

- Suppose  $\Sigma = \Sigma' \cup \{U, V\}$  and  $\Pi$  ends with  $p_L$  :

$$\frac{\Pi_1}{\frac{\Sigma', \langle U, V \rangle, U, V \vdash M}{\Sigma', \langle U, V \rangle \vdash M} p_L} p_L$$

By induction hypothesis, we have an  $\mathcal{N}$ -derivation  $\Pi'_1$  of  $\Sigma', \langle U, V \rangle, U, V \vdash M$ . The derivation  $\Pi'$  is constructed inductively from  $\Pi'_1$  by copying the same rule applications in  $\Pi'_1$ , except when  $\Pi'_1$  is either

$$\overline{\Sigma, U, V \vdash U} \textit{id} \quad \text{or} \quad \overline{\Sigma, U, V \vdash V} \textit{id}$$

in which case,  $\Pi'$  is

$$\frac{\overline{\Sigma \vdash \langle U, V \rangle} \textit{id}}{\Sigma \vdash U} p_E \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\overline{\Sigma \vdash \langle U, V \rangle} \textit{id}}{\Sigma \vdash V} p_E$$

respectively.

- Suppose  $\Sigma = \Sigma' \cup \{U\}_V$  and  $\Pi$  ends with  $e_L$  :

$$\frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{\frac{\Sigma \vdash V \quad \Sigma, U, V \vdash M}{\Sigma', \{U\}_V \vdash M} e_L} e_L$$

By induction hypothesis, we have an  $\mathcal{N}$ -derivation  $\Pi'_1$  of  $\Sigma \vdash V$  and an  $\mathcal{N}$ -derivation  $\Pi'_2$  of  $\Sigma, U, V \vdash M$ .  $\Pi'$  is then constructed inductively from  $\Pi'_2$  by applying the same rules as in  $\Pi'_2$ , except when  $\Pi'_2$  is either

$$\overline{\Sigma, U, V \vdash U} \textit{id} \quad \text{or} \quad \overline{\Sigma, U, V \vdash V} \textit{id}$$

in which case,  $\Pi'$  is, respectively,

$$\frac{\overline{\Sigma \vdash \{U\}_V} \textit{id} \quad \Pi'_1}{\Sigma \vdash U} e_E$$

and  $\Pi'_1$ .

- Suppose  $\Pi$  ends with  $s_1$  or  $s_2$ :

$$\frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{\frac{\Sigma \vdash A \quad \Sigma, A \vdash M}{\Sigma \vdash M} s} s$$

By induction hypothesis, we have an  $\mathcal{N}$ -derivation  $\Pi'_1$  of  $\Sigma \vdash A$  and an  $\mathcal{N}$ -derivation  $\Pi'_2$  of  $\Sigma, A \vdash M$ . Again, as in the previous two cases, we construct  $\Pi'$

inductively, on the height of  $\Pi'_2$ , by imitating the rules in  $\Pi'_2$ , except when  $\Pi'_2$  ends with an instance of  $id$  of the form

$$\frac{}{\Sigma, A \vdash A} id$$

in which case,  $\Pi'$  is  $\Pi'_1$ . □

**Proposition 4** *The judgment  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is provable in the natural deduction system  $\mathcal{N}$  if and only if  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash M \downarrow$  is provable in the sequent system  $\mathcal{S}$ .*

**Proof** Immediate from Lemma 2 and Lemma 3. □

### 2.3 Decomposition lemmas

In the following, we say that a guarded term  $A$  is a *factor* of another term  $M$  in normal form, if  $M \equiv A$  or  $M \equiv C[A, M_1, \dots, M_k]$  for some normal terms  $M_1, \dots, M_k$  and an  $E$ -context  $C[\dots]$ . In this section, unless stated otherwise, when we write that a sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable, we mean that it is derivable in the proof system  $\mathcal{S}$  given in Figure 2.

**Lemma 5** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be terms in normal form. If  $\Sigma, f(X, Y) \vdash M$  is cut-free derivable, where  $f$  is either  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  or  $\{ \cdot, \cdot \}$ , then  $\Sigma, X, Y \vdash M$  is also cut-free derivable.*

**Proof** Let  $\Pi$  be a cut-free derivation of  $\Sigma, f(X, Y) \vdash M$ . We construct a cut-free derivation  $\Pi'$  of  $\Sigma, X, Y \vdash M$  by induction on  $|\Pi|$ . The only non-trivial case is when  $\Pi$  ends with  $id$  and  $f(X, Y)$  is used in the rule, that is, we have

$$M = C[f(X, Y)^n, M_1, \dots, M_k]$$

where  $M_1, \dots, M_k \in \Sigma$ ,  $C[\dots]$  is an  $E$ -context and  $f(X, Y)$  fills  $n$ -holes in  $C[\dots]$ . We distinguish several cases:

- $f(X, Y)$  is a subterm of some  $M_i$ , i.e.,  $M_i \equiv D[f(X, Y)]$ . In this case,  $\Pi'$  is constructed as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\Sigma, X, Y \vdash f(X, Y) \quad \Xi}{\Sigma, X, Y, f(X, Y) \vdash M} id}{\Sigma', X, Y, D[f(X, Y)] \vdash M} s_1$$

where  $\Sigma = \Sigma' \cup \{D[f(X, Y)]\}$  and  $\Xi$  is a derivation formed using  $p_R$  or  $e_R$ , and  $id$ .

- $f(X, Y)$  is a subterm of  $M$ , i.e.,  $M \equiv D[f(X, Y)]$ .

$$\frac{\frac{\Sigma, X, Y \vdash f(X, Y) \quad \Xi}{\Sigma, X, Y, f(X, Y) \vdash M} id}{\Sigma, X, Y \vdash M} s_2$$

- Suppose  $f(X, Y)$  is not a subterm of  $M$  and any of the  $M_i$ 's. Note that we have

$$C[f(X, Y)^n, M_1, \dots, M_k] \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* M.$$

Since  $f \notin \text{Sig}_E$ , the term  $f(X, Y)$  is passive in the sequence of rewritings above, hence can be replaced by any term. Therefore, we also have

$$C[X^n, M_1, \dots, M_k] \longrightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* M.$$

Thus, in this case,  $\Pi'$  is constructed by an application of  $id$ . □

**Lemma 6** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  be normal terms and let  $\Pi$  be a cut-free derivation of  $\Sigma, f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow \vdash M$ , where  $f \in \text{Sig}_E$ . Then there exists a cut-free derivation  $\Pi'$  of  $\Sigma, X_1, \dots, X_k \vdash M$ .*

**Proof** By induction on  $|\Pi|$ . The case where  $\Pi$  ends with  $id$ , or rules in which  $f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow$  is not principal, is trivial. The other cases, where  $\Pi$  ends with a rule applied to  $f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow$ , are given in the following.

- Suppose  $\Pi$  ends with  $p_L$  on  $f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow$ . This means that  $f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow$  is a guarded term, i.e., it is a pair  $\langle U, V \rangle$  for some  $U$  and  $V$ . This also means that  $\langle U, V \rangle$  must be a subterm of some term  $X_i$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $i = 1$ , i.e.,  $X_1 = C[\langle U, V \rangle]$  for some context  $C[\dots]$ . Let  $\Sigma'$  be the set  $\Sigma \cup \{X_1, \dots, X_k\}$ . Then  $\Pi'$  is the derivation

$$\frac{\frac{\Sigma' \vdash \langle U, V \rangle \quad id \quad \Pi_1}{\Sigma', \langle U, V \rangle \vdash M} s_1}{\Sigma, C[\langle U, V \rangle], X_2, \dots, X_k \vdash M} s_1$$

The instance of  $id$  above is valid since  $\langle U, V \rangle = f(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  and  $X_1, \dots, X_k \in \Sigma$ . The derivation  $\Pi_1$  is obtained by weakening  $\Pi$  with  $X_1, \dots, X_k$ . The case where  $\Pi$  ends with  $e_L$  is dealt with analogously.

- Suppose  $\Pi$  ends with  $s_1$  on  $f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow$ :

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1 \quad \Pi_2}{\Sigma' \vdash A \quad \Sigma', A \vdash M} s_1}{\Sigma, f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow \vdash M} s_1$$

where  $A$  is a guarded subterm of  $f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow$  and  $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow\}$ . It must be the case that  $A$  is also a guarded subterm of some  $X_i$  (w.l.o.g. assume it is  $X_1$ , i.e.,  $X_1 = C[A]$ ). Then  $\Pi'$  is

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi'_1 \quad \Pi'_2}{\Sigma'' \vdash A \quad \Sigma'', A \vdash M} s_1}{\Sigma, X_1, \dots, X_k \vdash M} s_1$$

where  $\Sigma'' = \Sigma \cup \{X_1, \dots, X_k\}$  and  $\Pi'_1$  and  $\Pi'_2$  are obtained by applying the induction hypothesis on  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$ .

□

**Lemma 7** *Let  $M_1, \dots, M_k$  be terms in normal form and let  $C[\dots]$  be a  $k$ -hole  $E$ -context. If  $\Sigma, C[M_1, \dots, M_k] \downarrow \vdash M$  is cut-free derivable, then  $\Sigma, M_1, \dots, M_k \vdash M$  is also cut-free derivable.*

**Proof** By induction on the size of  $C[\dots]$  and Lemma 6.  
□

## 2.4 Cut elimination

The phrase *cut term* refers to the term introduced in an application of the cut rule, reading the rule bottom up.

**Theorem 8** *The cut rule is admissible.*

**Proof** We give a set of transformation rules for derivations ending with cuts and show that given any derivation, there is a sequence of reductions that applies to this derivation, and terminates with a cut free derivation with the same end sequent. This is proved by induction on the size of the cut term, with subinduction on the height of the *left premise derivation* immediately above the cut rule. This measure is called the *cut rank*. As usual in cut elimination, we proceed by eliminating the topmost cut with the highest rank. So in the following, we suppose a given derivation  $\Pi$  ending with a cut rule, which is the only cut in  $\Pi$ , and then show how to transform this to a cut free derivation  $\Pi'$ .

The cut reduction is driven by the left premise derivation of the cut. We distinguish several cases, based on the last rule of the left premise derivation.

1. Suppose the left premise of  $\Pi$  ends with either  $p_R$  or  $e_R$ , thus  $\Pi$  is

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash M} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma \vdash N}}{\Sigma \vdash f(M, N)} \rho \quad \frac{\Pi_3}{\Sigma, f(M, N) \vdash R}}{\Sigma \vdash R} \text{ cut}$$

where  $f$  is either  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  or  $\{ \cdot \}$ , and  $\rho$  is either  $p_R$  or  $e_R$ . In each case, by Lemma 5, we have a cut free derivation  $\Pi'_3$  of  $\Sigma, M, N \vdash R$ . By applying Lemma 1 to  $\Pi_2$ , we also have a cut-free derivation  $\Pi'_2$  of  $\Sigma, M \vdash N$ . The above cut is then reduced to

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash M} \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi'_2}{\Sigma, M \vdash N} \quad \frac{\Pi'_3}{\Sigma, M, N \vdash R}}{\Sigma, M \vdash R} \text{ cut}}{\Sigma \vdash R} \text{ cut}$$

These two cuts can then be eliminated by induction hypothesis (since the cut terms here are smaller than the original cut term).

2. Suppose the left premise of the cut ends with either  $p_L$ ,  $e_L$  or  $s_1$ , acting on  $\Sigma$ . We show here the case where the left-rule has only one premise; generalisation to the other case (with two premises) is straightforward. Therefore  $\Pi$  is of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma' \vdash M}}{\Sigma \vdash M} \rho \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma, M \vdash R}}{\Sigma \vdash R} \text{ cut}$$

By inspection of the inference rules in Figure 2, it is clear that in the rule  $\rho$  above, we have  $\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma'$ . We can therefore weaken  $\Pi_2$  to a derivation  $\Pi'_2$  of  $\Sigma', M \vdash R$ . The cut is then reduced as follows.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma' \vdash M} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma', M \vdash R}}{\Sigma' \vdash R} \text{ cut}}{\Sigma \vdash R} \rho$$

The cut rule above  $\rho$  can be eliminated by induction hypothesis, since although the cut term is of the same size, the height of the left premise of the cut is smaller than the original cut.

3. Suppose the left premise of the cut ends with  $s_2$ , i.e.,  $\Pi$  is

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash A} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma, A \vdash C[A]}}{\Sigma \vdash C[A]} s_2 \quad \frac{\Pi_3}{\Sigma, C[A] \vdash R}}{\Sigma \vdash R} \text{ cut}$$

If  $C[\cdot]$  is an empty context, then  $C[A] \equiv A$  and the above cut reduces to

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash A} \quad \frac{\Pi_3}{\Sigma, A \vdash R}}{\Sigma \vdash R} \text{ cut}}$$

This cut can be reduced by induction hypothesis, since the height of the left premise derivation ( $\Pi_1$ ) is smaller than the left premise of the original cut. If  $C[\cdot]$  is a non-empty context, the above cut reduces to the following two cuts:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash A} \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma, A \vdash C[A]} \quad \frac{\Pi'_3}{\Sigma, A, C[A] \vdash R}}{\Sigma, A \vdash R} \text{ cut}}{\Sigma \vdash R} \text{ cut}}$$

The derivation  $\Pi'_3$  is obtained by weakening  $\Pi_3$  with  $A$  (Lemma 1). The upper cut can be removed by induction hypothesis on the height and the lower cut can be eliminated by induction hypothesis on the size of cut terms.

4. Suppose the left premise of the cut ends with the *id*-rule:

$$\frac{\frac{}{\Sigma \vdash M} \textit{id} \quad \frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma, M \vdash R} \textit{cut}}{\Sigma \vdash R}$$

where  $M = C[M_1, \dots, M_k] \downarrow$  and  $M_1, \dots, M_k \in \Sigma$ . In this case, we apply Lemma 7 to  $\Pi_1$ , hence we get a cut free derivation  $\Pi'$  of  $\Sigma \vdash R$ .

□

**Remarks** The cut elimination proof above is surprisingly simple and perhaps a little unusual compared to standard cut elimination for logical systems, in that it uses an asymmetric measure on derivation length. This is because of the absence of an implication-like (or negation) operator, common in logic, which demands a right-to-left switch in the premises of a cut in the reduction.

### 3 Normal derivations and decidability

We now turn to the question of the decidability of the deduction problem  $\Sigma \vdash M$ . This problem is known already for several AC theories, e.g., exclusive-or, abelian groups and its extension with a homomorphism axiom [8, 6, 12, 11, 2]. What we would like to show here is how the decidability result can be reduced, in polynomial time, to a more elementary decision problem, i.e., deciding whether the *id*-rule is applicable. This reduction is obtained via a purely proof theoretical technique.

We first need to make sure that the problem of checking whether a rule is applicable to a sequent is decidable, or in the terminology of [8], that *one-step deducibility* is decidable. For all rules, except *id*, this decidability is checkable in PTIME. Our decidability result will therefore be parametric on the decidability of checking the applicability of the *id*-rule. Note that in the rules  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , which require extracting a subterm from a term, the restriction that the extracted subterm is a guarded term makes sure that the check is still polynomial. Note also that since we assume terms equal up to associativity and commutativity, if this restriction were not in place, then in the worst case, one would have to consider exponentially many subterms due to the commuting of subterms, e.g., in  $a \oplus b \oplus c \oplus d$ , one would have to consider summations from all possible subsets of  $\{a, b, c, d\}$ .

**Definition 9** Given an equational theory  $E$ , the *elementary deduction problem* for  $E$ , written  $\Sigma \Vdash_E M$ , is the problem of deciding whether the *id* rule is applicable to the sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$ , i.e., checking whether there exists an  $E$ -context  $C[\dots]$  and terms  $M_1, \dots, M_k \in \Sigma$  such that

$$C[M_1, \dots, M_k] = M.$$

Note that since the cut-free sequent system enjoys the sub-term property, i.e., the premises of a rule contain only subterms of its conclusion, it follows that the decidability of one-step deducibility and elementary deduction problem implies the decidability of the intruder deduction problem. This can be done by using a proof search procedure that non-deterministically tries all possible applicable rules and avoiding repeated sequents in the search. This naive procedure is of course rather expensive. We show that we can obtain a better complexity result by analysing the structures of cut-free derivations.

In the following, we say that a rule is a *left-rule* if it is in the set  $\{p_L, e_L, s_1, s_2\}$ , otherwise it is a *right-rule*.

**Definition 10** A cut-free derivation  $\Pi$  is said to be a *normal derivation* if it satisfies the following conditions:

1. There are no instances of left rules that appear above a right rule in the derivation tree.
2. There are no left rules that appear immediately above the left-premise of a branching left rule (i.e.,  $s_1, s_2$  or  $e_L$ ).

**Lemma 11** Let  $\Pi$  be a cut-free derivation of  $\Sigma \vdash M$ . Then there is a cut-free derivation of the same sequent such that all the right rules appear above left rules.

**Proof** We permute any offending right rules up over any left rules. This is done by induction on the number of occurrences of the offending rules. We first show the case where  $\Pi$  has at most one offending right rule. In this case, we show, by induction on the height of  $\Pi$ , that any offending right-introduction rule can be permuted up in the derivation tree until it is above any left-introduction rule. We show here the non-trivial case involving  $s_2$ ; the others are treated analogously. Suppose  $\Pi$  is

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash A} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma, A \vdash M}}{\Sigma \vdash M} s_2 \quad \frac{\Pi_3}{\Sigma \vdash N} \rho}{\Sigma \vdash f(M, N)}$$

Here  $\rho$  denotes either  $p_R$  or  $e_R$  and  $A$  is a guarded subterm of  $M$ . By the weakening lemma (Lemma 1), we have a derivation  $\Pi'_3$  of  $\Sigma, A \vdash N$  with  $|\Pi'_3| = |\Pi_3|$ .  $\Pi$  is then transformed into the following derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma \vdash A} \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma, A \vdash M} \quad \frac{\Pi'_3}{\Sigma, A \vdash N}}{\Sigma, A \vdash f(M, N)} s_2}{\Sigma \vdash f(M, N)}$$

The  $R$  rule in the right premise can then be further permuted up (i.e., if  $\Pi_2$  or  $\Pi'_3$  ends with a left rule) by induction hypothesis.

The derivation  $\Pi'$  is then constructed by repeatedly applying the above transformation to the topmost offending rules until all of them appear above left-introduction rules.  $\square$

**Proposition 12** *If  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable then it has a normal derivation.*

**Proof** Let  $\Pi$  be a cut-free derivation of  $\Sigma \vdash M$ . By Lemma 11, we can assume without loss of generality that all the right rules in  $\Pi$  appear above the left rules. We construct a normal derivation  $\Pi'$  of the same sequent by induction on the number of offending left rules in  $\Pi$ .

We first consider the case where  $\Pi$  has at most one offending left rule. Let  $\Xi$  be a subtree of  $\Pi$  where the offending rule occurs, i.e.,  $\Xi$  ends with either  $e_L$ ,  $s_1$  or  $s_2$ , whose left premise derivation ends with a left rule. We show by induction on the height of the left premise derivation of the last rule in  $\Xi$  that  $\Xi$  can be transformed into a normal derivation. There are two cases to consider: one in which the left premise derivation ends with a branching left rule and the other where it ends with a non-branching left rule. We consider the former case here, the latter can be dealt with analogously. So suppose  $\Xi$  is of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma_1 \vdash N_2} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma_2 \vdash N_1}}{\Sigma_1 \vdash N_1} L_2 \quad \frac{\Pi_3}{\Sigma_3 \vdash M'}}{\Sigma_1 \vdash M'} L_1$$

where  $L_1$  is  $e_L$ ,  $s_1$  or  $s_2$ , and  $\Pi_1$ ,  $\Pi_2$  and  $\Pi_3$  are normal derivations,  $\Sigma_2 \supseteq \Sigma$  and  $\Sigma_3 \supseteq \Sigma$ . We first weaken  $\Pi_3$  into a derivation  $\Pi'_3$  of  $\Sigma_4 \vdash M'$ , where  $\Sigma_4 = \Sigma_2 \cup \Sigma_3$ . Such a weakening can be easily shown to not affect the shape of the derivations (i.e., it does not introduce or remove any rules in  $\Pi_3$ ).  $\Xi$  is then transformed into

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma_1 \vdash N_2} \quad \frac{\frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma_2 \vdash N_1} \quad \frac{\Pi'_3}{\Sigma_4 \vdash M'}}{\Sigma_2 \vdash M'} L_2}{\Sigma_1 \vdash M'} L_1$$

By inspection of the rules in Figure 2, it can be shown that this transformation is valid for any pair of the rules from  $e_L$ ,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . Note that this transformation may introduce at most two offending left rules, i.e., if  $\Pi_1$  and/or  $\Pi_2$  end with left rules. But notice that the left premise derivations of both  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  in this case have smaller height than the left premise derivation of  $L_1$  in  $\Xi$ . By induction hypothesis, the right premise derivation of  $L_2$  can be transformed into a normal derivation, say  $\Pi_4$ , resulting in

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma_1 \vdash N_2} \quad \frac{\Pi_4}{\Sigma_2 \vdash M'}}{\Sigma_1 \vdash M'} L_2$$

$$\frac{\frac{\Sigma \Vdash_R M}{\Sigma \vdash M} r \quad \frac{\Sigma, \langle M, N \rangle, M, N \vdash T}{\Sigma, \langle M, N \rangle \vdash T} lp}{\frac{\Sigma, \{M\}_K, M, K \vdash N}{\Sigma, \{M\}_K \vdash N} le, \text{ where } \Sigma, \{M\}_K \Vdash_R K}{\frac{\Sigma, A \vdash M}{\Sigma \vdash M} ls}$$

where  $A$  is a guarded subterm of  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$  and  $\Sigma \Vdash_R A$ .

### Figure 3. System $\mathcal{L}$ : a linear proof system for intruder deduction.

By another application of the induction hypothesis, this derivation can be transformed into a normal derivation.

The general case where  $\Pi$  has more than one offending rules can be dealt with by transforming the topmost occurrences of the left rule one by one following the above transformation.  $\square$

## 3.1 A linear proof system

Recall that in a normal derivation, the left branch of a branching left rule is provable using only right rules. This means that we can represent a normal derivation as a sequence of sequents, each of which is obtained from the previous one by adding a subterm of the previous sequent, with the proviso that the subterm can be constructed using right-rules. Let us denote with  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} M$  the fact that the sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is provable using only the right rules, i.e., the rules  $id$ ,  $p_R$  and  $e_R$ . This suggests a more compact deduction system for intruder deduction, given in Figure 3. We refer to this system as  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**Proposition 13** *Every sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is provable in  $\mathcal{S}$  and only if it is provable in  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

**Proof** This follows immediately from cut elimination for  $\mathcal{S}$  and the normal form for  $\mathcal{S}$  (Proposition 12).  $\square$

## 3.2 Decidability

We now show that the decidability of the deduction problem  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{S}} M$  can be reduced to decidability of elementary deduction problems. In the following, we denote with  $st(\Sigma)$  the set of subterms of the terms in  $\Sigma$ . The *size* of  $\Sigma$ , written  $|\Sigma|$ , is the cardinality of  $st(\Sigma)$ , i.e., the number of distinct subterms of  $\Sigma$ .

**Definition 14** Let  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{D}} M$  be a deduction problem, where  $\mathcal{D}$  is some proof system, and let  $n$  be the size of  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$ . The problem  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{D}} M$  is said to be *polynomially reducible* to the elementary deduction problem if checking  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{D}} M$



reduces to checking at most  $n^k$ , for some constant  $k$ , elementary deduction problems of size less or equal to  $n$ .

To achieve polynomial reducibility of the deduction problems in the following, we consider representation of terms as directed acyclic graphs, with maximum sharing of subterms. Such a representation is quite standard and can be found in, e.g., [2], so we will not go into the details here.

**Lemma 15** *If there is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -derivation of  $\Sigma \vdash M$  then there is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -derivation of the same sequent whose length is linear with respect to the size of  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$ .*

**Proof** We first note that any derivation of  $\Sigma \vdash M$  can be turned into one in which every sequent in the derivation occurs exactly once. By inspection of the rules in Figure 3, we see that, reading the rules bottom up, they accumulate guarded subterms of  $\Sigma$  and  $M$ . Thus there can be at most  $n$ -sequents in such a derivation, where  $n$  is the number of distinct guarded subterms of  $\Sigma$  and  $M$ , which is linear in the size of  $\Sigma$  and  $M$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 16** *The decidability of the relation  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} M$  is reducible to the decidability of elementary deduction in polynomial time on the size of  $M$ .*

**Proof** Recall that the relation  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} M$  holds if we can derive  $\Sigma \vdash M$  using only right-rules (including *id*). Here is a simple proof search procedure for  $\Sigma \vdash M$ , using only right-rules:

1. If  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is elementarily deducible, then we are done.
2. Otherwise, apply a right-introduction rule to  $\Sigma \vdash M$  and repeat step 1. If no such rules are applicable, then  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is not derivable.

There are at most  $n$  iterations where  $n$  is the number of distinct subterms of  $M$ . Note that the check for elementary deducibility in step 1 is done on problems of size less or equal to  $n$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 17** *The decidability of the relation  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{L}} M$  is reducible to the decidability of elementary deduction in polynomial time on the size of  $\Sigma \vdash M$ .*

**Proof** Notice that the rules in Figure 3 are invertible, that is, we can at any time add a guarded subterm to  $\Sigma$  without destroying provability, provided that we can discharge that subterm using right-rules. The following simple algorithm provides a complete proof search procedure: Let  $\Sigma' = \Sigma$ .

1. If  $\Sigma' \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} M$  then we are done.
2. Otherwise, pick a guarded subterm  $A$  of  $\Sigma' \cup \{M\}$  which is not in  $\Sigma'$ , such that  $\Sigma' \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} A$ . If no such terms exist, then  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is not derivable. Otherwise, repeat Step 1 with  $\Sigma'$  updated to  $\Sigma' \cup \{A\}$ .

As shown in Lemma 15, there are at most  $n$ -iterations, where  $n$  is the number of distinct guarded subterms in  $\Sigma$  and  $M$ . At each iteration, we check (at step 2), at most  $n$  subterms for deducibility using right-rules. Therefore the algorithm does at most  $n^2$  checks for deducibility of  $\Vdash_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Since  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} M$  is polynomially reducible (Lemma 16) to elementary deduction, it follows that  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{L}} M$  is also polynomially reducible to elementary deduction.  $\square$

## 4 Some example theories

We now consider several concrete AC convergent theories that are often used in reasoning about security protocols. Decidability of intruder deduction under these theories has been extensively studied [8, 6, 2, 12, 13, 9]. These results can be broadly categorized into those with explicit pairing and encryption constructors, e.g., [8, 13], and those where the constructors are part of the equational theories, e.g., [2, 9]. For the latter, one needs explicit decryption operators with, e.g., an equation like

$$dec(\{M\}_N, N) = M.$$

Decidability results for these deduction problems, especially those with explicit constructors, are often obtained by separating elementary deducibility from the general deduction problem. This is obtained by studying some sort of normal derivations in a natural deduction setting. Such a reduction, as has been shown in the previous section, applies to our calculus in a more systematic fashion.

In the following, we make use of the following observation about elementary deducibility. Let  $\Sigma \Vdash_E M$  be an elementary deduction problem. Let  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  be the distinct factors of  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$ . Let  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  be a list of pairwise distinct names which do not occur in  $\Sigma$  and  $M$ . For every term  $N$  in  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$ , define a term  $[N]$  as follows: if  $N = C[A_{x_1}, \dots, A_{x_l}]$ , where  $A_{x_1}, \dots, A_{x_l}$  are distinct factors of  $N$ , then  $[N] = C[a_{x_1}, \dots, a_{x_l}]$ . Then  $\Sigma \Vdash_E M$  holds if and only if  $[\Sigma] \Vdash_E [M]$  holds.

The above observation simply means that, in considering elementary deducibility, it is enough to consider “pure” equational problems, i.e., those in which only the terms built from names and  $Sig_E$  appear in the sequent. Thus, when we talk about elementary deducibility in the following, we refer to the pure equational problems without constructors.

**Subterm convergent theories** This theory is given by axioms of the form  $M = N$  where  $N$  is a proper subterm of  $M$  and where by orienting the equation from left to right, one obtains a convergent rewrite system. Note that the AC axioms are not part of this theory. Decidability of the elementary deduction problem  $\Sigma \Vdash_E M$  is proved by first

computing a certain saturated set of  $\Sigma$  satisfying some closure conditions, e.g., closure with respect to one-step rewriting and subterms (see [2] for details). It is shown in [2] that satisfiability of the relation  $\Sigma \Vdash_E M$  is decidable in polynomial time, in the size of  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$ . It thus follows from Theorem 17 that the general deduction problem  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{S}} M$  under this theory is decidable in polynomial time.

**Exclusive-or** We now consider the theory of exclusive-or. The signature of this theory consists of a binary operator  $\oplus$  and a constant 0. The theory is given by the axioms of associativity and commutativity of  $\oplus$  together with the axiom  $x \oplus x = 0$  and  $x \oplus 0 = x$ . This theory can be turned into an AC convergent rewrite system with the following rewrite rules:

$$x \oplus x \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad x \oplus 0 \rightarrow x.$$

It is easy to devise an NP decision procedure for  $\Sigma \Vdash_E M$ . First notice that each element of  $\Sigma$  needs only be used at most once in order to derive  $M$ , due to the collapsing rewrite rule  $x \oplus x \rightarrow 0$ . So we guess a subset of  $\Sigma'$  of  $\Sigma$  to be used and check whether  $\bigoplus \Sigma' = M$ , which can be done in polynomial time. There is of course a more efficient procedure, which is PTIME, as shown in [6].

**Abelian groups** The exclusive-or theory is an instance of Abelian groups, where the inverse of an element is the element itself. The more general case of Abelian groups includes an inverse operator, denoted with  $I$  here. The equality theory for Abelian groups is given by the axioms of associativity and commutativity, plus the following axioms

$$x \oplus 0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad x \oplus I(x) = 0.$$

The equality theory of Abelian groups can be turned into a rewrite system modulo AC by orienting the above equalities from left to right, in addition to the following rewrite rules:

$$\begin{aligned} I(x \oplus y) &\rightarrow I(x) \oplus I(y) & I(I(x)) &\rightarrow x \\ I(0) &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

It is quite common to consider extensions of Abelian groups with a homomorphism axiom involving a unary operator, given by  $h(x \oplus y) = h(x) \oplus h(y)$ . In this case, the rewrite rules above need to be extended with

$$\begin{aligned} h(x \oplus y) &\rightarrow h(x) \oplus h(y) & h(0) &\rightarrow 0 \\ h(I(x)) &\rightarrow I(h(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Decidability of elementary deduction under Abelian groups (with homomorphism) can be reduced to solving a system of linear equations over some semirings (see [11] for details).

## 5 Combining disjoint convergent theories

We now consider the intruder deduction problem under a convergent AC theory  $E$ , which is obtained from the union of pairwise disjoint convergent AC theories  $E_1, \dots, E_n$ . Each theory  $E_i$  may contain an associative-commutative binary operator, which we denote with  $\oplus_i$ . We are interested in investigating whether the intruder deduction problem under  $E$  can be reduced to the elementary deduction problem of each  $E_i$ .

A term  $M$  is said to be *headed by* a symbol  $f$  if  $M \equiv f(M_1, \dots, M_k)$ . In this case,  $M_1, \dots, M_k$  are called *immediate subterms* of  $M$ . Given a term  $M$  and another term  $N$ , we say that  $N$  is a *cross-theory subterm* of  $M$  if  $N$  is headed with a symbol  $f \in \text{Sig}_{E_i}$  and it is an immediate subterm of a subterm in  $M$  which is headed by a symbol  $g \in \text{Sig}_{E_j}$ , where  $i \neq j$ . We shall also refer to  $N$  as an  *$E_{ij}$ -subterm* of  $M$  when we need to be explicit about the equational theories involved.

Throughout this section, we consider a sequent system  $\mathcal{D}$ , whose rules are those of  $\mathcal{S}$ , but with *id* replaced by

$$\frac{M = C[M_1, \dots, M_k] \quad C[\ ] \text{ an } E_i\text{-context, and } M_1, \dots, M_k \in \Sigma}{\Sigma \vdash M} \text{ id}_{E_i}$$

and with the addition of the following rule

$$\frac{\Sigma \vdash N \quad \Sigma, N \vdash M}{\Sigma \vdash M} \text{ cs}$$

where  $N$  is a cross-theory subterm of some term in  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$ . Also, when we mention  $E$ , it is understood that it is a disjoint union of some fixed AC-convergent equational theories  $E_1, \dots, E_n$ .

The analog of Proposition 4 holds for  $\mathcal{D}$ . Its proof is a straightforward adaptation of the proof of Proposition 4.

**Proposition 18** *The judgment  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is provable in the natural deduction system  $\mathcal{N}$ , under theory  $E$ , if and only if  $\Sigma \downarrow \vdash M \downarrow$  is provable in the sequent system  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

### 5.1 Cut elimination for $\mathcal{D}$

Cut elimination also holds for  $\mathcal{D}$ . As with  $\mathcal{S}$ , we first show that decomposition lemmas hold for  $\mathcal{D}$ . Cut elimination then follows straightforwardly from these lemmas.

**Lemma 19** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be normal terms. If  $\Sigma, f(X, Y) \vdash M$  is cut-free provable in  $\mathcal{D}$ , where  $f$  is either  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  or  $\{ \cdot \}$ , then  $\Sigma, X, Y \vdash M$  is also cut-free provable in  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

**Proof** Analogous to the proof of Lemma 5.  $\square$

**Lemma 20** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  be normal terms and let  $\Pi$  be a cut-free  $\mathcal{D}$ -derivation of  $\Sigma, f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow \vdash M$ , where  $f \in \text{Sig}_{E_i}$ . Then there exists a cut-free  $\mathcal{D}$ -derivation  $\Pi'$  of  $\Sigma, X_1, \dots, X_k \vdash M$ .*

**Proof** By induction on  $|\Pi|$ . Most cases are similar to the proof of Lemma 6. Let  $N \equiv f(X_1, \dots, X_k) \downarrow$ . The new case we need to consider is when  $\Pi$  ends with  $cs$ :

$$\frac{\frac{\Pi_1}{\Sigma, N \vdash R} \quad \frac{\Pi_2}{\Sigma, N, R \vdash M}}{\Sigma, N \vdash M} cs$$

where  $R$  is a cross-theory subterm of  $N$ . Note that since  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  are in normal form, the normalisation of  $f(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  involves only rewrite rules from  $E_i$ . If  $R$  is an  $E_{ij}$ -subterm of  $N$ , where  $j \neq i$ , obviously  $R$  is unaffected by the normalisation, i.e., it must have come from some  $X_l$ ; it is either  $X_l$  or an  $E_{ij}$ -subterm of  $X_l$ . On the other hand, if  $R$  is an  $E_{xy}$ -subterm, where  $x \neq i$ , then there is a subterm  $T$  of  $N$  such that  $T$  is headed by a symbol from  $E_x$ , and such that  $R$  is a subterm of  $T$ . In this case,  $T$  is unaffected by the normalisation, hence it must be present in some  $X_l$ . Therefore in both cases,  $R$  is either some  $X_l$  or a cross-theory subterm of  $X_l$ . Thus  $\Pi'$  is constructed straightforwardly by induction hypothesis on  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  followed by (possibly) an application of  $cs$  on  $X_l$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 21** *Let  $M_1, \dots, M_k$  be normal terms and let  $C[\dots]$  be a  $k$ -hole  $E_i$ -context. If  $\Sigma, C[M_1, \dots, M_k] \downarrow \vdash M$  is cut-free derivable in  $\mathcal{D}$ , then  $\Sigma, M_1, \dots, M_k \vdash M$  is also cut-free derivable in  $\mathcal{D}$ .*

**Proof** By induction on the size of  $C[\dots]$  and Lemma 20.  $\square$

**Theorem 22** *The cut rule in  $\mathcal{D}$  is admissible.*

**Proof** Analogous to the proof of Theorem 8, making use of Lemma 19 and Lemma 21.  $\square$

## 5.2 Decidability for combined theories

The decidability result for  $\mathcal{S}$  also holds for  $\mathcal{D}$ . This can be proved with straightforward modifications of the similar proof for  $\mathcal{S}$ , since the extra rule, i.e., the  $cs$ -rule, has the same structure as  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ . It is easy to see that the same normal forms for  $\mathcal{S}$  also holds for  $\mathcal{D}$ , with  $cs$  considered as a left-rule. It then remains to design a linear proof system for  $\mathcal{D}$ . We first define the notion of right-derivability: The relation  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{RD}} M$  holds if and only if the sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is derivable in  $\mathcal{D}$  using only the right rules. We next define a linear system for  $\mathcal{D}$ , called  $\mathcal{LD}$ ,

which consist of the rules of  $\mathcal{L}$  defined in the previous section, but with the proviso  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} M$  changed to  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{RD}} M$ , and with the additional rule:

$$\frac{\Sigma, R \vdash M}{\Sigma \vdash M} lcs$$

where  $R$  is a cross-theory subterm of some term in  $\Sigma \cup \{M\}$  and  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{RD}} R$ .

**Proposition 23** *Every sequent  $\Sigma \vdash M$  is provable in  $\mathcal{D}$  if and only if it is provable in  $\mathcal{LD}$ .*

**Theorem 24** *The decidability of the relation  $\Sigma \Vdash_{\mathcal{LD}} M$  is reducible to the decidability of elementary deduction, for each  $E_i$ , in polynomial time on the size of  $\Sigma \vdash M$ .*

## 6 Conclusion and related work

We have shown that decidability of the intruder deduction problem, under a wide range of equational theories, can be reduced in polynomial time to the simpler problem of elementary deduction problem, which amounts to solving equations in the underlying equational theories. This reduction is obtained in a purely proof theoretical way, using standard techniques such as cut elimination and permutation of inference rules. The cut elimination proof is rather simple, perhaps reflecting the simplicity of the ‘‘logical’’ structure of the intruder deduction problem; that is, its difficulty lies more in the algebraic part of the problem.

We have considered only the equational theories that have corresponding AC-convergent rewrite systems. We believe that the reducibility results can be generalised to a richer class of convergent theories, say, convergent theories modulo some equational theory  $E$  (which cannot be oriented). At least this is likely to be the case where  $E$  is *linear*, i.e., it is defined by equations like  $s = t$  where both sides of the equation have the same set of variables, and where each variable occurs exactly once in each side of the equation.

**Related work** As mentioned already in the introduction, there are several existing works in the literature that deal with intruder deduction. Our work is more closely related to, e.g., [8, 11, 13], in that we consider explicit constructors (pairing and encryption), than, say, [2, 9]. In the latter work, these constructors are considered part of the equational theory, so in this sense our work extended (slightly) theirs to allow explicit constructors. A drawback for the approach without explicit constructors is that one needs to consider these constructors together with other algebraic properties in proving decidability, although recent work in combining decidable theories [4] allows one to deal with them in a modular way. Combination of intruder theories has been

considered in [7, 4]. The work reported in [7] actually deals with a more general case of combining decision procedures for intruder deduction constraint problems. One difference between these works and ours is in how this combination is derived. Their approach is more algorithmic whereas our result is obtained through analysis of proof systems.

**Future work** It remains to be seen whether sequent calculus, and its associated proof techniques, can prove useful for richer theories. For certain deduction problems, i.e., those in which the constructors interact with the equational theory, there does not seem to be general results like the ones we obtain for theories with no interaction with the constructors. One natural problem where this interaction occurs is the theory with homomorphic encryption, e.g., like the one considered in [13]. Another interesting challenge is to see how sequent calculus can be used to study the more difficult problem of solving intruder deduction constraints, e.g., like those studied in [8, 6, 12].

**Acknowledgement** This work has been supported by a project funded by the Australian Research Council (ARC), under the Discovery Projects funding scheme.

## References

- [1] *18th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2003), 22-25 June 2003, Ottawa, Canada, Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society, 2003.
- [2] M. Abadi and V. Cortier. Deciding knowledge in security protocols under equational theories. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 367(1-2):2–32, 2006.
- [3] R. M. Amadio and D. Lugiez. On the reachability problem in cryptographic protocols. In C. Palamidessi, editor, *CONCUR*, volume 1877 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 380–394. Springer, 2000.
- [4] M. Arnaud, V. Cortier, and S. Delaune. Combining algorithms for deciding knowledge in security protocols. In B. Konev and F. Wolter, editors, *FroCos*, volume 4720 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 103–117. Springer, 2007.
- [5] M. Boreale. Symbolic trace analysis of cryptographic protocols. In F. Orejas, P. G. Spirakis, and J. van Leeuwen, editors, *ICALP*, volume 2076 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 667–681. Springer, 2001.
- [6] Y. Chevalier, R. Küsters, M. Rusinowitch, and M. Turuani. An np decision procedure for protocol insecurity with xor. In *LICS* [1], pages 261–270.
- [7] Y. Chevalier and M. Rusinowitch. Combining intruder theories. In L. Caires, G. F. Italiano, L. Monteiro, C. Palamidessi, and M. Yung, editors, *ICALP*, volume 3580 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 639–651. Springer, 2005.
- [8] H. Comon-Lundh and V. Shmatikov. Intruder deductions, constraint solving and insecurity decision in presence of exclusive or. In *LICS* [1], pages 271–280.
- [9] V. Cortier and S. Delaune. Deciding knowledge in security protocols for monoidal equational theories. In N. Dershowitz and A. Voronkov, editors, *LPAR*, volume 4790 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 196–210. Springer, 2007.
- [10] V. Cortier, S. Delaune, and P. Lafourcade. A survey of algebraic properties used in cryptographic protocols. *Journal of Computer Security*, 14(1):1–43, 2006.
- [11] S. Delaune. Easy intruder deduction problems with homomorphisms. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 97(6):213–218, 2006.
- [12] S. Delaune, P. Lafourcade, D. Lugiez, and R. Treinen. Symbolic protocol analysis in presence of a homomorphism operator and *exclusive or*. In M. Bugliesi, B. Preneel, V. Sassone, and I. Wegener, editors, *ICALP (2)*, volume 4052 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 132–143. Springer, 2006.
- [13] P. Lafourcade, D. Lugiez, and R. Treinen. Intruder deduction for the equational theory of abelian groups with distributive encryption. *Inf. Comput.*, 205(4):581–623, 2007.