

# Intuitionistic modal logics: new and simpler decidability proofs for **FIK** and **LIK**

Philippe Balbiani\* Çiğdem Gencer†

CNRS-INPT-UT3, IRIT, Toulouse, France

## Abstract

In this note, by integrating ideas concerning terminating tableaux-based procedures in modal logics and finite frame property of intuitionistic modal logic **IK**, we provide new and simpler decidability proofs for **FIK** and **LIK**.

**Keywords:** Intuitionistic modal logics. Decidability and complexity.

## 1 Introduction

Intuitionistic modal logic **FIK** has been introduced in [2]. Its semantics is based on Kripke frames  $(W, \leq, R)$  where  $\leq$  is a preorder on  $W$  and  $R$  is a binary relation on  $W$  satisfying the *condition of forward confluence*: for all  $s, t, u \in W$ , if  $t \leq s$  and  $tRu$  then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $sRv$  and  $u \leq v$ . Intuitionistic modal logic **LIK** has been introduced in [3]. Its semantics is based on Kripke frames  $(W, \leq, R)$  where  $\leq$  is a preorder on  $W$  and  $R$  is a binary relation on  $W$  satisfying the condition of forward confluence and the *condition of downward confluence*: for all  $s, t, u \in W$ , if  $s \leq t$  and  $tRu$  then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $sRv$  and  $v \leq u$ . In [2, 3], by integrating ideas coming from [9] about nested sequent calculi in intuitionistic modal logic **IK** and [11] about nested sequent calculi in first-order intuitionistic logic, Balbiani *et al.* have demonstrated that the membership problems in **FIK** and **LIK** are decidable.

In [12], Gasquet *et al.* have provided a general framework for defining tableau rules and tableau strategies in modal logics. By using a simple graph rewriting language, they have given uniform proofs of soundness and completeness of multifarious terminating tableaux-based procedures in modal logics. In [16], Grefe has provided an algorithm constructing a finite countermodel for any formula not belonging to **IK**. As **IK** is finitely axiomatizable, he has therefore proved

---

\*Corresponding author. Email address: philippe.balbani@irit.fr.

†Email addresses: cigdem.gencer@irit.fr.

that the membership problem in **IK** is decidable. The proofs of the decidability of the membership problems in **FIK** and **LIK** provided in [2, 3] are quite involved. In this note, by integrating ideas coming from Gasquet *et al.* [12] for what concerns terminating tableaux-based procedures in modal logics and Grefe [16] for what concerns finite frame property of **IK**, we provide new and simpler decidability proofs for the membership problems in **FIK** and **LIK**.

The usual approach to solving the membership problems in modal logics is to build finite models. In modal logics, filtration is a fundamental concept for building finite models. As far as we are aware, with a few exceptions such as [17, 23, 24], it has not been so much adapted to intuitionistic modal logics, probably because it does not easily work with conditions involving the composition of binary relations such as the above-mentioned conditions of forward confluence and downward confluence. In this note, considering that **L** is either **FIK**, or **LIK**, the new and simpler decidability proof for the membership problem in **L** that we provide is based on a selective filtration procedure: given a formula  $A$ , if  $A \notin \mathbf{L}$  then  $A$  is falsified in the canonical model of **L** studied in Sections 5 and 6 and a selective filtration procedure defined in Sections 7–12 can be used to constructing in Section 13 a finite model falsifying  $A$ .

## 2 Syntax

### Notes on notation

For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(n)$  denotes  $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ .

For all sets  $\Sigma$ ,  $\text{Card}(\Sigma)$  denotes the *cardinal* of  $\Sigma$ .

For all sets  $W$  and for all binary relations  $R, S$  on  $W$ ,  $R \circ S$  denotes the *composition of  $R$  and  $S$* , i.e. the binary relation  $T$  on  $W$  such that for all  $s, t \in W$ ,  $sTt$  if and only if there exists  $u \in W$  such that  $sRu$  and  $uSt$ .

For all sets  $W$  and for all binary relations  $R$  on  $W$ ,  $R^*$  denotes the least preorder on  $W$  containing  $R$ .

For all sets  $W$  and for all preorders  $\leq$  on  $W$ ,  $\geq$  denotes the preorder on  $W$  such that for all  $s, t \in W$ ,  $s \geq t$  if and only if  $t \leq s$ .

For all sets  $W$  and for all preorders  $\leq$  on  $W$ , a subset  $U$  of  $W$  is  $\leq$ -*closed* if for all  $s, t \in W$ , if  $s \in U$  and  $s \leq t$  then  $t \in U$ .

For all sets  $W$ , for all preorders  $\leq$  on  $W$  and for all  $s, t \in W$ , when we write “ $s < t$ ” we mean “ $s \leq t$  and  $t \not\leq s$ ”.

Finally, “**IPL**” stands for “Intuitionistic Propositional Logic” and “**IML**” stands

for “intuitionistic modal logic”.

## Formulas

Let  $\mathbf{At}$  be a countably infinite set (with typical members called *atoms* and denoted  $p, q$ , etc).

Let  $\mathbf{Fo}$  be the countably infinite set (with typical members called *formulas* and denoted  $A, B$ , etc) of finite words over  $\mathbf{At} \cup \{\rightarrow, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \Box, \Diamond, (, )\}$  defined by

$$A ::= p | (A \rightarrow A) | \top | \perp | (A \wedge A) | (A \vee A) | \Box A | \Diamond A$$

where  $p$  ranges over  $\mathbf{At}$ .

For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , the *length of  $A$*  (denoted  $\|A\|$ ) is the number of symbols in  $A$ .

We follow the standard rules for omission of the parentheses.

For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , when we write “ $\neg A$ ” we mean “ $A \rightarrow \perp$ ”.

## Sets of formulas

Let  $\bowtie$  be the binary relation between sets of formulas such that for all sets  $\Gamma, \Delta$  of formulas,  $\Gamma \bowtie \Delta$  if and only if for all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , the following conditions hold:

- if  $\Box A \in \Gamma$  then  $A \in \Delta$ ,
- if  $A \in \Delta$  then  $\Diamond A \in \Gamma$ .

A set  $\Sigma$  of formulas is *closed* if for all  $A, B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ ,

- if  $A \rightarrow B \in \Sigma$  then  $A \in \Sigma$  and  $B \in \Sigma$ ,
- if  $A \wedge B \in \Sigma$  then  $A \in \Sigma$  and  $B \in \Sigma$ ,
- if  $A \vee B \in \Sigma$  then  $A \in \Sigma$  and  $B \in \Sigma$ ,
- if  $\Box A \in \Sigma$  then  $A \in \Sigma$ ,
- if  $\Diamond A \in \Sigma$  then  $A \in \Sigma$ .

For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , let  $\Sigma_A$  be the least closed set of formulas containing  $A$ .

**Lemma 1** For all atoms  $p$ ,  $\Sigma_p = \{p\}$ . Moreover, for all  $A, B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ ,

- $\Sigma_{A \rightarrow B} = \{A \rightarrow B\} \cup \Sigma_A \cup \Sigma_B$ ,
- $\Sigma_{\top} = \{\top\}$ ,
- $\Sigma_{\perp} = \{\perp\}$ ,

- $\Sigma_{A \wedge B} = \{A \wedge B\} \cup \Sigma_A \cup \Sigma_B$ ,
- $\Sigma_{A \vee B} = \{A \vee B\} \cup \Sigma_A \cup \Sigma_B$ ,
- $\Sigma_{\Box A} = \{\Box A\} \cup \Sigma_A$ ,
- $\Sigma_{\Diamond A} = \{\Diamond A\} \cup \Sigma_A$ .

**Proof:** Left to the reader.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 2** For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ ,  $\Sigma_A$  is finite. More precisely, for all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ ,  $\text{Card}(\Sigma_A) \leq \|A\|$ .

**Proof:** By induction on  $A$ .  $\dashv$

For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$  and for all  $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma_A$ , let  $\Gamma^\circ = \bigcup \{\Sigma_B : B \in \mathbf{Fo} \text{ is such that either } \Box B \in \Gamma, \text{ or } \Diamond B \in \Gamma\}$ .

**Lemma 3** For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$  and for all  $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma_A$ ,  $\Gamma^\circ$  is closed. Moreover, if  $\Gamma$  is closed then  $\Gamma^\circ \subseteq \Gamma$ . If, in addition,  $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$  then  $\text{Card}(\Gamma^\circ) < \text{Card}(\Gamma)$ .

**Proof:** Left to the reader.  $\dashv$

For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , for all  $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma_A$  and for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\Gamma^\alpha$  be inductively defined as follows:

- $\Gamma^0 = \Gamma$ ,
- $\Gamma^{\alpha+1} = \Gamma^{\alpha^\circ}$ .

**Lemma 4** For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , for all  $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma_A$  and for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\text{Card}(\Gamma^\alpha) \leq \max\{0, \text{Card}(\Sigma_A) - \alpha\}$ .

**Proof:** By induction on  $\alpha$ .  $\dashv$

### 3 Semantics

#### Frames

A *frame* is a relational structure of the form  $(W, \leq, R)$  where  $W$  is a nonempty set of *worlds*,  $\leq$  is a preorder on  $W$  and  $R$  is a binary relation on  $W$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{all}}$  be the class of all frames.

For all classes  $\mathcal{C}$  of frames, let  $\mathcal{C}^\omega$  be the set of all finite frames in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## Confluences

A frame  $(W, \leq, R)$  is

- *forward confluent* if  $\geq \circ R \subseteq R \circ \geq$ , i.e. for all  $s, t, u \in W$ , if  $t \leq s$  and  $tRu$  then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $sRv$  and  $u \leq v$ ,
- *backward confluent* if  $R \circ \leq \subseteq \leq \circ R$ , i.e. for all  $s, t, u \in W$ , if  $sRt$  and  $t \leq u$  then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $s \leq v$  and  $vRu$ ,
- *downward confluent* if  $\leq \circ R \subseteq R \circ \leq$ , i.e. for all  $s, t, u \in W$ , if  $s \leq t$  and  $tRu$  then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $sRv$  and  $v \leq u$ ,
- *upward confluent* if  $R \circ \geq \subseteq \geq \circ R$ , i.e. for all  $s, t, u \in W$ , if  $sRt$  and  $u \leq t$  then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $v \leq s$  and  $vRu$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{bc}}$  be the class of all backward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{dc}}$  be the class of all downward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{uc}}$  be the class of all upward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fbc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent and backward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fdc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent and downward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fuc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent and upward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{bdc}}$  be the class of all backward confluent and downward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{buc}}$  be the class of all backward confluent and upward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{dudc}}$  be the class of all downward confluent and upward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fbdc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent, backward confluent and downward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fbuc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent, backward confluent and upward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fdudc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent, downward confluent and upward confluent frames,  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{bdudc}}$  be the class of all backward confluent, downward confluent and upward confluent frames and  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fbdudc}}$  be the class of all forward confluent, backward confluent, downward confluent and upward confluent frames.

## Valuations

A *valuation on a frame*  $(W, \leq, R)$  is a function  $V : \mathbf{At} \rightarrow \wp(W)$  such that for all atoms  $p$ ,  $V(p)$  is  $\leq$ -closed.

## Models

A *model* is a 4-tuple consisting of the 3 components of a frame and a valuation on that frame.

## Satisfiability

With respect to a model  $(W, \leq, R, V)$ , for all  $s \in W$  and for all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , the *satisfiability of  $A$  at  $s$  in  $(W, \leq, R, V)$*  (in symbols  $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models A$ ) is inductively defined as follows:

- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models p$  if and only if  $s \in V(p)$ ,

- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models A \rightarrow B$  if and only if for all  $t \in W$ , if  $s \leq t$  and  $(W, \leq, R, V), t \models A$  then  $(W, \leq, R, V), t \models B$ ,
- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models \top$ ,
- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \not\models \perp$ ,
- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models A \wedge B$  if and only if  $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models A$  and  $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models B$ ,
- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models A \vee B$  if and only if either  $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models A$ , or  $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models B$ ,
- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models \Box A$  if and only if for all  $t \in W$ , if  $s \leq t$  then for all  $u \in W$ , if  $tRu$  then  $(W, \leq, R, V), u \models A$ ,
- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models \Diamond A$  if and only if there exists  $t \in W$  such that  $t \leq s$  and there exists  $u \in W$  such that  $tRu$  and  $(W, \leq, R, V), u \models A$ .

For all models  $(W, \leq, R, V)$ , for all  $s \in W$  and for all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , if  $(W, \leq, R, V)$  is clear from the context then when we write “ $s \models A$ ” we mean “ $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models A$ ”.

**Lemma 5 (Hereditiy Property)** *Let  $(W, \leq, R, V)$  be a model. For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$  and for all  $s, t \in W$ , if  $s \models A$  and  $s \leq t$  then  $t \models A$ .*

**Proof:** By induction on  $A$ .  $\dashv$

## About Fischer Servi and Wijesekera

Fischer Servi [10] has defined the satisfiability of  $\Diamond$ -formulas as follows:

- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models_{\text{FS}} \Diamond A$  if and only if there exists  $t \in W$  such that  $sRt$  and  $(W, \leq, R, V), t \models_{\text{FS}} A$ .

The definition of the satisfiability of formulas considered by Fischer Servi necessitates to restrict the discussion to the class of all forward confluent frames, otherwise the above-described Hereditiy Property would not hold.

Wijesekera [25] has defined the satisfiability of  $\Diamond$ -formulas as follows:

- $(W, \leq, R, V), s \models_{\text{W}} \Diamond A$  if and only if for all  $t \in W$ , if  $s \leq t$  then there exists  $u \in W$  such that  $tRu$  and  $(W, \leq, R, V), u \models_{\text{W}} A$ .

The definition of the satisfiability of formulas considered by Wijesekera does not necessitate to restrict the discussion to a specific class of frames.

**Lemma 6** *In the class of all forward confluent frames, the definition of the satisfiability of formulas considered by Fischer Servi, the definition of the satisfiability of formulas considered by Wijesekera and our definition of the satisfiability of formulas give rise to the same relation of satisfiability between formulas, worlds and models.*

**Proof:** Let  $(W, \leq, R, V)$  be a model. Suppose  $(W, \leq, R)$  is forward confluent. By induction on  $A$ , the reader may easily verify that for all  $s \in W$ ,  $s \models_{\text{FS}} A$  if and only if  $s \models_w A$  if and only if  $s \models A$ .  $\dashv$

## Validity

A formula  $A$  is *true in a model*  $(W, \leq, R, V)$  (in symbols  $(W, \leq, R, V) \models A$ ) if for all  $s \in W$ ,  $s \models A$ .

A formula  $A$  is *valid in a frame*  $(W, \leq, R)$  (in symbols  $(W, \leq, R) \models A$ ) if for all models  $(W, \leq, R, V)$  based on  $(W, \leq, R)$ ,  $(W, \leq, R, V) \models A$ .

For all classes  $\mathcal{C}$  of frames, let  $\text{Log}(\mathcal{C}) = \{A \in \mathbf{Fo} : \text{for all } (W, \leq, R) \in \mathcal{C}, (W, \leq, R) \models A\}$ .

**Proposition 1**     •  $\text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fc}}) \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fuc}}) \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fuc}}^\omega)$ ,  
                          •  $\text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fdc}}) \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fduc}}) \subseteq \text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fduc}}^\omega)$ .

**Proof:** Left to the reader.  $\dashv$

## 4 Axiomatization

### Preliminaries

See [6, Chapter 2] for an introduction to the standard axioms of **IPL** and the standard inference rules of **IPL**.

The axioms

- (**D** $\square$ )  $\square p \wedge \square q \rightarrow \square(p \wedge q)$ ,
- (**D** $\diamond$ )  $\diamond(p \vee q) \rightarrow \diamond p \vee \diamond q$ ,
- (**N** $\square$ )  $\square \top$ ,
- (**N** $\diamond$ )  $\neg \diamond \perp$ ,
- (**wCD**)  $\square(p \vee q) \rightarrow ((\diamond p \rightarrow \square q) \rightarrow \square q)$ ,
- (**Af**)  $\diamond(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\square p \rightarrow \diamond q)$ ,
- (**Ab**)  $(\diamond p \rightarrow \square q) \rightarrow \square(p \rightarrow q)$ ,
- (**Ad**)  $\square(p \vee q) \rightarrow \diamond p \vee \square q$ ,

and the inference rules

$$(\mathbf{R}\Box) \frac{p \rightarrow q}{\Box p \rightarrow \Box q},$$

$$(\mathbf{R}\Diamond) \frac{p \rightarrow q}{\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond q},$$

$$(\mathbf{RI}) \frac{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Box(p \rightarrow r)}{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Diamond r},$$

have been recently used in IMLs [1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20].

## Intuitionistic modal logics

An *IML* is a set of formulas closed under uniform substitution, containing the standard axioms of **IPL**, closed under the standard inference rules of **IPL**, containing the axioms (**D** $\Box$ ), (**D** $\Diamond$ ), (**N** $\Box$ ), (**N** $\Diamond$ ) and (**wCD**) and closed under the inference rules (**R** $\Box$ ), (**R** $\Diamond$ ) and (**RI**).

The reader may easily see that axiom (**wCD**) has similarities with Přenosil's equation  $\Diamond a \rightarrow \Box b \leq \Box(a \vee b) \rightarrow \Box b$  and inference rule (**RI**) has similarities with Přenosil's *positive modal law*  $\Diamond b \leq \Box a \vee c \Rightarrow \Diamond b \leq \Diamond(a \wedge b) \vee c$  [21].

Let  $\mathbf{L}_{\min}$  be the least IML.

For all IMLs  $\mathbf{L}$  and for all sets  $\Sigma$  of formulas, let  $\mathbf{L} \oplus \Sigma$  be the least IML containing  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\Sigma$ .

For all IMLs  $\mathbf{L}$  and for all formulas  $A$ , we write  $\mathbf{L} \oplus A$  instead of  $\mathbf{L} \oplus \{A\}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{fc}} = \mathbf{L}_{\min} \oplus (\mathbf{Af})$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{bc}} = \mathbf{L}_{\min} \oplus (\mathbf{Ab})$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{dc}} = \mathbf{L}_{\min} \oplus (\mathbf{Ad})$ . We also write  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{fbc}}$  to denote  $\mathbf{L}_{\min} \oplus \{(\mathbf{Af}), (\mathbf{Ab})\}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{fdc}}$  to denote  $\mathbf{L}_{\min} \oplus \{(\mathbf{Af}), (\mathbf{Ad})\}$ , etc.

## 5 Canonical model

From now on in this note, let  $\mathbf{L}$  be either **FIK**, or **LIK**.

### Theories

A *theory* is a set of formulas containing  $\mathbf{L}$  and closed with respect to the inference rule of modus ponens.

**Lemma 7**  $\mathbf{L}$  is a theory.

**Proof:** Left to the reader.  $\dashv$

A theory  $s$  is *proper* if  $\perp \notin s$ .

**Lemma 8**  $\mathbf{L}$  is proper.

**Proof:** By Proposition ???.  $\dashv$

A proper theory  $s$  is *prime* if for all  $A, B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ , if  $A \vee B \in s$  then either  $A \in s$ , or  $B \in s$ .



**Lemma 9** *There exists prime theories.*

**Proof:** By Lindenbaum Lemma [4] and Lemma 8.  $\dashv$

### The canonical frame

Let  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$  be the frame such that

- $W_{\mathbf{L}}$  is the nonempty set of all prime theories,
- $\leq_{\mathbf{L}}$  is the preorder on  $W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that for all  $s, t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$ ,  $s \leq_{\mathbf{L}} t$  if and only if  $s \subseteq t$ ,
- $R_{\mathbf{L}}$  is the binary relation on  $W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that for all  $s, t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$ ,  $s R_{\mathbf{L}} t$  if and only if  $s \bowtie t$ .

The frame  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$  is called *canonical frame of  $\mathbf{L}$* .

**Lemma 10** •  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$  is in  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{fc}}$  when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{FIK}$ ,

- $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$  is in  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{fdc}}$  when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ .

**Proof:** See [4].  $\dashv$

### The canonical valuation

The *canonical valuation of  $\mathbf{L}$*  is the valuation  $V_{\mathbf{L}} : \mathbf{At} \rightarrow \wp(W_{\mathbf{L}})$  on  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$  such that for all atoms  $p$ ,  $V_{\mathbf{L}}(p) = \{s \in W_{\mathbf{L}} : p \in s\}$ .

### The canonical model

The *canonical model of  $\mathbf{L}$*  is the model  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}}, V_{\mathbf{L}})$ .

**Lemma 11 (Canonical Truth Lemma)** *For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$  and for all  $s \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$ ,  $A \in s$  if and only if  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}}, V_{\mathbf{L}}), s \models A$ .*

**Proof:** See [4].  $\dashv$

**Lemma 12** *For all  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ ,*

- *if  $A \notin \mathbf{L}$  then  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{fc}} \not\models A$  when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{FIK}$ ,*
- *if  $A \notin \mathbf{L}$  then  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{fdc}} \not\models A$  when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ .*

**Proof:** By Lindenbaum Lemma [4] and Lemmas 7, 10 and 11.  $\dashv$

**Proposition 2 (Completeness)**    •  $\mathbf{FIK} = \text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fc}})$ ,

•  $\mathbf{LIK} = \text{Log}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{fdc}})$ .

**Proof:** By Proposition ?? and Lemma 12.  $\dashv$

## 6 Maximal worlds

We say that  $s \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  is *maximal with respect to*  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$  if for all  $t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$ , if  $s <_{\mathbf{L}} t$  then  $t \models B$ .

**Lemma 13** *Let  $s \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  and  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ . If  $s$  is not maximal with respect to  $B$  then there exists  $t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $s <_{\mathbf{L}} t$ ,  $t \not\models B$  and  $t$  is maximal with respect to  $B$ .*

**Proof:** Suppose  $s$  is not maximal with respect to  $B$ . Let  $S = \{t \in W_{\mathbf{L}} : s <_{\mathbf{L}} t \text{ and } t \not\models B\}$ . Since  $s$  is not maximal with respect to  $B$ , then  $S$  is nonempty. Moreover, obviously, for all nonempty chains  $(t_i)_{i \in I}$  of elements of  $S$ ,  $\bigcup \{t_i : i \in I\}$  is in  $S$ . Hence, by Zorn's Lemma,  $S$  possesses a maximal element  $t$ . Obviously,  $s <_{\mathbf{L}} t$ ,  $t \not\models B$  and  $t$  is maximal with respect to  $B$ .  $\dashv$

**Lemma 14** *Let  $s \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  and  $B, C \in \mathbf{Fo}$ . If  $s \not\models B \rightarrow C$  and  $s$  is maximal with respect to  $B \rightarrow C$  then  $s \models B$  and  $s \not\models C$ .*

**Proof:** Suppose  $s \not\models B \rightarrow C$  and  $s$  is maximal with respect to  $B \rightarrow C$ . For the sake of the contradiction, suppose either  $s \not\models B$ , or  $s \models C$ . Since  $s \not\models B \rightarrow C$ , then there exists  $t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $s \leq_{\mathbf{L}} t$ ,  $t \models B$  and  $t \not\models C$ . Hence, either  $s = t$ , or  $s <_{\mathbf{L}} t$ . In the former case, since  $t \models B$  and  $t \not\models C$ , then  $s \models B$  and  $s \not\models C$ . Since either  $s \not\models B$ , or  $s \models C$ , then  $s \models C$ : a contradiction. In the latter case, since  $s$  is maximal with respect to  $B \rightarrow C$ , then  $t \models B \rightarrow C$ . Since  $t \models B$ , then  $t \models C$ : a contradiction.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 15** *Let  $s \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  and  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ . If  $s \not\models \Box B$  and  $s$  is maximal with respect to  $\Box B$  then there exists  $t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $t \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$  and  $t \not\models B$ .*

**Proof:** Suppose  $s \not\models \Box B$  and  $s$  is maximal with respect to  $\Box B$ . Hence, there exists  $t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $s \leq_{\mathbf{L}} t$  and there exists  $u \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $t R_{\mathbf{L}} u$  and  $u \not\models B$ . Thus, either  $s = t$ , or  $s <_{\mathbf{L}} t$ . In the former case, since  $t R_{\mathbf{L}} u$ , then  $u \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$ . In the latter case, since  $s$  is maximal with respect to  $\Box B$ , then  $t \models \Box B$ . Since  $t R_{\mathbf{L}} u$ , then  $u \models B$ : a contradiction.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 16** *Let  $s \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  and  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ . If  $s \models \Diamond B$  then there exists  $t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $t \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$  and  $t \models B$ .*

**Proof:** Suppose  $s \models \diamond B$ . Hence, there exists  $t \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $t \leq_{\mathbf{L}} s$  and there exists  $u \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $t R_{\mathbf{L}} u$  and  $u \models B$ . Since  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$  is in  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{fc}}$  when  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{FIK}$  and in  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{fdc}}$  when  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{LIK}$ , then  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$  is forward confluent. Since  $t \leq_{\mathbf{L}} s$  and  $t R_{\mathbf{L}} u$ , then there exists  $v \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $s R_{\mathbf{L}} v$  and  $u \leq_{\mathbf{L}} v$ . Thus,  $v \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$ . Moreover, since  $u \models B$ , then  $v \models B$ .  $\dashv$

## 7 Tips and clips

From now on in this note, let  $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$  be such that  $A \notin \mathbf{L}$ .

Therefore, by Lindenbaum Lemma [4] and Lemmas 7 and 11, there exists  $s_0 \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}}, V_{\mathbf{L}}), s_0 \not\models A$ .

### Tips

A *tip* is a 5-tuple of the form  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  where  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $s \in W_{\mathbf{L}}$ ,  $\Gamma$  is a closed subset of  $\Sigma_A$ ,  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $X \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The 5-tuple  $(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0)$  is called *initial tip of  $s_0$* .

The *name of the tip*  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is  $i$ .

The *correspondent of the tip*  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is  $s$ .

The *topic of the tip*  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is  $\Gamma$ .

The *rank of the tip*  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is  $\alpha$ .

The *height of the tip*  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is  $X$ .

The *degree of the tip*  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  (denoted  $\mathbf{deg}(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$ ) is the number of  $B \in \Gamma$  such that  $s \not\models B$  and  $s$  is not maximal with respect to  $B$ .

**Lemma 17**  $\mathbf{deg}(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0) \leq \mathbf{Card}(\Sigma_A)$ .

**Proof:** Left to the reader.  $\dashv$

For all finite nonempty sets  $\mathcal{T}$  of tips and for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\mathbf{h}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{T}) = \max\{X \in \mathbb{N} : (i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ .

### Clips

A *clip* is a triple of the form  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  where  $\mathcal{T}$  is a finite nonempty set of tips and  $\ll$  and  $\triangleright$  are binary relations on  $\mathcal{T}$ .

The triple  $(\{(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$  is called *initial clip of  $s_0$* .

## Coherence

We say that the clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is *coherent* if for all  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ ,

- if  $i=j$  then  $s=t, \Gamma=\Delta, \alpha=\beta$  and  $X=Y$ ,
- if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  then  $j \neq i, s \leq_{\mathbf{L}} t, \Gamma \neq \emptyset, \Delta = \Gamma, \beta = \alpha$  and  $Y = X + 1$ ,
- if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  then  $j \neq i, t \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s), \Gamma \neq \emptyset, \Delta = \Gamma^\circ, \beta = \alpha + 1$  and  $Y = X$ .

**Lemma 18**  $(\{(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$  is coherent.

**Proof:** Left to the reader.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 19** Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  be a clip. If  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is coherent then the function  $f : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow W_{\mathbf{L}}$  such that for all  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$ ,  $f(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) = s$  is a homomorphism from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll^*, \triangleright)$  to  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}})$ .

**Proof:** Suppose  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is coherent. Let  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ . Firstly, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \ll^* (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ . Hence, there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and there exists  $(k_0, u_0, \Lambda_0, \gamma_0, Z_0), \dots, (k_n, u_n, \Lambda_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $(k_0, u_0, \Lambda_0, \gamma_0, Z_0) = (i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$ ,  $(k_n, u_n, \Lambda_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) = (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  and for all  $i \in (n)$ ,  $(k_{i-1}, u_{i-1}, \Lambda_{i-1}, \gamma_{i-1}, Z_{i-1}) \ll (k_i, u_i, \Lambda_i, \gamma_i, Z_i)$ . By induction on  $n$ , the reader may easily verify that  $s \leq_{\mathbf{L}} t$ . Secondly, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}$  is coherent, then  $s R_{\mathbf{L}} t$ .  $\dashv$

## Regularity

We say that the clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is *regular* if for all  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}$ ,

- if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \ll (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  and  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \ll (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  then  $i=j$ ,
- if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \triangleright (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  and  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \triangleright (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  then  $i=j$ ,
- if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \triangleright (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  and  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \ll (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  then there exists  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T) \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T) \ll (i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  and  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T) \triangleright (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ .

**Lemma 20**  $(\{(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$  is regular.

**Proof:** Left to the reader.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 21** *Let  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  be a clip. If  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is regular then  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll^*, \triangleright)$  is upward confluent.*

**Proof:** Suppose  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is regular. Let  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}$ . Suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  and  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \ll^* (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ . Hence, there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and there exists  $(l_0, v_0, \Theta_0, \delta_0, T_0), \dots, (l_n, v_n, \Theta_n, \delta_n, T_n) \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $(l_0, v_0, \Theta_0, \delta_0, T_0) = (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$ ,  $(l_n, v_n, \Theta_n, \delta_n, T_n) = (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  and for all  $i \in (n)$ ,  $(l_{i-1}, v_{i-1}, \Theta_{i-1}, \delta_{i-1}, T_{i-1}) \ll (l_i, v_i, \Theta_i, \delta_i, T_i)$ . By induction on  $n$ , the reader may easily verify that there exists  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U) \ll^* (i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  and  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U) \triangleright (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$ .  $\dashv$

## 8 Defects

### Defects of $\rightarrow$ -maximality

A defect of  $\rightarrow$ -maximality of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is a triple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B, C)$  where  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $B, C \in \mathbf{Fo}$  are such that

- $B \rightarrow C \in \Gamma$ ,
- $s \neq B \rightarrow C$  and  $s$  is not maximal with respect to  $B \rightarrow C$ ,
- for all  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ , if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  then  $t \models B \rightarrow C$ .

The rank of the defect  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B, C)$  of  $\rightarrow$ -maximality is  $\alpha$ .

The height of the defect  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B, C)$  of  $\rightarrow$ -maximality is  $X$ .

### Defects of $\square$ -maximality

A defect of  $\square$ -maximality of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is a couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  where  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$  are such that

- $\square B \in \Gamma$ ,
- $s \neq \square B$  and  $s$  is not maximal with respect to  $\square B$ ,
- for all  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ , if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  then  $t \models \square B$ .

The rank of the defect  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\square$ -maximality is  $\alpha$ .

The height of the defect  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\square$ -maximality is  $X$ .

## Defects of $\square$ -accessibility

A *defect of  $\square$ -accessibility of a coherent and regular clip*  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is a couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  where  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$  are such that

- $\square B \in \Gamma$ ,
- $s \not\sqsubseteq \square B$  and  $s$  is maximal with respect to  $\square B$ ,
- for all  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ , if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  then  $t \sqsubseteq B$ .

The *rank of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\square$ -accessibility is  $\alpha$ .

The *height of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\square$ -accessibility is  $X$ .

## Defects of $\diamond$ -accessibility

A *defect of  $\diamond$ -accessibility of a coherent and regular clip*  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is a couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  where  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$  are such that

- $\diamond B \in \Gamma$ ,
- $s \sqsubseteq \diamond B$ ,
- for all  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ , if  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  then  $t \not\sqsubseteq B$ .

The *rank of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\diamond$ -accessibility is  $\alpha$ .

The *height of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\diamond$ -accessibility is  $X$ .

## Defects of downward confluence

When  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{LIK}$ , a *defect of downward confluence of a coherent and regular clip*  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is a triple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  where  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}$  are such that

- $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ ,
- $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \triangleright (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$ ,
- for all  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T) \in \mathcal{T}$ , either  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \not\prec (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$ , or  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T) \prec (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$ .

The *rank of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  of downward confluence is  $\alpha$ .

The *height of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  of downward confluence is  $X$ .

## Defects of forward confluence

A *defect of forward confluence of a coherent and regular clip*  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is a triple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  where  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}$  are such that

- $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \ll (i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$ ,
- $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \triangleright (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$ ,
- for all  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T) \in \mathcal{T}$ , either  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \not\prec (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$ , or  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \prec (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$ .

The *rank of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  of forward confluence is  $\alpha$ .

The *height of the defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  of forward confluence is  $X$ .

## Cleanness

For all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ , we say that a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is

- *$\alpha$ -clean for maximality* if for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\beta < \alpha$  then  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  contains no defect of maximality of rank  $\beta$ ,
- *$\alpha$ -clean for accessibility* if for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\beta < \alpha$  then  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  contains no defect of accessibility of rank  $\beta$ ,
- *$\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence* if for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\beta < \alpha$  then  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  contains no defect of downward confluence of rank  $\beta$ ,
- *$\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence* if for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\beta < \alpha$  then  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  contains no defect of forward confluence of rank  $\beta$ .

We say that a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is *clean* if it contains no defect.

## 9 Repair of maximality defects

### Repair of $\rightarrow$ -maximality defects

The *repair of a defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B, C)$  of  $\rightarrow$ -maximality of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  consists in sequentially executing the following actions:

- add a tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $j$  is new,  $s <_{\mathbf{L}} t$ ,  $t \not\prec B \rightarrow C$ ,  $t$  is maximal with respect to  $B \rightarrow C$ ,  $\Delta = \Gamma$ ,  $\beta = \alpha$  and  $Y = X + 1$ ,
- add the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\ll$ .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  and the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\ll$ , then the resulting clip is regular. Indeed, suppose for a while that the resulting clip is not regular. Hence, the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  has a  $\ll$ -predecessor that is different from  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  in the resulting clip. Since  $j$  is new, then this is impossible.

In other respect, notice that if  $\Gamma = \Sigma_A^\alpha$  then  $\Delta = \Sigma_A^\beta$ .

As well, notice that this repair is the repair of a defect of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  that only introduces in  $\mathcal{T}$  a tip of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X+1$ .

Finally, notice that  $\deg(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) < \deg(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$ .

### Repair of $\square$ -maximality defects

The *repair of a defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\square$ -maximality of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  consists in sequentially executing the following actions:

- add a tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $j$  is new,  $s <_{\mathbf{L}} t$ ,  $t \neq \square B$ ,  $t$  is maximal with respect to  $\square B$ ,  $\Delta = \Gamma$ ,  $\beta = \alpha$  and  $Y = X+1$ ,
- add the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\ll$ .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  and the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\ll$ , then the resulting clip is regular. Indeed, suppose for a while that the resulting clip is not regular. Hence, the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  has a  $\ll$ -predecessor that is different from  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  in the resulting clip. Since  $j$  is new, then this is impossible.

In other respect, notice that if  $\Gamma = \Sigma_A^\alpha$  then  $\Delta = \Sigma_A^\beta$ .

As well, notice that this repair is the repair of a defect of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  that only introduces in  $\mathcal{T}$  a tip of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X+1$ .

Finally, notice that  $\deg(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) < \deg(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$ .

### The maximality procedure

Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the *maximality procedure* is defined as follows:

1.  $x := (\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ ,
2.  $X := 0$ ,



3. while  $x$  contains defects of maximality of rank  $\alpha$  do
  - (a) repair in  $x$  all defects of maximality of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$ ,
  - (b)  $X := X+1$ .

Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the role of the maximality procedure is to iteratively repair all defects of maximality of  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  of rank  $\alpha$ .

**Lemma 22** *Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , at any moment of the execution of the maximality procedure, for all tips  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  occurring in  $x$ ,  $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\} + \text{Card}(\Sigma_A)$ .*

**Proof:** It suffices to notice that for all  $X \in \mathbb{N}$ , the repair of a defect of maximality of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  only introduces a tip of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X+1$ . Moreover, as noticed above, the degree of the introduced tip is strictly smaller than the degree of the tip that has caused this introduction.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 23** *Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the maximality procedure terminates.*

**Proof:** By Lemma 22.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 24** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  be a coherent and regular clip. If  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $\alpha$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the maximality procedure is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence.*

**Proof:** Suppose  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $\alpha$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence. Notice that by Lemma 23, the maximality procedure terminates. In other respect, since  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $\alpha$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence and the execution of the maximality procedure only introduces tips of rank  $\alpha$ , then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the maximality procedure is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence.  $\dashv$

## 10 Repair of accessibility defects

### Repair of $\square$ -accessibility defects

The repair of a defect  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\square$ -accessibility of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  consists in sequentially executing the following actions:

- add a tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $j$  is new,  $t \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$ ,  $t \neq B$ ,  $\Delta = \Gamma^\circ$ ,  $\beta = \alpha + 1$  and  $Y = X$ ,
- add the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\triangleright$ .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  and the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\triangleright$ , then the resulting clip is regular. Indeed, suppose for a while that the resulting clip is not regular. Hence, the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  has a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor that is different from  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  in the resulting clip. Since  $j$  is new, then this is impossible.

In other respect, notice that if  $\Gamma = \Sigma_A^\alpha$  then  $\Delta = \Sigma_A^\beta$ .

Finally, notice that this repair is the repair of a defect of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  that only introduces in  $\mathcal{T}$  a tip of rank  $\alpha + 1$  and height  $X$ .

### Repair of $\diamond$ -accessibility defects

The *repair of a defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), B)$  of  $\diamond$ -accessibility of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  consists in sequentially executing the following actions:

- add a tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $j$  is new,  $t \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$ ,  $t \neq B$ ,  $\Delta = \Gamma^\circ$ ,  $\beta = \alpha + 1$  and  $Y = X$ ,
- add the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\triangleright$ .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  and the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y))$  to  $\triangleright$ , then the resulting clip is regular. Indeed, suppose for a while that the resulting clip is not regular. Hence, the tip  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  has a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor that is different from  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  in the resulting clip. Since  $j$  is new, then this is impossible.

In other respect, notice that if  $\Gamma = \Sigma_A^\alpha$  then  $\Delta = \Sigma_A^\beta$ .

Finally, notice that this repair is the repair of a defect of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  that only introduces in  $\mathcal{T}$  a tip of rank  $\alpha + 1$  and height  $X$ .

### The accessibility procedure

Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the *accessibility procedure* is defined as follows:

1.  $x := (\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ ,
2.  $X := 0$ ,

3. while  $x$  contains defects of accessibility of rank  $\alpha$  do
  - (a) repair in  $x$  all defects of accessibility of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$ ,
  - (b)  $X := X+1$ .

Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the role of the accessibility procedure is to iteratively repair all defects of accessibility of  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  of rank  $\alpha$ .

**Lemma 25** *Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , at any moment of the execution of the accessibility procedure, for all tips  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  occurring in  $x$ ,  $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ .*

**Proof:** It suffices to notice that for all  $X \in \mathbb{N}$ , the repair of a defect of accessibility of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  only introduces a tip of rank  $\alpha+1$  and height  $X$ .  $\dashv$

**Lemma 26** *Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the accessibility procedure terminates.*

**Proof:** By Lemma 25.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 27** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  be a coherent and regular clip. If  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the accessibility procedure is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence.*

**Proof:** Suppose  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence. Notice that by Lemma 26, the accessibility procedure terminates. In other respect, since  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $\alpha$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence and the execution of the accessibility procedure only introduces tips of rank  $\alpha+1$ , then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the accessibility procedure is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence.  $\dashv$

## 11 Repair of confluence defects

### Repair of downward confluence defects

When  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ , the *repair of a defect*  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  of downward confluence of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  consists in sequentially executing the following actions:

- add a tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $l$  is new,  $v \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$ ,  $v \leq_{\mathbf{L}} u$ ,  $\Theta = \Gamma^\circ$ ,  $\Theta = \Lambda$ ,  $\delta = \alpha + 1$ ,  $\delta = \gamma$ ,  $T = X$  and  $T = Z - 1$ ,
- add the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T))$  to  $\triangleright$ ,
- add the couple  $((l, v, \Theta, \delta, T), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  to  $\llcorner$ .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$ , the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T))$  to  $\triangleright$  and the couple  $((l, v, \Theta, \delta, T), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  to  $\llcorner$ , then the resulting clip is regular. Indeed, suppose for a while that the resulting clip is not regular. Hence, either the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  has a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor that is different from  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  in the resulting clip, or the tip  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  has a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor that is different from  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  in the resulting clip, or the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  has a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  such that no  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  in the resulting clip, or the tip  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  has a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  such that no  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  in the resulting clip. In the first case, since  $l$  is new, then this is impossible. In the second case, consequently, there exists a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  of  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is regular, then  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  is a defect of downward confluence of  $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ , then this is impossible. In the third case, since  $l$  is new, then this is impossible. In the fourth case, since  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is regular, then  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  and a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  in the resulting clip: a contradiction.

In other respect, notice that if  $\Gamma = \Sigma_A^\alpha$ ,  $\Delta = \Sigma_A^\beta$  and  $\Lambda = \Sigma_A^\gamma$  then  $\Theta = \Sigma_A^\delta$ .

Finally, notice that this repair is the repair of a defect of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  that only introduces in  $\mathcal{T}$  a tip of rank  $\alpha + 1$  and height  $X$ .

## The procedure of downward confluence

When  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{LIK}$ , given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ , the *procedure of downward confluence* is defined as follows:

1.  $x := (\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ ,
2.  $X := \mathfrak{h}_\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ ,
3. while  $x$  contains defects of downward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  do
  - (a) repair in  $x$  all defects of downward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$ ,

(b)  $X := X-1$ .

When  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ , given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the role of the procedure of downward confluence is to iteratively repair all defects of downward confluence of  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  of rank  $\alpha$ .

**Lemma 28** *When  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ , given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , at any moment of the execution of the procedure of downward confluence, for all tips  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  occurring in  $x$ ,  $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ .*

**Proof:** It suffices to notice that for all  $X \in \mathbb{N}$ , the repair of a defect of downward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  only introduces a tip of rank  $\alpha+1$  and height  $X$ .  $\dashv$

**Lemma 29** *When  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ , given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the procedure of downward confluence terminates.*

**Proof:** By Lemma 28.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 30** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  be a coherent and regular clip. When  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ , if  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the procedure of downward confluence is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence.*

**Proof:** Suppose  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence. Notice that by Lemma 29, the procedure of downward confluence terminates. In other respect, since  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $\alpha$ -clean for downward confluence and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence and the execution of the procedure of downward confluence only introduces tips of rank  $\alpha+1$ , then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the procedure of downward confluence is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence.  $\dashv$

## Repair of forward confluence defects

The repair of a defect  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z))$  of forward confluence of a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  consists in sequentially executing the following actions:

- add a tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $l$  is new,  $v \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(s)$ ,  $u \leq_{\mathbf{L}} v$ ,  $\Theta = \Gamma^\circ$ ,  $\Theta = \Lambda$ ,  $\delta = \alpha+1$ ,  $\delta = \gamma$ ,  $T = X$  and  $T = Z+1$ ,

- add the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T))$  to  $\triangleright$ ,
- add the couple  $((k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z), (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T))$  to  $\llcorner$ .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$ , the couple  $((i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X), (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T))$  to  $\triangleright$  and the couple  $((k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z), (l, v, \Theta, \delta, T))$  to  $\llcorner$ , then the resulting clip is regular. Indeed, suppose for a while that the resulting clip is not regular. Hence, either the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  has a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor that is different from  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  in the resulting clip, or the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  has a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor that is different from  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in the resulting clip, or the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  has a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  such that no  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  in the resulting clip, or the tip  $(l, v, \Theta, \delta, T)$  has a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  such that no  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in the resulting clip. In the first case, since  $l$  is new, then this is impossible. In the second case, since  $l$  is new, then this is impossible. In the third case, since  $l$  is new, then  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  is equal to  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$ . Since  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  is a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  and no  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  in the resulting clip, then  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  is not a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ : a contradiction. In the fourth case, since  $l$  is new, then  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  is equal to  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$ . Since  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  is a  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$  and no  $\llcorner$ -predecessor of  $(m, w, \Phi, \epsilon, U)$  is a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in the resulting clip, then  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  is not a  $\triangleright$ -predecessor of  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ : a contradiction.

In other respect, notice that if  $\Gamma = \Sigma_A^\alpha$ ,  $\Delta = \Sigma_A^\beta$  and  $\Lambda = \Sigma_A^\gamma$  then  $\Theta = \Sigma_A^\delta$ .

Finally, notice that this repair is the repair of a defect of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  that only introduces in  $\mathcal{T}$  a tip of rank  $\alpha+1$  and height  $X$ .

## The procedure of forward confluence

Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ , the *procedure of forward confluence* is defined as follows:

1.  $x := (\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ ,
2.  $X := 0$ ,
3. while  $x$  contains defects of forward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  do
  - (a) repair in  $x$  all defects of forward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$ ,
  - (b)  $X := X+1$ .

Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ , the role of the procedure of forward confluence is to iteratively repair all defects of forward confluence of  $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$  of rank  $\alpha$ .

**Lemma 31** *Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , at any moment of the execution of the procedure of forward confluence, for all tips  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  occurring in  $x$ ,  $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ .*

**Proof:** It suffices to notice that for all  $X \in \mathbb{N}$ , the repair of a defect of forward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  and height  $X$  only introduces a tip of rank  $\alpha+1$  and height  $X$ .  $\dashv$

**Lemma 32** *Given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and a coherent and regular clip  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ , the procedure of forward confluence terminates.*

**Proof:** By Lemma 31.  $\dashv$

**Lemma 33** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  be a coherent and regular clip. If  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the procedure of forward confluence is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for forward confluence.*

**Proof:** Suppose  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence. Notice that by Lemma 32, the procedure of forward confluence terminates. In other respect, since  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $\alpha$ -clean for forward confluence and the execution of the procedure of forward confluence only introduces tips of rank  $\alpha+1$ , then the clip obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$  after the execution of the procedure of forward confluence is  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility,  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and  $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for forward confluence.  $\dashv$

## 12 A decision procedure

### The saturation procedure

The *saturation procedure* is defined as follows:

1.  $x := (\{(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ ,
2.  $\alpha := 0$ ,
3. while  $x$  is not clean do

- (a) repair in  $x$  all defects of maximality of rank  $\alpha$  by applying the maximality procedure,
- (b) repair in  $x$  all defects of accessibility of rank  $\alpha$  by applying the accessibility procedure,
- (c) when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$ , repair in  $x$  all defects of downward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  by applying the procedure of downward confluence,
- (d) repair in  $x$  all defects of forward confluence of rank  $\alpha$  by applying the procedure of forward confluence,
- (e)  $\alpha := \alpha+1$ .

The role of the saturation procedure is to iteratively repair all defects of  $(\{(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ .

**Lemma 34** *At any moment of the execution of the saturation procedure, for all tips  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  occurring in  $x$ ,  $\beta \leq \text{Card}(\Sigma_A) - \text{Card}(\Delta)$ .*

**Proof:** It suffices to notice that at any moment of the execution of the saturation procedure, for all tips  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  occurring in  $x$ ,  $\Delta = \Sigma_A^\beta$ .  $\dashv$

**Proposition 3** *The saturation procedure terminates.*

**Proof:** By Lemmas 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33 and 34.  $\dashv$

Therefore, there exists  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$  and there exists a finite sequence  $((\mathcal{T}_0, \ll_0, \triangleright_0), \dots, (\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \ll_\alpha, \triangleright_\alpha))$  of clips such that

- $(\mathcal{T}_0, \ll_0, \triangleright_0) = (\{(0, s_0, \Sigma_A, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ ,
- for all  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\beta < \alpha$  then  $(\mathcal{T}_\beta, \ll_\beta, \triangleright_\beta)$  is not clean and  $(\mathcal{T}_{\beta+1}, \ll_{\beta+1}, \triangleright_{\beta+1})$  is obtained from  $(\mathcal{T}_\beta, \ll_\beta, \triangleright_\beta)$  by firstly applying the maximality procedure iteratively repairing all defects of maximality of rank  $\beta$ , by secondly applying the accessibility procedure iteratively repairing all defects of accessibility of rank  $\beta$ , by thirdly applying the procedure of downward confluence iteratively repairing all defects of downward confluence of rank  $\beta$  when  $\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{LIK}$  and by fourthly applying the procedure of forward confluence iteratively repairing all defects of forward confluence of rank  $\beta$ ,
- $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \ll_\alpha, \triangleright_\alpha)$  is clean.

## 13 Finite frame property

### The saturated frame

Let  $(W', \leq', R')$  be the frame such that

- $W' = \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ ,



- $\leq' = \ll_{\alpha}^*$ ,
- $R' = \triangleright_{\alpha}$ .

The frame  $(W', \leq', R')$  is called *saturated frame of  $s_0$* .

**Lemma 35** •  $(W', \leq', R')$  is in  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fuc}}^{\omega}$  when  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{FIK}$ ,

- $(W', \leq', R')$  is in  $\mathcal{C}_{\text{fduc}}^{\omega}$  when  $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{LIK}$ .

**Proof:** By Lemma 21.  $\dashv$

### The saturated valuation

The *saturated valuation of  $s_0$*  is the valuation  $V': \mathbf{At} \rightarrow \wp(W')$  on  $(W', \leq', R')$  such that for all atoms  $p$ ,  $V'(p) = \{(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in W' : s \in V_{\mathbf{L}}(p)\}$ .

### The saturated model

The *saturated model of  $s_0$*  is the model  $(W', \leq', R', V')$ .

### The Saturated Truth Lemma

In Lemma 36, for all  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$  and for all  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in W'$ , when we write “ $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models B$ ” we mean “ $(W', \leq', R', V'), (i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models B$ ” and when we write “ $s \models B$ ” we mean “ $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}}, V_{\mathbf{L}}), s \models B$ ”.

**Lemma 36 (Saturated Truth Lemma)** Let  $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ . For all  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in W'$ , if  $B \in \Gamma$  then  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models B$  if and only if  $s \models B$ .

**Proof:** By induction on  $B$ .

**Case  $B = p$ :** Let  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in W'$ . Suppose  $p \in \Gamma$ . From left to right, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models p$ . Hence,  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in V'(p)$ . Thus,  $s \in V_{\mathbf{L}}(p)$ . Consequently,  $s \models p$ . From right to left, suppose  $s \models p$ . Hence,  $s \in V_{\mathbf{L}}(p)$ . Thus,  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in V'(p)$ . Consequently,  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models p$ .

**Case  $B = C \rightarrow D$ :** Let  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in W'$ . Suppose  $C \rightarrow D \in \Gamma$ . Hence,  $C \in \Gamma$  and  $D \in \Gamma$ . From left to right, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models C \rightarrow D$ . For the sake of the contradiction, suppose  $s \not\models C \rightarrow D$ . Since  $(\mathcal{T}_{\alpha}, \ll_{\alpha}, \triangleright_{\alpha})$  is clean, then there exists  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in W'$  such that  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \leq' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ ,  $t \not\models C \rightarrow D$  and  $t$  is maximal with respect to  $C \rightarrow D$ . Thus, by Lemma 14,  $t \models C$  and  $t \not\models D$ . Since  $C \in \Gamma$  and  $D \in \Gamma$ , then by induction hypothesis,  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \models C$  and  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \not\models D$ . Since  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \leq' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ , then  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \not\models C \rightarrow D$ : a contradiction. From right to left, suppose  $s \models C \rightarrow D$ . For the sake of the contradiction, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \not\models C \rightarrow D$ . Consequently, there exists  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in W'$  such that  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \leq' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ ,  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \models C$  and  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \not\models D$ . Hence,  $s \leq_{\mathbf{L}} t$ . Moreover, since  $C \in \Gamma$  and  $D \in \Gamma$ , then by induction hypothesis,  $t \models C$  and  $t \not\models D$ . Thus,  $s \not\models C \rightarrow D$ : a contradiction.

**Cases  $B=\top$ ,  $B=\perp$ ,  $B=C\vee D$  and  $B=C\wedge D$ :** These cases are left as exercises to the reader.

**Case  $B=\Box C$ :** Let  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in W'$ . Suppose  $\Box C \in \Gamma$ . Consequently,  $C \in \Gamma^\circ$ . From left to right, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models \Box C$ . For the sake of the contradiction, suppose  $s \not\models \Box C$ . Since  $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \ll_\alpha, \triangleright_\alpha)$  is clean, then there exists  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in W'$  such that  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \leq' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ ,  $t \not\models \Box C$  and  $t$  is maximal with respect to  $\Box C$ . Since  $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \ll_\alpha, \triangleright_\alpha)$  is clean, then there exists  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in W'$  such that  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) R' (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  and  $u \not\models C$ . Since  $C \in \Gamma^\circ$ , then by induction hypothesis,  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \not\models C$ . Since  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \leq' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  and  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) R' (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$ , then  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \not\models \Box C$ : a contradiction. From right to left, suppose  $s \models \Box C$ . For the sake of the contradiction, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \not\models \Box C$ . Hence, there exists  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in W'$  such that  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \leq' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ ,  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) R' (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  and  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \not\models C$ . Thus,  $s \leq t$  and  $u \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(t)$ . Moreover, since  $C \in \Gamma^\circ$ , then by induction hypothesis,  $u \not\models C$ . Consequently,  $s \not\models \Box C$ : a contradiction.

**Case  $B=\Diamond C$ :** Let  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \in W'$ . Suppose  $\Diamond C \in \Gamma$ . Hence,  $C \in \Gamma^\circ$ . From left to right, suppose  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models \Diamond C$ . Thus, there exists  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y), (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \in W'$  such that  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \leq' (i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X)$ ,  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) R' (k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z)$  and  $(k, u, \Lambda, \gamma, Z) \models C$ . Consequently,  $t \leq s$  and  $u \in R_{\mathbf{L}}(t)$ . Moreover, since  $C \in \Gamma^\circ$ , then by induction hypothesis,  $u \models C$ . Hence,  $s \models \Diamond C$ . From right to left, suppose  $s \models \Diamond C$ . Since  $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \ll_\alpha, \triangleright_\alpha)$  is clean, then there exists  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \in W'$  such that  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) R' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$  and  $t \models C$ . Since  $C \in \Gamma^\circ$ , then by induction hypothesis,  $(j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y) \models C$ . Since  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) R' (j, t, \Delta, \beta, Y)$ , then  $(i, s, \Gamma, \alpha, X) \models \Diamond C$ .  $\dashv$

**Lemma 37** *A is falsified in  $(W', \leq', R')$ .*

**Proof:** By Lemma 36 and the fact that  $(W_{\mathbf{L}}, \leq_{\mathbf{L}}, R_{\mathbf{L}}, V_{\mathbf{L}}), s_0 \not\models A$ .  $\dashv$

## The Finite Frame Property

All in all, the desired result is within reach.

**Proposition 4 (Finite Frame Property)**    •  $\mathbf{FIK} = \text{Log}(C_{\text{fc}}) = \text{Log}(C_{\text{fuc}})$   
 $= \text{Log}(C_{\text{fuc}}^\omega)$ ,  
     •  $\mathbf{LIK} = \text{Log}(C_{\text{fdc}}) = \text{Log}(C_{\text{fduc}}) = \text{Log}(C_{\text{fduc}}^\omega)$ .

**Proof:** By Propositions 1 and ?? and Lemmas 35 and 37.  $\dashv$

**Corollary 1** *The membership problems in  $\mathbf{FIK}$  and  $\mathbf{LIK}$  are decidable.*

**Proof:** By [5, Theorem 6.13] and Proposition 4.  $\dashv$

## 14 Conclusion

Much remains to be done. For example,

- adapt the above line of reasoning to the IMLs considered in [4, 22],
- determine the computational complexity of the membership problem in these IMLs,
- adapt the above line of reasoning to the intuitionistic variants of **S4** considered in [1, 14],
- determine the computational complexity of the membership problem in these intuitionistic variants of **S4**.

## Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Han Gao (Aix-Marseille University), Zhe Lin (Xiamen University), Nicola Olivetti (Aix-Marseille University) and Vladimir Sotirov (Bulgarian Academy of Sciences) for their valuable remarks.

Special acknowledgement is also granted to our colleagues of the Toulouse Institute of Computer Science Research for many stimulating discussions about the subject of this paper.

## References

- [1] Balbiani, P., Diéguez, M., Fernández-Duque, D.: *Some constructive variants of S4 with the finite model property*. In *LICS'21: Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE (2021) 1–13 (doi: 10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470643).
- [2] Balbiani, P., Gao, H., Gencer, Ç., Olivetti, N.: *A natural intuitionistic modal logic: axiomatization and bi-nested calculus*. In *32nd EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic*. LIPICS (2024) 13:1–13:21.
- [3] Balbiani, P., Gao, H., Gencer, Ç., Olivetti, N.: *Local intuitionistic modal logics and their calculi*. In *Automated Reasoning*. Springer (2024) 78–96.
- [4] Balbiani, P., Gencer, Ç.: *Intuitionistic modal logics: a minimal setting*. arXiv (2025) 2502.19060.
- [5] Blackburn, P., de Rijke, M., Venema, Y.: *Modal Logic*. Cambridge University Press (2001).
- [6] Chagrov, A., Zakharyashev, M.: *Modal Logic*. Oxford University Press (1997).

- [7] Dalmonte, T.: *Wijesekera-style constructive modal logics*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 14*. College Publications (2022) 281–303.
- [8] Dalmonte, T., Grellois, C., Olivetti, N.: *Terminating calculi and counter-models for constructive modal logics*. In *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods*. Springer (2021) 391–408.
- [9] Das, A., Marin, S.: *On intuitionistic diamonds (and lack thereof)*. In *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods*. Springer (2023) 283–301.
- [10] Fischer Servi, G.: *Axiomatizations for some intuitionistic modal logics*. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico Università e Politecnico di Torino* **42** (1984) 179–194.
- [11] Fitting, M.: *Nested sequents for intuitionistic logics*. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* **55** (2014) 41–61.
- [12] Gasquet, O., Herzig, A., Sahade, M.: *Terminating modal tableaux with simple completeness proof*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 6*. College Publications (2006) 167–186.
- [13] van der Giessen, I.: *Admissible rules for six intuitionistic modal logics*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **174** (2023) 103233.
- [14] Girlando, M., Kuznets, R., Marin, S., Morales, M., Straßburger, L.: *Intuitionistic  $S4$  is decidable*. In *38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE (2023) 10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175684.
- [15] Girlando, M., Kuznets, R., Marin, S., Morales, M., Straßburger, L.: *A simple loopcheck for intuitionistic  $K$* . In *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation*. Springer (2024) 47–63.
- [16] Grefe, C.: *Fischer Servi’s intuitionistic modal logic has the finite model property*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 1*. CSLI Publications (1996) 85–98.
- [17] Hasimoto, Y.: *Finite model property for some intuitionistic modal logics*. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic* **30** (2001) 87–97.
- [18] Marin, S., Morales, M., Straßburger, L.: *A fully labelled proof system for intuitionistic modal logics*. *Journal of Logic and Computation* **31** (2021) 998–1022.
- [19] Mendler, M., Scheele, S., Burke, L.: *The Došen square under construction: a tale of four modalities*. In *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods*. Springer (2021) 446–465.
- [20] Olivetti, N.: *A journey in intuitionistic modal logic: normal and non-normal modalities*. In *LATD 2022 and MOSAIC Kick Off Conference*. University of Salerno (2022) 12–13.

- [21] Přenosil, A.: *A duality for distributive unimodal logic*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 10*. College Publications (2014) 423–438.
- [22] Simpson, A.: *The Proof Theory and Semantics of Intuitionistic Modal Logic*. Doctoral thesis at the University of Edinburgh (1994).
- [23] Sotirov, V.: *Modal theories with intuitionistic logic*. In *Mathematical Logic*. Publishing House of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (1984) 139–171.
- [24] Takano, M.: *Finite model property for an intuitionistic modal logic*. *Nihonkai Mathematical Journal* **14** (2003) 125–132.
- [25] Wijesekera, D.: *Constructive modal logics I*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **50** (1990) 271–301.