
CONFLUENCE OF CONDITIONAL REWRITING MODULO

SALVADOR LUCAS 

DSIC & VRAIN, Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain
e-mail address: slucas@dsic.upv.es

ABSTRACT. Sets of equations E play an important computational role in rewriting-based systems \mathcal{R} by defining an equivalence relation $=_E$ inducing a partition of terms into E -equivalence classes on which rewriting computations, denoted $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ and called *rewriting modulo E* , are issued. This paper investigates *confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$* , usually called *$E$ -confluence*, for *conditional* rewriting-based systems, where rewriting steps are determined by *conditional* rules. We rely on Jouannaud and Kirchner’s framework to investigate confluence of an abstract relation R modulo an abstract equivalence relation E on a set A . We show how to particularize the framework to be used with conditional systems. Then, we show how to define appropriate finite sets of *conditional pairs* to prove and disprove E -confluence. In particular, we introduce *Logic-based Conditional Critical Pairs* which do not require the use of (often infinitely many) E -unifiers to provide a finite representation of the *local peaks* considered in the abstract framework. We also introduce *parametric Conditional Variable Pairs* which are essential to deal with conditional rules in the analysis of E -confluence. Our results apply to well-known classes of rewriting-based systems. In particular, to *Equational (Conditional) Term Rewriting Systems*.

1. INTRODUCTION


A sequence $0, s(0), s(s(0))$ of numbers in Peano’s notation is usually written as a *term* by using a ‘pairing’ (binary) operator $++$ as in $t_1 = (0 ++ s(0)) ++ s(s(0))$ or $t_2 = 0 ++ (s(0) ++ s(s(0)))$. This is necessary when computing with (variants of) Term Rewriting Systems (TRSs [BN98]), as function symbols have a fixed arity. However, *multiple* presentations of the sequence are possible, as in t_1 and t_2 above. We can overcome this if $++$ is made *associative*, i.e., the equation $xs ++ (ys ++ zs) = (xs ++ ys) ++ zs$ is satisfied for all terms xs, ys , and zs . Then, t_1 and t_2 are made *equivalent modulo associativity* and become members of an *equivalence class* $[t]$, consisting of all terms which are equivalent to t modulo associativity. Here, t can be t_1 or t_2 , the specific choice being immaterial.

In general, if $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$ is the set of terms built from a signature \mathcal{F} and variables in \mathcal{X} , a set of equations E on terms defines an equivalence $=_E$ and a partition $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})/_E$ of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$ into equivalence classes. When additionally considering a set of rules \mathcal{R} , it is

Received by the editors April 4, 2025.

Key words and phrases: Conditional rewriting, Confluence, Program analysis .

Partially supported by grant PID2021-122830OB-C42 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ERDF A way of making Europe”. and by the grant CIPROM/2022/6 funded by Generalitat Valenciana .

Figure 1: E -confluence

natural to view rewriting computations as transformations $[s]_E \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} [t]_E$ of *equivalence classes*. Here, $[s]_E \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} [t]_E$ (i.e., *rewriting modulo*) means that $s' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t'$ for some $s' \in [s]_E$ and $t' \in [t]_E$. We often just write $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} t$ instead of $s =_E s' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t' =_E t$.

In this paper we are interested in E -confluence of rewriting modulo, i.e., the commutation of the diagram in Figure 1, where for all equivalence classes $[s]_E$, $[t]_E$, and $[t']_E$ of E such that $[s]_E \xrightarrow[\mathcal{R}/E]{*} [t]_E$ and $[s]_E \xrightarrow[\mathcal{R}/E]{*} [t']_E$ holds (as usual, solid arrows in the diagram represent given reductions and dotted arrows represent *possible* alternatives, see, e.g., [CR36, page 473], whose existence must be proved), there is an equivalence class $[u]_E$ such that both $[t]_E \xrightarrow[\mathcal{R}/E]{*} [u]_E$ and $[t']_E \xrightarrow[\mathcal{R}/E]{*} [u]_E$ hold.

1.1. Rewriting with conditional systems.

Huet investigated confluence of rewriting with *Term Rewriting Systems* \mathcal{R} (TRSs [BN98]) modulo an equivalence defined by means of a set of equations E [Hue80, Section 3.4]. Jouannaud called *Equational Term Rewriting Systems* (ETRSs) to the combination of a TRS \mathcal{R} and a set of equations E [Jou83]. Term Rewriting Systems \mathcal{R} in ETRSs consist of unconditional rules $\ell \rightarrow r$ only; and the considered sets of equations E consist of unconditional equations $s = t$. In this paper, as in *Generalized Term Rewriting System* (GTRS [Luc24b]), we consider *conditional rules* $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ where c is a sequence of *atoms*, possibly defined by Horn clauses. A GTRS is a tuple $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, H, R)$, where \mathcal{F} (resp. Π) is a signature of *function* (resp. *predicate*) *symbols*, with $\rightarrow, \rightarrow^* \in \Pi$; μ is a *replacement map* selecting *active* arguments of function symbols (i.e., they can be rewritten [Luc20a]);¹ H is a set of definite Horn clauses $A \Leftarrow c$, where the predicate symbol of A is not \rightarrow or \rightarrow^* ; and R is a set of rewrite rules $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ such that $\ell \notin \mathcal{X}$ [Luc24b, Definition 51]. In both cases, c is a sequence of atoms. Since *conditional equations* $s = t \Leftarrow c$, can often be seen as Horn clauses, we obtain *Equational Generalized Term Rewriting Systems* (EGTRSs) $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ as a subclass of GTRSs, where such a distinction is made explicit.

Example 1.1. *The following EGTRS \mathcal{R} can be used to compute the sum of a nonempty sequence $n_1 ++ n_2 ++ \dots ++ n_p$ of $p \geq 1$ natural numbers n_i expressed in Peano's notation. A single number is considered a sequence as well. A signature $\mathcal{F} = \{0, s, ++\}$ of function*

¹In the following, we mark in **red** the non-active, or *frozen* subterms in rules. Although only the pdf version of the submission display them, the distinction can still be helpful, avoiding more 'invasive' notations such as underlining or overlining.

symbols is used to represent them.

$$xs ++ (ys ++ zs) = (xs ++ ys) ++ zs \quad (1.1)$$

$$\text{Nat}(0) \quad (1.2)$$

$$\text{Nat}(s(n)) \Leftarrow \text{Nat}(n) \quad (1.3)$$

$$x \approx y \Leftarrow x \rightarrow^* y \quad (1.4)$$

$$0 + n \rightarrow n \quad (1.5)$$

$$s(m) + n \rightarrow s(m + n) \quad (1.6)$$

$$\text{sum}(n) \rightarrow n \Leftarrow \text{Nat}(n) \quad (1.7)$$

$$\text{sum}(ms) \rightarrow m + n \Leftarrow ms \approx m ++ ns, \text{Nat}(m), \text{sum}(ns) \approx n \quad (1.8)$$

With $\mu(++) = \{1\}$, we specify that only the first argument of $++$ can be rewritten. With $\mu(\text{sum}) = \emptyset$, we forbid rewritings on the argument of sum . Predicate Nat defined by clauses (1.2) and (1.3) identifies an expression as representing a natural number $s^n(0)$ for some $n \geq 0$; clause (1.4) describes the interpretation of conditions $s \approx t$ as reachability in conditional rules like (1.8). The application of a rule like (1.8) to a term $\text{sum}(t)$ is as follows: for each substitution σ , if (i) t rewrites (modulo E) to $\sigma(m ++ ns)$, (ii) $\text{Nat}(\sigma(m))$ holds, and (iii) $\text{sum}(\sigma(ns))$ rewrites to $\sigma(n)$, then we obtain $\sigma(m) + \sigma(n)$. Note that associativity of $++$ is essential to obtain the expected functionality of sum as it permits the ‘reorganization’ of t into t' , i.e., $\sigma(m) ++ \sigma(ns)$, so that, for the first member $\sigma(m)$ of t' , $\text{Nat}(\sigma(m))$ holds.

A number of rewriting-based systems like TRSs, CS-TRSs [Luc20a], CTRSs [Kap84], and CS-CTRSs [Luc21, Section 8.1] can be seen as particular GTRSs [Luc24b, Section 7.3]. Similarly, EGTRSs capture the corresponding equational versions of these systems, like ETRSs and *Generalized Rewrite Theories* [BM06]. As for GTRSs, see, e.g., [Luc24c, Section 8], EGTRSs are intended to be useful to model and analyze properties of computations with sophisticated languages like Maude [CDE⁺07]. In particular, confluence of Maude programs.

1.2. Critical pairs in the analysis of rewriting modulo.

Huet’s starting point was a set of *equational axioms* (i.e., a set of pairs of terms), which is partitioned into a TRS \mathcal{R} and a set E of *variable preserving* equations (i.e., $\text{Var}(s) = \text{Var}(t)$ for all $s = t \in E$, c.f. [Ohl02, Definition 3.2.4(4)]. The pair (\mathcal{R}, E) is called an *equational theory*. For the analysis of E -confluence of \mathcal{R} , Huet considered critical pairs (see [Hue80, page 809]), as in his characterization of local confluence of rewriting with TRSs. They are obtained not only from rules in \mathcal{R} , but also from rules $s \rightarrow t$ and $t \rightarrow s$ obtained by the two possible *orientations* of equations $s = t$ in E [Hue80, page 817]. He proved that equational theories (\mathcal{R}, E) are confluent modulo E if \mathcal{R} is left-linear, all aforementioned critical pairs $\langle u, v \rangle$, are joinable modulo E , i.e., $u \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u' =_E v' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}^*$ holds, and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \circ =_E$ is terminating [Hue80, Theorem 3.3].

A pair (\mathcal{R}, E) where \mathcal{R} is a TRS and E a set of equations (no restriction is imposed) is called an *Equational TRS* (ETRS) in [Jou83]. Jouannaud’s result of confluence of \mathcal{R} modulo E does *not* require left-linearity of \mathcal{R} [Jou83, Theorem 4]. As a counterpart, *E-critical pairs* are used [Jou83, Definition 10]. In contrast to critical pairs, E -unification, i.e., the existence of θ such that $\theta(\ell|_p) =_E \theta(\ell')$ (then θ is called an *E-unifier*), is used to obtain an *E-critical pair* $\langle \theta(\ell)[\theta(r')|_p], \theta(r) \rangle$. In sharp contrast to critical pairs, (i) there is no general *E-unification algorithm* and “for each equational theory one must invent a special algorithm” [Plo72, page 74], which may fail to exist. Furthermore, even for E -unifying

terms, (ii) there can be several, even *infinitely many* E -unifiers θ which must be considered to obtain a *complete set of E -critical pairs* which can be used to check E -confluence of \mathcal{R} [BS01, PS81, Sie89].

1.3. Plan and contributions of the paper.

After some preliminary notions and notations (Section 2), Section 3 introduces some new notations and definitions useful to deal with the abstract framework by Jouannaud and Kirchner [JK86, Section 2] (extending Huet's one [Hue80, Section 2]) which we introduce in Section 4. This is our starting point, as it provides an analysis of confluence of an abstract relation R on a set A modulo an equivalence relation E as the joinability (modulo) of

$$\text{local confluence peaks } t \xrightarrow{R/E} s \rightarrow_R t' \quad \text{and} \quad \text{local coherence peaks } t \xrightarrow{R/E} s \vdash_E t', \quad (1.9)$$

where R^E is an auxiliary relation including R and included in R/E , and \vdash_E is a symmetric relation whose reflexive and transitive closure coincides with the equivalence E .

Section 5 introduces *Equational Generalized Term Rewriting Systems (EGTRSs)* $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ and show how to use the aforementioned abstract results to prove confluence modulo of EGTRSs. In particular, we show that a modification of the treatment of the conditional part of clauses in H and R (with respect to what is described in [Luc24b, Section 7.3] for GTRSs) is necessary for EGTRSs to fit Jouannaud and Kirchner's framework.

Section 6 shows how local confluence and local coherence peaks (1.9) look like when the parameter R^E in Jouannaud and Kirchner's framework is particularized to either

- (1) $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, the rewrite relation of \mathcal{R} . Then, we obtain \mathcal{R} -rewriting peaks, or *r-peaks*, for short; and \mathcal{R} -coherence peaks, or *c-peaks*; or to
- (2) $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$, where E -matching substitutions, rather than matching substitutions, are used in rewriting steps, i.e., $t|_p =_E \sigma(\ell)$, instead of $t|_p = \sigma(\ell)$, is required to apply a rule $\ell \rightarrow r$. This idea was introduced by Peterson & Stickel's [PS81] to improve efficiency of rewriting modulo $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$. Then, we obtain \mathcal{R}, E -rewriting peaks, or *PS-r-peaks*, for short; and \mathcal{R}, E -coherence peaks, or *PS-c-peaks*.

The different joinability conditions for each kind of peak are also discussed.

Section 7 describes the *conditional pairs* we use to obtain *finite representations* of the aforementioned peaks. Although *Conditional Critical Pairs (CCPs)* are already well-known for their use in proofs of confluence of CTRSs [Kap87] and GTRSs; and *Conditional Variable Pairs (CVPs)* are also known from their use to prove confluence of GTRSs [Luc24b, Section 7.5], we use them here in novel ways. Furthermore, we introduce *Logic-based Conditional Critical Pairs (LCCPs)* which are intended to provide a *logic-based* definition of (conditional) critical pair which *avoids* the explicit computation of E -unifiers. For this purpose, the E -unification condition $\ell|_p =^? \ell'$ for rules $\ell \rightarrow r \leftarrow c$ and $\ell' \rightarrow r' \leftarrow c'$ from which E -unifiers σ satisfying $\sigma(\ell|_p) =_E \sigma(\ell')$ would be obtained is placed in the conditional part of the conditional pair associated to them as an equational condition $\ell|_p = \ell'$.

Section 8 investigates how to obtain finite representations of r- and c-peaks by using conditional pairs. For this purpose, only CCPs (obtained from the rules in R and also from the combination of rules and equations in E) and (different classes of) CVPs are necessary. E -unification is *not* used. We prove that their joinability (using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$) modulo E characterizes Huet's abstract properties α and γ of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$. This provides a sufficient condition for E -confluence of EGTRSs, which is given in Section 9. For instance, E -confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 1.1 is proved using this result (see Example 9.2). When applied to *left-linear ETRSs*, as a particular case of EGTRSs, our result strictly subsumes [Hue80, Theorem 3.3].

We also provide a sufficient criterion for *disproving* E -confluence of EGTRSs by using CCPs and CVPs.

Section 10 investigates how to obtain finite representations of PS-r- and PS-c-peaks by using conditional pairs. For this purpose, only LCCPs (also obtained from the rules in R and from the equations in E), different classes of CVPs, and a new kind of conditional pairs specifically introduced here (we call *Down Conditional Pairs*, DCPs) are used. Again, E -unifiers are *not* necessary. We prove that their joinability (using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}^*$) modulo E characterizes Jouannaud and Kirchner’s properties of *local confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ modulo E* with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and *local coherence of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ modulo E* . This provides another sufficient condition for E -confluence of EGTRSs, which is given in Section 11. As we show by means of examples, this new criterion is complementary to the aforementioned one. We also provide a sufficient criterion for *disproving* E -confluence of EGTRSs by using LCCPs, CVPs, and DCPs.

Section 12 discusses some related work. Section 13 concludes and points to some future work.

This paper is an extended and revised version of [Luc24a]. Main improvements are:

- (1) Section 3 is new.
- (2) The abstract treatment of confluence of rewriting modulo developed by Huët is developed in detail in Section 4 and compared to Jouannaud and Kirchner’s. This is crucial as a basis for the new approach in Sections 8 and 9.
- (3) The definition of EGTRS in Section 5 differs from [Luc24a] in the inclusion of a *replacement map* μ . From a syntactical point of view, EGTRSs can be seen as particular GTRSs where E is treated as a distinguished subset of Horn clauses. All technical results stemming from [Luc24a] have been revised to accommodate the use of μ .
- (4) The new approach in Sections 8 and 9 considers the case when R^E above is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$. This is missing in [Luc24a]. This leads to new proofs of E -confluence that only use “ordinary” CCPs and different kinds of CVPs.
- (5) Several diagrams illustrating the relationship between different kinds of peaks and conditional pairs are provided.
- (6) The related work has been revised and extended to include additional work by researchers not considered in [Luc24a].
- (7) Several new examples have been introduced to illustrate the notions and results of the paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In the following, *s.t.* means *such that* and *iff* means *if and only if*. We assume some familiarity with the basic notions of term rewriting [BN98, Ohl02] and first-order logic [Fit96, Men97]. For the sake of readability, though, here we summarize the main notions and notations we use.

Abstract Reduction Relations. Given a binary relation $R \subseteq A \times A$ on a set A , we often write $a R b$ or $b R^{-1} a$ instead of $(a, b) \in R$ (and call R^{-1} the *inverse* relation of R). The *composition* of two relations R and R' is written $R \circ R'$ and defined as follows: for all $a, b \in A$, $a R \circ R' b$ iff there is $c \in A$ such that $a R c$ and $c R' b$. The *reflexive* closure of R is denoted by $R^=$; the *transitive* closure of R is denoted by R^+ ; and the *reflexive and transitive* closure by R^* . An element $a \in A$ is *R-irreducible* (or just *irreducible* if no confusion arises) if there is no b such that $a R b$. We say that $b \in A$ is *R-reachable* from $a \in A$ if $a R^* b$. We say that $a, b \in R$

are *R-joinable* if there is $c \in A$ such that $a R^*c$ and $b R^*c$. Also, $a, b \in R$ are *R-convertible* if $a (R \cup R^{-1})^* b$. Given $a \in A$, if there is no infinite sequence $a = a_1 R a_2 R \cdots R a_n R \cdots$, then a is *R-terminating*; R is *terminating* if a is *R-terminating* for all $a \in A$. We say that R is (locally) *confluent* if, for all $a, b, c \in A$, if $a R^*b$ and $a R^*c$ (resp. $a R b$ and $a R c$), then b and c are *R-joinable*.

Signatures, Terms, Positions. In this paper, \mathcal{X} denotes a countable set of *variables*. A *signature of symbols* is a set of *symbols* each with a fixed *arity*. We often write f/k to make explicit that f is a k -ary symbol. We use \mathcal{F} to denote a *signature of function symbols*, i.e., $\{f, g, \dots\}$ whose arity is given by a mapping $ar : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The set of terms built from \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{X} is $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$. The set of variables occurring in t is $Var(t)$. Terms are viewed as labeled trees in the usual way. *Positions* p are represented by chains of positive natural numbers used to address subterms $t|_p$ of t . The *set of positions* of a term t is $Pos(t)$. The set of positions of a subterm s in t is denoted $Pos_s(t)$. The set of positions of non-variable symbols in t are denoted as $Pos_{\mathcal{F}}(t)$. Positions are ordered by the *prefix ordering* \leq on sequences: given positions p, q , we write $p \leq q$ iff p is a prefix of q . If $p \not\leq q$ and $q \not\leq p$, we say that p and q are *disjoint* (written $p \parallel q$).

First-Order Logic. Here, Π denotes a signature of *predicate symbols*. First-order formulas are built using function symbols from \mathcal{F} , predicate symbols from Π , and variables from \mathcal{X} in the usual way. In particular, *atomic formulas* A (often called *atoms* in the realm of automated theorem proving [Rob67, page 2]), are expressions $P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ where $P \in \Pi$ and t_1, \dots, t_n are terms; we often refer to P as *root*(A). A first-order theory (FO-theory for short) Th is a set of *sentences* (formulas whose variables are all *quantified*). In the following, given an FO-theory Th and a formula φ , $\text{Th} \vdash \varphi$ means that φ is *deducible* from (or a *logical consequence* of) Th by using a correct and complete deduction procedure [Fit96, Men97]. A sequence A_1, \dots, A_n of atoms A_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$ is *Th-feasible* with respect to a theory Th (or just *feasible* if no confusion arises), if there is a substitution σ such that $\text{Th} \vdash \sigma(A_i)$ holds for all $1 \leq i \leq n$; otherwise, it is *infeasible* [GL20].

3. PEAKS AND JOINS IN ABSTRACT REDUCTION

This section introduces some new notations to represent and then compare different kinds of peaks and joins used in the following sections of the paper.

Notation 3.1 (Peaks and joins). *Given relations R and S on A ,*

- $R \uparrow_S$ denotes the family of peaks $t' R^{-1} s S t$ for some $s, t, t' \in A$, which we call an $R \uparrow_S$ -peak.
- $R \downarrow_S$ denotes the family of joins $t' R u S^{-1} t$ for some $t, t', u \in A$ (an $R \downarrow_S$ -join).
- $R \widetilde{\downarrow}_S$ denotes the family of joins $t' R u \sim u' S^{-1} t$ modulo an (implicit) equivalence \sim , for some $t, t', u, u' \in A$ (an $R \widetilde{\downarrow}_S$ -join).

The use of double up and down arrows (\uparrow and \downarrow , respectively) reinforces the idea that R and S can be different.

Due to their frequent use, Table 1 collects a number of simpler, more compact notations (some of them already used in the literature).

Definition 3.2. *A pair $\langle s, t \rangle$ is*

- $R \downarrow_S$ -joinable if $s R u$ and $t S u$ for some $u \in A$.
- $R \widetilde{\downarrow}_S$ -joinable if $s R u$, $t S u'$, and $u \sim u'$ for some $u, u' \in A$.

Accordingly, $J(R \downarrow_S)$ (resp. $J(R \widetilde{\downarrow}_S)$) is the set of all $R \downarrow_S$ -joinable (resp. $R \widetilde{\downarrow}_S$ -joinable) pairs.

Table 1: Compact notations for joinability

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Detailed notation: | $R^* \Downarrow_{R^*}$ | $R^+ \Downarrow_{R^*}$ | $R^* \Downarrow_{R^+}$ | $R^+ \Downarrow_{R^+}$ | $\widetilde{R}^* \Downarrow_{R^*}$ | $\widetilde{R}^+ \Downarrow_{R^*}$ | $\widetilde{R}^* \Downarrow_{R^+}$ | $\widetilde{R}^+ \Downarrow_{R^+}$ |
| Specific notation: | \downarrow_R | \downarrow_R^{ls} | \downarrow_R^{rs} | \downarrow_R^s | $\widetilde{\downarrow}_R$ | $\widetilde{\downarrow}_R^{ls}$ | $\widetilde{\downarrow}_R^{rs}$ | $\widetilde{\downarrow}_R^s$ |
| | where ‘ <i>ls</i> ’, ‘ <i>rs</i> ’, and ‘ <i>s</i> ’ stand for <i>left-strict</i> , <i>right-strict</i> , and <i>strict</i> (joinability). | | | | | | | |

The following property is obvious.

Proposition 3.3. *Let R, R', S, S' be relations on A . If $R \subseteq R'$ and $S \subseteq S'$, then $R \uparrow S \subseteq R' \uparrow S'$, $J(R \Downarrow S) \subseteq J(R' \Downarrow S')$, and $J(\widetilde{R} \Downarrow S) \subseteq J(\widetilde{R}' \Downarrow S')$.*

4. JOUANNAUD AND KIRCHNER’S ABSTRACT APPROACH TO CONFLUENCE OF R/E

Sethi and his collaborators pioneered the abstract analysis of reduction modulo an equivalence [ASU72, Set74]. Huet improved their work in [Hue80] and also showed how to apply the abstract notions and results to term rewriting systems. Jouannaud [Jou83] further developed Huet’s abstract analysis of confluence modulo, by providing an abstract treatment of Peterson & Stickel’s work on practical approaches to rewriting modulo in the realm of rewriting systems [PS81]. Jouannaud and Kirchner provided the technical presentation in [JK86] which we follow here, as it is essentially unchanged since then.

4.1. Basic notions.

Let \vdash_E be a *symmetric* relation on a set A and $\sim_E = \vdash_E^*$ be its reflexive and transitive closure: an *equivalence* relation often called *E-equality*. Let \rightarrow_R (R for short) be a binary relation on A . Given R and E , the relation $\rightarrow_{R/E}$ (R/E for short), is called *reduction (with \rightarrow_R) modulo \sim_E* and *defined* as

$$\rightarrow_{R/E} = \sim_E \circ \rightarrow_R \circ \sim_E \quad (4.1)$$

Let \vDash be the *symmetric* relation

$$\vDash = \vdash_E \cup \rightarrow_R \cup R \leftarrow \quad (4.2)$$

and \vDash^* be the reflexive and transitive closure of \vDash . Note that \vDash^* is an equivalence relation.

Computing with R/E is difficult as it may involve searching inside an infinite E -equivalence class $[t]_E$ for some t' on which a R -reduction step can be performed. Peterson and Stickel investigated this problem for TRSs \mathcal{R} and equational theories E . They introduced a reduction relation on terms, usually denoted $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$, which can be advantageously used for this purpose [PS81]. Thus, an important aspect of Jouannaud and Kirchner’s framework is the use of \rightarrow_{R^E} (R^E for short) as a *parameter* to define and further investigate confluence modulo. Such a relation, though, must satisfy the following *fundamental assumption* [JK86, page 1158]:

$$R \subseteq R^E \subseteq R/E \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, R^E can be “instantiated” in different ways.




Figure 2: R Church-Rosser modulo E and R confluent modulo E in [JK86, Definition 1]




Figure 3: R is R^E -Church-Rosser modulo E (1st diagram in [JK86, Figure 2.1])

4.2. Church-Rosser and confluence properties.

The main abstract properties at stake in the analysis of confluence of reduction modulo are introduced in the following.

Definition 4.1. *Let R and E be as above. Then, following [JK86, Definition 1],*

- R is Church-Rosser modulo E iff for all $t, t' \in A$, if $t \stackrel{*}{\parallel} t'$ then there are u and u' such that $t \rightarrow_{R/E}^* u$, $t' \rightarrow_{R/E}^* u'$ and $u \sim_E u'$,² see Figure 2 (left).
- R is confluent modulo E (or E-confluent) iff for all $s, t, t' \in A$, if $s \rightarrow_{R/E}^* t$ and $s \rightarrow_{R/E}^* t'$, then there are u and u' such that $t \rightarrow_{R/E}^* u$, $t' \rightarrow_{R/E}^* u'$ and $u \sim_E u'$, see footnote 2 and Figure 2 (right).
- R is terminating modulo E (or E-terminating) iff $\rightarrow_{R/E}$ is terminating [JK86, p. 1158].



The following is a *parametric* definition of *joinability* modulo using R^E .

Definition 4.2 (Joinability modulo). *A pair $\langle t, t' \rangle$ with $t, t' \in A$ is R^E -joinable modulo E, (denoted as $t \downarrow_{R^E} t'$), if $\exists u, u' \in A$ s.t. $t \rightarrow_{R^E}^* u$, $t' \rightarrow_{R^E}^* u'$, and $u \sim_E u'$ [JK86, Definition 2].*

Accordingly, the following definition is given in [JK86].

Definition 4.3 (R^E -Church-Rosser modulo E). *According to [JK86, Definition 3], R is R^E -Church-Rosser modulo E if for all t and t' , $t \stackrel{*}{\parallel} t'$ implies $t \downarrow_{R^E} t'$ (Figure 3).*

² Definition 1 in [JK86] does *not* use the last requirement $u \sim_E u'$ as the authors assume u and u' to be E-equivalence classes on A (i.e., $u, u' \in A/\sim_E$) rather than $u, u' \in A$. In order to make the difference explicit, consider $A = \{a, b, c\}$, E be given by (the reflexive, transitive, and symmetric closure of) $b \sim_E c$, and R be given by aRb and aRc . Then, $b \stackrel{*}{\parallel} c$, but b and c are $\rightarrow_{R/E}$ -irreducible. And $\rightarrow_{R/E}^* = \{(a, a)(b, b), (c, c), (a, b), (a, c)\}$. Thus, neither $b \rightarrow_{R/E}^* c$ nor $c \rightarrow_{R/E}^* b$, i.e., as a relation on A , $\rightarrow_{R/E}$ is *not* Church-Rosser. However, $b \sim_E c$. As a relation on A/\sim_E , $\rightarrow_{R/E}$ is confluent.


 Figure 4: R is R^E -Church-Rosser modulo E for R^E terminating

 Figure 5: Confluence and coherence properties: 3rd and 5th diagrams in [JK86, Figure 2.1]

As expected, if R/E is used instead of R^E in Figure 3, we obtain the leftmost diagram in Figure 2. Also note that, if R^E is *terminating*, then the diagram in Figure 3 is equivalent to the diagram in Figure 4, where $\rightarrow_{R^E}^!$ denotes the obtention of an R^E -normal form.

Proposition 4.4. [JK86, p. 1160, bullet 1] *If R is R -Church-Rosser modulo E , then R is R^E -Church-Rosser modulo E , and then R is E -confluent.*

Proof. If R is R -Church-Rosser modulo E , then for all t and t' , $t \Vdash^* t'$ implies $t \widetilde{\downarrow}_R t'$. Since $R \subseteq R^E \subseteq R/E$, we also have $t \widetilde{\downarrow}_{R^E} t'$ and $t \widetilde{\downarrow}_{R/E} t'$. \square

Testing the Church-Rosser or confluence properties of R modulo an equivalence E is difficult due to the need of considering unbounded sequences of steps with \Vdash , \rightarrow_{R^E} , or \vdash_E . Thus, a *local* analysis, reducing the *initial* aforementioned steps to only one is convenient.

4.3. Local confluence and local coherence properties.

Definition 4.6 below introduces the (parametric) *local* properties which are used to investigate the “global” properties above.


Definition 4.5 (Right-strict joinability modulo). *A pair $\langle t, t' \rangle$ with $t, t' \in A$ is right-strict R^E -joinable modulo E , (denoted as $t \downarrow_{R^E}^{rs} t'$), if $\exists u, u'$ s.t. $t \rightarrow_{R^E}^* u$, $t' \rightarrow_{R^E}^+ u'$, and $u \sim_E u'$.*

Definition 4.6 (Local confluence and local coherence). *For R , E , R^E , and R/E as above*

- (1) R^E is locally confluent modulo E with R iff for all t , t' , and t'' , if $t \rightarrow_{R^E} t'$ and $t \rightarrow_R t''$, then $t' \widetilde{\downarrow}_{R^E} t''$ [JK86, Definition 3(3)], see Figure 5 (left).
- (2) R^E is locally coherent modulo E iff for all t , t' , and t'' , if $t \rightarrow_{R^E} t'$ and $t \vdash_E t''$, then $t' \downarrow_{R^E}^{rs} t''$, [JK86, Definition 3(5)], see Figure 5 (right).

Below [JK86, Definition 3], Jouannaud and Kirchner remark that, if E-termination of R is assumed, then \rightarrow_{RE}^+ in the rightmost branch of the diagram in Figure 5(right) can be replaced by \rightarrow_{RE}^* (see property 5') in [JK86, page 1159]). We reproduce their argument.

Proposition 4.7. *If R is E-terminating, then local coherence modulo E of R^E is equivalent to the commutation of the following diagram:*



Proof. Since $\rightarrow_{RE}^+ \subseteq \rightarrow_{RE}^*$, commutation of the rightmost diagram in Figure 5 clearly implies commutation of the diagram above. On the other hand, assume that such a diagram commutes but t' is *not* R^E -reducible, as required by the rightmost diagram in Figure 5. Then, $u \sim_E t'$ holds and therefore, $u \sim_E t' \vdash_E s \rightarrow_{RE} t \rightarrow_{RE}^* u$ contradicts E-termination of R because $R \subseteq R^E \subseteq R/E$ and R/E is $\sim_E \circ \rightarrow_R \circ \sim_E$. \square

For E-terminating relations R, the following result characterizes the R^E -Church-Rosser property of R modulo E as the local confluence and coherence properties modulo E.

Theorem 4.8. [JK86, Theorem 5] *If R is E-terminating, then R is R^E -Church-Rosser modulo E iff R^E is (i) locally confluent modulo E with R and (ii) locally coherent modulo E.*

In [JK86, page 1162], Jouannaud and Kirchner show that E-termination of R *cannot* be replaced by termination of R^E in Theorem 4.8, see [JK86, Figures 2.4 & 2.5].

4.4. Proving and disproving E-confluence of R.

Theorem 4.8 and Proposition 4.4 yield a *sufficient condition* for E-confluence of R on the basis of the local properties in Definition 4.6.

Corollary 4.9. *If R is E-terminating, then R is E-confluent if R^E is (i) locally confluent with R modulo E and (ii) locally coherent modulo E.*

The following result is immediate from a close inspection of diagrams in Figure 2 (right), for E-confluence of R, and the leftmost diagram in Figure 5.

Theorem 4.10. *If R is E-confluent, then R/E is locally confluent modulo E with R.*

As a consequence of this result, we obtain a criterion to *disprove* E-confluence of R.

Corollary 4.11. *If there is a non- $\tilde{\downarrow}_{R/E}$ -joinable $R^E \uparrow_R$ -peak, then R is not E-confluent.*

Proof. Since $R^E \uparrow_R \subseteq R/E \uparrow_R$, the non- $\tilde{\downarrow}_{R/E}$ -joinability of any $R^E \uparrow_R$ -peak implies that R/E is not locally confluent modulo E with R. By Theorem 4.10, R is not E-confluent. \square

Note that peaks $t \leftarrow_{RE} s \vdash_E t'$ are always $\tilde{\downarrow}_{R/E}$ -joinable: since $R^E \subseteq R/E$ and $\vdash_E \subseteq E$,

$$\vdash_E \circ R^E \subseteq \vdash_E \circ R/E \subseteq E \circ R/E \subseteq R/E$$




Figure 6: Confluence of R modulo E and properties α , and γ [Hue80, Figures 8, 9 & 11]

Therefore, $t' \rightarrow_{R/E} t$. Thus, cannot be use such peaks to disprove E-confluence of R as done in Corollary 4.11.

4.5. Huet's approach vs. Jouannaud and Kirchner's.

Huet focused on proving the following property.

Definition 4.12 ([Hue80, first definition in page 802 and Figure 8]). *The relation R is confluent modulo E iff for all $s, s', t, t' \in A$, if $s \sim_E s'$, $s \rightarrow_R^* t$, and $s' \rightarrow_R^* t'$, then there are $u, u' \in A$ such that $t \rightarrow_R^* u$, $t' \rightarrow_R^* u'$, and $u \sim_E u'$, see Figure 6 (left).*

Regarding the relationship between this definition and E-confluence of R, immediately below his definition, Huet remarks that

this condition is different from \rightarrow_R / \sim_E being confluent in A / \sim_E , since we do not allow \sim along the \rightarrow -derivations.

The following example substantiates this claim.

Example 4.13 ([Hue80, Remark in p. 818]). *Consider $E = \{(4.4)\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{(4.5)\}$, with*

$$a = b \quad (4.4)$$

$$f(x, x) \rightarrow g(x) \quad (4.5)$$

Property γ does not hold, as the following peak

$$g(a) \mathcal{R} \leftarrow f(a, a) \vdash_E f(a, b) \quad (4.6)$$

is not $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable: $f(a, b)$ and $g(a)$ are non-E-equivalent $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -normal forms. Indeed, the leftmost diagram in Figure 6 cannot be closed if $s = f(a, a)$, $s' = t' = f(a, b)$, and $t = g(a)$. Hence, \rightarrow is not confluent modulo $=_E$ (Definition 4.12). However, we prove E-confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 11.4.

If R is *normalizing* (i.e., for all $t \in A$ there is an R-normal form t' such that $t \rightarrow_R^* t'$), then, by [Hue80, Lemma 2.6], confluence of R modulo E in Definition 4.12 is *equivalent* to the commutation of the diagram in Figure 4, provided that R is used instead of R^E . Thus, for *normalizing* relations R, [Hue80, Lemma 2.6] proves the equivalence between the notion of confluence modulo in Definition 4.12 and R being R-Church-Rosser modulo E.

If R is E-terminating, [Hue80, Lemma 2.8] proves that R is R-Church-Rosser modulo E iff properties α and γ hold, see Figure 6. Property α and local confluence modulo E of R^E with R (Figure 5, left) coincide if R is used instead of the parameter R^E . Although property γ does not fit the diagram of local coherence modulo R of R^E (due to the *strict* reduction

in the rightmost arrow from t' to u'), by Proposition 4.7, property γ and local coherence modulo R of R^E coincide if R is used instead of R^E and R is E -terminating.

Thus, by [Hue80, Lemma 2.8] (which assumes E -termination of R) and Theorem 4.8, Huet's confluence of R modulo E in Figure 6 (left) (or Definition 4.12) and the Church-Rosser property of R modulo E in Figure 3 coincide if R is used instead of R^E . Thus, we have the following.

Corollary 4.14. *If R is E -terminating, then R is E -confluent if properties α and γ hold.*

Overall, we can say that, if R is used instead of R^E , then Huet's results on confluence of R modulo E are subsumed by Jouannaud and Kirchner's.

4.6. Discussion.

In our setting, the diagrams for properties α and γ in Figure 6 are important because they have (local) peaks involving R and E only. This is important in practice: as shown in [Hue80, Section 3.4], in the realm of (equational) term rewriting systems $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, E, R)$, properties α and γ can be ensured as the joinability (modulo) of *ordinary* critical pairs $\langle s, t \rangle$ [Hue80, page 809] obtained from *both* the rules in R and also from the rules obtained by orienting the equations $\lambda = \rho$ in E as rules $\lambda \rightarrow \rho$ and $\rho \rightarrow \lambda$ [Hue80, Lemmata 3.4 and 3.5]. Furthermore, joinability of critical pairs $\langle s, t \rangle$ is tested as $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \circ =_E \circ_{\mathcal{R}}^* \leftarrow t$ (usually called *joinability modulo*, written $\tilde{\downarrow}$ in [Hue80]).

In sharp contrast (see Figure 5), (local) peaks in local confluence modulo E of R^E with R and local coherence modulo E of R^E (local) peaks involve E , R , and *also* R^E . As a consequence, if E is $=_E$, R is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, and R^E is the Peterson and Stickel's relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$, the analysis of the local properties requires E -critical pairs. E -critical pairs $\langle s, t \rangle$ [JK86, Definition 12] have a number of problems, as mentioned in the introduction (there can be infinitely many; they require E -unification algorithms which may *fail* to exist, ...). Also note that

- (1) ordinary critical pairs are also E -critical pairs but not vice versa, i.e., the use of E -critical pairs amounts at having more pairs to test. On the other hand,
- (2) joinability of E -critical pairs $\langle s, t \rangle$ is tested as $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^* \circ =_E \circ_{\mathcal{R}, E}^* \leftarrow t$, which is more *powerful* than joinability modulo, as $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^*$.

Thus, after presenting EGTRSs in the next section, in Section 6 we make explicit the kind of peaks and joinability conditions we need to consider to prove and disprove confluence modulo of EGTRSs in the remainder of the paper.

5. EQUATIONAL GENERALIZED TERM REWRITING SYSTEMS

The following definition introduces the kind of computational systems we consider here which can be viewed as an specialization of *Generalized Term Rewriting Systems* (GTRSs) introduced in [Luc24b] (see Section 12 for a more detailed comparison).

Definition 5.1 (Equational Generalized Term Rewriting Systems). *An Equational Generalized Term Rewriting System (EGTRS) is a tuple $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ where \mathcal{F} is a signature of function symbols Π is a signature of predicate symbols with $=, \rightarrow, \rightarrow^* \in \Pi$, μ is a replacement map for the signature \mathcal{F} of function symbols, and,*

- E is a set of conditional equations $s = t \leftarrow c$, for terms s and t ;

- H is a set of definite Horn clauses $A \Leftarrow c$ where $A = P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ for some terms t_1, \dots, t_n , $n \geq 0$, is such that $P \notin \{=, \rightarrow, \rightarrow^*\}$; and
- R is a set of conditional rules $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ for terms $\ell \notin \mathcal{X}$ and r .

where c is a sequence of atomic formulas.

Note that $E \cup H \cup R$ is a set of (definite) Horn clauses. Requiring $\text{root}(A) \notin \{=, \rightarrow, \rightarrow^*\}$ for all $A \Leftarrow c \in H$ ensures that computational predicates $=$, \rightarrow , and \rightarrow^* are defined by E and R only (with an *auxiliary* use of H).

Example 5.2. The EGTRS in Example 1.1 is $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$, where $\mathcal{F} = \{0/0, s/1, ++/2\}$, $\Pi = \{\text{Nat}/1, \approx/2, =/2, \rightarrow/2, \rightarrow^*/2\}$, $E = \{(1.1)\}$, $H = \{(1.2), (1.3), (1.4)\}$, and $R = \{(1.5), (1.6), (1.7), (1.8)\}$.

Example 5.3. Viewed as an EGTRS, the ETRS in Example 4.13 is $(\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ where $\mathcal{F} = \{a/0, b/0, f/2, g/1\}$, $\Pi = \{=/2, \rightarrow/2, \rightarrow^*/2\}$, $\mu = \mu_\top$, $E = \{(4.4)\}$, $H = \emptyset$, and $R = \{(4.5)\}$.

Remark 5.4 (Conditions $s \approx t$ and their interpretation). In the literature about Conditional TRSs (CTRSs, see, e.g., [Ohl02, Chapter 7]), symbol \approx is often used to specify conditions $s \approx t$ in rules having different interpretations: as joinability, reachability, etc. [Ohl02, Definition 7.1.3]. In EGTRSs, \approx would be treated as a predicate in Π and the desired interpretation is explicitly obtained by including in H an appropriate set of clauses defining \approx . For instance, (1.4) in Example 1.1 interprets \approx as reachability.

Notation 5.5. Equations $s = t \Leftarrow c$ in E are often transformed into rules by choosing a left-to-right or right-to-left orientation:

$$\overrightarrow{E} = \{s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c \mid s = t \Leftarrow c \in E\} \text{ and } \overleftarrow{E} = \{t \rightarrow s \Leftarrow c \mid s = t \Leftarrow c \in E\}.$$

We let $\overleftrightarrow{E} = \overrightarrow{E} \cup \overleftarrow{E}$. Note that \overleftrightarrow{E} may contain rules $\lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow c$ whose left-hand side λ is a variable. Let $\mathcal{D}(E) = \{\text{root}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{F} \mid \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow d \in \overleftrightarrow{E}\}$.

Definition 5.6. We say that $P \in \Pi$ depends on R if $P \in \{\rightarrow, \rightarrow^*\}$ or there is $A \Leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n \in E \cup H$ with $\text{root}(A) = P$ such that $\text{root}(A_i)$ depends on R for some $1 \leq i \leq n$.

5.1. First-order theory of an EGTRS.

In this paper, *computational relations* (e.g., $=_E$, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}, \dots$) induced by an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ are defined by deduction of atoms $s = t$ (equality in E), $s \rightarrow t$ (one-step rewriting in the usual sense), $s \xrightarrow{ps} t$ (rewriting modulo à la Peterson & Stickel), $s \xrightarrow{rm} t$ (rewriting modulo), etc., in some FO-theory. We *extend* Π with \xrightarrow{ps} , \xrightarrow{rm} , etc., and also \approx_{ps} , \approx_{rm} (as they depend on the previous predicates). Our FO-theories are obtained from the generic sentences in Table 2, where:

- Sentences $(\text{Rf})^\bowtie$, $(\text{Tr})^\bowtie$, and $(\text{Sy})^\bowtie$, which are parametric on a binary relation \bowtie , express *reflexivity*, *transitivity*, and *symmetry* of \bowtie , respectively;
- $(\text{Co})^\bowtie$ expresses *compatibility* of one-step and many-step reduction with \bowtie ;
- for each k -ary function symbol f , $1 \leq i \leq k$, and x_1, \dots, x_k and y_i distinct variables, $(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^\bowtie$ *propagates* an \bowtie -step to the i -th immediate subterm of an f -rooted term;
- $(\text{HC})_\alpha$ presents a clause $\alpha : A \Leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n$, with variables \vec{x} as a sentence.

Table 2: Generic sentences of the FO-theory of EGTRSs

| Label | Sentence |
|--|--|
| (Rf) $^{\boxtimes}$ | $(\forall x) x \boxtimes x$ |
| (Tr) $^{\boxtimes}$ | $(\forall x, y, z) x \boxtimes y \wedge y \boxtimes z \Rightarrow x \boxtimes z$ |
| (Sy) $^{\boxtimes}$ | $(\forall x, y) y \boxtimes x \Rightarrow x \boxtimes y$ |
| (Co) $^{\boxtimes}$ | $(\forall x, y, z) x \boxtimes y \wedge y \boxtimes^* z \Rightarrow x \boxtimes^* z$ |
| (Pr) $_{f,i}^{\boxtimes}$ | $(\forall x_1, \dots, x_k, y_i) x_i \boxtimes y_i \Rightarrow f(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_k) \boxtimes f(x_1, \dots, y_i, \dots, x_k)$ |
| (HC) $_{A \leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n}$ | $(\forall \vec{x}) A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n \Rightarrow A$ |
| (R,E) $_{\ell \rightarrow r \leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n}$ | $(\forall x, \vec{x}) x = \ell \wedge A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n \Rightarrow x \xrightarrow{ps} r$ |
| (R/E) | $(\forall x, x', y, y') x = x' \wedge x' \rightarrow y' \wedge y' = y \Rightarrow x \xrightarrow{rm} y$ |

- (R,E) $_{\alpha}$ defines a Peterson & Stickel rewriting step $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E} t$ (at the root) using rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \leftarrow c$ with variables \vec{x} . Here, $x \notin \vec{x}$.
- (R/E) defines reduction modulo $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ in the usual way.

The following example illustrates the differences between (i) rewriting with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ (where a term t is rewritten if $t|_p = \sigma(\ell)$ for some position p in t , rule $\ell \rightarrow r \leftarrow c$ in \mathcal{R} , and substitution σ such that $\sigma(c)$ holds), (ii) rewriting modulo $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ (where a term t is rewritten if it is E -equivalent to another term t' to which a rewrite rule applies as above), and (iii) rewriting à la Peterson & Stickel $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ (where a term t is rewritten if some subterm $t|_p$ is E -equivalent to an instance $\sigma(\ell)$ of the left-hand side ℓ of a rewrite rule $\ell \rightarrow r \leftarrow c$ and $\sigma(c)$ holds).

Example 5.7. Consider $E = \{(5.1), (5.2)\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, R)$ with $R = \{(5.3), (5.4)\}$, where

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \quad (5.1)$$

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} \quad (5.2)$$

$$\mathbf{c} \rightarrow \mathbf{d} \quad (5.3)$$

$$\mathbf{b} \rightarrow \mathbf{d} \quad (5.4)$$

Then,

- $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})$ is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -irreducible. However, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})$ because $\mathbf{a} =_E \mathbf{c} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{d}$. However,
- $\mathbf{b} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})$ because $\mathbf{b} =_E \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) =_E \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})$, but $\mathbf{b} \not\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})$.

Now, consider the following *parametric* theories with parameters \mathbb{S} (referring to a signature), \mathbb{M} (a replacement map), \mathbb{E} (a set of equations), and \mathbb{R} (a set of rules):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{E}] &= \{(\text{Rf})^=, (\text{Sy})^=, (\text{Tr})^=\} \cup \{(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^= \mid f \in \mathbb{S}, i \in \mathbb{M}(f)\} \cup \{(\text{HC})_e \mid e \in \mathbb{E}\} \\ \text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}}[\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{R}] &= \{(\text{Rf})^{\rightarrow^*}, (\text{Co})^{\rightarrow^*}\} \cup \{(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\rightarrow^*} \mid f \in \mathbb{S}, i \in \mathbb{M}(f)\} \cup \{(\text{HC})_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ \text{Th}_{\mathcal{R},\mathbb{M}}[\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{R}] &= \{(\text{Rf})^{\xrightarrow{ps}^*}, (\text{Co})^{\xrightarrow{ps}^*}\} \cup \{(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\xrightarrow{ps}^*} \mid f \in \mathbb{S}, i \in \mathbb{M}(f)\} \cup \{(\text{R,E})_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ \text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/\mathbb{M}}[\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{R}] &= \{(\text{Rf})^{\xrightarrow{rm}^*}, (\text{Co})^{\xrightarrow{rm}^*}\} \cup \{(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\xrightarrow{rm}^*} \mid f \in \mathbb{S}, i \in \mathbb{M}(f)\} \cup \{(\text{HC})_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(\text{R/E})\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that, in $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/\mathbb{M}}[\mathbb{S}, \mathbb{M}, \mathbb{R}]$ propagation sentences are given for \rightarrow rather than for \xrightarrow{rm} ; this is consistent with the usual definition of rewriting modulo implemented by (R/E).

Since rules $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \leftarrow c$ in R are used to specify *different* computational relations (see Definition 5.14), conditions $s \approx t \in c$ have different *interpretations* depending on the targetted relation: the meaning of \approx is based on predicate \rightarrow if α is used to describe the usual (conditional) rewrite relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$; however, \approx should be treated using \xrightarrow{ps} if α is used

to describe Peterson & Stickel's rewriting modulo $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$; and \approx should be treated using \xrightarrow{rm} if α is used to describe $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$. A simple way to deal with this situation is the following.

Definition 5.8. Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS.

- H^{ps} (resp. H^{rm}) is obtained from H by replacing in each $A \Leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n \in H$ all occurrences of \approx , \rightarrow and \rightarrow^* by \approx_{ps} , \xrightarrow{ps} and \xrightarrow{ps}^* (resp. \approx_{rm} , \xrightarrow{rm} , and \xrightarrow{rm}^*).
- R^{ps} (R^{rm}) is obtained from R by replacing all occurrences of \approx in each $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R$ by \approx_{ps} (\approx_{rm}).

Remark 5.9 (Predicate $=$ does not depend on R). In the following, we will assume that $=$ does not depend on R . Thus, the “meaning” of equational atoms $s = t$ does not depend on the rules in R . For this reason, we do not need versions $=_{ps}$ or $=_{rm}$ of the equality predicate. Similarly, E^{ps} or E^{rm} are not necessary.

Example 5.10. For \mathcal{R} in Example 1.1,

$$H^{rm} = \{(5.5), (5.6), (5.7)\} \text{ and } R^{rm} = \{(5.8), (5.9), (5.10), (5.11)\}$$

with:

$$\text{Nat}(0) \tag{5.5}$$

$$\text{Nat}(s(n)) \Leftarrow \text{Nat}(n) \tag{5.6}$$

$$x \approx_{rm} y \Leftarrow x \xrightarrow{rm}^* y \tag{5.7}$$

$$0 + n \rightarrow n \tag{5.8}$$

$$s(m) + n \rightarrow s(m + n) \tag{5.9}$$

$$\text{sum}(n) \rightarrow n \Leftarrow \text{Nat}(n) \tag{5.10}$$

$$\text{sum}(ms) \rightarrow m + n \Leftarrow ms \approx_{rm} m ++ ns, \text{Nat}(m), \text{sum}(ns) \approx_{rm} n \tag{5.11}$$

H^{ps} and R^{ps} are similarly obtained.

Given an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ whose equality predicate $=$ does *not* depend on R , the following theories are obtained:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Th}_E &= \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, E] \cup \{(\text{HC})_\alpha \mid \alpha \in H\} \\ \text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}} &= \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, E] \cup \text{Th}_R[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R] \cup \{(\text{HC})_\alpha \mid \alpha \in H\} \\ \text{Th}_{\mathcal{R},E} &= \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, E] \cup \text{Th}_{R,M}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{ps}] \cup \{(\text{HC})_\alpha \mid \alpha \in H^{ps}\} \\ \text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E} &= \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, E] \cup \text{Th}_{R/M}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \cup \{(\text{HC})_\alpha \mid \alpha \in H^{rm}\} \end{aligned}$$

Example 5.11. For the ETRS in Example 4.13, the corresponding EGTRS \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3 has an associated theory $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ which, since $H = \emptyset$, is the union of

$$\text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, \mu_{\top}, E] = \{(5.12), (5.13), (5.14), (5.15), (5.16), (5.17), (5.18)\}$$

and, since $R^{rm} = R$,

$$\text{Th}_{R/M}[\mathcal{F}, \mu_{\top}, R] = \{(5.19), (5.20), (5.21), (5.22), (5.23), (5.23), (5.25)\}$$

see Figure 7.

Remark 5.12 (Proving infeasibility as satisfiability). As explained in [GL20, Section 4.3], the infeasibility of an atom A with variables \vec{x} with respect to a first-order theory Th (i.e., the absence of a substitution σ such that $\text{Th} \vdash \sigma(A)$ holds), can be proved by finding a model \mathcal{I} of $\text{Th} \cup \neg(\exists \vec{x})A$. Such first-order models can often be automatically obtained by using model generators like AGES [GL19] or Mace4 [McC10].

$$\begin{aligned}
(\forall x) \quad x &= x & (5.12) \\
(\forall x, y) \quad x &= y \Rightarrow y = x & (5.13) \\
(\forall x, y, z) \quad x &= y \wedge y = z \Rightarrow x = z & (5.14) \\
(\forall x_1, y_1, x_2) \quad x_1 &= y_1 \Rightarrow f(x_1, x_2) = f(y_1, x_2) & (5.15) \\
(\forall x_1, x_2, y_2) \quad x_2 &= y_2 \Rightarrow f(x_1, x_2) = f(x_1, y_2) & (5.16) \\
(\forall x_1, y_1) \quad x_1 &= y_1 \Rightarrow g(x_1) = g(y_1) & (5.17) \\
& \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} & (5.18) \\
(\forall x) \quad x &\xrightarrow{rm}^* x & (5.19) \\
(\forall x, y, z) \quad x \xrightarrow{rm} y \wedge y &\xrightarrow{rm}^* z \Rightarrow x \xrightarrow{rm}^* z & (5.20) \\
(\forall x_1, y_1, x_2) \quad x_1 \rightarrow y_1 &\Rightarrow f(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow f(y_1, x_2) & (5.21) \\
(\forall x_1, x_2, y_2) \quad x_2 \rightarrow y_2 &\Rightarrow f(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow f(x_1, y_2) & (5.22) \\
(\forall x_1, y_1) \quad x_1 \rightarrow y_1 &\Rightarrow g(x_1) \rightarrow g(y_1) & (5.23) \\
(\forall x) \quad f(x, x) &\rightarrow g(x) & (5.24) \\
(\forall x, x', y, y') \quad x = x' \wedge x' &\rightarrow y' \wedge y' = y \Rightarrow x \xrightarrow{rm} y & (5.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 7: Theory $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ for \mathcal{R} in Example 4.13.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\forall x) \quad x &= x & (5.26) \\
(\forall x, y) \quad x &= y \Rightarrow y = x & (5.27) \\
(\forall x, y, z) \quad x &= y \wedge y = z \Rightarrow x = z & (5.28) \\
(\forall x_1, x_2) \quad x_1 &= x_2 \Rightarrow f(x_1) = f(x_2) & (5.29) \\
& \mathbf{b} = f(\mathbf{a}) & (5.30) \\
& \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} & (5.31) \\
(\forall x) \quad x &\xrightarrow{ps}^* x & (5.32) \\
(\forall x, y, z) \quad x \xrightarrow{ps} y \wedge y &\xrightarrow{ps}^* z \Rightarrow x \xrightarrow{ps}^* z & (5.33) \\
(\forall x_1, x_2) \quad x_1 \xrightarrow{ps} x_2 &\Rightarrow f(x_1) \xrightarrow{ps} f(x_2) & (5.34) \\
(\forall x) \quad x = \mathbf{c} &\Rightarrow x \xrightarrow{ps} \mathbf{d} & (5.35) \\
(\forall x) \quad x = \mathbf{b} &\Rightarrow x \xrightarrow{ps} \mathbf{d} & (5.36)
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 8: Theory $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ for \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7.

Example 5.13. For the ETRS in Example 5.7, the theory $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R},E} = \text{Th}_{Eq}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, E] \cup \text{Th}_{R,M}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{ps}] \cup \{(HC)_\alpha \mid \alpha \in H^{ps}\}$ is the union of

$$\text{Th}_{Eq}[\mathcal{F}, \mu_\top, E] = \{(5.26), (5.27), (5.28), (5.29), (5.30), (5.31)\}$$

and, since $R^{ps} = R$,

$$\text{Th}_{R,M}[\mathcal{F}, \mu_\top, R] = \{(5.32), (5.33), (5.34), (5.35), (5.36)\}$$

see Figure 8. In Example 5.7 we claim that \mathbf{b} does not reduce into $f(\mathbf{d})$ in one step of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$.

The following interpretation \mathcal{I} over the positive integers (computed by AGES), with

$$\begin{array}{llll} \mathbf{a}^{\mathcal{I}} = 1 & \mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{I}} = 1 & \mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{I}} = 1 & \mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{I}} = 1 \\ \mathbf{f}^{\mathcal{I}}(x) = 2 & x =^{\mathcal{I}} y \Leftrightarrow \text{true} & x(\overset{ps}{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}} y \Leftrightarrow x \geq_{\mathbb{N}} y & x(\overset{ps}{\rightarrow}^*)^{\mathcal{I}} y \Leftrightarrow \text{true} \end{array}$$

satisfies $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R},E} \cup \{\neg \mathbf{b} \overset{ps}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})\}$, thus formally proving our claim.

When necessary, AGES and Mace4 are often useful to prove infeasibility of rules, conditional pairs, joinability of terms, etc., see [Luc19, Figures 4–6] for some examples of use of first-order satisfiability when dealing with rewriting-based systems.

5.2. Computation with EGTRSSs. Confluence and termination modulo.

The theories above are used to define the expected computational relations as follows.

Definition 5.14. Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, \mu, H, R)$ be an EGTRS and $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$.

- We write $s =_E t$ (resp. $s \rightarrow_{\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}} t$) iff $\text{Th}_E \vdash s = t$ (resp. $\text{Th}_R[\mathcal{F}, \mu, \overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}] \vdash s \rightarrow t$) holds.
- We write $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t$ (resp. $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E} t$ and $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} t$) iff $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}} \vdash s \rightarrow t$ (resp. $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R},E} \vdash s \overset{ps}{\rightarrow} t$ and $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E} \vdash s \overset{rm}{\rightarrow} t$) holds. Similarly for $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$ (resp. $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}^* t$ and $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}^* t$).

Note that (i) $\rightarrow_{\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}}$ is symmetric by definition of $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$; (ii) $=_E$ is an equivalence due to $(\text{Rf})^=$ (reflexivity), $(\text{Sy})^=$ (symmetry), and $(\text{Tr})^=$ (transitivity), all included in Th_E ; and (iii) $=_E$ is the reflexive and transitive closure of $\rightarrow_{\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}}$.

Definition 5.15 (Confluence and termination modulo of an EGTRS). Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. We say that

- \mathcal{R} is confluent modulo E (or E -confluent) iff for all terms t, t_1 , and t_2 , if $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}^* t_1$ and $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}^* t_2$, then there are t'_1 and t'_2 such that $t_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}^* t'_1$, $t_2 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}^* t'_2$ and $t'_1 =_E t'_2$.
- \mathcal{R} is terminating modulo E (or E -terminating) iff $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ is terminating.

Remark 5.16 (Necessary conditions for E -termination). Regarding ETRSs $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, E, R)$, in [JK86, page 1169], Jouannaud and Kirchner noticed that:

- if E contains equations $s = t$ such that $\text{Var}(s) \neq \text{Var}(t)$ (so that there is a variable x occurring in s but not occurring in t), then E -termination is not possible. Consider substitutions σ and σ' such that $\sigma(x) = \ell$ for some rule $\ell \rightarrow r \in R$, $\sigma'(x) = r$, and $\sigma(y) = \sigma'(y) = y$ for all $y \in \mathcal{X} - \{x\}$. Then, it is possible to define an infinite $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -reduction sequence $t = \sigma(t) =_E \sigma(s) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^+ \sigma'(s) =_E \sigma'(t) = t$. For this reason, non-erasingness is assumed for the equational component E of an ETRS, i.e., for all $s = t \in E$, $\text{Var}(s) = \text{Var}(t)$.³ Actually, $\text{Var}(s) = \text{Var}(t)$ for all $s = t \in E$ is also assumed in Huet's work [Hue80, page 816, bottom]. Although the requirement is not justified, the first sentence of page 819, discussing techniques for proving E -termination, makes sense only if such a condition holds.
- Equations of the form $x = t$ where t contains at least two occurrences of x are also incompatible with E -termination. For instance, if $t = t[x, x]$, we have $\ell =_E t[\ell, \ell] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t[r, \ell] =_E t[r, t[\ell, \ell]] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t[r, t[r, \ell]] \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} \dots$. The requirement of linearity of equations in

³In the realm of unification theory, this condition was called *regularity* [Sie89, page 243]. The term is also used in recent papers investigating confluence modulo, e.g., [DM12, Section 2] and [Mes17, Section 2.1].

E (i.e., for all $s = t \in E$, both s and t are linear terms) imposed by other authors, e.g., [Mes17, Section 2.1], overcomes this difficulty.

5.3. E -termination of EGTRSs.

According to [LG18, Luc20b], the E -termination of EGTRSs \mathcal{R} can be proved by showing a first-order model \mathcal{I} of $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ where the interpretation $(\overset{rm}{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}}$ of predicate $\overset{rm}{\rightarrow}$ denoting $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ is *well-founded*. Again, AGES or Mace4 can be used to obtain such first-order models. As explained in [GL19, page 293] it is possible to instruct AGES to guarantee that the interpretation $P^{\mathcal{I}}$ of a binary predicate P is a *well-founded* relation on the interpretation domain. This is not possible with Mace4; however, as explained in [Luc20b, Section 5.5.1], it is possible to force the tool to do the same. When necessary, we use AGES to prove E -termination of the considered EGTRSs.

The following example shows an interpretation proving E -termination of \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3 automatically obtained by AGES.

Example 5.17. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3, the interpretation \mathcal{I} over the naturals, with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}^{\mathcal{I}} &= 1 & \mathbf{b}^{\mathcal{I}} &= 1 & \mathbf{f}^{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) &= x + 2y + 1 & \mathbf{g}^{\mathcal{I}}(x) &= 3x \\ x \overset{\mathcal{I}}{=} y &\Leftrightarrow x =_{\mathbb{N}} y & x \overset{\mathcal{I}}{\rightarrow} y &\Leftrightarrow x >_{\mathbb{N}} y & x(\overset{rm}{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}} y &\Leftrightarrow x >_{\mathbb{N}} y & x(\overset{rm}{\rightarrow}^*)^{\mathcal{I}} y &\Leftrightarrow x \geq_{\mathbb{N}} y \end{aligned}$$

is a model of $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ in Example 5.11. Since $(\overset{rm}{\rightarrow})^{\mathcal{I}}$ is *well-founded*, \mathcal{R} is E -terminating.

5.4. Use of Jouannaud & Kirchner's abstract framework with EGTRSs.

Unfortunately, the relationship between $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, $=_E$, and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$, is *not* as required in the abstract framework presented in Section 4. In particular, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} = (=E \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \circ =E)$ does *not* hold.

Example 5.18. Consider the following EGTRS

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} \tag{5.37}$$

$$\mathbf{a} \rightarrow \mathbf{c} \tag{5.38}$$

$$\mathbf{a} \rightarrow \mathbf{d} \Leftarrow \mathbf{b} \rightarrow^* \mathbf{c} \tag{5.39}$$

$$\mathbf{c} \rightarrow \mathbf{d} \tag{5.40}$$

We have $\mathbf{a} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{c}$; but (5.39) is $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R}}$ -infeasible, hence $\mathbf{a} \not\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{d}$. However, $\mathbf{a} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} \mathbf{d}$, as $\mathbf{b} =_E \mathbf{a} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{c}$, i.e., $\mathbf{b} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} \mathbf{c}$ and (5.39) can be used. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} &= \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}), (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})\} \\ (=E \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \circ =E) &= \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}), (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}), (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})\} \\ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} &= \{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c}), (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}), (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{d}), (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{d}), (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d})\} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} \neq (=E \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \circ =E)$.

Remark 5.19 (Rewriting modulo and rewriting in conditional systems). Example 5.18 shows a mismatch between the definition of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ for an EGTRS \mathcal{R} (Definition 5.14) and the abstract definition (4.1), usually understood for ETRSs. For EGTRSs (and already for CTRSs), the connection $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} = (=E \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \circ =E)$ is lost. This is because conditions in rules are treated using, e.g., $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ to obtain $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ (see, e.g., [Ohl02, Definition 7.1.4]), whereas computations with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ evaluate conditions using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}^*$ instead, see, e.g., [DM12, page 819].

We overcome this problem as follows.

Definition 5.20 (CR-theory of an EGTRS). *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. The CR-theory of \mathcal{R} is*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} = \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, E] \cup \text{Th}_R[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \cup \text{Th}_{R,M}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \cup \text{Th}_{R/M}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \cup \{(HC)_\alpha \mid \alpha \in H^{rm}\}$$

Then, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E}$ (and also $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}^*$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E}^*$) are defined as follows:

$$s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} t \Leftrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s \rightarrow t \quad \text{and} \quad s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E} t \Leftrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s \xrightarrow{ps} t$$

In contrast to $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$, to obtain $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E}$ conditions in rules are evaluated using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ (instead of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$). Now, the requirements (4.1) and (4.3) are fulfilled.

Proposition 5.21. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Then,*

$$\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} = (=E \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} \circ =E) \quad \text{and} \quad \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}.$$

Proof. As for the first claim, we have $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} t$ iff $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s \xrightarrow{rm} t$ iff (i) $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s = s'$ holds for some term s' , (ii) $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s' \rightarrow t'$ holds for some term t' , and (iii) $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash t' = t$ holds; then (R/E) applies to conclude $s \xrightarrow{rm} t$. Thus, we have $s =_E s'$, $s' \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} t'$, and $t' =_E t$, i.e., $s =_E \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} \circ =_E t$.

As for the second claim, in order to prove the first inclusion, since $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} t$ iff $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s \rightarrow t$, we have two possibilities: (i) there is a rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$ and a substitution σ such that $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash \sigma(A)$ holds for all $A \in c$, and then $s = \sigma(\ell)$ and $t = \sigma(r)$ due to the use of $(HC)_\alpha \in \text{Th}_R[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}}$. In this case, we can use $(R,E)_\alpha \in \text{Th}_{R,E}[\mathcal{F}, R^{rm}] \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}}$ by just letting $\sigma(x) = \sigma(\ell)$ for x the fresh variable in $(R,E)_\alpha$ and using $(\text{Rf})^= \in \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, E] \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}}$ to conclude $\sigma(x) =_E \sigma(\ell)$, as required to conclude $s \xrightarrow{ps}_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E} t$. The second case is (ii) the use of $(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\rightarrow} \in \text{Th}_R[\mathcal{F}, R^{rm}] \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}}$ for some k -ary symbol $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $i \in \mu(f)$ such that $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_i, \dots, s_k)$ for some terms s_1, \dots, s_k , $t = f(s_1, \dots, t_i, \dots, s_k)$ for some term s_i and $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s_i \rightarrow t_i$ holds. By an inductive argument, we can assume that $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s_i \xrightarrow{ps} t_i$ holds. Then, by using $(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\xrightarrow{ps}} \in \text{Th}_{R,E}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}}$ we conclude $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s \xrightarrow{ps} t$.

For the inclusion $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$, we proceed similarly. Since $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E} t$ iff $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s \xrightarrow{ps} t$, we have two possibilities: (i) $(R,E)_\alpha$ is used, i.e., there is a rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$ and a substitution σ such that (i.1) $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash \sigma(x) = \sigma(\ell)$ for x the fresh variable in $(R,E)_\alpha$, (i.2) $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash \sigma(A)$ holds for all $A \in c$, and then (i.3) $s = \sigma(x) =_E \sigma(\ell)$ and $t = \sigma(r)$ to conclude $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E} t$. By (i.2), we know that $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash \sigma(\ell) \rightarrow \sigma(r)$ by using $(HC)_\alpha$, i.e., $\sigma(\ell) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} \sigma(r)$ holds. Thus, we have $s =_E \sigma(\ell) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} \sigma(r) =_E t$ and, by the first (already proved) claim of this proposition, $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} t$. The second case is (ii) the use of $(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\xrightarrow{ps}} \in \text{Th}_R[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}}$ for some k -ary symbol $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $i \in \mu(f)$ such that $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_i, \dots, s_k)$ for some terms s_1, \dots, s_k , $t = f(s_1, \dots, t_i, \dots, s_k)$ for some term s_i and $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}} \vdash s_i \xrightarrow{ps} t_i$ holds. By an inductive argument, we can assume that $s_i \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} t_i$ and by using the first claim of the proposition, $s_i =_E s'_i \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} t'_i =_E t_i$ for some terms s'_i and t'_i . By using $(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\xrightarrow{ps}} \in \text{Th}_{\text{Eq}}[\mathcal{F}, \mu, R^{rm}] \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{R}^{\text{CR}}}$, we conclude $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_i, \dots, s_k) =_E f(s_1, \dots, s'_i, \dots, s_k)$ and $f(s_1, \dots, t'_i, \dots, s_k) =_E f(s_1, \dots, t_i, \dots, s_k) = t$. Now, by $(\text{Pr})_{f,i}^{\rightarrow}$, we have $f(s_1, \dots, s'_i, \dots, s_k) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} f(s_1, \dots, t'_i, \dots, s_k)$. Thus, $s =_E f(s_1, \dots, s'_i, \dots, s_k) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} f(s_1, \dots, t'_i, \dots, s_k) =_E t$, i.e., $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} t$. \square

Table 3: Abstract notions in Section 4.1 applied to EGTRSs

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|----------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Abstract reduction: | \vdash_E | \sim_E | \rightarrow_R | \rightarrow_{R^E} | $\rightarrow_{R/E}$ |
| Application to EGTRSs: | $\rightarrow_{\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}}$ | $=_E$ | $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ | $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm},E}$ | $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ |

Remark 5.22 (Use of Jouannaud & Kirchner’s abstract framework). *By the first statement in Proposition 5.21, E -confluence of EGTRSs (Definition 5.15) and E -confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ (as an abstract relation on terms, Definition 4.1) coincide. This enables the use of the notions in Section 4.1 to analyze E -confluence of EGTRSs.*

The results in Section 4 apply to EGTRSs according to the correspondence in Table 3. Note that Corollary 4.14 (from Huet’s results) is equivalent to Corollary 4.9 if $R = R^E = \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$. Thus, as a consequence of Corollary 4.14 we have the following two sufficient conditions for E -confluence of E -terminating EGTRSs.

Corollary 5.23. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an E -terminating EGTRS. Then, \mathcal{R} is E -confluent if one of the following conditions hold:*

- (1) $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ and \vdash_E (i.e., $\rightarrow_{\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}}$) satisfy properties α and γ , or
- (2) $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm},E}$ is locally confluent modulo E with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ and locally coherent modulo E .

The following result is essential in the analysis of peaks in Sections 8 and 10.

Proposition 5.24. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be a EGTRS and $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$.*

- (1) *If $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} t$, then there is $p \in \mathcal{Pos}^\mu(s)$ and $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$ such that (i) $s|_p = \sigma(\ell)$ for some substitution σ , (ii) for all $A \in c$, $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}} \vdash \sigma(A)$ holds, and (iii) $t = s[\sigma(r)]_p$.*
- (2) *If $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm},E} t$, then there is $p \in \mathcal{Pos}^\mu(s)$ and $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$ such that (i) $s|_p =_E \sigma(\ell)$ for some substitution σ , (ii) for all $A \in c$, $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}} \vdash \sigma(A)$ holds, and (iii) $t = s[\sigma(r)]_p$.*

Proof. Since $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} t$ iff $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}} \vdash s \rightarrow t$, we have two possibilities:

- (1) There is a clause $(HC)_\alpha$ for some rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$ and a substitution σ such that $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}} \vdash \sigma(A)$ holds for all $A \in c$, and then $s = \sigma(\ell)$ and $t = \sigma(r)$. In this case, we just need to take $p = \Lambda$ to obtain the desired conclusion.
- (2) There is a clause $(Pr)_{f,i}$ for some $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $i \in \mu(f)$ so that (a) $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_i, \dots, s_k)$ for some terms s_1, \dots, s_k , (b) $t = f(s_1, \dots, t_i, \dots, s_k)$, and $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}} \vdash s_i \rightarrow t_i$ holds. By the induction hypothesis, $s_i \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}} t_i$ holds and there is $q \in \mathcal{Pos}^\mu(s_i)$, $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in \mathcal{R}$ and substitution σ such that $s_i|_q = \sigma(\ell)$, $t_i = s_i[\sigma(r)]_q$, and each atom in $\sigma(c)$ is deducible from $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}}$. Since $s|_{i,q} = \sigma(\ell)$ and $t = s[\sigma(r)]_{i,q}$, the conclusion follows by letting $p = i.q$, which belongs to $\mathcal{Pos}^\mu(s)$ by definition of \mathcal{Pos}^μ .

The case $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm},E} t$ is similar. □

Notation 5.25. *For the sake of readability, in the following, if no confusion arises we drop rm from R^{rm} and \mathcal{R}^{rm} in $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm},E}$ (and associated peak and joinability notions $\uparrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}, \dots, \downarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}, \downarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm},E}$, etc.) and write $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$, $\uparrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, $\dots, \downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$, etc., by assuming that the corresponding reduction relations are obtained as indicated in the paragraph below Definition 5.20.*

Also, if no confusion arises, in the following we use *(in)feasible* instead of $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}}$ -*(in)feasible*, i.e., theory $\overline{\mathcal{R}^{CR}}$ is used for any statement about (in)feasibility of sequences of atoms.

Table 4: Joinability conditions for \mathcal{R} -reduction and coherence peaks

| Property | Figure | Peak | Joinability |
|---|--------|--------|------------------------------------|
| α (of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$) | 6(m) | r-peak | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ |
| γ (of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and \vdash_E) | 6(r) | c-peak | $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ |

6. REDUCTION AND COHERENCE PEAKS

According to Corollary 5.23, in order to prove E -confluence of (E -terminating) EGTRSs \mathcal{R} , we have to investigate

- (1) $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability of $\uparrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -peaks (Property α) and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}\uparrow_{\vdash_E}$ -peaks (Property γ), which we denote $\mathcal{R}\uparrow_E$ for short and for the sake of readability; or
- (2) $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinability of $\mathcal{R},E\uparrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -peaks (local confluence of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ modulo E with \mathcal{R}) and $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinability of $\mathcal{R},E\uparrow_E$ -peaks (local coherence of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ modulo E).

Roughly speaking, we need to consider two families of peaks as described in the following.

6.1. \mathcal{R} -reduction and coherence peaks.

Peaks $\mathcal{R}\uparrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathcal{R}\uparrow_E$ considered in properties α and γ (see Figure 6) used in Corollary 5.23(1) to prove E -confluence share the use of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ in the leftmost fork; hence the name \mathcal{R} -reduction and coherence peaks. The following (shorter) names and structure of peaks are used in the following:

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-r-peaks} \quad t \mathcal{R}\leftarrow s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t' \quad (6.1)$$

$$\mathcal{R}\text{-c-peaks} \quad t \mathcal{R}\leftarrow s \rightarrow_{\vdash_E} t' \quad (6.2)$$

We often just refer them as r-peaks or c-peaks if the use of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is clear from the context. According to Corollary 5.23(1), the joinability conditions for these peaks are identical. Section 8 deals with the analysis of \mathcal{R} -reduction and coherence peaks.

6.2. \mathcal{R}, E -reduction and coherence peaks.

Peaks $\mathcal{R},E\uparrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\mathcal{R},E\uparrow_E$ considered in Corollary 5.23(2) are as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}, E\text{-r-peaks} \quad t \mathcal{R},E\leftarrow s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t' \quad (6.3)$$

$$\mathcal{R}, E\text{-c-peaks} \quad t \mathcal{R},E\leftarrow s \rightarrow_{\vdash_E} t' \quad (6.4)$$

We often refer to them as PS-r-peaks or PS-c-peaks, where ‘‘PS’’ reminds the use of *Peterson & Stickel* reduction $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ in the leftmost branch of the peaks. The joinability conditions for these peaks are given in Table 5. Note that, according to the corresponding abstract properties (Figure 5), the joinability conditions differ.

Remark 6.1 ($\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability and $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinability). *Note that $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability implies $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinability. In practice, trying $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability first can be better as it is simpler to implement, as $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -rewriting requires E -matching substitutions. In general, E -matching is not decidable, see, e.g., [Sie89].*

Table 5: Joinability conditions for \mathcal{R}, E -reduction and coherence peaks

| Property | Fig. | Peak | Joinability |
|--|------|-----------|--|
| Local conf. modulo E of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ | 5(l) | PS-r-peak | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ |
| Local coh. modulo E of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ | 5(r) | PS-c-peak | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}^{\text{rs}}$ |
| | | | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ with E -termination |

The next section investigates finite representations of peaks as conditional pairs. Sections 8 and 9 deals with the analysis of \mathcal{R} -reduction and coherence peaks, their finite representation using conditional pairs, and their use in proofs of E -confluence of EGTRSs. Sections 10 and 11 consider \mathcal{R}, E -reduction and coherence peaks in proofs of E -confluence of EGTRSs.

7. CONDITIONAL PAIRS FOR PROVING E -CONFLUENCE OF EGTRSs

In Sections 8 and 10, we investigate how (PS-) r-peaks and c-peaks of *terms* can be proved (or disproved to be) joinable. For this purpose, we use *general conditional pairs*, or just *conditional pairs*, as in [Luc24b, Section 5]:

Definition 7.1 (Conditional pair). *A conditional pair is an expression*

$$\underbrace{\langle s, t \rangle}_{\text{peak}} \Leftarrow \underbrace{A_1, \dots, A_n}_{\text{conditional part}} \quad (7.1)$$

where s and t are terms and A_1, \dots, A_n are atoms.

A conditional pair (7.1) is *trivial* if $s = t$. Conditional pairs $\langle s, t \rangle \Leftarrow c$ and $\langle t, s \rangle \Leftarrow c$, whose peaks are symmetric but share the same conditional part (possibly after reordering the atoms) are called *symmetric*.

Definition 7.2 (Joinability of conditional pairs). *Let \mathcal{R} be an EGTRS and R, S be relations on terms. A conditional pair $\pi : \langle s, t \rangle \Leftarrow c$ is $R \Downarrow_S$ -joinable if for all substitutions σ , if $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{CR}} \vdash \sigma(A)$ holds for all $A \in c$, then $\sigma(s)$ and $\sigma(t)$ are $R \Downarrow_S$ -joinable.*

Definition 7.3 (Feasible conditional pair). *Let \mathcal{R} be an EGTRS. A general conditional pair $\langle s, t \rangle \Leftarrow c$ is feasible if c is feasible. Otherwise, it is infeasible.*

The following result is immediate from Definitions 7.2 and 7.3.

Proposition 7.4. *Let \mathcal{R} be an EGTRS and R, S be relations on terms. Trivial and infeasible conditional pairs are $R \Downarrow_S$ -joinable.*

7.1. Conditional critical and variable pairs.

Following [Luc24b, Definition 59], we describe two families of conditional pairs we use to prove and disprove E -confluence of GTRSs $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$:

- *Conditional critical pairs (CCPs)* $\pi_{\alpha, p, \alpha'}$ of the form

$$\langle \theta(s)[\theta(v)]_p, \theta(t) \rangle \Leftarrow \theta(c), \sigma(d) \quad (7.2)$$

for variable disjoint rules $\alpha : s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c$ and $\alpha' : u \rightarrow v \Leftarrow d$ (rename if necessary) and an active non-variable position of s , $p \in \mathcal{P}os_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(s)$ such that $s|_p$ and u unify with $mgu \theta$.

Definition 7.5 (Proper, improper, and root CCPs). *If α and α' in a CCP $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$ are renamed versions of the same rule and $p = \Lambda$, then $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$ is called improper (*iCCP*, simply written π_{α}^i); otherwise, it is proper (*pCCP*).⁴ Furthermore, CCPs $\pi_{\alpha,\Lambda,\alpha'}$ are called root CCPs (*rCCPs*).⁵*

Note that improper CCPs are root CCPs.

Remark 7.6 (CCPs involving rules in \overleftrightarrow{E}). *In our setting, rules of the form $\beta : x \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow \gamma$ for some term ρ may belong to \overleftrightarrow{E} if an equation $x = \rho \Leftarrow \gamma$ (or $\rho = x \Leftarrow \gamma$) is in E . They produce no CCP $\pi_{\beta,p,\alpha}$ for any position p because the only possibility $p = \Lambda$ is not a non-variable position. However, CCPs $\pi_{\alpha,p,\beta}$ for some rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ are possible. Actually, since $\text{Var}(\beta) \cap \text{Var}(\alpha) = \emptyset$, p could be any active, non-variable position of ℓ , see also [JK86, footnote 1 in page 1166], where such pairs are called variable critical pairs.*

- Conditional \bowtie -variable pairs (CVPs) $\pi_{\alpha,x,p}^{\bowtie}$ of the form

$$\pi_{\alpha,x,p}^{\bowtie} : \langle s[x']_p, t \rangle \Leftarrow x \bowtie x', c \quad (7.3)$$

which in this paper are *parametric* on \bowtie , a binary relation on terms, $\alpha : s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c$ is a rule (where s can be a variable), $x \in \text{Var}^\mu(s)$ is an active variable of s , $p \in \text{Pos}_x^\mu(s)$ is an active position of x in s , and x' is a fresh variable. We often talk about conditional variable pairs rather than conditional \bowtie -variable pairs if no confusion arises. In the following, $\text{CVP}(U, \bowtie)$ is the set of all \bowtie -parametric CVPs (7.3) for a set of rules U .

7.2. Equational CCPs and Logic-based conditional critical pairs.

Dealing with Peterson & Stickel's rewriting, each reduction step $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E} t$ involves the computation of E -matching substitutions σ such that $s|_p =_E \sigma(\ell)$ for some rule $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ and $t = s[\sigma(r)]_p$. Accordingly, dealing with peaks involving at least one of such reduction steps (e.g., PS-r-peaks (6.3) or PS-c-peaks (6.4)) may involve the use of E -unifiers in the computation of critical pairs by replacing syntactic unifiers by E -unifiers θ leading to the notion of E -critical pairs for ETRSs, see [JK86, Definition 12]. This notion has been extended to *Generalized Rewrite Theories* [BM06] as follows [DM12, Definition 6], which we slightly adapt to our setting. Given terms s and t , $\text{CSU}_E(s, t)$ denotes a *complete* (possibly infinite) set of E -unifiers of s and t , i.e., for each E -unifier σ of s and t , there is $\theta \in \text{CSU}_E(s, t)$ such that $\theta(s) =_E \sigma(s)$ and there is a substitution τ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\sigma(x) =_E \tau(\theta(x))$ [BN98, Definition 10.1.4].

- Conditional E -critical pairs (ECCPs) $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha',\theta}^{\text{ECCP}}$ of the form

$$\langle \theta(s)[\theta(v)]_p, \theta(t) \rangle \Leftarrow \theta(c), \sigma(d) \quad (7.4)$$

for variable disjoint rules $\alpha : s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c$ and $\alpha' : u \rightarrow v \Leftarrow d$, an active non-variable position of s , $p \in \text{Pos}_x^\mu(s)$, and $\theta \in \text{CSU}_E(s|_p, u)$.

Of course, in order to obtain each θ above, an appropriate E -unification algorithm is necessary. As mentioned in the introduction, however, that such an algorithm does not always exist.

In order to avoid the (computation of possibly infinitely many) E -unifiers of two terms with respect to a given set of equations E , we introduce the following.

⁴This terminology is borrowed from [AL94, Definition 4.2].

⁵We borrow this terminology from [BN98, Exercise 6.19].

Definition 7.7 (Logic-based conditional critical pair). *Let $\alpha : s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c$ and $\alpha' : u \rightarrow v \Leftarrow d$ be rules sharing no variables, together with an active non-variable position $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(s)$. The logic-based conditional critical pair (LCCP for short) $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$ of α at position p with α' is:*

$$\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}^{\text{LCCP}} : \langle s[v]_p, t \rangle \Leftarrow s|_p = u, c, d \quad (7.5)$$

Our terminology “*logic-based conditional critical pair*” tries to avoid confusion with the *E-critical pairs* for ETRSs of [JK86, Definition 12] and also the *conditional critical pairs* for rewrite theories (the ECCPs above). We avoid the *explicit* use of *E-unifiers* by including the *atom* $\ell|_p = \ell'$ in the conditional part of (7.5). Given a replacement map μ and sets of rules U and V , we let $\text{GLCCP}(U, V) = \{\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}^{\text{LCCP}} \mid \alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in U, p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell), \alpha' \in V\}$. As for CCPs (Definition 7.5), we distinguish between proper and improper LCCPs in the same way.

8. ANALYSIS OF \mathcal{R} -REDUCTION AND COHERENCE PEAKS

8.1. \mathcal{R} -reduction peaks.

Given an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ and *terms* s, t , and t' , we consider *r-peaks* (6.1) as follows:

$$t \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t' \quad (8.1)$$

Although a these peaks were considered in [Luc24b, Section 4] for the analysis of local confluence of CTRSs (and GTRSs), we briefly reproduce it here as it is the basis of the analysis of \mathcal{R} -coherence peaks in Section 8.2 and also of \mathcal{R}, E -peaks in Section 10.

By Proposition 5.24(1), there are positions $\bar{p}, \bar{p}' \in \text{Pos}^{\mu}(s)$, rules $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c, \alpha' : \ell' \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c' \in R$ sharing no variable (rename if necessary), and a substitution σ , such that (i) $s|_{\bar{p}} = \sigma(\ell)$ and $\sigma(c)$ hold; and (ii) $s|_{\bar{p}'} = \sigma(\ell')$ and $\sigma(c')$ hold, i.e., every r-peak is of the form

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} s[\underline{\sigma(\ell)}]_{\bar{p}} = s = s[\underline{\sigma(\ell')}]_{\bar{p}'} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} = t' \quad (8.2)$$

Note from Table 4, that r-peaks are required to be $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.

8.1.1. *Classes of r-peaks.* Depending on the relative location of \bar{p} and \bar{p}' , different classes of r-peaks (8.2) are distinguished.

Disjoint r-peaks. If \bar{p} and \bar{p}' in (8.2) are *disjoint*, i.e., $\bar{p} \parallel \bar{p}'$, then $s = s[\sigma(\ell)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\ell')]_{\bar{p}'} = s[\sigma(\ell')]_{\bar{p}'}[w]_{\bar{p}}$. Accordingly, (8.2) can be written as follows:

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\ell')]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} s[\underline{\sigma(\ell)}]_{\bar{p}}[\underline{\sigma(\ell')}]_{\bar{p}'} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s[\sigma(\ell)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} = t' \quad (8.3)$$

Now, $t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\underline{\sigma(\ell')}]_{\bar{p}'} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} s[\underline{\sigma(\ell)}]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} = t'$, i.e., t and t' are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.

Nested r-peaks. If $\bar{p}' = \bar{p}.p \in \text{Pos}^{\mu}(s)$ for some position p , then (8.2) can be written in one of the following possibilities, according to the position where the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -step applies (by abuse, we also use t and t'). Without loss of generality, we can assume that the rightmost $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -step occurs *below or on* the leftmost $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -step and we have

$$t = \sigma(\ell)[\sigma(r')]_p \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \underline{\sigma(\ell)[\sigma(\ell')]}_p \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \sigma(r) = t' \quad (8.4)$$

where $p \geq \Lambda$. We distinguish two cases:




Figure 9: Critical r-peak and CCP




Figure 10: Variable r-peak and CVP

- (1) If $p \in \mathcal{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$, then $\sigma(\ell)|_p = \sigma(\ell'|_p) = \sigma(\ell')$, i.e., $\ell|_p$ and ℓ' unify and we say that (8.4) is a *critical r-peak* (Figure 9);
- (2) If $p \notin \mathcal{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$, there is $x \in \mathcal{Var}^{\mu}(\ell)$ and $q \in \mathcal{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\ell)$ such that $\ell|_q = x$ and $q \leq p$; then we call (8.4) a *variable r-peak* (Figure 10).

Definition 8.1 (μ -homogeneous term; left μ -homogeneous rule). *Given a replacement map μ , we say that a term t is μ -homogeneous if no variable occurs both active and frozen in t , i.e., $\mathcal{Var}^{\mu}(t) \cap \mathcal{Var}^{\#}(t) = \emptyset$. A rule $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ is left- μ -homogeneous if ℓ is μ -homogeneous.*

If the replacement map in use is μ_{\top} (all argument of all function symbols can be rewritten), then every term is μ_{\top} -homogeneous.

Definition 8.2 (μ -compatible rule). *A rule $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ is μ -compatible if (i) no active variable in ℓ is frozen in r , i.e., $\mathcal{Var}^{\mu}(\ell) \cap \mathcal{Var}^{\#}(r) = \emptyset$, and (ii) no active variable in ℓ occurs in c , i.e., $\mathcal{Var}^{\mu}(\ell) \not\subseteq \mathcal{Var}(c)$.*

If the replacement map in use is μ_{\top} , then (i) in Definition 8.2 trivially holds, as $\mathcal{Var}^{\#}(t) = \emptyset$ for all terms t .

Example 8.3. *All rules in $R \cup \overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$ in Example 1.1 are left- μ -homogeneous (and also for R^{rm} in Example 5.10). All rules in $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$ are μ -compatible. Rules (1.5) and (1.6) in Example 1.1 are μ -compatible. However, rules (1.7) and (1.8) are not because all active variables in the left-hand sides of rules (i.e., n in (1.7) and m in (1.7)) occur in the conditional part.*

We have the following.

Proposition 8.4 (Joinable variable r-peaks). *A variable r-peak (8.4) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinable if $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ is left μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Furthermore, if $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(r)$, then (8.4) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{s}}$ -joinable.*

Proof. Since $p \in \text{Pos}^{\mu}(\sigma(\ell)) - \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$, we have $\ell|_q = x$ for some $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\ell)$ and $q \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\ell)$ such that $p = q.u$ for some position u . Note that $\sigma(x) = \sigma(x)[\sigma(\ell')]_u \xrightarrow{u}_{\alpha'} \sigma(x)[\sigma(r')]_u$. Let $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ be the set of positions of occurrences of x in ℓ (i.e., $q \in Q$). Since ℓ is μ -homogeneous, $Q \subseteq \text{Pos}^{\mu}(\ell)$. Thus, $\sigma(\ell) = \sigma(\ell)[\sigma(x)]_Q$ and we have $t = \sigma(\ell)[\sigma(r')]_p \rightarrow_{\alpha'}^* \sigma'(\ell)$, where $\sigma'(x) = \sigma(x)[\sigma(r')]_u$ and $\sigma'(y) = \sigma(y)$ for all $y \neq x$. By μ -compatibility, x does not occur in the conditional part c of α . Since $\sigma(c)$ holds, we have that $\sigma'(c)$ holds as well. Thus, we have $\sigma'(\ell) \xrightarrow{\Lambda}_{\alpha} \sigma'(r)$, i.e., $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* \sigma'(r)$. We also have $t' = \sigma(r) \rightarrow_{\alpha'}^* \sigma'(r)$ by just reducing any possible occurrence of $\sigma(x)$ in t' , i.e., $\sigma(r)$, using α' (which is possible by μ -compatibility). Hence, $t \rightarrow_{\alpha'}^* \sigma'(\ell) \rightarrow_{\alpha} \sigma'(r) \xrightarrow{\alpha' \leftarrow} \sigma(r) = t'$ proves $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinability of (8.4). Furthermore, if $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(r)$, then $t' = \sigma(r) \rightarrow_{\alpha'}^+ \sigma'(r)$ proves $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{s}}$ -joinability of (8.4). \square

8.1.2. *Conditional pairs for nested r-peaks.* Nested r-peaks (8.4) are captured by means of CCPs and CVPs:

- (1) Critical r-peaks are captured by means of CCPs $\pi_{\alpha, p, \alpha'}$ for $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$, $\alpha' : \ell' \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c' \in R^{rm}$ and $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$ (Figure 9). The set of *feasible* CCPs obtained in this way is denoted $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$.
- (2) Variable r-peaks are captured by means of CVPs $\pi_{\alpha, x, p}^{\rightarrow}$ for $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$, $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\ell)$, and $p \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\ell)$ (Figure 10). The set of *feasible* CVPs obtained in this way is denoted $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$.

$\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$ can be partitioned as $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \text{pCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \uplus \text{iCCP}(\mathcal{R})$, where $\text{pCCP}(\mathcal{R})$ (resp. $\text{iCCP}(\mathcal{R})$) consists of all feasible *proper* (resp. *improper*) CCPs.

Proposition 8.5. *Improper CCPs $\pi_{\alpha}^{\downarrow}$ of 2-rules α are trivial.*

Proof. If $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ is a 2-rule, then $\text{Var}(r) \subseteq \text{Var}(\ell)$, and the renamed versions ℓ and ℓ' (with each variable x in ℓ renamed as x' in ℓ') of the left-hand side of α unify with *mgu* $\theta(x) = x'$ for all $x \in \text{Var}(\ell)$. Thus, we also have $\theta(r) = \theta(r')$. Hence $\pi_{\alpha}^{\downarrow} : \langle \theta(r'), \theta(r) \rangle \Leftarrow \sigma(c), \theta(c')$ is trivial. \square

In contrast, dealing with rules α where $\text{Var}(r) \not\subseteq \text{Var}(\ell)$, Proposition 8.5 may *fail* to hold (see [AL94, Example 4.1(a)] for an example in the realm of CTRSs).

Remark 8.6 (Refining $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$). *For the purposes of this paper, we only consider one among all pairwise symmetric CCPs in \mathcal{R} . This is because the joinability notions we use with CCPs are symmetric, i.e., the two compared terms can be switched without changing the joinability result. In particular, we would choose one between the two root CCPs $\pi_{\alpha, \Lambda, \alpha'}$ or $\pi_{\alpha', \Lambda, \alpha}$ for rules α and α' . Also, we can drop all *iCCPs* $\pi_{\alpha}^{\downarrow}$ of 2-rules α from $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$.*

Example 8.7. For \mathcal{R} in Example 1.1, using R^{rm} in Example 5.10, there is a pCCP and an iCCP

$$\pi_{(5.10),\Lambda,(5.11)} : \langle m + n, ms \rangle \Leftarrow \text{Nat}(ms), ms \approx_{rm} m ++ ns, \text{Nat}(m), \text{sum}(ns) \approx_{rm} n \quad (8.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{(5.11)}^1 : \langle m + n, m' + n' \rangle \Leftarrow ms \approx_{rm} m ++ ns, ms \approx_{rm} m' ++ ns', \text{Nat}(m), \\ \text{Nat}(m'), \text{sum}(ns) \approx_{rm} n, \text{sum}(ns') \approx_{rm} n' \end{aligned} \quad (8.6)$$

Note that (8.5) is infeasible: assume that a substitution σ satisfies the conditional part of (8.5): if $\text{Nat}(\sigma(ms))$ holds, then $\sigma(ms)$ is of the form $s^p(0)$ for some $p \geq 0$; then, $\sigma(ms)$ is not $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}^*$ -reducible to $\sigma(m) ++ \sigma(ns)$. Thus, $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.6)\}$. However, (8.6) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. This can be proved by induction on the structure of $\sigma(ms)$ for all all substitutions σ satisfying the conditional part of (8.6).

Example 8.8. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3 (see also Example 4.13), $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$, as the only rule (4.5) is a 2-rule and it does not overlap with itself.

Example 8.9. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7, we have $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$, as there is no overlap between R and $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$. Also, $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$ as no variable occurs in the left-hand sides of rules.

Proposition 8.10. Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Then, \mathcal{R} has property α iff all conditional pairs in $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ are $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.

Proof. It follows by the thorough consideration in this section of disjoint r-peaks (which are always $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable, hence $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable; and then (critical and variable) nested r-peaks with associated conditional pairs mimicking their structure by the application of substitutions: CCPs for critical r-peaks and CVPs for variable r-peaks. \square

8.1.3. *Joinability of CVPs.* As a consequence of Proposition 8.4, we have the following.

Corollary 8.11. Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS and $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$. Then, $\pi_{\alpha,x,p}^{\rightarrow}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^s$ -joinable if α is left μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. If $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(r)$, then $\pi_{\alpha,x,p}^{\rightarrow}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^s$ -joinable

Example 8.12. For \mathcal{R} in Example 1.1 and R^{rm} in Example 5.10, the CVPs are:

$$\pi_{(5.8),n,2}^{\rightarrow} : \langle 0 + n', n \rangle \Leftarrow n \rightarrow n' \quad (8.7)$$

$$\pi_{(5.9),m,1.1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle s(m') + n, s(m + n) \rangle \Leftarrow m \rightarrow m' \quad (8.8)$$

$$\pi_{(5.9),n,2}^{\rightarrow} : \langle s(m) + n', s(m + n) \rangle \Leftarrow n \rightarrow n' \quad (8.9)$$

There is no CVP for rules (5.10) and (5.11) as no active variable occurs in the left-hand sides. The CVPs are all feasible, hence

$$\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.7), (8.8), (8.9)\}$$

By Corollary 8.11, the CVPs (8.7)-(8.9) are all $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^s$ -joinable and hence $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^s$ -joinable.

Example 8.13. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3, $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.10), (8.11)\}$ with

$$\langle f(x', x), g(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.10)$$

$$\langle f(x, x'), g(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.11)$$

which, by Corollary 8.11, are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^s$ -joinable.

Example 8.14. Consider the following variant \mathcal{R} of the EGTRS in Example 5.3, where $E = \{(8.12)\}$ and $R = \{(8.13), (8.15), (8.16), (8.17), (8.18)\}$, with

$$a = b \quad (8.12)$$

$$f(x, x) \rightarrow g(x) \quad (8.13)$$

$$f(x, x) \rightarrow h(x) \quad (8.14)$$

$$a \rightarrow c \quad (8.15)$$

$$b \rightarrow c \quad (8.16)$$

$$g(x) \rightarrow x \quad (8.17)$$

$$h(x) \rightarrow x \quad (8.18)$$

We have $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.19)\}$, with

$$\pi_{(8.13), \Lambda, (8.14)} : \langle h(x), g(x) \rangle \quad (8.19)$$

which is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^s$ -joinable as $h(x) \xrightarrow{(8.18)} x \xleftarrow{(8.17)} g(x)$; and

$$\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.20), (8.21), (8.22), (8.23), (8.24), (8.25)\}$$

with

$$\pi_{(8.13), x, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle f(x', x), g(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.20)$$

$$\pi_{(8.13), x, 2}^{\rightarrow} : \langle f(x, x'), g(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.21)$$

$$\pi_{(8.14), x, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle f(x', x), h(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.22)$$

$$\pi_{(8.14), x, 2}^{\rightarrow} : \langle f(x, x'), h(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.23)$$

$$\pi_{(8.17), x, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle g(x'), x \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.24)$$

$$\pi_{(8.18), x, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle h(x'), x \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x' \quad (8.25)$$

which, by Corollary 8.11, are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^s$ -joinable.

8.2. \mathcal{R} -coherence peaks.

Given an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ and terms s, t, t' , c-peaks (6.2) are of the form

$$t \xleftarrow{\mathcal{R}} s \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} t' \quad (8.26)$$

Given a term s , positions $\bar{p}, \bar{p}' \in \mathcal{P}os^{\mu}(s)$, a rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R$, an oriented equation $\beta : \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow d \in \overleftrightarrow{E}$ (sharing no variables with α), and substitution σ , such that (i) $s|_{\bar{p}} = \sigma(\ell)$ and $\sigma(c)$ holds; and (ii) $s|_{\bar{p}'} = \sigma(\lambda)$ and $\sigma(d)$ holds, every c-peak (8.26) is of the form

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{R}} s[\sigma(\ell)]_{\bar{p}} = s = s[\sigma(\lambda)]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} s[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'} = t' \quad (8.27)$$

Note from Table 4, that c-peaks are required to be $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.

8.2.1. *Classes of c-peaks.* In the following, we enumerate different classes of c-peaks according to the structure of involved terms and rules.

Disjoint c-peaks. If \bar{p} and \bar{p}' in (8.27) are *disjoint*, then $s = s[\sigma(\ell)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\lambda)]_{\bar{p}'} = s[\sigma(\lambda)]_{\bar{p}'}[\sigma(\ell)]_{\bar{p}}$ and we have:

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\lambda)]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'} \mathcal{R} \leftarrow s[\sigma(\ell)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'} = t'$$

Since $t \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'}$ implies $t =_E s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'}$, we conclude $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinability of t and t' .

Nested c-peaks. If \bar{p} and \bar{p}' in (8.27) are *not* disjoint, then (8.27) can be written in one of the following two ways (again, by abuse, we use t and t' ; and $p \geq \Lambda$):

$$t = \sigma(\lambda)[\sigma(r)]_p \mathcal{R} \leftarrow \frac{\overleftarrow{\sigma(\lambda)[\sigma(\ell)]_p}}{\sigma(\lambda)[\sigma(\ell)]_p} \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} \sigma(\rho) = t' \quad (8.28)$$

$$t = \sigma(r) \mathcal{R} \leftarrow \frac{\overleftarrow{\sigma(\ell)[\sigma(\lambda)]_p}}{\sigma(\ell)[\sigma(\lambda)]_p} \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} \sigma(\ell)[\sigma(\rho)]_p = t' \quad (8.29)$$

Depending on the application (*above* or *below*) of the $\xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E}$ -step with respect to the application of the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -step, we call them

- (1) *c-up-peaks* (8.28), where $\beta \in \overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$ is applied *above* the application of $\alpha \in R$. We distinguish two cases:
 - (a) If $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\lambda)$, then $\sigma(\lambda)|_p = \sigma(\lambda|_p) = \sigma(\ell)$, i.e., $\lambda|_p$ and ℓ unify and we say that (8.28) is a *critical c-up-peak*;
 - (b) If $p \notin \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\lambda)$, then there is $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\lambda)$ and $q \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\lambda)$ such that $\lambda|_q = x$, $q \leq p$ and $\sigma(x) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \sigma(x')$ for some fresh variable x' . We say that (8.28) is a *variable c-up-peak*. The case $p = \Lambda$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{X}$, which is possible for rules $\beta \in \overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$, is considered here.
- (2) *c-down-peaks* (8.29), where $p > \Lambda$ (the case $p = \Lambda$ being treated as an E -up c-peak), i.e., $\beta \in \overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$ is applied *below* the application of $\alpha \in R$. We distinguish two cases:
 - (a) If $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell) - \{\Lambda\}$, then $\sigma(\ell)|_p = \sigma(\ell|_p) = \sigma(\lambda)$, i.e., $\ell|_p$ and λ unify and we say that (8.29) is a *critical c-down-peak*;
 - (b) If $p \notin \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$, then there is $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\ell)$ and $q \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\ell)$ such that $\ell|_q = x$, $q \leq p$ and $\sigma(x) \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} \sigma(x')$ for some fresh variable x' . We say that (8.29) is a *variable c-down-peak*.

Proposition 8.15 (Joinable variable c-up-peaks). *A variable c-up-peak (8.28) is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable if β is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Furthermore,*

- (1) *if x occurs more than once in λ , then (8.28) is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinable.*
- (2) *If $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\rho)$, then (8.28) is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable.*

Proof. Since $p \notin \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\lambda)$, there is $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\lambda)$ and $q \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\lambda)$ such that $\lambda|_q = x$ and $p = q.u$ for some position u . Note that $\sigma(x) = \sigma(x)[\sigma(\ell)]_u \xrightarrow{u}_{\alpha} \sigma(x)[\sigma(r)]_u$. Let $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ be the set of positions of occurrences of x in λ (i.e., $q \in Q$). Since λ is μ -homogeneous, $Q \subseteq \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\lambda)$. Thus, $\sigma(\lambda) = \sigma(\lambda)[\sigma(x)]_Q$ and we have $t = \sigma(\lambda)[\sigma(r)]_p \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} \sigma'(\lambda)$, where $\sigma'(x) = \sigma(x)[\sigma(r)]_u$ and $\sigma'(y) = \sigma(y)$ for all $y \neq x$. By μ -compatibility of β , x does not occur in the conditional part γ of β . Thus, since $\sigma(\gamma)$ holds, we have that $\sigma'(\gamma)$ holds as well. Therefore, we have $\sigma'(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\Lambda}_{\beta} \sigma'(\rho)$, i.e., since $\beta \in \overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$, $t \xrightarrow{\alpha^*}_{\mathcal{R}} \circ \xrightarrow{\leftrightarrow_E} \sigma'(\rho)$. We

also have $t' = \sigma(\rho) \rightarrow_{\alpha}^* \sigma'(\rho)$ by just reducing any possible occurrence of $\sigma(x)$ in t' using α (which is possible by μ -compatibility of β), i.e., $t \rightarrow_{\alpha}^* \sigma'(\lambda) =_E \sigma'(\rho) \xrightarrow{\alpha}^* t'$, thus proving $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability of (8.28).

If x occurs more than once in λ , then $t \rightarrow_{\alpha}^+ \sigma'(\lambda) =_E \sigma'(\rho) \xrightarrow{\alpha}^* t'$, thus proving $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinability of (8.28). If $x \in \text{Var}(\rho)$, then $t' = \sigma(\rho) \rightarrow_{\alpha}^+ \sigma'(\rho)$, thus proving $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinability of (8.28). \square

Definition 8.16 (μ -linear term; μ -left-linear rule and EGTRS). *A term is μ -linear if no active variable in occurs twice. A rule $\ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c$ is μ -left-linear if ℓ is μ -linear. An EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ is μ -left-linear if all rules in R are.*

Linear terms are, of course, μ -left-linear, but not vice versa. For instance, $t = f(x, x)$ is μ_{\perp} -left-linear, as no occurrence of x is active in t due to $\mu_{\perp}(f) = \emptyset$.

Proposition 8.17 (Joinable variable c-down-peaks). *A variable c-down-peak (8.29) is $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable if α is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Furthermore, if α is μ -left-linear, then (8.29) is $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable.*

Proof. Since $p \notin \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$, there is $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\ell)$ and $q \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\ell)$ such that $\ell|_q = x$ and $p = q.u$ for some position u . Note that $\sigma(x) = \sigma(x)[\sigma(\lambda)]_u \xrightarrow{u} \sigma(x)[\sigma(\rho)]_u$. Let $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$, for some $n \geq 0$, be the set of positions of occurrences of x in r . Thus, $t = \sigma(r) = \sigma(r)[\sigma(x)]_U$. By μ -compatibility, no occurrence of x is frozen in r . Thus, we have $t \xrightarrow{E}^* \sigma'(r)$ for some substitution σ' such that $\sigma'(x) = \sigma(x)[\sigma(\rho)]_u$ and $\sigma'(y) = \sigma(y)$ if $y \neq x$, i.e., for each occurrence of x in r , $\sigma(x)$ is reduced using β , i.e., for all $z \in \mathcal{X}$, $\sigma(z) =_E \sigma'(z)$. Since ℓ is μ -homogeneous all occurrences of x in ℓ are active and we have $t' = \sigma(\ell)[\sigma(\rho)]_p \xrightarrow{E}^* \sigma'(\ell)$, i.e., $t' =_E \sigma'(\ell)$. By μ -compatibility, x does not occur in the conditional part c of α . Since $\sigma(c)$ holds, we have that $\sigma'(c)$ holds as well. Thus, $t =_E \sigma'(r) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \sigma'(\ell) =_E t'$, i.e., $t =_E \sigma'(r) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}, E} t'$. Hence, (8.29) is $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable.

If ℓ is μ -left-linear, then q is the only position of x in ℓ and $t =_E \sigma'(r) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \sigma'(\ell) = t'$, thus proving $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinability of (8.29). \square

8.2.2. *Conditional pairs for nested c-peaks.* Nested c-peaks are captured by means of CCPs and CVPs as follows:

- (1) Regarding c-up-peaks (8.28),
 - (a) Critical c-up-peaks are captured by means of CCPs $\pi_{\beta, p, \alpha}$ for $\beta : \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow \gamma \in \overleftrightarrow{E}$, $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c' \in R^{rm}$, and $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\lambda)$. The set of feasible CCPs of this form is $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$.
 - (b) Variable c-up-peaks are captured by means of CVPs $\pi_{\beta, x, p}^{\rightarrow}$ for $\beta : \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow \gamma \in \overleftrightarrow{E}$, $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\lambda)$, and $p \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\lambda)$. The set of feasible CVPs of this form is $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E)$.
- (2) Regarding c-down-peaks (8.29),
 - (a) Critical c-down-peaks are captured by means of CCPs $\pi_{\alpha, p, \beta}$ for $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$, $\beta : \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow \gamma \in \overleftrightarrow{E}$, and $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell) - \{\Lambda\}$. The set of feasible CCPs of this form is $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$.
 - (b) Variable c-down-peaks are captured by means of CVPs $\pi_{\alpha, x, p}^{\dashv}$ for $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$, $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(\ell)$, and $p \in \text{Pos}_x^{\mu}(\ell)$. The set of feasible CVPs of this form

is $\text{CVP}^{\vdash}(\mathcal{R})$. The intended meaning of \vdash in these CVPs is $\rightarrow_{\overleftrightarrow{E}}$. We use \vdash to improve readability.

According to Table 4, the joinability conditions for all these CCPs and CVPs to prove property γ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$.

Proposition 8.18. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Then, \mathcal{R} has property γ iff all conditional pairs in $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) \cup \text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E) \cup \text{CVP}^{\vdash}(\mathcal{R})$ are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.*

Proof. It follows by the thorough consideration in this section of disjoint c-peaks (which are always $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable); and then (critical and variable) nested c-up and c-down peaks with associated conditional pairs mimicking their structure by the application of substitutions: CCPs for critical c-up and c-down peaks and CVPs for variable c-up and c-down peaks. \square

8.2.3. *Joinability of CVPs.* According to Propositions 8.15 and 8.17, we have the following.

Corollary 8.19. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS, $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R$ and $\beta : \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow \gamma \in E$. Then,*

- (1) $\pi_{\beta, x, p}^{\rightarrow}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable if β is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Furthermore,
 - (a) If x occurs more than once in λ , then $\pi_{\beta, x, p}^{\rightarrow}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{ls}$ -joinable.
 - (b) If $x \in \text{Var}(\rho)$, then $\pi_{\beta, x, p}^{\rightarrow}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{rs}$ -joinable.
- (2) $\pi_{\alpha, x, p}^{\vdash}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{ls}$ -joinable if α is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Furthermore, if α is μ -left-linear, then $\pi_{\alpha, x, p}^{\vdash}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{ls}$ -joinable.

Remark 8.20 (From right- to left- strict joinability in CVPs). *Note that $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{rs}$ - and $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{rs}$ -joinability of variable c-down peaks (8.29) in Proposition 8.17 become $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{ls}$ - and $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{ls}$ -joinability of the corresponding CVPs in Corollary 8.19(2). The reason is that the usual structure of CVPs introduces an inversion of the represented terms in c-down peaks (8.29). Thus, in order to keep the appropriate joinability condition for the represented peaks, the obtained joinability conditions for CVPs need to be consistently inverted. Although this difference is not crucial in the current setting where only $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is required for all peaks (see Table 4), it will be important in the following sections, where asymmetric joinability conditions could be required for PS-c-peaks (Table 5).*

Example 8.21. *For \mathcal{R} in Example 1.1, we have:*

- No rule in R^{rm} overlaps a rule in \overleftrightarrow{E} . Thus, $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$,
- $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E) = \{(8.30), (8.31)\}$, with

$$\pi_{(1.1), xs, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle xs' ++ (ys ++ zs), (xs ++ ys) ++ zs \rangle \Leftarrow xs \rightarrow xs' \quad (8.30)$$

$$\pi_{(1.1), xs, 1.1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle (xs' ++ ys) ++ zs, xs ++ (ys ++ zs) \rangle \Leftarrow xs \rightarrow xs' \quad (8.31)$$

By Corollary 8.19(1b), these CVPs are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{rs}$ -joinable.

- No rule in \overleftrightarrow{E} overlaps a rule in R^{rm} . Thus, $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) = \emptyset$.

- $\text{CVP}^{\perp}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.32), (8.33), (8.34)\}$ with

$$\pi_{(5.8),n,2}^{\perp} : \quad \langle 0 + n', n \rangle \Leftarrow n \vdash n' \quad (8.32)$$

$$\pi_{(5.9),m,1.1}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{s}(m') + n, \mathbf{s}(m + n) \rangle \Leftarrow m \vdash m' \quad (8.33)$$

$$\pi_{(5.9),n,2}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{s}(m) + n', \mathbf{s}(m + n) \rangle \Leftarrow n \vdash n' \quad (8.34)$$

By Corollary 8.19(2), the CVPs (8.32)–(8.34), are all $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{ls}$ -joinable.

Example 8.22. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3, we have $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) = \text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E) = \emptyset$, and $\text{CVP}^{\perp}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.35), (8.36)\}$ with

$$\pi_{(4.5),x,1}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{f}(x', x), \mathbf{g}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.35)$$

$$\pi_{(4.5),x,2}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{f}(x, x'), \mathbf{g}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.36)$$

Note that rule (4.5) is (trivially) left- μ_{\top} -homogeneous and μ_{\top} -compatible. By Corollary 8.19(2), both (8.35) and (8.36) are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}^{ls}$ -joinable. However, they not $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable: $\sigma = \{x \mapsto \mathbf{a}, x' \mapsto \mathbf{b}\}$ satisfies the conditional part of (8.35). However, $\sigma(\mathbf{f}(x', x)) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a})$ is not $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -reducible and $\sigma(\mathbf{g}(x)) = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{a})$ is not $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -reducible or $=_E$ -equivalent to $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{a})$. Thus, (8.35) is not $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. For (8.36) it is similar.

Example 8.23. For \mathcal{R} and E in Example 5.7, we have $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \{(8.37), (8.38)\}$, for

$$\pi_{(5.1),\Lambda,(5.4)}^{\rightarrow} : \quad \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \rangle \quad (8.37)$$

$$\pi_{(5.2),\Lambda,(5.3)}^{\leftarrow} : \quad \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{a} \rangle \quad (8.38)$$

and $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E) = \emptyset$, $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) = \emptyset$ (only overlaps below the root of the left-hand sides of rules in \mathcal{R} are allowed), and $\text{CVP}^{\perp}(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$. However, the CCPs (8.37) and (8.38) are not even $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}^{ls}$ -joinable because \mathbf{d} is not $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -reducible.

Example 8.24. For \mathcal{R} and E in Example 8.14, we have $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \{(8.39), (8.40)\}$, $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E) = \emptyset$, $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) = \emptyset$ (the root overlaps are considered in $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$) and $\text{CVP}^{\perp}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(8.41), (8.42), (8.43), (8.44), (8.45), (8.46)\}$ with

$$\pi_{(8.12),\Lambda,(8.15)}^{\rightarrow} : \quad \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} \rangle \quad (8.39)$$

$$\pi_{(8.12),\Lambda,(8.16)}^{\leftarrow} : \quad \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{a} \rangle \quad (8.40)$$

$$\pi_{(8.13),x,1}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{f}(x', x), \mathbf{g}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.41)$$

$$\pi_{(8.13),x,2}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{f}(x, x'), \mathbf{g}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.42)$$

$$\pi_{(8.14),x,1}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{f}(x', x), \mathbf{h}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.43)$$

$$\pi_{(8.14),x,2}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{f}(x, x'), \mathbf{h}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.44)$$

$$\pi_{(8.17),x,1}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{g}(x'), x \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.45)$$

$$\pi_{(8.18),x,1}^{\perp} : \quad \langle \mathbf{h}(x'), x \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x' \quad (8.46)$$

Note that (8.39) and (8.40), from $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$, are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{rs}$ -joinable. The CVPs (8.41)–(8.44), from $\text{CVP}^{\perp}(E)$, are all $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{ls}$ -joinable: if σ satisfies their common conditional part, $x \vdash x'$

Table 6: Conditional pairs for \mathcal{R} -reduction and coherence peaks

| Nested peak | Ref. | Cond. Pairs | Joinability |
|----------------------|--------|---|------------------------------------|
| Critical r-peak | (8.4) | $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ |
| Variable r-peak | (8.4) | $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ |
| Critical c-up-peak | (8.28) | $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ |
| Variable c-up-peak | (8.28) | $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E)$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ |
| Critical c-down-peak | (8.29) | $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ |
| Variable c-down-peak | (8.29) | $\text{CVP}^{\text{H}}(\mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ |

then $\sigma = \{x \mapsto C[\mathbf{a}], x' \mapsto C[\mathbf{b}]\}$ or $\sigma = \{x \mapsto C[\mathbf{b}], x' \mapsto C[\mathbf{a}]\}$ for some context $C[\]$. Then (in particular for (8.41); for the others it is similar),

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\mathbf{f}(x', x)) &= \mathbf{f}(C[\mathbf{b}], C[\mathbf{a}]) \rightarrow^+ \mathbf{f}(C[\mathbf{c}], C[\mathbf{c}]) \rightarrow \mathbf{g}(C[\mathbf{c}]) \\ \sigma(\mathbf{g}(x)) &= \mathbf{g}(C[\mathbf{a}]) \rightarrow \mathbf{g}(C[\mathbf{c}])\end{aligned}$$

and similarly for the second possible σ , as required. By Corollary 8.19(2), the CVPs (8.45) and (8.46) are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinable, as rules (8.17) and (8.18) are μ_{\top} -left-linear (hence μ_{\top} -homogeneous) and μ_{\top} -compatible.

9. E -CONFLUENCE OF \mathcal{R} AS THE CHURCH-ROSSER PROPERTY MODULO E OF $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$

Now we can provide our first criteria for (dis)proving E -confluence of EGTRSs, which uses CCPs and CVPs together with Huet's abstract results. Table 6 summarizes the use of conditional pairs for proving joinability of r- and c-peaks for proving properties α and β .

Theorem 9.1. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS.*

(1) *If \mathcal{R} is E -terminating, then it is E -confluent if all pairs in*

$$\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) \cup \text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E) \cup \text{CVP}^{\text{H}}(\mathcal{R})$$

are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.

(2) *If there is a non- \mathcal{R}/E -joinable $\pi \in \text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$, then \mathcal{R} is not E -confluent.*

Proof. (1) By Propositions 8.10 and 8.18, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ satisfies properties α and γ . By Corollary 4.14, \mathcal{R} is E -confluent.

(2) Since conditional pairs in $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ represent all $\mathcal{R} \uparrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -peaks, the claim follows by Corollary 4.11. □

Example 9.2. *The EGTRS \mathcal{R} in Example 1.1 is E -confluent as $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$ consists of a $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable improper CCP (Example 8.7) and all CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable (Example 8.12). According to Example 8.21, $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) = \emptyset$, all CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E)$ and $\text{CVP}^{\text{H}}(\mathcal{R})$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. By Theorem 9.1(1), \mathcal{R} is E -confluent.*

Example 9.3. *The EGTRS \mathcal{R} in Example 8.14 is E -confluent as all conditional pairs in $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$ and $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable (Example 8.14). According to Example 8.24, all CCPs in $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$ and $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable, $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E) = \emptyset$ and all CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\text{H}}(E)$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. By Theorem 9.1, \mathcal{R} is E -confluent.*

Example 9.4. Consider the EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$, where $\mathcal{F} = \{0_{/0}, \text{odd}_{/1}, \text{pev}_{/1}, s_{/1}, \text{test}_{/1}, \text{zero}_{/1}\}$, $\Pi = \{\geq_{/2}, =_{/2}, \rightarrow_{/2}, \rightarrow^*_{/2}\}$, $\mu = \mu_{\top}$, $E = \{(9.1)\}$, $H = \{(9.2), (9.3)\}$, and $R = \{(9.4), (9.5), (9.6)\}$.

$$s(s(x)) = x \Leftarrow x \geq s(0) \quad (9.1)$$

$$x \geq 0 \quad (9.2)$$

$$s(x) \geq s(y) \Leftarrow x \geq y \quad (9.3)$$

$$\text{test}(x) \rightarrow \text{pev}(x) \Leftarrow x = s(s(0)) \quad (9.4)$$

$$\text{test}(x) \rightarrow \text{odd}(x) \Leftarrow x = s(0) \quad (9.5)$$

$$\text{test}(x) \rightarrow \text{zero}(x) \Leftarrow x = 0 \quad (9.6)$$

where \geq is defined by the Horn clauses (9.2) and (9.3). Rules (9.4), (9.5), and (9.6) define tests to check whether a number (in Peano notation) is either positive and even, odd or zero using the equivalence specified by (9.1). We obtain the following conditional pairs:

$$\pi_{(9.4), \Lambda, (9.5)} : \langle \text{odd}(x), \text{pev}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x = s(s(0)), x = s(0) \quad (9.7)$$

$$\pi_{(9.4), \Lambda, (9.6)} : \langle \text{zero}(x), \text{pev}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x = s(s(0)), x = 0 \quad (9.8)$$

$$\pi_{(9.5), \Lambda, (9.6)} : \langle \text{zero}(x), \text{odd}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x = s(0), x = 0 \quad (9.9)$$

$$\pi_{(9.4), x, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle \text{test}(x'), \text{pev}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x', x = s(s(0)) \quad (9.10)$$

$$\pi_{(9.5), x, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle \text{test}(x'), \text{odd}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x', x = s(0) \quad (9.11)$$

$$\pi_{(9.6), x, 1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle \text{test}(x'), \text{zero}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x', x = 0 \quad (9.12)$$

$$\pi_{(9.4), \Lambda, (9.1)}^{\leftarrow} : \langle s(s(x)), \text{pev}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x = s(s(0)), \text{test}(x) \geq s(0) \quad (9.13)$$

$$\pi_{(9.5), \Lambda, (9.1)}^{\leftarrow} : \langle s(s(x)), \text{odd}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x = s(0), \text{test}(x) \geq s(0) \quad (9.14)$$

$$\pi_{(9.6), \Lambda, (9.1)}^{\leftarrow} : \langle s(s(x)), \text{zero}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x = 0, \text{test}(x) \geq s(0) \quad (9.15)$$

$$\pi_{(9.1), x, 1.1}^{\rightarrow} : \langle s(s(x')), x \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x', x \geq s(0) \quad (9.16)$$

$$\pi_{(9.1), x, 1.1}^{\leftarrow} : \langle x', s(s(x)) \rangle \Leftarrow x \rightarrow x', x \geq s(0) \quad (9.17)$$

$$\pi_{(9.4), x, 1}^{\vdash} : \langle \text{test}(x'), \text{pev}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x', x = s(s(0)) \quad (9.18)$$

$$\pi_{(9.5), x, 1}^{\vdash} : \langle \text{test}(x'), \text{odd}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x', x = s(0) \quad (9.19)$$

$$\pi_{(9.6), x, 1}^{\vdash} : \langle \text{test}(x'), \text{zero}(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \vdash x', x = 0 \quad (9.20)$$

We have:

- $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$, as all CCPs (9.7), (9.8), and (9.9) are infeasible and no iCCP is considered, as all rules in R are 2-rules.
- $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$, as the CVPs (9.10), (9.11), and (9.12) are all infeasible: terms s which can be rewritten with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ cannot be proved equivalent to $s(s(0))$, $s(0)$ or 0 , i.e., $s = s(s(0))$, $s = s(0)$, and $s = 0$ cannot be proved. Indeed, if s can be rewritten with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, at least a subterm $\text{test}(s')$ is inside s for some term s' . Since symbols test are not removed but just replaced by pev , odd , or zero , no $=_E$ -match with a term $s^n(0)$ is possible for any $n \geq 0$.
- $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$, as there is no rule in R overlaps a rule in \overleftrightarrow{E} .
- $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E) = \emptyset$ is empty because the CCPs (9.13), (9.14), and (9.15) are all infeasible, as the condition $\text{test}(x) \geq s(0)$, which occurs in all of them, is not satisfiable.

- $\text{CVP}^\rightarrow(E) = \emptyset$ as the CVPs (9.16) and (9.17) are infeasible: terms s which can be rewritten with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ cannot be compared with $\mathfrak{s}(0)$ using \geq , i.e., $s \geq \mathfrak{s}(0)$ cannot be proved.
- $\text{CVP}^\leftarrow(\mathcal{R}) = \{(9.18), (9.19), (9.20)\}$, consists of $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable CVPs. For instance, consider (9.18): if $s \vdash_E t$ holds for some terms s and t , then either
 - (1) $s \xrightarrow{(9.1)} t$ (hence $s = \mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{s}(t))$) and $t \geq \mathfrak{s}(0)$ holds; furthermore, $s =_E \mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{s}(0))$ also holds. This implies that $s = \mathfrak{s}^{2n}(0)$ for some $n > 1$ and $t = \mathfrak{s}^{2n-2}(0)$. Since $n > 1$, $2n - 2 \geq 2$, we have $\text{test}(t) \xrightarrow{(9.4)} \text{pev}(t) \vdash_E \text{pev}(s)$, i.e., (9.18) is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinable, hence $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.
 - (2) Dually, if $s \xleftarrow{(9.1)} t$ (hence $t = \mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{s}(s))$) and $s \geq \mathfrak{s}(0)$ holds; furthermore, $s =_E \mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{s}(0))$ also holds. This implies that $s = \mathfrak{s}^{2n}(0)$ for some $n > 0$ and $t = \mathfrak{s}^{2n+2}(0)$. Since $n \geq 0$, $2n + 2 \geq 2$ and $\text{test}(t) \xrightarrow{(9.4)} \text{pev}(t) \vdash_E \text{pev}(s)$, i.e., (9.18) is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinable, hence $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.

For (9.19) and (9.20), we reason similarly to conclude their $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability.

Overall, Theorem 9.1(1) proves E -confluence of \mathcal{R} (which is clearly E -terminating).

As a corollary of Theorem 9.1(1) and our previous results on joinability of CVPs, we give syntactic conditions on EGTRSs showing that only CCPs need to be proved $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable to conclude E -confluence.

Corollary 9.5. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS such that R is μ -left-linear and μ -compatible and \overleftrightarrow{E} is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. If \mathcal{R} is E -terminating, then it is E -confluent if all pairs in $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable.*

Proof. Due to μ -left-linearity (which implies μ -homogeneity) and μ -compatibility of rules in R , by Corollary 8.11 and Corollary 8.19(2), the CVPs in $\text{CVP}^\rightarrow(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^\leftarrow(\mathcal{R})$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. Due to left- μ -homogeneity and μ -compatibility of rules in \overleftrightarrow{E} , by Corollary 8.19(1), the CVPs in $\text{CVP}^\rightarrow(E)$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. By Theorem 9.1(1), \mathcal{R} is E -confluent. \square

Note the following:

- (1) Example 8.22 shows that we *cannot prove* E -confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3 by using Theorem 9.1(1) or Corollary 9.5 as \mathcal{R} is not left-linear and the CVPs in $\text{CVP}^\leftarrow(\mathcal{R})$ are not $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable, although they are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable.
- (2) Example 8.9 shows that we *cannot disprove* E -confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7 (witnessed by the peak $d \vdash_{\mathcal{R}, E} \leftarrow f(c) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} f(d)$, which is not $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable) by using Theorem 9.1(2), as $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \text{CVP}^\rightarrow(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$.

The use of Jouannaud and Kirchner's notions of *local confluence modulo E* of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and *local coherence modulo E* of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ permits to obtain E -confluence criteria exploiting $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinability of conditional pairs.

In the following, we develop this approach, which permits to solve the two aforementioned open problems. A proof of E -confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3 is given in Example 11.4. Example 11.2 proves that \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7 is not E -confluent.

10. ANALYSIS OF \mathcal{R}, E -REDUCTION AND COHERENCE PEAKS

In this section, we consider the shape of PS-r-peaks (6.3) and PS-c-peaks (6.4).

10.1. \mathcal{R}, E -reduction peaks.

Given an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ and terms s, t , and t' defining a PS-r-peak (6.3), i.e.,

$$t \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow s} t',$$

by Proposition 5.24(2) there are active positions $\bar{p}, \bar{p}' \in \mathcal{P}os^\mu(s)$, rules $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c, \alpha' : \ell' \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c' \in R$ sharing no variable, and substitution σ , such that (i) $s|_{\bar{p}} = w =_E \sigma(\ell)$ and $\sigma(c)$ hold; and (ii) $s|_{\bar{p}'} = \sigma(\ell')$ and $\sigma(c')$ hold, i.e., every rewriting peak is of the form

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow} s[\underline{w}]_{\bar{p}} = s = s[\underline{\sigma(\ell')}]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} s[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} = t' \quad (10.1)$$

Note from Table 5, that PS-r-peaks are required to be $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable.

10.1.1. *Classes of PS-r-peaks.* Depending on the relative location of \bar{p} and \bar{p}' , different classes of peaks (10.1) are distinguished.

Disjoint PS-r-peaks. If \bar{p} and \bar{p}' in (10.1) are *disjoint*, i.e., $\bar{p} \parallel \bar{p}'$, then $s = s[w]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\ell')]_{\bar{p}'} = s[\sigma(\ell')]_{\bar{p}'}[w]_{\bar{p}}$. Accordingly, (10.1) can be written as follows:

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\ell')]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow} s[\underline{w}]_{\bar{p}}[\underline{\sigma(\ell')}]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} s[w]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} = t' \quad (10.2)$$

Since $t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\underline{\sigma(\ell')}]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow} s[\underline{w}]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(r')]_{\bar{p}'} = t'$, t and t' are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable.

Nested PS-r-peaks. If $\bar{p}' = \bar{p}.p \in \mathcal{P}os^\mu(s)$ for \bar{p} and \bar{p}' in (10.1) and some position p , then (10.1) can be written in one of the following possibilities, according to the position where the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -step applies (by abuse, we also use t and t').

(1) In the first case, rewriting with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ occurs *above or on* the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -step and we have

$$t = \sigma(\ell)[\sigma(r')]_p \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow} \underline{\sigma(\ell)[\underline{w}]_p} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \sigma(r) = t' \quad (10.3)$$

where $w =_E \sigma(\ell')$ and $p \geq \Lambda$. We call (10.3) a *PS-r-up-peak*. We distinguish two cases:

- (a) If $p \in \mathcal{P}os_{\mathcal{F}}^\mu(\ell)$, then $\sigma(\ell)|_p = \sigma(\ell|_p) = w =_E \sigma(\ell')$, i.e., ℓ' and $\ell|_p$ E -unify. Then, we say that (10.3) is a *critical PS-r-up-peak*;
- (b) If $p \notin \mathcal{P}os_{\mathcal{F}}^\mu(\ell)$, there is $x \in \mathcal{V}ar^\mu(\ell)$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}os^\mu(\ell)$ such that $\ell|_q = x$ and $q \leq p$. Then, we say that (10.3) is a *variable PS-r-up-peak*.


(2) In the second case, rewriting with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ occurs *below* the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -step; we have

$$t = \sigma(r') \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow} \overleftarrow{w[\underline{\sigma(\ell)}]_p} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} w[\sigma(r)]_p = t' \quad (10.4)$$

where $w = w[\sigma(\ell')]_p =_E \sigma(\ell)$ and $p > \Lambda$, as $p = \Lambda$ coincide with $p = \Lambda$ in (10.3). We call (10.4) a *PS-r-down peak*.

Remark 10.1 (Critical and variable PS-r-down-peaks?). *We do not distinguish between critical and variable PS-r-down-peaks: due to the use E-matching in $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -steps, it is not possible to qualify position p , where the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -step using α occurs, as “overlapping” (or not) rule α' which is used in the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -step.*

Proposition 8.4 has a counterpart for PS-r-up-peaks; the proof is analogous.


 Figure 11: Critical PS-r-up-peak and GLCCPs in $LCCP(\mathcal{R})$

Proposition 10.2 (Joinable variable PS-r-up-peaks). *A variable PS-r-up-peak (10.3) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}^s$ -joinable if α is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Furthermore, if $x \in \text{Var}^{\mu}(r)$, then (10.3) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}^s$ -joinable.*

10.1.2. *Conditional pairs for nested PS-r-peaks.* Given an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$, critical PS-r-peaks (10.3) are captured by different kinds of conditional pairs as follows.

Critical PS-r-up-peaks. In contrast to critical r-peaks, which are treated by means of CCPs (Section 8.1.2), critical PS-r-up-peaks (10.3) are captured by LCCPs (Figure 11) as follows:

$$LCCP(\mathcal{R}) = GLCCP(R^{rm}, R^{rm})$$

Proposition 10.3 (Critical PS-r-up-peaks and LCCPs). *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Let $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c, \alpha' : \ell' \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c' \in R$, sharing no variable, induce critical PS-r-up-peaks (10.3) with $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell')$ as in (10.3). Then, (10.3) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinable ($\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable), iff $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'} \in LCCP(\mathcal{R})$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinable ($\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable).*


Proof. Let (10.3) be

$$t = \sigma(\ell)[\sigma(r')]_p \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R},E\leftarrow} \sigma(\ell)[\overleftarrow{w}]_p \xrightarrow{\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}} \sigma(r) = t'$$

where $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$ and $\sigma(c)$ and $\sigma(c')$ are satisfied, and $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$ is $\langle \ell[r']_p, r \rangle \Leftarrow \ell|_p = \ell', c, c'$. Since $\sigma(\ell)|_p = \sigma(\ell|_p) = w =_E \sigma(\ell')$ in (10.3), σ is also an E -unifier of $\ell|_p$ and ℓ' . Hence, σ satisfies the conditional part of $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$. By \mathcal{R}, E -joinability (resp. \mathcal{R}/E -joinable) of (10.3), $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$ is also \mathcal{R}, E -joinable (resp. \mathcal{R}/E -joinable), as σ is not restricted in any way. Vice versa: every substitution σ satisfying the conditional part of $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$ can also be used to define a peak (10.3), which is \mathcal{R}, E -joinable (resp. \mathcal{R}/E -joinable), if $\pi_{\alpha,p,\alpha'}$ is \mathcal{R}, E -joinable (resp. \mathcal{R}/E -joinable). \square

As for CCPs, $LCCP(\mathcal{R}) = \text{pLCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \uplus \text{iLCCP}(\mathcal{R})$, where $\text{pLCCP}(\mathcal{R})$ (resp. $\text{iLCCP}(\mathcal{R})$) consists of all feasible *proper* (resp. *improper*) LCCPs. Improper LCCPs of 2-rules are also trivial. Thus, we can drop all iLCCP $\pi_{\alpha}^{\text{iLCCP}}$ of 2-rules α from $LCCP(\mathcal{R})$. We can also consider only one symmetric LCCP among the pairwise symmetric ones (see Remark 8.6).

Example 10.4. *For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3 (see also Example 4.13), $LCCP(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$, as there is a single iLCCP for (4.5), which is a 2-rule.*

Figure 12: Variable PS-r-up-peak and CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R})$

Example 10.5. (Continuing Example 5.7) Since \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7 consists of 2-rules only, all *iLCCPs* are dismissed. Thus, $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(10.5)\}$, with a trivial *LCCP*

$$\pi_{(5.3), \Lambda, (5.4)}^{\text{LCCP}} : \quad \langle d, d \rangle \Leftarrow c = b \quad (10.5)$$

The following result is useful to analyze joinability of *LCCPs* (as infeasibility). Here, given a set of rules S , $\mathcal{D}(S) = \{\text{root}(s) \mid s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c \in S\}$ is the set of function symbols defined by means of some rule in the usual sense. Also, we say that a rule $s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c$ is *collapsing* if t is a variable (cf. [BN98, Definition 9.2.3]).

Proposition 10.6. Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an *EGTRS*, $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c, \alpha' : \ell' \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c' \in R^{rm}$ and $\pi_{\alpha, p, \alpha'}^{\text{LCCP}} \in \text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R})$ be such that $\text{root}(\ell|_p) \notin \mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E})$ and $\text{root}(\ell|_p) \neq \text{root}(\ell')$. If (i) \overleftrightarrow{E} is not collapsing, or (ii) $\text{root}(\ell') \notin \mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E})$, then $\pi_{\alpha, p, \alpha'}^{\text{LCCP}}$ is infeasible.


Proof. By definition of *LCCP*, since $p \in \text{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\ell)$ and $\alpha' \in R^{rm}$, we have $\ell|_p, \ell' \notin \mathcal{X}$. If σ satisfies $\ell|_p = \ell'$, then,

$$\sigma(\ell|_p) \xrightarrow[\overleftrightarrow{E}]{*} \sigma(\ell') \quad (10.6)$$

Note that $\text{root}(\ell|_p) \neq \text{root}(\ell')$ and $\text{root}(\ell|_p) \notin \mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E})$. In case (i), reductions with $\xrightarrow[\overleftrightarrow{E}]{*}$ are not applied at the root and cannot change $\text{root}(\sigma(\ell|_p))$, which is $\text{root}(\ell|_p)$. Since ℓ' is not a variable and $\text{root}(\sigma(\ell')) = \text{root}(\ell') \neq \text{root}(\ell|_p)$, sequence (10.6) is not possible. Thus, $\pi_{\alpha, p, \alpha'}^{\text{LCCP}}$ is infeasible. In case (ii), even if a rule $x \rightarrow t \in \overleftrightarrow{E}$ is applied for some variable x , $\text{root}(t) \in \mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E})$ and t could not be rewritten to $\sigma(\ell')$ whose root symbol $\text{root}(\ell')$ is not in $\mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E})$. Thus, $\pi_{\alpha, p, \alpha'}^{\text{LCCP}}$ is infeasible. \square

Variable PS-r-up-peaks. As for variable PS-r-up-peaks (10.3) we use CVPs $\pi_{\alpha, x, p}^{\boxtimes}$. However, in contrast to variable r-peaks (see Section 8.1.2), we use \xrightarrow{ps} as parameter \boxtimes because reductions below active variables of the left-hand side of the rule α are made using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ rather than $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ (see Figure 12). Thus, we let

$$\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) = \text{CVP}(R^{rm}, \xrightarrow{ps})$$


 Figure 13: PS-r-down peak and DCPs in $DCP(\mathcal{R})$

Example 10.7. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7, $CVP^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$ as all rules in R^{rm} are ground.

As a corollary of Proposition 10.2, we have the following.

Corollary 10.8. Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS and $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{\text{rm}}$. Then, $\pi_{\alpha, x, p}^{\text{ps}}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^s$ -joinable if α is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Furthermore, if $x \in \text{Var}^\mu(r)$, then $\pi_{\alpha, x, p}^{\text{ps}}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^s$ -joinable

Example 10.9. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3, $CVP^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(10.7), (10.8)\}$, with

$$\pi_{(4.5), x, 1}^{\text{ps}} : \quad \langle f(x', x), g(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \xrightarrow{\text{ps}} x' \quad (10.7)$$

$$\pi_{(4.5), x, 2}^{\text{ps}} : \quad \langle f(x, x'), g(x) \rangle \Leftarrow x \xrightarrow{\text{ps}} x' \quad (10.8)$$

which, by Corollary 10.8, are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^s$ -joinable.

PS-r-down-peaks. Since PS-r-down-peaks (10.4) combine possible *rule overlaps* (modulo) and the application of rules ‘below’ a variable, these two sources of divergence do not admit a neat separation (as done for PS-r-up-peaks) into “critical” and “variable” \mathcal{R} -down peaks to be captured by means of LCCPs and CVPs (Figure 13). Alternatively, *down conditional pairs* capture these two (mingled) situations at once.

Definition 10.10 (Down conditional pairs). Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R$ defines a Down Conditional Pair (DCP for short) as follows:

$$\pi_{\alpha}^{\text{DCP}} : \langle r, x' \rangle \Leftarrow x = \ell, x \xrightarrow{>\Lambda} x', c \quad (10.9)$$

where x and x' are fresh variables. The set of feasible DCPs obtained in this way $DCP(\mathcal{R})$.

In Definition 10.10, predicate symbol $\xrightarrow{>\Lambda}$ refers to *inner* (i.e., *non-root*) $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -rewriting steps. As usual, $\xrightarrow{>\Lambda}$ is defined by deduction on $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{\text{CR}}$ extended with the theory

$$\{\text{InR}_{f, i, \alpha} \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, i \in \mu(f), \alpha \in R\} \cup \{(\text{Pr})_{f, i}^{\text{ps}} \mid f \in \mathcal{F}, i \in \mu(f)\} \quad (10.10)$$

where sentences $\text{InR}_{f, i, \alpha}$ for rules $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n$ are as follows:

$$(\forall \vec{x} \vec{y}) A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n \Rightarrow f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \ell, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k) \xrightarrow{>\Lambda} f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, r, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)$$

where \vec{x} , i.e., x_1, \dots, x_k are fresh, pairwise distinct variables, which are not in \vec{y} , the variables occurring in α .

Proposition 10.11 (PS-r-down peaks and DCPs). *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Let $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c, \alpha' : \ell' \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c' \in R$, sharing no variable, determine PS-r-down peaks (10.4). Then, (10.4) is $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable ($\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable) iff $\pi_\alpha \in \text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ is $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable ($\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable).*

Proof. Let (10.4) be

$$t = \sigma(r) \quad \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow \quad \overleftarrow{w[\sigma(\ell')]}_p \quad \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \quad w[\sigma(r')]_p = t'$$

where $p > \Lambda$ and $\sigma(c)$ and $\sigma(c')$ are satisfied, and π_α is $\langle r, x' \rangle \Leftarrow x = \ell, x \xrightarrow{\geq \Lambda} x', c$.

As for the *only if* part, since $w = w[\sigma(\ell')]_p =_E \sigma(\ell)$, and $x, x' \notin \text{Var}(\alpha, \alpha')$, we can let $\sigma(x) = w[\sigma(\ell')]_p$ and $\sigma(x') = w[\sigma(r')]_p$. Hence, the conditional part of $\pi_{\alpha, \alpha'}$ is satisfied by σ . By $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinability of (10.4), π_α is also $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable (and hence $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable).

As for the *if* part, let σ be a substitution satisfying the conditional part of π_α . In particular, $\sigma(x) =_E \sigma(\ell)$ holds and, since $\sigma(c)$ also holds, we have $\sigma(x) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E} \sigma(r) = t$. We also have $\sigma(x) \xrightarrow{\geq \Lambda}_{\mathcal{R}} \sigma(x')$, i.e., $\sigma(x) = w[\sigma(\ell')]_p$ and $\sigma(x') = w[\sigma(r')]_p = t'$ for some $p > \Lambda$ and rule $\ell' \rightarrow r' \Leftarrow c'$ such that $\sigma(c')$ holds. By $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinability of π_α , (10.4) is also $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable (and hence $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable). \square

Example 10.12. For \mathcal{R} in Example 4.13, $\text{DCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(10.11)\}$, with

$$\pi_{(4.5)}^{\text{DCP}} : \quad \langle \mathbf{g}(x), y' \rangle \Leftarrow y = \mathbf{f}(x, x), y \xrightarrow{\geq \Lambda} y' \quad (10.11)$$

Example 10.13. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7, we have the following DCPs:

$$\pi_{(5.3)}^{\text{DCP}} \quad \langle \mathbf{d}, x' \rangle \Leftarrow x = \mathbf{c}, x \xrightarrow{\geq \Lambda} x' \quad (10.12)$$

$$\pi_{(5.4)}^{\text{DCP}} \quad \langle \mathbf{d}, x' \rangle \Leftarrow x = \mathbf{b}, x \xrightarrow{\geq \Lambda} x' \quad (10.13)$$

Note that (10.12) is infeasible: if a substitution σ satisfies the conditional part of (10.12), then $\sigma(x) =_E \mathbf{c}$, and either $\sigma(x) = \mathbf{c}$ or $\sigma(x) = \mathbf{a}$. Since \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{c} are constants, no $\xrightarrow{\geq \Lambda}$ -step is possible on them.

However, (10.13) is not even $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable. Note that $\sigma = \{x \mapsto \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}), x' \mapsto \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})\}$ satisfies the conditional part as $\sigma(x) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) =_E \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) =_E \mathbf{b}$ and $\sigma(x) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) \xrightarrow{\geq \Lambda}_{(5.3)} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}) = \sigma(x')$, i.e., we have $\mathbf{d} \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{c}) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})$. However, \mathbf{d} and $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})$ are not \mathcal{R}/E -reducible (hence not \mathcal{R}, E -reducible) nor E -equivalent. Hence they are not $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinable.

The following result is the counterpart of Proposition 8.10 (concerning property α) in the realm of this section based on Jouannaud and Kirchner's approach.

Proposition 10.14. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Then, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ is locally confluent modulo E with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ iff all conditional pairs in $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ are $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable.*

As a consequence of Proposition 10.14 and Corollary 10.8, we have the following.

Corollary 10.15. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS such that all rules in R^{rm} are left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Then, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ is locally confluent modulo E with $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ iff all conditional pairs in $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable.*

10.2. \mathcal{R}, E -coherence peaks.

Given an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ and terms s, t, t' defining a PS-c-peak (6.4), i.e.,

$$t \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow s \rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E} t' \quad (10.14)$$

by Proposition 5.24(2), there are positions $\bar{p}, \bar{p}' \in \text{Pos}^\mu(s)$, an *oriented* equation $\lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow d \in \overleftrightarrow{E}$, a rule $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$ (sharing no variables), and substitution σ , such that (i) $s|_{\bar{p}} = w =_E \sigma(\ell)$ and $\sigma(c)$ hold; and (ii) $s|_{\bar{p}'} = \sigma(\lambda)$ and $\sigma(d)$ hold, every coherence peak (10.14) is of the form

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}} \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow s[\underline{w}]_{\bar{p}} = s = s[\underline{\sigma(\lambda)}]_{\bar{p}'} \rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E} s[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'} = t' \quad (10.15)$$

Note from Table 5, that PS-c-peaks are required to be $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable (or just $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable if \mathcal{R} is E -terminating).

10.2.1. *Classes of PS-c-peaks.* As usual, depending on the relative locations of \bar{p} and \bar{p}' , different peaks (10.15) are distinguished.

Disjoint PS-c-peaks. If \bar{p} and \bar{p}' in (10.15) are *disjoint*, then $s = s[w]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\lambda)]_{\bar{p}'} = s[\sigma(\lambda)]_{\bar{p}'}[w]_{\bar{p}}$ and we have:

$$t = s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\lambda)]_{\bar{p}'} \xleftrightarrow{E} \leftarrow s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'} \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow s[w]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'} = t'$$

Since $t \rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E} s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'}$ implies $t =_E s[\sigma(r)]_{\bar{p}}[\sigma(\rho)]_{\bar{p}'}$, t and t' are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable.

Nested PS-c-peaks. If \bar{p} and \bar{p}' in (10.15) are *not* disjoint, then (10.15) can be written in one of the following three ways (again, by abuse, we use t and t'):

$$t = \sigma(\lambda)[\sigma(r)]_p \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow \overleftarrow{\sigma(\lambda)} \rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E} \sigma(\rho) = t' \quad (10.16)$$

$$t = \sigma(\lambda)[\sigma(r)]_p \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow \overleftarrow{\sigma(\lambda)[\underline{w}]_p} \rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E} \sigma(\rho) = t' \quad (10.17)$$

$$t = \sigma(r) \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow \overleftarrow{w[\underline{\sigma(\lambda)}]_p} \rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E} w[\sigma(\rho)]_p = t' \quad (10.18)$$


that we call PS-c-root-peak (10.16), PS-c-up-peak (10.17), and PS-c-down-peak (10.18), depending on the application of the $\rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E}$ -step. Note that $\sigma(\ell) =_E \sigma(\lambda)$ in (10.16), and $p > \Lambda$ in (10.17) and (10.18).

Proposition 10.16. *PS-c-root peaks (10.16) and PS-c-down peaks (10.18) are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable.*

Proof. For PS-c-root (10.16) peaks it is obvious. For PS-c-down peaks (10.18), i.e.,

$$t = \sigma(r) \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow \overleftarrow{w[\underline{\sigma(\lambda)}]_p} \rightarrow_{\leftrightarrow_E} w[\sigma(\rho)]_p = t'$$

where $w = w[\sigma(\lambda)]_p =_E \sigma(\ell)$, we have $t' \xleftrightarrow{E} w =_E \sigma(\ell) \xrightarrow{\Lambda} \sigma(r) = t$. Therefore, $t = \sigma(r) \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow t'$, i.e., (10.18) is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable. \square



$$\begin{aligned} LCCP : \langle \lambda[r]_p, \rho \rangle &\Leftarrow \lambda|_p = \ell, c, \gamma \\ \ell \rightarrow r &\Leftarrow c \in \mathcal{R}, \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow \gamma \in \overleftrightarrow{E}, p \in \mathcal{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

Figure 14: Critical PS-c-up-peak and GLCCPs in $LCCP(E, \mathcal{R})$

As a consequence of this result, as for $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinability of PS-c-peaks, *only PS-c-up peaks (10.17) need to be considered in some detail.* In this respect, we distinguish two cases:

- (1) If $p \in \mathcal{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\lambda)$, then $\sigma(\lambda)|_p = \sigma(\lambda|_p) = w =_E \sigma(\ell)$, i.e., ℓ and $\lambda|_p$ E -unify. Then, we say that (10.17) is a *critical PS-c-up-peak*;
- (2) If $p \notin \mathcal{Pos}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mu}(\lambda)$, there is $x \in \mathcal{Var}^{\mu}(\lambda)$ and $q \in \mathcal{Pos}^{\mu}(\lambda)$ such that $\lambda|_q = x$ and $q \leq p$. Then, we say that (10.17) is a *variable PS-c-up-peak*.

10.2.2. *Conditional pairs for PS-c-up-peaks.* Given an EGTRS $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$, PS-c-up-peaks (10.17) are captured by two kinds of conditional pairs as follows.

Critical PS-c-up-peaks. For critical PS-c-up-peaks (10.17), we let (see Figure 14):

$$LCCP(E, \mathcal{R}) = GLCCP(\overleftrightarrow{E}, R^{rm})$$

The required $\widetilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinability condition for PS-c-up peaks remains the same for LCCPs in $LCCP(E, \mathcal{R})$. The following result is useful to analyze their joinability. The proof is analogous to item (i) of Proposition 10.6.

Proposition 10.17. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS, $\alpha : \ell \rightarrow r \Leftarrow c \in R^{rm}$, $\beta : \lambda \rightarrow \rho \Leftarrow \gamma \in \overleftrightarrow{E}$, and $\pi_{\beta, p, \alpha}^{\text{LCCP}} \in LCCP(E, \mathcal{R})$. If \overleftrightarrow{E} is not collapsing and $\text{root}(\ell) \notin \mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E})$, then $\pi_{\beta, p, \alpha}^{\text{LCCP}}$ is infeasible.*

The following example shows that non-collapsingness of \overleftrightarrow{E} is necessary for Proposition 10.17 to hold.

Example 10.18. *Consider the following EGTRS*


$$0 + x = x \tag{10.19}$$

$$f(0) \rightarrow 0 \tag{10.20}$$

where $\mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E}) = \{+_2\}$ and the root symbol f in the left-hand side of (10.20) is not in $\mathcal{D}(\overleftrightarrow{E})$. We have the following LCCP in $LCCP(E, \mathcal{R})$:

$$\pi_{(10.19), \Lambda, (10.20)}^{\text{LCCP}} : \langle (0, x) \Leftarrow 0 + x = f(0) \rangle \tag{10.21}$$

Substitution $\sigma = \{x \mapsto f(0)\}$ satisfies the conditional part of (10.21), i.e., it is feasible.


 Figure 15: E -up variable peak and CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E)$

Example 10.19. For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.3 (from Example 4.13), $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$ as the LCCPs

$$\pi_{(4.4), \Lambda, (4.5)}^{\text{LCCP}} : \langle \mathbf{g}(x), \mathbf{b} \rangle \leftarrow \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{f}(x, x) \quad (10.22)$$

$$\pi_{(4.4), \Lambda, (4.5)}^{\text{LCCP}} : \langle \mathbf{g}(x), \mathbf{a} \rangle \leftarrow \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{f}(x, x) \quad (10.23)$$

are infeasible (use Proposition 10.17).

Example 10.20. (Continuing Example 5.7) As for $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$, note that $\pi_{(5.1), 1, (5.3)}^{\text{LCCP}}$ i.e.,

$$\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}), \mathbf{b} \rangle \leftarrow \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c}$$

is not $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable: $\mathbf{a} =_E \mathbf{c}$ holds, but $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d})$ is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -irreducible and $\mathbf{b} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E} \mathbf{d}$, but $\langle \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d}), \mathbf{d} \rangle$ is not $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable.

Variable PS-c-up-peaks. For variable PS-c-up-peaks (10.17), we let

$$\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E) = \text{CVP}(\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}, \overset{\text{ps}}{\rightarrow})$$

Remark 10.21 (Joinability of CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E)$). The $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinability condition for PS-c-up peaks (10.17) must be changed into $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinability for CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E)$, see Remark 8.20 for a detailed explanation.

The proof of the following result is similar to that of Proposition 8.15.

Proposition 10.22. Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS and $\beta : \lambda \rightarrow \rho \leftarrow \gamma \in \overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$ be a left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible rule, where s can be a variable. Then, for all $x \in \text{Var}^\mu(\lambda)$ and $p \in \text{Pos}_x^\mu(\lambda)$, $\pi_{\beta, x, p}^{\text{ps}}$ is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable. Furthermore,

- (1) If x occurs more than once in λ , then $\pi_{\beta, x, p}^{\text{ps}}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{ls}}$ -joinable.
- (2) If $x \in \text{Var}^\mu(\rho)$, then $\pi_{\beta, x, p}^{\text{ps}}$ is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable.

Example 10.23. For \mathcal{R} in Example 4.13, $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E) = \emptyset$ as rules in $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$ are ground.

The following result is the counterpart of Proposition 8.18 (concerning property γ) in the realm of this section based on Jouannaud and Kirchner's approach.

Table 7: Conditional pairs for \mathcal{R}, E -reduction and coherence peaks

| Nested Peak | Ref. | Cond. Pairs | Joinability of conditional pairs |
|-----------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Critical PS-r-up peak | (10.3) | $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ |
| Variable PS-r-up peak | (10.3) | $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ |
| PS-r-down peak | (10.4) | $\text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ |
| Critical PS-c-up peak | (10.17) | $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}^{\text{rs}}$ ($\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ with E -termination) |
| Variable PS-c-up peak | (10.17) | $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E)$ | $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}^{\text{ls}}$ ($\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ with E -termination) |

Proposition 10.24. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS. Then, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ is locally coherent modulo E iff all conditional pairs in $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E)$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}^{\text{rs}}$ -joinable (or just $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinable, if \mathcal{R} is E -terminating).*

As a consequence of Propositions 10.24 and 10.22, we have the following.

Corollary 10.25. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an E -terminating EGTRS such that all rules in $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$ are left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. Then, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ is locally coherent modulo E iff all conditional pairs in $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinable.*

11. E -CONFLUENCE OF \mathcal{R} AS THE CHURCH-ROSSER PROPERTY MODULO E OF $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$

Table 7 summarizes the treatment of E -confluence using conditional pairs if the auxiliary relation is \mathcal{R}^E is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$. The following result shows how to prove and disprove E -confluence.

Theorem 11.1. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an EGTRS.*

- (1) *If \mathcal{R} is E -terminating and every $\pi \in \text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{DCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E)$ is $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinable, then \mathcal{R} is E -confluent.*
- (2) *If there is $\pi \in \text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ which is not \mathcal{R}/E -joinable, then \mathcal{R} is not E -confluent.*

Proof. (1) By Proposition 10.14, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ is locally confluent modulo E . By Proposition 10.24, $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ is locally coherent modulo E . Now use Corollary 5.23(2).

(2) Since conditional pairs in $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ represent $\mathcal{R}, E \uparrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -peaks, the claim follows by Corollary 4.11. □

Example 11.2. *For \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7, the DCP (10.13) has been proved non- \mathcal{R}/E -joinable in Example 10.13. By Theorem 11.1(2), \mathcal{R} is not E -confluent. Note that $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R})$ consists of a trivial, hence $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -joinable LCCP (see Example 10.5) and $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R})$ is empty (Example 10.7). Thus, $\text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ is the only set of conditional pairs that can be used to disprove E -confluence of \mathcal{R} , witnessed by the PS-r-down critical peak*

$$d \mathcal{R}, E \leftarrow f(c) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} f(d) \tag{11.1}$$

which is not \mathcal{R}/E -joinable.

LCCP (Example 10.4) and $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E)$ is empty (Example 10.23); By Theorem 11.3, \mathcal{R} is E -confluent.

Example 10.13 shows that \mathcal{R}, E -joinability of all $\pi \in \text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CVP}(\mathcal{R})$ does *not* imply \mathcal{R}, E -joinability of DCPs in $\text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ unless the conditions in Proposition ?? are fulfilled.

Corollary 11.5. *Let $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, \Pi, \mu, E, H, R)$ be an E -terminating EGTRS such that $R \cup \tilde{E}$ is left- μ -homogeneous and μ -compatible. If all pairs in $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable, then \mathcal{R} is E -confluent.*

Example 11.6. *Consider the Equational CTRS \mathcal{R} in Example 5.18. Note that $\text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(\mathcal{R}) = \text{CVP}^{\text{ps}}(E) = \emptyset$, as all rules and equations are ground. We have the following LCCPs:*

$$\pi_{(5.38), \Lambda, (5.39)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle d, c \rangle \Leftarrow a = a, b \approx_{rm} c \quad (11.3)$$

$$\pi_{(5.38), \Lambda, (5.40)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle d, c \rangle \Leftarrow a = c \quad (11.4)$$

$$\pi_{(5.39), \Lambda, (5.40)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle d, d \rangle \Leftarrow a = c, b \approx_{rm} c \quad (11.5)$$

$$\pi_{(5.37), \Lambda, (5.38)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle c, b \rangle \Leftarrow a = a \quad (11.6)$$

$$\pi_{(5.37), \Lambda, (5.39)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle d, b \rangle \Leftarrow a = a, b \approx_{rm} c \quad (11.7)$$

$$\pi_{(5.37), \Lambda, (5.40)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle d, b \rangle \Leftarrow a = c \quad (11.8)$$

$$\pi_{(5.37), \Lambda, (5.38)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle c, a \rangle \Leftarrow b = a \quad (11.9)$$

$$\pi_{(5.37), \Lambda, (5.39)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle d, a \rangle \Leftarrow b = a, b \approx_{rm} c \quad (11.10)$$

$$\pi_{(5.37), \Lambda, (5.40)}^{\text{LCCP}} \quad \langle d, a \rangle \Leftarrow b = c \quad (11.11)$$

where (11.4), (11.8) and (11.11) are infeasible. Therefore, $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R}) = \{(11.3), (11.5)\}$ and $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) = \{(11.6), (11.7), (11.9), (11.10)\}$, Regarding $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R})$, (11.3) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable, and hence $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable, as $c \rightarrow_{(5.40)} d$; and (11.5) is trivial. Regarding $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$,

- (11.6) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable: $b =_E a \rightarrow_{(5.38)} c$;
- (11.7) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable: $b =_E a \rightarrow_{(5.39)} d$, as $b =_E a \rightarrow_{(5.38)} c$, i.e., the conditional part of (11.7) is satisfied;
- (11.9) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable, and hence $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable, as $a \rightarrow_{(5.38)} c$; finally,
- (11.10) is $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable, and hence $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable, as $a \rightarrow_{(5.39)} d$.

The E -termination of \mathcal{R} is proved with the following interpretation \mathcal{I} over the domain $\mathcal{A} = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ (computed with AGES), with

$$\begin{array}{lll} a^{\mathcal{I}} = -1 & b^{\mathcal{I}} = -1 & c^{\mathcal{I}} = 0 \\ d^{\mathcal{I}} = 1 & x =^{\mathcal{I}} y \Leftrightarrow x =_{\mathcal{A}} y & x \rightarrow^{\mathcal{I}} y \Leftrightarrow 9y \geq_{\mathbb{N}} 10x + 9 \\ & x \xrightarrow{(rm)}^{\mathcal{I}} y \Leftrightarrow 18y >_{\mathbb{N}} 18x + 12 & x \left(\xrightarrow{(rm)^*}^{\mathcal{I}} \right) y \Leftrightarrow \text{true} \end{array}$$

which is a model of $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$, where $(\xrightarrow{(rm)^*})^{\mathcal{I}}$ is well-founded (on \mathcal{A}). By Corollary 11.5, \mathcal{R} is E -confluent.

12. RELATED WORK

Huet. Dealing with *left-linear* unconditional rules, Huet proved that what we call *variable c-down-peaks* here (8.29) are *harmless* (see Case 2a in the proof of [Hue80, Lemma 3.5]). In our setting, Theorem 9.1(1) works without assuming left-linearity of rules; for ETRSs (with no conditional rule or equation, and without replacement restrictions) since μ_{\top} would be used, μ_{\top} -homogeneity and μ_{\top} -compatibility trivially hold. Thus, Corollaries 8.11 and 8.19(1) show that CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ and $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E)$ are always $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. Also, μ_{\top} -left-linearity and left-linearity coincide, and hence Corollary 8.19(2) shows that left-linearity can be seen as a sufficient condition for $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability of CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{R})$. Actually, Corollary 9.5 and [Hue80, Theorem 3.3] *coincide* if the EGTRS in Corollary 9.5 is obtained from an ETRS consisting of a set E of (unconditional) equations and a set R of *left-linear* (unconditional) rules such that \mathcal{R} is E -terminating, as required in [Hue80, Theorem 3.3]: Huet's result implies E -confluence of \mathcal{R} if all critical pairs in $\text{CP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CP}(E, \mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$ are $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinable. In this case, such (unconditional) critical pairs coincide with $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R}) \cup \text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$. Thus, Corollary 9.5 applies to conclude E -confluence of \mathcal{R} .

Furthermore, E -confluence of the TRS \mathcal{R} in Example 8.14 cannot be proved by using [Hue80, Theorem 3.3], as \mathcal{R} is not left-linear. However, we could prove it using our methods (Example 9.3).

Jouannaud and Kirchner. The main result for ETRSs [JK86, Theorem 16], cannot be used to *disprove* E -confluence of ETRSs as the theorem proves the $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -Church-Rosser property, which is only a sufficient condition for E -confluence. For instance, for \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7, the proof of non- E -confluence in Example 11.2 would not be obtained. Actually, (11.1) in Example 11.2 is a PS-r-down peak (10.4). Such peaks are explicitly *excluded* to obtain E -critical pairs in [Jou83, JK86]⁶. Our *down conditional pairs* (DCPs) fill this gap.

On the other hand, Jouannaud and Kirchner's results permit the particularization of \mathbb{R}^E to the combination $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathcal{N}, E}$ of rewriting and Peterson & Stickel rewriting, where \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{N} partition \mathcal{R} into a left-linear system \mathcal{L} , and \mathcal{N} which includes any (possibly left-linear) rule not in \mathcal{L} [JK86, Section 3.5].

The case considered here, where \mathbb{R}^E is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$, is a particular case of the previous one, where $\mathcal{L} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{R}$. Under these conditions, [JK86, Theorem 16], as sufficient E -confluence criterion, boils down to Theorem 11.3. This is because ETRSs consist of unconditional rules and no replacement restriction is considered. Thus, rules are trivially left- μ_{\top} -homogeneous and μ_{\top} -compatible. Therefore, by Propositions 10.8 and 10.22 all CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\xrightarrow{ps}}(\mathcal{R})$ and $\text{CVP}^{\xrightarrow{ps}}(E)$ are $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinable and can be dismissed.

The aforementioned more general treatment for EGTRSs where \mathbb{R}^E is $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{L}} \cup \rightarrow_{\mathcal{N}, E}$ is left as an interesting subject for future work.

Durán and Meseguer. The E -confluence of *conditional rewrite theories* $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{F}, E, R)$ has been investigated in [DM12]. Conditional equations $s = t \Leftarrow c$ can be specified, but they are treated as conditional rewrite rules (in R) by imposing some specific orientation (e.g., $s \rightarrow t \Leftarrow c$). Only unconditional equations $s = t$ (called *axioms*) which are *linear* and *regular* (i.e., $\text{Var}(s) = \text{Var}(t)$ [DM12, page 819]) are used in E (denoted A in [DM12]).

⁶"we do not consider the case where $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ applies at an occurrence p and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ at the outermost occurrence Λ " [JK86, below E -critical pairs lemma] (notation adapted).

The main result about E -confluence is [DM12, Theorem 2], characterizing E -confluence as the $\downarrow_{\mathcal{R},A}$ -joinability ([DM12, Definition 7]) of the set of *Equational Conditional Critical Pairs* with respect to the equational theory A (see Section 7.2) obtained (if an appropriate A -unification algorithm exists) from rules in R (which may include oriented conditional equations). However, a number of restrictions are imposed [DM12, Section 3.1]:

- (1) A is a set of *linear and regular unconditional* equations;
- (2) R is *strongly A -coherent*, i.e., the following diagram commutes [DM12, page 819]:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} u & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}/A} & v \\ * \downarrow A & & A \downarrow * \\ u' & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R},A} & v' \end{array}$$

- (3) the rules in R are *strongly deterministic* [DM12, Definition 1]; and
- (4) \mathcal{R} is *quasi-decreasing* [DM12, Definition 2], which is quite a strong termination condition. Together with strong A -coherence above, it entails E -termination.

Such criteria, in particular quasi-decreasingness, can be used to decide the appropriate orientation of equations in E into rules to be added to R . By lack of space, we cannot provide a detailed comparison with our approach. However, sometimes our results can be advantageously used to improve on [DM12]:

- (1) E -confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 5.18 cannot be proved with [DM12, Theorem 2] as \mathcal{R} is *not* strongly deterministic [DM12, Definition 1]: condition $\mathbf{b} \rightarrow^* \mathbf{c}$ in rule (5.39) does not fulfill the requirement of $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -irreducibility of \mathbf{c} . We prove E -confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 11.6.
- (2) [DM12, Theorem 2] would *not* apply to disprove E -confluence of \mathcal{R} in Example 5.7; note that E satisfies the requirements for axioms A in [DM12]. We have: $\mathbf{b} =_E f(\mathbf{a}) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} f(\mathbf{d})$, i.e., $\mathbf{b} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E} f(\mathbf{d})$, but the only $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ -step on \mathbf{b} is $\mathbf{b} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E} \mathbf{d}$, and $f(\mathbf{d}) \neq_E \mathbf{d}$. Thus, \mathcal{R} is not strongly E -coherent and [DM12, Theorem 2] does not apply.

Meseguer. Coherence of conditional rewriting modulo axioms is investigated in [Mes17]. Working on Jouannaud and Kirchner’s abstract approach, in [Mes17, Section 4.3] the problem discussed in Example 5.18 is noticed. That is: in conditional rewriting, the *natural choice* of interpreting R as $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$, E as $=_E$, and R/E as $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ does *not* fulfill the requirement (4.1) of Jouannaud and Kirchner’s abstract framework, i.e., $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ and $=_E \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \circ =_E$ does *not* coincide. Meseguer’s solution is interpreting R and R^E as the *same* relation, see [Mes17, paragraph above Proposition 1]. This solution, though, is not appropriate for our purposes, as it implies that only $\mathcal{R},E\leftarrow \circ \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R},E}$ and $\mathcal{R},E\leftarrow \circ \vdash_E$ peaks can be considered, thus making the use of E -unification mandatory when computing CCPs. In contrast, our approach also permits E -confluence proofs based on considering “classical” conditional critical pairs, not requiring E -unifiers, as in Sections 8 and 9.

13. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have introduced *Equational Generalized Term Rewriting Systems* (EGTRSs) consisting of *conditional rules* and *conditional equations* whose conditions are sequences of *atoms*, possibly defined by additional Horn clauses. Replacement restrictions μ specifying which arguments of function symbols can be rewritten are also allowed. Rewriting computations with EGTRSs \mathcal{R} are described by *deduction* in appropriate First-Order theories.

We have shown that an appropriate definition of a rewrite relation $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ based on a modification of the treatment of the conditional part of clauses in H and R permits the use of Jouannaud and Kirchner's framework in Section 4.1 to prove E -confluence of EGTRSs (Table 3). As discussed in Section 12, when compared to related uses of the framework (e.g., in [Mes17]), our approach permits a more flexible application of Jouannaud and Kirchner's framework to conditional rewriting.

We have shown that E -confluence of E -terminating EGTRSs can be *proved* by checking

- (1) $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -joinability of (i) CCPs in $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R})$ and CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ representing local confluence peaks $\mathcal{R}\uparrow\mathcal{R}$ using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ to build the fork, and (ii) CCPs in $\text{CCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$ and $\text{CCP}(\mathcal{R}, E)$ and CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E)$ and $\text{CVP}^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{R})$ representing local coherence peaks $\mathcal{R}\uparrow E$ using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\rightarrow_{\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}}$ (see Table 6 and Theorem 9.1(1)), and also
- (2) $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ -joinability of (i) LCCPs in $\text{LCCP}(\mathcal{R})$ and CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\overset{ps}{\rightarrow}}(\mathcal{R})$, and DCPs in $\text{DCP}(\mathcal{R})$ representing local confluence peaks $\mathcal{R}, E\uparrow\mathcal{R}$ using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ and $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ to build the fork, and (ii) LCCPs in $\text{LCCP}(E, \mathcal{R})$ and CVPs in $\text{CVP}^{\overset{ps}{\rightarrow}}(E)$ representing local coherence peaks $\mathcal{R}, E\uparrow E$ using $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}, E}$ and $\rightarrow_{\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}}$ (Table 7 and Theorems 11.1(1) and 11.3).

We provide criteria for disproving E -confluence on the basis of the non- $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ -joinability of conditional pairs as the aforementioned ones (Theorems 9.1(2) and 11.1(2)).

Although CCPs and CVPs were already used in proofs of confluence of GTRSs, here CCPs are used not only to deal with overlaps between rules of R^{rm} but also to handle overlaps between rules from R^{rm} and $\overset{\leftrightarrow}{E}$. Furthermore, we have introduced the notion of *parametric* CVP, which are used in several novel ways specific for proving E -confluence, as in the definitions of $\text{CVP}^{\rightarrow}(E)$, $\text{CVP}^{\leftarrow}(\mathcal{R})$, $\text{CVP}^{\overset{ps}{\rightarrow}}(\mathcal{R})$, and $\text{CVP}^{\overset{ps}{\rightarrow}}(E)$. Besides, DCPs have been introduced here and showed useful to *disprove* E -confluence, although can also be dismissed under some conditions (Theorem 11.3). Finally, we have also introduced LCCPs as an alternative to ECCPs to avoid the computation of E -unifiers in proofs of E -confluence, thus leading to a finite representation of local confluence and coherence peaks $\mathcal{R}, E\uparrow\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}, E\uparrow E$. As far as we know, CVPs, DCPs, and LCCPs have not been used yet in proofs of E -confluence.

The discussed examples (see also Section 12) show that the new techniques are useful, not only for EGTRSs which cannot be seen as already existing rewriting-based systems (for instance, \mathcal{R} in Examples 1.1 and 9.4), but also for those which can be seen as ETRSs (e.g., \mathcal{R} in Examples 4.13, 5.7, and 8.14) or conditional rewrite theories (e.g., \mathcal{R} in Example 5.18) as existing results cannot appropriately handle them.

Future work. Much work remains to be done for a *practical* use of these new proposals.

First, E -termination of EGTRSs \mathcal{R} , which is required in our main results, is under-explored to date. As discussed in Section 5.3, the (automatic) computation of models of $\text{Th}_{\mathcal{R}/E}$ making $\overset{rm}{\rightarrow}$ well-founded is possible by using existing tools (e.g., AGES or Mace4) is an interesting starting point, but the development of more specific techniques would be necessary.

Also, our results heavily rely on checking $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}}$ -joinability, $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}, E}$ -joinability and non- $\tilde{\downarrow}_{\mathcal{R}^{rm}/E}$ -joinability of CCPs, (different kinds of) CVPs, DCPs, and LCCPs to obtain proofs of (non) E -confluence. We plan to improve our tool CONFident [GLV24], which implements methods for the analysis of similar conditional pairs. Such results heavily relies on the (in)feasibility results developed in [GL20] and implemented in the tool infChecker, which

currently deals with CS-CTRSs and should also be adapted to deal with more general theories as the ones used with EGTRSs. `infChecker` also uses theorem provers like `Prover9` [McC10] and model generators like `Mace4` and `AGES` to implement these checkings. Overall, this approach has proved useful to prove confluence of variants of TRSs, see [GLV24, Section 8] for an account. Also, from a practical point of view, it is important to investigate the possibility of a *mixed* use of ECCPs together with LCCPs. For instance, if there is an *E*-unification algorithm and the set of (complete) *E*-unifiers is finite, then the corresponding (computable and finite set of) ECCPs could be used instead of LCCPs.

Finally, exploring the impact of our techniques in *first-order deduction modulo* see, e.g., [Dow23] and the references therein, is another interesting subject of future work.

REFERENCES

- [AL94] Jürgen Avenhaus and Carlos Loría-Sáenz. On Conditional Rewrite Systems with Extra Variables and Deterministic Logic Programs. In Frank Pfenning, editor, *Logic Programming and Automated Reasoning, 5th International Conference, LPAR'94, Proceedings*, volume 822 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 215–229. Springer, 1994. doi:10.1007/3-540-58216-9_40.
- [ASU72] Alfred V. Aho, Ravi Sethi, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. Code optimization and finite Church-Rosser theorems. In Randall Rustin, editor, *Design and Optimization of Compilers, New York, March 29-30 1971.*, volume 5 of *Courant Computer Science Symposium*, pages 89–105. Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- [BM06] Roberto Bruni and José Meseguer. Semantic foundations for generalized rewrite theories. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 360(1-3):386–414, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2006.04.012.
- [BN98] Franz Baader and Tobias Nipkow. *Term Rewriting and All That*. Cambridge University Press, 1998. doi:10.1017/CB09781139172752.
- [BS01] Franz Baader and Wayne Snyder. Unification theory. In John Alan Robinson and Andrei Voronkov, editors, *Handbook of Automated Reasoning (in 2 volumes)*, pages 445–532. Elsevier and MIT Press, 2001. doi:10.1016/b978-044450813-3/50010-2.
- [CDE⁺07] Manuel Clavel, Francisco Durán, Steven Eker, Patrick Lincoln, Narciso Martí-Oliet, José Meseguer, and Carolyn L. Talcott. *All About Maude - A High-Performance Logical Framework, How to Specify, Program and Verify Systems in Rewriting Logic*, volume 4350 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2007. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-71999-1.
- [CR36] Alonzo Church and J. B. Rosser. Some properties of conversion. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 39(3):472–482, 1936. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1989762>.
- [DM79] Nachum Dershowitz and Zohar Manna. Proving termination with multiset orderings. In Hermann A. Maurer, editor, *Automata, Languages and Programming, 6th Colloquium, Graz, Austria, July 16-20, 1979, Proceedings*, volume 71 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 188–202. Springer, 1979. doi:10.1007/3-540-09510-1_15.
- [DM12] Francisco Durán and José Meseguer. On the church-rosser and coherence properties of conditional order-sorted rewrite theories. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, 81(7-8):816–850, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.jlap.2011.12.004.
- [Dow23] Gilles Dowek. Automated theorem proving in first-order logic modulo: on the difference between type theory and set theory. *CoRR*, abs/2306.00498, 2023. doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2306.00498.
- [Fit96] Melvin Fitting. *First-Order Logic and Automated Theorem Proving, Second Edition*. Graduate Texts in Computer Science. Springer, 1996. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-2360-3.
- [GL19] Raúl Gutiérrez and Salvador Lucas. Automatic Generation of Logical Models with AGES. In Pascal Fontaine, editor, *Automated Deduction - CADE 27 - 27th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Proceedings*, volume 11716 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 287–299. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-29436-6_17.
- [GL20] Raúl Gutiérrez and Salvador Lucas. Automatically Proving and Disproving Feasibility Conditions. In Nicolas Peltier and Viorica Sofronie-Stokkermans, editors, *Automated Reasoning - 10th International Joint Conference, IJCAR 2020, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 12167 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 416–435. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-51054-1_27.

- [GLV24] Raúl Gutiérrez, Salvador Lucas, and Miguel Vítores. Proving Confluence in the Confluence Framework with CONFident. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 192:167–217, 2024.
- [Hue80] Gérard P. Huet. Confluent Reductions: Abstract Properties and Applications to Term Rewriting Systems. *J. ACM*, 27(4):797–821, 1980. doi:10.1145/322217.322230.
- [JK86] Jean-Pierre Jouannaud and Hélène Kirchner. Completion of a set of rules modulo a set of equations. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 15(4):1155–1194, 1986. doi:10.1137/0215084.
- [Jou83] Jean-Pierre Jouannaud. Confluent and coherent equational term rewriting systems: Application to proofs in abstract data types. In Giorgio Ausiello and Marco Protasi, editors, *CAAP’83, Trees in Algebra and Programming, 8th Colloquium, Proceedings*, volume 159 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 269–283. Springer, 1983. doi:10.1007/3-540-12727-5_16.
- [Kap84] Stéphane Kaplan. Conditional Rewrite Rules. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 33:175–193, 1984. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(84)90087-2.
- [Kap87] Stéphane Kaplan. Simplifying Conditional Term Rewriting Systems: Unification, Termination and Confluence. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 4(3):295–334, 1987. doi:10.1016/S0747-7171(87)80010-X.
- [LG18] Salvador Lucas and Raúl Gutiérrez. Automatic Synthesis of Logical Models for Order-Sorted First-Order Theories. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 60(4):465–501, 2018. doi:10.1007/s10817-017-9419-3.
- [Luc19] Salvador Lucas. Proving semantic properties as first-order satisfiability. *Artif. Intell.*, 277, 2019. doi:10.1016/j.artint.2019.103174.
- [Luc20a] Salvador Lucas. Context-sensitive Rewriting. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 53(4):78:1–78:36, 2020. doi:10.1145/3397677.
- [Luc20b] Salvador Lucas. Using Well-Founded Relations for Proving Operational Termination. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 64(2):167–195, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10817-019-09514-2.
- [Luc21] Salvador Lucas. Applications and extensions of context-sensitive rewriting. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 121:100680, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2021.100680.
- [Luc24a] Salvador Lucas. Confluence of Conditional Rewriting Modulo. In Aniello Murano and Alexandra Silva, editors, *32nd EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2024)*, volume 288 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 37:1–37:21, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2024.37.
- [Luc24b] Salvador Lucas. Local confluence of conditional and generalized term rewriting systems. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 136:paper 100926, pages 1–23, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2023.100926.
- [Luc24c] Salvador Lucas. Termination of Generalized Term Rewriting Systems. In Jakob Rehof, editor, *9th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction (FSCD 2024)*, volume 299 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 29:1–29:18, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.FSCD.2024.29.
- [McC10] William McCune. Prover9 & Mace4. Technical report, University of New Mexico, 2005–2010. URL: <http://www.cs.unm.edu/~mccune/prover9/>.
- [Men97] Elliott Mendelson. *Introduction to mathematical logic (4. ed.)*. Chapman and Hall, 1997.
- [Mes17] José Meseguer. Strict coherence of conditional rewriting modulo axioms. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 672:1–35, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2016.12.026>, doi:10.1016/J.TCS.2016.12.026.
- [Ohl02] Enno Ohlebusch. *Advanced Topics in Term Rewriting*. Springer, 2002. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-3661-8.
- [Plo72] Gordon D. Plotkin. Building-in equational theories. *Machine Intelligence*, 7:73–90, 1972.
- [PS81] Gerald E. Peterson and Mark E. Stickel. Complete sets of reductions for some equational theories. *J. ACM*, 28(2):233–264, 1981. doi:10.1145/322248.322251.
- [Rob67] John Alan Robinson. A review of automatic theorem proving. In J.T. Schwartz, editor, *Mathematical Aspects of Computer Science*, volume XIX of *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics*, pages 1–18, 1967. doi:10.1090/psapm/019.
- [Set74] Ravi Sethi. Testing for the church-rosser property. *J. ACM*, 21(4):671–679, 1974. doi:10.1145/321850.321862.
- [Sie89] Jörg H. Siekmann. Unification theory. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 7(3/4):207–274, 1989. doi:10.1016/S0747-7171(89)80012-4.