# Computational content of circular proof systems.

Denis Kuperberg Laureline Pinault Damien Pous

LIP, ENS Lyon

Lambda Pros Paris, June 28th 2023

### 1 Context

2 Computing languages

3 Computing functions

 $\mathsf{Proof} \text{ of formula } \varphi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{Program} \text{ of type } \varphi$ 

**Example:** The identity program  $\lambda x.x$  is a proof of  $p \rightarrow p$ .

 $\mathsf{Proof of formula} \ \varphi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{Program of type} \ \varphi$ 

**Example:** The identity program  $\lambda x.x$  is a proof of  $p \rightarrow p$ .

Deduction Rule

implies 
$$\frac{A \qquad B}{C}$$

 $\begin{array}{c|c} \mbox{Proof of formula } \varphi \leftrightarrow \mbox{Program of type } \varphi \\ \hline \mbox{Example: The identity program } \lambda x.x \mbox{ is a proof of } p \rightarrow p. \\ \hline \mbox{Deduction Rule} & \mbox{Program instruction} \\ \hline \mbox{implies} & \hline \mbox{A} & \hline \mbox{C} & \mbox{calls} \end{array}$ 

Proof of formula  $\varphi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{Program}$  of type  $\varphi$ **Example:** The identity program  $\lambda x.x$  is a proof of  $p \to p$ . Program instruction Deduction Rule implies  $\frac{A}{C}$   $\frac{B}{C}$  calls Correspondence well-understood for usual proof systems [Curry, Howard] Intuitionistic logic  $\leftrightarrow$  Typed  $\lambda$ -calculus [...]  $\ldots \leftrightarrow \ldots$ 

Proof of formula  $\varphi \leftrightarrow \mathsf{Program}$  of type  $\varphi$ **Example:** The identity program  $\lambda x.x$  is a proof of  $p \rightarrow p$ . Program instruction Deduction Rule implies  $\frac{A}{C}$   $\frac{B}{C}$  calls Correspondence well-understood for usual proof systems [Curry, Howard] Intuitionistic logic  $\leftrightarrow$  Typed  $\lambda$ -calculus [...]  $\dots \leftrightarrow \dots$ 

This work: Study the computational content of cyclic proofs.

### Usual proofs:

	$Axiom_2$	
$Axiom_1$	$\overline{A}$	$Axiom_3$
В		C
	D	

Usual proofs:

Cyclic Proofs:



Usual proofs:

Cyclic Proofs:



Validity conditions: Cycles must contain particular rules.

Usual proofs:

Cyclic Proofs:



Validity conditions: Cycles must contain particular rules.

As programs: recursive calls must be done on smaller arguments.

Usual proofs:

Cyclic Proofs:



Validity conditions: Cycles must contain particular rules.

As programs: recursive calls must be done on smaller arguments.  $\rightarrow$  guarantees termination.

## A proof system for regular expressions

#### Example: [Das, Pous '17]

Cyclic proof system for inclusion of regular expressions:



## A proof system for regular expressions

#### Example: [Das, Pous '17]

Cyclic proof system for inclusion of regular expressions:



Soundness and completeness [Das, Pous '17]

 $L(e)\subseteq L(f)\Leftrightarrow \exists \text{ proof of }e\subseteq f.$ 

## A proof system for regular expressions

#### Example: [Das, Pous '17]

Cyclic proof system for inclusion of regular expressions:



 $L(e)\subseteq L(f)\Leftrightarrow \exists \text{ proof of }e\subseteq f.$ 

Here, we care about computational content.

**This example**: program whose type is  $a^* \rightarrow a^*$ :

### 1 Context

2 Computing languages

3 Computing functions

# Computing languages

Goal: Avoid transductions, start with languages.

- $\blacktriangleright \text{ Regular expressions } e,f:=a\in A\mid e.f\mid e+f\mid e^*$
- ▶ Boolean type *bool* (encoded by  $\varepsilon + \varepsilon$ )

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{Proof of} \ A^* \vdash bool & \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{Program of type} \ A^* \to bool \\ & \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{Language} \ L \subseteq A^*. \end{array}$ 

# Computing languages

Goal: Avoid transductions, start with languages.

- ▶ Regular expressions  $e, f := a \in A \mid e.f \mid e + f \mid e^*$
- ▶ Boolean type *bool* (encoded by  $\varepsilon + \varepsilon$ )

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{Proof of} \ A^* \vdash bool & \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{Program of type} \ A^* \to bool \\ & \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{Language} \ L \subseteq A^*. \end{array}$ 

Structural rules: basic data manipulation (erase, copy).

# Computing languages

Goal: Avoid transductions, start with languages.

- ▶ Regular expressions  $e, f := a \in A \mid e.f \mid e + f \mid e^*$
- ▶ Boolean type *bool* (encoded by  $\varepsilon + \varepsilon$ )

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{Proof of} \ A^* \vdash bool & \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{Program of type} \ A^* \to bool \\ & \Leftrightarrow \mathsf{Language} \ L \subseteq A^*. \end{array}$ 

Structural rules: basic data manipulation (erase, copy).

On the proof side: reuse or ignore hypotheses (cf linear logic)

Simplified proof system

**Expressions**  $e := A \mid A^*$ **Lists**  $E, F = e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n$  interpreted as tuples Proof system: Return true or false  $\frac{}{\vdash bool} \quad ^{(false)}$  $\overline{\vdash bool}$  (true) Pattern matchings  $\frac{(E,F \vdash bool)_{\underline{a} \in A}}{E,A,F \vdash bool} ~(\mathsf{A})$  $\frac{E, F \vdash bool \qquad E, A, A^*, F \vdash bool}{E, A^*, F \vdash bool}$ (\*)Erase, copy  $\frac{E, \underline{e}, \underline{e}, F \vdash bool}{E, e, F \vdash bool} \quad \text{(contraction)}$  $\frac{E, F \vdash bool}{E, e, F \vdash bool} \text{ (weakening)}$ 

## Proofs as language acceptors

What are the languages computed by cyclic proofs ?

Example on alphabet  $\{a, b\}$ : The language  $b^*$ 



## Proofs as language acceptors

What are the languages computed by cyclic proofs?

Example on alphabet  $\{a, b\}$ : The language  $b^*$ 



**No contraction rule**: *Affine* system.

## Proofs as language acceptors

What are the languages computed by cyclic proofs?

Example on alphabet  $\{a, b\}$ : The language  $b^*$ 



**No contraction rule**: *Affine* system.

#### Lemma

The affine system captures exactly regular languages.

## With contractions: what class of language?

Example on alphabet  $\{a, b\}$ : Language  $\{a^n b^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Intuition:

- Copy the input  $u_1$  into  $u_2$ : aaabbb aaabbbb
- Erase leading a's in  $u_2$ :  $aaabbb \ bbb$
- Match each leading a in  $u_1$  to a leading b in  $u_2$ :  $bbb \in \varepsilon$
- When  $u_2$  becomes empty, verify that  $u_1 \in b^*$ .

## With contractions: what class of language?

Example on alphabet  $\{a, b\}$ : Language  $\{a^n b^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Intuition:

- Copy the input  $u_1$  into  $u_2$ : aaabbb aaabbbb
- Erase leading a's in  $u_2$ :  $aaabbb \ bbb$
- Match each leading a in  $u_1$  to a leading b in  $u_2$ :  $bbb \in \varepsilon$
- When  $u_2$  becomes empty, verify that  $u_1 \in b^*$ .

We can also recognize  $a^n b^n c^n$  with the same technique.

With contractions: what class of language?

Example on alphabet  $\{a, b\}$ : Language  $\{a^n b^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . Intuition:

- Copy the input  $u_1$  into  $u_2$ : aaabbb aaabbbb
- Erase leading a's in  $u_2$ :  $aaabbb \ bbb$
- Match each leading a in  $u_1$  to a leading b in  $u_2$ :  $bbb \in \varepsilon$
- When  $u_2$  becomes empty, verify that  $u_1 \in b^*$ .

We can also recognize  $a^n b^n c^n$  with the same technique.

### Theorem

The proof system recognizes exactly languages in LOGSPACE.

Proof technique: Design an equivalent automaton model.

## A new automaton model

### Jumping Multihead Automata

A JMA is an automaton with k reading heads.

Transitions:  $Q \times (A \cup \{\triangleleft\})^k \to Q \times \{\aleph, \because, J_1, \dots, J_k\}^k$ 



- $\blacktriangleright$   $\blacksquare$  : advance one step
- stay in place
- $J_i$ : jump to the position of head i

## A new automaton model

Jumping Multihead Automata

A JMA is an automaton with k reading heads.

Transitions:  $Q \times (A \cup \{\triangleleft\})^k \to Q \times \{\blacktriangleright, \vdots, J_1, \dots, J_k\}^k$ 



- $\blacktriangleright$   $\blacksquare$  : advance one step
- stay in place
- $J_i$ : jump to the position of head i

(optional: Syntactic criterion guaranteeing halting)
























Example:  $\{a^{2^n} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is accepted by a 2-head JMA.



Theorem

Cyclic proofs and JMA recognize the same class of languages.

JMAs  $\subseteq$  LOGSPACE easy: remember the location of the k heads.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

- ► No jump, but heads can move left or right.
- ► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

- ► No jump, but heads can move left or right.
- ► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

$$\begin{vmatrix} & & \\ &$$

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

 $\mathsf{JMAs} \subseteq \mathsf{LOGSPACE}$  easy: remember the location of the k heads.

2MAs: 2-way Multihead Automata [Holzer, Kutrib, Malcher '08]:

► No jump, but heads can move left or right.

► Characterizes LOGSPACE.

Theorem

Any 2MA can be simulated by a JMA

Difficulty: simulate a left move of some head.

Example:  $Palindroms = \{u \in \Sigma^* \mid u = u^R\}$  is accepted by a JMA.

$$\triangleright \ a \ a \ b \ c \ c \ b \ a \ a \ \triangleleft$$

Generalization of this idea  $\Rightarrow$  Translation from 2MA to JMA.

#### 1 Context

2 Computing languages

3 Computing functions

# Cut rule and integer functions

The cut rule:

$$\frac{E\vdash e \quad e,F\vdash g}{E,F\vdash g}$$

- Corresponds to composition of programs.
- ► Fundamental in proof theory.
- ► Computation ↔ cut elimination process.

# Cut rule and integer functions

The cut rule:

$$\frac{E\vdash e \quad e,F\vdash g}{E,F\vdash g}$$

- Corresponds to composition of programs.
- ► Fundamental in proof theory.
- Computation  $\leftrightarrow$  cut elimination process.

We can now consider transductions:  $A^* \to B^*$ . Focus on functions:  $\mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$  (unary alphabet).

# Cut rule and integer functions

The cut rule:

$$\frac{E \vdash e \quad e, F \vdash g}{E, F \vdash g}$$

- Corresponds to composition of programs.
- ► Fundamental in proof theory.
- Computation  $\leftrightarrow$  cut elimination process.

We can now consider transductions:  $A^* \to B^*$ . Focus on functions:  $\mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$  (unary alphabet).

**Expressions** (simplified):  $e, f := 1 | e \cdot f | e + f | e^* | e \rightarrow f$ .

**Sequents**:  $(1^*)^k \vdash 1^*$ : functions  $\mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$ .
# Cut rule and integer functions

The cut rule:

$$\frac{E\vdash e \quad e,F\vdash g}{E,F\vdash g}$$

- Corresponds to composition of programs.
- ► Fundamental in proof theory.
- Computation  $\leftrightarrow$  cut elimination process.

We can now consider transductions:  $A^* \to B^*$ . Focus on functions:  $\mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$  (unary alphabet).

**Expressions** (simplified):  $e, f := 1 | e \cdot f | e + f | e^* | e \rightarrow f$ .

**Sequents**:  $(1^*)^k \vdash 1^*$ : functions  $\mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N}$ .

Which functions  $\mathbb{N}^k o \mathbb{N}$  can the system with cuts compute ?

# System T

As automata before, we want a computational framework to characterize the expressive power of our cyclic proof system.

#### System T:

- $\lambda$ -calculus with explicit integer type,
- ► Explicit recursion operator on integers,
- Type system, typing derivations are finite trees.

# System T

As automata before, we want a computational framework to characterize the expressive power of our cyclic proof system.

#### System T:

- $\lambda$ -calculus with explicit integer type,
- Explicit recursion operator on integers,
- Type system, typing derivations are finite trees.

## System T terms:

$$\begin{split} M,N &::= & x \mid 0 \mid s(M) \mid \lambda x.M \mid MN \mid \mathbf{Rec}(N,M_0,M_s(x,y)) \\ & (+ \mathsf{constructors}/\mathsf{destructors} \text{ for pairs, lists}) \end{split}$$

 $\mathbf{Rec}(N,M_0,M_s) \text{ returns } \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} M_0 & \text{if } N=0\\ M_s(N,\mathbf{Rec}(n,M_0,M_s)) & \text{if } N=s(n) \end{array} \right.$ 

# System T

As automata before, we want a computational framework to characterize the expressive power of our cyclic proof system.

#### System T:

- $\lambda$ -calculus with explicit integer type,
- Explicit recursion operator on integers,
- Type system, typing derivations are finite trees.

#### System T terms:

$$\begin{split} M,N &::= & x \mid 0 \mid s(M) \mid \lambda x.M \mid MN \mid \mathbf{Rec}(N,M_0,M_s(x,y)) \\ & (+ \mathsf{constructors}/\mathsf{destructors} \text{ for pairs, lists}) \end{split}$$

 $\mathbf{Rec}(N, M_0, M_s) \text{ returns } \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} M_0 & \text{if } N = 0 \\ M_s(N, \mathbf{Rec}(n, M_0, M_s)) & \text{if } N = s(n) \end{array} \right.$ 

**Example**: Addition a + b:  $\lambda ab$ . **Rec**(b, a, s(y))

**System T**<sub>aff</sub>: Affine version of System T, data cannot be duplicated. Example:  $\lambda f x. f(f(x))$  is not typable in T<sub>aff</sub>.

**System T**<sub>aff</sub>: Affine version of System T, data cannot be duplicated. Example:  $\lambda f x. f(f(x))$  is not typable in T<sub>aff</sub>.

Theorem

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{System } \textbf{T}_{aff} : \text{ Affine version of System T, data cannot be duplicated.} \\ \text{Example: } \lambda f x. f(f(x)) \text{ is not typable in } \textbf{T}_{aff}. \end{array}$ 

Theorem

Affine Cyclic proofs	$\iff$	System T <sub>aff</sub>	$\iff$	Prim. rec.
Cyclic proofs	$\iff$	System T	$\iff$	Peano



 $\lambda ab.\mathbf{Rec}(b, a, s(y))$ 

**System T**<sub>aff</sub>: Affine version of System T, data cannot be duplicated. Example:  $\lambda f x. f(f(x))$  is not typable in T<sub>aff</sub>.

TheoremAffine Cyclic proofs $\Leftrightarrow$ System  $T_{aff}$  $\leftrightarrow$ Prim. rec.Cyclic proofs $\Leftrightarrow$ System T $\Leftrightarrow$ PeanoEasy $\lambda ab. \operatorname{Rec}(b, a, s(y))$ 

**System T**<sub>aff</sub>: Affine version of System T, data cannot be duplicated. Example:  $\lambda f x. f(f(x))$  is not typable in T<sub>aff</sub>.

TheoremAffine Cyclic proofs $\iff$  System  $T_{aff}$  $\iff$  Prim. rec.Cyclic proofs $\iff$  System T $\iff$  PeanoEasy



**System T**<sub>aff</sub>: Affine version of System T, data cannot be duplicated. Example:  $\lambda f x. f(f(x))$  is not typable in T<sub>aff</sub>.

Theorem Affine Cyclic proofs  $\iff$  System  $T_{aff}$   $\iff$  Prim. rec. Cyclic proofs  $\iff$  System T  $\iff$  Peano Easy  $\lambda ab. \mathbf{Rec}(b, a, s(y))$ Hard

Open problems in proof theory: infinite descent versus induction.

# Proof schemes

## Affine proofs $\rightarrow T_{aff}$ :

▶ normal form for proofs, with explicit hierarchy of cycles,

• inductively build  $T_{aff}$  terms.

# Proof schemes

### Affine proofs $\rightarrow T_{aff}$ :

- normal form for proofs, with explicit hierarchy of cycles,
- inductively build  $T_{aff}$  terms.

#### Affine proofs $\rightarrow$ Prim. rec.:

- ► Stronger normal form through T<sub>aff</sub>,
- ▶ RCA<sub>0</sub>: constructive fragment of 2<sup>nd</sup>-order arithmetic,
- $\blacktriangleright$   $\forall$  affine cyclic proof, prove in RCA<sub>0</sub> that its computation terminates,
- From reverse maths:  $RCA_0 \leftrightarrow Prim. rec.$

# Proof schemes

### Affine proofs $\rightarrow T_{aff}$ :

- normal form for proofs, with explicit hierarchy of cycles,
- inductively build  $T_{aff}$  terms.

#### Affine proofs $\rightarrow$ Prim. rec.:

- ► Stronger normal form through T<sub>aff</sub>,
- ▶ RCA<sub>0</sub>: constructive fragment of 2<sup>nd</sup>-order arithmetic,
- $\blacktriangleright$   $\forall$  affine cyclic proof, prove in RCA<sub>0</sub> that its computation terminates,
- From reverse maths:  $RCA_0 \leftrightarrow Prim. rec.$

#### Proofs $\rightarrow$ System T:

- ► ACA<sub>0</sub>: RCA<sub>0</sub> + König's lemma,
- $\blacktriangleright$   $\forall$  cyclic proof , prove in ACA\_0 that its computation terminates,
- Conservativity result:  $ACA_0 \leftrightarrow Peano$  for integer functions,
- Classic result: Peano  $\leftrightarrow$  System T.

# Conclusion

#### **Open problems**:

- ► Avoid the "blackbox" of reverse maths.
- ► Lift results to transductions.
- Generalize the normal form with hierarchy of cycles to other cyclic proof systems.
- ► Include greatest fixed point (ω-regular expressions)
  → Internship supervision planned in September 2023 with Tito Nguyen.

# Conclusion

#### **Open problems**:

- ► Avoid the "blackbox" of reverse maths.
- ► Lift results to transductions.
- Generalize the normal form with hierarchy of cycles to other cyclic proof systems.
- ► Include greatest fixed point (ω-regular expressions)
  → Internship supervision planned in September 2023 with Tito Nguyen.

Thank you for your attention !