

Intuitionistic modal logic **LIK**4 is decidable

Philippe Balbiani^{a*} Çiğdem Gencer^{a,b†} Tinko Tinchev^{c‡}

^aToulouse Institute of Computer Science Research
CNRS–INPT–UT, Toulouse, France

^bFaculty of Arts and Sciences
Istanbul Aydın University, Istanbul, Turkey

^cFaculty of Mathematics and Informatics
Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, Bulgaria

Abstract

In this note, we prove that intuitionistic modal logic **LIK**4 is decidable.

Keywords: Intuitionistic modal logics. Decidability. Tableaux-based procedures. Finite frame property.

1 Introduction

In this note, we prove that intuitionistic modal logic **LIK**4 is decidable.

In Sections 3, we introduce labelled trees, i.e. the relational structures that will be our main tools in our proof of the decidability of **LIK**4. In Section 4, we introduce the syntax of **LIK**4. In Section 5, we introduce the relational semantics of **LIK**4. In Section 6, we present a Hilbert-style axiomatization of **LIK**4. In Section 7, we present the canonical model construction of **LIK**4. In Sections 8–15, we prove that intuitionistic modal logic **LIK**4 is decidable.

This paper includes the proofs of several of our results. Some of these proofs are relatively simple and we have included them here just for the sake of the completeness.

2 Some notations

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

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

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

‡Email address: tinko@fmi.uni-sofia.bg.

For all sets U, V , when we write “ $U \subset V$ ”, we mean “ $U \subseteq V$ and $V \not\subseteq U$ ”.

For all sets Σ , $\wp(\Sigma)$ denotes the *powerset* of Σ .

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

For all sets U, V and for all bijective functions $f: U \rightarrow V$, f^{-1} denotes the *inverse function* of f , that is to say the bijective function $g: V \rightarrow U$ such that for all $x \in U$, $g(f(x)) = x$ and for all $y \in V$, $f(g(y)) = y$.

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

For all sets W and for all binary relations R on W , R^+ denotes the least transitive binary relation on W containing R and R^* denotes the least reflexive and transitive binary relation on W containing R .

For all sets W , for all binary relations R on W and for all $s \in W$, let $R(s) = \{t \in W : s R t\}$.

For all sets W , a *preorder* on W is a reflexive and transitive binary relation on W .

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

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

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

For all sets W , a *partial order* on W is an antisymmetric preorder on W .

“**IPL**” stands for “Intuitionistic Propositional Logic”.

3 Labelled trees

Let P be a finite set and \leq be a partial order on P .

A *P-labelled tree* is a triple (N, E, λ) where the finite set N , the binary relation E on N and the function $\lambda: N \rightarrow P$ are such that

- (N, E) is a tree,¹
- λ is \leq -monotone, that is to say for all nodes i, j , if iEj then $\lambda(i) \leq \lambda(j)$.

For all P -labelled trees $(N, E, \lambda), (N', E', \lambda')$, a P -embedding of (N, E, λ) into (N', E', λ') is a function $f: N \rightarrow N'$ such that

- for all $i, j \in N$, if iEj then $f(i)E'^*f(j)$,
- for all $k \in N$, $\lambda(k) = \lambda'(f(k))$.

Let \sim be the equivalence relation on the set of all P -labelled trees such that for all P -labelled trees $(N, E, \lambda), (N', E', \lambda')$, $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$ if and only if there exists a P -embedding of (N, E, λ) into (N', E', λ') and there exists a P -embedding of (N', E', λ') into (N, E, λ) .

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a finitely indexed family $(N_m, E_m, \lambda_m)_{m \in (n)}$ of P -labelled trees is *dreary* if there exists $m \in (n)$ such that $m < n$ and $(N_m, E_m, \lambda_m) \sim (N_n, E_n, \lambda_n)$.

At the end of this section, we will show that for all countably indexed families $(N_m, E_m, \lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of P -labelled trees, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the finitely indexed family $(N_m, E_m, \lambda_m)_{m \in (n)}$ of P -labelled trees is dreary.²

A P -labelled tree (N, E, λ) is *strict* if

- for all nodes i, j , if iEj then $\lambda(i) < \lambda(j)$.

Obviously, for all strict P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , the height of the tree (N, E) does not exceed $\text{Card}(P)$.

For all P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , a *duplicate in* (N, E, λ) is a couple (i, j) of nodes such that iEj and $\lambda(i) = \lambda(j)$.

Obviously, for all P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , if (N, E, λ) is non-strict then (N, E, λ) contains duplicates.

Lemma 1 *Let (N, E, λ) be a P -labelled tree and (i, j) be a duplicate in (N, E, λ) . The structure (N', E', λ') such that*

- $N' = N \setminus \{j\}$,
- E' is the binary relation on N' such that for all $k, l \in N'$, $kE'l$ if and only if either kEl , or $k=i$ and jEl ,
- $\lambda': N' \rightarrow P$ is the function such that for all $k \in N'$, $\lambda'(k) = \lambda(k)$,

is a P -labelled tree.

¹We assume the reader is at home with the basic definitions concerning trees: roots, paths, etc.

²See Lemma 10.

Proof: Let $k, l \in N'$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $kE'l$ and $\lambda'(k) \not\subseteq \lambda'(l)$. Hence, either kEl , or $k=i$ and jEl . In the former case, $\lambda(k) \subseteq \lambda(l)$. Thus, $\lambda'(k) \subseteq \lambda'(l)$: a contradiction. In the latter case, $\lambda(k) = \lambda(i)$ and $\lambda(j) \subseteq \lambda(l)$. Since (i, j) is a duplicate in (N, E, λ) , then $\lambda(i) = \lambda(j)$. Since $\lambda(k) = \lambda(i)$ and $\lambda(j) \subseteq \lambda(l)$, then $\lambda(k) \subseteq \lambda(l)$. Consequently, $\lambda'(k) \subseteq \lambda'(l)$: a contradiction. \dashv

Lemma 2 *For all P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , if (N, E, λ) is non-strict then there exists a P -labelled tree (N', E', λ') such that $N' \subset N$ and $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$.*

Proof: Let (N, E, λ) be a P -labelled tree. Suppose (N, E, λ) is non-strict. Hence, there exists a duplicate (i, j) in (N, E, λ) . Thus, iEj and $\lambda(i) = \lambda(j)$. Let (N', E', λ') be the structure such that

- $N' = N \setminus \{j\}$,
- E' is the binary relation on N' such that for all $k, l \in N'$, $kE'l$ if and only if either kEl , or $k=i$ and jEl ,
- λ' : $N' \rightarrow P$ is the function such that for all $k \in N'$, $\lambda'(k) = \lambda(k)$.

By Lemma 1, (N', E', λ') is a P -labelled tree.

Obviously, $N' \subset N$.

Moreover, the reader may easily verify that the function f : $N \rightarrow N'$ such that for all $k \in N$, if $k \neq j$ then $f(k) = k$ else $f(k) = i$ is a P -embedding of (N, E, λ) into (N', E', λ') .

In other respect, the reader may easily verify that the function f' : $N' \rightarrow N$ such that for all $k \in N'$, $f'(k) = k$ is a P -embedding of (N', E', λ') into (N, E, λ) .

Consequently, $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$. \dashv

Lemma 3 *For all P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , there exists a strict P -labelled tree (N', E', λ') such that $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$.*

Proof: By Lemma 2. \dashv

For all P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) and for all nodes i , let (N^i, E^i, λ^i) be the restriction of (N, E, λ) to $E^*(i)$.

For all P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , (N', E', λ') , a P -isomorphism from (N, E, λ) onto (N', E', λ') is a bijective function f : $N \rightarrow N'$ such that

- for all $i, j \in N$, iEj if and only if $f(i)E'f(j)$,
- for all $k \in N$, $\lambda(k) = \lambda'(f(k))$.

Let \simeq be the equivalence relation on the set of all P -labelled trees such that for all P -labelled trees $(N, E, \lambda), (N', E', \lambda')$, $(N, E, \lambda) \simeq (N', E', \lambda')$ if and only if there exists a P -isomorphism from (N, E, λ) onto (N', E', λ') .

Obviously, \simeq is finer than \sim , i.e. for all P -labelled trees $(N, E, \lambda), (N', E', \lambda')$, if $(N, E, \lambda) \simeq (N', E', \lambda')$ then $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$.

A strict P -labelled tree (N, E, λ) is *nice* if

- for all nodes i, j, k , if kEi , kEj and $i \neq j$ then $(N^i, E^i, \lambda^i) \not\simeq (N^j, E^j, \lambda^j)$.

For all strict P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , a *triplicate in* (N, E, λ) is a triple (i, j, k) of nodes such that kEi , kEj , $i \neq j$ and $(N^i, E^i, \lambda^i) \simeq (N^j, E^j, \lambda^j)$.

Obviously, for all strict P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , if (N, E, λ) is non-nice then (N, E, λ) contains triplicates.

Lemma 4 *Let (N, E, λ) be a strict P -labelled tree and (i, j, k) be a triplicate in (N, E, λ) . The structure (N', E', λ') such that*

- $N' = N \setminus N^j$,
- E' is the binary relation on N' such that for all $l, m \in N'$, $lE'm$ if and only if lEm ,
- $\lambda': N' \rightarrow P$ is the function such that for all $l \in N'$, $\lambda'(l) = \lambda(l)$,

is a strict P -labelled tree.

Proof: Let $l, m \in N'$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $lE'm$ and $\lambda'(l) \not\subset \lambda'(m)$. Hence, lEm . Thus, $\lambda(l) \subset \lambda(m)$. Consequently, $\lambda'(l) \subset \lambda'(m)$: a contradiction. \dashv

Lemma 5 *For all strict P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , if (N, E, λ) is non-nice then there exists a strict P -labelled tree (N', E', λ') such that $N' \subset N$ and $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$.*

Proof: Let (N, E, λ) be a strict P -labelled tree. Suppose (N, E, λ) is non-nice. Hence, there exists a triplicate (i, j, k) in (N, E, λ) . Thus, kEi , kEj , $i \neq j$ and $(N^i, E^i, \lambda^i) \simeq (N^j, E^j, \lambda^j)$. Consequently, there exists a P -isomorphism f_{ij} from (N^i, E^i, λ^i) onto (N^j, E^j, λ^j) . Let (N', E', λ') be the structure such that

- $N' = N \setminus N^j$,
- E' is the binary relation on N' such that for all $l, m \in N'$, $lE'm$ if and only if lEm ,
- $\lambda': N' \rightarrow P$ is the function such that for all $l \in N'$, $\lambda'(l) = \lambda(l)$.

By Lemma 4, (N', E', λ') is a strict P -labelled tree.

Obviously, $N' \subset N$.

Moreover, the reader may easily verify that the function $f: N \rightarrow N'$ such that for all $l \in N$, if $l \notin N^j$ then $f(l) = l$ else $f(l) = f_{ij}^{-1}(l)$ is a P -embedding of (N, E, λ) into (N', E', λ') .

In other respect, the reader may easily verify that the function $f': N' \rightarrow N$ such that for all $l \in N'$, $f'(l) = l$ is a P -embedding of (N', E', λ') into (N, E, λ) .

Hence, $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$. \dashv

Lemma 6 *For all strict P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , there exists a nice P -labelled tree (N', E', λ') such that $(N, E, \lambda) \sim (N', E', \lambda')$.*

Proof: By Lemma 5. \dashv

Lemma 7 *Modulo \simeq , there exists only a finite number of nice P -labelled trees.*

Proof: Reminding that for all strict P -labelled trees (N, E, λ) , the height of the tree (N, E) does not exceed $\text{Card}(P)$, the reader may easily verify that for all $h \in \mathbb{N}$, if $h \leq \text{Card}(P)$ then modulo \simeq , the number $\text{nlt}(h)$ of nice P -labelled trees of height at most h is such that if $h = 0$ then $\text{nlt}(h) = \text{Card}(P)$ else $\text{nlt}(h) = \text{Card}(P) \times 2^{\text{nlt}(h-1)}$. Hence, modulo \simeq , there exists only a finite number of nice P -labelled trees. \dashv

Lemma 8 *Modulo \sim , there exists only a finite number of P -labelled trees.*

Proof: By Lemmas 3, 6 and 7 and the fact that \simeq is finer than \sim . \dashv

Lemma 9 *For all countably indexed families $(N_m, E_m, \lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of P -labelled trees, there exists a strictly increasing function $\theta: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(N_{\theta(m)}, E_{\theta(m)}, \lambda_{\theta(m)}) \sim (N_{\theta(n)}, E_{\theta(n)}, \lambda_{\theta(n)})$.*

Proof: By Lemma 8. \dashv

Now, we present our promised result about P -labelled trees.

Lemma 10 *For all countably indexed families $(N_m, E_m, \lambda_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of P -labelled trees, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the finitely indexed family $(N_m, E_m, \lambda_m)_{m \in (n)}$ of P -labelled trees is dreary.*

Proof: By Lemma 9. \dashv

4 Syntax

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

Let \mathbf{Fo} be the countably infinite set (with typical members called *formulas* and denoted A, B , etc) of finite words over $\mathbf{At} \cup \{\rightarrow, \top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \Box, \Diamond, (,)\}$ defined by³

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

where p ranges over \mathbf{At} .

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

We follow the standard rules for omission of the parentheses.

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

Let \bowtie be the *binary relation of accessibility between sets of formulas* such that for all sets Γ, Δ of formulas, $\Gamma \bowtie \Delta$ if and only if for all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$, the following conditions hold:⁴

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

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

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

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

Lemma 11 *For all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$, $\text{Card}(\Sigma_A) \leq \|A\|$.*

Proof: By induction on $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$. \dashv

For all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$, let $P_A = \{-1\} \cup \wp(\Sigma_A)$.

³Notice that each connective but \rightarrow has a dual one. Imitating the “Brouwerian implication” introduced by Rauszer [25] within the context **IPL**, a dual implication could be added to the language of **LIK4** as well. We will address this possibility in future work.

⁴Obviously, there exist sets Γ, Δ of formulas such that $\Gamma \bowtie \Delta$ and $\Delta \not\bowtie \Gamma$. However, we use a symmetric symbol to denote the binary relation of accessibility between sets of formulas, seeing that in its definition, \Box -formulas and \Diamond -formulas play symmetric roles.

Lemma 12 For all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$, $\text{Card}(P_A) \leq 1 + 2^{\|A\|}$.

Proof: By Lemma 11. \dashv

For all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$, let \leq_A be the least partial order on P_A such that

- for all $\Delta \in \wp(\Sigma_A)$, $-1 \leq_A \Delta$,
- for all $\Gamma, \Delta \in \wp(\Sigma_A)$, if $\Gamma \subseteq \Delta$ then $\Gamma \leq_A \Delta$.

5 Relational semantics

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

A frame (W, \leq, R) is *finite* if W is finite.

A frame (W, \leq, R) is *transitive* if R is transitive.

A frame (W, \leq, R) is *upward confluent* if $R \circ \geq \subseteq \geq \circ R$, that is to say for all $s, t, u \in W$, if $s R t$ and $u \leq t$ then there exists $v \in W$ such that $v \leq s$ and $v R u$.

A frame (W, \leq, R) is *downward confluent* if $\leq \circ R \subseteq R \circ \leq$, that is to say for all $s, t, u \in W$, if $s \leq t$ and $t R u$ then there exists $v \in W$ such that $s R v$ and $v \leq u$.

A frame (W, \leq, R) is *forward confluent* if $\geq \circ R \subseteq R \circ \geq$, that is to say for all $s, t, u \in W$, if $t \leq s$ and $t R u$ then there exists $v \in W$ such that $s R v$ and $u \leq v$.

The elementary conditions characterizing upward confluent frames and downward confluent frames have been considered in [7] where they have received no specific name. The elementary condition characterizing forward confluent frames has been considered in [13] where it has been called “connecting property” and in [26, Chapter 3] where it has been called “(F1)”. These 3 elementary conditions have also been considered in [23].

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lemma 13 (Heredity Property) *Let (W, \leq, R, V) be a model based on a downward confluent and forward confluent frame. For all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ and for all $s, t \in W$, if $s \models A$ and $s \leq t$ then $t \models A$.⁵*

Proof: By induction on $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$. \dashv

Our definition of the satisfiability of formulas is the one introduced by Božić and Došen [7].

Fischer Servi [13] defines the satisfiability of \Box -formulas and \Diamond -formulas as follows: $s \models_{\text{FS}} \Box A$ if and only if for all $t \in W$, if $s \leq t$ then for all $u \in W$, if tRu then $u \models_{\text{FS}} A$; $s \models_{\text{FS}} \Diamond A$ if and only if there exists $t \in W$ such that sRt and $t \models_{\text{FS}} A$.

Prénosil [24] defines the satisfiability of \Box -formulas and \Diamond -formulas as follows: $s \models_{\text{P}} \Box A$ if and only if for all $t \in W$, if $s \leq t$ then for all $u \in W$, if tRu then $u \models_{\text{P}} A$; $s \models_{\text{P}} \Diamond A$ if and only if there exists $t \in W$ such that $s \geq t$ and there exists $u \in W$ such that tRu and $u \models_{\text{P}} A$.

Wijesekera [32] defines the satisfiability of \Box -formulas and \Diamond -formulas as follows: $s \models_{\text{W}} \Box A$ if and only if for all $t \in W$, if $s \leq t$ then for all $u \in W$, if tRu then $u \models_{\text{W}} A$; $s \models_{\text{W}} \Diamond A$ if and only if for all $t \in W$, if $s \leq t$ then there exists $u \in W$ such that tRu and $u \models_{\text{W}} A$.

In the class of all downward confluent and forward confluent frames, the definition of the satisfiability of formulas considered by Fischer Servi, the definition of

⁵The heredity property is probably the most fundamental property of the relational semantics of intuitionistically-based logics.

the satisfiability of formulas considered by Přenosil, the definition of the satisfiability of formulas considered by Wijesekera and the definition of the satisfiability of formulas considered by Božić and Došen give rise to the same relation of satisfiability.

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

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

6 Axiomatization

See [8, Chapter 2] for an introduction to the standard axioms of **IPL** and the standard inference rules of **IPL**.

Let **LIK4** be the least set of formulas closed under uniform substitution, containing the standard axioms of **IPL**, closed under the standard inference rules of **IPL**, containing the following axioms and closed under the following inference rules:⁶

- (**C** \Box) $\Box p \wedge \Box q \rightarrow \Box(p \wedge q)$,
- (**C** \Diamond) $\Diamond(p \vee q) \rightarrow \Diamond p \vee \Diamond q$,
- (**N** \Box) $\Box \top$,
- (**N** \Diamond) $\neg \Diamond \perp$,
- (**R** \Box) $\frac{p \rightarrow q}{\Box p \rightarrow \Box q}$,
- (**R** \Diamond) $\frac{p \rightarrow q}{\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond q}$,
- (4 \Box) $\Box p \rightarrow \Box \Box p$,
- (4 \Diamond) $\Diamond \Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond p$,
- (**Ad**) $\Box(p \vee q) \rightarrow \Diamond p \vee \Box q$,
- (**Af**) $\Diamond(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (\Box p \rightarrow \Diamond q)$.

The axioms (**C** \Box), (**C** \Diamond), (**N** \Box) and (**N** \Diamond) and the inference rules (**R** \Box) and (**R** \Diamond) are well-known. They are sometimes associated to the concept of normality in classical modal logics. The axioms (4 \Box) and (4 \Diamond) are also well-known. They are classically related to the elementary condition of transitivity. The axiom (**Ad**) has been already considered by Božić and Došen [7]. It is related

⁶The reason why we have separated the condition of closure under uniform substitution and the condition of closure under the standard inference rules of **IPL** is simply the following: uniform substitution is not an inference rule.

to the elementary condition of downward confluence. The axiom **(Af)** has been already considered by Fischer Servi [13]. It is related to the elementary condition of forward confluence.

The reader may easily see that the axiom $\Box(p \vee q) \rightarrow ((\Diamond p \rightarrow \Box q) \rightarrow \Box q)$ and the inference rule $\frac{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Box(p \rightarrow r)}{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Diamond r}$ considered in Lemmas 14 and 15 have similarities with the equation $\Diamond a \rightarrow \Box b \leq \Box(a \vee b) \rightarrow \Box b$ and the law $\Diamond b \leq \Box a \vee c \Rightarrow \Diamond b \leq \Diamond(a \wedge b) \vee c$ considered by Přenosil [24]. Together, they will allow us to use the canonical model construction developed in [4].

Lemma 14 *The axiom $\Box(p \vee q) \rightarrow ((\Diamond p \rightarrow \Box q) \rightarrow \Box q)$ is derivable in **LIK4**.*

Proof: By considering for all $A, B \in \mathbf{Fo}$, the following sequence of formulas, the reader may easily construct a proof of the derivability of the axiom $\Box(p \vee q) \rightarrow ((\Diamond p \rightarrow \Box q) \rightarrow \Box q)$ in **LIK4**:⁷

1. $\Diamond A \vee \Box B \rightarrow ((\Diamond A \rightarrow \Box B) \rightarrow \Box B)$ (**IPL**-reasoning),
2. $\Box(A \vee B) \rightarrow \Diamond A \vee \Box B$ (axiom **(Ad)**),
3. $\Box(A \vee B) \rightarrow ((\Diamond A \rightarrow \Box B) \rightarrow \Box B)$ (**IPL**-reasoning on (1) and (2)).

⊢

Lemma 15 *The inference rule $\frac{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Box(p \rightarrow r)}{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Diamond r}$ is derivable in **LIK4**.*

Proof: By considering for all $A, B, C \in \mathbf{Fo}$, the following sequence of formulas, the reader may easily construct a proof of the derivability of the inference rule $\frac{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Box(p \rightarrow r)}{\Diamond p \rightarrow q \vee \Diamond r}$ in **LIK4**:⁸

1. $\Diamond A \rightarrow B \vee \Box(A \rightarrow C)$ (hypothesis),
2. $A \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow C)$ (**IPL**-reasoning),
3. $\Diamond A \rightarrow \Diamond((A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow C)$ (inference rule **(R \Diamond)** on (2)),
4. $\Diamond((A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (\Box(A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow \Diamond C)$ (axiom **(Af)**),
5. $\Diamond A \rightarrow B \vee \Diamond C$ (**IPL**-reasoning on (1), (3) and (4)).

⊢

Lemma 16 (Soundness) *Let A be a formula. If $A \in \mathbf{LIK4}$ then for all transitive, downward confluent and forward confluent frames (W, \leq, R) , $(W, \leq, R) \models A$.*

⁷We invite the reader to notice where axiom **(Ad)** is used in this sequence.

⁸We invite the reader to notice where axiom **(Af)** is used in this sequence.

7 Canonical model

A *theory* is a set of formulas containing **LIK4** and closed with respect to the inference rule of modus ponens.

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

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

Lemma 17 (Lindenbaum Lemma) *Let $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$. If $A \notin \mathbf{LIK4}$ then there exists a prime theory s such that $A \notin s$.*

Proof: See [4, Lemma 24]. \dashv

Let (W_c, \leq_c, R_c) be the frame such that

- W_c is the nonempty set of all prime theories,⁹
- \leq_c is the preorder on W_c such that for all $s, t \in W_c$, $s \leq_c t$ if and only if $s \subseteq t$,¹⁰
- R_c is the binary relation on W_c such that for all $s, t \in W_c$, $s R_c t$ if and only if $s \boxtimes t$.

The frame (W_c, \leq_c, R_c) is called *canonical frame of LIK4*.

Lemma 18 (W_c, \leq_c, R_c) *is transitive, downward confluent and forward confluent.*

Proof: About downward confluence, it follows from Lemmas 14 and 15 and [4, Lemma 29]. As for forward confluence, it follows from Lemmas 14 and 15 and [4, Lemma 27]. \dashv

The *canonical valuation of LIK4* is the valuation $V_c: \mathbf{At} \rightarrow \wp(W_c)$ on (W_c, \leq_c, R_c) such that for all $p \in \mathbf{At}$, $V_c(p) = \{s \in W_c: p \in s\}$.¹¹

The *canonical model of LIK4* is the model (W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c) .

Lemma 19 (Canonical Truth Lemma) *For all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ and for all $s \in W_c$, $A \in s$ if and only if $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), s \models A$.*

Proof: See [4, Lemma 26]. \dashv

⁹By Lemma 16, $\perp \notin \mathbf{LIK4}$. As a result, by Lemma 17, there exists a prime theory. Therefore, W_c is a nonempty set.

¹⁰Obviously, \leq_c is a reflexive and transitive binary relation on W_c . As a result, \leq_c is a preorder on W_c .

¹¹Obviously, for all $p \in \mathbf{At}$, $V_c(p)$ is \leq_c -closed.

8 Maximality

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

Lemma 20 *Let $s \in W_c$ and $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$. If s is not maximal with respect to B then there exists $t \in W_c$ such that $s <_c t$, $t \not\models B$ and t is maximal with respect to B .*

Proof: Suppose s is not maximal with respect to B . Let $S = \{t \in W_c : s <_c t \text{ and } t \not\models B\}$. Since s is not maximal with respect to B , then S is nonempty. Moreover, obviously, for all nonempty chains $(t_a)_{a \in I}$ of elements of S , $\bigcup \{t_a : a \in I\}$ is in S .¹² Hence, by Zorn's Lemma, S possesses a maximal element t .¹³ Obviously, $s <_c t$, $t \not\models B$ and t is maximal with respect to B . \dashv

Lemma 21 *Let $s \in W_c$ and $B, C \in \mathbf{Fo}$. If $s \not\models B \rightarrow C$ and s is maximal with respect to $B \rightarrow C$ then $s \models B$ and $s \not\models C$.*

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

9 Tips and clips

From now on in this note and up to Lemma 42, let $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$ and s_0 be a prime theory.

A *tip* is a 4-tuple of the form (i, s, α, X) where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \in W_c$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X \in \mathbb{N}$.

The tip $(0, s_0, 0, 0)$ is called *initial tip of* s_0 .

The *rank of the tip* (i, s, α, X) is α .

The *height of the tip* (i, s, α, X) is X .

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

Lemma 22 *For all tips (i, s, α, X) , $\mathbf{deg}(i, s, \alpha, X) \leq \mathbf{Card}(\Sigma_A)$.*

¹²Remind that for all $a \in I$, $s <_c t_a$ and $t_a \not\models B$, i.e. $s \subseteq t_a$, $t_a \not\subseteq s$ and $B \not\subseteq t_a$. Moreover, for all $b, c \in I$, either $t_b \subseteq t_c$, or $t_c \subseteq t_b$. As a result, $s \subseteq \bigcup \{t_a : a \in I\}$, $\bigcup \{t_a : a \in I\} \not\subseteq s$ and $B \not\subseteq \bigcup \{t_a : a \in I\}$, i.e. $s <_c \bigcup \{t_a : a \in I\}$ and $\bigcup \{t_a : a \in I\} \not\models B$.

¹³See [12, Chapter 10] and [31, Chapter 1] for details about Zorn's Lemma.

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

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

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

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

- if $i=j$ then $s=t$, $\alpha=\beta$ and $X=Y$,
- if $(i, s, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \beta, Y)$ then $j \neq i$, $s \leq_c t$, $\beta=\alpha$ and $Y=X+1$,
- if $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \beta, Y)$ then $j \neq i$, $t \in R_c(s)$, $\beta=\alpha+1$ and $Y=X$.

Lemma 23 *The initial clip of s_0 is coherent.*

Obviously, for all clips $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, the frame $(\mathcal{T}, \ll^*, \triangleright^+)$ is finite and transitive.

Lemma 24 *Let $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ be a clip. If $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is coherent then the function $f: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow W_c$ such that for all $(i, s, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$, $f(i, s, \alpha, X) = s$ is a homomorphism from the frame $(\mathcal{T}, \ll^*, \triangleright^+)$ to the canonical frame of **LIK4**.*

Proof: Suppose $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is coherent. Let $(i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$.

Firstly, suppose $(i, s, \alpha, X) \ll^*(j, t, \beta, Y)$. Hence, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and there exists $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0), \dots, (k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0) = (i, s, \alpha, X)$, $(k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) = (j, t, \beta, Y)$ and for all $a \in (n)$, $(k_{a-1}, u_{a-1}, \gamma_{a-1}, Z_{a-1}) \ll (k_a, u_a, \gamma_a, Z_a)$. By induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the reader may easily verify that $s \leq_c t$.

Secondly, suppose $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright^+(j, t, \beta, Y)$. Thus, there exists $n \geq 1$ and there exists $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0), \dots, (k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0) = (i, s, \alpha, X)$, $(k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) = (j, t, \beta, Y)$ and for all $a \in (n)$, $(k_{a-1}, u_{a-1}, \gamma_{a-1}, Z_{a-1}) \triangleright (k_a, u_a, \gamma_a, Z_a)$. By induction on $n \geq 1$, the reader may easily verify that $s R_c t$. \dashv

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

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

Lemma 25 *The initial clip of s_0 is regular.*

Obviously, for all regular clips $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, the relational structure (\mathcal{T}, \ll) is a disjoint union of trees.

Moreover, for all regular clips $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, the frame $(\mathcal{T}, \ll^*, \triangleright^+)$ is upward confluent.

For all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, the α -slice of a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is the P_A -labelled tree $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \ll_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)$ where¹⁴

- $\mathcal{T}_\alpha = \{-1\} \cup \{(j, t, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T} : \alpha = \beta\}$,
- \ll_α is the least binary relation on \mathcal{T}_α such that
 - for all $(k, u, \alpha, Z) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, if for all $(j, t, \alpha, Y) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, $(j, t, \alpha, Y) \not\ll (k, u, \alpha, Z)$ then $-1 \ll_\alpha (k, u, \alpha, Z)$,
 - for all $(j, t, \alpha, Y), (k, u, \alpha, Z) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, if $(j, t, \alpha, Y) \ll (k, u, \alpha, Z)$ then $(j, t, \alpha, Y) \ll_\alpha (k, u, \alpha, Z)$,
- $\lambda_\alpha : \mathcal{T}_\alpha \rightarrow P_A$ is the function such that
 - $\lambda_\alpha(-1) = -1$,
 - for all $(j, t, \alpha, Y) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$, $\lambda_\alpha(j, t, \alpha, Y) = t \cap \Sigma_A$.

The finitely indexed family of P_A -labelled trees associated to a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ is the finitely indexed family $(\mathcal{T}_\beta, \ll_\beta, \lambda_\beta)_{\beta \in (\alpha)}$.

10 Defects

Let $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ be a regular clip.

It might be the case that for some $(i, s, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$ and for some $B \rightarrow C \in \Sigma_A$, $s \not\models B \rightarrow C$ and s is not maximal with respect to $B \rightarrow C$ whereas there is no witness in \mathcal{T} of this fact, i.e. there is no $(j, t, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(i, s, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \beta, Y)$, $t \models B$ and $t \not\models C$. Such situation will correspond to a defect of maximality.

Moreover, it might also be the case that for some $(i, s, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$ and for some $\Box B \in \Sigma_A$, $s \not\models \Box B$ whereas there is no witness in \mathcal{T} of this fact, i.e. there is no $(j, t, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \beta, Y)$ and $t \models B$. Such situation will correspond to a defect of \Box -accessibility.

In other respect, it might also be the case that for some $(i, s, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$ and for some $\Diamond B \in \Sigma_A$, $s \models \Diamond B$ whereas there is no witness in \mathcal{T} of this fact, i.e. there is no $(j, t, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \beta, Y)$ and $t \models B$. Such situation will correspond to a defect of \Diamond -accessibility.

¹⁴The reader may easily verify that $(\mathcal{T}_\alpha, \ll_\alpha)$ is a tree and λ_α is \leq_A -monotone.

Finally, it might as well be the case that either the frame $(\mathcal{T}, \ll^*, \triangleright^+)$ is not downward confluent, or the frame $(\mathcal{T}, \ll^*, \triangleright^+)$ is not forward confluent. Such situation will correspond to defects of downward confluence and defects of forward confluence.

A *defect of maximality of a regular clip* $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is a triple $((i, s, \alpha, X), B, C)$ where $(i, s, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $B, C \in \mathbf{Fo}$ are such that¹⁵

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

The *rank of the defect* $((i, s, \alpha, X), B, C)$ of maximality is α .

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

A *defect of \Box -accessibility of a regular clip* $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is a couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), B)$ where $(i, s, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ are such that¹⁶

- $\Box B \in \Sigma_A$,
- $s \not\models \Box B$,
- for all $(j, t, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$, if $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \beta, Y)$ then $t \models B$.

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

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

A *defect of \Diamond -accessibility of a regular clip* $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is a couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), B)$ where $(i, s, \alpha, X) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$ are such that¹⁷

- $\Diamond B \in \Sigma_A$,
- $s \models \Diamond B$,
- for all $(j, t, \beta, Y) \in \mathcal{T}$, if $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright (j, t, \beta, Y)$ then $t \not\models B$.

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

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

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

¹⁵Here, when we write “ $s \not\models B \rightarrow C$ ” and “ $t \models B \rightarrow C$ ”, we mean “ $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), s \not\models B \rightarrow C$ ” and “ $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), t \models B \rightarrow C$ ”.

¹⁶Here, when we write “ $s \not\models \Box B$ ” and “ $t \models B$ ”, we mean “ $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), s \not\models \Box B$ ” and “ $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), t \models B$ ”.

¹⁷Here, when we write “ $s \models \Diamond B$ ” and “ $t \not\models B$ ”, we mean “ $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), s \models \Diamond B$ ” and “ $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), t \not\models B$ ”.

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

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

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

Lemma 26 Let $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ be a regular clip. If $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y), (k, u, \gamma, Z))$ is a defect of downward confluence of $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ then for all $(l, v, \delta, T) \in \mathcal{T}$, $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\ll (k, u, \gamma, Z)$.

Proof: Suppose $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y), (k, u, \gamma, Z))$ is a defect of downward confluence of $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose there exists $(l, v, \delta, T) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(l, v, \delta, T) \ll (k, u, \gamma, Z)$. Since $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y), (k, u, \gamma, Z))$ is a defect of downward confluence of $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, then $(i, s, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \beta, Y)$ and $(j, t, \beta, Y) \triangleright (k, u, \gamma, Z)$. Since $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is regular and $(l, v, \delta, T) \ll (k, u, \gamma, Z)$, then there exists $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \ll (j, t, \beta, Y)$ and $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \triangleright (l, v, \delta, T)$. Since $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is regular and $(i, s, \alpha, X) \ll (j, t, \beta, Y)$, then $m=i$. Hence, $w=s$, $\epsilon=\alpha$ and $U=X$. Since $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \triangleright (l, v, \delta, T)$ and $m=i$, then $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright (l, v, \delta, T)$. Since $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y), (k, u, \gamma, Z))$ is a defect of downward confluence of $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, then either $(i, s, \alpha, X) \not\preceq (l, v, \delta, T)$, or $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\ll (k, u, \gamma, Z)$. Since $(i, s, \alpha, X) \triangleright (l, v, \delta, T)$, then $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\ll (k, u, \gamma, Z)$: a contradiction. \neg

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

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

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

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

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

- α -clean for maximality if for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\beta < \alpha$ then $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ contains no defect of maximality of rank β ,

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

We say that a regular clip is *clean* if it contains no defect.

Lemma 27 *The initial clip of s_0 is 0-clean for maximality, 0-clean for accessibility, 0-clean for downward confluence and 0-clean for forward confluence.*

Defects are not welcome. Luckily, they are repairable. In Sections 11, 12 and 13, we are showing how defects can be repaired.

11 Repair of maximality defects

In this section, we are showing how maximality defects can be repaired.

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

- add a tip (j, t, β, Y) to \mathcal{T} such that j is new, $s <_c t$, $t \not\models B \rightarrow C$, t is maximal with respect to $B \rightarrow C$, $\beta = \alpha$ and $Y = X + 1$,¹⁸
- add the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y))$ to \ll .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip (j, t, β, Y) to \mathcal{T} and the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y))$ to \ll , then the resulting clip is regular.

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

As well, notice that $\deg(j, t, \beta, Y) < \deg(i, s, \alpha, X)$.

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

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

¹⁸The existence of $t \in W_c$ such that $s <_c t$, $t \not\models B \rightarrow C$ and t is maximal with respect to $B \rightarrow C$ is an immediate consequence of Lemma 20 and the fact that $((i, s, \alpha, X), B, C)$ is a defect of maximality.

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

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

Lemma 28 *Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, at any moment of the execution of the maximality procedure, for all tips (j, t, β, Y) occurring in x , $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\} + \text{Card}(\Sigma_A)$.*

Proof: It suffices to notice that for all $X \in \mathbb{N}$, the repair of a defect of maximality of rank α and height X only introduces a tip of rank α and height $X+1$. Moreover, as noticed above, the degree of the introduced tip is strictly smaller than the degree of the tip that has caused this introduction. Hence, by Lemma 22, at any moment of the execution of the maximality procedure, for all tips (j, t, β, Y) occurring in x , $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\} + \text{Card}(\Sigma_A)$. \dashv

Lemma 29 *Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, the maximality procedure terminates.*

Proof: By Lemma 28. \dashv

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

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

12 Repair of accessibility defects

In this section, we are showing how defects of \square -accessibility and defects of \diamond -accessibility can be repaired.

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

- add a tip (j, t, β, Y) to \mathcal{T} such that j is new, $t \in R_c(s)$, $t \not\models B$, $\beta = \alpha + 1$ and $Y = X$,¹⁹
- add the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y))$ to \triangleright .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip (j, t, β, Y) to \mathcal{T} and the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y))$ to \triangleright , then the resulting clip is regular.

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

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

- add a tip (j, t, β, Y) to \mathcal{T} such that j is new, $t \in R_c(s)$, $t \models B$, $\beta = \alpha + 1$ and $Y = X$,²⁰
- add the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y))$ to \triangleright .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip (j, t, β, Y) to \mathcal{T} and the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y))$ to \triangleright , then the resulting clip is regular.

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

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

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

¹⁹The existence of $t \in W_c$ such that $t \in R_c(s)$ and $t \not\models B$ is an immediate consequence of the fact that $((i, s, \alpha, X), B)$ is a defect of \square -accessibility.

²⁰The existence of $t \in W_c$ such that $t \in R_c(s)$ and $t \models B$ is an immediate consequence of the fact that $((i, s, \alpha, X), B)$ is a defect of \diamond -accessibility.

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

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

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

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

Proof: By Lemma 31. \dashv

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

Proof: Suppose $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, α -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence. Notice that by Lemma 32, the accessibility procedure terminates. Since the execution of the accessibility procedure only introduces tips of rank $\alpha+1$, then the regular clip obtained from $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ after the execution of the accessibility procedure is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence. \dashv

13 Repair of confluence defects

In this section, we are showing how defects of downward confluence and defects of forward confluence can be repaired.

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

- add a tip (l, v, δ, T) to \mathcal{T} such that l is new, $v \in R_c(s)$, $v \leq_c u$, $\delta = \alpha+1$, $\delta = \gamma$, $T = X$ and $Z = T+1$,²¹

²¹The existence of $v \in W_c$ such that $v \in R_c(s)$ and $v \leq_c u$ is an immediate consequence of the fact that $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y), (k, u, \gamma, Z))$ is a defect of downward confluence.

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

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip (l, v, δ, T) to \mathcal{T} , the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (l, v, \delta, T))$ to \triangleright and the couple $((l, v, \delta, T), (k, u, \gamma, Z))$ to \llcorner , then by Lemma 26, the resulting clip is regular.

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

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

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

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

Lemma 34 *Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$, at any moment of the execution of the procedure of downward confluence, for all tips (j, t, β, Y) occurring in x , $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\}$.*

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

Lemma 35 *Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$, the procedure of downward confluence terminates.*

Proof: By Lemma 34. \dashv

Lemma 36 *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ be a regular clip. If $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence then the regular clip obtained from $(\mathcal{T}, \llcorner, \triangleright)$ after the execution of the procedure of downward confluence is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence.*

Proof: Suppose $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence. Notice that by Lemma 35, the procedure of downward confluence terminates. Since the execution of the procedure of downward confluence only introduces tips of rank $\alpha+1$, then the regular clip obtained from $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ after the execution of the procedure of downward confluence is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence. \dashv

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

- add a tip (l, v, δ, T) to \mathcal{T} such that l is new, $v \in R_c(s)$, $u \leq_c v$, $\delta = \alpha+1$, $\delta = \gamma$, $T = X$ and $T = Z+1$,²²
- add the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (l, v, \delta, T))$ to \triangleright ,
- add the couple $((k, u, \gamma, Z), (l, v, \delta, T))$ to \ll .

Obviously, the resulting clip is coherent.

Moreover, since the resulting clip is obtained by adding the tip (l, v, δ, T) to \mathcal{T} , the couple $((i, s, \alpha, X), (l, v, \delta, T))$ to \triangleright and the couple $((k, u, \gamma, Z), (l, v, \delta, T))$ to \ll , then the resulting clip is regular.

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

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

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

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

Lemma 37 *Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, at any moment of the execution of the procedure of forward confluence, for all tips (j, t, β, Y) occurring in x , $Y \leq \max\{Z \in \mathbb{N} : (k, u, \gamma, Z) \in \mathcal{T}\}$.*

²²The existence of $v \in W_c$ such that $v \in R_c(s)$ and $u \leq_c v$ is an immediate consequence of the fact that $((i, s, \alpha, X), (j, t, \beta, Y), (k, u, \gamma, Z))$ is a defect of forward confluence.

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

Lemma 38 *Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and a regular clip $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$, the procedure of forward confluence terminates.*

Proof: By Lemma 37. \dashv

Lemma 39 *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ be a regular clip. If $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence then the regular clip obtained from $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ after the execution of the procedure of forward confluence is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for forward confluence.*

Proof: Suppose $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence. Notice that by Lemma 38, the procedure of forward confluence terminates. Since the execution of the procedure of forward confluence only introduces tips of rank $\alpha+1$, then the regular clip obtained from $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ after the execution of the procedure of forward confluence is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for forward confluence. \dashv

14 A decision procedure

The *saturation procedure* is the following sequence of steps:

- (1) $x := (\{(0, s_0, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$,
- (2) $\alpha := 0$,
- (3) repair in x all defects of maximality of rank α by applying the maximality procedure,
- (4) if the finitely indexed family of P_A -labelled trees associated to x and α is dreary then goto (10) else goto (5),
- (5) repair in x all defects of accessibility of rank α by applying the accessibility procedure,
- (6) repair in x all defects of downward confluence of rank α by applying the procedure of downward confluence,

- (7) repair in x all defects of forward confluence of rank α by applying the procedure of forward confluence,
- (8) $\alpha := \alpha + 1$,
- (9) goto (3),
- (10) halt.

The role of the saturation procedure is to iteratively repair all defects of $(\{(0, s_0, 0, 0)\}, \emptyset, \emptyset)$. A few remarks must be made about its steps.

About step (1), by Lemma 27, the regular clip x is 0-clean for maximality, 0-clean for accessibility, 0-clean for downward confluence and 0-clean for forward confluence.

Therefore, about step (2), the regular clip x is α -clean for maximality, α -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence.

As a result, by Lemma 29, the procedure used in step (3) terminates. Moreover, since after step (2), the regular clip x given as an input to the maximality procedure is α -clean for maximality, α -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence, then by Lemma 30, the regular clip x given as an output to the procedure used in step (3) is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, α -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence.

Concerning step (4), obviously, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\alpha < \beta$ then the β -slice of x is empty.

By Lemma 32, the procedure used in step (5) terminates. Moreover, since after step (3), the regular clip x given as an input to the procedure used in step (5) is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, α -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence, then by Lemma 33, the regular clip x given as an output to the procedure used in step (5) is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence.

By Lemma 35, the procedure used in step (6) terminates. Moreover, since after step (5), the regular clip x given as an input to the procedure used in step (6) is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, α -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence, then by Lemma 36, the regular clip x given as an output to the procedure used in step (6) is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence.

By Lemma 38, the procedure used in step (7) terminates. Moreover, since after step (6), the regular clip x given as an input to the procedure used in step (7) is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and α -clean for forward confluence, then by Lemma 39, the regular clip x given as an output to the procedure used in step (7) is $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for maximality, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for accessibility, $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for downward confluence and $(\alpha+1)$ -clean for forward confluence.

With respect to steps (8) and (9), there is nothing to say.

And in the end, when the saturation procedure arrives at step (10), the finitely indexed family of P_A -labelled trees associated to x and α is dreary.

Lemma 40 *The saturation procedure terminates.*

Proof: By Lemma 10. \dashv

Let $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ and α_f be the values of x and α when the saturation procedure terminates.

Therefore, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\alpha_f < \beta$ then the β -slice of $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is empty.²³

Moreover, $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is (α_f+1) -clean for maximality, α_f -clean for accessibility, α_f -clean for downward confluence and α_f -clean for forward confluence.²⁴

In other respect, the finitely indexed family $(\mathcal{T}_\beta, \ll_\beta, \lambda_\beta)_{\beta \in (\alpha_f)}$ of P_A -labelled trees associated to $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ and α_f is dreary.²⁵ As a result, there exists $\beta_f \in (\alpha_f)$ such that $\beta_f < \alpha_f$ and $(\mathcal{T}_{\beta_f}, \ll_{\beta_f}, \lambda_{\beta_f}) \sim (\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_f}, \ll_{\alpha_f}, \lambda_{\alpha_f})$. Therefore, there exists a function $f: \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_f} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f}$ such that

- for all $(i, s, \alpha_f, X), (j, t, \alpha_f, Y) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_f}$, if $(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \ll_{\alpha_f} (j, t, \alpha_f, Y)$ then $f(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \ll_{\beta_f}^* f(j, t, \alpha_f, Y)$,
- for all $(k, u, \alpha_f, Z) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_f}$, $\lambda_{\alpha_f}(k, u, \alpha_f, Z) = \lambda_{\beta_f}(f(k, u, \alpha_f, Z))$.

15 Finite frame property

Let $\triangleright' = \{((i, s, \alpha_f, X), (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)): (i, s, \alpha_f, X) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_f}, (l, v, \beta_f+1, T) \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f+1} \text{ and } f(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \triangleright (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)\}$. Let (W', \leq', R') be the frame such that

- $W' = \mathcal{T}$,²⁶
- $\leq' = \ll^*$,²⁷

²³See the above remark about step (4).

²⁴See the above remarks about steps (3), (5), (6) and (7).

²⁵See the above remark about step (10).

²⁶Obviously, W' is nonempty.

²⁷Obviously, \leq' is a preorder on W' .

- $R' = (\triangleright \cup \triangleright')^+$.

Lemma 41 *The frame (W', \leq', R') is finite, transitive, downward confluent and forward confluent.*

Proof: About downward confluence, it suffices to demonstrate that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\gamma < \alpha_f$ then $\ll_{\gamma} \circ \triangleright \subseteq \triangleright \circ \ll_{\gamma+1}$ and $\ll_{\alpha_f} \circ \triangleright' \subseteq \triangleright' \circ \ll_{\beta_f+1}^*$. The former inclusions are consequences of the effect of step (6) in the saturation procedure. As for the latter inclusion, suppose $(i, s, \alpha_f, X), (j, t, \alpha_f, Y) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_f}$ and $(l, v, \beta_f+1, T) \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f+1}$ are such that $(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \ll_{\alpha_f} (j, t, \alpha_f, Y)$ and $(j, t, \alpha_f, Y) \triangleright' (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$. Hence, $f(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \ll_{\beta_f}^* f(j, t, \alpha_f, Y)$ and $f(j, t, \alpha_f, Y) \triangleright (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$. Thus, as a consequence of the effect of step (6) in the saturation procedure, there exists $(m, w, \beta_f+1, U) \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f+1}$ such that $f(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \triangleright (m, w, \beta_f+1, U)$ and $(m, w, \beta_f+1, U) \ll_{\beta_f+1}^* (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$. Consequently, $(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \triangleright' (m, w, \beta_f+1, U)$ and $(m, w, \beta_f+1, U) \ll_{\beta_f+1}^* (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$.

As for forward confluence, it suffices to demonstrate that for all $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\gamma < \alpha_f$ then $\gg_{\gamma} \circ \triangleright \subseteq \triangleright \circ \gg_{\gamma+1}$ and $\gg_{\alpha_f} \circ \triangleright' \subseteq \triangleright' \circ \gg_{\beta_f+1}^*$. The former inclusions are consequences of the effect of step (7) in the saturation procedure. As for the latter inclusion, suppose $(i, s, \alpha_f, X), (j, t, \alpha_f, Y) \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_f}$ and $(l, v, \beta_f+1, T) \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f+1}$ are such that $(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \gg_{\alpha_f} (j, t, \alpha_f, Y)$ and $(j, t, \alpha_f, Y) \triangleright' (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$. Hence, $f(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \gg_{\beta_f}^* f(j, t, \alpha_f, Y)$ and $f(j, t, \alpha_f, Y) \triangleright (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$. Thus, as a consequence of the effect of step (7) in the saturation procedure, there exists $(m, w, \beta_f+1, U) \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f+1}$ such that $f(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \triangleright (m, w, \beta_f+1, U)$ and $(m, w, \beta_f+1, U) \gg_{\beta_f+1}^* (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$. Consequently, $(i, s, \alpha_f, X) \triangleright' (m, w, \beta_f+1, U)$ and $(m, w, \beta_f+1, U) \gg_{\beta_f+1}^* (l, v, \beta_f+1, T)$. \dashv

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

The *saturated valuation of s_0* is the valuation $V': \mathbf{At} \rightarrow \wp(W')$ on (W', \leq', R') such that for all $p \in \mathbf{At}$, $V'(p) = \{(l, v, \delta, T) \in \mathcal{T} : v \in V_c(p)\}$.²⁸

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

Lemma 42 (Saturated Truth Lemma) *Let $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$. For all $(l, v, \delta, T) \in W'$, if $B \in \Sigma_A$ then $(l, v, \delta, T) \models B$ if and only if $v \models B$.²⁹*

Proof: By induction on $B \in \mathbf{Fo}$. Let $(l, v, \delta, T) \in W'$. Suppose $B \in \Sigma_A$.

Case $B = p$:

From left to right, suppose $(l, v, \delta, T) \models p$. Hence, $(l, v, \delta, T) \in V'(p)$. Thus, $v \in$

²⁸Obviously, for all $p \in \mathbf{At}$, $V'(p)$ is \leq' -closed.

²⁹Here, when we write “ $(l, v, \delta, T) \models B$ ” and “ $v \models B$ ”, we mean “ $(W', \leq', R', V'), (l, v, \delta, T) \models B$ ” and “ $(W_c, \leq_c, R_c, V_c), v \models B$ ”.

$V_c(p)$. Consequently, $v \models p$.

From right to left, suppose $v \models p$. Hence, $v \in V_c(p)$. Thus, $(l, v, \delta, T) \in V'(p)$. Consequently, $(l, v, \delta, T) \models p$.

Case $B = C \rightarrow D$:

From left to right, suppose $(l, v, \delta, T) \models C \rightarrow D$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $v \not\models C \rightarrow D$. For a while, suppose v is maximal with respect to $C \rightarrow D$. Since $v \not\models C \rightarrow D$, then by Lemma 21, $v \models C$ and $v \not\models D$. Hence, by induction hypothesis, $(l, v, \delta, T) \models C$ and $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\models D$. Since $(l, v, \delta, T) \models C \rightarrow D$, then $(l, v, \delta, T) \models D$: a contradiction. Thus, v is not maximal with respect to $C \rightarrow D$. Since $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is $(\alpha_f + 1)$ -clean for maximality, there exists $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $w \not\models C \rightarrow D$, w is maximal with respect to $C \rightarrow D$ and $(l, v, \delta, T) \ll (m, w, \epsilon, U)$. Consequently, by Lemma 21, $w \models C$ and $w \not\models D$. Hence, by induction hypothesis, $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \models C$ and $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \not\models D$. Since $(l, v, \delta, T) \models C \rightarrow D$ and $(l, v, \delta, T) \ll (m, w, \epsilon, U)$, then $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \models D$: a contradiction.

From right to left, suppose $v \models C \rightarrow D$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\models C \rightarrow D$. Thus, there exists $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(l, v, \delta, T) \ll^*(m, w, \epsilon, U)$, $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \models C$ and $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \not\models D$. Consequently, by Lemma 24, $v \leq_c w$. Moreover, by induction hypothesis, $w \models C$ and $w \not\models D$. Since $v \models C \rightarrow D$, then $w \models D$: a contradiction.

Case $B = \Box C$:

From left to right, suppose $(l, v, \delta, T) \models \Box C$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $v \not\models \Box C$. We consider the following cases: $\delta < \alpha_f$; $\delta = \alpha_f$. When $\delta < \alpha_f$, since $v \not\models \Box C$ and $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is α_f -clean for accessibility, then there exists $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(l, v, \delta, T) \triangleright (m, w, \epsilon, U)$ and $w \not\models C$. Hence, $(l, v, \delta, T) R' (m, w, \epsilon, U)$. Since $(l, v, \delta, T) \models \Box C$, then $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \models C$. Thus, by induction hypothesis, $w \models C$: a contradiction. When $\delta = \alpha_f$, let $(m, w, \beta_f, U) \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f}$ be such that $f(l, v, \delta, T) = (m, w, \beta_f, U)$. Consequently, $v \cap \Sigma_A = w \cap \Sigma_A$. Since $v \not\models \Box C$, then $w \not\models \Box C$. Since $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is α_f -clean for accessibility, then there exists $(n, x, \beta_f + 1, V) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(m, w, \beta_f, U) \triangleright (n, x, \beta_f + 1, V)$ and $x \not\models C$. Since $f(l, v, \delta, T) = (m, w, \beta_f, U)$, then $(l, v, \delta, T) R' (n, x, \beta_f + 1, V)$. Since $(l, v, \delta, T) \models \Box C$, then $(n, x, \beta_f + 1, V) \models C$. Hence, by induction hypothesis, $x \models C$: a contradiction.

From right to left, suppose $v \models \Box C$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\models \Box C$. Thus, there exists $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(l, v, \delta, T) R' (m, w, \epsilon, U)$ and $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \not\models C$. Consequently, there exists $n \geq 1$ and there exists $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0), \dots, (k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0) = (l, v, \delta, T)$, $(k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) = (m, w, \epsilon, U)$ and for all $a \in (n)$, either $(k_{a-1}, u_{a-1}, \gamma_{a-1}, Z_{a-1}) \triangleright (k_a, u_a, \gamma_a, Z_a)$, or $(k_{a-1}, u_{a-1}, \gamma_{a-1}, Z_{a-1}) \triangleright' (k_a, u_a, \gamma_a, Z_a)$. Moreover, by induction hypothesis, $w \not\models C$. By induction on $n \geq 1$, the reader may easily verify that $w \models C$:

a contradiction.

Case $B = \Diamond C$:

From left to right, suppose $(l, v, \delta, T) \models \Diamond C$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $v \not\models \Diamond C$. Since $(l, v, \delta, T) \models \Diamond C$, then there exists $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(l, v, \delta, T) R' (m, w, \epsilon, U)$ and $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \models C$. Hence, there exists $n \geq 1$ and there exists $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0), \dots, (k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(k_0, u_0, \gamma_0, Z_0) = (l, v, \delta, T)$, $(k_n, u_n, \gamma_n, Z_n) = (m, w, \epsilon, U)$ and for all $a \in (n)$, either $(k_{a-1}, u_{a-1}, \gamma_{a-1}, Z_{a-1}) \triangleright (k_a, u_a, \gamma_a, Z_a)$, or $(k_{a-1}, u_{a-1}, \gamma_{a-1}, Z_{a-1}) \triangleright' (k_a, u_a, \gamma_a, Z_a)$. Moreover, by induction hypothesis, $w \models C$. By induction on $n \geq 1$, the reader may easily verify that $w \not\models C$: a contradiction.

From right to left, suppose $v \models \Diamond C$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\models \Diamond C$. We consider the following cases: $\delta < \alpha_f$; $\delta = \alpha_f$. When $\delta < \alpha_f$, since $v \models \Diamond C$ and $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is α_f -clean for accessibility, then there exists $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(l, v, \delta, T) \triangleright (m, w, \epsilon, U)$ and $w \models C$. Thus, $(l, v, \delta, T) R' (m, w, \epsilon, U)$. Since $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\models \Diamond C$, then $(m, w, \epsilon, U) \not\models C$. Consequently, by induction hypothesis, $w \not\models C$: a contradiction. When $\delta = \alpha_f$, let $(m, w, \beta_f, U) \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta_f}$ be such that $f(l, v, \delta, T) = (m, w, \beta_f, U)$. Hence, $v \cap \Sigma_A = w \cap \Sigma_A$. Since $v \models \Diamond C$, then $w \models \Diamond C$. Since $(\mathcal{T}, \ll, \triangleright)$ is α_f -clean for accessibility, then there exists $(n, x, \beta_f + 1, V) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $(m, w, \beta_f, U) \triangleright (n, x, \beta_f + 1, V)$ and $x \models C$. Since $f(l, v, \delta, T) = (m, w, \beta_f, U)$, then $(l, v, \delta, T) R' (n, x, \beta_f + 1, V)$. Since $(l, v, \delta, T) \not\models \Diamond C$, then $(n, x, \beta_f + 1, V) \not\models C$. Thus, by induction hypothesis, $x \not\models C$: a contradiction. \dashv

All in all, the desired result is within reach.

Proposition 1 (Completeness and Finite Frame Property) *For all $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $A \in \mathbf{LIK4}$,
2. for all transitive, downward confluent and forward confluent frames (W, \leq, R) , $(W, \leq, R) \models A$,
3. for all finite, transitive, downward confluent and forward confluent frames (W, \leq, R) , $(W, \leq, R) \models A$.

Proof: Let $A \in \mathbf{Fo}$.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) By Lemma 16.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose for all finite, transitive, downward confluent and forward confluent frames (W, \leq, R) , $(W, \leq, R) \models A$. For the sake of the contradiction, suppose $A \notin \mathbf{LIK4}$. Hence, by Lemma 17, there exists a prime theory s_0 such that $A \not\leq s_0$. Thus, by Lemma 19, $s_0 \not\models A$. Let (W', \leq', R') be the saturated frame of s_0 . Since for all finite, transitive, downward confluent and forward confluent frames (W, \leq, R) , $(W, \leq, R) \models A$, then by Lemma 41, $(W', \leq', R') \models A$. Let

$V': \mathbf{At} \rightarrow \wp(W')$ be the saturated valuation of s_0 . Since $(W', \leq', R') \models A$, then $(W', \leq', R', V') \models A$. Consequently, $(0, s_0, 0, 0) \models A$. Hence, by Lemma 42, $s_0 \models A$: a contradiction. \dashv

Proposition 2 *The membership problem in LIK4 is decidable.*

Proof: By [6, Theorem 6.13] and Proposition 1. \dashv

Acknowledgements

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

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

References

- [1] Balbiani, P., Diéguez, M., Fernández-Duque, D.: *Some constructive variants of $\mathbf{S4}$ with the finite model property*. In *LICS'21: Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE (2021) 1–13 (doi: 10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470643).
- [2] Balbiani, P., Gao, H., Gencer, Ç., Olivetti, N.: *A natural intuitionistic modal logic: axiomatization and bi-nested calculus*. In *32nd EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic*. LIPICs (2024) 13:1–13:21.
- [3] Balbiani, P., Gao, H., Gencer, Ç., Olivetti, N.: *Local intuitionistic modal logics and their calculi*. In *Automated Reasoning*. Springer (2024) 78–96.
- [4] Balbiani, P., Gencer, Ç.: *Intuitionistic modal logics: a minimal setting*. *Studia Logica* (to appear).
- [5] Balbiani, P., Gencer, Ç.: *Intuitionistic modal logics: tips and clips*. *Logic Journal of the IGPL* (to appear).
- [6] Blackburn, P., de Rijke, M., Venema, Y.: *Modal Logic*. Cambridge University Press (2001).
- [7] Božić, M., Došen, K.: *Models for normal intuitionistic modal logics*. *Studia Logica* **43** (1984) 217–245.
- [8] Chagrov, A., Zakharyashev, M.: *Modal Logic*. Oxford University Press (1997).

- [9] Dalmonte, T.: *Wijesekera-style constructive modal logics*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 14*. College Publications (2022) 281–303.
- [10] Dalmonte, T., Grellois, C., Olivetti, N.: *Terminating calculi and counter-models for constructive modal logics*. In *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods*. Springer (2021) 391–408.
- [11] Das, A., Marin, S.: *On intuitionistic diamonds (and lack thereof)*. In *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods*. Springer (2023) 283–301.
- [12] Davey, B., Priestley, H.: *Introduction to Lattices and Order*. Cambridge University Press (2002).
- [13] Fischer Servi, G.: *Axiomatizations for some intuitionistic modal logics*. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico Università e Politecnico di Torino* **42** (1984) 179–194.
- [14] Fitting, M.: *Nested sequents for intuitionistic logics*. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* **55** (2014) 41–61.
- [15] Gasquet, O., Herzig, A., Sahade, M.: *Terminating modal tableaux with simple completeness proof*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 6*. College Publications (2006) 167–186.
- [16] Girlando, M., Kuznets, R., Marin, S., Morales, M., Straßburger, L.: *Intuitionistic $\mathbf{S4}$ is decidable*. In *38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. IEEE (2023) 10.1109/LICS56636.2023.10175684.
- [17] Girlando, M., Kuznets, R., Marin, S., Morales, M., Straßburger, L.: *A simple loopcheck for intuitionistic \mathbf{K}* . In *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation*. Springer (2024) 47–63.
- [18] Grefe, C.: *Fischer Servi’s intuitionistic modal logic has the finite model property*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 1*. CSLI Publications (1996) 85–98.
- [19] Hasimoto, Y.: *Finite model property for some intuitionistic modal logics*. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic* **30** (2001) 87–97.
- [20] Marin, S., Morales, M., Straßburger, L.: *A fully labelled proof system for intuitionistic modal logics*. *Journal of Logic and Computation* **31** (2021) 998–1022.
- [21] Olivetti, N.: *A journey in intuitionistic modal logic: normal and non-normal modalities*. In *LATD 2022 and MOSAIC Kick Off Conference*. University of Salerno (2022) 12–13.
- [22] de Paiva, V., Artemov, S. (editors): *Intuitionistic Modal Logic 2017*. *Journal of Applied Logics* **8** (2021) special issue.

- [23] Plotkin, G., Stirling, C.: *A framework for intuitionistic modal logics*. In *Theoretical Aspects of Reasoning About Knowledge*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers (1986) 399–406.
- [24] Přenosil, A.: *A duality for distributive unimodal logic*. In *Advances in Modal Logic. Volume 10*. College Publications (2014) 423–438.
- [25] Rauszer, C.: *An Algebraic and Kripke-Style Approach to a Certain Extension of Intuitionistic Logic*. PWN — Polish Scientific Publishers (1980).
- [26] Simpson, A.: *The Proof Theory and Semantics of Intuitionistic Modal Logic*. Doctoral thesis at the University of Edinburgh (1994).
- [27] Sotirov, V.: *Modal theories with intuitionistic logic*. In *Mathematical Logic*. Publishing House of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (1984) 139–171.
- [28] Stewart, C., de Paiva, V., Alechina, N.: *Intuitionistic modal logic: a 15-year retrospective*. *Journal of Logic and Computation* **28** (2018) 873–882.
- [29] Takano, M.: *Finite model property for an intuitionistic modal logic*. *Nihonkai Mathematical Journal* **14** (2003) 125–132.
- [30] Vakarelov, D.: *Intuitionistic modal logics incompatible with the law of the excluded middle*. *Studia Logica* **40** (1981) 103–111.
- [31] Wechler, W.: *Universal Algebra for Computer Scientists*. Springer (1992).
- [32] Wijesekera, D.: *Constructive modal logics I*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **50** (1990) 271–301.