

Interpolation for the two-way modal μ -calculus

Johannes Kloibhofer
University of Amsterdam
Amsterdam, Netherlands

Yde Venema
University of Amsterdam
Amsterdam, Netherlands

Abstract—The two-way modal μ -calculus is the extension of the (standard) one-way μ -calculus with converse (backward-looking) modalities. For this logic we introduce two new sequent-style proof calculi: a non-wellfounded system admitting infinite branches and a finitary, cyclic version of this that employs annotations.

As is common in sequent systems for two-way modal logics, our calculi feature an analytic cut rule. What distinguishes our approach is the use of so-called trace atoms, which serve to apply Vardi’s two-way automata in a proof-theoretic setting.

We prove soundness and completeness for both systems and subsequently use the cyclic calculus to show that the two-way μ -calculus has the (local) Craig interpolation property, with respect to both propositions and modalities. Our proof uses a version of Maehara’s method adapted to cyclic proof systems. As a corollary we prove that the two-way μ -calculus also enjoys Beth’s definability property.

Index Terms—fixpoint logic, two-way modal μ -calculus, cyclic proofs, sequent systems, interpolation

I. INTRODUCTION

a) The modal μ -calculus: The (standard, one-way) modal μ -calculus \mathcal{L}_μ ([1], [2]) is an extension of propositional (poly-)modal logic with explicit least- and greatest fixpoint operators which allow the expression of various recursive concepts in the language. The version used today, which was introduced by Kozen [3], has become a key tool in the formal study of the behaviour of programs and the dynamics of processes in general. Many temporal and dynamic logics such as the computational tree logics CTL and CTL*, and propositional dynamic logic PDL, have natural embeddings in \mathcal{L}_μ . It has been shown that when it comes to bisimulation-invariant properties, \mathcal{L}_μ has the same expressive power as monadic second-order logic [4]. Despite this increase in expressiveness, the μ -calculus has remarkably good computational properties, such as an EXPTIME-complete satisfiability problem [5].

Furthermore, \mathcal{L}_μ displays some excellent meta-logical behaviour. For instance, it enjoys the finite model property (Kozen [6]), and a strong, *uniform interpolation* property as shown by D’Agostino and Hollenberg [7]. The set of valid \mathcal{L}_μ -formulas has an elegant Hilbert-style axiomatisation, already proposed by Kozen [3] but only proved to be complete by Walukiewicz [8].

The *proof theory* of the modal μ -calculus is generally considered to be hard, largely due to the subtleties of nested least-

and greatest fixpoint operators. Niwiński & Walukiewicz [9] introduced, in a framework of infinite games, a certain sequent system in which sequents can be derived by means of non-wellfounded proofs allowing infinite branches, as long as these satisfy a certain success (or ‘progress’) condition.¹ Using results from automata theory one may show that any such non-wellfounded proof can be replaced by one that is regular - it has only finitely many distinct subderivations. Such a regular proof can be represented as the unfolding of a *cyclic* proof, that is, a certain finite derivation tree with back edges. As a further step, Jungteerapanitch [10] and Stirling [11] annotate formulas to encode the automata-theoretic information, which guarantees that all infinite branches in a proof tree satisfy the mentioned success condition. We shall build on this work.

b) The two-way μ -calculus: Despite its expressive power, *enrichments* of the standard modal μ -calculus have been introduced with various features that are well-known in the setting of basic (that is, fixpoint-free) modal logic, such as converse modalities, nominals or counting modalities [12]. In this paper we shall focus on the *two-way μ -calculus* \mathcal{L}_μ^2 [13], perhaps the most natural and simple extension of \mathcal{L}_μ . Concretely, we obtain the language of \mathcal{L}_μ^2 by adding, for each modality a , a modality \check{a} which in the semantics will be interpreted as the converse of the accessibility relation for a . This addition enables \mathcal{L}_μ^2 to reason about the past, which is attractive from the perspective of formal program verification [14], but also in the area of description logics, where converse modalities correspond to inverse roles [15].

Compared to its one-way version, surprisingly little seems to be known about this logic. While it is not hard to see that the two-way μ -calculus lacks the finite model property, a key result by Vardi [13] states that the satisfiability problem for the two-way μ -calculus can be solved in exponential time. Vardi introduces the notion of an alternating two-way tree automaton, and the key argument in his proof is based on a reduction of these two-way automata to one-way deterministic tree automata. Building on this, French [16], [17] proves various results on bisimulation quantifiers for \mathcal{L}_μ^2 via a transfer of results for \mathcal{L}_μ . Afshari, Jäger & Leigh proposed a sound, complete and cut-free derivation system, which features an

¹Niwiński & Walukiewicz actually work with *tableaux*, which are somewhat dual to sequent systems by establishing satisfiability rather than validity of finite sets of formulas. However, tableau calculi and sequent-style proof systems have so much in common, that in this paper we do not differentiate between the two approaches.

infinitely branching proof rule [18]. A finitary, cyclic proof calculus was given by Afshari et al. [19]; this calculus is not cut-free, but its restrictions on the cut rule make the system suitable for proof search procedures.

Our goal is to contribute to the knowledge on the two-way μ -calculus by showing that it has two important properties: Craig interpolation and Beth definability. Our main tool for establishing this, is a new, cyclic proof system for \mathcal{L}_μ^2 that is of independent interest.

c) *Craig interpolation and Beth definability:* A logic has the Craig Interpolation Property (CIP) if for any pair of formulas φ and ψ such that ψ is a consequence of φ (denoted as $\varphi \models \psi$), one may find an *interpolant*; that is, a formula θ in the common vocabulary of φ and ψ such that $\varphi \models \theta$ and $\theta \models \psi$. The property was named of William Craig who proved it for first-order logic [20], since then it has been studied intensively in logic (see for instance van Benthem [21]) while it also has many computer science applications in for instance knowledge representation [22] and model checking [23].

Beth Definability is a related property; informally it states that the implicit definability of a concept in a logic implies the existence of an explicit definition. This notion has its origin in the work of Beth [24] who discovered it as a property of classical first-order logic. Beth definability is studied intensively in the area of description logics, where it is used to optimize reasoning [25].

The main result in our paper is the following.

Theorem 1. *The two-way modal μ -calculus has the Craig interpolation property and, as a corollary, the Beth definability property.*

We now sketch our proof for this result, which is proof-theoretic in nature.

d) *Our proof systems:* The basis of our proof system is the annotated cyclic system of Jungteerapanitch [10] and Stirling [11] for \mathcal{L}_μ , which itself builds on the non-wellfounded tableau system of Niwiński & Walukiewicz [9]. The extension with backward modalities causes two kinds of challenges.

The first complication is that, already in the setting without fixpoint operators, cut-free derivation systems for modal logics with backward modalities have to go beyond simple sequent systems [26]. One solution to this problem is to take resort to more structured sequents, such as the nested sequents of Kashima [27]. This road, however, also taken by Afshari et al. [18], does not combine well with cyclic proofs, since there is no bound on the number of possible sequents. Alternatively, one may simply allow the cut rule: applications of cut that are *analytic* (in the wide sense that the cut formula must be taken from some bounded set of formulas) fit well in cyclic proofs. Afshari et al. [19] took this approach, and so will we.

The second and main challenge is to formulate adequate success conditions on infinite proof branches. The problem is that the combinatorics of the formula traces are more complicated than in the one-way setting, since traces may move both up and down a proof tree. In order to deal with this issue, we follow Rooduijn & Venema [28], who enrich

the syntax of their proof calculus with so-called *trace atoms*. Roughly speaking, trace atoms hardwire the ideas underlying Vardi's two-way automata explicitly into the syntax. Rooduijn & Venema restricted attention to the *alternation-free fragment* of \mathcal{L}_μ^2 , in which entanglement of least- and greatest fixpoint operators is basically avoided. Our contribution here is to extend their approach to the technically more challenging setting of the full two-way μ -calculus.

e) *Interpolation for the two-way μ -calculus:* As mentioned, our approach is *proof-theoretic*; more specifically, we employ a version of *Maehara's method* [29]. In this approach, in order to obtain an interpolant for an implication, one takes some finite proof for it and defines interpolants for each node of the derivation tree, by means of a leaf-to-root induction. It has been shown by Kowalski & Ono [30] that the presence of an analytic cut rule does not preclude the application of Maehara's methods.

In recent years, the scope of the method has been extended to include cyclic proofs. Shamkanov [31], Afshari & Leigh [32] and Marti & Venema [33] used it to prove interpolation properties for, respectively, Gödel-Löb logic, \mathcal{L}_μ and its alternation-free fragment. Roughly, the challenge here is that in a cyclic proof some proof leaves are not axiomatic and hence fail to have a trivial interpolant. However, each such leaf is discharged at a companion node, closer to the root. The idea is now to associate, as a kind of pre-interpolant, a fixpoint variable with each discharged leaf, and to bind this variable at the companion with a fixpoint operator.

The main technical novelty in our approach is to make this method work for our proof system, which is not only cyclic, but also features a cut rule, and operates a nonstandard syntax including trace atoms.

f) *Related work:* Other proof systems for \mathcal{L}_μ^2 and its alternation-free fragment were introduced in [18], [19] and [28]. There is also work by Benedikt and collaborators on *guarded fixpoint logics* [34], [35], formalisms that *extend* \mathcal{L}_μ^2 in expressive power. Their approach is model-theoretic in nature.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Two-way modal μ -calculus

a) *Syntax:* Let Prop be a set of propositions, Var a set of variables and Act a set of actions. We assume an involution operation $\check{\cdot} : \text{Act} \rightarrow \text{Act}$ such that for every $a \in \text{Act}$ it holds that $a \neq \check{a}$ and $a = \check{\check{a}}$. The set \mathcal{L}_μ^2 of *formulas* of the two-way modal μ -calculus is generated by the grammar

$$\varphi := \perp \mid \top \mid p \mid \bar{p} \mid x \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \langle a \rangle \varphi \mid [a] \varphi \mid \mu x. \varphi \mid \nu x. \varphi,$$

where $p \in \text{Prop}$, $x \in \text{Var}$ and $a \in \text{Act}$.

We define the *vocabulary* of φ , written $\text{Voc}(\varphi)$, to be the set of propositions and actions occurring in φ (with the proviso that we include both a and \check{a} in the vocabulary of any expression in which a or \check{a} occurs).

We refer to formulas of the form $\mu x. \varphi$ and $\nu x. \varphi$ as μ - and ν -*formulas*, respectively; formulas of either kind are called *fixpoint formulas*, and the symbols μ and ν themselves are *fixpoint operators*. This terminology is in line with the intended

semantics, where $\mu x.\varphi$ and $\nu x.\varphi$ describe, respectively, the least and greatest fixpoint of φ with respect to x .

Formulas that do not contain fixpoint operators are called *fixpoint-free formulas*. We use standard terminology and notation for the binding of variables by the fixpoint operators and for the substitution operation. We call a formula φ a *sentence* if all variable occurrences in φ are bound. Unless otherwise noted we will assume that every formula is a sentence. We make sure only to apply substitution in situations where no variable capture will occur. An important use of the substitution operation concerns the *unfolding* $\chi[\xi/x]$ of a fixpoint formula $\xi = \eta x.\chi$.

Given two formulas $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^2$ we write $\varphi \rightarrow_C \psi$ if either φ is boolean or modal and ψ is a direct subformula of φ , or else φ is a fixpoint formula and ψ is its unfolding. The *closure* $\text{Clos}(\Phi) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\mu^2$ of $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\mu^2$ is the least superset of Φ that is closed under this relation. It is well known that $\text{Clos}(\Phi)$ is finite iff Φ is finite. A *trace* is a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n < \kappa}$, with $\kappa \leq \omega$, such that $\varphi_n \rightarrow_C \varphi_{n+1}$, for all $n + 1 < \kappa$. It is well known that any infinite trace $\tau = (\varphi_n)_{n < \omega}$ features a unique formula φ that occurs infinitely often on τ and is a subformula of φ_n for cofinitely many n . This formula is always a fixpoint formula, and where it is of the form $\eta x.\psi$ we call τ an η -trace.

We define a *dependence order* on the fixpoint formulas in Φ , written $\text{Fix}(\Phi)$, by setting $\eta x.\varphi \geq_\Phi \lambda y.\psi$ (where bigger in \geq_Φ means being of higher priority) if $\text{Clos}(\eta x.\varphi) = \text{Clos}(\lambda y.\psi)$ and $\eta x.\varphi$ is a subformula of $\lambda y.\psi$. Let $\mathbb{N}^+ := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. One may define a *priority function* $\Omega : \text{Fix}(\Phi) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$, which respects this order (namely, $\Omega(\eta x.\varphi) \geq \Omega(\lambda y.\psi)$ if $\eta x.\varphi \geq_\Phi \lambda y.\psi$) and satisfies that $\Omega(\eta x.\varphi)$ is even iff $\eta = \mu$. We extend Ω to a function $\Omega : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ by setting $\Omega(\varphi) = 1$ if φ is not a fixpoint formula.

Given a formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^2$ we inductively extend the map $p \mapsto \bar{p}$ to a full-blown negation operation:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \overline{\top} & := & \top \\ \overline{\bot} & := & \bot \\ \overline{x} & := & x \\ \overline{p} & := & p \\ \overline{\varphi \wedge \psi} & := & \overline{\varphi} \vee \overline{\psi} \\ \overline{\varphi \vee \psi} & := & \overline{\varphi} \wedge \overline{\psi} \\ \overline{[a]\varphi} & := & \langle a \rangle \overline{\varphi} \\ \overline{\langle a \rangle \varphi} & := & [a] \overline{\varphi} \\ \overline{\mu x.\varphi} & := & \nu x.\overline{\varphi} \\ \overline{\nu x.\varphi} & := & \mu x.\overline{\varphi} \end{array}$$

Note that $\overline{\overline{\varphi}} = \varphi$ for every formula φ . For a set of formulas Φ we define $\overline{\Phi} = \{\overline{\varphi} \mid \varphi \in \Phi\}$. We define $\text{Clos}^-(\Phi) := \text{Clos}(\Phi) \cup \text{Clos}(\overline{\Phi})$.

For this work we fix a finite set of \mathcal{L}_μ^2 formulas Φ , that is closed under \rightarrow_C and negation, in other words such that $\text{Clos}^-(\Phi) = \Phi$. For a proof of a sequent Γ the set Φ can be defined as $\text{Clos}(\Gamma) \cup \text{Clos}(\overline{\Gamma})$. We also fix the priority function $\Omega : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and let n be the maximal even number in $\text{ran}(\Omega)$.

b) Semantics: We assume some basic familiarity with *parity games*. Definitions and notations that we use can be found in Appendix A.

A *Kripke model* is a tuple $\mathbb{S} = (S, R, V)$, where S is a non-empty set, $R = \{R_a \subseteq S \times S \mid a \in \text{Act}\}$ is a family of binary relation on S , such that $(s, s') \in R_a$ iff $(s', s) \in R_{\bar{a}}$,

and V is a function $\text{Prop} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$. A pair of a Kripke model \mathbb{S} and a state $s \in S$ is called a *pointed model*.

The meaning of \mathcal{L}_μ^2 -formulas on Kripke models can be given, as for the one-way μ -calculus, by algebraic semantics or game semantics. We define the latter and refer for a definition of the former and a proof of its equivalence to [36].

Let $\xi \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^2$ and let $\mathbb{S} = (S, R, V)$ be a Kripke model. The *evaluation game* $\mathcal{E}(\xi, \mathbb{S})$ is the following infinite two-player game. Its positions are pairs of the form $(\varphi, s) \in \text{Clos}(\xi) \times S$, and its ownership function and admissible moves are given in Table I. Infinite matches of the form $(\varphi_n, s_n)_{n < \omega}$ are won by \exists if the induced trace $(\varphi_n)_{n < \omega}$ is a ν -trace, and won by \forall if it is a μ -trace. It is well-known that this game can be presented as a parity game, and as such it is positionally determined.

Position	Owner	Admissible moves
(p, s) with $s \in V(p)$	\forall	\emptyset
(p, s) with $s \notin V(p)$	\exists	\emptyset
(\bar{p}, s) with $s \in V(p)$	\exists	\emptyset
(\bar{p}, s) with $s \notin V(p)$	\forall	\emptyset
$(\varphi \vee \psi, s)$	\exists	$\{(\varphi, s), (\psi, s)\}$
$(\varphi \wedge \psi, s)$	\forall	$\{(\varphi, s), (\psi, s)\}$
$(\langle a \rangle \varphi, s)$	\exists	$\{(\varphi, t) \mid (s, t) \in R_a\}$
$([a]\varphi, s)$	\forall	$\{(\varphi, t) \mid (s, t) \in R_a\}$
$(\eta x.\varphi, s)$	-	$\{(\varphi[\eta x.\varphi/x], s)\}$

TABLE I
THE EVALUATION GAME $\mathcal{E}(\xi, \mathbb{S})$

Definition 2. Let \mathbb{S}, s be a pointed model, let f be a strategy for \exists in $\mathcal{E}(\bigwedge \Phi, \mathbb{S})$ and let φ be a formula. We write $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \varphi$ if f is winning for \exists at (φ, s) .

Definition 3. For any pair of formulas φ, ψ and $k = 1, \dots, n$ we let $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ be the *trace atom of priority k* and $\varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ be the *negated trace atom of priority k*.

Definition 4. Given a strategy f for \exists in $\mathcal{E}(\bigwedge \Phi, \mathbb{S})$, we say that $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ is *satisfied* in \mathbb{S} at s with respect to f , written $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ if there is an f -guided match

$$(\varphi, s) = (\varphi_0, s_0) \cdots (\varphi_n, s_n) = (\psi, s), \quad n > 0$$

such that $k = \max\{\Omega(\varphi_i) \mid i = 0, \dots, n-1\}$.

A *pure sequent* is a finite set of formulas, a *trace sequent* is a finite set of trace atoms, and a *sequent* is a pure sequent together with a trace sequent. We will use letters A, B, \dots as variables ranging over formulas and trace atoms; $\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, \dots$ for sequents and state explicitly if a sequent is a pure or a trace sequent. We define $[a]\Gamma = \{[a]\varphi \mid \varphi \in \Gamma\}$.

Note that our perspective on sequents and derivations is partly tableau-theoretic: We read sequents *conjunctively* and aim to derive sequents that are *unsatisfiable*.

Definition 5. We say that $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \Gamma$ if $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f A$ for all $A \in \Gamma$. We define $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash \Gamma$ if $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \Gamma$ for some strategy f for \exists in $\mathcal{E}(\bigwedge \Phi, \mathbb{S})$. A sequent Γ is *satisfiable* if $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash \Gamma$ for some pointed model \mathbb{S}, s and *unsatisfiable* otherwise.

We write $\varphi \models \psi$ for the *local consequence relation* meaning that $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash \varphi$ implies $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash \psi$ for every pointed model \mathbb{S}, s .

²For any function $f : A \rightarrow B$ we define $\text{ran}(f) := \{f(x) \mid x \in A\}$.

B. Stream automata with ε -relations

We define automata operating on streams (infinite words). In addition to basic transitions we allow ε -transitions: transitions without an input letter. We call those automata ε -automata.

Let Σ be a finite set, called an *alphabet*. An ε -automaton over Σ is a quadruple $\mathbb{A} = \langle A, \Delta, a_I, \text{Acc} \rangle$, where A is a finite set; $\Delta = \Delta_b \cup \Delta_\varepsilon$ is the transition function of \mathbb{A} split up in a set of *basic transitions* $\Delta_b : A \times \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ and a set of ε -transitions $\Delta_\varepsilon : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$; $a_I \in A$ its initial state; and $\text{Acc} \subseteq A^\omega$ its acceptance condition. An ε -automaton is called *deterministic* if $|\Delta_b(a, y)| = 1$ for all pairs $(a, y) \in A \times \Sigma$ and $\Delta_\varepsilon(a)$ is empty for all $a \in A$. We assume that $\Delta_\varepsilon(a_I) = \emptyset$.

A *run* of such an ε -automaton \mathbb{A} on a stream $w = z_0 z_1 z_2 \dots \in \Sigma^\omega$ is a stream $(a_0, n_0)(a_1, n_1)(a_2, n_2) \dots \in (A \times \mathbb{N})^\omega$ such that $(a_0, n_0) = (a_I, 0)$, and for all $i \in \omega$ either (i) $a_{i+1} \in \Delta_b(a_i, z_{n_i})$ and $n_{i+1} = n_i + 1$ or (ii) $a_{i+1} \in \Delta_\varepsilon(a_i)$ and $n_{i+1} = n_i$, and $\sup\{n_i \mid i \in \omega\} = \omega$. The last condition guarantees that every run contains infinitely many basic transitions; in other words, we do not allow runs that from some point onwards only consist of ε -transitions.

The *projection* of a run $(a_0, n_0)(a_1, n_1)(a_2, n_2) \dots$ is the stream $a_0 a_1 a_2 \dots \in A^\omega$. A stream w is *accepted* by \mathbb{A} if there is a run of \mathbb{A} on w , whose projection is in Acc . We define $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A})$ to be the set of all accepting streams of \mathbb{A} .

The acceptance condition can be given in different ways: A *Büchi* condition is given as a subset $F \subseteq A$. The corresponding acceptance condition is the set of runs, which contain infinitely many states in F . A *parity* condition is given as a map $\Omega : A \rightarrow \omega$. The corresponding acceptance condition is the set of runs α such that $\max\{\Omega(a) \mid a \text{ occurs infinitely often in } \alpha\}$ is even. A *Rabin* condition is given as a set $R = ((G_i, B_i))_{i \in I}$ of pairs of subsets of A . The corresponding acceptance condition is the set of runs α for which there exists $i \in I$ such that α contains infinitely many states in G_i and finitely many in B_i . ε -Automata with these acceptance conditions are called *Büchi*, *parity* and *Rabin automata*, respectively.

III. TRAIL-BASED PROOF SYSTEM

We introduce the non-wellfounded proof system NW^2 , which generalizes tableau games for the one-way modal μ -calculus introduced by Niwiński & Walukiewicz [9]. They construct a tree-shaped tableau T for every unsatisfiable sequent Γ , where every infinite path in T carries a μ -trail: an ancestry-path of formulas, where the most important formula occurring infinitely often is a μ -formula. For the two-way case we will introduce a similar notion, but now trails may go up and down in T . As T has the shape of a tree we can split up an infinite trail into segments that return to the same node and those only going up. We will call the former *detour trails* and model them with trace atoms. Detour trails at a node v talk about possible trails further up in the tree, hence we need a cut rule in the proof system to model that behaviour. This approach stems from Vardi's two-way automata [13] and inspired Rooduijn & Venema [28] to develop a proof system for the alternation-free fragment of the modal μ -calculus.

A. NW^2 proofs

Rules have the form $R: \frac{\Gamma_1 \dots \Gamma_n}{\Gamma}$, where $\Gamma, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n$ are sequents. We call $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n$ the *premisses* of R and Γ its *conclusion*.

The rules of the NW^2 proof system are given in Figure 1. Apart from the inclusion of trace atoms these rules coincide with the tableau rules introduced in [9] for the one-way μ -calculus, except that formulas are added in the premiss of $R_{(a)}$. Trace atoms and the extra rules *cut*, *tcut* and *trans* are added to deal with converse modalities.

In the rules R_\wedge , R_\vee , R_η and $R_{(a)}$ the single explicitly written formula in the conclusion is called the *principal formula*. The other rules do not have a principal formula.

Definition 6. In order to define the modal rule $R_{(a)}$, let $\Psi = \langle a \rangle \varphi, [a] \Sigma, \Gamma$ be the conclusion of the modal rule. We demand that Σ is a pure sequent, and define $\langle \check{a} \rangle \Gamma := \{ \langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma \}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{\langle a \rangle \varphi} := & \{ \varphi \not\sim_k [\check{a}] \chi \mid \langle a \rangle \varphi \not\sim_k \chi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}] \chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi) \} \\ & \cup \{ [\check{a}] \chi \sim_k \varphi \mid \chi \sim_k \langle a \rangle \varphi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}] \chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi) \} \\ & \cup \{ \psi \not\sim_k [\check{a}] \chi \mid [a] \psi \not\sim_k \chi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}] \chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi) \} \\ & \cup \{ [\check{a}] \chi \sim_k \psi \mid \chi \sim_k [a] \psi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}] \chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi) \} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\langle \check{a} \rangle \Gamma$ and $\Gamma^{\langle a \rangle \varphi}$ also depend on Ψ , yet for simpler notation we omit the extra subscript.

Definition 7 (Derivation). An NW^2 *derivation* $\pi = (T, P, S, R, f)$ is a proof tree defined from the rules in Figure 1 such that (T, P) is a, possibly infinite, tree with nodes T and parent relation P ; S is a function that maps each node $u \in T$ to a sequent S_u ; R is a function that maps each node $u \in T$ to the name of a rule in Figure 1; and $f : T \rightarrow S_u \cup \{\text{nil}\}$ is a function that maps each node $u \in T$ to its *principal formula* or to *nil* if the rule does not have a principal formula. Finally, we require the maps S, R and f to be in accordance with the formulation of the rules.

In our notation trees grow *upwards*. We call an NW^2 derivation π *regular*, if it has finitely many distinct subderivations.

Remark 8. An occurrence of a rule is usually called *analytic*, if all formulas φ in the premiss of the rule are subformulas of the conclusion Γ . In the context of fixpoint logics, this notion has to be extended, such that we demand that all formulas φ are in the *closure* of Γ . Because the rules *cut*, *tcut* and $R_{(a)}$ are restricted, all rules in NW^2 are analytic.

Different than usual, we define the trail relation to consist of triples, where we include the weight of the trail. The weight keeps track of the priority of unfolded fixpoints along the trail.

Definition 9 (Trails). Let Γ, Γ' be sequents and $\xi \in \Gamma \cup \{\text{nil}\}$, such that Γ describes the conclusion, and Γ' a premiss of a rule R in Figure 1 and ξ is either the principal formula of R or else R does not have a principal formula and $\xi = \text{nil}$.

We define the *upward trail relation* $T_{\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma'} \subseteq \Phi \times \Phi \times \mathbb{N}$ as follows by a case distinction on the principal formula ξ :

Ax1: $\frac{}{\varphi, \bar{\varphi}, \Gamma}$	Ax2: $\frac{}{\perp, \Gamma}$	Ax3: $\frac{}{\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \Gamma}$	Ax4: $\frac{}{\varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k} \varphi, \Gamma}$
R_{\wedge} : $\frac{\varphi, \psi, \varphi \wedge \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \varphi, \varphi \wedge \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \psi, \Gamma}{\varphi \wedge \psi, \Gamma}$	R_{\vee} : $\frac{\varphi, \varphi \vee \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \varphi, \Gamma \quad \psi, \varphi \vee \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \psi, \Gamma}{\varphi \vee \psi, \Gamma}$		
R_{η} : $\frac{\varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], \eta x. \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{\Omega(\eta x. \varphi)} \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], \Gamma}{\eta x. \varphi, \Gamma}$	trans : $\frac{\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \psi \rightsquigarrow_l \chi, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{\max\{k, l\}} \chi, \Gamma}{\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \psi \rightsquigarrow_l \chi, \Gamma}$		
weak : $\frac{\Gamma}{A, \Gamma}$			
$R_{(a)}$: $\frac{\varphi, \Sigma, \langle \bar{a} \rangle \Gamma, \Gamma^{(a)} \varphi}{\langle a \rangle \varphi, [a] \Sigma, \Gamma}$	cut : $\frac{\varphi, \Gamma \quad \bar{\varphi}, \Gamma}{\Gamma}$	$\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$	tcut : $\frac{\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \Gamma \quad \varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \Gamma}{\Gamma}$
		$\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$	

Fig. 1. Proof rules of the tableau system NW²

- if $\xi = \langle a \rangle \varphi$, then $T_{\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma'} := \{(\langle a \rangle \varphi, \varphi, 1)\} \cup \{([a]\psi, \psi, 1) \mid [a]\psi \in \Gamma'\}$,
- if $\xi = \eta x. \varphi$, then $T_{\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma'} := \{(\eta x. \varphi, \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], \Omega(\eta x. \varphi))\} \cup \{(\psi, \psi, 1) \mid \psi \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma'\}$,
- if $\xi = \text{nil}$, then $T_{\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma'} := \{(\psi, \psi, 1) \mid \psi \in \Gamma \cap \Gamma'\}$,
- Similarly for the other cases.

In all of these cases we call (φ, ψ, k) an *upward trail*.

Let u, v be nodes in an NW² derivation, such that v is a child of u or $u = v$. We define the *trail relation* $T_{u, v} \subseteq S_u \times S_v \times \mathbb{N}$ as follows. If $u = v$ we define $T_{u, u} := \{(\varphi, \psi, k) \mid \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi \in S(u)\}$ and call (φ, ψ, k) a *detour trail*. Otherwise v is the child of u and we define $T_{u, v} := T_{S(u), f(u), S(v)}$.

Let α be a branch in an NW² proof π . A *trail* on α is a sequence of upward trails with inserted detour trails. Due to the presence of cuts, trails do not necessarily start at the root, but could also start from a cut formula. Formally a *trail* τ on α is a word in

$$T_{v_N, v_{N+1}}(T_{v_{N+1}, v_{N+2}})^* T_{v_{N+2}, v_{N+3}}(T_{v_{N+3}, v_{N+4}})^* \dots$$

for some $N \geq 0$ and such that for any subword $(\varphi, \psi, k)(\chi, \zeta, l)$ of τ it holds $\psi = \chi$. An infinite trail τ is called a μ -trail, if $\max\{k \mid k \text{ appears infinitely often on } \tau\}$ is even and a ν -trail otherwise.

Definition 10 (Proof). An NW² proof π is an NW² derivation such that on every infinite branch of π there is a μ -trail.

We say that NW² proves a sequent Γ , written $\text{NW}^2 \vdash \Gamma$ if there is an NW² proof π , where the root is labelled by Γ .

B. Proof search game

A *rule instance* is a triple $(\Delta, R, \langle \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n \rangle)$ such that $R \frac{\Delta_1 \quad \dots \quad \Delta_m}{\Delta}$ is a valid rule application in NW². We let conc be the function mapping rule instances to their conclusions. A rule instance is *cumulative* if all premisses are supersets of the conclusion and *productive* if all the premisses are distinct from its conclusion.

We define the proof search game $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)$, here we call the two players Prover and Builder. Its positions are given by $\text{Seq}_{\Phi} \cup \text{Inst}_{\Phi}$, where Seq_{Φ} is the set of sequences and Inst_{Φ} the set of

rule instances containing only formulas in Φ . The ownership function and admissible moves are given in Table II.

Position	Owner	Admissible moves
Γ	Prover	$\{i \in \text{Inst}_{\Phi} \mid \text{conc}(i) = \Gamma\}$
$(\Gamma, R, \langle \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m \rangle)$	Builder	$\{\Delta_i \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}$

TABLE II
THE PROOF SEARCH GAME $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)$

An infinite match is won by Prover iff on the resulting branch there is a μ -trail.

An NW² proof of Γ can be seen as a winning strategy of Prover in $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)@ \Gamma$. Note that $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)$ is an ω -regular game and that ω -regular games have finite-memory strategies. Therefore we may assume that winning strategies for Prover are regular and consequently that NW² proofs are regular.

C. Soundness and Completeness

For proving soundness we need to show that, if NW² proves Γ , then Γ is unsatisfiable. By contradiction we assume that Γ is satisfiable and show that NW² does not prove Γ . To do so, we assume a pointed model \mathbb{S}, s and a strategy f for \exists in $\mathcal{E}(\wedge \Phi, \mathbb{S})$ such that $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \Gamma$. Using f we can construct a winning strategy \bar{f} for Builder in $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)@ \Gamma$. The proof is rather straight-forward and can be found in Appendix B.

Theorem 11 (Soundness). *If $\text{NW}^2 \vdash \Gamma$, then Γ is unsatisfiable.*

To prove completeness for pure sequents Γ , we follow the same proof strategy as in [28]. We only state the definitions and main ideas and refer to Appendix C for full proofs.

We show that every unsatisfiable pure sequent is provable in NW². By contraposition, given a winning strategy f for Builder in $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)@ \Gamma$, we construct a model \mathbb{S}^f and a positional strategy \bar{f} for \exists in $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}(\wedge \Phi, \mathbb{S}^f)$ such that $\mathbb{S}^f \Vdash_{\bar{f}} \Gamma$.

Let \mathcal{T} be the subtree of the game-tree of $\mathcal{G}(\Phi)@ \Gamma$, where Builder plays the strategy f and Prover picks rule instances according to the following priorities: 1) axioms Ax1, Ax2, Ax3 and Ax4; 2) cumulative and productive instances of R_{\vee} , R_{\wedge} , R_{μ} , R_{ν} and trans ; 3) cumulative and productive instances of cut and tcut ; 4) modal rules $R_{(a)}$.

We say that a trace atom $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ is *relevant* if (i) $\psi \in \text{Clos}(\varphi)$ and (ii) φ, ψ contain fixpoints. We restrict instances

of tcut and $R_{(a)}$ to only introduce relevant trace atoms. For the rule $R_{(a)}$ this amounts to changing the rule to a variant, where only relevant trace atoms occur in the premiss. This rule can easily be shown to be admissible using weak. Because of these assumptions we may assume that all trace atoms in a constructed proof are relevant.

The model $\mathbb{S}^f = (S_f, \{R_a^f\}_{a \in \text{Act}}, V^f)$ is defined as follows: The set S^f of states consists of maximal upward paths ρ in \mathcal{T} not containing a modal rule. We write $\Gamma(\rho) = \bigcup \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \text{ occurs in } \rho\}$. We write $\rho_1 \xrightarrow{a} \rho_2$ if ρ_2 is directly above ρ_1 only separated by an application of $R_{(a)}$. The relations R_a^f are defined as follows:

$$\rho_1 R_a^f \rho_2 \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \rho_1 \xrightarrow{a} \rho_2 \text{ or } \rho_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{a}} \rho_1.$$

The valuation $V^f(\rho)$ is defined as $V^f(\rho) := \{p \mid p \in \Gamma(\rho)\}$.

The strategy \underline{f} for \exists in \mathcal{E} is defined as follows:

- At $(\varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1, \rho)$ pick a disjunct φ_i such that $\varphi_i \in \Gamma(\rho)$.
- At $(\langle a \rangle \varphi, \rho)$ choose (φ, τ) for some τ such that $\rho \xrightarrow{a} \tau$, where the principal formula in the rule instance $R_{(a)}$ between ρ and τ is $\langle a \rangle \varphi$.

Let ρ_0 be a state of \mathbb{S}^f containing the root Γ of \mathcal{T} and let $\varphi_0 \in \Gamma$. We can show that the strategy \underline{f} is well-defined and winning for \exists in $\mathcal{E} @ (\varphi_0, \rho_0)$. From this completeness follows.

Theorem 12 (Completeness). *If a pure sequent Γ is unsatisfiable, then Γ is provable in NW^2 .*

D. Tracking automaton for NW^2

The main difficulty of working with NW^2 is the handling of infinite trails, as they behave non-deterministically: trails split and merge. We define a non-deterministic ε -parity automaton \mathbb{A}_Φ , that checks the success condition on infinite paths and will be used later to show completeness of the JS^2 proof system. First we have to bring NW^2 proofs in a certain normal form.

We call an NW^2 proof π *saturated*, if (i) the rule trans is always applied when applicable and (ii) all applications of R_η rules are cumulative. Note that every NW^2 proof π can easily be transformed into a saturated proof π' of the same sequent.

We call an infinite trail τ *slim*, if (i) there are no two consecutive detour trails on τ and (ii) there is no upward trail of the form $(\eta x.\varphi, \varphi[\eta x.\varphi/x], k)$ on τ .

Lemma 13. *Let π be a saturated NW^2 proof of Γ . On every infinite branch of π there is a slim μ -trail.*

We will define a nondeterministic parity automaton \mathbb{A}_Φ , called *tracking automaton*, that checks if an infinite branch α of a saturated NW^2 proof π is successful. Conceptually the automaton \mathbb{A}_Φ non-deterministically follows the trail relation on α . The states of the automaton will be formulas and trace atoms, where we add extra states for every fixpoint formula, in order to track the unfolding of fixpoints. Additionally we have an extra initial state, which is always reachable, as trails may start at any node.

Upward trails on α correspond to basic transitions in \mathbb{A}_Φ and detour trails are modelled by ε -transitions going through a trace atom. In order to simplify the automaton we do not

allow consecutive ε -transitions and ε -transitions starting from the auxiliary formula $\varphi[\eta x.\varphi/x]$ of the rule R_η . Hence \mathbb{A}_Φ will not follow all infinite trails, but only those of a simple form, in particular all slim trails.

The alphabet Σ consists of all triples (Γ, ξ, Γ') , where $\Gamma \subseteq \Phi$ describes the conclusion, and $\Gamma' \subseteq \Phi$ a premiss of a rule R in Figure 1 and ξ is either the principal formula of R or else R does not have a principal formula and $\xi = \text{nil}$.

We define the following nondeterministic ε -parity automaton $\mathbb{A}_\Phi = (A, \Delta, a_I, \Omega_A)$:

$$A := \{a_I\} \cup \Phi \cup \{\eta x.\psi^* \mid \eta x.\psi \in \Phi\} \\ \cup \{\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi \mid \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi \text{ a trace atom}\}.$$

For each $\gamma \in A$ and $(\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma') \in \Sigma$ we define Δ_b as follows.

- 1) if $\gamma = a_I$, then $\Delta_b(\gamma, (\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma')) := \Gamma' \cup \{a_I\}$,
- 2) if $\gamma = \xi = \eta x.\psi$ then $\Delta_b(\gamma, (\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma')) := \{\eta x.\psi^*\}$,
- 3) else if $\gamma = \varphi \in \Phi$ then
$$\Delta_b(\varphi, (\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma')) := \{\varphi' \mid (\varphi, \varphi', 1) \in \mathsf{T}_{\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma'}\} \cup \\ \{\varphi' \rightsquigarrow_k \psi' \mid (\varphi, \varphi', 1) \in \mathsf{T}_{\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma'} \text{ \& } \psi', \varphi' \rightsquigarrow_k \psi' \in \Gamma'\}.$$
- 4) else $\Delta_b(\gamma, (\Gamma, \xi, \Gamma')) := \emptyset$.

For each $\gamma \in A$ we define Δ_ε as follows.

- 1) if $\gamma = \eta x.\psi^*$, then $\Delta_\varepsilon(\eta x.\psi^*) := \{\eta x.\psi\}$,
- 2) if $\gamma = \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ then $\Delta_\varepsilon(\gamma) := \{\psi\}$ and
- 3) else $\Delta_\varepsilon(\gamma) := \emptyset$.

For states of the form $\eta x.\psi^*$ let $\Omega_A(\eta x.\psi^*) := \Omega(\eta x.\psi)$. For states of the form $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ let $\Omega_A(\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi) := k$. For all other states γ let $\Omega_A(\gamma) := 1$.

Let $\alpha = (v_i)_{i \in \omega}$ be an infinite branch in an NW^2 proof π . We define the stream $w(\alpha) \in \Sigma^\omega$ induced by α to be the infinite word $(\mathsf{S}(v_0), \mathsf{f}(v_0), \mathsf{S}(v_1), \mathsf{f}(v_1), \mathsf{S}(v_2), \mathsf{f}(v_2)) \dots$.

The following proposition states the adequacy of the tracking automaton.

Proposition 14. *Let α be an infinite branch in a saturated NW^2 proof. Then α is successful iff $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A}_\Phi)$.*

Proof. If α is successful, then α carries a slim μ -trail due to Lemma 13 and therefore $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A}_\Phi)$. Conversely, $w(\alpha) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A}_\Phi)$ implies that there is a μ -trail on α . \square

IV. DETERMINIZATION OF ε -PARITY AUTOMATA

In the last section the tracking automaton \mathbb{A}_Φ was defined, which checks if an infinite branch in an NW^2 proof is successful. We want to find an equivalent deterministic automaton \mathbb{B} and use it to obtain a simpler proof system. For this to work we have to define the determinization method in a simple way, in particular it has to rely on a “powerset-construction”, meaning that states of \mathbb{B} consist of subset of states in \mathbb{A}_Φ plus some extra information. Our method is a generalization of the Safra construction for Büchi automata [37].

Let Σ be an alphabet and fix an ε -parity automaton $\mathbb{A} = \langle A, \Delta, a_I, \Omega \rangle$. Let n be the maximal even priority of \mathbb{A} and $m = |A|$ be the size of \mathbb{A} .

Definition 15. Let $a \in A$. The k -parity ε -Closure of a , written $\varepsilon\text{Clos}_k(a)$, consists of all states $b \in A$ for which there is a

Δ_ε -path $a = a_0 a_1 \cdots a_n = b$ in \mathbb{A} with $\max\{\Omega(a_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\} = k$.

For each even number $k = 0, 2, \dots, n$ we fix a set of k -names X_k , such that $|X_k| = 4m$ and $X_k \cap X_l = \emptyset$ if $k \neq l$. We define the set of names $X = X_0 \uplus X_2 \uplus \cdots \uplus X_n$ and use the symbols x, y, z, \dots for names. We call a non-repeating sequence of k -names τ_k a k -stack and let T_k be the set of all k -stacks. The empty sequence will be denoted by ε . We define the set of all stacks T to be $T_n \cdots T_2 \cdot T_0$, for clarity $T := \{\tau_n \cdots \tau_2 \cdot \tau_0 \mid \tau_n \in T_n, \dots, \tau_0 \in T_0\}$. In case $\tau_i = \varepsilon$ for all $i < k$ we may write $\tau_n \cdots \tau_k$ rather than $\tau_n \cdots \tau_2 \cdot \tau_0$. For a stack τ we define $\tau \upharpoonright l$ to be the stack obtained from τ by removing all k -names, where $k < l$.

Each non-repeating sequence of names θ defines a *linear order* $<_\theta$ on names by setting $x <_\theta y$ if x occurs before y in θ . This order extends to an order on stacks as follows: $\sigma <_\theta \tau$ if either

- $\sigma \upharpoonright k$ is a proper extension of $\tau \upharpoonright k$ for some $k \leq n$, or
- σ is lexicographically $<_\theta$ -smaller than τ , meaning that σ and τ can be written as $\sigma = \rho \cdot x \cdot \sigma'$ and $\tau = \rho \cdot y \cdot \tau'$ with $x <_\theta y$.

It can be proven that $<_\theta$ is a linear order on any set $T_0 \subseteq T$ such that θ contains all names in T_0 .

Let θ, τ be non-repeating sequences of names. We say that θ is an *initial segment* of τ if $\tau = \theta \cdot \sigma$ for some sequence of names σ . We say that θ is a *subword* of τ , notation: $\theta \sqsubseteq \tau$ if every name that occurs in θ also occurs in τ and if for all names x, y in θ the relation $x <_\theta y$ implies $x <_\tau y$.

We now define the deterministic Rabin automaton $\mathbb{A}^S := \langle A^S, \delta_A, a_I^S, R_A \rangle$. Its carrier set A^S consists of tuples (A_0, f, θ, c) , where

- A_0 is a subset of A ,
- $f : A_0 \rightarrow T$ maps each state a of A_0 to a stack $\tau \in T$, such that $\tau = \tau \upharpoonright k$, where $k = \Omega(a)$,
- θ is a non-repeating sequence of all names occurring in $\text{ran}(f)$.
- c is a map $c : \text{ran}(f) \rightarrow \{\text{green}, \text{white}\}$.

A subset $A_0 \subseteq A$ will be called a *macrostate* and we call $S_0 \in A^S$ a *Safra-state*, in other words a Safra-state is a macrostate with additional information. We will present a Safra-state $S_0 \in A^S$ as a set of elements a^τ , where $a \in A, \tau \in T$ and $f(a) = \tau$, and deal with θ and c implicitly. The sequence θ will be called the *control*. We say a name is *active* if it appears in θ . An active k -name is *visible* if it is the last k -name in some stack and *invisible* otherwise. The function c is called the *colouring map* and we say that a name x is coloured green/white, if $c(x) = \text{green}/c(x) = \text{white}$.

The initial Safra-state is $a_I^S := \{a_I^\varepsilon\}$. To define the transition function δ_A let S be in A^S and $z \in \Sigma$. We define $\delta_A(S, z) := S'$, where S' is constructed in the following steps. Note that intermediate positions in this construction are not necessarily Safra-states; in particular there may be multiple stacks associated with some states.

- 1) **Basic move:** For every $a^\tau \in S$ and $(a, z, b) \in \Delta_b$, add $b^\tau \upharpoonright k$ to S' , where $\Omega(b) = k$.

- 2) **Cover:** For every $a^\tau \in S'$, where $\Omega(a) = k$ is even, change a^τ to $a^{\tau \cdot x}$, where x is a fresh k -name that is not active in $S \cup S'$. If two different states are labelled by the same stack, we add the same name x . Add x as the last element in θ .
- 3) **ε -Move:** For every $a^\tau \in S'$, odd k and $b \in \varepsilon \text{Clos}_k(a)$ add $b^\tau \upharpoonright k$ to S' . For every $a^\tau \in S'$, even k and $b \in \varepsilon \text{Clos}_k(a)$ add $b^\tau \upharpoonright k \cdot x$ to S' , where x is a fresh k -name that is not active in $S \cup S'$. Add x as the last element in θ .
- 4) **Thin:** If a^σ and a^τ are in S' and $\sigma <_\theta \tau$, remove a^τ .
- 5) **Reset:** Colour any invisible name x green and change $a^{\sigma \cdot x \cdot \tau}$ to $a^{\sigma \cdot x}$ for every $a^{\sigma \cdot x \cdot \tau} \in S'$.

Any name removed in this process is also removed from θ .

The automaton \mathbb{A}^S accepts a stream if in its run some name x is active cofinitely often and coloured green infinitely often.

Remark 16. In any Safra-state occurring in a run of \mathbb{A}^S there are at most m active k -names for every $k = 0, 2, \dots, n$, otherwise there is an invisible k -name and the Safra-state changes in step 5 of δ_A . In step 2 of δ_A at most m fresh k -names are introduced, resulting in at most $2m$ distinct elements a^τ in S' after step 2. In step 3 up to $2m$ names are added. Thus in total at most $4m$ k -names are needed for each $k = 0, 2, \dots, n$.

Remark 17. It may seem that the transition map δ_A is formulated in a non-deterministic way, but this is only superficially so: all choices can be made *canonical*, based on an arbitrary but fixed order on names and states.

Theorem 18. *The automaton \mathbb{A}^S is equivalent to \mathbb{A} .*

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as the determinization for Büchi automata [37] and can be found in Appendix E. \square

V. ANNOTATED PROOF SYSTEM

Following Jungteerapanich [10] and Stirling [11], our approach is to use the determinization method of Section IV and build the automaton \mathbb{A}_Φ^S into the proof system. Hence, sequents of JS^2 correspond to Safra-states in \mathbb{A}_Φ^S and the rules of JS^2 correspond to the transition function in \mathbb{A}_Φ^S . This substantially simplifies the success condition on infinite paths and allows us to formulate the cyclic proof system JS^2 .

A. Cyclic JS^2 proofs

Recall that we fixed a finite set of formulas Φ with associated priority function $\Omega : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ and let n be the maximal even number in $\text{ran}(\Omega)$. As in Section IV let N_k be the set of k -names for even $k = 0, 2, \dots, n$ and let $N := \bigcup N_k$ be the set of names. Stacks are defined as in Section IV.

An *annotated formula* is a pair (φ, σ) , written as φ^σ , where φ is a formula and σ is a stack such that $\sigma = \sigma \upharpoonright \Omega(\varphi)$. We will call σ the *annotation* of φ . An *annotated sequent* consists of a finite set of annotated formulas $\{\varphi_1^{\sigma_1}, \dots, \varphi_n^{\sigma_n}\}$, a set of trace atoms T and a finite, non-repeating sequence of names θ , called the *control*, such that θ contains all names that occur in $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$. The control can be seen as a linear order on the names occurring in a sequent; it keeps track of when a name is added to a sequent. If it is clear from the context

we call annotated sequents just sequents and denote them as $\theta \vdash \varphi_1^{\sigma_1}, \dots, \varphi_n^{\sigma_n}, T$. We use A, B, \dots as variables ranging over annotated formulas and trace atoms and use $\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, \dots$ for sets of annotated formulas and trace atoms. For a set of formulas Γ we define $\Gamma^\varepsilon = \{\varphi^\varepsilon \mid \varphi \in \Gamma\}$ and for an annotated sequent Γ we define $\Gamma^\varepsilon = \{\varphi^\varepsilon \mid \varphi^\sigma \in \Gamma \text{ for some } \sigma\}$.

In Figure 2 the rules of the JS^2 proof system are given. If we ignore the control and the annotations, the axioms and the rules $R_\wedge, R_\vee, R_\eta, R_{(a)}$, trans, weak, cut and tcut coincide with the rules of NW^2 . Annotated sequents correspond to Safra-states of \mathbb{A}_Φ^S , where \mathbb{A}_Φ is the tracking automaton checking the success condition on infinite NW^2 paths. The transition function δ_A is split up between multiple rules: Step 1 is carried out in every rule; Step 2 adds a fresh name in R_μ ; Step 3 corresponds to the jump rules; Step 4 is a special instance of weak and Step 5 corresponds to Reset_x . We also add a weakening rule for names, called exp. In order to obtain a cyclic system we add the discharge rule D that tracks repeats. Every D rule is labelled by a unique *discharge token* taken from a fixed infinite set $\mathcal{D} = \{d, e, \dots\}$.

Definition 19 (Derivation). A JS^2 derivation $\pi = (T, P, S, R, f)$ is a proof tree defined from the rules in Figure 2 such that T, P and f are defined as for NW^2 derivations; S maps each node $u \in T$ to an annotated sequent S_u ; and R is a function that maps every node $u \in T$ to either (i) the name of a rule in Figure 2, (ii) a discharge token or (iii) an extra value o , such that every node labelled with a discharge token or o is a leaf.

For every leaf l that is labelled with a discharge token $d \in \mathcal{D}$ there is a proper ancestor $c(l)$ of l that is labeled with D_d and such that l and $c(l)$ are labelled by the same sequent. In this situation we call l a *repeat leaf* and $c(l)$ its *companion*. Leaves labelled by o are called *open assumptions*.

Given π we define the usual *proof tree* $\mathcal{T}_\pi = (T, P)$ and the *proof tree with back edges* $\mathcal{T}_\pi^C = (T, P^C)$ where $P^C = P \cup \{(l, c(l)) \mid l \text{ is a repeat leaf}\}$.

Definition 20 (Successful path). A finite path α in a JS^2 derivation is called *successful* if there is a name x such that

- 1) x occurs in the control of every sequent on α and
- 2) there is an application of Reset_x on α .

Let v be a repeat leaf in a JS^2 derivation $\pi = (T, P, S, R, f)$ with companion $c(v)$, and let α_v denote the *repeat path* of v in \mathcal{T}_π from $c(v)$ to v . We say that v is *discharged* if the path α_v is successful. A leaf is called *closed* if it is either discharged or labelled by an axiom, and is called *open* otherwise.

Definition 21 (Cyclic proof). A JS^2 proof is a finite JS^2 derivation, where every leaf is closed.

We say that JS^2 proves a set of formulas Γ , written $\text{JS}^2 \vdash \Gamma$, if there is a JS^2 proof π , where the root is labelled by $\varepsilon \vdash \Gamma^\varepsilon$.

B. Infinite JS^2 proofs

Definition 22. Let π be a JS^2 derivation and α an infinite path in π . We call α *successful*, if there is a name x such that

- 1) x occurs in the control of cofinitely many sequents on α and
- 2) there are infinitely many applications of Reset_x on α .

Definition 23 (Infinitary proofs). A JS_∞^2 proof is a JS^2 derivation, where every leaf is labelled by an axiom and every infinite path is successful.

Lemma 24. $\text{JS}^2 \vdash \Gamma$ iff there is a regular JS_∞^2 proof of Γ .

Proof. First let π be a JS^2 proof of Γ . The infinite unfolding π^* of π is the JS^2 derivation obtained from π by recursively replacing every discharged leaf l with the subtree of π rooted at the child node of $c(l)$. It easy to see that π^* is a regular JS_∞^2 proof of Γ .

Conversely, let ρ be a regular JS_∞^2 proof. For a node $v \in \rho$ let ρ_v be the subtree of ρ rooted at v . For every infinite path $\alpha = (\alpha(i))_{i \in \omega}$ define minimal indices $j < k$ such that

- 1) $\rho_{\alpha(j)} = \rho_{\alpha(k)}$ and
- 2) the path $\alpha(j) \cdots \alpha(k)$ is successful.

Because ρ is regular and every infinite path is successful, such indices always exist. For each such infinite path we introduce a D_d node at $\alpha(j)$ and let $\alpha(k)$ be a leaf discharged by d . Using König's Lemma we can show that this procedure results in a finite JS^2 proof π of Γ . \square

C. Soundness and Completeness

The proof system JS_∞^2 was constructed as follows: Take an NW^2 proof and define the tracking automaton \mathbb{A}_Φ that checks whether an infinite branch carries a μ -trail. Using the determinization method from Section IV we simulate Safra-states of \mathbb{A}_Φ^S by annotated sequents in the JS_∞^2 system. Thus Safra-states in \mathbb{A}_Φ^S correspond to annotated sequents and the transition function of \mathbb{A}_Φ^S corresponds to various rules of JS^2 . In particular, step 4 corresponds to a specific shape of weak, which we call thin. We also need a particular instance of exp, that only removes names from θ which do not occur in Γ :

$$\text{thin: } \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \varphi^\tau, \Gamma} \quad \sigma <_\theta \tau \quad \text{exp': } \frac{\theta' \vdash \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \Gamma} \quad \theta' \sqsubseteq \theta$$

Infinite runs of \mathbb{A}_Φ^S correspond to infinite branches in JS_∞^2 . This will be formalized in the proof of Lemma 25.

Lemma 25. There is a JS_∞^2 proof ρ of Γ iff there is an NW^2 proof π of Γ . The proof ρ is regular iff π is so.

Proof. First let π be an NW^2 proof of a sequent Γ . We may assume that π is saturated, otherwise add trans rules whenever applicable and make R_η rules cumulative. Inductively we translate every node v in π to a node v' (potentially with additional nodes), such that v' is labelled by the same sequent as v plus annotations, where v' corresponds to a macrostate in \mathbb{A}_Φ^S . This can be achieved by replacing every rule in NW^2 by its corresponding rule in JS^2 and adding productive instances of the rules jump, thin, Reset and exp' whenever applicable (in that order bottom-up). This yields a JS_∞^2 derivation ρ that is regular if π is regular. It remains to show that every infinite branch $\alpha = (v_i)_{i \in \omega}$ in ρ is successful. Let $\hat{\alpha}$ be

$\text{Ax1: } \frac{}{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \overline{\varphi}^\tau, \Gamma}$	$\text{Ax2: } \frac{}{\theta \vdash \perp^\sigma, \Gamma}$	$\text{Ax3: } \frac{}{\theta \vdash \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \Gamma}$	$\text{Ax4: } \frac{}{\theta \vdash \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k} \varphi, \Gamma}$
$\text{R}_\wedge: \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \psi^\sigma, \varphi \wedge \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \varphi, \varphi \wedge \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \psi, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash (\varphi \wedge \psi)^\sigma, \Gamma}$	$\text{R}_\vee: \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \varphi \vee \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \varphi, \Gamma \quad \theta \vdash \psi^\sigma, \varphi \vee \psi \rightsquigarrow_1 \psi, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash (\varphi \vee \psi)^\sigma, \Gamma}$		
$\text{R}_\mu: \frac{\theta \cdot x \vdash \varphi[\mu x.\varphi/x]^\sigma, \mu x.\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \varphi[\mu x.\varphi/x], \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \mu x.\varphi^\sigma, \Gamma} \quad k = \Omega(\mu x.\varphi) \text{ and } x \text{ is a fresh } k\text{-name}$			
$\text{R}_\nu: \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi[\nu x.\varphi/x]^\sigma, \nu x.\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \varphi[\nu x.\varphi/x], \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \nu x.\varphi^\sigma, \Gamma} \quad k = \Omega(\nu x.\varphi)$		$\text{R}_{(a)}: \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \Sigma, \langle \check{a} \rangle \Gamma^\varepsilon, \Gamma^{\langle a \rangle \varphi}}{\theta \vdash \langle a \rangle \varphi^\sigma, [a] \Sigma, \Gamma}$	
$\text{trans: } \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \psi \rightsquigarrow_l \chi, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{\max\{k,l\}} \chi, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \psi \rightsquigarrow_l \chi, \Gamma}$	$\text{weak: } \frac{\theta \vdash \Gamma}{\theta \vdash A, \Gamma}$	$\text{exp: } \frac{\theta' \vdash \varphi^\tau, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \Gamma} \quad \theta' \sqsubseteq \theta \text{ and } \tau \sqsubseteq \sigma$	
$\text{jump}_o: \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \psi^{\sigma ^{2k+1}}, \psi^\tau, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k+1} \psi, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \psi^\tau, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k+1} \psi, \Gamma}$	$\text{jump}_e: \frac{\theta \cdot x \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \psi^{\sigma ^{2k \cdot x}}, \psi^\tau, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k} \psi, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \psi^\tau, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k} \psi, \Gamma} \quad x \text{ is a fresh } 2k\text{-name}$		
$\text{cut: } \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\varepsilon, \Gamma \quad \theta \vdash \overline{\varphi}^\varepsilon, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \Gamma} \quad \varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$	$\text{tcut: } \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \Gamma \quad \theta \vdash \varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \Gamma} \quad \varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$		
$[\theta \vdash \Gamma]^d$			
$\text{Reset}_x: \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi_1^{\sigma x}, \dots, \varphi_n^{\sigma x}, \Gamma}{\theta \vdash \varphi_1^{\sigma x \tau_1}, \dots, \varphi_n^{\sigma x \tau_n}, \Gamma} \quad x, x_1, \dots, x_n \text{ are } k\text{-names, } x \text{ not in } \Gamma$			
$\text{D}_d: \frac{\vdots}{\theta \vdash \Gamma}$			

Fig. 2. Proof rules of the proof system JS²

the corresponding infinite branch in π . Due to Proposition 14 it holds that $w(\hat{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A}_\Phi)$ and Theorem 18 yields $w(\hat{\alpha}) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A}_\Phi^S)$. As the branch α closely resembles the run of \mathbb{A}_Φ^S on $w(\hat{\alpha})$ it follows that α is successful.

Conversely let ρ be a JS_∞² proof of Γ . We let π be the NW² derivation defined from ρ by omitting the rules exp, jump and Reset and reducing all other rules to their corresponding NW² rules by removing annotations. If ρ is regular, so is π . To show that π is actually a proof, take an arbitrary branch $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i \in \omega}$; we have to prove that α is successful.

Let $\beta = (\beta_j)_{j \in \omega}$ be the corresponding infinite branch in ρ . In this direction we can not apply the determinization of the tracking automaton directly, as in ρ the rules do not have to be applied in a specific order, meaning that branches in ρ do not necessarily correspond to runs in \mathbb{A}_Φ^S . Yet we show how one can reuse the proof of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A}_\Phi^S) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{A}_\Phi)$ (Converse direction of Theorem 18) with only minor adaptations, here is the resulting proof sketch. As β is successful, there is a k -name x that occurs in the control of cofinitely many sequents on β and such that there are infinitely many applications of Reset_x on β . We can define minimal indices $t(0) < t(1) < \dots$ such that x occurs in the control of β_j for $j \geq t(0)$ and such that in $\beta_{t(i)}$ the rule Reset_x is applied for $i \in \omega$. The nodes $\beta_{t(i)}$ correspond to nodes $\alpha_{s(i)}$ on α for $i \in \omega$. As in the proof of Theorem 18 we can find trails τ_i from $\alpha_{s(i)}$ to $\alpha_{s(i+1)}$ with

maximal weight k . Using König's Lemma we can again glue together such trails and obtain an infinite μ -trail on α , which means that α is successful indeed. \square

Theorem 26 (Soundness and Completeness). *A pure sequent Γ is unsatisfiable iff JS² $\vdash \Gamma$.*

Proof. From Theorem 11 and Theorem 12 it follows that Γ is unsatisfiable iff there is a regular NW² proof of Γ . This is equivalent to the existence of a regular JS_∞² proof due to Lemma 25. Hence Lemma 24 concludes the proof. \square

D. Invariant proofs

In the interpolation proof we need our proofs to satisfy a certain monotonicity condition: Names witnessing the success of repeats also should occur in repeats further up in the proof tree, as formally expressed in Lemma 29. One way to provide such a “monotone” proof is to unfold a cyclic proof, see [38]. Our approach is different; we obtain a cyclic JS² proof by folding an infinite JS_∞² proof as before – but now we only allow repeats that adhere to a certain invariant condition.

Let π be a proof. A *repeat* R of π is a pair (l, c) , such that $c(l) = l$. We say that R is *labelled by a sequent* S , if l is labelled by S . We say a sequent S *occurs on* R if a node on the repeat path α_l is labelled by S .

Definition 27. Let R be a repeat in a JS^2 proof π . We define the *invariant* $\iota(R)$ of R to be the longest word which occurs as an initial segment of the control of each sequent on R .

We call a JS^2 proof π *invariant*, if for all repeats R labelled by $\theta \vdash \Gamma$ it holds $\iota(R) = \theta$.

Lemma 28. *There is a JS^2 proof of a sequent Γ iff there is an invariant JS^2 proof of Γ .*

Proof. Let π be a regular JS^2_{∞} proof of Γ . We can follow the same lines as in the converse direction of the proof of Lemma 24. Let $(\alpha(i))_{i \in \omega}$ be an infinite path and let the node $\alpha(i)$ be labelled by $\theta_i \vdash \Gamma_i$. As in the proof of Lemma 24 we can define indices $j < k$, where we add the extra condition

- 3) θ_j is an initial segment of θ_i for all $i = j, \dots, k$.

Following the rest of the proof of Lemma 24 yields an invariant JS^2 proof π' of Γ . \square

Let π be a proof and u a companion node in π . A *strongly connected subgraph* S of π is a strongly connected subgraph of \mathcal{T}_{π}^C . The *strongly connected subtree* $\text{scs}(u)$ of u is the maximal strongly connected subgraph S of \mathcal{T}_{π}^C , such that $u \in S$ and all nodes $v \in S$ are descendants of u in \mathcal{T}_{π} .

Lemma 29. *Let π be an invariant proof. Let u be a companion node and $v \in \text{scs}(u)$. If u is labelled by $\theta_u \vdash \Gamma_u$ and v is labelled by $\theta_v \vdash \Gamma_v$, then θ_u is an initial segment of θ_v .*

Proof. By induction on the length of the path from u to v . \square

VI. SPLIT JS^2 SYSTEM

Our overall strategy to prove interpolation is as follows: Given a JS^2 proof π of φ, ψ we define a formula I in the common vocabulary of φ and ψ and construct proofs π^l of φ, I and π^r of \bar{I}, ψ . This is done by structural induction on π , where roughly π^l contains those rules of π concerning descendants of φ and π^r contains those rules of π concerning descendants ψ . In order to make that formal, we have to separate, in every sequent, those parts originating from φ and those originating from ψ . Sequents of this kind will be called split sequents.

A. Split JS^2 proofs

A *split sequent* is a triple (θ, Γ, Δ) , usually written as $\theta \vdash \Gamma \mid \Delta$, such that $\theta \vdash \Gamma, \Delta$ is an annotated sequent. Note that we do not require that Γ and Δ are disjoint. Given a split sequent $\theta \vdash \Gamma \mid \Delta$ we call Γ the left and Δ the right component of the split sequent. We will write Σ^l and Σ^r for the left and right component of the split sequent Σ , respectively.

We will define *split JS^2 proofs* consisting of split sequents, where JS^2 rules are applied to either the left or the right component of a split sequent. Importantly, if Ψ^l is the left component of the conclusion, all formulas in the left component of a premiss will be in $\text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l)$.

Let R be a JS^2 rule. We say that R^l of the following form³

$$R: \frac{\theta' \vdash \Gamma', \Delta'}{\theta \vdash \Gamma, \Delta} \quad R^l: \frac{\theta' \vdash \Gamma' \mid \Delta'}{\theta \vdash \Gamma \mid \Delta}$$

is a *left rule*, if the following conditions are satisfied:

- 1) if $R \neq \text{Ax1}$, then all explicitly written formulas in the premiss and conclusion of R are in Γ' and Γ , respectively;
- 2) if $R \neq R_{(a)}$ and R is not an axiom, then $\Delta = \Delta'$;
- 3) if $R = \text{cut}$ or $R = \text{tcut}$, then $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$; and
- 4) if $R = R_{(a)}$, let $\Psi^l = \langle a \rangle \varphi, [a]\Sigma, \Gamma$ and $\Psi^r = [a]\Pi, \Delta$ be the respective left and right component of the split of the conclusion. Then R^l is of the form

$$R_{(a)}^l: \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \Sigma, \langle \check{a} \rangle^l \Gamma^\varepsilon, \Gamma^{(a)l} \varphi \mid \Pi, \langle \check{a} \rangle^r \Delta^\varepsilon, \Delta^{(a)r} \varphi}{\theta \vdash \langle a \rangle \varphi^\sigma, [a]\Sigma, \Gamma \mid [a]\Pi, \Delta}$$

where we define $\langle \check{a} \rangle^l \Gamma := \langle \check{a} \rangle \Gamma \cap \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l)$ and $\langle \check{a} \rangle^r \Delta := \langle \check{a} \rangle \Delta \cap \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^r)$. The conditions in $\Gamma^{(a)l} \varphi$ are adapted, such that $\Gamma^{(a)l} \varphi$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \varphi \not\prec_k [\check{a}]\chi \mid \langle a \rangle \varphi \not\prec_k \chi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}]\chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l) \} \\ & \cup \{ [\check{a}]\chi \rightsquigarrow_k \varphi \mid \chi \rightsquigarrow_k \langle a \rangle \varphi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}]\chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l) \} \\ & \cup \{ \psi \not\prec_k [\check{a}]\chi \mid [a]\psi \not\prec_k \chi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}]\chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l) \} \\ & \cup \{ [\check{a}]\chi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi \mid \chi \rightsquigarrow_k [a]\psi \in \Gamma \text{ and } [\check{a}]\chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l) \} \end{aligned}$$

Analogously for $\Delta^{(a)r} \varphi$.

Right rules are defined analogously.

For most rules the left and the right component of the split do not interact. The only exceptions are the modal rule $R_{(a)}$ and the axiom Ax1 . Note that for trace atoms there is no interaction between the left and the right component at all, and even the axiom Ax3 may only be applied if both a trace atom and its negated trace atom occur in the same component.

Definition 30. A *split JS^2 derivation* is a proof tree defined from all left and right rules.

A finite path α in a JS^2 derivation is called *left-successful* if there is a name x such that

- 1) x occurs in the left component of every sequent on α and
- 2) there is an application of Reset_x^l on α .

Let v be a repeat leaf in a split JS^2 derivation π with companion $c(v)$ labelled by D_d^l , meaning that v is a descendant of $c(v)$ and v and $c(v)$ are labelled by the same split sequent. Let τ_v denote the repeat path of v from $c(v)$ to v . We say that the leaf v is *discharged* by D_d^l if the path τ_v is left-successful. Right-successful paths and leaves discharged by D_d^r are defined analogously. A leaf is called *closed* if it is either discharged or labelled by an axiom, and *open* otherwise.

Definition 31. A *split JS^2 proof* is a finite split JS^2 derivation, where every leaf is closed.

Invariant split JS^2 proofs can be defined as for JS^2 proofs.

B. Soundness and completeness of split proofs

Lemma 32. *If there is a split JS^2 proof of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$, then there is a JS^2 proof of Γ, Δ .*

³For simplicity we only depict a unary rule, the case of a binary rule is analogous.

Proof. Let π be a split JS² proof of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$. By simply replacing at every node the split sequent $\theta \vdash \Sigma \mid \Pi$ by $\theta \vdash \Sigma, \Pi$ we obtain a JS² proof ρ of Γ, Δ . \square

In the soundness proof it sufficed to translate split JS² proofs to JS² proofs. The converse translation from JS² proofs to split JS² proofs is more tricky, as we have to choose in which component formulas are put. We will show how this can be mitigated. First we need a technical lemma.

Lemma 33. *If JS² $\vdash \Gamma$, then there is a JS² proof π of Γ , where every fixpoint-free formula has an empty annotation. Formally this means that, whenever φ^σ occurs at a node u with φ fixpoint-free and $\sigma \neq \varepsilon$, then u is labelled by exp .*

Proof. Let π be a JS² derivation of Γ . By applying an exp rule to annotated formulas φ^σ , whenever φ is quantifier-free and $\sigma \neq \varepsilon$, we obtain a JS² derivation π' with the desired condition. It remains to show that all leaves of π' are closed. Clearly every repeat leaf v in π gets translated to a repeat leaf v' in π' . Let α_v be the successful repeat path of v in π , witnessed by a name x . As names are only added to quantified formulas and a Reset_x rule is applied on α_v , each sequent of α_v must contain a quantified formula which annotation contains x . Therefore the repeat path $\alpha_{v'}$ in π' is successful as well, as witnessed by the same name x . Therefore every repeat leaf is discharged. \square

In order to simplify the following proof we introduce two extensions of our split proof system JS². Recall that in a cut ^{l} rule in JS² of the form $\text{cut}^l \frac{\varphi^\varepsilon, \Lambda \mid \Pi \quad \overline{\varphi}^\varepsilon, \Lambda \mid \Pi}{\Lambda \mid \Pi}$ we demand that $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Lambda)$. A slightly weaker condition would be to demand that in a proof of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$ we demand that for any cut ^{l} rule with cut-formula φ it holds $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ and analogously for cut ^{r} rules. We call those cuts *globally analytic*. We obtain the proof system JS² + cut ^{g} by extending JS² with globally analytic cut rules and obtain JS² + cut by extending JS² with arbitrary cuts. Note that, as cut rules with any cut-formula are sound, the proof systems JS² + cut ^{g} and JS² + cut are sound proof systems for \mathcal{L}_μ^2 .

Lemma 34. *If there is a JS² proof ρ of a pure sequent Γ, Δ , then there is a split JS² + cut ^{g} proof π of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$, which is invariant if ρ is so.*

Proof. Let ρ be a JS² proof of $\Gamma \cup \Delta$. We want to translate ρ to a split JS² proof π of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$. For the time being we assume that the bound variables in Γ and Δ are disjoint. Therefore all formulas in $\text{Clos}^-(\Gamma) \cap \text{Clos}^-(\Delta)$ are fixpoint-free.

In the completeness proof of NW² an NW² proof ρ' was constructed such that all trace atoms $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ in ρ' are relevant, meaning that (i) $\psi \in \text{Clos}^-(\varphi)$ and (ii) φ and ψ contain fixpoints. In the completeness proof of JS² we translated ρ' to a JS² proof ρ without adding extra trace atoms. Thus we may assume for every trace atom $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ in ρ that $\varphi, \psi \notin \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma) \cap \text{Clos}^-(\Delta)$ and either $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ or $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Delta)$. For simplicity we write $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Sigma)$ in the case that $\varphi, \psi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Sigma)$.

We inductively translate ρ to a split JS² derivation π of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$, such that every node u labelled by $\theta \vdash \Sigma$ in ρ is translated to a node v (possibly with some additional nodes) in π labelled by $\theta \vdash \Sigma^l \mid \Sigma^r$ such that

- 1) $\Sigma = \Sigma^l \cup \Sigma^r$,
- 2) $\Sigma^l \subseteq \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ and $\Sigma^r \subseteq \text{Clos}^-(\Delta)$,
- 3) $\Sigma^l \cap \Sigma^r = \emptyset$,
- 4) if $R_u \neq \text{exp}$, then $\Sigma^l = \Sigma \cap \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ and $\Sigma^r = \Sigma \setminus \Sigma^l$.

The root $\varepsilon \vdash \Gamma, \Delta$ is translated to $\varepsilon \vdash \Gamma \mid \Delta \setminus \Gamma$. For every rule in ρ we apply a corresponding left or right rule in π . By a case distinction on the applied rule we show how to satisfy conditions 1 and 2.

- Assume that in ρ the following $R_{\langle a \rangle}$ rule is applied:

$$R_{\langle a \rangle} \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\sigma, \Sigma, \langle \check{a} \rangle \Lambda^\varepsilon, \Lambda^{\langle a \rangle \varphi}, \Pi, \langle \check{a} \rangle \Theta^\varepsilon, \Theta^{\langle a \rangle \varphi}}{\theta \vdash \langle a \rangle \varphi^\sigma, [a] \Sigma, \Lambda, [a] \Pi, \Theta}$$

Let the split of the translation of the conclusion in π be

$$\Psi = \theta \vdash \langle a \rangle \varphi^\sigma, [a] \Sigma, \Lambda \mid [a] \Pi, \Theta.$$

Let Ψ^l be the left, and Ψ^r be the right component of Ψ . If we just try to apply $R_{\langle a \rangle}^l$ to Ψ this will not work: It could be that there is $\gamma^\tau \in \Lambda \setminus \Theta$ and $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma^\varepsilon \in \langle \check{a} \rangle \Lambda^\varepsilon$ such that $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi)$ but $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma \notin \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l)$. Hence $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma^\varepsilon$ would be added neither in the left nor the right component of the premiss of $R_{\langle a \rangle}^l$, yet in ρ the formula is added to the premiss of $R_{\langle a \rangle}$.

In this case we must have $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^r)$. Thus $\gamma \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^r)$ as well, and thence $\gamma \in \text{Clos}^-(\Lambda) \cap \text{Clos}^-(\Theta)$. This yields that γ is fixpoint-free. For any such γ we apply a cut ^{r} rule with cut-formula γ , where $\Lambda = \Lambda', \gamma$:⁴

$$\text{cut}^r \frac{\theta \vdash \gamma^\tau \mid \overline{\gamma}^\varepsilon \quad \theta \vdash \langle a \rangle \varphi^\sigma, [a] \Sigma, \Lambda', \gamma^\tau \mid [a] \Pi, \Theta, \gamma^\varepsilon}{\theta \vdash \langle a \rangle \varphi^\sigma, [a] \Sigma, \Lambda', \gamma^\tau \mid [a] \Pi, \Theta}$$

Applying the modal rule will now make $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma$ land in the proper (right) component of the premiss. Likewise, applying a cut ^{l} rule for every $\langle \check{a} \rangle \delta^\varepsilon \in \langle \check{a} \rangle \Theta^\varepsilon$, where $\langle \check{a} \rangle \delta \in \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^l) \setminus \text{Clos}^-(\Psi^r)$ yields a split sequent, where we may apply $R_{\langle a \rangle}^l$ and satisfy conditions 1 – 2.

For trace atoms $\gamma \rightsquigarrow_k \chi$ (and negated trace atoms $\gamma \not\rightsquigarrow_k \chi$) occurring in $\Lambda^{\langle a \rangle \varphi}$ this is not a problem, as there are no trace atoms where γ is fixpoint-free.

- Any discharge rule D_d is duplicated to $D_{d(l)}^l$ and $D_{d(r)}^r$, where $d(l)$ and $d(r)$ are fresh discharge tokens.
- Reset rules: By induction on π we can show that in every annotated sequent no name x occurs in both the left and the right component. This holds as only fresh names are introduced and in no rule do names cross the split. Thus Reset can always be translated to either Reset ^{l} or Reset ^{r} .
- Any discharged leaf u in ρ labelled by d is translated to a discharged leaf v in π , that is labelled by $d(l)$ if the repeat path α_v is left-successful and by $d(r)$ otherwise.

⁴In addition we implicitly weakened all unimportant side-formulas in the left premiss.

- Ax1 can either be translated to a left or a right rule, as we allow φ and $\bar{\varphi}$ to appear on different sides of the component.
- If the applied rule is cut (or tcut), add φ and $\bar{\varphi}$ (or $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ and $\varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi$) to the respective left components if $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ and to the respective right components otherwise.
- In the rule jump it holds that $\varphi^\sigma, \psi^\tau, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ are all either in $\text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ or in $\text{Clos}^-(\Delta)$, since all trace atoms are relevant. Similarly, for trans and Ax3 all explicitly written formulas in its conclusion belong to the same component of the sequent.
- All other rules have only one explicitly written formula in the conclusion and thus can easily be translated to a left or right rule.

Condition 3 can easily be satisfied by applying weak^r if necessary. If condition 4 is dissatisfied, then there is $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma) \cap \text{Clos}^-(\Delta)$ such that φ^σ occurs in the right component at a node v and $R_u \neq \text{exp}$. We may assume that $\sigma = \varepsilon$ due to Lemma 33 and add a cut^l rule of the form

$$\text{Ax1} \quad \frac{}{\theta \vdash \bar{\varphi}^\varepsilon, \Lambda \mid \Pi, \varphi^\varepsilon} \quad \text{weak}^r \quad \frac{\theta \vdash \varphi^\varepsilon, \Lambda \mid \Pi}{\theta \vdash \varphi^\varepsilon, \Lambda \mid \Pi, \varphi^\varepsilon} \\ \text{cut}^l \quad \frac{}{\theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Pi, \varphi^\varepsilon}$$

In the right branch we moved φ^ε to the left component. Note that not necessarily $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Lambda)$, yet $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ and therefore the cut is globally analytic.

Thus we obtain a split JS^2 derivation satisfying the specified conditions. It remains to show that every leaf of π is closed. First we note that every repeat leaf in ρ is translated to a repeat leaf in π , as the split of any sequent Σ into Σ^l and Σ^r only depends on Σ , assuming that the applied rule is not exp. Let α be a successful repeat path in ρ , and β its translated path in π . There is a name x that occurs in every sequent on α and there is an application of Reset_x on α . We can show inductively that x either occurs in every left, or in every right component of β . If x occurs in every left component of β , then Reset_x is translated to a Reset_x^l rule in π . Thus β is left-successful. Otherwise β is right-successful by an analogous argument.

Lastly we deal with the general case, where Γ and Δ may share bound variables. Let Γ' be an α -equivalent sequent of Γ , where all bound variables in Γ' and Δ are disjoint; for example replace every bound variable in Γ by a fresh new variable not occurring in either Γ or Δ . By the above reasoning we obtain a split $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proof π' of $\Gamma' \mid \Delta$. In π' we can translate back all newly introduced bound variables. This yields a split $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proof π of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$. All controls remained the same in the translation, thus π is invariant if ρ is. \square

It is clear that any split JS^2 proof is also a split $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proof. While the other direction is not necessarily true, we can show that globally analytic cuts do not add expressivity when compared to analytic cuts. For a finitary proof system this was first shown by Kowalski & Ono [30]. The proof we give here is tailored for the derivation system JS^2 , but it may be generalized to a broader class of cyclic systems.

Lemma 35. *If there is a split $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proof π of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$, then there is a split JS^2 proof of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$, which is invariant if π is so.*

Proof. Let π be a $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proof of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$. We first claim that for any node v labelled by Σ_v in π there is an invariant $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proof ρ_v of Σ_v .

Let v be a node in π , we first may construct a $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}$ proof π_v of Σ_v . The proof π_v can be obtained by taking the subproof of π rooted at v and inductively unfold open assumptions. Although all cut formulas are globally analytic with respect to the root sequent $\Gamma \mid \Delta$ of π , this might not be the case with respect to Σ_v . However, as $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}$ is a sound proof system for \mathcal{L}_μ^2 it follows that Δ_v is unsatisfiable. Hence by the completeness of $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$, Lemma 34 and Theorem 26, we obtain a $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proof ρ_v of Σ_v , which may assumed to be invariant due to Lemma 28.

We prove the lemma by induction on $|\text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)| + |\text{Clos}^-(\Delta)|$. Let v_1, \dots, v_n be the root-most nodes labelled by sequents $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n$ such that $\text{Clos}^-(\Sigma_i^l) \subsetneq \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma)$ or $\text{Clos}^-(\Sigma_i^r) \subsetneq \text{Clos}^-(\Delta)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. By the above claim there are invariant split $\text{JS}^2 + \text{cut}^g$ proofs ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n of the split sequents $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n$. The induction hypothesis yields invariant split JS^2 proofs π_1, \dots, π_n of $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n$. In the subproof π_r of π up to the nodes v_1, \dots, v_n all cut rules are analytic. Thus we can combine π_r with π_1, \dots, π_n to obtain a split JS^2 proof of Γ that is invariant if π is so. \square

Theorem 36. *Γ, Δ is unsatisfiable iff there is an invariant split JS^2 proof of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$ for any pure sequents Γ and Δ .*

Proof. The soundness of split JS^2 proofs follows from Lemma 32 and the soundness of ordinary JS^2 proofs Theorem 26. For the completeness we may combine Lemma 34 and Lemma 35 with the completeness of ordinary JS^2 proofs Theorem 26. \square

VII. INTERPOLATION

In the previous section we saw that a sequent Γ, Δ is unsatisfiable iff there is an invariant split JS^2 proof π of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$. Given such a π we will define an interpolant I and construct split proofs π^l of $\Gamma \mid I$ and π^r of $I \mid \Delta$.

Theorem 37 (Craig interpolation). *Let φ and ψ be two \mathcal{L}_μ^2 formulas such that $\varphi \models \psi$, then there is an interpolant of φ and ψ .*

Proof. Follows from Lemma 39. \square

Corollary 38 (Beth definability). *Let $p, q \in \text{Prop}$ and let $\varphi(p)$ be a \mathcal{L}_μ^2 formula. If $\varphi(p), \varphi(q) \models p \leftrightarrow q$, then there is a formula χ with $\text{Voc}(\chi) \subseteq \text{Voc}(\varphi) \setminus \{p\}$ and $\varphi(p) \models p \leftrightarrow \chi$.*

Proof. Apply Craig interpolation to $\varphi(p), p \models \varphi(q) \rightarrow q$. \square

Let $\theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Pi$ be a split sequent occurring in a split JS^2 proof. Then no name x in θ occurs both in Λ and Π . To see that this holds, recall that the root of a split JS^2 proof of an (unannotated) split sequent $\Gamma \mid \Delta$ is labelled by $\varepsilon \vdash \Gamma^\varepsilon \mid \Delta^\varepsilon$.

⁵Here $\varphi(q)$ is an abbreviation of $\varphi(p)[q/p]$

A straightforward induction (as in the proof of Lemma 34) will show that for any node in a split JS² proof labelled by $\theta \vdash \Lambda \mid \Pi$ no name x in θ occurs both in Λ and Π .

We define θ^l and θ^r to be the subwords of θ consisting of all names in θ that occur in the left component Λ and the right component Π , respectively.

Lemma 39. *Let π be an invariant split JS² proof of $\Gamma \mid \Delta$. Then there is a formula I such that $\text{Voc}(I) \subseteq \text{Voc}(\Gamma) \cap \text{Voc}(\Delta)$ and for which there are split JS² proofs π^l of $\Gamma \mid I$ and π^r of $\bar{I} \mid \Delta$.*

Proof. We define $\text{FV}(\varphi)$ to be the set of free variables occurring in φ . Let D be the set of nodes in π that are labelled by D . Let $c \in D$ be labelled by $\theta_c \vdash \Gamma_c \mid \Delta_c$. For a node $u \in \pi$ we define the set of *active repeats* $A_u := \{c \in D \mid u \in \text{scs}(c)\}$. We define a priority function $\Omega_\pi : D \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ satisfying $\Omega_\pi(c) < \Omega_\pi(d)$ if c is a proper descendent of d . Let $V_D := \{x_c \mid c \in D\}$ be a set of fresh new variables such that $x_c \in N_k$ with $k = \Omega_\pi(c)$ and define $V_u := \{x_c \in V_D \mid c \in A_u\}$. Our interpolant will be a formula with bound variables in V_D .

For each node $u \in \pi$ labelled by $\theta_u \vdash \Gamma_u \mid \Delta_u$ we define

- 1) a formula I_u with $\text{FV}(I_u) \subseteq V_u$ and $\text{Voc}(I_u) \subseteq \text{Voc}(\Gamma_u) \cap \text{Voc}(\Delta_u)$,
- 2) a derivation π_u^l of $\theta_u^l \vdash \Gamma_u \mid I_u$ such that all open assumptions in π_u^l are labelled by $\theta_c^l \vdash \Gamma_c \mid x_c$ for some $c \in A_u$ and
- 3) a derivation π_u^r of $\theta_u^r \vdash \bar{I}_u \mid \Delta_u$ such that all open assumptions in π_u^r are labelled by $\theta_c^r \vdash x_c \mid \Delta_u$ for some $c \in A_u$.

We define I_u, π_u^l, π_u^r by induction on the proof tree of π , starting from the leaves. For the root r of π this will yield $I := I_r$ such that $\text{Voc}(I) \subseteq \text{Voc}(\Gamma) \cap \text{Voc}(\Delta)$ and proofs π^l of $\Gamma \mid I$ and π^r of $\bar{I} \mid \Delta$.

The construction is defined by a case distinction on the last applied rule.

- *Axioms:* If u is labelled by an axiom of the form $\theta \vdash \varphi, \Gamma \mid \bar{\varphi}, \Delta$, then $I_u := \bar{\varphi}$ and dually $I_u := \varphi$ if φ and $\bar{\varphi}$ are swapped. Otherwise an axiom is applied, where either $\varphi, \bar{\varphi}; \perp$; $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ or $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k} \varphi$ is on the left or the right side of the split. If it is on the left, let $I_u := \top$ and otherwise $I_u := \perp$. It is straightforward to check the conditions 1–3.
- *Discharged leaves:* For every discharged leaf u labelled by $\theta_u \vdash \Gamma_u \mid \Delta_u$ with companion node c , let $I_u := x_c$. Define π_u^l to be the derivation consisting of one open assumption $\theta_u^l \vdash \Gamma_u \mid x_c$ and π_u^r to be $\theta_u^r \vdash x_c \mid \Delta_u$. It is straightforward to verify the conditions 1–3.
- *Companion nodes:* Let u be labelled by D_d^r and let v be its child. By induction hypothesis there is a formula I_v and derivations π_v^l and π_v^r satisfying conditions 1–3. We define $I_u := \mu x_u. I_v$. In order to define π_u^l we want to transform the derivation π_v^l of $\theta_v^l \vdash \Gamma_v \mid I_v$. Let O be the set of open assumptions in π_v^l labelled by $\theta_u^l \vdash \Gamma_u \mid x_u$ and let P be the set of all other open assumptions.

By uniformly substituting every occurrence of x_u in π_v^l by I_u we obtain a derivation ρ_v of $\theta_v^l \vdash \Gamma_u \mid I_v[\mu x_u. I_v/x_u]$, where all open assumptions are either in P or labelled by $\theta_u^l \vdash \Gamma_u \mid \mu x_u. I_v$. Let ρ_v^x be obtained from ρ_v by replacing every node w in the strongly connected subtree $\text{scs}(u)$ of u labelled by $\theta_u^l \cdot \theta_w \vdash \Gamma_w \mid I_w^{\sigma(w)}$ with w' , where w' is labelled by the sequent $\theta_u^l \cdot x \cdot \theta_w \vdash \Gamma_w \mid I_w^{x\sigma(w)}$. If a node w is not in the strongly connected subtree of u , but its parent is, then add an exp rule to remove the name x . This results in a well-formed derivation because (i) π is invariant and therefore θ_u^l is an initial segment of every control in the strongly connected subtree of u (see Lemma 29) and (ii) x is a higher-ranking name than all names in $\sigma(w)$ for all w .

Now define the following derivation π_u^l , where all open assumptions are in P and all assumptions from O are discharged as follows.

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Reset}_x^r \frac{[\theta_u^l \cdot x \vdash \Gamma_u \mid I_v[\mu x_u. I_v/x_u]^x]^e}{\theta_u^l \cdot xy \vdash \Gamma_u \mid I_v[\mu x_u. I_v/x_u]^{xy}} \\ R_\mu^r \frac{\theta_u^l \cdot x \vdash \Gamma_u \mid \mu x_u. I_v^x}{\vdots} \\ \vdots \\ \rho_v^x \\ \vdots \\ D_e^r \frac{\theta_u^l \cdot x \vdash \Gamma_u \mid I_v[\mu x_u. I_v/x_u]^x}{\theta_u^l \cdot x \vdash \Gamma_u \mid I_v[\mu x_u. I_v/x_u]^x} \\ R_\mu^r \frac{\theta_u^l \cdot x \vdash \Gamma_u \mid \mu x_u. I_v}{\theta_u^l \vdash \Gamma_u \mid \mu x_u. I_v} \end{array}$$

For the definition of π_u^r we let ρ_v^r be obtained from π_v^r by uniformly substituting every occurrence of x_u in π_v^r by \bar{I}_u . We let π_u^r be the following derivation

$$\begin{array}{c} [\theta_u^r \vdash \nu x_u. \bar{I}_v \mid \Delta_u]^f \\ \vdots \\ \rho_v^r \\ \vdots \\ R_\nu^l \frac{\theta_u^r \vdash \bar{I}_v[\nu x_u. \bar{I}_v/x_u] \mid \Delta_u}{\theta_u^r \vdash \nu x_u. \bar{I}_v \mid \Delta_u} \\ D_f^r \frac{\theta_u^r \vdash \nu x_u. \bar{I}_v \mid \Delta_u}{\theta_u^r \vdash \nu x_u. \bar{I}_v \mid \Delta_u} \end{array}$$

It holds that $\text{FV}(I_u) = \text{FV}(I_v) \setminus \{x_u\} \subseteq V_u$ and $\text{Voc}(I_u) = \text{Voc}(I_v)$, thus the conditions 1–3 are satisfied. The case where a D^l rule is applied is dual with $I_u := \nu x_u. I_v$.

- *Modal rules:* Let u be labelled by $R_{\langle a \rangle}$ and let v be its child. If the left component of v is empty define $I_u := \perp$, then π_u^l is an instance of Ax2 and π_u^r is obtained from π_v and applications of $R_{\langle a \rangle}$ and weak. If the right component of u is empty, define $I_u := \top$ and the proofs π_u^l, π_u^r likewise, the conditions 1–3 are clearly satisfied.

Otherwise both components of the premiss of $R_{\langle a \rangle}$ in π_u are non-empty. Then it follows that the action a belongs to the vocabulary of both Γ_u and Δ_u . To see that for the left component, let $\Gamma_v = \varphi, \Sigma, \langle \check{a} \rangle \Pi_u^\varepsilon$ be non-empty. If

φ, Σ is non-empty, then clearly $a \in \text{Voc}(\Gamma_u)$. Otherwise there is $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma^\varepsilon \in \langle \check{a} \rangle \Pi_u^\varepsilon$, yet this is only the case if $\langle \check{a} \rangle \gamma \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma_u)$, which implies $a \in \text{Voc}(\Gamma_u)$ indeed.

We define $I_u := [a]I_v$ or $I_u := \langle a \rangle I_v$, depending on whether the principal formula of $R_{\langle a \rangle}$ is in the left or the right component. The proofs π_u^i are obtained from π_v^i by applying a $R_{\langle a \rangle}$ rule for $i = l, r$. It holds $\text{Voc}(I_u) = \text{Voc}(I_v) \cup \{a\} \subseteq \text{Voc}(\Gamma_u) \cap \text{Voc}(\Delta_u)$ and therefore the conditions 1–3 are satisfied.

- **Unary rules:** If u is the conclusion of an unary rule different than D and $R_{\langle a \rangle}$ with premiss v , then we define $I_u := I_v$. The proofs π_u^l and π_u^r are defined straightforwardly. For example if the applied rule is trans^r then $\pi_u^l := \pi_v^l$ and π_u^r is defined as

$$\text{trans}^r \frac{\pi_v^r \quad \theta_v^r \vdash \overline{I_u} \mid \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \psi \rightsquigarrow_l \chi, \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{\max\{k,l\}} \chi, \Delta_u}{\theta_v^r \vdash \overline{I_u} \mid \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \psi \rightsquigarrow_l \chi, \Delta_u}$$

- **Binary rules:** If u is the conclusion of a binary rule R with premisses v and w , then $I_u := I_v \wedge I_w$ or $I_u := I_v \vee I_w$, depending on whether R is a left or right rule. The proofs π_u^l and π_u^r are defined straightforwardly. For example, if $R = \text{cut}^l$, then π_u^l is the following proof, where $\theta_v^l = \theta_w^l = \theta_u^l$.

$$\text{cut}^l \frac{\text{R}_\wedge^r \frac{\pi_v^l \quad \theta_v^l \vdash \varphi^\varepsilon, \Gamma_u \mid I_v}{\theta_u^l \vdash \varphi^\varepsilon, \Gamma_u \mid I_v \wedge I_w} \quad \text{R}_\wedge^r \frac{\pi_w^l \quad \theta_w^l \vdash \overline{\varphi^\varepsilon}, \Gamma_u \mid I_w}{\theta_u^l \vdash \overline{\varphi^\varepsilon}, \Gamma_u \mid I_v \wedge I_w}}{\theta_u^l \vdash \Gamma_u \mid I_v \wedge I_w}$$

Note that on both branches we applied weak^r implicitly. The proof π_u^r is defined as follows, where again weak^l is applied implicitly.

$$\text{R}_\vee^l \frac{\pi_v^r \quad \theta_v^r \vdash \overline{I_v} \mid \Delta_u \quad \pi_w^r \quad \theta_w^r \vdash \overline{I_w} \mid \Delta_u}{\theta_u^r \vdash \overline{I_v \vee I_w} \mid \Delta_u}$$

As every application of cut is analytic it holds that $\text{FV}(\varphi) \subseteq \text{FV}(\Gamma_u)$. Therefore $\text{Voc}(I_v \wedge I_w) \subseteq \text{Voc}(\Gamma_u, \varphi) \cap \text{Voc}(\Delta_u) = \text{Voc}(\Gamma_u) \cap \text{Voc}(\Delta_u)$, hence conditions 1–3 are satisfied. \square

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND QUESTIONS

The main contribution of this paper is the result that the two-way μ -calculus has the Craig interpolation property.

Below we mention some questions for further research.

- 1) Do natural *fragments* of \mathcal{L}_μ^2 have interpolation? Based on Rooduijn & Venema's focus system an affirmative answer seems within reach for the alternation-free fragment. Building on recent developments on the interpolation problem for propositional dynamic logic [39], we are currently working on a proof for the Craig Interpolation Property for Converse PDL.
- 2) Since the two-way μ -calculus does not have the finite model property, an interesting question is whether it has

interpolation *in the finite*, that is, for the finite-model-theory version \models_f of \models given by $\varphi \models_f \psi$ if $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash \varphi$ implies $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash \psi$ for every *finite* pointed model \mathbb{S}, s .

- 3) In the introduction we mentioned work by Benedikt and collaborators on *guarded fixpoint logics* [34], [35]. It would be interesting to compare these results to ours, and to see whether our approach could lead to proof systems for their logics, or whether their model-theoretic approach would also work for the two-way μ -calculus.
- 4) A similar question applies to the work of French [16], [17]. Given the connection between uniform interpolation and bisimulation quantifiers [7], French's results might even lead to an (indirect) proof that the two-way μ -calculus has the Uniform Interpolation Property.
- 5) The uniform interpolation property of \mathcal{L}_μ [7] is related to the fact that every \mathcal{L}_μ -formula has a so-called *disjunctive normal form* [40] using the cover modality ∇ . Can we prove a similar result for the two-way μ -calculus?
- 6) To the best of our knowledge many other natural questions about the two-way μ -calculus are open as well, for instance: is \mathcal{L}_μ^2 the fragment of monadic second-order logic that is invariant under two-way bisimulations?

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bradfield and C. Stirling, "Modal μ -calculi," in *Handbook of Modal Logic*, J. van Benthem, P. Blackburn, and F. Wolter, Eds. Elsevier, 2006, pp. 721–756.
- [2] J. Bradfield and I. Walukiewicz, "The mu-calculus and model checking," in *Handbook of Model Checking*, E. M. Clarke, T. Henzinger, H. Veith, and R. Bloem, Eds. Springer, 2018, pp. 871–919. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8_26
- [3] D. Kozen, "Results on the propositional μ -calculus," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 27, pp. 333–354, 1983.
- [4] D. Janin and I. Walukiewicz, "On the expressive completeness of the propositional μ -calculus w.r.t. monadic second-order logic," in *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR '96*, ser. LNCS, vol. 1119, 1996, pp. 263–277.
- [5] E. Emerson and C. Jutla, "The complexity of tree automata and logics of programs," *SIAM Journal of Computing*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 132–158, 1999.
- [6] D. Kozen, "A finite model theorem for the propositional μ -calculus," *Studia Logica*, vol. 47, pp. 233–241, 1988.
- [7] G. D'Agostino and M. Hollenberg, "Logical questions concerning the μ -calculus," *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 65, pp. 310–332, 2000.
- [8] I. Walukiewicz, "Completeness of Kozen's axiomatisation of the propositional μ -calculus," *Information and Computation*, vol. 157, pp. 142–182, 2000.
- [9] D. Niwinski and I. Walukiewicz, "Games for the mu-Calculus," *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 163, no. 1&2, pp. 99–116, 1996.
- [10] N. Jungteerapanich, "Tableau systems for the modal μ -calculus," Ph.D. dissertation, School of Informatics; The University of Edinburgh, 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/4208>
- [11] C. Stirling, "A tableau proof system with names for modal mu-calculus," in *HOWARD-60. A Festschrift on the Occasion of Howard Barringer's 60th Birthday*, ser. EPiC Series in Computing, A. Voronkov and M. Korovina, Eds., vol. 42. EasyChair, 2014, pp. 306–318.
- [12] P. A. Bonatti, C. Lutz, A. Murano, and M. Y. Vardi, "The complexity of enriched mu-calculi," *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2008. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-4\(3:11\)2008](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-4(3:11)2008)
- [13] M. Y. Vardi, "Reasoning about the past with two-way automata," in *Automata, Languages and Programming*, K. G. Larsen, S. Skyum, and G. Winskel, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 1998, pp. 628–641.

- [14] O. Lichtenstein, A. Pnueli, and L. D. Zuck, “The glory of the past,” in *Logics of Programs, Conference, Brooklyn College, New York, NY, USA, June 17-19, 1985, Proceedings*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, R. Parikh, Ed., vol. 193. Springer, 1985, pp. 196–218. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-15648-8_16
- [15] G. D. Giacomo and M. Lenzerini, “Description logics with inverse roles, functional restrictions, and n -ary relations,” in *Logics in Artificial Intelligence, European Workshop, JELIA '94, 1994, Proceedings*. Springer, 1994.
- [16] T. French, “Bisimulation quantifiers for modal logic,” Ph.D. dissertation, School for Computer Science and Software Engineering, University of Western Australia, 2006.
- [17] —, “Idempotent transductions for modal logics,” in *Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on Frontiers of Combining Systems (FroCoS 2007)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, B. Konev and F. Wolter, Eds., vol. 4720. Springer, 2007, pp. 178–192. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74621-8_12
- [18] B. Afshari, G. Jäger, and G. E. Leigh, “An infinitary treatment of full μ -calculus,” in *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation - 26th International Workshop, WoLLIC 2019, Proceedings*, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-59533-6_2
- [19] B. Afshari, S. Enqvist, G. Leigh, J. Marti, and Y. Venema, “Proof systems for two-way modal μ -calculus,” *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, p. 1–50, 2023.
- [20] W. Craig, “Three uses of the herbrand-gentzen theorem in relating model theory and proof theory,” *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 269–285, 1957.
- [21] J. van Benthem, “The many faces of interpolation,” *Synthese*, vol. 164, no. 3, pp. 451–460, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-008-9351-5>
- [22] J. C. Jung, C. Lutz, H. Pulcini, and F. Wolter, “Separating data examples by description logic concepts with restricted signatures,” in *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR, 2021*. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.24963/krr.2021/37>
- [23] K. L. McMillan, “Applications of craig interpolants in model checking,” in *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems, 11th International Conference, TACAS 2005, Proceedings*, 2005. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-31980-1_1
- [24] E. W. Beth, “On padoa’s methods in the theory of definitions,” *Indagationes Math-ematicae*, vol. 15, pp. 330–339, 1953.
- [25] B. ten Cate, E. Franconi, and I. Seylan, “Beth definability in expressive description logics,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 48, pp. 347–414, 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.4057>
- [26] M. Ohnishi and K. Matsumoto, “Gentzen method in modal calculi,” *Osaka Mathematical Journal*, vol. 9, p. 113 – 130, 1957.
- [27] R. Kashima, “Cut-free sequent calculi for some tense logics,” *Studia Logica*, vol. 53, p. 119–136, 1994.
- [28] J. Rooduijn and Y. Venema, “Focus-style proofs for the two-way alternation-free μ -calculus,” in *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation - 29th International Workshop, WoLLIC 2023, Proceedings*, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39784-4_20
- [29] S. Maehara, “Craig’s interpolation theorem,” *Sugaku*, vol. 12, pp. 235–237, 1961, japanese.
- [30] T. Kowalski and H. Ono, “Analytic cut and interpolation for bi-intuitionistic logic,” *Review of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 259–283, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S175502031600040X>
- [31] D. S. Shamkanov, “Circular proofs for the Gödel-Löb provability logic,” *Mathematical Notes*, vol. 96, no. 3–4, pp. 575–585, sep 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1134/2F0001434614090326>
- [32] B. Afshari and G. E. Leigh, “Lyndon Interpolation for Modal μ -Calculus,” in *Language, Logic, and Computation: 13th International Tbilisi Symposium, Tbilisi 2019, Revised Selected Papers*, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-98479-3_10
- [33] J. Marti and Y. Venema, “Focus-style proof systems and interpolation for the alternation-free μ -calculus,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2103.01671, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.01671>
- [34] M. Benedikt, B. ten Cate, and M. Vanden Boom, “Interpolation with decidable fixpoint logics,” in *30th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015*. IEEE Computer Society, 2015, pp. 378–389. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2015.43>
- [35] M. Benedikt, P. Bourhis, and M. Vanden Boom, “Definability and interpolation within decidable fixpoint logics,” *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2019. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-15\(3:29\)2019](https://doi.org/10.23638/LMCS-15(3:29)2019)
- [36] S. Demri, V. Goranko, and M. Lange, *Temporal Logics in Computer Science: Finite-State Systems*, ser. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [37] S. Safra, “On the complexity of ω -automata,” in *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1988, pp. 319–327.
- [38] C. Sprenger and M. Dam, *On the Structure of Inductive Reasoning: Circular and Tree-Shaped Proofs in the μ Calculus*, 2003.
- [39] M. Borzeczowski, M. Gättinger, H. H. Hansen, R. Ramanayake, V. T. Dalmas, and Y. Venema, “Propositional dynamic logic has Craig interpolation: a tableau-based proof,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.13276>
- [40] D. Janin and I. Walukiewicz, “Automata for the modal μ -calculus and related results,” in *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS’95*, ser. LNCS, vol. 969. Springer, 1995, pp. 552–562.
- [41] E. Grädel, W. Thomas, and T. Wilke, Eds., *Automata, Logic, and Infinite Games*, ser. LNCS. Springer, 2002, vol. 2500.
- [42] A. Mostowski, “Games with forbidden positions,” 1991, technical Report 78, Instytut Matematyki, Uniwersytet Gdański, Poland.

APPENDIX

A. Parity games

In this appendix we briefly define infinite two-player games, for more details we refer to [41]. We fix two players that we shall refer to as \exists (Eloise, female) and \forall (Abelard, male) and use Π as a variable ranging over the set $\{\exists, \forall\}$.

A *two-player game* is a quadruple $\mathbb{G} = (V, E, O, W)$ where (V, E) is a graph, O is a map $V \rightarrow \{\exists, \forall\}$, and W is a set of infinite paths in (V, E) . An *initialised game* is a pair consisting of a game \mathbb{G} and an element v of V , usually denoted as $\mathbb{G} @ v$.

We will refer to (V, E) as the *board* of the game. Elements of V will be called *positions*, and $O(v)$ is the *owner* of v . Given a position v for player Π , the set $E[v]$ denotes the set of *moves* that are *admissible* for Π at v . We denote $V_\Pi := O^{-1}(\Pi)$. The set W is called the *winning condition* of the game.

A *match* of the game $\mathbb{G} = (V, E, O, W)$ is a path π through the graph (V, E) . Such a match π is *full* if it is maximal as a path, that is, either finite with $E[\text{last}(\pi)] = \emptyset$, or infinite. If a position has no E -successors, the owner of that positions *gets stuck* and loses the match. Infinite matches are won by \exists if the match, as an E -path, belongs to the set W and won by \forall otherwise.

Let PM_Π denote the collection of partial matches π ending in a position⁶ $\text{last}(\pi) \in V_\Pi$. A *strategy* for a player Π is a partial function $f : PM_\Pi \rightarrow V$ such that $f(\pi) \in E[\text{last}(\pi)]$ if $E[\text{last}(\pi)] \neq \emptyset$. A match $\pi = (v_i)_{i < \kappa}$ is *guided* by a Π -strategy f , in short *f -guided*, if $f(v_0 v_1 \cdots v_{n-1}) = v_n$ for all $n < \kappa$ such that $v_0 \cdots v_{n-1} \in PM_\Pi$. A Π -strategy f is *winning for Π from v* if Π wins all f -guided full matches starting at v . The game \mathbb{G} is *determined* if every position is winning for either \exists or \forall .

A strategy is *positional* if it only depends on the last position of a partial match, namely, if $f(\pi) = f(\pi')$ whenever

⁶For a finite sequence $s = v_0 \dots v_n$ we define $\text{first}(s) := v_0$ and $\text{last}(s) := v_n$.

$\text{last}(\pi) = \text{last}(\pi')$; such a strategy can and will be presented as a map $f : V_\Pi \rightarrow V$.

A *parity game* is a board game $\mathbb{G} = (V, E, O, W_\Omega)$ in which the winning condition W_Ω is given by a priority map $\Omega : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows: $\pi \in W_\Omega$ iff $\max\{\Omega(v) \mid v \text{ occurs infinitely often in } \pi\}$ is even. Such a parity game is usually denoted as $\mathbb{G} = (V, E, O, \Omega)$. The following theorem is independently due to Emerson & Jutla [5] and Mostowski [42].

Theorem 40 (Positional Determinacy). *Let $\mathbb{G} = (G, E, O, \Omega)$ be a parity game. Then \mathbb{G} is determined, and both players have positional winning strategies.*

B. Soundness of NW²

The following lemma deals with the local soundness of our rules and can be proven straightforwardly:

Lemma 41. *Let*

$$\text{R} \frac{\Delta_1 \quad \cdots \quad \Delta_m}{\Gamma}$$

be a rule instance of Figure 1. If Γ is satisfiable, then there is an $i = 1, \dots, m$ such that Δ_i is satisfiable.

In particular, if $\text{R} \neq \text{R}_{\langle a \rangle}$, and given a pointed model \mathbb{S}, s and positional strategy f for \exists in $\mathcal{E}(\bigwedge \Phi, \mathbb{S})$ such that $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \Gamma$, then $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \Delta_i$. If $\text{R} = \text{R}_\vee$ and $\varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1$ is the principal formula, then $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \varphi_i, \varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1 \rightsquigarrow_1 \varphi_i, \Gamma$, where $f(\varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1, s) = (\varphi_i, s)$.

If $\text{R} = \text{R}_{\langle a \rangle}$ with principal formula $\langle a \rangle \varphi$ and given a pointed model \mathbb{S}, s and positional strategy f for \exists in $\mathcal{E}(\bigwedge \Phi, \mathbb{S})$ such that $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \langle a \rangle \varphi, [a]\Sigma, \Gamma$, then $\mathbb{S}, t \Vdash_f \varphi, \Sigma, \langle \bar{a} \rangle \Gamma, \Gamma^{(a)} \varphi$, where $f(\langle a \rangle \varphi, s) = (\varphi, t)$.

Theorem 11. *If $\text{NW}^2 \vdash \Gamma$, then Γ is unsatisfiable.*

Proof. By contraposition we show that, if Γ is satisfiable, then Builder has a winning strategy in $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}(\Phi) @ \Gamma$. So assume that there is a pointed model \mathbb{S}, s and a positional strategy f for \exists in the game $\mathcal{E} := \mathcal{E}(\bigwedge \Phi, \mathbb{S})$ such that $\mathbb{S}, s \Vdash_f \Gamma$. We will construct a winning strategy \bar{f} for Builder in \mathcal{G} and a function $s_f : PM(\Phi) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}$, mapping partial \mathcal{G} -matches to states of \mathbb{S} , such that $\mathbb{S}, s_f(\mathcal{M}) \Vdash_f \text{last}(\mathcal{M})$ for every \bar{f} -guided $\mathcal{M} \in PM_P(\Phi)$.

The functions \bar{f} and s_f can be defined inductively by a case distinction based on the rule instance. For the base case $|\mathcal{M}| = 1$ it holds $\mathcal{M} = \Gamma$. We define $s_f(\mathcal{M}) := s$ and do not have to define \bar{f} as this is a position owned by Prover. Otherwise we follow the specifications of the rule instance. If the rule is $\text{R}_{\langle a \rangle}$, define s_f as given by f and let \bar{f} choose the only premiss. For any other rule s_f remains the same and we invoke Lemma 41 for the definition of \bar{f} .

We need to show that \bar{f} is a winning strategy for Builder in \mathcal{G} . Because of Lemma 41 we know that all finite matches are won by Builder. Thus, assume by contradiction that Prover wins an infinite \bar{f} -guided \mathcal{G} -match \mathcal{M} . Then there is a μ -trail $\tau = \tau_0 \tau_1 \cdots$ on \mathcal{M} . Note that τ is not necessarily a trail starting from the root; it might also be starting from a cut

formula. We will use τ to obtain an infinite f -guided \mathcal{E} -match \mathcal{N} that is won by \forall .

Let $\tau_i = (\varphi_i, \psi_i, k_i)$ for $i \geq 0$, remember that $\varphi_{i+1} = \psi_i$ for all i . Let \mathcal{M}_i be the initial partial match of \mathcal{M} , such that τ_i “is a trace starting at $\text{last}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ ”. We will define f -guided partial \mathcal{E} -matches \mathcal{N}_i starting at $(\varphi_i, s_f(\mathcal{M}_i))$ and ending at $(\varphi_{i+1}, s_f(\mathcal{M}_{i+1}))$ for every $i \geq 0$, such that $k_i = \max\{\Omega(\varphi) \mid (\varphi, s) \text{ is a position in } \mathcal{N}_i \text{ for some } s\}$.

If τ_i is an upward trace in $\tau_{u,v}$ for $u \neq v$, then we can define \mathcal{N}_i straightforwardly. Otherwise τ_i is a detour trace in $\tau_{u,u}$ for some u . Then $\varphi_i \rightsquigarrow_{k_i} \varphi_{i+1} \in \text{last}(\mathcal{M}_i)$. As $\mathbb{S}, s_f(\mathcal{M}_i) \Vdash_f \text{last}(\mathcal{M}_i)$ it holds $\mathbb{S}, s_f(\mathcal{M}_i) \Vdash_f \varphi_i \rightsquigarrow_{k_i} \varphi_{i+1}$. This exactly means that there is an f -guided match \mathcal{N}_i starting at $(\varphi_i, s_f(\mathcal{M}_i))$ and ending at $(\varphi_{i+1}, s_f(\mathcal{M}_{i+1}))$ as needed.

Glueing together the matches \mathcal{N}_i we obtain an infinite f -guided \mathcal{E} -match $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_0 \mathcal{N}_1 \cdots$, such that $\max\{\Omega(\varphi) \mid \varphi \text{ occurs infinitely often in } \mathcal{N}\} = \max\{k \mid k \text{ appears infinitely often on } \tau\}$. Thus we conclude that \mathcal{N} is won by \forall and therefore $\mathbb{S}, s_f(\mathcal{M}_0) \not\Vdash_f \text{last}(\mathcal{M}_0)$, which is the desired contradiction. \square

C. Completeness of NW²

Lemma 42 (Saturation). *For every state ρ in \mathcal{S}^f the set $\Gamma(\rho)$ is saturated, meaning that the following conditions are satisfied:*

- 1) *For all $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^\neg(\Gamma(\rho))$ it holds that $\varphi \in \Gamma(\rho)$ iff $\bar{\varphi} \notin \Gamma(\rho)$.*
- 2) *Never $\perp \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*
- 3) *For all $\varphi \in \text{Clos}^\neg(\Gamma(\rho))$ and relevant trace atoms $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ it holds that $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi \in \Gamma(\rho)$ iff $\varphi \not\rightsquigarrow_k \psi \notin \Gamma(\rho)$.*
- 4) *For no φ, k it holds $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_{2k} \varphi \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*
- 5) *If $\varphi_0 \wedge \varphi_1 \in \Gamma(\rho)$, then for all $i = 0, 1$ it holds that $\varphi_i \in \Gamma(\rho)$ and $\varphi_0 \wedge \varphi_1 \rightsquigarrow_1 \varphi_i \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*
- 6) *If $\varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1 \in \Gamma(\rho)$, then for some $i = 0, 1$ it holds that $\varphi_i \in \Gamma(\rho)$ and $\varphi_0 \vee \varphi_1 \rightsquigarrow_1 \varphi_i \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*
- 7) *If $\eta x. \varphi \in \Gamma(\rho)$, then $\varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], \eta x. \varphi \rightsquigarrow_{\Omega(\eta x. \varphi)} \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x] \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*
- 8) *If $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi, \psi \rightsquigarrow_l \chi \in \Gamma(\rho)$, then $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_{\max\{k, l\}} \chi \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*

Proof. Follows from our restriction on the strategy of Prover. \square

Lemma 43. *Let ρ_0 be a state of \mathcal{S}^f containing the root Γ of \mathcal{T} and let $\psi_0 \in \Gamma$. Let \mathcal{M} be an f -guided \mathcal{E} -match with starting position (ψ_0, ρ_0) . Then for every position (ψ, ρ) in \mathcal{M} it holds that $\psi \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*

Proof. We write (ψ_n, ρ_n) for the n -th position of \mathcal{M} and prove the claim by strong induction on n . The base case is clear. For the induction step let $\psi_n \in \Gamma(\rho_n)$, we have to show that $\psi_{n+1} \in \rho_{n+1}$. We proceed by a case distinction based on the shape of ψ . If ψ is not a modal formula, then $\rho_{n+1} = \rho_n$ and the claim follows from Lemma 42.

Now assume that $\psi_n = [a]\chi$, then $\psi_{n+1} = \chi$. In this case $\rho_n R_a^f \rho_{n+1}$, so either $\rho_n \xrightarrow{a} \rho_{n+1}$ or $\rho_{n+1} \xrightarrow{\bar{a}} \rho_n$. If $\rho_n \xrightarrow{a} \rho_{n+1}$, then $[a]\chi$ is in the conclusion of $\text{R}_{\langle a \rangle}$, hence χ is in its premiss and thus $\chi \in \rho_{n+1}$.

Because \mathbb{S}^f is a forest and $\rho_0 \dots \rho_{n+1}$ forms a path in \mathbb{S}^f starting at one of the roots, where the last step of the path is downwards, there has to be an $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ with $\rho_i = \rho_{n+1}$. As \mathcal{M} is a match with positions (ψ_i, ρ_i) and $([a]\chi, \rho_n)$ for some ψ_i , it holds $[a]\chi \in \text{Clos}(\psi_i)$. As by induction hypothesis $\psi_i \in \Gamma(\rho_i) = \Gamma(\rho_{n+1})$, this yields $[a]\chi \in \text{Clos}(\Gamma(\rho_{n+1}))$ and also $\chi \in \text{Clos}(\Gamma(\rho_{n+1}))$.

Towards a contradiction assume that $\chi \notin \Gamma(\rho_{n+1})$. Because $\chi \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma(\rho_{n+1}))$ it holds $\bar{\chi} \in \Gamma(\rho_{n+1})$ by Lemma 42. If $\bar{\chi}$ is in the conclusion of R_{\exists} , then $\langle a \rangle \bar{\chi}$ is in its premiss as $\langle a \rangle \bar{\chi} \in \text{Clos}^-(\Gamma(\rho_{n+1}))$, therefore $\langle a \rangle \bar{\chi} \in \rho_n$. Again by Lemma 42 we conclude that $[a]\chi \notin \rho_n$, which is a contradiction.

Finally the case where $\psi_n = \langle a \rangle \chi$ is similar to the first direction of the last case. \square

Lemma 44. *Let $\rho \in S^f$, $\varphi \in \Gamma(\rho)$ and $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$ a relevant trace atom. Then for every k such that $\mathbb{S}^f, \rho \Vdash_f \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi$, it holds that $\varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \psi \in \Gamma(\rho)$.*

Proof. An analogous proof for the case of alternation-free μ -calculus can be found in [28, Lemma 4]. \square

Proposition 45. *Let ρ_0 be a state of \mathbb{S}^f containing the root Γ of \mathcal{T} and let $\psi_0 \in \Gamma$. Then the strategy \underline{f} is winning for \exists in $\mathcal{E}@\!(\psi_0, \rho_0)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be an arbitrary \underline{f} -guided $\mathcal{E}@\!(\psi_0, \rho_0)$ -match. If \mathcal{M} is a finite match, then it is straightforward to check that it is won by \exists .

Suppose that $\mathcal{M} = (\psi_n, \rho_n)_{n \in \omega}$ is infinite, and to arrive at a contradiction assume that \forall wins \mathcal{M} . By positional determinacy we may assume that his strategy is positional. We make a case distinction.

First assume that there is a state ρ that is visited infinitely often. Then there must be a segment \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} such that $\text{first}(\mathcal{N}) = \text{last}(\mathcal{N}) = (\psi, \rho)$ for some formula ψ . As the match is positional this means that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{KN}^*$ for some initial segment \mathcal{K} of \mathcal{M} , meaning that only finitely many states are visited. By our assumption the match \mathcal{M} is winning for \forall , thus the most important fixpoint formula occurring infinitely often is of the form $\mu x. \psi$. Let $k = \Omega(\mu x. \psi)$. Because only finitely many states are visited, there has to be a position $(\tau, \mu x. \psi)$ occurring infinitely often in \mathcal{M} and thus $\mathbb{S}^f, \tau \Vdash_f \mu x. \psi \rightsquigarrow_k \mu x. \psi$. But then Lemma 44 gives $\mu x. \psi \rightsquigarrow_k \mu x. \psi \in \Gamma(\tau)$ and therefore Ax4 would be applicable, contradicting the assumption that \mathcal{M} is infinite.

Now consider the case that $\mathcal{M} = (\psi_n, \rho_n)_{n \in \omega}$ visits each state at most finitely often. Then there are sequences of indices $(\alpha(n))_{n \in \omega}, (\beta(n))_{n \in \omega} \in \omega^\omega$, such that

- $\alpha(n) \leq \beta(n)$ and $\beta(n) + 1 = \alpha(n+1)$ for all $n \in \omega$,
- $\rho_{\alpha(n)} = \rho_{\beta(n)}$ for all $n \in \omega$ and
- $\psi_{\beta(n)}$ is modal for every $n \in \omega$ and there is an action a_n such that $\rho_{\beta(n)} \xrightarrow{a_n} \rho_{\alpha(n+1)}$.

These indices can be defined by induction rather straightforwardly.

Again assume that \mathcal{M} is winning for \forall , then there is $N \in \omega$ such that for some even k it holds that $\Omega(\psi_n) \leq k$ for all

$n \geq N$ and $\Omega(\psi_n) = k$ for infinitely many $n \geq N$. Therefore it holds $\mathbb{S}^f, \rho_{\alpha(n)} \Vdash_f \psi_{\alpha(n)} \rightsquigarrow_{k(n)} \psi_{\beta(n)}$, where $k(n) \leq k$ for all $n \geq N$ and $k(n) = k$ for infinitely many $n > N$. Lemma 44 yields that $\psi_{\alpha(n)} \rightsquigarrow_{k(n)} \psi_{\beta(n)} \in \Gamma(\rho_{\alpha(n)})$ and because Prover only applies cumulative rules in \mathcal{T} this implies $\psi_{\alpha(n)} \rightsquigarrow_{k(n)} \psi_{\beta(n)} \in \text{last}(\rho_{\alpha(n)})$.

Clearly there is a trail τ_n from $\psi_{\beta(n)}$ at $\text{last}(\rho_{\alpha(n)})$ to $\psi_{\alpha(n+1)}$ at $\text{first}(\rho_{\alpha(n+1)})$ of weight 1; there is only one modal rule applied. Again because Prover only applies cumulative rules in \mathcal{T} there are trails τ'_n of weight 1 from $\psi_{\alpha(n)}$ at $\text{first}(\rho_{\alpha(n)})$ to $\psi_{\alpha(n)}$ at $\text{last}(\rho_{\alpha(n)})$.

Thus we obtain the weighted trail

$$\tau = (\psi_{\alpha(0)}, \psi_{\beta(0)}, k(0)) \cdot \tau_0 \cdot \tau'_1 \cdot (\psi_{\alpha(1)}, \psi_{\beta(1)}, k(1)) \cdot \tau_1 \cdots$$

where $\max\{l \mid l \text{ appears infinitely often on } \tau\} = k$ is even and therefore τ is a μ -trail. Yet this contradicts the fact that \mathcal{G} is winning for Builder. \square

Theorem 12 (Completeness). *If a pure sequent Γ is unsatisfiable, then Γ is provable in NW².*

Proof. Follows by contraposition from Proposition 45. \square

D. Tracking automaton

Lemma 13. *Let π be a saturated NW² proof of Γ . On every infinite branch of π there is a slim μ -trail.*

Proof. Let π be a saturated NW² proof of Γ . Let α be a branch of π and τ be a μ -trail on α . For condition (ii) assume that there is an upward trail $(\eta x. \varphi, \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], k) \in T_{u,v}$ on τ . The sequent S_v contains $\eta x. \varphi \rightsquigarrow_k \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x]$ and $\eta x. \varphi$, because the application of R_η is cumulative. Thus we can replace the trail $(\eta x. \varphi, \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], k) \in T_{u,v}$ in τ by $(\eta x. \varphi, \eta x. \varphi, 1)(\eta x. \varphi, \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], k) \in T_{u,v} T_{v,v}$.

Regarding condition (i) we first assume that in τ there are only detour trails at nodes, that are labelled by a different rule than trans. This is not a restriction as all upward trail relations for the rule trans are of the form $(\varphi, \varphi, 1)$, thus we can apply the same detour trail at its child. Assume that there is a subword of τ consisting of two detour trails $(\varphi, \psi, k)(\psi, \chi, l)$, where $(\varphi, \psi, k), (\psi, \chi, l) \in T_{u,u}$. As u is not labelled by trans and trans is always applied if applicable, also $(\varphi, \chi, \max\{k, l\}) \in T_{u,u}$. Hence we can replace $(\varphi, \psi, k), (\psi, \chi, l)$ by $(\varphi, \chi, \max\{k, l\})$. Doing this for all upward trails of the form $(\eta x. \varphi, \varphi[\eta x. \varphi/x], k)$ and subwords consisting of two consecutive detour trails results in a slim μ -trail τ' . \square

E. Determinisation of ε -parity automata

Theorem 18. *The automaton \mathbb{A}^S is equivalent to \mathbb{A} .*

Proof. “ \supseteq ”: Let $r = (a_0, n_0)(a_1, n_1) \cdots$ be an accepting run of \mathbb{A} on some word w . We want to show that the unique run $\rho = S_0 S_1 \cdots$ of \mathbb{A}^S on w is accepting.

We define a sequence of natural numbers $m(0) < m(1) < \cdots$ such that $m(j) = \max\{i \mid n_i = j\}$ for $j \geq 0$. Intuitively $m(j)$ is the last index in the run r such that j -many basic

transitions were applied. In other words in the run r at index $m(j)$ the $j+1$ -th basic transition is applied.

Claim 1: For every $j \in \omega$ there is a unique stack τ_j such that $a_{m(j)}^{\tau_j}$ is in the Safra-state S_j .

Proof of Claim 1: By induction on j . It holds that $a_0 = a_I$ and $m(j) = 0$, as we assume that $\Delta_\varepsilon(a_I) = \emptyset$. By definition $S_0 = \{a_I^\varepsilon\}$.

Now assume that $a_{m(j)}^{\tau_j} \in S_j$. After step 1 of the transition function $a_{m(j)+1}^{\tau_j} \in S'_j$. In the run r between $(a_{m(j)+1}, j)$ and $(a_{m(j+1)}, j)$ all transitions are ε -transitions. Therefore after step 3 of the transition function $a_{m(j+1)}^{\tau'} \in S'_j$ for some τ' . After that elements are removed such that we end up with an unique τ_{j+1} with $a_{m(j+1)}^{\tau_{j+1}} \in S_{j+1}$. \dashv

We will now analyse the sequence $(\tau_j)_{j \in \omega}$. Let $h := \liminf |\tau_j|$, that is, h is the maximal number such that cofinitely many τ_j have size at least h . Let J_0 be such that $|\tau_j| \geq h$ for all $j \geq J_0$. For $0 \leq l \leq h$ we let $\tau[l]$ denote the stack consisting of the first l names in τ . We say that $\tau_j[l]$ is constant for $j \geq J$ if for all $i, j \geq J$ it holds $\tau_i[l] = \tau_j[l]$.

Claim 2: There exists $J \in \omega$ such that $\tau_j[h]$ is constant for $j \geq J$.

Proof of Claim 2: By induction on l we prove that there exist $J_l \geq J_0$ such that $\tau_j[l]$ is constant for $j \geq J_l$, for all $0 \leq l \leq h$. For $l = 0$ this is trivial. Now assume that it holds for $l < h$. For simpler notation write $g := J_l$, and let x and σ_g be such that $\tau_g = \tau_g[l] \cdot x \cdot \sigma_g$. Let θ_j denote the control in the Safra-state S_j . The only way that $\tau_j[l+1]$ might change for $j \geq J_l$ is in step 4 of the transition function, if $\tau_j = \tau_j[l] \cdot y \cdot \sigma_j$ with $y <_{\theta_j} x$. As every newly introduced name is added as the last element in θ this implies that already $y <_{\theta_g} x$. If $\tau_i[l+1]$ changes again, then there is $z <_{\theta_i} y$, which already implies $z <_{\theta_g} y$ and so on. As there are only finitely many names below x in $<_{\theta_g}$ the stack $\tau_j[l+1]$ can only change finitely often for $j \geq J_l$ and thus for some $J_{l+1} \geq J_l$ it must hold that $\tau_j[l+1]$ is constant for $j \geq J_{l+1}$. \dashv

Let $J \in \omega$ be as given in Claim 2 and let x be the h -th name in τ_J . For $j \geq J$ the name x is always active. The run r is accepting, thus there is an even k such that $\Omega(a_j) = k$ for infinitely many j and $\Omega(a_j) \leq k$ for all $j \geq T$ from some time T onwards. We assume that J is picked big enough such that $J \geq m(T)$. Therefore for some $j \geq J$ a k -name y is added to the stack τ_j . But we have $|\tau_i| = h$ for some $i \geq j$, and this can only happen in step 4 of the transition function if x was invisible and thus x is coloured green. Note that this also implies that x is a k -name. Repeating this argument yields that x is active cofinitely often and is coloured green infinitely often in ρ .

“ \subseteq ”: Assume that there is an accepting run $\rho = S_0 S_1 \dots$ of \mathbb{A}^S on w . Let x be a k -name, that is active cofinitely often and coloured green infinitely often. Let $t(0) < t(1) < \dots$ be the minimal indices such that x is in play in S_j for every $j \geq t(0)$ and such that x is green in $S_{t(i)}$ for every $i \in \omega$.

For $j \in \omega$ let $S_{t(j)} = (A_j, f_j, \theta_j, c_j)$. For $p, q \in \omega$ let $w[p, q]$ denote the segment $z_p \dots z_{q-1}$ of the infinite word $w = z_0 z_1 \dots$. In particular $w = w[0, t_0] \cdot w[t_0, t_1] \cdot \dots$. Our goal is to find certain $[t(j), t(j+1))$ -labelled paths⁷ in \mathbb{A} which can be composed to obtain a successful run. These will be formalized in the following claims. Afterwards we can glue together those paths to obtain an infinite run of \mathbb{A} on the word w .

For $j \in \omega$ let B_j be the set of states in the macrostate A_j which have x in their stack. Formally, $B_j := \{b \in A_j \mid x \text{ occurs in } f_j(b)\}$.

Claim 3: For every $a \in B_0$ there is an $w[0, t_0)$ -labelled path from a_I to a .

Proof of Claim 3: For all $i = 0, \dots, t(0)$ let $C_i \subseteq A$ be the macrostate in S_i . For all $b \in C_{i+1}$ there is $a \in C_i$ such that there exists $c \in A$ with $\Delta_b(a, c_i) = c$ and $b \in \varepsilon \text{Clos}(a)$. This follows from the definition of step 1 and 3 of the transition function. The other steps only manipulate stacks but do not change macrostates. The claim then follows by induction. \dashv

Claim 4: For all $j > 0$ and all $b \in B_{j+1}$ there is a state $a \in B_j$ and a $w[t_j, t_{j+1})$ -labelled path $c_0 \dots c_h$ with $a = c_0$, $b = c_h$ and $\max\{\Omega(c_j) \mid i = 1, \dots, h\} = k$.

Proof of Claim 4: As in the proof of Claim 3 we can show that there is $a \in A_j$ and a $w[t_j, t_{j+1})$ -labelled path $c_0 \dots c_h$ with $a = c_0$ and $b = c_h$. Because x is in play in S_j for all $j \geq t_0$ the name x can never be introduced in the transition function. Thus we may conclude that x was already present in the stack τ_j of a in $S_{t(j)}$, meaning that $a \in B_j$. It remains to show that there is such a path where $\max\{\Omega(c_j) \mid i = 1, \dots, h\} = k$. In $S_{t(j)}$ the name x is visible in all stacks, where x occurs. In $S_{t(j+1)}$ the name x is coloured green, indicating that after step 4 of the transition function in $S'_{t(j+1)-1}$ the name x is invisible. This can only happen if a k -name y was added to the stack τ_j in $S_{t(j)+1} \dots S_{t(j+1)}$ in step 2 or 3 of the transition function. Then $\Omega(c_j) = k$ for some $j = 1, \dots, h$. As x is always in play we also have $\Omega(c_j) \leq k$ for all $j = 1, \dots, h$ and thus $\max\{\Omega(c_j) \mid i = 1, \dots, h\} = k$. \dashv

We will now glue paths together to obtain an infinite path through \mathbb{A} . This can be achieved using König's Lemma. Let $G = (V, E)$ where

$$V = \{a_I\} \cup \{(a, j) \mid a \in B_j \text{ and } j \in \omega\},$$

$$E = \{(a_I, (a, 0))\} \cup$$

$$\{((a, j), (b, j+1)) \mid b \in B_{j+1} \text{ and } a \in B_j \text{ as in Claim 4}\}$$

Clearly G is a connected, finitely branching and infinite graph. Hence we can apply König's Lemma to obtain an w -labelled path $r' = a_0 a_1 \dots$ in \mathbb{A} , where $\Omega(a_j) \leq k$ for cofinitely many $j \in \omega$ and $\Omega(a_j) = k$ for infinitely many $j \in \omega$. In particular we find $r' \in \text{Acc}$. By adding natural numbers n_0, n_1, \dots in a straightforward way we obtain the accepting run $r = (a_0, n_0)(a_1, n_1) \dots$ of \mathbb{A} on w , whose projection is r' . \square

⁷That is, paths $a_0 \dots a_k$ in \mathbb{A} on input $[t(j), t(j+1))$ starting at state a_0 .