
THE EMBEDDING PATH ORDER FOR LAMBDA-FREE HIGHER-ORDER TERMS

ALEXANDER BENTKAMP

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands

State Key Lab. of Computer Science, Institute of Software, CAS, Beijing, China

`bentkamp@gmail.com`

Abstract

The embedding path order, introduced in this article, is a variant of the recursive path order (RPO) for untyped λ -free higher-order terms (also called applicative first-order terms). Unlike other higher-order variants of RPO, it is a ground-total and well-founded simplification order, making it more suitable for the superposition calculus. I formally proved the order's theoretical properties in Isabelle/HOL and evaluated the order in a prototype based on the superposition prover Zipperposition.

1 Introduction

Superposition [2] is one of the most successful calculi for proof search in first-order logic with equality. To restrict the search space, it uses a term order, which in practice is usually the Knuth–Bendix order (KBO) [24] or the recursive path order (RPO) [16]. Although, in isolation, KBO often achieves better results, modern portfolio provers employ both KBO and RPO in separate proof attempts because the two orders complement each other well.

With colleagues, I have developed a superposition-like calculus for λ -free higher-order logic (also called applicative first-order logic) [6]. Supporting partial applications and applied variables, this logic allows for terms such as \mathbf{fab} , \mathbf{fa} , \mathbf{f} , and \mathbf{xab} . To apply superposition to this logic, the term order must be generalized. For KBO, a suitable generalization is λ -free higher-order KBO ($\lambda\mathbf{fKBO}$) [3]. It is a ground-total and well-founded simplification order, and therefore a straight-forward generalization of superposition is refutationally complete—i.e., the generalized calculus will eventually find a proof for any given theorem. This approach has been implemented in the E prover [36].

In contrast, RPO’s generalization to λ -free higher-order terms, λ fRPO [9], is nonmonotonic—i.e. it lacks the property that $t > s$ implies $u[t] > u[s]$. Without monotonicity, the straight-forward generalization of superposition is not refutationally complete. In our work on superposition for λ -free higher-order logic, we have shown that performing additional inferences can recover refutational completeness for nonmonotonic orders. Our calculus for nonmonotonic orders has promising evaluation results, but the theory and implementation of the calculus is rather complex. We asked ourselves:

Is there an RPO-like ground-total and well-founded simplification order for lambda-free higher-order terms?

If “RPO-like” means that the order must coincide with RPO on the first-order fragment of lambda-free higher-order logic, then the answer is no, as the following example shows: If $g \succ f \succ b \succ a$, then $g\ b > f\ (g\ a)\ b$ by coincidence with first-order RPO, corresponding to $g(b) > f(g(a), b)$ in first-order syntax, but $g < f\ (g\ a)$ by the subterm property and hence $g\ b < f\ (g\ a)\ b$ by monotonicity, yielding a contradiction.

If “RPO-like” means that the order should merely resemble RPO, the answer is yes. One candidate is the applicative RPO, which is obtained by encoding λ -free higher-order terms applicatively into first-order logic via a binary symbol `app` representing application—e.g. $x\ a\ b$ as `app(app(x, a), b)`—and then using first-order RPO. However, with this approach the symbol `app` becomes pervasive, which undermines RPO’s principle of comparing the precedence of different symbols. Moreover, it is impossible to assign different extension orders such as the lexicographic or multiset extension to different function symbols because the only applied function symbol in the encoding is `app`.

This article presents an answer to our question that avoids the applicative encoding: the embedding path order (EPO¹). It supports different extension operators for different function symbols (Section 3). The main difference to RPO lies in using the notion of embeddings where RPO uses the notion of direct subterms (Section 4). EPO is a ground-total and well-founded simplification order and I have formally proved this property in Isabelle/HOL (Section 5). Thus EPO allows us to avoid the theoretical and implementational challenges that λ fRPO poses.

However, a good term order for superposition must also be efficient to compute. I have implemented EPO as a prototype in the superposition prover Zipperposition (Section 6). Its worst-case time complexity is quintic, and thus slower than for KBO and RPO, which can be computed in linear and quadratic time, respectively. I evaluate the use of EPO for superposition on TPTP [35] and Sledgehammer [32]

¹Beware that the unrelated exptime path order [19] has the same abbreviation.

benchmarks and compare it with λ FRPO, using our approach for nonmonotonic orders (Section 7). The results show that the approach with the nonmonotonic λ FRPO performs slightly better. Nonetheless, EPO offers a way to complement λ KBO with much less implementation effort in provers that currently support only monotonic orders, such as the E prover.

An earlier version of this article is part of my PhD thesis [5].

2 Preliminaries

We fix a set of variables \mathcal{V} and a nonempty (possibly infinite) set of symbols Σ . We reserve the names x, y, z for variables and a, b, c, f, g, h for symbols.

In untyped λ -free higher-order logic, a term is defined inductively as being either a variable, a symbol, or an application $s t$, where s and t are terms.

These terms are isomorphic to applicative terms [23]. We reserve the names t, s, v, u for terms and use \mathcal{T} to denote the set of all terms. Application is left-associative, i.e., $s t u = (s t) u$. Any term can be written as $\zeta \bar{t}_n$ using spine notation [13], where ζ is a nonapplication term, called *head*, and \bar{t}_n is a tuple of terms, called *arguments*. It represents the term $\zeta t_1 \dots t_n$. Here and elsewhere, \bar{t}_n or \bar{t} stands for the tuple (t_1, \dots, t_n) . We write $()$ for the empty tuple, t for the singleton tuple (t) , and $\bar{s} \cdot \bar{t}$ for the concatenation of the tuples \bar{s} and \bar{t} .

The *size* $|t|$ of a term t is inductively defined as 1 if $t \in \mathcal{V} \cup \Sigma$ and as $|t_1| + |t_2|$ if t is an application $t_1 t_2$. A *subterm* of a term t is inductively defined as being either t itself or, if t is an application $t_1 t_2$, a subterm of t_1 or of t_2 .

The embedding relation [1, Definition 5.4.2] is a generalization of the subterm relation: First, the embedding step relation \rightarrow_{emb} is inductively defined as follows. For any terms s, t , and t' , we have $t s \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} t$ and $t s \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} s$; and if $t \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} t'$, then $t s \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} t' s$ and $s t \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} s t'$. For example, $f a b c d \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} a b c d$, $f a b c d \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} f a c d$, and $f(g(h a) b) c \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} f(g h b) c$. Let the embedding relation \succeq_{emb} be the reflexive transitive closure of \rightarrow_{emb} .

Given a binary relation $>$, we write $<$ for its converse (i.e., $a < b \Leftrightarrow b > a$) and \geq for its reflexive closure (i.e., $b \geq a \Leftrightarrow b > a \vee b = a$). A binary relation $>$ on λ -free higher-order terms is a *simplification order* if it is irreflexive (i.e., $t \not> t$), is transitive (i.e., $u > t > s \Rightarrow u > s$), is monotonic (i.e., $t > s \Rightarrow ut > us \wedge tu > su$), is stable under substitutions (i.e., $t > s \Rightarrow t\sigma > s\sigma$), and has the subterm property (i.e., $t \geq s$ if s is a subterm of t). It is *ground-total* if for all distinct ground terms s and t either $t > s$ or $t < s$. It is *well founded* if there is no infinite descending chain $t_1 > t_2 > \dots$.

We view RPO as a term order on the first-order fragment of λ -free higher-order

terms, identifying first-order terms $f(\bar{t})$ with $f\bar{t}$. Let \succ be a well-founded total order on Σ . Then RPO is inductively defined as follows: $t >_{\text{rp}} s$ if any of the following conditions are met, where $t = g\bar{t}$ and $s = f\bar{s}$:

- R1.** $s \in \mathcal{V}$, $t \neq s$, and s occurs in t ;
- R2.** $t_i \geq_{\text{rp}} s$ for some i ;
- R3.** $g \succ f$ and $t >_{\text{rp}} s_i$ for all i ;
- R4.** $g = f$, $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{rp}}^f \bar{s}_m$, and $t >_{\text{rp}} s_i$ for all i .

where \gg_{rp}^f is an extension of $>_{\text{rp}}$ to tuples—e.g., the lexicographic extension or the multiset extension. I will present a more formal definition of extension operators $> \mapsto \gg$ in the following section.

3 Extension operators

In the spirit of RPO, EPO compares the heads of terms and, in case of equality, proceeds to compare the argument tuples. There is a variety of ways to extend a binary relation $>$ on an arbitrary set A to a binary relation \gg on tuples A^* , which we call extension operators. We define extension operators on binary relations, not on partial orders, because they are used in the definition of EPO at a point where we have not shown EPO to be a partial order yet.

Definition 1. We define the following properties of extension operators $> \mapsto \gg$, which are required for EPO to be a ground-total and well-founded simplification order. Here, given a function $h : A \rightarrow A$, we write $h(\bar{a})$ for the componentwise application of h to \bar{a} .

X1. Monotonicity:

$\bar{b} \gg_1 \bar{a}$ implies $\bar{b} \gg_2 \bar{a}$ if for all $a, b \in A$, $b >_1 a$ implies $b >_2 a$

X2. Preservation of stability:

$\bar{b} \gg \bar{a}$ implies $h(\bar{b}) \gg h(\bar{a})$ if for all $a, b \in \bar{a} \cup \bar{b}$, $b > a$ implies $h(b) > h(a)$

X3. Preservation of transitivity: \gg is transitive if $>$ is transitive

X4. Preservation of irreflexivity:

\gg is irreflexive if $>$ is irreflexive and transitive

X5. Preservation of well-foundedness: \gg is well founded if $>$ is well founded

- X6. Compatibility with tuple contexts:** $b > a$ implies $\bar{c} \cdot b \cdot \bar{d} \gg \bar{c} \cdot a \cdot \bar{d}$
- X7. Preservation of totality:** \gg is total if $>$ is total
- X8. Compatibility with prepending:** $\bar{b} \gg \bar{a}$ implies $c \cdot \bar{b} \gg c \cdot \bar{a}$
- X9. Compatibility with appending:** $\bar{b} \gg \bar{a}$ implies $\bar{b} \cdot c \gg \bar{a} \cdot c$
- X10. Minimality of the empty tuple:** $a \gg ()$ for all $a \in A$

The length-lexicographic extension operator, left-to-right or right-to-left, fulfills all these properties:

Definition 2. The *left-to-right length-lexicographic extension operator* $> \mapsto \gg^{\text{ltr}}$ is defined inductively as follows: $\bar{a}_m \gg^{\text{ltr}} \bar{b}_n$ if $m > n$; or $m = n > 0$ and $a_1 > b_1$; or $m = n > 0$, $a_1 = b_1$, and $(a_2, \dots, a_m) \gg^{\text{ltr}} (b_2, \dots, b_n)$. The *right-to-left length-lexicographic extension operator* $> \mapsto \gg^{\text{rtl}}$ is defined inductively as follows: $\bar{a}_m \gg^{\text{rtl}} \bar{b}_n$ if $m > n$; or $m = n > 0$ and $a_m > b_n$; or $m = n > 0$, $a_m = b_n$, and $(a_1, \dots, a_{m-1}) \gg^{\text{rtl}} (b_1, \dots, b_{n-1})$.

The multiset extension operator fulfills all properties except X7, but if combined with a lexicographic comparison as a tie-breaker, it fulfills all properties as well:

Definition 3. The *multiset extension operator with tie-breaker* $> \mapsto \gg^{\text{ms}}$ is defined as follows: $\bar{a} \gg^{\text{ms}} \bar{b}$ if the multiset containing the elements of \bar{a} is larger than the multiset containing the elements of \bar{b} with respect to Dershowitz and Manna's multiset order [18]; or if the two multisets are equal and $\bar{a} \gg^{\text{ltr}} \bar{b}$.

Blanchette et al. [9] give a more detailed account of different extension operators. Their list of properties is identical with the one above, except for X2, which they originally formulated differently but corrected in their technical report [8].

4 The order

Any simplification order has the embedding property, i.e., the property that $t \succeq_{\text{emb}} s$ implies $t \succeq s$ [1, Lemma 5.4.7]. The fundamental idea of EPO is to enforce the embedding property by replacing the notion of subterms used in the definition of RPO by the notion of embeddings. Performed naively, this causes issues with stability under substitution and with the time complexity of the order computation due to the large number of possible embedding steps. Both of these issues are addressed by EPO.

Definition 4 (EPO). Let \succ be a well-founded total order on Σ . For each $f \in \Sigma$, let $> \mapsto \gg^f$ be an extension operator satisfying the properties of Definition 1. The induced *embedding path order* $>_{\text{ep}}$ is inductively defined as follows: $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ if any of the following conditions is met, where $t = \xi \bar{t}_n$ and $s = \zeta \bar{s}_m$:

E1. $n > 0$ and $\text{chop}(t) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$

E2. $\xi, \zeta \in \Sigma$, $\xi \succ \zeta$, and either $m = 0$ or $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$

E3. $\xi, \zeta \in \Sigma$, $\xi = \zeta$, $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}_m$, and either $m = 0$ or $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$

E4. $\xi, \zeta \in \mathcal{V}$, $\xi = \zeta$, $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m$ for all $f \in \Sigma$, $n > 0$, and either $m = 0$ or $\text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$

Here, for a term $\xi \bar{t}_n$ with $n > 0$, we define $\text{chop}(\xi \bar{t}_n)$ as the term resulting from applying t_1 to the remaining arguments, i.e., $\text{chop}(\xi \bar{t}_n) = t_1 t_2 \dots t_n$. (For example, $\text{chop}(f(g a)(h b)) = g a(h b)$.)

The following examples illustrate the differences between RPO and EPO on first-order terms. We use the precedence $g \succ f \succ c \succ b \succ a$ and the left-to-right length-lexicographic extension for both orders.

$$\begin{array}{lll} f(g a) b <_{\text{rp}} g b & f(g a) c <_{\text{rp}} g b & g x y >_{\text{rp}} f y y \\ f(g a) b >_{\text{ep}} g b & f(g a) c >_{\text{ep}} g b & g x y \not>_{\text{ep}} f y y \end{array}$$

The first term pair illustrates that RPO does not have the embedding property, whereas EPO does. The relation $f(g a) b >_{\text{ep}} g b$ can be shown by applying E1. E1 requires $g a b >_{\text{ep}} g b$, which holds by E3. Finally we need E2 to show $g a b >_{\text{ep}} b$. The second term pair shows that there are further disagreements between the two orders, even if one term is not an embedding of the other. As above, $f(g a) c >_{\text{ep}} g b$ can be established by applying E1, followed by E3 and E2. The third term pair is comparable with RPO but incomparable with EPO. In general, EPO cannot judge a term to be smaller if it contains more occurrences of a variable. I conjecture that there are no first-order terms comparable with EPO but incomparable with RPO. In this sense, EPO is weaker than RPO on first-order terms.

4.1 Rationale of the Definition

The definition of EPO has been carefully designed to make EPO a ground-total and well-founded simplification order that can be computed in polynomial time with respect to the size of the compared terms.

Condition E1 enforces the embedding property in a similar way as RPO's condition R2 enforces the subterm property. This underlying idea gives EPO its name. A naive approach would be to test all embedding steps to enforce the embedding property, but it is sufficient to test only the embedding step *chop*, yielding a better computational complexity. The remaining conditions follow a similar structure as RPO, but contain subconditions on *chop* where RPO has subconditions on subterms.

To achieve stability under substitutions, it is essential to demand $\text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$ instead of $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$ in E4, as the following examples show. If $>_{\text{ep}}'$ is the relation obtained from $>_{\text{ep}}$ by replacing '*chop*(*t*)' by '*t*' in E4, then we have

$$x f f >_{\text{ep}}' x x, \text{ but } f y f f \not>_{\text{ep}}' f y (f y) \quad x f x >_{\text{ep}}' x (x f), \text{ but } y f f (y f) \not>_{\text{ep}}' y f (y f f)$$

Using $>_{\text{ep}}$, all of these pairs are incomparable.

In condition E4, it is crucial to check $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m$ for all $f \in \Sigma$. In contrast, λfKBO [3] and λfRPO [9] allow us to use a map *ghd* from variables to possible ground heads that might occur when a variable is instantiated. The corresponding condition in these orders then states ' $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m$ for all $f \in \text{ghd}(\zeta)$ '. For EPO, this approach cannot be used. For example, assume $\mathbf{b} \succ \mathbf{a}$, $\text{ghd}(x) = \{\mathbf{f}\}$, and that \mathbf{f} uses the left-to-right length-lexicographic extension. Then we would have $x \mathbf{b} \mathbf{a} > x \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}$ if we checked only the extension orders for $\text{ghd}(x)$. This contradicts stability under substitutions because, if \mathbf{g} uses the right-to-left length-lexicographic extension, $y \mathbf{g} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{a}$ and $y \mathbf{g} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}$ are incomparable, assuming $\text{ghd}(y) = \{\mathbf{f}\}$.

EPO is not a simplification order when (nonlength-)lexicographic extensions are used. With the left-to-right lexicographic extension, it is nonmonotonic because for $\mathbf{g} \succ \mathbf{f} \succ \mathbf{b} \succ \mathbf{a}$, we have $\mathbf{f} (\mathbf{g} \mathbf{a}) >_{\text{ep}} \mathbf{g}$ but $\mathbf{f} (\mathbf{g} \mathbf{a}) \mathbf{b} <_{\text{ep}} \mathbf{g} \mathbf{b}$. With the right-to-left lexicographic extension, it lacks stability under substitutions because $x \mathbf{f} > x$ but $\mathbf{f} y \mathbf{f} \not> \mathbf{f} y$. With the right-to-left lexicographic extension, it also lacks well-foundedness because for $\mathbf{f} \succ \mathbf{b} \succ \mathbf{a}$, we have $\mathbf{f} \mathbf{b} >_{\text{ep}} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{a} >_{\text{ep}} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{b} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a} >_{\text{ep}} \dots$.

4.2 In-Depth Example

The following example illustrates the benefits of EPO for superposition. Consider the following term rewriting system:

$$f x \text{ Nil} \xrightarrow{1} x \quad f x (A y) \xrightarrow{2} f (A (B x)) y \quad f x (B y) \xrightarrow{3} f (B (A x)) y$$

This rewriting system can be interpreted as a definition of a function on strings. In this interpretation, Nil represents the empty string, and chains of applications of the functions A and B to Nil represent strings over the alphabet $\{A, B\}$; thus, $A (B (B \text{ Nil}))$ represents the string ABB. The function \mathbf{f} takes two such strings,

reverses the second string, replaces in the resulting string each A by AB and each B by BA , and finally appends the first string.

All three rules are orientable by EPO with the right-to-left length-lexicographic extension for f and precedence $f \succ A, B$. To show that rule 1 can be oriented, we apply E1. To do so, we need to prove $x \text{ Nil} >_{\text{ep}} x$, which holds by E4. To show that rule 2 can be oriented, we apply E3. To do so, we need to prove $(x, A y) \gg_{\text{ep}}^f ((A (B x)), y)$ and $f x (A y) >_{\text{ep}} A (B x) y$. The former holds by the definition of the right-to-left length-lexicographic extension and by E1. For the latter, we apply E2. To show $f x (A y) >_{\text{ep}} B x y$, we apply E2 again. To show $f x (A y) >_{\text{ep}} x y$, we apply E1. To show $x (A y) >_{\text{ep}} x y$, we apply E4. Finally, $A y >_{\text{ep}} y$ holds by E1. The proof for rule 3 is analogous.

To my knowledge, the literature contains no other ground-total simplification order for λ -free higher-order terms that can orient all three of these rules. Rules 2 and 3 are not orientable by applicative KBO or applicative RPO. With applicative KBO, the weight of the right-hand sides is always too large. With applicative RPO, too many heads are the application symbol `app`, preventing us from finding an appropriate precedence. With λ fKBO [3], one of the two rules 2 and 3 can be oriented by assigning either A or B zero weight, but the system as a whole is not orientable with this order either. With λ fRPO [9], we can orient all three rules, but λ fRPO is not a simplification order.

This rewriting system suggests that EPO with a right-to-left length-lexicographic extension is generally stronger than left-to-right. If the two arguments of f were swapped, one would intuitively attempt to use the left-to-right extension for f , but fail because $f (A y) x \not>_{\text{ep}} y (A (B x))$. For this system with the arguments of f swapped, applicative RPO can orient all three rules. However, swapping arguments cannot be used as a general approach to orient rewriting systems if the affected function appears unapplied.

The term order's ability to orient equations in the right way can have considerable effects on the performance of superposition provers. Consider the rewrite rules above, recast as equations, and the negated conjecture given below, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} f x \text{ Nil} &\approx x & f x (A y) &\approx f (A (B x)) y & f x (B y) &\approx f (B (A x)) y \\ & & f c (AB)^{k+1} &\not\approx B (A (f c ((AB)^k A))) & & \end{aligned}$$

where the abbreviation $(AB)^{k+1}$ stands for $A (B \dots (A (B \text{ Nil})) \dots)$ and $(AB)^k A$ for $A (B \dots (A \text{ Nil}) \dots)$. Using the EPO above that can orient the equations left to right, superposition provers can solve this problem by simplification rules only. Simplification rules are much more efficient than inference rules because simplifications replace clauses and do not add new ones. Using an order that can orient only the

first equation from left to right, we would need at least k inferences; using an order that can orient the first equation and only one of the other two, we would need at least $k/2$ inferences.

5 Properties of the order

EPO fulfills all the properties of a ground-total and well-founded simplification order. The proofs in this section have been developed in Isabelle/HOL and published in the Archive of Formal Proofs [4]. They are inspired by the corresponding proofs about λ fRPO [9], which in turn were adapted from Baader and Nipkow [1] and Zantema [37].

Theorem 5 (Transitivity). $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ and $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ implies $u >_{\text{ep}} s$.

Proof. By well-founded induction on the multiset $\{|u|, |t|, |s|\}$ with respect to the multiset extension [18] of $>$ on \mathbb{N} . Let $u = \psi \bar{u}_r$, $t = \xi \bar{t}_n$ and $s = \zeta \bar{s}_m$.

If $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ is derived by E1, then $r > 0$ and $\text{chop}(u) \geq_{\text{ep}} t$. Applying the induction hypothesis to $\text{chop}(u)$, t , s , it follows that $\text{chop}(u) >_{\text{ep}} s$ and hence $u >_{\text{ep}} s$ by E1.

If $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ is derived by E2 or E3 and $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E1, then $n > 0$ and $u >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$. Applying the induction hypothesis to u , $\text{chop}(t)$, s , it follows that $u >_{\text{ep}} s$.

If $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ is derived by E4 and $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E1, then $r > 0$, $n > 0$, and $\text{chop}(u) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$. By applying the induction hypothesis to $\text{chop}(u)$, $\text{chop}(t)$, s , we get $\text{chop}(u) >_{\text{ep}} s$. By E1, it follows that $u >_{\text{ep}} s$.

If $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ and $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ are derived by E2 and E2, by E2 and E3, or by E3 and E2, respectively, then $\psi \succ \zeta$ and $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. If $m = 0$, we can apply E2 directly to obtain $u >_{\text{ep}} s$. If $m > 0$, by the induction hypothesis for u , t , $\text{chop}(s)$, it follows from $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ and $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$ that $u >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. Then we can apply E2 to obtain $u >_{\text{ep}} s$.

If $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ and $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ are both derived by E3, then $\psi = \xi = \zeta \in \Sigma$, $\bar{u} \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\xi} \bar{t}$, $\bar{t} \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}$, and either $m = 0$ or $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. By the induction hypothesis and by preservation of transitivity (property X3) on the set consisting of the elements of \bar{u} , \bar{t} and \bar{s} , it follows that $\bar{u} \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}$. If $m = 0$, we obtain $u >_{\text{ep}} s$ directly by E3. If $m > 0$, we have $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$ and by applying the induction hypothesis to u , t , $\text{chop}(s)$, it follows that $u >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. By E3, we have $u >_{\text{ep}} s$.

If $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ and $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ are both derived by E4, then $\psi = \xi = \zeta \in \Sigma$, $\bar{u} \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{t}$, $\bar{t} \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}$ for all $f \in \Sigma$, $r > 0$, $n > 0$, $\text{chop}(u) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t)$, and either $m = 0$ or $\text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. As above, by the induction hypothesis and by preservation of transitivity (property X3) on the set consisting of the elements of \bar{u} , \bar{t} and \bar{s} , it follows

that $\bar{u} \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}$ for all $f \in \Sigma$. If $m = 0$, we obtain $u >_{\text{ep}} s$ directly by E4. If $m > 0$, we have $\text{chop}(u) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. By applying the induction hypothesis to $\text{chop}(u)$, $\text{chop}(t)$, $\text{chop}(s)$, it follows that $\text{chop}(u) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. By E4, we have $u >_{\text{ep}} s$.

If one of the inequalities $u >_{\text{ep}} t$ and $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E2 or E3, the other cannot be derived by E4 because ξ must be either a variable or a symbol. \square

Theorem 6 (Irreflexivity). $s \not>_{\text{ep}} s$.

Proof. By strong induction on $|s|$. We suppose that $s >_{\text{ep}} s$ and derive a contradiction. Let $s = \zeta \bar{s}_m$.

If $s >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E1, then $m > 0$ and $\text{chop}(s) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$. From the definition of chop , it is clear that $\text{chop}(s) \neq s$. Hence, $\text{chop}(s) >_{\text{ep}} s$. By E1, we have $s >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. By transitivity (Theorem 5), it follows that $\text{chop}(s) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$, which contradicts the induction hypothesis.

If $s >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E2, we have $\zeta \succ \zeta$, in contradiction to \succ being a total order.

If $s >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E3 or E4, we have $\bar{s} \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}$ for some $f \in \Sigma$. By preservation of irreflexivity (property X4) on the set consisting of the elements of \bar{s} and by transitivity of $>_{\text{ep}}$ (Theorem 5), it follows that $s' >_{\text{ep}} s'$ for some $s' \in \bar{s}$. This contradicts the induction hypothesis. \square

Lemma 7. $t u >_{\text{ep}} u$.

Proof. By strong induction on $|t|$. If $|t| = 1$, then $\text{chop}(t u) = u$ and thus $t u >_{\text{ep}} u$ by E1. If $|t| > 1$, then $\text{chop}(t u) = \text{chop}(t) u$, and by the induction hypothesis $\text{chop}(t) u >_{\text{ep}} u$. Thus $t u >_{\text{ep}} u$ by E1. \square

Lemma 8. $t u >_{\text{ep}} t$.

Proof. By strong induction on $|t|$. Let $t = \xi \bar{t}_n$.

If $\xi \in \Sigma$, we apply E3. We have $\bar{t}_n \cdot u \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\xi} \bar{t}_n$ by properties X8 and X10. If $n \neq 0$, we apply the induction hypothesis on $\text{chop}(t)$ to obtain $\text{chop}(t u) = \text{chop}(t) u >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t)$, and we apply E1 to obtain $t u >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t)$, as required for E3.

If $\xi \in \mathcal{V}$, we apply E4. We have $\bar{t}_n \cdot u \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{t}_n$ for all f by properties X8 and X10. If $n \neq 0$, we apply the induction hypothesis on $\text{chop}(t)$ to obtain $\text{chop}(t) u >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t)$. Thus, $\text{chop}(t u) = \text{chop}(t) u >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t)$ as required for E4. \square

Theorem 9 (Subterm Property). *For all subterms s of a term t , we have $t \geq_{\text{ep}} s$.*

Proof. Follows from Lemmas 7 and 8. \square

Lemma 10 (Compatibility with Functions). *If $v >_{\text{ep}} u$, then $s v >_{\text{ep}} s u$.*

Proof. By induction on $|s|$.

Let $s = \zeta \bar{s}$. Depending on whether $\zeta \in \Sigma$ or $\zeta \in \mathcal{V}$, we show $s v >_{\text{ep}} s u$ by applying E3 or E4. By compatibility with tuple contexts (property X6), $v >_{\text{ep}} u$ implies $\bar{s} \cdot v \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s} \cdot u$ for all $f \in \Sigma$. Obviously, the tuples $\bar{s} \cdot v$ and $\bar{s} \cdot u$ are not empty. So it remains to show $s v >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s u)$ if $\zeta \in \Sigma$ or $\text{chop}(s v) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s u)$ if $\zeta \in \mathcal{V}$. By E1, it suffices to show $\text{chop}(s v) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s u)$ in both cases.

If $\bar{s} = ()$, then $\text{chop}(s v) = v >_{\text{ep}} u = \text{chop}(s u)$ by assumption. Otherwise, $\text{chop}(s v) = \text{chop}(s) v >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s) u = \text{chop}(s u)$ by the induction hypothesis. \square

Lemma 11. *If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ and $v \geq_{\text{ep}} u$, then $t v >_{\text{ep}} s u$.*

Proof. By induction on $|t| + |s|$ and a case distinction on how $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived. Let $t = \xi \bar{t}_n$ and $s = \zeta \bar{s}_m$.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E1, then $\text{chop}(t) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$. By E1, $t v >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t v) = \text{chop}(t) v$. So it suffices to show $\text{chop}(t) v \geq_{\text{ep}} s u$. If $\text{chop}(t) = s$, this follows from Lemma 10. Otherwise, we have $\text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} s$ and hence $\text{chop}(t) v >_{\text{ep}} s u$ holds by the induction hypothesis.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E2, then $\xi \succ \zeta$ and either $m = 0$ or $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. To derive $t v >_{\text{ep}} s u$ using E2, it remains to show $t v >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s u)$. If $m = 0$, then $\text{chop}(s u) = u$. Therefore, by the subterm property (Theorem 9), $t v >_{\text{ep}} v \geq_{\text{ep}} u = \text{chop}(s u)$. If $m > 0$, then $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$, and hence by the induction hypothesis, $t v >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s) u = \text{chop}(s u)$.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E3 or E4, we need to show that $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m$ implies $\bar{t}_n \cdot v \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m \cdot u$ for all $f \in \Sigma$. We have $\bar{t}_n \cdot v \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m \cdot v$ by compatibility with appending (property X9). If $v = u$, we are done. Otherwise, since $\bar{s}_m \cdot v \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m \cdot u$ by compatibility with tuple contexts (property X6), it follows that $\bar{t}_n \cdot v \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m \cdot u$ by preservation of transitivity (property X3) and transitivity of $>_{\text{ep}}$ (Theorem 5).

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E3, we can apply E3 to derive $t v >_{\text{ep}} s u$. The condition $t v >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s u)$ can be shown as we did for E2 above.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E4, we can apply E4 to derive $t v >_{\text{ep}} s u$. The proof for the condition $\text{chop}(t v) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s u)$ is similar to the argument made for E2 above. \square

Theorem 12 (Monotonicity). *If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$, then $u t >_{\text{ep}} u s$ and $t u >_{\text{ep}} s u$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 10 and 11. \square

Theorem 13 (Embedding Property). *$t \succeq_{\text{emb}} s$ implies $t \geq_{\text{ep}} s$.*

Proof. By induction on $t \succeq_{\text{emb}} s$, it suffices to assume that $t \succeq_{\text{emb}} s$ consists of a single step $t \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} s$. By Theorems 9 and 12, we then have $t >_{\text{ep}} s$. \square

Theorem 14 (Stability under Substitutions). *If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$, then $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} s\sigma$.*

Proof. By well-founded induction on the multiset $\{|t|, |s|\}$ with respect to the multiset extension [18] of $>$ on \mathbb{N} , followed by a case distinction on how $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived. Let $t = \xi \bar{t}_n$ and $s = \zeta \bar{s}_m$.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E1, then $\text{chop}(t) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$. By the induction hypothesis, $\text{chop}(t)\sigma \geq_{\text{ep}} s\sigma$. Since $t\sigma \rightarrow_{\text{emb}} \text{chop}(t)\sigma$, we have $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(t)\sigma$ by the embedding property (Theorem 13). Hence, by transitivity $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} s\sigma$.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E2, then $\xi, \zeta \in \Sigma$, $\xi \succ \zeta$, and either $m = 0$ or $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. We show $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} s\sigma$ by applying E2. Since $\xi, \zeta \in \Sigma$, the head of $t\sigma$ is ξ , the head of $s\sigma$ is ζ , and the number of arguments of $s\sigma$ is m . Hence, it only remains to show that $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$ implies $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s\sigma)$, which follows from the induction hypothesis and from $\text{chop}(s)\sigma = \text{chop}(s\sigma)$.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E3, then $\xi = \zeta \in \Sigma$, $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}_m$, and either $m = 0$ or $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. Since $\xi, \zeta \in \Sigma$, the head of $t\sigma$ is ξ , the head of $s\sigma$ is ζ , and $\bar{t}_n\sigma$ and $\bar{s}_m\sigma$ are the respective argument tuples of $t\sigma$ and $s\sigma$. By the induction hypothesis and preservation of stability (property X2) on the set of elements of \bar{t}_n and \bar{s}_m , we have $\bar{t}_n\sigma \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}_m\sigma$. We apply E3 to show $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} s\sigma$. It remains to show that $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$ implies $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s\sigma)$, which follows from the induction hypothesis and from $\text{chop}(s)\sigma = \text{chop}(s\sigma)$.

If $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ is derived by E4, then $\xi = \zeta \in \mathcal{V}$, $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\mathbf{f}} \bar{s}_m$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in \Sigma$, $n > 0$, and either $m = 0$ or $\text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$. We will show that $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)$ for all u with $|u| \leq |\zeta\sigma|$. For $u = \zeta\sigma$, it then follows that $t\sigma >_{\text{ep}} s\sigma$. We show this by induction on $|u|$. We will refer to this induction as the inner induction and to the induction on the multiset $\{|t|, |s|\}$ as the outer induction.

We have to show $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)$. We apply E3 or E4 to do so, depending on whether the head of u is a symbol or a variable. We write $u = \psi \bar{u}_r$.

First, we show that $\bar{u}_r \cdot (\bar{t}_n\sigma) \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\mathbf{f}} \bar{u}_r \cdot (\bar{s}_m\sigma)$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in \Sigma$. As above, by the outer induction hypothesis and preservation of stability (property X2) on the set of elements of \bar{t}_n and \bar{s}_m , we have $\bar{t}_n\sigma \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\mathbf{f}} \bar{s}_m\sigma$. Then $\bar{u}_r \cdot (\bar{t}_n\sigma) \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\mathbf{f}} \bar{u}_r \cdot (\bar{s}_m\sigma)$ follows by compatibility with prepending (property X8).

If $m = 0$ and $r = 0$, we can apply E3 or E4 directly to show $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)$.

If $r > 0$, then $\text{chop}(u(\bar{t}_n\sigma)) = \text{chop}(u)(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(u)(\bar{s}_m\sigma) = \text{chop}(u(\bar{s}_m\sigma))$ by the inner induction hypothesis. If $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$, we can then apply E4 to obtain $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)$. Otherwise, $\psi \in \Sigma$, and we can apply E1 to obtain $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(u(\bar{s}_m\sigma))$ and then E3 to obtain $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)$.

If $m > 0$ and $r = 0$, then we have $\text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$, $\text{chop}(u(\bar{t}_n\sigma)) = \text{chop}(t)\sigma$, and $\text{chop}(u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)) = \text{chop}(s)\sigma$. By the outer induction hypothesis, $\text{chop}(t)\sigma >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)\sigma$, i.e., $\text{chop}(u(\bar{t}_n\sigma)) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(u(\bar{s}_m\sigma))$. As above, if $\psi \in \mathcal{V}$, we can then

apply E4 to obtain $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)$. Otherwise, $\psi \in \Sigma$, and we can apply E1 to obtain $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} \mathit{chop}(u(\bar{s}_m\sigma))$ and then E3 to obtain $u(\bar{t}_n\sigma) >_{\text{ep}} u(\bar{s}_m\sigma)$.

This concludes the inner and the outer induction. \square

Theorem 15 (Ground Totality). *For ground terms t and s , we have $t <_{\text{ep}} s$, $t = s$, or $t >_{\text{ep}} s$.*

Proof. By well-founded induction on the multiset $\{|t|, |s|\}$ with respect to the multiset extension [18] of $>$ on \mathbb{N} . Let $t = \xi \bar{t}_n$ and $s = \zeta \bar{s}_m$. Then $\xi, \zeta \in \Sigma$ because t and s are ground.

If $n > 0$ and $\mathit{chop}(t) \not\geq_{\text{ep}} s$, then by the induction hypothesis $\mathit{chop}(t) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$ and hence $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ by E1. Thus we can assume that either $n = 0$ or $s >_{\text{ep}} \mathit{chop}(t)$. Analogously, we can assume that either $m = 0$ or $t >_{\text{ep}} \mathit{chop}(s)$.

If $\xi \succ \zeta$ or $\xi \prec \zeta$, we have $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ or $t <_{\text{ep}} s$ by E2. Otherwise, we have $\xi = \zeta$ by totality of \succ . If either $\bar{t} \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}$ or $\bar{t} \ll_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}$, then we have $t >_{\text{ep}} s$ or $t <_{\text{ep}} s$ by E3. By the induction hypothesis and preservation of totality (property X7) on the set of elements of \bar{s} and \bar{t} , if $\bar{t} \not\gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}$ and $\bar{t} \not\ll_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}$, then $\bar{t} = \bar{s}$ and hence $t = s$. \square

Theorem 16 (Well-Foundedness). *The order $>_{\text{ep}}$ is well founded.*

Proof. For finite signatures, simplification orders are always well-founded [1, Proposition 6.3.15(ii)]. For infinite signatures, we need to prove well-foundedness. A short proof is to invoke Theorem 5.3 of Middeldorp and Zantema [30]. (Note that their definition of a simplification order differs from mine.) In the Isabelle/HOL formalization, it was more convenient to use the following direct proof.

We suppose that there exists an infinite descending chain $s_0 >_{\text{ep}} s_1 >_{\text{ep}} \dots$ and derive a contradiction. We use a minimal counterexample argument [20].

A term s is *bad* if there is an infinite descending $>_{\text{ep}}$ -chain from s . Other terms are *good*. Without loss of generality, we assume that s_0 has minimal size among all bad terms and that s_{i+1} has minimal size among all bad terms u with $s_i >_{\text{ep}} u$.

For each i , let $U_i = \{u \mid s_i \triangleright_{\text{emb}} u\}$, where $\triangleright_{\text{emb}}$ is the irreflexive counterpart of $\triangleright_{\text{emb}}$. Let $U = \bigcup_i U_i$. All terms in U are good: If there existed a bad $u \in U_0$, then $|s_0| > |u|$, contradicting the minimality of s_0 . If there existed a bad $u \in U_{i+1}$ for some i , then $s_i >_{\text{ep}} s_{i+1} >_{\text{ep}} u$ by the embedding property (Theorem 13), contradicting the minimality of s_{i+1} .

Only conditions E2, E3, and E4 can have been used to derive $s_i >_{\text{ep}} s_{i+1}$. If E1 was used, then $\mathit{chop}(s_i) \geq_{\text{ep}} s_{i+1} >_{\text{ep}} s_{i+2}$. But then there would be an infinite descending chain $\mathit{chop}(s_i) >_{\text{ep}} s_{i+2} >_{\text{ep}} s_{i+3} >_{\text{ep}} \dots$ from $\mathit{chop}(s_i)$, contradicting the goodness of $\mathit{chop}(s_i) \in U$.

E2 can have been used only finitely many times in the chain since E3 and E4 preserve the head and E2 makes the head smaller with respect to the well-founded relation \succ . Hence, there is a number k such that the entire chain $s_k >_{\text{ep}} s_{k+1} >_{\text{ep}} \dots$ has been derived by E3 and E4. Let $s_i = \zeta \bar{u}_i$ (where contrary to our usual convention the indices of \bar{u}_i identify the tuple and do not denote its length). Then we have an infinite chain $\bar{u}_k \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{u}_{k+1} \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \dots$ for some f . All elements of these tuples are in U because each element of \bar{u}_i is embedded in s_i . However, since all elements of U are good, $>_{\text{ep}}$ is well founded on U . By preservation of well-foundedness (property X5), \gg_{ep}^f is well founded on U^* , which contradicts the existence of the above \gg_{ep}^f -chain. \square

6 Implementation

I implemented EPO in the Zipperposition prover. Zipperposition [14, 15] is an open source² superposition-based theorem prover for first- and higher-order logic written in OCaml. In previous work [7], together with colleagues I extended it with refutationally complete modes for λ -free higher order logic, also known as applicative first-order logic. We will focus on the mode that performed best in the evaluation of that paper, the “nonpurifying intensional variant”. It is designed to deal with nonmonotonic orders such as λ FRPO, but falls back to a simpler calculus with monotonic orders, such as λ fKBO or EPO.

The pseudocode of the prototype implementation of EPO is given in Figure 1. As usual in superposition provers, the procedure compares two terms in both directions, yielding one of the answers `GreaterThan`, `Equal`, `LessThan`, or `Incomparable`. When the pseudocode refers to $>_{\text{ep}}$, \geq_{ep} , and \gg_{ep}^f , this is to be interpreted in terms of the function `epo`. The syntax ‘ $\xi \bar{t}_n$ as t ’ in the arguments of function definitions means that t denotes the entire term, ξ denotes its head, and \bar{t}_n denotes its arguments.

It is crucial to the performance of this implementation to use memoization in the form of a cache on the function `epo`. For example, to compute that $f^m x \not\leq_{\text{ep}} f^n y$ for $m \leq n$, we need at least 4^m calls to `epo` if the cache is inactive. With a cache however, only $(m+1)(n+1)$ of these calls to `epo` have to be computed; the other return values can be found in the cache. More generally, the following lemma holds:

Lemma 17. *To calculate the order of two terms t and s , the pseudocode in Figure 1 needs at most $\text{depth}(t) \cdot \text{depth}(s) \cdot |t| \cdot |s|$ distinct calls to `epo`. Here, the depth of a term $\zeta \bar{u}_m$ is 1 if $m = 0$ and $\max_{u \in \bar{u}}(\text{depth}(u)) + 1$ otherwise.*

Proof. We define a set S_t that overapproximates the set of all embeddings of t that may be involved in computing the order of t with some other term.

²<https://github.com/sneeuwballen/zipperposition>

```

epo( $\xi \bar{t}_n$  as  $t$ ,  $\zeta \bar{s}_m$  as  $s$ ) =
  if  $t = s$  then Equal
  elif  $t \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $s \in \mathcal{V}$  then Incomparable
  elif  $t \in \mathcal{V}$  then (if  $t$  occurs in  $s$  then LessThan else Incomparable)
  elif  $s \in \mathcal{V}$  then (if  $s$  occurs in  $t$  then GreaterThan else Incomparable)
  else
    if  $\xi \succ \zeta$  then  $\text{check}_{E2,E3}(t, s)$ 
    elif  $\xi \prec \zeta$  then  $\text{check}_{E2,E3}^{\text{inv}}(t, s)$ 
    elif  $\xi = \zeta$  and  $\zeta \in \Sigma$  then
      if  $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}_m$  then  $\text{check}_{E2,E3}(t, s)$ 
      elif  $\bar{t}_n \ll_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}_m$  then  $\text{check}_{E2,E3}^{\text{inv}}(t, s)$ 
      else  $\text{check}_{E1}(t, s)$ 
    elif  $\xi = \zeta$  and  $\zeta \in \mathcal{V}$  then
      if  $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m$  for all  $f \in \Sigma$  and  $n > 0$  then  $\text{check}_{E4}(t, s)$ 
      elif  $\bar{t}_n \ll_{\text{ep}}^f \bar{s}_m$  for all  $f \in \Sigma$  and  $m > 0$  then  $\text{check}_{E4}^{\text{inv}}(t, s)$ 
      else  $\text{check}_{E1}(t, s)$ 
    else  $\text{check}_{E1}(t, s)$ 

 $\text{check}_{E1}(\xi \bar{t}_n$  as  $t$ ,  $\zeta \bar{s}_m$  as  $s$ ) =
  if  $n > 0$  and  $\text{chop}(t) \geq_{\text{ep}} s$  then GreaterThan
  elif  $m > 0$  and  $t \leq_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$  then LessThan
  else Incomparable

 $\text{check}_{E2,E3}(\xi \bar{t}_n$  as  $t$ ,  $\zeta \bar{s}_m$  as  $s$ ) =
  if  $m = 0$  or  $t >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$  then GreaterThan else  $\text{check}_{E1}(t, s)$ 

 $\text{check}_{E2,E3}^{\text{inv}}(\xi \bar{t}_n$  as  $t$ ,  $\zeta \bar{s}_m$  as  $s$ ) =
  if  $n = 0$  or  $\text{chop}(t) <_{\text{ep}} s$  then LessThan else  $\text{check}_{E1}(t, s)$ 

 $\text{check}_{E4}(\xi \bar{t}_n$  as  $t$ ,  $\zeta \bar{s}_m$  as  $s$ ) =
  if  $m = 0$  or  $\text{chop}(t) >_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$  then GreaterThan else  $\text{check}_{E1}(t, s)$ 

 $\text{check}_{E4}^{\text{inv}}(\xi \bar{t}_n$  as  $t$ ,  $\zeta \bar{s}_m$  as  $s$ ) =
  if  $n = 0$  or  $\text{chop}(t) <_{\text{ep}} \text{chop}(s)$  then LessThan else  $\text{check}_{E1}(t, s)$ 
    
```

Figure 1: Pseudocode of the EPO implementation

To this end, let $\triangleright_{\text{arg}}$ be the relation defined by $\zeta \bar{u}_n \triangleright_{\text{arg}} u_i$ for all terms $\zeta \bar{u}_n$ and all i . Let $\triangleright_{\text{chop}}$ be the relation defined by $\zeta \bar{u}_n \triangleright_{\text{chop}} \text{chop}(\zeta \bar{u}_n)$ for all terms $\zeta \bar{u}_n$ with $n > 0$. Finally, let S_t be the set of all terms u such that $t (\triangleright_{\text{arg}} \cup \triangleright_{\text{chop}})^* u$. In other words, S_t is inductively defined as follows: Let $t \in S_t$. For any term $\zeta \bar{u}_n \in S_t$, let $\text{chop}(\zeta \bar{u}_n) \in S_t$ and $u_i \in S_t$ for all i .

Inspecting the pseudocode, it is obvious that S_t and S_s together overapproximate all terms that are involved in computing the order for the two terms t and s .

In a derivation of $(\triangleright_{\text{arg}} \cup \triangleright_{\text{chop}})^*$, any $\triangleright_{\text{chop}}$ step before a $\triangleright_{\text{arg}}$ step can be eliminated. More precisely, we show that $(\triangleright_{\text{arg}} \cup \triangleright_{\text{chop}})^* = (\triangleright_{\text{arg}}^* \circ \triangleright_{\text{chop}}^*)$ by proving that $(\triangleright_{\text{chop}} \circ \triangleright_{\text{arg}}) \subseteq (\triangleright_{\text{arg}}^*)$. We assume that $w \triangleright_{\text{chop}} v \triangleright_{\text{arg}} u$ for some terms w , v , and u . Let $w = \zeta \bar{w}_n$. Then $v = \text{chop}(\zeta \bar{w}_n) = w_1 w_2 \dots w_n$. Let $w_1 = \xi \bar{v}_n$. Then $v = \xi \bar{v}_n w_2 \dots w_n$. Hence $u \in \bar{v}_n$ or $u \in \{w_2, \dots, w_n\}$. In the first case, we have $w \triangleright_{\text{arg}} w_1 \triangleright_{\text{arg}} u$; In the second case $w \triangleright_{\text{arg}} u$. Either way, $w (\triangleright_{\text{arg}}^*) u$, which is what we needed to show.

Hence, S_t is the set of all terms v such that $t (\triangleright_{\text{arg}}^* \circ \triangleright_{\text{chop}}^*) v$. Therefore, we can overapproximate the size of S_t as follows:

$$|S_t| \leq \sum_{u \in \mathcal{T}, t \triangleright_{\text{arg}}^* u} |\{v \mid u \triangleright_{\text{chop}}^* v\}| \leq \sum_{u \in \mathcal{T}, t \triangleright_{\text{arg}}^* u} |u| \leq \text{depth}(t) \cdot |t|$$

The last inequality holds because for any number of steps k ,

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{T}, t \triangleright_{\text{arg}}^k u} |u| \leq |t|$$

and the number of $\triangleright_{\text{arg}}$ steps from t is bounded by $\text{depth}(t)$.

Since S_t and S_s together overapproximate all terms that are involved in computing the order for the two terms t and s , we can overapproximate the number of distinct calls to epo by $|S_t \times S_s| = |S_t| \cdot |S_s| \leq \text{depth}(t) \cdot |t| \cdot \text{depth}(s) \cdot |s|$. \square

We can use this lemma to derive the computational complexity of epo . The following theorem is stated only for the length-lexicographic extension operators since other extension operators may have a higher computational complexity.

Theorem 18. *For each $f \in \Sigma$, let $> \mapsto \gg^f$ be either the left-to-right or the right-to-left length-lexicographic extension operator. For terms t and s , the computational complexity of $\text{epo}(t, s)$ as given in Figure 1 is $O(\text{depth}(t) \cdot \text{depth}(s) \cdot |t| \cdot |s| \cdot (|t| + |s|))$ if recursive calls are cached.*

Proof. Let $R(t, s)$ be the set of term pairs (v, u) , for which $\text{epo}(t, s)$ triggers directly or indirectly a call to $\text{epo}(v, u)$. Let $C(v, u)$ be the complexity of $\text{epo}(v, u)$ assuming

$O(|v| + |u|)$ for all recursive calls. Then the computational complexity of $\text{epo}(t, s)$ is

$$O\left(\sum_{(v,u) \in R(t,s)} C(v,u)\right) \quad (*)$$

We assume $O(|v| + |u|)$ for the recursive calls in the definition of $C(v, u)$ because each recursive call is either the first one for this argument pair and therefore counted by another summand of the sum above, or it is not the first one for this argument pair and can therefore be retrieved from the cache in $O(|v| + |u|)$. (Zipperposition can retrieve the result from the cache even in constant time because it uses hash consing for terms.)

To determine $C(v, u)$, we analyze the implementation in Figure 1, assuming that all recursive calls are linear. Retrieving a result from the cache, searching for occurrences of a given variable in a term, computing *chiop*, counting the number of arguments of a term, and iterating through the arguments for the length-lexicographic comparison are $O(|v| + |u|)$. All other operations are $O(1)$. Hence, $C(v, u)$ is $O(|v| + |u|)$. Since the term sizes do not increase in recursive calls, $C(v, u)$ is also $O(|t| + |s|)$ for all $(v, u) \in R(t, s)$. By Lemma 17, $|R(t, s)| \leq \text{depth}(t) \cdot \text{depth}(s) \cdot |t| \cdot |s|$. Hence, by (*), the computational complexity of $\text{epo}(t, s)$ is $O(\text{depth}(t) \cdot \text{depth}(s) \cdot |t| \cdot |s| \cdot (|t| + |s|))$. \square

Compared with first-order KBO or RPO, this is rather slow. Löchner [27, 28] showed that, with a lexicographic extension, KBO can be computed in $O(|t| + |s|)$ and RPO in $O(|t| \cdot |s|)$. RPO can be implemented so efficiently because the computation of the lexicographic order of the arguments, i.e., computing $\bar{t}_n \gg_{\text{ep}}^{\zeta} \bar{s}_m$, can be merged with testing other conditions, i.e., the condition corresponding to $\text{check}_{E2, E3}(t, s)$. It is an open question whether a similar optimization is possible for EPO, although it is definitely not as straightforward as for RPO.

7 Evaluation

The following evaluation compares the prototype implementation of EPO with other orders in Zipperposition. It was performed with a CPU time limit of 300 s on StarExec Iowa nodes equipped with Intel Xeon E5-2609 0 CPUs clocked at 2.40 GHz. The raw evaluation results are available online and reproducible.³

From the TPTP [35], 665 higher-order problems in THF format were used, containing both monomorphic and polymorphic problems and excluding problems

³<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3992684>

that contain arithmetic, tuples, the `$distinct` predicate, or the `$ite` symbol, as well as problems whose clausal normal form falls outside the λ -free fragment.

The Sledgehammer (SH) benchmarks, corresponding to the Isabelle’s Judgment Day problems [12], were regenerated to target λ -free higher-order logic, encoding λ -expressions as λ -lifted supercombinators [29]. The SH benchmarks comprise 1253 problems, each including 256 Isabelle facts.

Besides EPO, I evaluate λ fRPO, λ fKBO, and their applicative counterparts (appRPO, appKBO). Each of the orders were used twice, once using the left-to-right length-lexicographic extension (LTR) and once using the right-to-left length-lexicographic extension (RTL) for all symbols. In principle, EPO also allows for different extension operators for different symbols, but it is unclear how to design appropriate heuristics. For all orders, I use the inverse frequency of symbols as precedence. On first-order benchmarks, λ fRPO and λ fKBO coincide with first-order RPO and KBO. The calculus used for EPO, λ fRPO, and λ fKBO is the intensional non-purifying variant of the calculus described in my earlier work [7]. For the monotonic orders EPO and λ fKBO, the calculus degrades to essentially first-order superposition, with the addition of an argument congruence rule that adds arguments of partially applied functions. In the case of the nonmonotonic order λ fRPO, the calculus performs additional superposition inferences onto variables to remain complete, which is why we would generally expect a better performance with monotonic orders. To evaluate the applicative counterparts appKBO and appRPO, I apply the applicative encoding to the given problem directly after the clausal normal form transformation and use first-order KBO and RPO, respectively, on the resulting problem. The results for these last two orders are therefore to be interpreted with care because the applicative encoding also influences various unrelated heuristics in Zipperposition.

Figure 2 displays the number of problems found to be satisfiable (`#sat`), the number of problems found to be unsatisfiable (`#uns`), the average CPU time per problem (`∅tim`), the average percentage of the CPU time used to compute order comparisons (`%ord`), and the average number of clauses produced during a run (`∅cla`). When computing the three averages, satisfiable problems and problems that at least one of the ten configurations failed to solve within the time limit were excluded.

From first-order provers, it is well known that KBO generally outperforms RPO. In the `#uns` columns, we observe the same effect. In the present setting, the advantage of λ fKBO is possibly even greater because the calculus performs inferences onto variables with RPO. Although these additional superposition inferences are not performed when using EPO, the `#uns` results for EPO are worse than λ fRPO and λ fKBO. The `%ord` columns reveal that this is probably because EPO takes considerably more time to compute. I hypothesized that a second reason could be that generally more term pairs are incomparable under EPO and thus more inferences

		LTR					RTL				
		#sat	#uns	∅tim	%ord	∅cla	#sat	#uns	∅tim	%ord	∅cla
TPTP	EPO	120	463	1.3	6.9	2155	120	462	1.2	6.8	2163
	λfRPO	119	472	0.3	0.9	1196	119	471	0.3	1.0	1171
	λfKBO	121	474	0.1	1.6	430	121	473	0.2	1.6	600
	appRPO	138	472	0.6	1.1	749	123	472	1.6	2.0	1489
	appKBO	122	476	0.1	1.9	306	122	476	0.3	2.0	462
SH	EPO	1	509	2.6	23.5	6356	1	505	3.1	23.2	6251
	λfRPO	1	550	1.6	4.7	7130	1	549	2.4	4.8	8612
	λfKBO	1	594	1.6	8.8	9206	1	590	1.3	8.7	6949
	appRPO	1	481	13.3	8.1	26346	1	462	17.9	16.3	28897
	appKBO	1	502	10.6	11.3	25236	1	502	10.9	11.6	26202

Figure 2: Evaluation

need to be performed and more clauses are produced. Although the numbers in the $\emptyset\text{cla}$ column on the TPTP benchmark set confirm this hypothesis, the corresponding numbers on the SH benchmark set contradict it because on those benchmarks, EPO is actually producing the least amount of clauses.

The raw data indicate that despite the poor performance of λfRPO and EPO these orders may be useful in a portfolio prover. The λfRPO configurations can solve 16 problems that neither of the λfKBO configurations can solve. The EPO configurations can solve 11 problems that neither of the λfRPO configurations can solve, 12 problems that neither of the λfKBO configurations can solve, 51 problems that neither of the appRPO configurations can solve, 66 problems that neither of the appKBO configurations can solve, and 4 problems that no other configuration can solve. Most of the problems where EPO outperforms other orders are in the SH benchmark set. Overall, λfRPO is preferable over EPO if one is willing to face the complications of a nonmonotonic order in theory and in implementation.

The direction (LTR or RTL) of the length-lexicographic extension does not have a large impact. For λfKBO and appKBO , this is to be expected since the lexicographic comparison comes into play only when weights are equal. For EPO, the advantage of RTL suggested in Section 4.2 is not corroborated by the evaluation. Only with appRPO , LTR performs better than RTL. This might be because LTR tends to put more importance to the symbols that were at the heads of terms before the applicative encoding, yielding a better measure of the complexity of a term.

8 Discussion and related work

I presented a ground-total and well-founded simplification order for λ -free higher-order terms resembling RPO. In first-order logic, KBO generally outperforms RPO, but RPO with well-chosen parameters behaves better than KBO on many examples. In λ -free higher-order logic, the situation appears to be similar. However, RPO cannot be easily used for superposition in this logic if we want the calculus to remain complete because the natural generalization [9] is nonmonotonic. If one wants to avoid the complications of nonmonotonic orders, EPO seems to be a good replacement to fill the role of RPO in λ -free higher-order logic. Otherwise, calculi specialized to deal with nonmonotonic orders such as λ RPO [7, 11] are the better choice.

The literature contains several other variants of RPO targeting the more difficult problem of providing useful orders for full higher-order terms with λ -abstractions: Lifantsev and Bachmair’s lexicographic path-order on λ -free higher-order terms [26], Jouannaud and Rubio’s higher-order RPO (HORPO) [22], Kop and Van Raamsdonk’s iterative HORPO [25], the HORPO extension with polynomial interpretation orders by Bofill et al. [11], and the computability path order by Blanqui et al. [10]. However, these orders all lack ground-totality and, except for Lifantsev and Bachmair’s order, the subterm property for terms of different types.

Goubault-Larrecq [21] and Dershowitz [17] provide general frameworks to prove well-foundedness of RPO-like orders. I have considered using them, but determined that they would not reduce the overall complexity of my proofs because establishing that these frameworks apply to EPO is not trivial, and EPO’s well-foundedness is not the most difficult property to establish. In fact, the subterm property and stability under substitutions are the ones that are difficult to show. Goubault-Larrecq’s framework offers a lemma to prove stability under substitutions, but unfortunately it is limited to first-order logic.

To explore different candidate definitions for EPO, I formalized my ideas early on in Isabelle/HOL [31]. This allowed me to keep track of changes in the definition and how they influence the properties and their proofs more easily. To find examples explaining why certain properties do not hold for some tentative definitions of EPO, Lazy SmallCheck [33] was of great help. For instance, it was Lazy SmallCheck that found the example $x \text{ f f } >_{\text{ep}}' x x$ versus $\text{f y f f } \not>_{\text{ep}}' \text{f y (f y)}$ mentioned in Section 4.

In future work, I would like to investigate whether the computation of EPO can be optimized further. To put EPO to use in practice, implementing it in E prover [34] would be a good target because E’s λ -free higher-order mode is designed for ground-total simplification orders and its calculus is more efficient for those than Zipperposition’s by circumventing the argument congruence rule.

Acknowledgments I am grateful to the maintainers of StarExec Iowa for letting me use their service; to Jasmin Blanchette for his excellent supervision and for providing benchmarks; to Ahmed Bhayat, Simon Cruanes, Wan Fokkink, Carsten Fuhs, and Petar Vukmirović for the stimulating discussions and the constructive feedback; to Jürgen Giesl and Femke van Raamsdonk for pointers to the literature; and to the anonymous reviewers for suggesting many improvements to this text. My research has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 713999, Matryoshka). It has also been funded by a Chinese Academy of Sciences President’s International Fellowship for Postdoctoral Researchers (grant No. 2021PT0015).

References

- [1] Franz Baader and Tobias Nipkow. *Term Rewriting and All That*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [2] Leo Bachmair and Harald Ganzinger. Rewrite-based equational theorem proving with selection and simplification. *J. Log. Comput.*, 4(3):217–247, 1994.
- [3] Heiko Becker, Jasmin Christian Blanchette, Uwe Waldmann, and Daniel Wand. A transfinite Knuth–Bendix order for lambda-free higher-order terms. In Leonardo de Moura, editor, *CADE-26*, volume 10395 of *LNCS*, pages 432–453. Springer, 2017.
- [4] Alexander Bentkamp. Formalization of the embedding path order for lambda-free higher-order terms. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2018. http://isa-afp.org/entries/Lambda_Free_EPO.html.
- [5] Alexander Bentkamp. *Superposition for Higher-Order Logic*. PhD thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2021.
- [6] Alexander Bentkamp, Jasmin Blanchette, Simon Cruanes, and Uwe Waldmann. Superposition for lambda-free higher-order logic. Accepted in *Log. Meth. Comput. Sci.* Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.02094v2> (2020). arXiv:2005.02094.
- [7] Alexander Bentkamp, Jasmin Christian Blanchette, Simon Cruanes, and Uwe Waldmann. Superposition for lambda-free higher-order logic. In Didier Galmiche, Stephan Schulz, and Roberto Sebastiani, editors, *IJCAR 2018*, volume 10900 of *LNCS*, pages 28–46. Springer, 2018.
- [8] Jasmin Christian Blanchette, Uwe Waldmann, and Daniel Wand. A lambda-free higher-order recursive path order. Tech. report, http://people.mpi-inf.mpg.de/~jblanche/lambda_free_rpo_rep.pdf, 2016.
- [9] Jasmin Christian Blanchette, Uwe Waldmann, and Daniel Wand. A lambda-free higher-order recursive path order. In Javier Esparza and Andrzej S. Murawski, editors, *FOSSACS 2017*, volume 10203 of *LNCS*, pages 461–479. Springer, 2017.

- [10] Frédéric Blanqui, Jean-Pierre Jouannaud, and Albert Rubio. The computability path ordering. *Log. Meth. Comput. Sci.*, 11(4), 2015.
- [11] Miquel Bofill, Cristina Borralleras, Enric Rodríguez-Carbonell, and Albert Rubio. The recursive path and polynomial ordering for first-order and higher-order terms. *J. Log. Comput.*, 23(1):263–305, 2013.
- [12] Sascha Böhme and Tobias Nipkow. Sledgehammer: Judgement Day. In Jürgen Giesl and Reiner Hähnle, editors, *IJCAR 2010*, volume 6173 of *LNCS*, pages 107–121. Springer, 2010.
- [13] Iliano Cervesato and Frank Pfenning. A linear spine calculus. *J. Log. Comput.*, 13(5):639–688, 2003.
- [14] Simon Cruanes. *Extending Superposition with Integer Arithmetic, Structural Induction, and Beyond*. Ph.D. thesis, École polytechnique, 2015.
- [15] Simon Cruanes. Superposition with structural induction. In Clare Dixon and Marcelo Finger, editors, *FroCoS 2017*, volume 10483 of *LNCS*, pages 172–188. Springer, 2017.
- [16] Nachum Dershowitz. Orderings for term-rewriting systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 17:279–301, 1982.
- [17] Nachum Dershowitz. Jumping and escaping: Modular termination and the abstract path ordering. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 464:35–47, 2012.
- [18] Nachum Dershowitz and Zohar Manna. Proving termination with multiset orderings. *Commun. ACM*, 22(8):465–476, 1979.
- [19] Naohi Eguchi. A lexicographic path order with slow growing derivation bounds. *Math. Log. Q.*, 55(2):212–224, 2009.
- [20] Maria C. F. Ferreira and Hans Zantema. Well-foundedness of term orderings. In Nachum Dershowitz and Naomi Lindenstrauss, editors, *CTRS-94*, volume 968 of *LNCS*, pages 106–123. Springer, 1994.
- [21] Jean Goubault-Larrecq. Well-founded recursive relations. In Laurent Fribourg, editor, *Computer Science Logic (CSL 2001)*, volume 2142 of *LNCS*, pages 484–497. Springer, 2001.
- [22] Jean-Pierre Jouannaud and Albert Rubio. Polymorphic higher-order recursive path orderings. *J. ACM*, 54(1):2:1–2:48, 2007.
- [23] Richard Kennaway, Jan Willem Klop, M. Ronan Sleep, and Fer-Jan de Vries. Comparing curried and uncurried rewriting. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 21(1):15–39, 1996.
- [24] D. E. Knuth and P. B. Bendix. Simple word problems in universal algebras. In J. Leech, editor, *Computational Problems in Abstract Algebra*, pages 263–297. Pergamon Press, 1970.
- [25] Cynthia Kop and Femke van Raamsdonk. A higher-order iterative path ordering. In Iliano Cervesato, Helmut Veith, and Andrei Voronkov, editors, *LPAR 2008*, volume 5330 of *LNCS*, pages 697–711. Springer, 2008.
- [26] Maxim Lifantsev and Leo Bachmair. An LPO-based termination ordering for higher-order terms without λ -abstraction. In Jim Grundy and Malcolm C. Newey, editors, *TPHOLs '98*, volume 1479 of *LNCS*, pages 277–293. Springer, 1998.

- [27] Bernd Löchner. Things to know when implementing KBO. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 36(4):289–310, 2006.
- [28] Bernd Löchner. Things to know when implementing LPO. *Internat. J. Artificial Intelligence Tools*, 15(1):53–80, 2006.
- [29] Jia Meng and Lawrence C. Paulson. Translating higher-order clauses to first-order clauses. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 40(1):35–60, 2008.
- [30] Aart Middeldorp and Hans Zantema. Simple termination of rewrite systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 175(1):127–158, 1997.
- [31] Tobias Nipkow, Lawrence C. Paulson, and Markus Wenzel. *Isabelle/HOL - A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*, volume 2283 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2002.
- [32] Lawrence C. Paulson and Jasmin Christian Blanchette. Three years of experience with Sledgehammer, a practical link between automatic and interactive theorem provers. In Geoff Sutcliffe, Stephan Schulz, and Eugenia Ternovska, editors, *IWIL-2010*, volume 2 of *EPiC*, pages 1–11. EasyChair, 2012.
- [33] Jason S. Reich, Matthew Naylor, and Colin Runciman. Advances in Lazy SmallCheck. In Ralf Hinze, editor, *IFL*, volume 8241 of *LNCS*, pages 53–70. Springer, 2012.
- [34] Stephan Schulz, Simon Cruanes, and Petar Vukmirović. Faster, higher, stronger: E 2.3. In Pascal Fontaine, editor, *CADE-27*, volume 11716 of *LNCS*, pages 495–507. Springer, 2019.
- [35] G. Sutcliffe. The TPTP Problem Library and Associated Infrastructure. From CNF to TH0, TPTP v6.4.0. *J. Autom. Reason.*, 59(4):483–502, 2017.
- [36] Petar Vukmirović, Jasmin Blanchette, Simon Cruanes, and Stephan Schulz. Extending a brainiac prover to lambda-free higher-order logic. In Tomás Vojnar and Lijun Zhang, editors, *TACAS 2019*, volume 11427 of *LNCS*, pages 192–210. Springer, 2019.
- [37] Hans Zantema. Termination. In Marc Bezem, Jan Willem Klop, and Roel de Vrijer, editors, *Term Rewriting Systems*, volume 55 of *Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 181–259. Cambridge University Press, 2003.