

The big five systems of reverse mathematics and their computational interpretation

Gyesik Lee

(Work in progress with Hugo Herbelin and Keiko Nakata)

Hankyong National University

CORCON 2014 Genoa
25 March, 2014

Contents

- 1 Basis of Reverse Mathematics
- 2 Uniform Formulation of the Big Five
- 3 Constructive Formulation of the Big Five

The “proof-as-program” point of view

Goal: Redefining the “Big Five” as typed programming languages

- Curry [1958]: Hilbert-style propositional logic = simply-typed combinatory logic
- Howard [1969]: Gentzen’s natural deduction = some simply-typed λ -calculus
- Martin-Löf’s type theory with W-type [around 1980]: an intuitionistic logic the strength of Π_1^1 -CA₀ which is also a programming language
- Griffin [1990]: Classical logic = control operator (`callcc/throw`)
- etc.

Basis of Reverse Mathematics

- Started by Harvey Friedman in the 70's.
- *Determine the logical strength underlying standard mathematical theorems.*

The Big Five Systems

- RCA_0 suffices to prove: Baire category theorem, Intermediate Value Theorem, Soundness of predicate logic, ... (Note: reals are Cauchy sequences, represented as funct. relations)
- WKL_0 = Heine/Borel covering lemma = Gödel's Completeness Theorem = Brouwer's Fixed Point Theorem = Separable Hahn/Banach Theorem = Countable commutative rings have a prime ideal = ...
- ACA_0 = Bolzano/Weierstraß Theorem = Countable commutative rings have a maximal ideal = Ramsey's Theorem for colourings of $[\mathbb{N}]^n = \dots$
- ATR_0 = countable well-orderings are comparable = Perfect Set Theorem = Lusin's separation theorem = ...
- $\Pi_1^1\text{-}CA_0$ = trees have a largest perfect subtree = Cantor/Bendixson Theorem = Silver's Theorem = ...

The Big Five Systems

- $RCA_0 = \Sigma_1^0\text{-IND} + \Delta_1^0\text{-CA}$
- $WKL_0 = RCA_0 + \text{Weak König's Lemma}$
- $ACA_0 = \text{IND} + \Sigma_1^0\text{-CA}$
- $ATR_0 = ACA_0 + \text{Arithmetic Transfinite Recursion}$
- $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0 = ACA_0 + \Pi_1^1\text{-CA}$

Interpolation Scheme

strong	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ZF, ZFC, ...} \\ \text{Zermelo set theory} \\ \text{HOL (Church's Simple Type Theory)} \end{array} \right.$	System $F_{\omega, 2+}$ Girard's System F_{ω}	
medium	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Z}_2 \text{ (full 2nd order arithmetic)} \\ \text{\color{blue}\Pi}_1^1\text{-CA}_0 \\ \text{CZF (Aczel's Constructive Set Theory)} \end{array} \right.$	Girard-Reynolds' System F	$\Psi_0(\Omega_{\omega})$ $\Psi_0(\epsilon_{\Omega+1})$ (Bachmann-Howard) Γ_0 (Feferman-Schütte)
	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{\color{blue}ATR}_0 \\ \text{\color{blue}ACA}_0 \end{array} \right.$	Gödel's System T	ϵ_0
	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{HA}^{\omega} \text{ (intuit. arithm. in finite types)} \end{array} \right.$	Gödel's System T	ϵ_0
	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{PA} \end{array} \right.$	Gödel's System T	ϵ_0
	weak	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{\color{blue}WKL}_0 \\ \text{\color{blue}RCA}_0 \end{array} \right.$	prim. rec. funct.
$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{IS}_1 \end{array} \right.$		prim. rec. funct.	ω^{ω}
$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{PRA (prim. rec. arithmetic)} \end{array} \right.$		prim. rec. funct.	ω^{ω}
$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{EFA (elementary funct. arithmetic)} \end{array} \right.$		prim. rec. funct. up to p^n	ω^3

- RCA₀ is characterised by the axiom of Δ_1^0 -comprehension:

$$\Delta_1^0\text{-CA} : \exists X \forall n (n \in X \iff A(n))$$

for $A(n) \in \Delta_1^0$ (possibly with parameters)

- The only definable sets are the recursive ones.
- The second-order variant of $\text{I}\Sigma_1$.
- The functions provably total in RCA₀ are the primitive recursive functions.

- WKL₀ extends RCA₀ with Weak König's Lemma:
(WKL) "Every infinite binary tree has an infinite path."
- WKL is not strong enough to make induction exceed the strength of Σ_1^0 -induction.
- Like for RCA₀, the first-order fragment of WKL₀ is $I\Sigma_1$.

WKL₀ with Separation

- Over RCA₀, WKL is equivalent to separation of non-overlapping Σ_1^0 -formulas:

$$\Sigma_1^0\text{-SEP} : \forall n \neg (A_1(n) \wedge A_2(n)) \rightarrow \exists X \forall n \begin{cases} A_1(n) \rightarrow n \in X \\ A_2(n) \rightarrow n \notin X \end{cases}$$

for any $A_1(n), A_2(n) \in \Sigma_1^0$.

- Σ_1^0 -SEP directly implies Δ_1^0 -CA

- ACA₀ is characterised by the axiom of Σ_1^0 -comprehension:

$$\Sigma_1^0\text{-CA} : \exists X \forall n (n \in X \iff A(n))$$

for $A(n) \in \Sigma_1^0$ (possibly with parameters)

- Σ_1^0 -comprehension is equivalent to

$$\Pi_1^0\text{-CA} : \exists X \forall n (n \in X \iff A(n))$$

for $A(n) \in \Pi_1^0$ (possibly with parameters)

- Hence, Σ_k^0 -CA and Π_k^0 -CA are available.
- The first-order part of ACA₀ is Peano Arithmetic.

- ATR₀ extends further arithmetical comprehension (i.e. Σ_k^0 -CA) using arithmetical transfinite recursion:

$$\text{ATR} : \forall \langle J \rangle (\text{WO}(\langle J \rangle) \rightarrow \exists Y ((n, j) \in Y \iff j \in J \wedge A(n, Y^j)))$$

where:

- ▶ $A(n, X)$ is a Σ_1^0 -formula (or any arbitrary arithmetical formula)
 - ▶ Y^j is the unique set defined by $(n, i) \in Y^j \iff i <_J j \wedge (n, i) \in Y$
 - ▶ $\text{WO}(\langle J \rangle)$ means that $\langle J \rangle$ is a set of pairs defining a well-ordered subset of \mathbb{N}
- It is said to be that it has the same ordinal strength as that of Martin-Löf's type theory with countably many universes but no W-type.

ATR₀ with Separation

- ATR is indeed equivalent to separation of non-overlapping Σ_1^1 -formulas:

$$\Sigma_1^1 - \text{SEP} : \forall n \neg (A_1(n) \wedge A_2(n)) \rightarrow \exists X \forall n \begin{cases} A_1(n) \rightarrow n \in X \\ A_2(n) \rightarrow n \notin X \end{cases}$$

for any $A_1(n), A_2(n) \in \Sigma_1^1$

- $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ is characterised by the axiom of Σ_1^1 -comprehension:

$$\Sigma_1^1\text{-CA} : \exists X \forall n (n \in X \iff A(n))$$

for $A(n) \in \Sigma_1^1$ (possibly with parameters)

- We also have

$$\Pi_1^1\text{-CA} : \exists X \forall n (n \in X \iff A(n))$$

for $A(n) \in \Pi_1^1$ (possibly with parameters)

How to make the big 5 look uniform?

RCA_0	Δ_1^0 -CA
WKL_0	Weak König's Lemma
ACA_0	Σ_1^0 -CA
ATR_0	Arithmetic Transfinite Recursion
Π_1^1 -CA ₀	Π_1^1 -CA

Summary (Simpson '99)

RCA_0	$\Delta_1^0\text{-CA}$
WKL_0	$\Sigma_1^0\text{-SEP}$ (or WKL)
ACA_0	$\Sigma_1^0\text{-CA}$ (or $\Pi_1^0\text{-CA}$)
ATR_0	$\Sigma_1^1\text{-SEP}$ (or ATR)
$\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$	$\Sigma_1^1\text{-CA}$ (or $\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}$)

Comprehension vs. Separation

(S-CA):

$$\exists X \forall n (n \in X \leftrightarrow A(n))$$

for any $A \in S$

(S-SEP)

$$\forall n \neg (A_1(n) \wedge A_2(n)) \rightarrow \exists X \forall n ((A_1(n) \rightarrow n \in X) \wedge (A_2(n) \rightarrow n \notin X))$$

for any $A_1(n), A_2(n) \in S$.

S_1 - S_2 -Interpolation

$$S_1\text{-}S_2\text{-INTERPOL} : \forall n (A_1(n) \rightarrow A_2(n)) \rightarrow \exists X \forall n \begin{cases} A_1(n) \rightarrow n \in X \\ n \in X \rightarrow A_2(n) \end{cases}$$

for $A_i(n) \in S_i$ (possibly with parameters).

- S -CA iff S - S -INTERPOL.
- S -SEP iff S - $\neg S$ -INTERPOL where $\neg S := \{\neg A \mid A \in S\}$.

Summary again

<i>System</i>	<i>Characterization</i>
RCA_0	Δ_1^0 - Δ_1^0 -INTERPOL (i.e. Δ_1^0 -CA)
WKL_0	Σ_1^0 - Π_1^0 -INTERPOL (i.e. Σ_1^0 -SEP)
ACA_0	Σ_1^0 - Σ_1^0 -INTERPOL (i.e., Σ_1^0 -CA)
ATR_0	Σ_1^1 - Π_1^1 -INTERPOL (i.e., Σ_1^1 -SEP)
Π_1^1 - CA_0	Σ_1^1 - Σ_1^1 -INTERPOL (i.e., Σ_1^1 -CA)

Summary again

<i>System</i>	<i>Characterization</i>
RCA_0	$\Pi_1^0\text{-}\Sigma_1^0\text{-INTERPOL}$ (i.e. $\Pi_1^0\text{-SEP}$)
WKL_0	$\Sigma_1^0\text{-}\Pi_1^0\text{-INTERPOL}$ (i.e. $\Sigma_1^0\text{-SEP}$)
ACA_0	$\Sigma_1^0\text{-}\Sigma_1^0\text{-INTERPOL}$ (i.e., $\Sigma_1^0\text{-CA}$)
ATR_0	$\Sigma_1^1\text{-}\Pi_1^1\text{-INTERPOL}$ (i.e., $\Sigma_1^1\text{-SEP}$)
$\Pi_1^1\text{-CA}_0$	$\Sigma_1^1\text{-}\Sigma_1^1\text{-INTERPOL}$ (i.e., $\Sigma_1^1\text{-CA}$)

Hierarchy of Interpolation: first-order (Simpson)

- $\Pi_1^0\text{-}\Sigma_1^0\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_1^0\text{-}\Pi_1^0\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_1^0\text{-}\Sigma_1^0\text{-INTERPOL}$.
- $\Sigma_1^0\text{-}\Sigma_1^0\text{-INTERPOL} = \Sigma_k^0\text{-}\Sigma_k^0\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_k^0\text{-}\Pi_k^0\text{-INTERPOL}$ for all $k \geq 1$.
- $\Pi_k^0\text{-}\Sigma_k^0\text{-INTERPOL} = \Sigma_k^0\text{-}\Pi_k^0\text{-INTERPOL} = \Sigma_k^0\text{-}\Sigma_k^0\text{-INTERPOL}$ for all $k > 1$.
- For $k > 0$, $\Pi_k^0\text{-}\Sigma_k^0\text{-INTERPOL}$, $\Sigma_k^0\text{-}\Pi_k^0\text{-INTERPOL}$, and $\Sigma_k^0\text{-}\Sigma_k^0\text{-INTERPOL}$ is equivalent to one of RCA_0 , WKL_0 , or ACA_0 .

Hierarchy of Interpolation: second-order (Simpson)

- $\Pi_0^1\text{-}\Sigma_0^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Sigma_0^1\text{-}\Pi_0^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Sigma_0^1\text{-}\Sigma_0^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_0^1\text{-}\Pi_0^1\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Pi_1^1\text{-}\Sigma_1^1\text{-INTERPOL}.$
- $\Pi_1^1\text{-}\Sigma_1^1\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_1^1\text{-}\Pi_1^1\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_1^1\text{-}\Sigma_1^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_1^1\text{-}\Pi_1^1\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Pi_2^1\text{-}\Sigma_2^1\text{-INTERPOL}.$
- $\Pi_2^1\text{-}\Sigma_2^1\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_2^1\text{-}\Pi_2^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Sigma_2^1\text{-}\Sigma_2^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_2^1\text{-}\Pi_2^1\text{-INTERPOL}.$
- $\Sigma_k^1\text{-}\Sigma_k^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_k^1\text{-}\Pi_k^1\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL} \preceq \Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL}.$
- $\Sigma_k^1\text{-}\Sigma_k^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_k^1\text{-}\Pi_k^1\text{-INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL} \preceq \Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL}.$

Hierarchy of Interpolation: second-order (Simpson)



$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_0^1\text{-CA} &= \Sigma_0^1\text{-}\Sigma_0^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_0^1\text{-}\Pi_0^1\text{-INTERPOL} \\ &\prec \Delta_{k+1}^1\text{-CA} \\ &\prec \Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Sigma_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-}\Pi_{k+1}^1\text{-INTERPOL} \\ &\prec \Delta_{k+2}^1\text{-CA}\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_2^1\text{-CA}_0 &= \Pi_2^1\text{-}\Sigma_2^1\text{-INTERPOL} \\ &\prec \Sigma_2^1\text{-}\Pi_2^1\text{-INTERPOL} \\ &= \Pi_2^1\text{-CA} = \Sigma_2^1\text{-}\Sigma_2^1\text{-INTERPOL} = \Pi_2^1\text{-}\Pi_2^1\text{-INTERPOL}\end{aligned}$$

Questions

- $\Delta_1^1 - \mathbf{CA}_0 = \Pi_1^1 - \Sigma_1^1 - \text{INTERPOL?}$
- $\Delta_{k+3}^1 - \mathbf{CA}_0 = \Pi_{k+3}^1 - \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL?}$
- $\Pi_{k+3}^1 - \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL} \preceq \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \Pi_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL}$, or even
- $\Pi_{k+3}^1 - \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \Pi_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL?}$

Questions

- $\Delta_1^1 - \mathbf{CA}_0 = \Pi_1^1 - \Sigma_1^1 - \text{INTERPOL?}$ (No! by A. Montalbán, 2008)
- $\Delta_{k+3}^1 - \mathbf{CA}_0 = \Pi_{k+3}^1 - \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL?}$
- $\Pi_{k+3}^1 - \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL} \preceq \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \Pi_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL}$, or even
- $\Pi_{k+3}^1 - \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL} \prec \Sigma_{k+3}^1 - \Pi_{k+3}^1 - \text{INTERPOL?}$

Towards a computational meaning to the big five

- Comprehension S -CA has a standard computational interpretation resulting from skolemisation

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{formulas} & A ::= \dots \\ \text{sets} & P ::= X \mid \{n|A\} \end{array}$$

Comprehension rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A[t/n] \quad A \in S}{\Gamma \vdash t \in \{n|A\}} \text{Compr}_I$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t \in \{n|A\} \quad A \in S}{\Gamma \vdash A[t/n]} \text{Compr}_E$$

Towards a computational meaning to the big five

- A similar approach can be taken for S_1 - S_2 -interpolation:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{formulas} & A ::= \dots \\ \text{sets} & P ::= X \mid \{n \mid A \triangleright A\} \end{array}$$

Interpolation rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A_1[t/n] \quad A_1 \in S_1}{\Gamma \vdash t \in \{n \mid A_1 \triangleright A_2\}} \text{Interpol}_I$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t \in \{n \mid A_1 \triangleright A_2\} \quad A_2 \in S_2 \quad \Gamma, A_1 \vdash A_2}{\Gamma \vdash A_2[t/n]} \text{Interpol}_E$$

The Resulting System (Syntax)

formulae $A, B, C ::= t \in P \mid t = t \mid \top \mid \perp \mid A \Rightarrow A \mid A \wedge A \mid A \vee A$
 | $\forall n A \mid \exists n A \mid \forall X A \mid \exists X A$

sets $P ::= X \mid \{n \mid A \triangleright A\}$

terms $t, u ::= n \mid 0 \mid t + 1 \mid \text{rec } t \text{ of } [t \mid (x, y).t]$

proofs $p, q ::= a \mid \iota_i(p) \mid (p_1, p_2) \mid (t, p) \mid (P, p) \mid \lambda a.p \mid \lambda x.p \mid \lambda X.p \mid ()$
 | $pq \mid pt \mid pP \mid \text{absurd } p$
 | $\text{case } p \text{ of } [a_1.p_1 \mid a_2.p_2] \mid \pi_i p$
 | $\text{dest } p \text{ as } (x, a) \text{ in } q \mid \text{dest } p \text{ as } (X, a) \text{ in } q$
 | $\text{refl} \mid \text{subst } pq \mid \text{ind } t \text{ of } [p \mid (x, a).q]$
 | $\text{catch}_\alpha p \mid \text{throw}_\alpha p$
 | $\text{interpol } p \mid \text{compose } p \text{ as } a \text{ in } q$

The Resulting System (Congruence)

- The congruence rules express Peano's axioms, generalising the axioms for $+$ and \times into defining rules for a primitive recursion operator.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{rec } 0 \text{ of } [t_0 \mid (x, y).t_S] &\rightarrow t_0 \\ \text{rec } t + 1 \text{ of } [t_0 \mid (x, y).t_S] &\rightarrow t_S[t/x][\text{rec } t \text{ of } [t_0 \mid (x, y).t_S]/y]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= t + 1 &&\rightarrow \perp \\ t + 1 &= 0 &&\rightarrow \perp \\ 0 &= 0 &&\rightarrow \top \\ t + 1 &= u + 1 &&\rightarrow t = u\end{aligned}$$

The Resulting System (Inference rules, part 1)

$$\frac{(a : A) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash a : A} \text{AXIOM} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A \quad A \equiv B}{\Gamma \vdash p : B} \text{CONV}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p_1 : A_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash p_2 : A_2}{\Gamma \vdash (p_1, p_2) : A_1 \wedge A_2} \wedge_I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A_1 \wedge A_2}{\Gamma \vdash \pi_i p : A_i} \wedge_E^o$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A_i}{\Gamma \vdash \iota_i(p) : A_1 \vee A_2} \vee_I^i \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A_1 \vee A_2 \quad \Gamma, a_1 : A_1 \vdash p_1 : B \quad \Gamma, a_2 : A_2 \vdash p_2 : B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{case } p \text{ of } [a_1.p_1 \mid a_2.p_2] : B} \vee_E$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, a : A \vdash p : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda a.p : A \Rightarrow B} \Rightarrow_I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A \Rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \vdash q : A}{\Gamma \vdash pq : B} \Rightarrow_E$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash () : \top} \top_I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : \perp}{\Gamma \vdash \text{absurd } p : C} \perp_E$$

The Resulting System (Inference rules, part 2)

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A(x) \quad x \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.p : \forall x A(x)} \forall_I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : \forall x A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash p t : A(t)} \forall_E$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A(X) \quad X \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda X.p : \forall X A(X)} \forall_I^2 \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash P : \forall X A(X)}{\Gamma \vdash p P : A(P)} \forall_E^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A(t)}{\Gamma \vdash (t, p) : \exists x A(x)} \exists_I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : \exists x A(x) \quad \Gamma, a : A(x) \vdash q : B \quad x \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{dest } p \text{ as } (x, a) \text{ in } q : B} \exists_E$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A(P)}{\Gamma \vdash (P, p) : \exists X A(X)} \exists_I^2 \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : \exists X A(X) \quad \Gamma, a : A(X) \vdash q : C \quad X \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{dest } p \text{ as } (X, a) \text{ in } q : C} \exists_E^2$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \alpha : T^\perp \vdash p : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{catch}_\alpha p : T} \text{CATCH} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : T \quad (\alpha : T^\perp) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash \text{throw}_\alpha p : C} \text{THROW}$$

The Resulting System (Inference rules, part 3)

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{refl} : (t = t)} \text{REFL} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash p : (t = u) \quad \Gamma \vdash q : A[t/x]}{\Gamma \vdash \text{subst } p \text{ in } q : A[u/x]} \text{SUBST}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A(0) \quad \Gamma, a : A(n) \vdash q : A(n+1) \quad n \text{ fresh} \quad A \in \Sigma_1^0}{\Gamma \vdash \text{ind } t \text{ of } [p \mid (n, a).q] : A(t)} \text{IND}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : A_1[t/n] \quad A_1 \in S_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{interpol } p : (t \in \{n \mid A_1 \triangleright A_2\})} \text{INTERPOL}_I$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash p : (t \in \{n \mid A_1 \triangleright A_2\}) \quad A_2 \in S_2 \quad \Gamma, a : A_1 \vdash q : A_2 \quad n \text{ fresh}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{compose } p \text{ as } a \text{ in } q : A_2[t/n]} \text{INTERPOL}_E$$

The Resulting System

- The system is fully constructive.
- It is equipped with a normalisation procedure that we believe to be terminating (by adaptation of the normalisation of System F with interpolation replacing comprehension).
- We immediately obtain intuitionistic restrictions by dropping the rule for classical reasoning.
- We expect also that the intuitionistic restrictions prove similar Σ_1^0 -formulas. (work in progress)

- Cross-fertilization of computer science and reverse mathematics
 - ▶ What is the computational contents of the Big Five?
 - ▶ What results become different if intuitionistic logic or type theory is adopted instead?
 - ▶ What computability can say about reverse mathematics?