

Faithful Logic Embeddings in HOL — Deep and Shallow (Isabelle/HOL dataset)

Christoph Benz Müller

September 1, 2025

Abstract

A recipe for the simultaneous deployment of different forms of deep and shallow embeddings of non-classical logics in classical higher-order logic is presented, which enables interactive or even automated faithfulness proofs between the logic embeddings. The approach, which is particularly fruitful for logic education, is explained in detail in an associated CADE conference paper. This paper presents the corresponding Isabelle/HOL dataset (which is only slightly modified to meet AFP requirements).

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	2
3	Deep embedding of PML in HOL	3
4	Shallow embedding of PML in HOL (maximal)	4
5	Shallow embedding of PML in HOL (minimal)	4
6	Automated faithfulness proofs	5
7	Appendix: proof automation tests	6
7.1	Tests with the deep embedding	6
7.2	Tests with the maximal shallow embedding	8
7.3	Tests with the minimal shallow embedding	10
8	Test Examples: Formula classification	12
8.1	Tests with the deep embedding: axiom schemata	12
8.2	Tests with the deep embedding: semantic frame conditions .	22
8.3	Tests with the (maximal) shallow embedding: axiom schemata	29

8.4 Tests with the (maximal) shallow embedding: semantic frame conditions	39
8.5 Tests with the (minimal) shallow embedding: axiom schemata	46
8.6 Tests with the (minimal) shallow embedding: semantic frame conditions	54

1 Introduction

The Isabelle/HOL dataset associated with [1] is presented. Sections 3, 4 and 5 present deep, maximally shallow, and minimally shallow embeddings of propositional modal logic (PML) in classical higher-order logic (HOL). These are connected, as a novel contribution, by automated faithfulness proofs given in Sect. 6. This connection ensures that these deep and shallow embeddings can now be used interchangeably in subsequent applications. Several experiments with the presented embeddings are presented in Sect. 7. The presented work is conceptual in nature and can be adapted to other non-classical logics. For more detailed explanations of the presented material, including a discussion of related works, see [1].

2 Preliminaries

The following preliminaries are shared between all embeddings introduced in the remainder of this paper.

```
theory PMLinHOL-preliminaries
  imports Main
begin
```

— Type declarations common for both the deep and shallow embedding

typedec1 w — Type for possible worlds

typedec1 $\mathcal{S}$ — Type for propositional constant symbols

consts $p::\mathcal{S}$ $q::\mathcal{S}$ — Some propositional constant symbols

type-synonym $\mathcal{W} = w \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ — Type for sets of possible worlds

type-synonym $\mathcal{R} = w \Rightarrow w \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ — Type for accessibility relations

type-synonym $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{S} \Rightarrow w \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ — Type for valuation functions

— Some useful predicates for accessibility relations

abbreviation(*input*) *reflexive* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \forall x. R\ x\ x$

abbreviation(*input*) *symmetric* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \forall x\ y. R\ x\ y \longrightarrow R\ y\ x$

abbreviation(*input*) *transitive* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \forall x\ y\ z. (R\ x\ y \wedge R\ y\ z) \longrightarrow R\ x\ z$

abbreviation(*input*) *equivrel* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \text{reflexive } R \wedge \text{symmetric } R \wedge \text{transitive } R$

abbreviation(*input*) *irreflexive* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \forall x. \neg R\ x\ x$

abbreviation(*input*) *euclidean* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \forall x\ y\ z. R\ x\ y \wedge R\ x\ z \longrightarrow R\ y\ z$

abbreviation(*input*) *wellfounded* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \forall P::\mathcal{W}. (\forall x. (\forall y. R\ y\ x \longrightarrow P\ y) \longrightarrow P\ x) \longrightarrow (\forall x. P\ x)$

abbreviation(*input*) *converserel* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \lambda y::w. \lambda x::w. R\ x\ y$

abbreviation(*input*) *conversewf* $\equiv \lambda R::\mathcal{R}. \text{wellfounded } (\text{converserel } R)$

— Bounded universal quantifier: $\forall x:W. \varphi$ stands for $\forall x. W x \longrightarrow \varphi x$

abbreviation(*input*) *BoundedAll*:: $\mathcal{W} \Rightarrow \mathcal{W} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ **where** *BoundedAll* *W* $\varphi \equiv \forall x. W x \longrightarrow \varphi x$

syntax *-BoundedAll*:: $\text{pttrn} \Rightarrow \mathcal{W} \Rightarrow \text{bool} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ $((\exists \forall (-/:-)/-) [0, 0, 10] 10)$

translations $\forall x:W. \varphi \equiv \text{CONST } \text{BoundedAll } W (\lambda x. \varphi)$

— Backward implication; useful for aesthetic reasons

abbreviation(*input*) *Bimp* (**infixr** $\longleftarrow$ 50) **where** $\varphi \longleftarrow \psi \equiv \psi \longrightarrow \varphi$

— Some further settings

declare[[*syntax-ambiguity-warning=false*]]

nitpick-params[*user-axioms, expect=genuine, timeout=60*]

end

3 Deep embedding of PML in HOL

theory *PMLinHOL-deep*

imports *PMLinHOL-preliminaries*

begin

— Deep embedding (of propositional modal logic in HOL)

datatype *PML* = *AtmD* $\mathcal{S} (-^d) \mid \text{NotD } \text{PML } (\neg^d) \mid \text{ImpD } \text{PML } \text{PML } (\text{infixr } \supset^d 93) \mid \text{BoxD } \text{PML } (\Box^d)$

— Further logical connectives as definitions

definition *OrD* (**infixr** $\vee^d$ 92) **where** $\varphi \vee^d \psi \equiv \neg^d \varphi \supset^d \psi$

definition *AndD* (**infixr** $\wedge^d$ 95) **where** $\varphi \wedge^d \psi \equiv \neg^d (\varphi \supset^d \neg^d \psi)$

definition *DiaD* ($\Diamond^d$) **where** $\Diamond^d \varphi \equiv \neg^d (\Box^d (\neg^d \varphi))$

definition *TopD* ($\top^d$) **where** $\top^d \equiv p^d \supset^d p^d$

definition *BotD* ($\perp^d$) **where** $\perp^d \equiv \neg^d \top^d$

— Definition of truth of a formula relative to a model $\langle W, R, V \rangle$ and possible world *w*

primrec *RelativeTruthD* :: $\mathcal{W} \Rightarrow \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow \mathcal{V} \Rightarrow w \Rightarrow \text{PML} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ $(\langle -, -, - \rangle, - \models^d -)$ **where**

$\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d a^d = (V a w)$
 $\mid \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \neg^d \varphi = (\neg \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi)$
 $\mid \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \psi = (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \psi)$
 $\mid \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d \varphi = (\forall v:W. R w v \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, v \models^d \varphi)$

— Definition of validity

definition *ValD* ($\models^d -$) **where** $(\models^d \varphi) \equiv (\forall W R V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi)$

— Collection of definitions in a bag called DefD

named-theorems *DefD* **declare** *OrD-def*[*DefD, simp*] *AndD-def*[*DefD, simp*] *DiaD-def*[*DefD, simp*] *TopD-def*[*DefD, simp*] *BotD-def*[*DefD, simp*] *RelativeTruthD-def*[*DefD, simp*] *ValD-def*[*DefD, simp*]
end

4 Shallow embedding of PML in HOL (maximal)

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow*

imports *PMLinHOL-preliminaries*

begin

— Shallow embedding (of propositional modal logic in HOL)

type-synonym $\sigma = \mathcal{W} \Rightarrow \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow \mathcal{V} \Rightarrow w \Rightarrow \text{bool}$

definition *AtmS*:: $\mathcal{S} \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($-^s$) **where** $a^s \equiv \lambda W R V w. V a w$

definition *NegS*:: $\sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($\neg^s$) **where** $\neg^s \varphi \equiv \lambda W R V w. \neg(\varphi W R V w)$

definition *ImpS*:: $\sigma \Rightarrow \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$ (**infixr** $\supset^s$ 93) **where** $\varphi \supset^s \psi \equiv \lambda W R V w. (\varphi W R V w) \longrightarrow (\psi W R V w)$

definition *BoxS*:: $\sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($\Box^s$) **where** $\Box^s \varphi \equiv \lambda W R V w. \forall v:W. R w v \longrightarrow (\varphi W R V v)$

— Further logical connectives as definitions

definition *OrS* (**infixr** $\vee^s$ 92) **where** $\varphi \vee^s \psi \equiv \neg^s \varphi \supset^s \psi$

definition *AndS* (**infixr** $\wedge^s$ 95) **where** $\varphi \wedge^s \psi \equiv \neg^s(\varphi \supset^s \neg^s \psi)$

definition *DiaS* ($\Diamond^s$) **where** $\Diamond^s \varphi \equiv \neg^s (\Box^s (\neg^s \varphi))$

definition *TopS* ($\top^s$) **where** $\top^s \equiv p^s \supset^s p^s$

definition *BotS* ($\perp^s$) **where** $\perp^s \equiv \neg^s \top^s$

— Definition of truth of a formula relative to a model $\langle W, R, V \rangle$ and possible world w

definition *RelativeTruthS*:: $\mathcal{W} \Rightarrow \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow \mathcal{V} \Rightarrow w \Rightarrow \sigma \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ ($\langle -, -, - \rangle, - \models^s -$) **where** $\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \equiv \varphi W R V w$

— Definition of validity

definition *ValS* ($\models^s -$) **where** $\models^s \varphi \equiv \forall W R V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi$

— Collection of definitions in a bag called DefS

named-theorems *DefS* **declare** *AtmS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *NegS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *ImpS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *BoxS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *OrS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *AndS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *DiaS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *TopS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *BotS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *RelativeTruthS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*] *ValS-def*[*DefS*,*simp*]
end

5 Shallow embedding of PML in HOL (minimal)

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal*

imports *PMLinHOL-preliminaries*

begin

— The acessibility relation R and the valuation function V are introduced as constants at the meta-level HOL

consts *R*:: $\mathcal{R}$ *V*:: $\mathcal{V}$

— Shallow embedding (of propositional modal logic in HOL)

type-synonym $\sigma = w \Rightarrow \text{bool}$

definition *AtmM*:: $\mathcal{S} \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($-^m$) **where** $a^m \equiv \lambda w. V a w$

definition $NegM::\sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($\neg^m$) **where** $\neg^m \varphi \equiv \lambda w. \neg \varphi \ w$
definition $ImpM::\sigma \Rightarrow \sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$ (**infixr** $\supset^m$ 93) **where** $\varphi \supset^m \psi \equiv \lambda w. \varphi \ w \longrightarrow \psi \ w$
definition $BoxM::\sigma \Rightarrow \sigma$ ($\Box^m$) **where** $\Box^m \varphi \equiv \lambda w. \forall v. R \ w \ v \longrightarrow \varphi \ v$

— Further logical connectives as definitions

definition OrM (**infixr** $\vee^m$ 92) **where** $\varphi \vee^m \psi \equiv \neg^m \varphi \supset^m \psi$
definition $AndM$ (**infixr** $\wedge^m$ 95) **where** $\varphi \wedge^m \psi \equiv \neg^m (\varphi \supset^m \neg^m \psi)$
definition $DiaM$ ($\Diamond^m$ -) **where** $\Diamond^m \varphi \equiv \neg^m (\Box^m (\neg^m \varphi))$
definition $TopM$ ($\top^m$) **where** $\top^m \equiv p^m \supset^m p^m$
definition $BotM$ ($\perp^m$) **where** $\perp^m \equiv \neg^m \top^m$

— Definition of truth of a formula relative to a model $\langle W, R, V \rangle$ and a possible world w

definition $RelativeTruthM::w \Rightarrow \sigma \Rightarrow bool$ ($\models^m$ -) **where** $w \models^m \varphi \equiv \varphi \ w$

— Definition of validity

definition $ValM$ ($\models^m$ -) **where** $\models^m \varphi \equiv \forall w::w. w \models^m \varphi$

— Collection of definitions in a bag called DefM

named-theorems $DefM$ **declare** $AtmM-def[DefM,simp]$ $NegM-def[DefM,simp]$
 $ImpM-def[DefM,simp]$ $BoxM-def[DefM,simp]$ $OrM-def[DefM,simp]$ $AndM-def[DefM,simp]$
 $DiaM-def[DefM,simp]$ $TopM-def[DefM,simp]$ $BotM-def[DefM,simp]$ $RelativeTruthM-def[DefM,simp]$
 $ValM-def[DefM,simp]$
end

6 Automated faithfulness proofs

theory $PMLinHOL-faithfulness$

imports $PMLinHOL-deep$ $PMLinHOL-shallow$ $PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal$
begin

— Mappings: deep to maximal shallow and deep to minimal shallow

primrec $DpToShMax$ ($\Downarrow$ -) **where** $\Downarrow \varphi^d = \varphi^s \mid \Downarrow \neg^d \varphi = \neg^s \Downarrow \varphi \mid \Downarrow \varphi \supset^d \psi = \Downarrow \varphi \supset^s \Downarrow \psi \mid \Downarrow \Box^d \varphi = \Box^s \Downarrow \varphi$
primrec $DpToShMin$ ($\Downarrow$ -) **where** $\Downarrow \varphi^d = \varphi^m \mid \Downarrow \neg^d \varphi = \neg^m \Downarrow \varphi \mid \Downarrow \varphi \supset^d \psi = \Downarrow \varphi \supset^m \Downarrow \psi \mid \Downarrow \Box^d \varphi = \Box^m \Downarrow \varphi$

— Proving faithfulness between deep and maximal shallow

theorem $Faithful1a$: $\forall W \ R \ V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \longleftrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Downarrow \varphi$ **apply** *induct by auto*

theorem $Faithful1b$: $\models^d \varphi \longleftrightarrow \models^s \Downarrow \varphi$ **using** $Faithful1a$ **by** *auto*

— Proving faithfulness between deep and minimal shallow

theorem $Faithful2$: $\forall w. \langle (\lambda x::w. True), R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \longleftrightarrow w \models^m \Downarrow \varphi$ **apply** *induct by auto*

— Proving faithfulness maximal shallow and minimal shallow

theorem $Faithful3$: $\forall w. \langle (\lambda x::w. True), R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Downarrow \varphi \longleftrightarrow w \models^m \Downarrow \varphi$ **apply** *induct by auto*

— Additional check for soundness for the minimal shallow embedding
lemma *Sound1*: $\models^m \psi \longleftrightarrow (\exists \varphi. \psi = \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \wedge \models^d \varphi)$ **by** (*smt Faithful2 DefM DefD RelativeTruthD.simps ext[of $\psi \llbracket x \supset^d x \rrbracket$]*)
lemma *Sound2*: $\models^m \psi \longleftrightarrow (\exists \varphi. \psi = \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket \wedge \models^m \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket)$ **using** *Sound1* **by** *blast*
end

7 Appendix: proof automation tests

7.1 Tests with the deep embedding

theory *PMLinHOL-deep-tests*
imports *PMLinHOL-deep*
begin

— Hilbert calculus: proving that the schematic axioms and rules implied by the embedding
lemma *H1*: $\models^d \varphi \supset^d (\psi \supset^d \varphi)$ **by** *auto*
lemma *H2*: $\models^d (\varphi \supset^d (\psi \supset^d \gamma)) \supset^d ((\varphi \supset^d \psi) \supset^d (\varphi \supset^d \gamma))$ **by** *auto*
lemma *H3*: $\models^d (\neg^d \varphi \supset^d \neg^d \psi) \supset^d (\psi \supset^d \varphi)$ **by** *auto*
lemma *MP*: $\models^d \varphi \implies \models^d (\varphi \supset^d \psi) \implies \models^d \psi$ **by** *auto*

— Reasoning with the Hilbert calculus: interactive and fully automated
lemma *HCderived1*: $\models^d (\varphi \supset^d \varphi)$ — *sledgehammer(HC1 HC2 HC3 MP)* returns:
by (*metis HC1 HC2 MP*)
proof —
have *1*: $\models^d \varphi \supset^d ((\psi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi)$ **using** *H1* **by** *auto*
have *2*: $\models^d (\varphi \supset^d ((\psi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi)) \supset^d ((\varphi \supset^d (\psi \supset^d \varphi)) \supset^d (\varphi \supset^d \varphi))$ **using**
H2 **by** *auto*
have *3*: $\models^d (\varphi \supset^d (\psi \supset^d \varphi)) \supset^d (\varphi \supset^d \varphi)$ **using** *1 2 MP* **by** *meson*
have *4*: $\models^d \varphi \supset^d (\psi \supset^d \varphi)$ **using** *H1* **by** *auto*
thus *?thesis* **using** *3 4 MP* **by** *meson*
qed

lemma *HCderived2*: $\models^d \varphi \supset^d (\neg^d \varphi \supset^d \psi)$ **by** (*metis H1 H2 H3 MP*)
lemma *HCderived3*: $\models^d (\neg^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi$ **by** (*metis H1 H2 H3 MP*)
lemma *HCderived4*: $\models^d (\varphi \supset^d \psi) \supset^d (\neg^d \psi \supset^d \neg^d \varphi)$ **by** *auto*

— Modal logic: the schematic necessitation rule and distribution axiom are implied
lemma *Nec*: $\models^d \varphi \implies \models^d \Box^d \varphi$ **by** *auto*
lemma *Dist*: $\models^d \Box^d (\varphi \supset^d \psi) \supset^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d \psi)$ **by** *auto*

— Correspondence theory: correct statements
lemma *cM*: *reflexive* *R* $\longleftrightarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi)$ —
sledgehammer: Proof found **oops**
lemma *cBa*: *symmetric* *R* $\longrightarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi))$
by *auto*
lemma *cBb*: *symmetric* *R* $\longleftarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi))$
— *sledgehammer*: No proof **oops**

lemma *c4a*: *transitive* $R \longrightarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi))$
by (*metis* *RelativeTruthD.simps*)
lemma *c4b*: *transitive* $R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi))$
— sledgehammer: No proof **oops**

— Correspondence theory: incorrect statements

lemma *reflexive* $R \longrightarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi))$
nitpick[*card w=3*] **oops** — nitpick: Cex.

— Simple, incorrect validity statements

lemma $\models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d \varphi$ **nitpick**[*card w=2, card S= 1*] **oops** — nitpick: Counterexample: modal collapse not implied

lemma $\models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d \psi) \vee^d \Box^d (\Box^d \psi \supset^d \Box^d \varphi)$ **nitpick**[*card w=3*] **oops**
— nitpick: Counterexample

lemma $\models^d (\Diamond^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)$ **nitpick**[*card w=2*] **oops** — nitpick: Counterexample

— Implied axiom schemata in S5

lemma *KB*: *symmetric* $R \longrightarrow (\forall \varphi \ \psi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Diamond^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi))$ **by** *auto*

lemma *K4B*: *symmetric* $R \wedge$ *transitive* $R \longrightarrow (\forall \varphi \ \psi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d \psi) \vee^d \Box^d (\Box^d \psi \supset^d \Box^d \varphi))$ **by** (*smt* *OrD-def* *RelativeTruthD.simps*)
end

theory *PMLinHOL-deep-further-tests*

imports *PMLinHOL-deep-tests*

begin

— Implied modal principle

lemma *K-Dia*: $\models^d (\Box^d (\varphi \supset^d \psi)) \supset^d ((\Diamond^d \varphi) \supset^d \Diamond^d \psi)$ **by** *auto*

— Example 6.10 of Sider (2009) Logic for Philosophy

lemma *T1a*: $\models^d \Box^d p^d \supset^d ((\Diamond^d q^d) \supset^d \Diamond^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d))$ **by** *auto* — fast automation in meta-logic HOL

lemma *T1b*: $\models^d \Box^d p^d \supset^d ((\Diamond^d q^d) \supset^d \Diamond^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d))$ — alternative interactive proof in modal object logic K

proof —

have 1: $\models^d p^d \supset^d (q^d \supset^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d))$ **unfolding** *AndD-def* **using** *H1 H2 H3*
MP **by** *metis*

have 2: $\models^d \Box^d (p^d \supset^d (q^d \supset^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d)))$ **using** 1 *Nec* **by** *metis*

have 3: $\models^d \Box^d p^d \supset^d \Box^d (q^d \supset^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d))$ **using** 2 *Dist* *MP* **by** *metis*

have 4: $\models^d (\Box^d (q^d \supset^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d))) \supset^d ((\Diamond^d q^d) \supset^d \Diamond^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d))$ **using**

K-Dia **by** *metis*

have 5: $\models^d \Box^d p^d \supset^d ((\Diamond^d q^d) \supset^d \Diamond^d (p^d \wedge^d q^d))$ **using** 3 4 *H1 H2 MP* **by**

metis

thus *?thesis* .

qed

end

```

theory PMLinHOL-deep-Loeb-tests
  imports PMLinHOL-deep
begin

```

— Löb axiom: with the deep embedding automated reasoning tools are not very responsive

```

lemma Loeb1:  $\forall \varphi. \models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d \varphi$  nitpick[card w=1, card S=1] oops

```

— nitpick: Counterexample

```

lemma Loeb2:  $(\text{conversewf } R \wedge \text{transitive } R) \longrightarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d \varphi)$  — sledgehammer: No Proof oops

```

```

lemma Loeb3:  $(\text{conversewf } R \wedge \text{transitive } R) \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d \varphi)$  — sledgehammer: No Proof oops

```

```

lemma Loeb3a:  $\text{conversewf } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d \varphi)$  — sledgehammer: No Proof oops

```

```

lemma Loeb3b:  $\text{transitive } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d \varphi)$  — sledgehammer: No Proof oops

```

```

lemma Loeb3c:  $\text{irreflexive } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d \varphi)$  — sledgehammer: No Proof oops

```

```

end

```

7.2 Tests with the maximal shallow embedding

```

theory PMLinHOL-shallow-tests
  imports PMLinHOL-shallow
begin

```

— Hilbert calculus: proving that the schematic axioms and rules implied by the embedding

```

lemma H1:  $\models^s \varphi \supset^s (\psi \supset^s \varphi)$  by auto

```

```

lemma H2:  $\models^s (\varphi \supset^s (\psi \supset^s \gamma)) \supset^s ((\varphi \supset^s \psi) \supset^s (\varphi \supset^s \gamma))$  by auto

```

```

lemma H3:  $\models^s (\neg^s \varphi \supset^s \neg^s \psi) \supset^s (\psi \supset^s \varphi)$  by auto

```

```

lemma MP:  $\models^s \varphi \implies \models^s (\varphi \supset^s \psi) \implies \models^s \psi$  by auto

```

— Reasoning with the Hilbert calculus: interactive and fully automated

```

lemma HCderived1:  $\models^s (\varphi \supset^s \varphi)$  — sledgehammer(HC1 HC2 HC3 MP) returns:
by (metis HC1 HC2 MP)

```

```

proof —

```

```

  have 1:  $\models^s \varphi \supset^s ((\psi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi)$  using H1 by auto

```

```

  have 2:  $\models^s (\varphi \supset^s ((\psi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi)) \supset^s ((\varphi \supset^s (\psi \supset^s \varphi)) \supset^s (\varphi \supset^s \varphi))$  using

```

```

H2 by auto

```

```

  have 3:  $\models^s (\varphi \supset^s (\psi \supset^s \varphi)) \supset^s (\varphi \supset^s \varphi)$  using 1 2 MP by meson

```

```

  have 4:  $\models^s \varphi \supset^s (\psi \supset^s \varphi)$  using H1 by auto

```

```

  thus ?thesis using 3 4 MP by meson

```

```

qed

```

```

lemma HCderived2:  $\models^s \varphi \supset^s (\neg^s \varphi \supset^s \psi)$  by (metis H1 H2 H3 MP)

```

```

lemma HCderived3:  $\models^s (\neg^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi$  by (metis H1 H2 H3 MP)

```

```

lemma HCderived4:  $\models^s (\varphi \supset^s \psi) \supset^s (\neg^s \psi \supset^s \neg^s \varphi)$  by auto

```

— Modal logic: the schematic necessitation rule and distribution axiom are implied

lemma *Nec*: $\models^s \varphi \implies \models^s \Box^s \varphi$ **by** *auto*

lemma *Dist*: $\models^s \Box^s(\varphi \supset^s \psi) \supset^s (\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s \psi)$ **by** *auto*

— Correspondence theory: correct statements

lemma *cM*: *reflexive* $R \iff (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi)$ —
sledgehammer: Proof found **oops**

lemma *cBa*: *symmetric* $R \implies (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi))$
by *auto*

lemma *cBb*: *symmetric* $R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi))$
— sledgehammer: No proof **oops**

lemma *cAa*: *transitive* $R \implies (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi))$
by (*smt DefS*)

lemma *cAb*: *transitive* $R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi))$
— sledgehammer: No proof **oops**

— Correspondence theory: incorrect statements

lemma *reflexive* $R \implies (\forall \varphi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi))$
nitpick[*card w=3*] **oops** — nitpick: Counterexample

— Simple, incorrect validity statements

lemma $\models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s \varphi$ **nitpick**[*card w=2, card S=1*] **oops** — nitpick: Counterexample: modal collapse not implied

lemma $\models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s \psi) \vee^s \Box^s(\Box^s \psi \supset^s \Box^s \varphi)$ **oops** — *nitpick*[*card w=3*]
returns: unknown

lemma $\models^s (\Diamond^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)$ **nitpick**[*card w=2*] **oops** — nitpick: Counterexample

— Implied axiom schemata in S5

lemma *KB*: *symmetric* $R \implies (\forall \varphi \ \psi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Diamond^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi))$ **by** *auto*

lemma *K4B*: *symmetric* $R \wedge$ *transitive* $R \implies (\forall \varphi \ \psi \ W \ V. \forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s \psi) \vee^s \Box^s(\Box^s \psi \supset^s \Box^s \varphi))$ **by** (*smt DefS*)
end

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow-further-tests*

imports *PMLinHOL-shallow-tests*

begin

— Implied modal principle

lemma *K-Dia*: $\models^s (\Box^s(\varphi \supset^s \psi)) \supset^s ((\Diamond^s \varphi) \supset^s \Diamond^s \psi)$ **by** *auto*

— Example 6.10 of Sider (2009) Logic for Philosophy

lemma *T1a*: $\models^s \Box^s p^s \supset^s ((\Diamond^s q^s) \supset^s \Diamond^s (p^s \wedge^s q^s))$ **by** *auto* — fast automation in meta-logic HOL

lemma *T1b*: $\models^s \Box^s p^s \supset^s ((\Diamond^s q^s) \supset^s \Diamond^s (p^s \wedge^s q^s))$ — alternative interactive proof in modal object logic K

proof —

have 1: $\models^s p^s \supset^s (q^s \supset^s (p^s \wedge^s q^s))$ **unfolding** *AndS-def* **using** *H1 H2 H3*

MP by metis
have 2: $\models^s \Box^s(p^s \supset^s (q^s \supset^s (p^s \wedge^s q^s)))$ **using 1 Nec by metis**
have 3: $\models^s \Box^s p^s \supset^s \Box^s(q^s \supset^s (p^s \wedge^s q^s))$ **using 2 Dist MP by metis**
have 4: $\models^s (\Box^s(q^s \supset^s (p^s \wedge^s q^s))) \supset^s ((\Diamond^s q^s) \supset^s \Diamond^s(p^s \wedge^s q^s))$ **using K-Dia**
by metis
have 5: $\models^s \Box^s p^s \supset^s ((\Diamond^s q^s) \supset^s \Diamond^s (p^s \wedge^s q^s))$ **using 3 4 H1 H2 MP by metis**

thus ?thesis .
qed
end

theory PMLinHOL-shallow-Loeb-tests

imports PMLinHOL-shallow

begin

— Löb axiom: with the minimal shallow embedding automated reasoning tools are still partly responsive

lemma Loeb1: $\forall \varphi. \models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s \varphi$ **nitpick[card w=1, card S=1] oops**

— nitpick: Counterexample

lemma Loeb2: $(\text{conversewf } R \wedge \text{transitive } R) \longrightarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s \varphi)$ — sledgehammer: Proof found **oops**

lemma Loeb3: $(\text{conversewf } R \wedge \text{transitive } R) \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s \varphi)$ — sledgehammer: No Proof **oops**

lemma Loeb3a: $\text{conversewf } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s \varphi)$ — sledgehammer: Proof found **oops**

lemma Loeb3b: $\text{transitive } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s \varphi)$ — sledgehammer: No Proof **oops**

lemma Loeb3c: $\text{irreflexive } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi W V. \forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi \supset^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s \varphi)$ — sledgehammer: Proof found **oops**

end

7.3 Tests with the minimal shallow embedding

theory PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal-tests

imports PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal

begin

— Hilbert calculus: proving that the schematic axioms and rules implied by the embedding

lemma H1: $\models^m \varphi \supset^m (\psi \supset^m \varphi)$ **by auto**

lemma H2: $\models^m (\varphi \supset^m (\psi \supset^m \gamma)) \supset^m ((\varphi \supset^m \psi) \supset^m (\varphi \supset^m \gamma))$ **by auto**

lemma H3: $\models^m (\neg^m \varphi \supset^m \neg^m \psi) \supset^m (\psi \supset^m \varphi)$ **by auto**

lemma MP: $\models^m \varphi \implies \models^m (\varphi \supset^m \psi) \implies \models^m \psi$ **by auto**

— Reasoning with the Hilbert calculus: interactive and fully automated

lemma HCderived1: $\models^m (\varphi \supset^m \varphi)$ — sledgehammer(HC1 HC2 HC3 MP) returns: by (metis HC1 HC2 MP)

proof —

have 1: $\models^m \varphi \supset^m ((\psi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \varphi)$ **using H1 by auto**

have 2: $\models^m (\varphi \supset^m ((\psi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \varphi)) \supset^m ((\varphi \supset^m (\psi \supset^m \varphi)) \supset^m (\varphi \supset^m \varphi))$

using *H2* by *auto*

have *3*: $\models^m (\varphi \supset^m (\psi \supset^m \varphi)) \supset^m (\varphi \supset^m \varphi)$ using *1 2 MP* by *meson*

have *4*: $\models^m \varphi \supset^m (\psi \supset^m \varphi)$ using *H1* by *auto*

thus *?thesis* using *3 4 MP* by *meson*

qed

lemma *HCderived2*: $\models^m \varphi \supset^m (\neg^m \varphi \supset^m \psi)$ by (*metis H1 H2 H3 MP*)

lemma *HCderived3*: $\models^m (\neg^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \varphi$ by (*metis H1 H2 H3 MP*)

lemma *HCderived4*: $\models^m (\varphi \supset^m \psi) \supset^m (\neg^m \psi \supset^m \neg^m \varphi)$ by *auto*

— Modal logic: the schematic necessitation rule and distribution axiom are implied

lemma *Nec*: $\models^m \varphi \implies \models^m \Box^m \varphi$ by (*smt DefM*)

lemma *Dist*: $\models^m \Box^m (\varphi \supset^m \psi) \supset^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m \psi)$ by *auto*

— Correspondence theory: correct statements

lemma *cM:reflexive R*: $\longleftrightarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi)$ by *auto*

lemma *cBa: symmetric R*: $\longrightarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m \Diamond^m \varphi)$ by *auto*

lemma *cBb: symmetric R*: $\longleftarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m \Diamond^m \varphi)$ by (*metis DefM*)

lemma *c4a: transitive R*: $\longrightarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi))$ by (*smt DefM*)

lemma *c4b: transitive R*: $\longleftarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi))$ by *auto*

— Correspondence theory: incorrect statements

lemma *reflexive R*: $\longrightarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi))$ nitpick[*card w=3, show-all*]

oops — nitpick: Counterexample

— Simple, incorrect validity statements

lemma $\models^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m \varphi$ nitpick[*card w=2, card S= 1*] oops — nitpick: Counterexample: modal collapse not implied

lemma $\models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m \psi) \vee^m \Box^m (\Box^m \psi \supset^m \Box^m \varphi)$ nitpick[*card w=3*] oops

— nitpick: Counterexample

lemma $\models^m (\Diamond^m (\Box^m \varphi)) \supset^m \Box^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)$ nitpick[*card w=2*] oops — nitpick: Counterexample

— Implied axiom schemata in S5

lemma *KB: symmetric R*: $\longrightarrow (\forall \varphi \psi. \models^m (\Diamond^m (\Box^m \varphi)) \supset^m \Box^m (\Diamond^m \varphi))$ by *auto*

lemma *K4B: symmetric R $\wedge$ transitive R*: $\longrightarrow (\forall \varphi \psi. \models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m \psi) \vee^m \Box^m (\Box^m \psi \supset^m \Box^m \varphi))$ by (*smt DefM*)

end

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal-further-tests*

imports *PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal-tests*

begin

— Implied modal principle

lemma *K-Dia*: $\models^m (\Box^m (\varphi \supset^m \psi)) \supset^m ((\Diamond^m \varphi) \supset^m \Diamond^m \psi)$ by *auto*

— Example 6.10 of Sider (2009) Logic for Philosophy

lemma *T1a*: $\models^m \Box^m p^m \supset^m ((\Diamond^m q^m) \supset^m \Diamond^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m))$ by *auto* — fast automation in meta-logic HOL

lemma *T1b*: $\models^m \Box^m p^m \supset^m ((\Diamond^m q^m) \supset^m \Diamond^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m))$ — alternative interactive proof in modal object logic K

proof –

have 1: $\models^m p^m \supset^m (q^m \supset^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m))$ **unfolding** *AndM-def* **using** *H1 H2 H3 MP* **by** *metis*

have 2: $\models^m \Box^m (p^m \supset^m (q^m \supset^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m)))$ **using** 1 *Nec* **by** *metis*

have 3: $\models^m \Box^m p^m \supset^m \Box^m (q^m \supset^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m))$ **using** 2 *Dist MP* **by** *metis*

have 4: $\models^m (\Box^m (q^m \supset^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m))) \supset^m ((\Diamond^m q^m) \supset^m \Diamond^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m))$ **using** *K-Dia* **by** *metis*

have 5: $\models^m \Box^m p^m \supset^m ((\Diamond^m q^m) \supset^m \Diamond^m (p^m \wedge^m q^m))$ **using** 3 4 *H1 H2 MP* **by** *metis*

thus *?thesis* .

qed

end

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal-Loeb-tests*

imports *PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal*

begin

— Löb axiom: with the minimal shallow embedding automated reasoning tools are still partly responsive

lemma *Loeb1*: $\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \Box^m \varphi$ **nitpick**[*card w=1, card S=1*]

oops — nitpick: Counterexample.

lemma *Loeb2*: $(\text{conversewf } R \wedge \text{transitive } R) \longrightarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \Box^m \varphi)$ — sh: Proof found **oops**

lemma *Loeb3*: $(\text{conversewf } R \wedge \text{transitive } R) \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \Box^m \varphi)$ — sh: No Proof **oops**

lemma *Loeb3a*: $\text{conversewf } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \Box^m \varphi)$ **unfolding** *DefM* **by** *blast*

lemma *Loeb3b*: $\text{transitive } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \Box^m \varphi)$ — sledgehammer: No Proof **oops**

lemma *Loeb3c*: $\text{irreflexive } R \longleftarrow (\forall \varphi. \models^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi \supset^m \varphi) \supset^m \Box^m \varphi)$ — sledgehammer: Proof found **oops**

end

8 Test Examples: Formula classification

8.1 Tests with the deep embedding: axiom schemata

theory *PMLinHOL-deep-further-tests-1*

imports *PMLinHOL-deep-tests*

begin

— What is the weakest modal logic in which the following test formulas F1-F10 are provable?

— Test with schematic axioms

consts $\varphi::PML \ \psi::PML$

abbreviation(*input*) *F1* $\equiv (\Diamond^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \supset^d \Diamond^d \varphi$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) *F2* $\equiv (\Diamond^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) *F3* $\equiv (\Diamond^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \supset^d \Box^d \varphi$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F4 \equiv (\Box^d(\Diamond^d(\Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)))) \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)$ — holds in KB/K4
abbreviation(*input*) $F5 \equiv (\Diamond^d(\varphi \wedge^d (\Diamond^d\psi))) \supset^d ((\Diamond^d\varphi) \wedge^d (\Diamond^d\psi))$ — holds in K4
abbreviation(*input*) $F6 \equiv ((\Box^d(\varphi \supset^d \psi)) \wedge^d (\Diamond^d(\Box^d(\neg^d\psi)))) \supset^d \neg^d(\Diamond^d\psi)$ — holds in KB4
abbreviation(*input*) $F7 \equiv (\Diamond^d\varphi) \supset^d (\Box^d(\varphi \vee^d \Diamond^d\varphi))$ — holds in KB4
abbreviation(*input*) $F8 \equiv (\Diamond^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \supset^d (\varphi \vee^d \Diamond^d\varphi)$ — holds in KT/KB
abbreviation(*input*) $F9 \equiv ((\Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)) \wedge^d (\Box^d(\Diamond^d(\neg^d\varphi)))) \supset^d \Diamond^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)$ — holds in KT
abbreviation(*input*) $F10 \equiv ((\Box^d(\varphi \supset^d \Box^d\psi)) \wedge^d (\Box^d(\Diamond^d(\neg^d\psi)))) \supset^d \neg^d(\Box^d\psi)$ — holds in KT

declare *imp-cong*[*cong del*]

experiment begin

lemma $S5: \forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*smt* (*z3*) *PML.simps*(22))

lemma $S4: \forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

by (*smt* (*z3*) *PML.simps*(22))

lemma $KB4: \forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*smt* (*z3*) *PML.simps*(22))

lemma $KTB: \forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma $KT: \forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma $KB: \forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma $K4: \forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d\varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

```

  by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

end

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F4$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma S_4 : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_4$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB_4 : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_4$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_4$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KT : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_4$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_4$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K_4 : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_4$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K : $\forall w:W. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_4$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctext — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

lemma S_5 : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_5$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma S_4 : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_5$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma KB_4 : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F_5$

```

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F5$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F5$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F5$ 

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F5$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F5$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$ 

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

```

oops

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F6$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

end

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F7$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F7$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F7$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F7$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F7$
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F7$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 lemma K4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 lemma K: $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 end

experiment begin

lemma S5: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 lemma S4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 lemma KB4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
 lemma KTB: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by (smt (z3) PML.simps(22))
 lemma KT: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 lemma KB: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d (\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 lemma K4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi) \supset^d \Box^d (\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

```

oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) PML.simps(22))
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) PML.simps(22))
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) PML.simps(22))
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis (mono-tags, lifting) PML.simps(22))
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi))) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi))) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*metis* (*mono-tags*, *lifting*) *PML.simps*(22))

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi))) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*metis* (*mono-tags*, *lifting*) *PML.simps*(22))

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi))) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi))) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

by (*smt* (*verit*) *PML.simps*(22,24))

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

by (*smt* (*verit*) *PML.simps*(22,24))

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d (\Box^d \varphi \supset^d \Box^d(\Box^d \varphi))) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F10$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

end

— Summary of experiments: Nitpick: ctex=16 (with simp 10, without simp 6), none=74 (with simp 0, without simp 74), unknown=70 (with simp 70, without simp 0) Sledgehammer: proof=33 (with simp 16, without simp 17), no prf=127 (with simp 64, without simp 63)

— No conflict

end

8.2 Tests with the deep embedding: semantic frame conditions

theory *PMLinHOL-deep-further-tests-2*

imports *PMLinHOL-deep-tests*

begin

— What is the weakest modal logic in which the following test formulas F1-F10 are provable?

— Test with semantic conditions

abbreviation(*input*) *refl* (*r*) **where** $r \equiv \lambda R. \text{ reflexive } R$

abbreviation(*input*) *sym* (*s*) **where** $s \equiv \lambda R. \text{ symmetric } R$

abbreviation(*input*) *tra* (*t*) **where** $t \equiv \lambda R. \text{ transitive } R$

consts $\varphi::PML \ \psi::PML$

abbreviation(*input*) $F1 \equiv (\Diamond^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)) \supset^d \Diamond^d\varphi$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F2 \equiv (\Diamond^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F3 \equiv (\Diamond^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \supset^d \Box^d\varphi$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F4 \equiv (\Box^d(\Diamond^d(\Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)))) \supset^d \Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)$ — holds in KB/K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F5 \equiv (\Diamond^d(\varphi \wedge^d (\Diamond^d\psi))) \supset^d ((\Diamond^d\varphi) \wedge^d (\Diamond^d\psi))$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F6 \equiv ((\Box^d(\varphi \supset^d \psi)) \wedge^d (\Diamond^d(\Box^d(\neg^d\psi)))) \supset^d \neg^d(\Diamond^d\psi)$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F7 \equiv (\Diamond^d\varphi) \supset^d (\Box^d(\varphi \vee^d \Diamond^d\varphi))$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F8 \equiv (\Diamond^d(\Box^d\varphi)) \supset^d (\varphi \vee^d \Diamond^d\varphi)$ — holds in KT/KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F9 \equiv ((\Box^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)) \wedge^d (\Box^d(\Diamond^d(\neg^d\varphi)))) \supset^d \Diamond^d(\Diamond^d\varphi)$ — holds in KT

abbreviation(*input*) $F10 \equiv ((\Box^d(\varphi \supset^d \Box^d\psi)) \wedge^d (\Box^d(\Diamond^d(\neg^d\psi)))) \supset^d \neg^d(\Box^d\psi)$ — holds in KT

declare *imp-cong*[*cong del*]

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *blast*

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *blast*

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *blast*

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. r \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$

```

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F1)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by meson
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F2)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

```

oops
end

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops

lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
 end

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F4)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *meson*

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F4)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *meson*

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F4)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by meson
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_4)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by meson
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_4)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_4)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_4)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by meson
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_4)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_5)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_5)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_5)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_5)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_5)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F_5)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops

```

lemma $K4$: $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F5)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma K : $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F5)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

lemma $S5$: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma $S4$: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma $KB4$: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KT : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma $K4$: $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K : $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F6)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

lemma $S5$: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *blast*
lemma S_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KT : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K : $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

lemma S_5 : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma S_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KB_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KT : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$

```

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F8)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^d F9)$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

```

```

oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^d F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
end

```

— Summary of experiments: Nitpick: ctex=32 (with simp 8, without simp 24), none=56 (with simp 0, without simp 56), unknown=72 (with simp 72, without simp 0) Sledgehammer: proof=70 (with simp 38, without simp 32), no prf=90 (with simp 42, without simp 48)

— No conflicts
end

8.3 Tests with the (maximal) shallow embedding: axiom schemata

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow-further-tests-1* **imports** *PMLinHOL-shallow-tests*

begin

— What is the weakest modal logic in which the following test formulas F1-F10 are provable?

— Test with schematic axioms

consts $\varphi::\sigma \ \psi::\sigma$

abbreviation(*input*) $F1 \equiv (\Diamond^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \supset^s \Diamond^s\varphi$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F2 \equiv (\Diamond^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F3 \equiv (\Diamond^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \supset^s \Box^s\varphi$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F4 \equiv (\Box^s(\Diamond^s(\Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)))) \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KB/K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F5 \equiv (\Diamond^s(\varphi \wedge^s (\Diamond^s\psi))) \supset^s ((\Diamond^s\varphi) \wedge^s (\Diamond^s\psi))$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F6 \equiv ((\Box^s(\varphi \supset^s \psi)) \wedge^s (\Diamond^s(\Box^s(\neg^s\psi)))) \supset^s \neg^s(\Diamond^s\psi)$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F7 \equiv (\Diamond^s\varphi) \supset^s (\Box^s(\varphi \vee^s \Diamond^s\varphi))$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F8 \equiv (\Diamond^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \supset^s (\varphi \vee^s \Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KT/KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F9 \equiv ((\Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)) \wedge^s (\Box^s(\Diamond^s(\neg^s\varphi)))) \supset^s \Diamond^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KT

abbreviation(*input*) $F10 \equiv ((\Box^s(\varphi \supset^s \Box^s\psi)) \wedge^s (\Box^s(\Diamond^s(\neg^s\psi)))) \supset^s \neg^s(\Box^s\psi)$ — holds in KT

declare *imp-cong*[*cong del*]

experiment begin

lemma $S5$: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s\varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s\varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*smt* (*verit*) *NegS-def*)

lemma $S4$: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s\varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s\varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*metis* *NegS-def*)

lemma $KB4$: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s\varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*smt* (*verit*) *NegS-def*)

lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s\varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma KT : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s\varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

oops

lemma KB : $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1$

```

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $K4$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F1$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis NegS-def)
lemma  $K$ :  $\forall w:W. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F1$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma  $S5$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (smt (verit) NegS-def)
lemma  $S4$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB4$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (smt (verit) NegS-def)
lemma  $KTB$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (smt (verit) NegS-def)
lemma  $KT$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (smt (verit) NegS-def)
lemma  $K4$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

```

```

oops
lemma  $K$ :  $\forall w:W. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma  $S5$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $S4$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB4$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $KTB$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $KT$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $K4$ :  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma  $K$ :  $\forall w:W. \langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

```

lemma S5: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma S4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KTB: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KT: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K: $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

lemma S5: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (smt (verit) NegS-def)
lemma S4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (*smt (verit) NegS-def*)
lemma KB4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (*smt (verit) NegS-def*)
lemma KTB: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KT: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (*smt (verit, del-insts) NegS-def*)
lemma K: $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F5$
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma S4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KB4: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma KTB: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s$

$\varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *KT*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *KB*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *K4*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *K*: $\forall w: W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F6$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 oops
 end

experiment begin
lemma *S5*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *S4*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *KB4*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *KTB*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops
lemma *KT*: $\forall w: W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 oops

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops

lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (*metis NegS-def*)

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (*metis NegS-def*)

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (*metis NegS-def*)

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (*metis NegS-def*)

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis NegS-def)
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis NegS-def)
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis NegS-def)
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by (metis NegS-def)
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s(\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F9$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s (\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s (\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*metis NegS-def*)

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s (\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*metis NegS-def*)

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s (\Diamond^s \varphi)) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s (\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \wedge (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s (\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*metis (lifting) BoxS-def NegS-def*)

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \varphi) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by (*metis (lifting) BoxS-def NegS-def*)

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s \varphi \supset^s \Box^s (\Diamond^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. (\forall \varphi. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s (\Box^s \varphi) \supset^s \Box^s (\Box^s \varphi)) \longrightarrow \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. \langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

end

— Summary of experiments: Nitpick: ctex=32 (with simp 16, without simp 16), none=0, unknwn=128 (with simp 64, without simp 64) Sledgehammer: proof=32 (with simp 24, without simp 8), no prf=128 (with simp 56, without simp 72)

— No conflict

end

8.4 Tests with the (maximal) shallow embedding: semantic frame conditions

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow-further-tests-2*

imports *PMLinHOL-shallow-tests*

begin

— What is the weakest modal logic in which the following test formulas F1-F10 are provable?

— Test with semantic conditions

abbreviation(*input*) *refl* (*r*) **where** *r* $\equiv \lambda R. \text{ reflexive } R$

abbreviation(*input*) *sym* (*s*) **where** *s* $\equiv \lambda R. \text{ symmetric } R$

abbreviation(*input*) *tra* (*t*) **where** *t* $\equiv \lambda R. \text{ transitive } R$

consts $\varphi::\sigma \ \psi::\sigma$

abbreviation(*input*) *F1* $\equiv (\Diamond^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)) \supset^s \Diamond^s\varphi$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) *F2* $\equiv (\Diamond^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) *F3* $\equiv (\Diamond^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \supset^s \Box^s\varphi$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) *F4* $\equiv (\Box^s(\Diamond^s(\Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)))) \supset^s \Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) *F5* $\equiv (\Diamond^s(\varphi \wedge^s (\Diamond^s\psi))) \supset^s ((\Diamond^s\varphi) \wedge^s (\Diamond^s\psi))$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) *F6* $\equiv ((\Box^s(\varphi \supset^s \psi)) \wedge^s (\Diamond^s(\Box^s(\neg^s\psi)))) \supset^s \neg^s(\Diamond^s\psi)$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) *F7* $\equiv (\Diamond^s\varphi) \supset^s (\Box^s(\varphi \vee^s \Diamond^s\varphi))$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) *F8* $\equiv (\Diamond^s(\Box^s\varphi)) \supset^s (\varphi \vee^s \Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KT and in KB

abbreviation(*input*) *F9* $\equiv ((\Box^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)) \wedge^s (\Box^s(\Diamond^s(\neg^s\varphi)))) \supset^s \Diamond^s(\Diamond^s\varphi)$ — holds in KT

abbreviation(*input*) *F10* $\equiv ((\Box^s(\varphi \supset^s \Box^s\psi)) \wedge^s (\Box^s(\Diamond^s(\neg^s\psi)))) \supset^s \neg^s(\Box^s\psi)$ — holds in KT

declare *imp-cong*[*cong del*]

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. \ r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *blast*

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. \ r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *blast*

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. \ s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *blast*

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. \ r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. \ r \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F1)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

```

end

experiment begin

lemma $S5$: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma $S4$: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma $KB4$: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma KT : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma KB : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma $K4$: $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma K : $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F3)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

end

experiment begin

lemma $S5$: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *metis*

lemma $S4$: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *metis*

lemma $KB4$: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F4)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

by *metis*
lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_4)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by *blast*
lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_4)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 oops
lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_4)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by *blast*
lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_4)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by *meson*
lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_4)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 oops
 end

experiment begin
lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_5)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by *blast*
lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_5)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by *blast*
lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_5)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
 by *blast*
lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_5)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 oops
lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_5)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 oops
lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_5)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
 oops
lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F_5)$

```

— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F5)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. r \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F6)$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$ 
— nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast

```

lemma S_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KT : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K : $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F7)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

lemma S_5 : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma S_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KB_4 : $\forall w:W. \text{s } R \wedge \text{t } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KTB : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \wedge \text{s } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*
lemma KT : $\forall w:W. \text{r } R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by blast
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F8)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma S4:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma KB4:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KTB:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma KT:  $\forall w:W. r\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by blast
lemma KB:  $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K4:  $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K:  $\forall w:W. (\langle W,R,V \rangle, w \models^s F9)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops

```

end

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma *S4*: $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma *KB4*: $\forall w:W. s\ R \wedge t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma *KTB*: $\forall w:W. r\ R \wedge s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma *KT*: $\forall w:W. r\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by *blast*

lemma *KB*: $\forall w:W. s\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma *K4*: $\forall w:W. t\ R \longrightarrow (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

lemma *K*: $\forall w:W. (\langle W, R, V \rangle, w \models^s F10)$
 — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops

end

— Summary of experiments: Nitpick: ctex=84 (with simp 42, without simp 42), none=0, unknwn=76 (with simp 38, without simp 38) Sledgehammer: proof=66 (with simp 38, without simp 28), no prf=94 (with simp 42, without simp 52)

— No conflicts

end

8.5 Tests with the (minimal) shallow embedding: axiom schemata

theory *PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal-further-tests-1*

imports *PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal* — C.B., 2025

begin

— What is the weakest modal logic in which the following test formulas F1-F10 are provable?

— Test with schematic axioms

abbreviation(*input*) $AxT \equiv \forall \varphi. \models^m (\Box^m \varphi) \supset^m \varphi$

abbreviation(*input*) $AxB \equiv \forall \varphi. \models^m \varphi \supset^m \Box^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)$

abbreviation(*input*) $Ax4 \equiv \forall \varphi. \models^m (\Box^m \varphi) \supset^m \Box^m (\Box^m \varphi)$

consts $\varphi::\sigma \ \psi::\sigma$

abbreviation(*input*) $F1 \equiv (\Diamond^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)) \supset^m \Diamond^m \varphi$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F2 \equiv (\Diamond^m (\Box^m \varphi)) \supset^m \Box^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F3 \equiv (\Diamond^m (\Box^m \varphi)) \supset^m \Box^m \varphi$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F4 \equiv (\Box^m (\Diamond^m (\Box^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)))) \supset^m \Box^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)$ — holds in KB/K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F5 \equiv (\Diamond^m (\varphi \wedge^m (\Diamond^m \psi))) \supset^m ((\Diamond^m \varphi) \wedge^m (\Diamond^m \psi))$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F6 \equiv ((\Box^m (\varphi \supset^m \psi)) \wedge^m (\Diamond^m (\Box^m (\neg^m \psi)))) \supset^m \neg^m (\Diamond^m \psi)$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F7 \equiv (\Diamond^m \varphi) \supset^m (\Box^m (\varphi \vee^m \Diamond^m \varphi))$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F8 \equiv (\Diamond^m (\Box^m \varphi)) \supset^m (\varphi \vee^m \Diamond^m \varphi)$ — holds in KT/KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F9 \equiv ((\Box^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)) \wedge^m (\Box^m (\Diamond^m (\neg^m \varphi)))) \supset^m \Diamond^m (\Diamond^m \varphi)$ — holds in KT

abbreviation(*input*) $F10 \equiv ((\Box^m (\varphi \supset^m \Box^m \psi)) \wedge^m (\Box^m (\Diamond^m (\neg^m \psi)))) \supset^m \neg^m (\Box^m \psi)$ — holds in KT

declare *imp-cong*[*cong del*]

nitpick-params

experiment begin

lemma $S5: AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

by *metis*

lemma $S4: AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

by *metis*

lemma $KB4: AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F1$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

by *metis*

lemma $KTB: AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F1$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctx — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctx — no prf

oops

lemma $KT: AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F1$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctx — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctx — no prf

oops

lemma $KB: AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F1$

```

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \rightarrow \models^m F1$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma K:  $\models^m F1$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \rightarrow \models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by (metis NegM-def)
lemma S4:  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \rightarrow \models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB4:  $AxB \wedge Ax4 \rightarrow \models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by (metis NegM-def)
lemma KTB:  $AxT \wedge AxB \rightarrow \models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by (metis NegM-def)
lemma KT:  $AxT \rightarrow \models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $AxB \rightarrow \models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by (metis NegM-def)
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \rightarrow \models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\models^m F2$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

```

```

lemma S5:  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma S4:  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KB4:  $AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma KTB:  $AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KT:  $AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KB:  $AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K:  $\models^m F3$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma S5:  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma S4:  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
  by smt
lemma KB4:  $AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma KTB:  $AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

```

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by (metis NegM-def)
lemma KT:  $AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by (metis NegM-def)
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=unknown] — sledgehammer — unkn — proof
by smt
lemma K:  $\models^m F4$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma S4:  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB4:  $AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KTB:  $AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KT:  $AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis

```

```

lemma  $K$ :  $\models^m F5$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma  $S5$ :  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma  $S4$ :  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB4$ :  $AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma  $KTB$ :  $AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $KT$ :  $AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB$ :  $AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $K4$ :  $Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $K$ :  $\models^m F6$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma  $S5$ :  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma  $S4$ :  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

```

```

oops
lemma  $KB_4: AxB \wedge Ax_4 \longrightarrow \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma  $KTB: AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $KT: AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB: AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $K_4: Ax_4 \longrightarrow \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $K: \models^m F7$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma  $S5: AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax_4 \longrightarrow \models^m F8$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $S_4: AxT \wedge Ax_4 \longrightarrow \models^m F8$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KB_4: AxB \wedge Ax_4 \longrightarrow \models^m F8$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by (metis NegM-def)
lemma  $KTB: AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F8$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KT: AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F8$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KB: AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F8$ 

```

```

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by (metis NegM-def)
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F8$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\models^m F8$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma S4:  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB4:  $AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KTB:  $AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KT:  $AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB:  $AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K:  $\models^m F9$ 
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin

```

```

lemma S5:  $AxT \wedge AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma S4:  $AxT \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma KB4:  $AxB \wedge Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KTB:  $AxT \wedge AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma KT:  $AxT \longrightarrow \models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma KB:  $AxB \longrightarrow \models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K4:  $Ax4 \longrightarrow \models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K:  $\models^m F10$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
end

```

— Summary of experiments: Nitpick: ctex=84 (with simp 42, without simp 42), none=72 (with simp 36, without simp 36), unknown=4 (with simp 2, without simp 2) Sledgehammer: proof=73 (with simp 38, without simp 35), no prf=87 (with simp 42, without simp 45)

— No conflicts
end

8.6 Tests with the (minimal) shallow embedding: semantic frame conditions

```

theory PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal-further-tests-2
  imports PMLinHOL-shallow-minimal
begin

```

— What is the weakest modal logic in which the following test formulas F1-F10

are provable?

— Test with semantic conditions

abbreviation(*input*) *refl* (r) **where** $r \equiv \lambda R. \text{ reflexive } R$

abbreviation(*input*) *sym* (s) **where** $s \equiv \lambda R. \text{ symmetric } R$

abbreviation(*input*) *tra* (t) **where** $t \equiv \lambda R. \text{ transitive } R$

consts $\varphi::\sigma \ \psi::\sigma$

abbreviation(*input*) $F1 \equiv (\Diamond^m(\Diamond^m\varphi)) \supset^m \Diamond^m\varphi$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F2 \equiv (\Diamond^m(\Box^m\varphi)) \supset^m \Box^m(\Diamond^m\varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F3 \equiv (\Diamond^m(\Box^m\varphi)) \supset^m \Box^m\varphi$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F4 \equiv (\Box^m(\Diamond^m(\Box^m(\Diamond^m\varphi)))) \supset^m \Box^m(\Diamond^m\varphi)$ — holds in KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F5 \equiv (\Diamond^m(\varphi \wedge^m (\Diamond^m\psi))) \supset^m ((\Diamond^m\varphi) \wedge^m (\Diamond^m\psi))$ — holds in K4

abbreviation(*input*) $F6 \equiv ((\Box^m(\varphi \supset^m \psi)) \wedge^m (\Diamond^m(\Box^m(\neg^m\psi)))) \supset^m \neg^m(\Diamond^m\psi)$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F7 \equiv (\Diamond^m\varphi) \supset^m (\Box^m(\varphi \vee^m \Diamond^m\varphi))$ — holds in KB4

abbreviation(*input*) $F8 \equiv (\Diamond^m(\Box^m\varphi)) \supset^m (\varphi \vee^m \Diamond^m\varphi)$ — holds in KT and in KB

abbreviation(*input*) $F9 \equiv ((\Box^m(\Diamond^m\varphi)) \wedge^m (\Box^m(\Diamond^m(\neg^m\varphi)))) \supset^m \Diamond^m(\Diamond^m\varphi)$ — holds in KT

abbreviation(*input*) $F10 \equiv ((\Box^m(\varphi \supset^m \Box^m\psi)) \wedge^m (\Box^m(\Diamond^m(\neg^m\psi)))) \supset^m \neg^m(\Box^m\psi)$ — holds in KT

declare *imp-cong*[*cong del*]

experiment begin

lemma *S5*: $r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F1)$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

by *metis*

lemma *S4*: $r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F1)$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

by *metis*

lemma *KB4*: $s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F1)$

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

by *metis*

lemma *KTB*: $r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F1)$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *KT*: $r \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F1)$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

oops

lemma *KB*: $s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F1)$

— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

apply *simp* — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

```

oops
lemma  $K4$ :  $t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F1)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $K$ :  $(\models^m F1)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma  $S5$ :  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $S4$ :  $r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB4$ :  $s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KTB$ :  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KT$ :  $r \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $KB$ :  $s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $K4$ :  $t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma  $K$ :  $(\models^m F2)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma  $S5$ :  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F3)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

```

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma S4: r R ∧ t R → (|=m F3)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB4: s R ∧ t R → (|=m F3)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KTB: r R ∧ s R → (|=m F3)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KT: r R → (|=m F3)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB: s R → (|=m F3)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4: t R → (|=m F3)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K: (|=m F3)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5: r R ∧ s R ∧ t R → (|=m F4)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma S4: r R ∧ t R → (|=m F4)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB4: s R ∧ t R → (|=m F4)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KTB: r R ∧ s R → (|=m F4)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis

```

```

lemma KT:  $r \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_4)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_4)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma K4:  $t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_4)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma K:  $(\models^m F_4)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5:  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma S4:  $r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma KB4:  $s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma KTB:  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KT:  $r \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB:  $s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4:  $t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma K:  $(\models^m F_5)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf

```

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma S5:  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma S4:  $r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KB4:  $s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma KTB:  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KT:  $r \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KB:  $s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K4:  $t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma K:  $(\models^m F6)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma S5:  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F7)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma S4:  $r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F7)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma KB4:  $s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F7)$ 

```

```

— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KTB: r R ∧ s R → (|=m F7)
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KT: r R → (|=m F7)
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KB: s R → (|=m F7)
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4: t R → (|=m F7)
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K: (|=m F7)
— nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

experiment begin
lemma S5: r R ∧ s R ∧ t R → (|=m F8)
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma S4: r R ∧ t R → (|=m F8)
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB4: s R ∧ t R → (|=m F8)
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KTB: r R ∧ s R → (|=m F8)
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KT: r R → (|=m F8)
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB: s R → (|=m F8)
— nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

```

```

by metis
lemma K4: t R → (|=m F8)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K: (|=m F8)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma S5: r R ∧ s R ∧ t R → (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma S4: r R ∧ t R → (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB4: s R ∧ t R → (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma KTB: r R ∧ s R → (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KT: r R → (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma KB: s R → (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K4: t R → (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
lemma K: (|=m F9)
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
oops
end

```

experiment begin

```

lemma S5: r R ∧ s R ∧ t R → (|=m F10)
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof

```

```

apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
by metis
lemma  $S4$ :  $r \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KB4$ :  $s \ R \wedge t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma  $KTB$ :  $r \ R \wedge s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KT$ :  $r \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=none] — sledgehammer — none — proof
  by metis
lemma  $KB$ :  $s \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma  $K4$ :  $t \ R \longrightarrow (\models^m F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
lemma  $K$ :  $(\models^m F10)$ 
  — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  apply simp — nitpick[expect=genuine] — sledgehammer — ctex — no prf
  oops
end

```

— Summary of experiments: Nitpick: ctex=84 (with simp 42, without simp 42), none=76 (with simp 38, without simp 38), unknwn=0 Sledgehammer: proof=76 (with simp 38, without simp 38), no prf=84 (with simp 42, without simp 42)

— No conflicts
end

References

- [1] C. Benzmüller. Faithful logic embeddings in HOL — deep and shallow. In C. Barrett and U. Waldmann, editors, *Automated Deduction – CADE-30 – 30th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Stuttgart, Germany, July 28-31, 2025, Proceedings*, volume 15943 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 280–302. Springer, 2025. (preprint: [arXiv:2502.19311](https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.19311)).