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Introduction
In [Cichon 1990] the question has been discussed (and investigated) whether the order type of a termination ordering \( \prec \) places a bound on the lengths of reduction sequences in rewrite systems reducing under \( \prec \). It was claimed that at least in the cases of the recursive path ordering \( \prec_{rpo} \) and the lexicographic path ordering \( \prec_{rpo} \) the following theorem holds.

(0) If \( \Lambda \) is the order type of a termination ordering \( \prec \) for a finite rewrite system \( \mathcal{R} \) then the function \( G_\Lambda \) from the Slow-Growing Hierarchy bounds the lengths of reduction sequences in \( \mathcal{R} \).

From (0) together with Girard’s Hierarchy Comparison Theorem one derives

(I) If the rules of a finite rewrite system \( \mathcal{R} \) are reducing under \( \prec_{rpo} \) then the lengths of reduction sequences in \( \mathcal{R} \) are bounded by some primitive recursive function.

(II) If the rules of a finite rewrite system \( \mathcal{R} \) are reducing under \( \prec_{rpo} \) then the lengths of reduction sequences in \( \mathcal{R} \) are bounded by some function \( F_\alpha \) from the fast-growing hierarchy below \( \omega^\omega \).

Unfortunately the proof of (0) given in [Cichon 1990] (or [Cichon 1993]) contains a major error (namely Lemma 4.16 in [Cichon 1990], Lemma 6.9 in [Cichon 1993]). But in [Hofbauer 1990] and [Weiermann 1997], resp., by means of rather cumbersome calculations the correctness of (I) and (II) has been shown directly, i.e. without referring to the slow-growing hierarchy. In the present paper we give alternative proofs of (I) and (II) which avoid those cumbersome calculations and in addition provide very good insight into the relationship between the “strength” of a termination ordering \( \prec \) and the derivation lengths in rewrite systems reducing under \( \prec \). We show that if a finite rewrite system \( \mathcal{R} \) is reducing under \( \prec_{rpo} \) (\( \prec_{rpo} \), resp.) then termination of \( \mathcal{R} \) can be proved within the fragment \( \Sigma_1^0 \)-IA (\( \Pi_1^0 \)-IA, resp.) of Peano-Arithmetic PA. Combining this with the well-known proof-theoretical result on bounds for provable \( \Pi_2^0 \)-sentences in fragments of PA (cf. Parsons 1996) yields (I) and (II).

Since the treatment of \( \prec_{rpo} \) is particularly simple, we start with the proof of (II) which runs as follows. In §1 we carry out a termination (or wellfoundedness) proof for \( \prec_{rpo} \) which as its main tool uses the \( \Pi^1_1 \)-set \( W := \bigcap \{ X \subseteq T : \forall t \in T : \exists s < t \text{ s.t. } (s \in X \rightarrow t \in X) \} \) (i.e. the so-called accessible part of \( \prec_{rpo} \)). Then in §2 we take advantage of the fact that for proving termination of a single finite rewrite system reducing under \( \prec_{rpo} \) one does not need the full relation \( \prec_{rpo} \), since every such system \( \mathcal{R} \) is already reducing under a suitable “approximation” \( \prec_k \) of \( \prec_{rpo} \) (with \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) depending on \( \mathcal{R} \)). The essential property of \( \prec_k \) is that for every term \( t \) there are only finitely many predecessors \( s <_k t \) and therefore the accessible part \( W_k \) of \( \prec_k \) can already be defined by a \( \Sigma_1^0 \)-formula. Moreover by replacing in the termination proof for \( \prec_{rpo} \) all occurrences of \( \prec_{rpo} \) and \( W \) by \( \prec_k, W_k \), resp., one obtains a termination proof for \( \prec_k \) which is formalizable in the fragment \( \Pi_2^0 \)-IA of Peano-Arithmetic. It follows that if \( \mathcal{R} \) is reducing under \( \prec_k \) then \( \Pi_2^0 \)-IA proves the \( \Pi_2^0 \)-sentence saying that for every term \( t \) there exists an \( l \in \mathbb{N} \) such that every \( \mathcal{R} \)-reduction sequence starting with \( t \) has length less than \( l \). Now one applies the above mentioned result from classical proof-theory and obtains (II).

The main idea for the just sketched proof (namely the transition from the \( \Pi_1^1 \)-set \( W \) to the \( \Sigma_1^0 \)-set \( s \subseteq W_k \))...
comes from [Arai 1991] where a similar method has been used to establish one direction of the Hierarchy Comparison Theorem (cf. also [Schmerl 1981]).

In §3 we define suitable approximations \( \prec_k \) for the recursive path ordering \( \prec_{rp} \) and prove wellfoundedness of \( \prec_k \) within \( \Sigma^0_1 \)-IA. Then (I) is established in the same way as (II).

§1 A termination proof for the lexicographic path ordering

Let \( p \in \mathbb{N} \), and let \( f_0, \ldots, f_p \) be function symbols where each \( f_p \) has a fixed arity \( \#(f_p) \).

Let \( T \) be the set of all terms built up from variables \( u_0, v_1, \ldots \) by means of \( f_0, \ldots, f_p \).

In the following, \( s, t, s_i, t_i \) denote elements of \( T \), and \( i, j, k, l, m, n \) denote natural numbers.

**Abbreviation**

By \( A(\prec, s, t) \) we abbreviate the following proposition:

\( t \) is of the form \( f_s t_1 \ldots t_n \) and one of the following three cases holds

- (1) \( s \preceq t_j \) for some \( j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \)
- (2) \( s = f_{s_1} \ldots s_m \) with \( \mu \prec \nu \) and \( s_1, \ldots, s_m \prec t \)
- (3) \( s = f_{s_1} \ldots s_n \) and there is a \( j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) such that \( \forall i < j(s_i = t_i) \land s_j \prec t_j \land s_{j+1}, \ldots, s_n \prec t \).

As usual \( s \preceq t \) abbreviates \( s \prec t \lor s = t \).

**Definition**

The lexicographic path ordering \( \prec_{lp} \) on \( T \) is the least binary relation \( \prec \) such that \( \forall s, t(A(\prec, s, t) \rightarrow s \prec t) \).

**Remark**: As an immediate consequence from this definition we get: \( \forall s, t(s \prec_{lp} t \rightarrow A(\prec_{lp}, s, t)) \).

We now prove that \( (T, \prec_{lp}) \) is wellfounded.

To simplify notation we write \( \prec \) for \( \prec_{lp} \).

**Definition**

Let \( W \) be the accessible part of \( (T, \prec) \), i.e. \( W := \bigcap\{X \subseteq T : \forall t(\forall s < t(s \in X) \rightarrow t \in X)\} \).

**Corollary**

(W1) \( \forall t(\forall s < t(s \in W) \leftrightarrow t \in W) \),

(W2) \( \forall t \in W(\forall s < t(F[s] \rightarrow F(t)) \rightarrow \forall t \in W F(t) \), for each predicate (formula) \( F \).

**Definition**

\( (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \prec^{lex} (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \) \iff \( \exists j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \{s_j \prec t_j \land \forall i < j(s_i = t_i)\} \).

**Lemma 1** (Transfinite induction over \( (\mathbb{N}^n, \prec^{lex}) \))

\( \forall t_1, \ldots, t_n \in W(\forall s_1, \ldots, s_n \in W((s_1, \ldots, s_n) \prec^{lex} (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \rightarrow G(s_1, \ldots, s_n) \rightarrow G(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) \rightarrow \rightarrow \forall t_1, \ldots, t_n \in W G(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \).

**Proof by induction on \( n \):**

1. \( n = 1 \): Trivial consequence of (W1),(W2).
2. \( n > 1 \): Abbreviations:
   - \( \overline{G}(t_1) := \forall s_2, \ldots, s_n \in W G(t_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \),
   - \( A := \forall t_1, \ldots, t_n \in W(\forall s_1, \ldots, s_n \in W((s_1, \ldots, s_n) \prec^{lex} (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \rightarrow G(s_1, \ldots, s_n) \rightarrow G(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) \rightarrow \rightarrow G(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \),
   - \( B := t_1 \in W \land \forall s_1 \prec t_1(\overline{G}(s_1)) \),
   - \( C := t_2, \ldots, t_n \in W \land \forall s_2, \ldots, s_n \in W((s_2, \ldots, s_n) \prec^{lex} (t_2, \ldots, t_n) \rightarrow G(t_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)) \).
Then we get:
\[ B \land C \rightarrow t_1, \ldots, t_n \in W \land \forall s_1, \ldots, s_n \in W \left( (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \prec t_1, \ldots, t_n \rightarrow G(s_1, \ldots, s_n) \right), \]
\[ A \land B \land C \rightarrow G(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n), \]
\[ A \land B \rightarrow \forall t_2, \ldots, t_n \in W [\forall s_2, \ldots, s_n \in W ( (s_2, \ldots, s_n) \prec t_2, \ldots, t_n ) \rightarrow G(t_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) ] \rightarrow G(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n), \]
\[ A \land B \rightarrow \forall t_2, \ldots, t_n \in W G(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n), \quad \text{by IH} \]
\[ A \rightarrow \forall t_1 \in W \left( \forall s_1 \prec t_1 G(s_1) \rightarrow G(t_1) \right), \]
\[ A \rightarrow \forall t_1 \in W \overline{G}(t_1), \quad \text{by (W2)}. \]

**Lemma 2**
\[ \forall t_1, \ldots, t_n \in W ( f_v t_1 \ldots t_n \in W ), \quad \text{where } n := \#(v) . \]

**Proof by induction on** \( v \):

By Lemma 1 it suffices to prove:
\[ \forall t_1, \ldots, t_n \in W [ \forall s_1, \ldots, s_n \in W ( (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \prec t_1, \ldots, t_n ) \rightarrow f_v s_1 \ldots s_n \in W ] \rightarrow f_v t_1 \ldots t_n \in W . \]

So let us assume that \( t_1, \ldots, t_n \in W \) and \( \forall s_1, \ldots, s_n \in W ( (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \prec t_1, \ldots, t_n ) \rightarrow f_v s_1 \ldots s_n \in W \). By induction on the build-up of \( s \) we prove: \( s \prec f_v t_1 \ldots t_n \rightarrow s \in W \). Then (W1) yields \( f_v t_1 \ldots t_n \in W \).

So let \( s \prec t := f_v t_1 \ldots t_n \). Then one of the following three cases holds.
1. \( s \leq t_j \). In this case \( s \in W \) follows from \( t_j \in W \) by (W1).
2. \( s = f_v s_1 \ldots s_m \) with \( \mu < \nu \) and \( s_1, \ldots, s_m \prec t \).

Then by IH we have \( s_1, \ldots, s_m \in W \) which by MIH yields \( s \in W \).
3. \( s = f_v s_1 \ldots s_m \) with \( s_1 = t_1, \ldots, s_{j-1} = t_{j-1}, s_j \prec t_j \) and \( s_{j+1}, \ldots, s_m \prec t \).

Then \( (s_1, \ldots, s_m) \prec t_1, \ldots, t_n \), and by IH we have \( s_1, \ldots, s_m \in W \).

Therefore the assumption \( (s) \) yields \( s \in W \).

**Lemma 3.** \( \forall t ( t \in W ) \).

**Proof by induction on the build-up of** \( t \) **using** Lemma 2.

**Corollary.** There is no infinite \( \prec \)-descending sequence \( (t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \).

**Proof:** By (W2) one obtains for each \( t \in W \): There exists no infinite \( \prec \)-descending sequence \( (t_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) with \( t_0 = t \). From this the claim follows by Lemma 3.

### §2 Proof-theoretic analysis

Now we analyze the just given wellfoundedness proof for \( (T, \prec) \). The first observation is that we did not use the implication \( A(\prec, s, t) \rightarrow s < t \) but only its reverse direction (namely in the proof of Lemma 2). Secondly we observe that complete induction has only been used w.r.t. the following formulas \( \Phi(x) \):
\[ \Phi(x) := (x \in W) \quad \text{[in the proof of Lemma 3]}, \]
\[ \Phi(x) := (x < f_v t_1 \ldots t_n \rightarrow x \in W) \quad \text{[in the proof of Lemma 2]} . \]

Further in the proof of Lemma 2 we used Lemma 1 for \( G(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \equiv (f_v t_1 \ldots t_n \in W) \), and in the proof of Lemma 1 we used (W2) for \( F(t) \equiv \overline{G}(t) \). Hence in the whole wellfoundedness proof the scheme (W2) is only needed for the formulas \( F(t) \equiv \forall t_2, \ldots, t_n \in W (f_v t_2 \ldots t_n \in W) \).

Putting things together we obtain the following meta-theorem:
If \( \prec \) is a primitive recursive relation on \( T \) such that \( \Pi^2_1 \text{-IA} \) proves \( \forall s, t (s < t \rightarrow A(\prec, s, t)) \) and if \( W \) is a \( \Sigma^0_2 \)-set such that \( \Pi^0_2 \text{-IA} \) proves (W1) and (W2) for all \( \Pi^0_2 \) formulas \( F(t) \) then the wellfoundedness proof from §1 can be formalized in \( \Pi^2_1 \text{-IA} \), and thus \( \Pi^0_2 \text{-IA} \) proves \( \forall t (t \in W) \).
Below we define (for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \)) a relation \( \prec_k \) on \( T \) and a subset \( W_k \) of \( T \) such that \( \prec_k \) and \( W_k \) satisfy the assumptions of the just stated meta-theorem (cf. Lemma 4). Hence this theorem yields \( \Pi^0_2\text{-IA} \vdash \forall t(t \in W_k) \).

**Definition** of \(|t|\) for each \( t \in T \)
1. \( |s| := i \)
2. \( |f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)| := \max\{n, |t_1|, \ldots, |t_n|\} + 1 \).

**Inductive Definition of** \( \prec_k \)

\[ \mathcal{A}(\prec_k, s, t) \land |s| \leq k + |t| \implies s \prec_k t. \]

**Corollary:** \( s \prec_k t \implies \mathcal{A}(\prec_k, s, t) \land |s| \leq k + |t| \).

**Remark**
In the following we assume some canonical arithmetization of terms and identify each term with its numerical code (Gödel number). According to this \( T \) and \( \prec_k \) are primitive recursive relations. Without loss of generality we may assume that there is an increasing primitive recursive function \( h \) such that \( |t| \leq t < h(|t|) \) for all \( t \).

Hence \( \forall s \prec_k t F(s) \iff \forall s < h(k + t)[s \prec_k t \to F(s)] \) and therefore \( \forall s \prec_k t \) can be treated as a bounded quantifier.

**Definition**

\[ t \in (t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1}) \implies \exists i < n(t = t_i) \]

\[ D_k := \{(t_0, \ldots, t_i) : \forall j \leq n \forall s \prec_k t_j(s \in (t_0, \ldots, t_{j-1}))\} \]

\[ W_k := \{t : \exists d(d \in D_k \land t \in d)\} \]

The elements of \( D_k \) are called \( k \)-derivations.

**Lemma 4**
In \( \Pi^0_2\text{-IA} \) the following is provable

(W1) \( \forall t(\forall s \prec_k t(s \in W_k) \leftrightarrow t \in W_k) \).

(W2) \( \forall t \in W_k(\forall s \prec_k t F(s) \to F(t)) \to \forall t \in W_k F(t) \), for each \( \Pi^0_2 \)-formula \( F \).

**Proof:**
(W1) “\( \Rightarrow \)” : obvious.

“\( \Leftarrow \)” : (1) \( \forall s \prec_k t \exists d(d \in D_k \land s \in d) \to \exists d(d \in D_k \land \forall s \prec_k t(s \in d)) \).

Proof: Under the assumption \( \forall s \prec_k t \exists d(d \in D_k \land s \in d) \) one proves \( \exists d(d \in D_k \land \forall s < h(k + t)[s \prec_k t \to F(s)] \)
by induction on \( n \). Since \( s \prec_k t \implies s < h(k + t) \) this yields \( \exists d(d \in D_k \land \forall s \prec_k t(s \in d)) \).

Assume that \( d \in D_k \land \forall s < h(k + t) \to s \in d \). If \( n \prec_k t \) does not hold then \( \forall s < n + 1(s \prec_k t \to s \in d) \). If \( n \prec_k t \) holds then by assumption there exists some \( \bar{d} \in D_k \) with \( n \in \bar{d} \), and it follows that \( d \prec \bar{d} \in D_k \) and \( \forall s < n + 1(s \prec_k t \to s \in d \land s \prec \bar{d}) \).

By definition of \( D_k \) we have \( (2) d \in D_k \land \forall s \prec_k t(s \in d) \to d \in \bar{d} \).

From (1) and (2) we get \( \forall s \prec_k t(s \in W_k) \to t \in W_k \).

(W2): Assume \( \forall t \in W_k(\forall s \prec_k t F(s) \to F(t)) \) and \( t \in W_k \). Then \( t \in (t_0, \ldots, t_i) \) for some \( k \)-derivation \( (t_0, \ldots, t_i) \). By induction on \( i \) we prove \( \forall i \leq t F(t_i) \). So let \( j \leq i \). Then \( \forall s \prec_k t_j(s \in (t_0, \ldots, t_{j-1})) \) and by IH \( \forall i < j F(t_i) \). Hence \( \forall s \prec_k t_j F(s) \) and therefore \( F(t_j) \), since \( t_j \in W_k \).

As explained above the contents of §1 together with Lemma 4 yield \( \Pi^0_2\text{-IA} \vdash F(t \in W_k) \), i.e. \( \Pi^0_2\text{-IA} \vdash \forall t F(t \in D_k \land t \in d) \). Therefore according to [Parsons 1966] there exists an \( \alpha \prec \omega \) such that \( \forall \exists d \leq F_0(t)(d \in D_k \land t \in d) \) and consequently \( \forall t(t_1, \ldots, t_n)[t_n \prec_k \ldots \prec_k t_1 \prec_k t \to n < F_0(t)] \). (Note that if \( t_n \prec_k \ldots \prec_k t_1 \prec_k t \), and \( d \) is a \( k \)-derivation of \( t \) then \( (t_n, \ldots, t_1, t) \) is a subsequence of \( d \) and thus \( n < d \).)
Now let $R$ be some finite rewrite system over $T$ which is reducing under $\prec_{lp}$, i.e. $R$ is a finite subset of $\{(\ell, r) \in T \times T : r \prec_{lp} \ell\}$. As usual $\to_R$ denotes the rewrite relation generated by $R$, i.e. $t \to_R s$ iff there exists $(\ell, r) \in R$ and a substitution $\theta$ such that $s$ results from $t$ by replacing one occurrence of $\ell\theta$ in $t$ by $r\theta$.

Below (in Lemma 7) we will prove that $\to_R$ is contained in $\prec_k$ with $k := \max \{|r| : (\ell, r) \in R\}$. Therefore the just established bound on the lengths of $\prec_k$-descending sequences is also a bound for the lengths of $R$-reduction sequences. This finishes the proof of (II).

**Lemma 5**

$s \prec_{lp} t \implies s\theta \prec_{lp} t\theta$, for each substitution $\theta$.

**Proof:** One first proves $s \prec_{lp} t \implies |s\theta| \leq |s| + |t\theta|$ by induction on the definition of $\prec_{lp}$. Using this one then obtains $s \prec_{lp} t \implies s\theta \prec_{lp} t\theta$ by another induction of this kind. □

**Lemma 6**

If $t = f_p t_1 \ldots t_n$ and $s = f_p t_1 \ldots t_{j-1} t'_j t_{j+1} \ldots t_n$ with $t'_j \prec_k t_j$ then $s \prec_k t$.

**Proof:** By $(\prec_k 1)$ we have $t_{j+1} \ldots t_n \prec_k t$, and from $t'_j \prec_k t_j$ we get $|t'_j| \leq k + |t_j| \leq |t|$. Hence $|s| \leq k + |t|$ and therefore $s \prec_k t$ by $(\prec_k 3)$. □

**Lemma 7**

$t \to_R s \implies s \prec_k t$, with $k := \max \{|r| : (\ell, r) \in R\}$.

**Proof:**

By Lemma 5 we have $r\theta \prec_{lp} t\theta$ and thus $r\theta \prec_k t\theta$ for each $(\ell, r) \in R$ and each substitution $\theta$. From this together with Lemma 6 we obtain the assertion by induction on $|t|$. □

§3 Treatment of the recursive path ordering $\prec_{rp}$

In this section we indicate briefly how a proof of (I) can be obtained by some minor modifications from the proof of (II) given in §1 and §2. We only present a list of definitions and lemmata and leave it to the reader to compose from that of a proof of (I) by observing that all what follows can be formalized in $\Sigma^0_1$-IA.

$f_0, \ldots, f_p$ are now assumed to be variadic function symbols.

$T^*$ denotes the set of all finite sequences of terms $t \in T$.

Every term $t \in T$ is identified with the one element sequence $(t) \in T^*$. Hence $T \subseteq T^*$.

We use $s, t$ as syntactic variables for elements of $T$, and $a, b, c$ as syntactic variables for elements of $T^*$.

For $a = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ we set $|a| := \max \{|t_1|, \ldots, |t_n|\}$ and $f_p a := f_p t_1 \ldots t_n$. Hence $|f_p a| = |a| + 1$.

Further we define: $(s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}) \approx (t_0, \ldots, t_{n-1}) : \iff m = n \land 3$ permutation $\pi$ of $n \forall i \prec n (t_i = s_{\pi(i)})$

We forget the definition of $\prec_k$ given in §2.

**Inductive Definition of** $b \prec_k a$ **for** $a, b \in T^*$

1. $s \preceq_k t_j \& j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \implies s \preceq_k f_s t_1 \ldots t_n$
2. $t = f_p t_1 \ldots t_n \& |b| = f_p s_1, \ldots, s_m$ with $\mu < \nu$ or $b = (s_1, \ldots, s_m) \& |s_1, \ldots, s_m| \prec_k t \& |b| \leq k + |t| \implies b \prec_k t$
3. $t = f_p t_1 \ldots t_n \& s = f_s s_1, \ldots, s_m \prec_k t \& |s| \leq k + |t| \implies s \prec_k t$
4. $a \approx (t_0, \ldots, t_n) \& b \approx b_0 s \ldots s b_n \& n \geq 1 \& \forall i \leq n (b_i \preceq_k t_i) \& \exists i \leq n (b_i \prec_k t_i) \implies b \prec_k a$

Note that in rule 2 (and also in rule 3) $m = 0$ is allowed. Hence $(\prec_k t$ for each $t \in T$.

5
Definition of $\prec_{rpo}$

The recursive path ordering $\prec_{rpo}$ on $T^*$ is inductively defined by the same rules as $\prec_k$ only that in rule 2 and rule 3 the condition $|\cdot| \leq k + |f|$ is omitted.

Lemma 8

a) $b \prec_k t \implies |b| \leq k + |f|$

b) $b \prec_k a \implies |b| \leq |a| \cdot (k + |a|)$.

Proof:

a) trivial.

b) Let $a \approx (t_0, ... , t_n)$ and $b \approx b_0 \ast \ldots \ast b_n$ with $\forall i \leq n(b_i \preceq_k t_i)$. Then $\forall i \leq n(|b_i| \leq k + |t_i| \leq k + |a|)$ and thus $|b| \leq |b_0| + \ldots + |b_n| \leq (n+1) \cdot (k + |a|) \leq |a| \cdot (k + |a|)$.

Definition

$D_k := \{ (a_0, \ldots , a_1) : \forall j \leq k \forall c \prec_k a_j(c \in (a_0, \ldots , a_{j-1}) \} \}$

$W_k := \{ a \in T^* : \exists d \in D_k \land a \in d \} \}$

Lemma 9

(W1) $\forall a (\forall b \prec_k a(b \in W_k) \implies a \in W_k)$

(W2) $\forall a \in W_k (\forall b \prec_k F(a) \implies F(a) \in W_k)$ for all $F \in \Sigma_1^0$.

Lemma 10

If $c \prec_k a \ast b$ then there are $a_1, b_1$ such that $c \approx a_1 \ast b_1$ and $[a_1 = a \land b_1 \preceq_k b]$ or $[a_1 \preceq_k a \land b_1 \preceq_k b]$.

Proof:

Let $c \prec_k a \ast b$ with $a = (t_0, ... , t_{i-1})$ and $b = (t_i, ... , t_{n-1})$. Then there are $c_0, ... , c_{n-1}$ with $c \approx c_0 \ast \ldots \ast c_{n-1}$ and $\forall i < n(c_i \preceq_k t_i)$. Let $a_1 := c_0 \ast \ldots \ast c_{i-1}$ and $b_1 := c_i \ast \ldots \ast c_{n-1}$.

Lemma 11

$a \in W_k \land b \in W_k \to a \ast b \in W_k$.

Proof:

1) $(c_0, ... , c_{n-1}) \in D_k \land \forall x \prec_k a \forall i < n(x \ast c_i \in W_k) \to \forall i < n(a \ast c_i \in W_k)$.

Proof: We prove $a \ast c_i \in W_k$ by induction on $i$.

So let $i < n$ and $b := c_i$. We show $\forall c \prec_k a \ast b(c \in W_k)$.

Let $c \prec_k a \ast b$. By Lemma 10 we have $c \approx a_1 \ast b_1$ with $[a_1 = a \land b_1 \preceq_k b]$ or $[a_1 \preceq_k a \land b_1 \preceq_k b]$.

Case 1: $a_1 = a \land b_1 \preceq_k b$. Then $b_1 = c_j$ with $j < i$. Hence, by I.H., $c \approx a \ast b_1 \in W_k$.

Case 2: $a_1 \preceq_k a \land b_1 \preceq_k b$. Then $b_1 = c_j$ with $j \leq i$. Hence $a_1 \ast b_1 \in W_k$ by assumption.

From (1) and (W2) we get

2) $(c_0, ... , c_{n-1}) \in D_k \land \forall a \in W_k \to \forall i < n(a \ast c_i \in W_k)$,

3) $d \in D_k \land a \in W_k \land b \in d \to a \ast b \in W_k$,

4) $a \in W_k \land b \in W_k \to a \ast b \in W_k$.

Lemma 12

$\forall a \in W_k (f_\ldots a \in W_k)$.

Proof by induction on $\nu$:

We prove $\forall a \in W_k (\forall b \prec_k a(f_\ldots b \in W_k) \to f_\ldots a \in W_k)$. The claim then follows by (W2).

So assume $a = (t_1, ... , t_n) \in W_k$ and $\forall b \prec_k a(f_\ldots b \in W_k)$. The claim then follows by (W2).
By side induction on the build-up of $c$ we prove $c \in W_k$ for all $c \prec_k f_\sigma a$. Then $(W_k) \text{ yields } f_\sigma a \in W_k$.

Case 1: $c = c_0 \ast c_1$ with $\alpha_0, c_1 \neq ()$.

Then $\alpha_1 \prec_k f_\sigma a$ and therefore by SIH $c_0, c_1 \in W_k$. From this we get $c \in W_k$ by Lemma 11.

Case 2: $c \in T$ and $c \preceq_k t_j$ with $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then $c \in W_k$ follows from $c \preceq_k t_j \preceq_k a \in W_k$ by (W1).

Case 3: $c = f_\mu s_1 \ldots s_m$ with $\mu < \nu$ and $s_1, \ldots, s_m \prec_k f_\sigma a$ and $|c| \leq k + |f_\sigma a|$.

Then $\tilde{c} := (s_1, \ldots, s_m) \prec_k f_\sigma a$, and the SIH yields $\tilde{c} \in W_k$. From this we obtain $c = f_\mu \tilde{c} \in W_k$ by MIH.

Case 4: $c = f_\nu b$ with $b \prec_k a$. Then by assumption $c \in W_k$.

\begin{lemma}
\forall a (a \in W_k).
\end{lemma}

Proof by induction on the build-up of $a$ using Lemma 11 and Lemma 12.

\begin{lemma}
$b \prec_{\rho \sigma} a \iff b \theta \prec_{[\theta]} a \theta$ for each substitution $\theta$.
\end{lemma}

\begin{lemma}
If $R$ is a finite rewrite system reducing under $\prec_{\rho \sigma}$ then the rewrite relation $\rightarrow_R$ is contained in $\prec_k$ with $k := \max \{|\varphi|: (\ell, r) \in R\}$.
\end{lemma}
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