

Generalized Decidability via Brouwer Trees

Tom de Jong¹, Nicolai Kraus¹, Aref Mohammadzadeh¹, and
Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg²

¹ University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

² University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

Summary Decidability and semidecidability are at the heart of computer science. If we think of “decidable” as “the answer is discoverable in finitely many (i.e. less than ω , the smallest infinite ordinal) steps,” then “semidecidable” means that the answer is discoverable in less than $\omega + 1$ steps. This formulation allows for a finer hierarchy than just “decidable, semidecidable, undecidable.” For example, if every P_i is semidecidable, then $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}. P_i$ may not be semidecidable, but intuitively, its answer is discoverable in ω^2 steps: each $P(i)$ requires at most ω steps, and there are ω instances. An example is the twin prime conjecture: For every n , it is semidecidable whether there is a pair $(p, p + 2)$ of primes larger than n , but asking whether this is true for all n would, at least on an intuitive level, require ω^2 steps. We suggest and study a framework in which this and related statements can be formulated and proved. All our results are formalized in cubical Agda [15]. The formalization can be found in our git repository [10].

A preliminary variant of Definition 1 below, and its relation to semidecidability, were presented in a talk at TYPES’22 [12]. We develop and refine the theory suggested in that talk. For more details, see our arXiv preprint [9].

Setting and Background We work in homotopy type theory, following notions of decidability in constructive mathematics. A proposition P is decidable if $P \vee \neg P$ holds, and semidecidable if there exists a binary sequence that is 1 somewhere if and only if P holds — see the work on synthetic computability theory by Bauer [1] and Forster, Kirst, and Smolka [5]. The type \mathbf{Brw} of *Brouwer tree ordinals* (in the following just *ordinals*) is given by a quotient inductive-inductive construction together with an order relation $\leq : \mathbf{Brw} \rightarrow \mathbf{Brw} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ [13]. The constructors for \mathbf{Brw} are `zero`, `succ`, and `limit`, constructing zero, successors, and limits of sequences (cf. Kleene’s \mathcal{O} [11, 3]), together with a path constructor to ensure that bisimilar sequences give equal limits, and constructors for the relation \leq to ensure that the expected equations holds. An important design choice for the current work is that the constructor `limit` only accepts *strictly* increasing sequences as its argument. As a consequence, it is decidable whether a given ordinal is finite or infinite: `zero` is finite, `limit f` is always infinite, and `succ β` is finite if and only if β is; moreover, each ordinal α can be written as $\lambda + n$, where λ is a limit (or zero) and n is a natural number.

Generalized Decidability For the following definition, a *proposition* is a type with at most one element (i.e. the HoTT sense of proposition), and *exists* (\exists) means “truncated Σ ”.

Definition 1. Let $\alpha : \mathbf{Brw}$ be an ordinal and P a proposition. We say that P is α -decidable if there exists $x : \mathbf{Brw}$ such that $P \leftrightarrow x \geq \alpha$.

For sufficiently low ordinals α , the statement “ P is α -decidable” can be understood intuitively as “if evidence for P exists, then it can be discovered in less than α steps,” as discussed in the first paragraph. One can show that P is decidable if and only if it is ω -decidable, i.e. evidence can be discovered in finitely many steps, and semidecidable if and only if its evidence can be discovered in less than $(\omega + 1)$ steps.

Remark 2. For the technical development, it is useful to observe that considering limit ordinals is sufficient; for example, the notions of $(\omega + 1)$ -decidability and $(\omega \cdot 2)$ -decidability coincide, and the first steps of the hierarchy can be presented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P \text{ holds} &\leftrightarrow P \text{ is } (\omega \cdot 0)\text{-decidable} \\ P \text{ is decidable} &\leftrightarrow P \text{ is } (\omega \cdot 1)\text{-decidable} \\ P \text{ is semidecidable} &\leftrightarrow P \text{ is } (\omega \cdot 2)\text{-decidable} \end{aligned}$$

Proof sketch. We give some proofs to illustrate the notions. As explained in our introduction to Brouwer tree ordinals, it is decidable whether a given ordinal x is finite. Hence, $\omega \leq x$ is decidable. Now, a proposition P is $(\omega \cdot 1)$ -decidable if there exists $x : \mathbf{Brw}$ with $P \leftrightarrow \omega \leq x$. Thus, if P is ω -decidable, then it is equivalent to a decidable proposition and hence decidable itself. Conversely, if P is decidable, then we can take $x = \omega$ if P holds, and $x = 0$ if not.

For the left-to-right direction of the second equivalence, we note that for semidecidable P we have $s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ such that $P \leftrightarrow \exists i. s_i = 1$. Let $x := \text{limit } y$ where $y : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Brw}$ is given by

$$y_n := \begin{cases} \omega + n & \text{if } \exists(i \leq n). s_i = 1, \\ n & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Using s , one then shows that $x = \omega \cdot 2 \leftrightarrow P$, so that P is $(\omega \cdot 2)$ -decidable. \square

Closure under Logical Connectives The decidable propositions and the semidecidable propositions are closed under binary conjunctions as well as binary disjunctions. The more general situation is subtle.

Let P and Q be α -decidable, evidenced by x and y (i.e. $P \leftrightarrow x \geq \alpha$ and $Q \leftrightarrow y \geq \alpha$). If m is the minimum of the two numbers (i.e., $\forall \gamma. m \geq \gamma \leftrightarrow (x \geq \gamma \times y \geq \gamma)$) then m is evidence that $P \times Q$ is α -decidable. In general, we cannot expect to be able to calculate such a minimum, as this would imply LPO (the Limited Principle of Omniscience), a constructive taboo. Fortunately, we are able to define a function $\text{limMin} : \mathbf{Brw} \rightarrow \mathbf{Brw} \rightarrow \mathbf{Brw}$ that is correct as long as the two arguments are limits, which suffices in line with Remark 2.

Binary disjunctions would follow similarly if we could calculate binary maxima of limits. However, and possibly surprisingly, the existence of binary maxima would imply LPO even if restricted to limits. Therefore, we only get a restricted form of closure under binary disjunctions:

Theorem 3. The α -decidable propositions are closed under binary conjunction (i.e., if P and Q are α -decidable, then so is $P \times Q$). For natural numbers n and k , the $(\omega \cdot n + k)$ -decidable propositions are closed under binary disjunctions (i.e., if P and Q are $(\omega \cdot n + k)$ -decidable, then so is $\|P + Q\|$). \square

Quantifiers Assume that $P : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ is a family of α -decidable propositions; our next goal is to characterize the decidability of $\forall i. P_i$ and $\exists i. P_i$. For the time being, we only have results for families of semidecidable propositions ($\alpha = \omega \cdot 2$), which covers the above-mentioned twin prime conjecture. To solve this case, we calculate the *characteristic ordinal* of P , with the following strategy. In the first step (1), we define a function $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Brw}$ which, at position n , assumes that the binary sequence evidencing semidecidability is given as data (Σ instead of \exists) for all P_i where $i < n$. The second step (2) is to show that this function is (weakly) constant in the semidecidability data, and thus is well-defined even if the evidence for semidecidability merely exists. The third and final step (3) uses finite choice (i.e. the repeated application of the equivalence $\|A \times B\| \simeq \|A\| \times \|B\|$). These steps are illustrated and summarized in the following diagram where we have fixed $n : \mathbb{N}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Pi(i < n). \text{semidec-data}(P_i) & \xrightarrow{(1) \text{ [weakly constant]}} & \\
\downarrow |-| & & \\
\|\Pi(i < n). \text{semidec-data}(P_i)\| & \xrightarrow{(2) \text{ ---}} & \text{Brw} \\
\uparrow \simeq \text{finite choice} & & \uparrow \\
\Pi(i < n). \|\text{semidec-data}(P_i)\| & \xrightarrow{(3) \text{ ---}} &
\end{array}$$

Figure 1: For a family $P : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ of semidecidable propositions, by varying $n : \mathbb{N}$, the map (3) in the above construction yields a function $\Psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Brw}$. The characteristic ordinal of P is then defined as $\text{limit}(n \mapsto \Psi_n + n)$, where the part $+n$ ensures that the sequence is strictly increasing.

The characteristic ordinal is used to prove the following:

Theorem 4. If $P : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ is a family of semidecidable propositions, then $\forall i. P_i$ is ω^2 -decidable, and $\exists i. P_i$ is $(\omega \cdot 3)$ -decidable. \square

The characteristic ordinal also allows us to show that, if $Q : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ is a family of semidecidables such that $Q(n, m)$ implies $Q(n, m+1)$, then $\exists m. \forall n. Q(n, m)$ is $(\omega^2 + \omega)$ -decidable. An instance is the search for a counter-example for the twin prime conjecture.

Generalized Decidability and Countable Choice As we consider sequences indexed by \mathbb{N} , it is unsurprising that the assumption of countable choice makes a difference. It is well-known that, under countable choice, semidecidable propositions are closed under countable joins, in contrast to our Theorem 4. We generalize this fact:

Theorem 5. Assuming countable choice, every $(\omega \cdot k)$ -decidable proposition is semidecidable. \square

However, countable choice does not collapse the whole hierarchy, as ω^2 -decidable propositions are distinguishable from $(\omega \cdot k)$ -decidable ones. There are models where both countable choice and Markov's principle hold, but LPO does not [7], which means that the following result shows that countable choice is not sufficient to prove that ω^2 -decidable propositions are semidecidable.

Theorem 6. If every ω^2 -decidable proposition is semidecidable, then MP implies LPO. \square

Consequences for ω^2 -decidable proposition include the following:

Theorem 7. Assuming countable choice, any ω^2 -decidable proposition is the countable meet of semidecidables. Further, ω^2 -decidable propositions are closed under countable meets. \square

In relation to countable choice, it is worth commenting on a variation of the notion of semidecidability that we call *Sierpiński semidecidability* (cf. Gilbert [6]). A proposition P is Sierpiński-semidecidable if there exists $x : \mathcal{S}$ such that $P \leftrightarrow (x = \top)$, where the Sierpiński type \mathcal{S} is defined to be the initial σ -frame [14, 2]. Assuming countable choice, it is equivalent to semidecidability, but without the assumption, it is more well-behaved as Sierpiński-semidecidables are closed under countable joins; and the two notions do not coincide, as this would imply *Escardó-Knapp choice* [4, 8].

Theorem 8. If a proposition is $(\omega \cdot n + k)$ -decidable, then it is Sierpiński-semidecidable. \square

Agda Formalization We have formalized all our results in cubical Agda. A convenient technique for formalizing our work is a relational approach to the `limMin` function. The development can be found in our Git repository [10].

Acknowledgments We are grateful to Chuangjie Xu for early discussions on the topic of α -decidability. The work was supported by the Royal Society [grant numbers URF\R1\191055, URF\R\241007], and the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [EP/Z000602/1, EP/Y000455/2].

References

- [1] Andrej Bauer. “First Steps in Synthetic Computability Theory”. In: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference on Mathematical Foundations of Programming Semantics (MFPS XXI)*. Ed. by Martín Escardó, Achim Jung, and Michael Mislove. Vol. 155. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science. Elsevier, 2006, pp. 5–31. DOI: [10.1016/j.entcs.2005.11.049](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2005.11.049).
- [2] James Chapman, Tarmo Uustalu, and Niccolò Veltri. “Quotienting the delay monad by weak bisimilarity”. In: *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 29.1 (2019), pp. 67–92. DOI: [10.1017/S0960129517000184](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129517000184).
- [3] Alonzo Church. “The Constructive Second Number Class”. In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 44.4 (1938), pp. 224–232. DOI: [10.1090/s0002-9904-1938-06720-1](https://doi.org/10.1090/s0002-9904-1938-06720-1).
- [4] Martín H Escardó and Cory M Knapp. “Partial elements and recursion via dominances in univalent type theory”. In: *26th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2017)*. Ed. by Valentin Goranko and Mads Dam. Vol. 82. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs). Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017, 21:1–21:16. DOI: [10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2017.21](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CSL.2017.21).
- [5] Yannick Forster, Dominik Kirst, and Gert Smolka. “On synthetic undecidability in Coq, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem”. In: CPP 2019. Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 38–51. DOI: [10.1145/3293880.3294091](https://doi.org/10.1145/3293880.3294091).
- [6] Gaëtan Gilbert. “Formalising real numbers in homotopy type theory”. In: *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*. 2017, pp. 112–124. DOI: [10.1145/3018610.3018614](https://doi.org/10.1145/3018610.3018614).
- [7] Matt Hendtlass and Robert Lubarsky. “Separating fragments of WLEM, LPO, and MP”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 81.4 (2016), pp. 1315–1343. ISSN: 00224812, 19435886. DOI: [10.1017/jsl.2016.38](https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2016.38).
- [8] Tom de Jong. *Semidecidability: Constructive Taboos, Choice Principles and Closure Properties*. Agda development. 2022. URL: <https://martinescardo.github.io/TypeTopology/NotionsOfDecidability.SemiDecidable.html>.
- [9] Tom de Jong, Nicolai Kraus, Aref Mohammadzadeh, and Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg. “Generalized Decidability via Brouwer Trees”. In: *41st Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*. Vol. 380. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs). To appear. 2026. arXiv: [2602.10844](https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.10844) [cs.LO].
- [10] Tom de Jong, Nicolai Kraus, Aref Mohammadzadeh, and Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg. *OrdinalDecidability*. <https://bitbucket.org/nicolaikraus/constructive-ordinals-in-hott/src/master/BrouwerTree/OrdinalDecidability/>. 2026.
- [11] Stephen C. Kleene. “On Notations for Ordinal Numbers”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 3.4 (1938), pp. 150–155. DOI: [10.2307/2267778](https://doi.org/10.2307/2267778).
- [12] Nicolai Kraus, Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg, and Chuangjie Xu. “Decidability and Semidecidability via Ordinals”. In: *TYPES 2022*. Available at <https://nicolaikraus.github.io/docs/decidabilityViaOrdinals.pdf>. Nantes, France, 2022.
- [13] Nicolai Kraus, Fredrik Nordvall Forsberg, and Chuangjie Xu. “Type-Theoretic Approaches to Ordinals”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 957 (2023), p. 113843. DOI: [10.1016/j.tcs.2023.113843](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2023.113843). arXiv: [2208.03844](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.03844) [cs.LO].
- [14] Niccolò Veltri. “A type-theoretical study of nontermination”. PhD thesis. Tallinn University of Technology, 2017.
- [15] Andrea Vezzosi, Anders Mörtberg, and Andreas Abel. “Cubical Agda: A dependently typed programming language with univalence and higher inductive types”. In: *Journal of Functional Programming* 31 (2021), e8. DOI: [10.1017/S0956796821000034](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796821000034).