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Abstract

A proof assistant based on Setoid Type Theory would be practical for dealing with quotient inductive types. In order for such a system to be implemented in a proof assistant, we have to prove that it has decidability of equality. Our aim is to verify this property by constructing a syntactic translation from the syntax of Martin-Löf Type Theory and showing that this translation is injective.

1 Motivation

Type theory has proven to be an indispensable tool for precisely formalizing statements as well as constructing and validating proofs for them. In its current implementations handling some problems is quite cumbersome though. For example dealing with quotient types involves either lots of extra manual work, because the added equalities need to be eliminated manually (so called "transport hell") or the other option is to enable certain language features (e.g. rewrite rules in Agda [?]) which in turn deteriorate the computational properties of the type theory.

One possible alleviation of this problem could be basing proof assistants on Setoid Type Theory (SeTT, [?]), also called observational type theory ([?], [?]), which would natively enable the usage of quotient inductive types. SeTT is based on the setoid model where the equality relation for any type can be specified arbitrarily.

2 Requirements

For SeTT to be usable for such purposes, it needs to have certain properties such as canonicity and decidable equality which is necessary for type checking. Instead of proving these properties using usual methods such as logical relations [?], we simplify the procedure using a model construction. We call the model construction setoidification. We use the variant of the model construction described in [?]. Any model of Martin-Löf type theory with strict propositions (MLTTP) can be turned into a model of SeTT. We aim to transport the necessary properties of the model of MLTTP to its setoidified version. In particular, we want to prove that the interpretation of the syntax of SeTT into the setoidified syntax of MLTTP is injective. Injectivity can also be called completeness: every equality that holds in the setoidification of MLTTP is reflected in the syntax of SeTT.
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A term in the setoidified model $t$ is a term in the original model $|t|$ together with a proof that it respect the equivalence relation belonging to the type of the term. We call the projection $|\_\_|$ the *evaluation* function.

\[\text{Setoidification} \quad \text{Evaluation} \quad \text{Decidable Equality} \quad \text{Canonicity} \]

Let the $[\_\_]$ operation be the interpretation from the syntax of SeTT to the setoidification of the syntax of MLTTP. We assume injectivity of the interpretation function, that is, for any $t, t'$ terms in SeTT of the same type, $[t] = [t'] \Rightarrow t = t'$.

- **Decidability of equality**
  Decidability of equality states that either $t = t'$ or $t \neq t'$ holds. Through interpretation and evaluation, $[t] = [t']$ is an equality in the base model. If we have decidable equality there, we have two cases:

  - $[t] = [t']$ implies $t = t'$ by injectivity
  - $[t] \neq [t']$ implies $t \neq t'$ by contradiction

- **Canonicity**
  Canonicity means that every closed term can be equated to one that is only built using the constructors of the given type. For example, the type Bool has two canonical forms in the base model:

  - $[\text{false}_{\text{MLTTP-\text{syntax}}}]$ implies $t = \text{false}_{\text{SeTT-\text{syntax}}}$ by injectivity
  - $[\text{true}_{\text{MLTTP-\text{syntax}}}]$ implies $t = \text{true}_{\text{SeTT-\text{syntax}}}$ by injectivity

We are in the process of proving injectivity of interpretation into setoidification following the analogous proof of injectivity of interpretation into termification [?].
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