A Framework for the Development and Presentation of Formal Mathematical Theories

Onri Jay Benally

November 15, 2025

Contents

Part I
The Anatomy of a Formal Mathematical Theory

Introduction to Part I

Before a mathematical theory can be communicated in a paper or presented at a conference, it must first exist as a coherent logical structure. This initial part of the framework is dedicated to the abstract anatomy of a formal mathematical theory, distinct from the narrative and stylistic choices of its presentation. The focus here is on the essential components that provide a theory with its internal consistency, structure, and meaning. This exploration will construct the concept of a theory from its most fundamental elements, establishing the logical skeleton upon which the expository body of a research paper is built. Understanding this "Platonic ideal" of the theory is a prerequisite for its effective communication.

1 The Foundational Layer: Language, Axioms, and Inference

A formal mathematical theory is built upon a foundational layer comprising a defined language, a set of starting assumptions (axioms), and a mechanism for deduction (rules of inference). The careful construction of this layer is the primary creative act in developing a new theory. It is a common point of discussion whether a "theory" refers to its set of foundational axioms or the entire set of theorems that can be derived from them [1]. For the creator of a new theory, the focus must be on the former: the deliberate and precise definition of the generative system. The body of theorems is the consequence—the logical universe that unfolds from these initial choices.

1.1 The Formal Language

Any rigorous theory begins with the specification of a formal language, a framework designed to be precise, unambiguous, and mechanically checkable [2]. This is not a natural language like English, but a symbolic system with explicit rules governing its structure and interpretation [3, 4]. It consists of three primary components.

- **Alphabet (Σ):** The alphabet is the finite set of primitive symbols from which all statements in the theory are constructed [5]. This set typically includes:
  - Variables (e.g., x, y, z)
  - Constants (e.g., $0, 1, c$)
  - Logical connectives (e.g., $\rightarrow$ for implication, $\neg$ for negation, $\wedge$ for conjunction, $\vee$ for disjunction)
  - Quantifiers (e.g., $\forall$ for "for all", $\exists$ for "there exists")
  - Non-logical symbols specific to the theory (e.g., $+$ for addition in arithmetic, $\in$ for set membership in set theory)
  - Punctuation and grouping symbols (e.g., parentheses, commas)

- **Formation Rules (Syntax):** These are the grammatical rules of the language, specifying how symbols from the alphabet can be combined to form "well-formed formulas" (WFFs) [2, 6]. For instance, a formation rule in propositional logic might state that if ϕ and ψ are WFFs, then $(\phi \to \psi)$ is also a WFF. These rules ensure that statements are structurally sound and prevent nonsensical constructions [5].

- **Semantics:** While syntax governs structure, semantics assigns meaning or interpretation to the WFFs [3, 4]. A common approach is model-theoretic, where symbols and formulas are mapped to objects and relations within a concrete mathematical structure. For example, the symbols of Peano arithmetic can be interpreted within the set of natural numbers. Semantics allows for the discussion of truth and validity; a WFF is true under a particular interpretation if the statement it represents holds true in that structure.

1.2 The Axiomatic Basis

Axioms are the foundational propositions of a theory—a set of WFFs that are assumed to be true without proof within the system [2, 4]. They serve as the starting points for all logical deduction. The selection of axioms is a critical design choice, as they must be powerful enough to derive interesting and useful theorems, yet not so powerful as to introduce a contradiction.

A key consideration in axiom selection is independence. An axiom is independent of a set of other axioms if it cannot be proven or disproven from them [7]. For example, the Axiom of Choice is independent of the Zermelo-Fraenkel (ZF) axioms of set theory, and the Parallel Postulate is independent of the other axioms of Euclidean geometry [7]. While a minimal, independent set of axioms is often sought for elegance and clarity, it is not a strict logical requirement. The primary goal is to establish a consistent and sufficiently rich foundation.

1.3 The Deductive Apparatus (Rules of Inference)

Rules of inference are the engine of proof. They are purely syntactic transformation rules that allow for the derivation of new WFFs (theorems) from the axioms and other previously proven theorems [2, 3]. These rules are the procedural component of the deductive system.

Common examples of inference rules include [3, 4]:

- **Modus Ponens:** From the formulas P and $(P \to Q)$, one can derive the formula Q.

- **Modus Tollens:** From the formulas $\neg Q$ and $(P \to Q)$, one can derive the formula $\neg P$.

- **Universal Generalization:** From a formula $\phi(x)$ that has been proven for an arbitrary element x, one can derive the formula $\forall x \phi(x)$.

A formal proof is thus a finite sequence of WFFs where each formula is either an axiom or is derived from preceding formulas in the sequence by applying a rule of inference [2].

1.4 Metatheoretical Properties: Soundness and Completeness

Soundness and completeness are properties *about* a formal system, not statements *within* it. They are critical for evaluating the system's power and reliability [2].

- **Soundness:** A formal system is sound if every theorem that can be proven within the system is actually true in the intended semantic interpretation. In essence, a sound system cannot prove false statements. It ensures that the deductive apparatus respects the intended meaning of the symbols [2].

- **Completeness:** A formal system is complete if every true statement that can be expressed in the formal language is also provable from the axioms using the rules of inference. Completeness guarantees that the axiomatic system is powerful enough to capture all the truths of its intended domain [2].

However, as established by Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems, any formal system that is powerful enough to express basic arithmetic cannot be both consistent and complete. This places a profound and fundamental limit on what can be achieved with formal systems.

Part II
The Presentation Framework: From Theory to Conference Paper

Introduction to Part II

Having established the abstract logical architecture of a formal theory, this second part provides a practical, fillable template for structuring a research paper suitable for a mathematics or mathematical design conference. It addresses the translation of the abstract theory from Part I into a compelling and comprehensible narrative. Mathematical writing is fundamentally an act of communication [8, 9]. The goal is not merely to present a sequence of correct deductions, but to guide the reader, build intuition, and convince them of the work's importance and validity [8]. Unlike the rigid Introduction-Methods-Results-Discussion (IMRaD) structure common in empirical sciences, mathematical papers exhibit a more flexible format [10]. The paramount principles are clarity and logical flow, which this framework is designed to promote.

2 Structuring the Narrative: A Template for Your Paper

2.1 Title and Abstract

- **Title:** The title is the first point of contact with a potential reader and must be crafted with care. It should be specific, informative, and concise, ideally containing fewer than ten words [11, 12]. A strong title accurately reflects the paper's core contribution and helps readers quickly determine its relevance. Vague formulations such as "On a Conjecture of..." or "Some Results in..." should be avoided in favor of descriptive titles that state the subject matter directly [11].

- **Abstract:** The abstract is a self-contained, single-paragraph summary of the entire paper, typically between 150 and 250 words [12, 13]. Its purpose is to provide a crisp and direct overview of the research. The structure should be simple and declarative, often following a "We consider... We show that..." pattern [14]. It must clearly state the problem being addressed, the main contribution or result, and the broader significance of that result [13, 14]. To ensure it is self-contained, the abstract should use a minimal amount of mathematical notation and must not contain any citations or footnotes [12, 14].

Abstract Template

Abstract. Motivated by [state the problem domain or context], we consider the problem of [describe the specific problem]. We introduce [name of your theory/framework], a formal system characterized by [list 1-2 key features or axioms]. Our main result is [state the main theorem or finding in clear, accessible language]. This result [explain the significance, e.g., resolves an open question, unifies two concepts, provides a new method]. The framework and its consequences are detailed, offering new insights into [the broader field].

2.2 Introduction: Setting the Stage and Stating the Contribution

The introduction is arguably the most critical section of a mathematical paper [11]. It must orient the reader, establish the importance of the work, and provide a clear statement of the contribution. Its purpose is to answer the reader's implicit question: "Why should I read this paper?" [8]. It is often beneficial to write the introduction first to organize one's thoughts, but it should be revisited and revised multiple times throughout the writing process [11].

- **Paragraph 1: The Big Picture.** Begin with a broad overview of the relevant mathematical field. Describe the established context and why this area of study is significant. This orients readers who may not be experts in the specific subfield [8, 10, 11].
- **Paragraph 2: The Research Gap.** Transition from the broad context to the specific problem your paper addresses. This involves a concise literature review that situates your work historically. What was previously known? What are the limitations of existing theories or methods? What is the specific open question, unresolved problem, or gap in understanding that your research aims to fill? [8, 13]. This section should place your work in context without gratuitous "name-dropping" of famous mathematicians [11].
- **Paragraph 3: The Contribution (Your Solution).** This is the heart of the introduction. State your main contribution directly and clearly. Introduce your new theory, framework, or main result. It is often effective to present this informally at first, avoiding dense notation to ensure the core idea is communicated [11]. Explicitly state *what* has been achieved—for example, a new theorem has been proven, a stronger result has been obtained by weakening hypotheses, two previously separate fields have been connected, or a new proof of an old theorem has been found [8].
- **Paragraph 4: Outline of the Paper.** Conclude the introduction with a roadmap for the reader. Briefly describe the content of each subsequent section. For example: "In Section 2, we introduce the necessary definitions and notation. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of our main theorem. In Section 4, we explore several illustrative examples and discuss the implications of our results." This helps the reader navigate the logical structure of the paper [13, 14].

2.3 Core Theoretical Development (The Body of the Paper)

The body of the paper contains the formal exposition of the theory. While its structure is more flexible than in other disciplines [10], the logical progression must be impeccable [15]. Good practice suggests breaking long sections into shorter, thematically focused subsections of one to three pages, each with a clear heading that acts as a signpost for the reader [14]. Every section or subsection should begin with a brief introductory sentence that guides the reader on what to expect [14].

There are two primary organizational schemes for the body of a mathematical paper [10]:

1. **Linear Development:** This approach builds the theory from the ground up. It begins with foundational definitions and notation, then proceeds through a series of lemmas and propositions, culminating in the proof of the main theorem(s) at the end of the development.

2. **Main Result First:** This alternative structure states the main theorem(s) immediately following the introduction. The remainder of the paper is then dedicated to developing the necessary formal machinery (definitions, lemmas) required to prove the main result, with the proof itself appearing as the climax.

Regardless of the high-level structure chosen, the core content is built from modular units of formal exposition. The following template for a **Definition-Theorem-Proof (DTP) Unit** can be used repeatedly to construct the paper's body.

Definition 2.1 (Name of Concept)**.** *Informal Exposition before the formal definition [14, 15].*
Formal definition text goes here...

Theorem 2.2 (Name of Theorem)**.** Informal Exposition before the formal theorem statement [8, 15].
Statement of the theorem goes here...

Proof. Proof goes here. ∎

Informal Exposition (Discussion) after the proof [10].

2.4 Illustrative Examples and Counterexamples

Examples and counterexamples are not mere additions; they are essential components of effective mathematical communication [10]. They provide the informal, intuitive exposition that complements the formal, logical development, making abstract concepts concrete and understandable [8, 15]. This material can be integrated throughout the body of the paper or collected in a dedicated section.

Example Section Template

```
\section{Examples and Applications}
To illustrate the abstract concepts developed in the preceding
sections, we now consider several concrete examples.

\begin{ex}
A case demonstrating the application of [Concept X].
[Provide a detailed walkthrough of the example, showing how the
definitions and theorems apply in a specific, simplified setting.]
\end{ex}

\begin{counterex}
A case demonstrating the necessity of [Hypothesis Y]
```

```
in Theorem [Z].
[Provide a detailed counterexample.]
\end{counterex}
```

2.5 Discussion, Conclusions, and Future Work

The concluding section of a mathematical paper should offer more than a simple restatement of results, as a good introduction has already provided a summary [14]. Instead, this section is an opportunity to reflect on the work's broader implications, acknowledge its boundaries, and chart a course for subsequent research [13, 14].

Conclusion Section Template

```
\section{Conclusions and Future Directions}
In this work, we have introduced the theory of [Theory Name]
and established our main result, [Main Result]. The primary
insight emerging from this development, which was difficult
to articulate fully in the introduction, is that [state a
high-level takeaway, a new perspective, or a unifying
principle that the work reveals] \cite{ref14}.

\subsection*{Limitations}
It is important to acknowledge the boundaries of the present
work. [Describe limitations, scope, or assumptions] \cite{ref16}.

\subsection*{Future Work}
This research opens several avenues for future investigation.
We pose the following open problems, conjectures, and potential
extensions:
\begin{enumerate}
    \item \textbf{Open Problem:} [State an open problem.]
    \item \textbf{Conjecture:} [Propose a statement that is
          believed to be true based on the evidence but has
          not been proven.]
    \item \textbf{Generalization:} [Suggest how the results
          might be generalized] \cite{ref13, ref14}.
    \item \textbf{New Applications:} [Propose an alternative
          model or a different field of application where the
          theory might prove useful.]
\end{enumerate}
```

2.6 Acknowledgments and References

- **Acknowledgments:** This optional section is used to recognize contributions that do not meet the criteria for authorship. It is standard practice to acknowledge funding sources (e.g., National Science Foundation, Department of Defense, with grant numbers) and individuals who provided significant intellectual feedback, data, or technical assistance [12, 16].

- **References:** This section must provide complete citation information for all previously published work referred to in the paper [12]. It is critical to adhere strictly to the citation style mandated by the conference or journal. For many mathematics venues, this will be a style specified by the American Mathematical Society (AMS), which typically uses either bracketed numbers (e.g., [1]) that correspond to a numbered list or an author-year system [17, 18].

3 Formatting and Conventions

3.1 Typesetting with LaTeX

For any serious work in mathematics, LaTeX is the undisputed standard for typesetting [15]. Its ability to handle complex equations, symbols, and document structures is unmatched by general word processors. Authors are strongly encouraged to use LaTeX, and specifically the packages developed and supported by the American Mathematical Society, which are included in all modern LaTeX distributions [19, 20]. The most crucial packages are:

- `amsmath`: For advanced mathematical formula environments.
- `amssymb`: For an extended library of mathematical symbols.
- `amsthm`: For defining and formatting theorem-like environments.

3.2 Formatting Enunciations (Theorems, Definitions, Proofs)

Key logical components such as theorems, definitions, lemmas, and proofs must be physically set apart from the surrounding text to give them prominence and to facilitate cross-referencing [15]. The `amsthm` package provides a robust system for this [21]. It allows the author to define custom environments and control their appearance (e.g., font style, numbering scheme) [22].

A standard preamble setup in a LaTeX document might look like this:

```
\usepackage{amsmath,amssymb,amsthm}

% Define theorem styles
\theoremstyle{plain} % Bold title, italic body text
\newtheorem{thm}{Theorem}[section]
\newtheorem{lem}[thm]{Lemma}
\newtheorem{cor}[thm]{Corollary}

\theoremstyle{definition} % Bold title, Roman (upright) body text
\newtheorem{defn}[thm]{Definition}
\newtheorem{ex}[thm]{Example}

\theoremstyle{remark} % Italic title, Roman body text
\newtheorem*{rem}{Remark} % An unnumbered remark
```

Using these definitions in the document is straightforward. For instance, a theorem is created with `\begin{thm}...\end{thm}` [23, 24]. This approach ensures consistent, professional formatting that conforms to the established style of mathematical publications [21].

3.3 Handling Equations and References

- **Equation Formatting:** Short or incidental mathematical expressions can be included directly inline with the text (e.g., "the function $f(x) = x^2$ is continuous"). Important, complex, or lengthy equations should be displayed on their own line [25, 26]. In a displayed equation, variables should be italicized, but function names (like $\sin, \cos, \log, \exp$) and other textual operators should be set in Roman (upright) type to distinguish them from products of variables [25].

- **Punctuation:** A displayed equation should be treated grammatically as part of the sentence in which it appears. It should be followed by a comma if the sentence continues, or a period if the sentence ends [26].

- **Numbering and Cross-referencing:** Any displayed equation that needs to be referred to later in the text must be numbered [27]. The number is typically placed in parentheses at the right margin. The standard LaTeX `\label{}` and `\ref{}` mechanism should be used for all cross-references to sections, figures, tables, theorems, and equations. This ensures that all numbering is automatically updated and accurate, which is crucial for maintaining the logical integrity of the paper [21, 23].

Part III
Advanced Concepts: Achieving Representation-Agnosticism

Introduction to Part III

This part of the framework addresses the most sophisticated aspect of the request: the development and presentation of ideas that are "representation-agnostic." This requires moving beyond the structure of a paper to the philosophical and formal foundations of mathematical abstraction. The goal is to provide concepts and tools that allow a researcher to reason about, define, and present a theory in a way that transcends specific notational choices, data structures, or constructive methods. This is the hallmark of deep mathematical insight, focusing on the essential structure of a concept rather than the incidental details of its description.

4 Beyond Notation: The Principle of Representation Independence

4.1 The Map and the Territory in Mathematics

A foundational principle of abstract thought is the distinction between an object and its representation—the "territory" and the "map" [28]. In mathematics, this distinction is paramount. The underlying mathematical object or concept (the territory) exists independently of the particular set of symbols used to denote it (the map) [29]. For example, the concept of the number four is the territory; the symbols '4', 'IV', '100_2', and the phrase "the successor of three" are all different maps pointing to the same territory.

While the underlying mathematical truths are considered universal, the notational systems are human inventions, chosen for strategic reasons of clarity, conciseness, and convention [14, 29]. A poor notational choice can obscure a simple idea, while an elegant one can reveal deep connections [30, 31]. A representation-agnostic approach seeks to define and prove properties at the level of the territory, ensuring the results are not mere artifacts of the chosen map.

4.2 Logical Independence

A powerful form of representation-agnosticism is found in the concept of logical independence. A statement is independent of a set of axioms if it can neither be proved nor disproved from those axioms [7]. This demonstrates that the truth or falsity of the statement is not tied to that particular axiomatic "representation" of a mathematical universe.

The classic example is the Parallel Postulate in geometry. For centuries, mathematicians attempted to prove it from Euclid's other axioms. The discovery that it is independent of them was a monumental achievement. It showed that one could consistently construct geometries (hyperbolic, elliptic) where the postulate is false, demonstrating that the concept of "parallelism" is not uniquely determined by the other foundational axioms of geometry [7]. This is representation-agnosticism in action: the properties of geometric space depend on which "representation" (i.e., which set of axioms) one chooses.

4.3 Representation-Agnosticism in Modern Computer Science

The abstract principle of representation-agnosticism finds concrete analogies in modern computer science and machine learning. A representation-agnostic algorithm or model is one designed to operate on data presented in multiple different formats, without being tied to any single one [32, 33].

For example, a 3D shape analysis model might be designed to be "representation-agnostic" by learning to process shapes regardless of whether they are represented as point clouds, polygonal meshes, or voxels [32]. This is typically achieved by defining an abstract intermediate representation into which all input formats can be mapped. Similarly, in statistical learning theory, a key goal is to find "agnostic to realizable reductions," where a learning algorithm designed for a simple, idealized setting (the "realizable" case) can be provably extended to a general, noisy setting (the "agnostic" case) [34]. These practical examples mirror the mathematical goal: to find a core, abstract structure that is invariant across different concrete manifestations.

5 A Language for Abstraction: Category Theory and Universal Properties

5.1 Introduction to Categorical Thinking

Category theory is a branch of mathematics that formalizes structure in a highly abstract way. It shifts the focus from the internal elements of mathematical objects (like the elements of a set or the points in a space) to the structure-preserving relationships *between* them [35, 36]. These relationships are called morphisms or arrows. This approach allows for the unified description of disparate mathematical fields, revealing deep structural analogies [37].

Formally, a **category** consists of [37, 38]:

1. A collection of **objects**.
2. For every pair of objects A and B, a collection of **morphisms** (or arrows) from A to B.

3. An **identity morphism** for each object, $id_A : A \to A$.

4. A rule for **composition** of morphisms, such that if $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to C$ are morphisms, their composite $g \circ f : A \to C$ is also a morphism. This composition must be associative, and composing with an identity morphism has no effect.

The power of this framework lies in its generality. The "objects" can be sets (with morphisms being functions), groups (with morphisms being homomorphisms), or topological spaces (with morphisms being continuous functions) [39]. By studying properties defined only in terms of objects and arrows, one can prove theorems that apply simultaneously to all these fields.

5.2 Universal Properties: The Ultimate Representation-Agnostic Tool

The central tool for achieving representation-agnosticism in category theory is the **universal property**. A universal property defines an object not by describing its internal construction, but by specifying its unique relationship to all other objects in the category [40, 41, 42]. It characterizes an object "up to a unique isomorphism," meaning that any two objects in a category that satisfy the same universal property are, for all practical purposes, identical. They are structurally indistinguishable, even if their concrete constructions were wildly different [41, 43].

This provides the ultimate form of representation independence: the definition is based entirely on external relationships, not internal details. Formally, a universal property can be defined as an initial or terminal object in a specially constructed "comma category" [41]. Intuitively, this means the universal object is the "most efficient" or "best possible" solution to a given structural problem posed within the category [43, 44].

5.3 Representation-Agnostic Examples via Universal Properties

The value of this approach is best seen through examples that contrast a construction-dependent definition with a representation-agnostic one.

Example 5.1 (The Product of Two Sets).

- **Construction-Dependent (Representational) View:** The product of two sets, A and B, is defined as the set of all ordered pairs (a, b) where $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. This definition depends on the pre-existing notion of an "ordered pair," which itself has a specific set-theoretic construction (e.g., Kuratowski's definition: $(a, b) = \{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}$).

- **Representation-Agnostic (Universal) View:** In the category of sets (**Set**), the product of A and B is an object $A \times B$ equipped with two projection morphisms, $p_A : A \times B \to A$ and $p_B : A \times B \to B$. This pair $(A \times B, \{p_A, p_B\})$ must satisfy the following property: for any other set X with morphisms $f_A : X \to A$ and $f_B : X \to B$, there exists a *unique* morphism $u : X \to A \times B$ such that $f_A = p_A \circ u$ and $f_B = p_B \circ u$ [41, 42].

This universal definition makes no mention of ordered pairs. It defines the product solely by its relational properties. Any object that satisfies this mapping property is the product of A and B, regardless of how it was built. This definition also generalizes immediately to other categories, defining direct products of groups, product topologies, and more, all with the same abstract diagram.

Example 5.2 (The Free Group).

- **Construction-Dependent (Representational) View:** The free group on a set of generators S is constructed by considering all finite "words" made of symbols from S and their formal inverses, and then defining a group operation (concatenation) and an equivalence relation to handle cancellations (e.g., $gg^{-1} = e$). This is a complex and highly representation-specific process.

- **Representation-Agnostic (Universal) View:** The free group on a set S is a group $F(S)$ together with a map $i : S \to F(S)$, such that for any other group G and any map of sets $f : S \to G$, there exists a *unique* group homomorphism $\phi : F(S) \to G$ for which $f = \phi \circ i$ [42].

This definition characterizes the free group as the "most general" group generated by S. It is defined by its ability to map uniquely into any other group that contains the generators, a purely relational and representation-independent property.

Part IV
Practical Toolkit

Introduction to Part IV

This final part provides a set of concrete, fillable templates to assist in the practical development and presentation of a formal theory. Building on the theoretical and structural principles from the preceding parts, this section offers immediately useful tools for analysis and communication. The toolkit includes templates for comparative analysis tables, which are essential for positioning new work against existing literature, and a glossary of key terms to ensure clarity and accessibility.

6 The Art of Comparison: Crafting Insightful Analysis Tables

A well-crafted comparison table is a powerful rhetorical device in a technical paper. It is not merely a list of data but a structured argument designed to highlight the novelty and advantages of the proposed work [45, 46]. An effective table requires a clear "frame of reference" (the context for comparison) and well-chosen "grounds for comparison" (the criteria or features being evaluated) [47]. The primary goal is to consolidate related information, enabling the reader to make quick and insightful comparisons without searching through the text [48]. The design of these tables should follow established best practices for clarity and readability [48, 49].

6.1 Template 1: Comparative Analysis of Theoretical Frameworks

This table is designed to situate a new theory within the existing intellectual landscape. It is an invaluable tool for the introduction or literature review section of a paper, allowing the author to systematically compare their framework against established alternatives on several key dimensions [50, 51, 52]. The criteria for comparison should be chosen strategically to underscore the unique contributions of the new work.

6.2 Template 2: Analysis of Representational Choices

This table serves as an internal development tool or as part of a methodology section in a paper. It facilitates a rigorous justification for the specific notational systems or formal constructions chosen by the author, demonstrating that the choices were made deliberately and with consideration of alternatives.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Theoretical Frameworks

Criterion for Comparison	**Theory A**	**Theory B**	**Our Proposed Theory**
Axiomatic Basis / Core Principles	[Text]	[Text]	[Text]
Expressive Power / Scope	Models continuous systems.	Excels at discrete computation.	Unified framework for hybrid systems.
Key Limitations / Known Issues	Undecidable decision problems.	Intractably long proofs.	[State known limitations]
Primary Domain of Application	Foundational mathematics.	Formal verification, PL semantics.	Control systems, systems biology.
Metatheoretical Properties	Known to be incomplete if consistent; proofs are generally non-constructive.	Constructive proofs.	Proven to be sound and decidable for its target problem class, enabling automated analysis.

7 Glossary of Acronyms and Key Terminology

7.1 Purpose and Formatting

A glossary is a list of technical terms, acronyms, and specialized symbols used in a paper that may not be immediately familiar to all readers [53]. Including a glossary can significantly enhance readability, especially in a work that introduces a new formal system with its own vocabulary. If included, the glossary should appear at the beginning of the document, typically after the table of contents and any list of figures, to allow readers to familiarize themselves with the terminology before engaging with the main text. All entries in the glossary must be arranged in alphabetical order [53].

7.2 Template and Pre-populated Entries

The following provides a template for a glossary. It has been pre-populated with terms relevant to the development of formal theories.

Table 3: Glossary of Terms and Symbols

Acronym / Symbol	**Full Name / Meaning**	**Definition and Context**
AD	Axiom of Determinacy	An axiom in set theory, an alternative to the Axiom of Choice [7].
AMS	American Mathematical Society	Professional society of mathematicians [17, 19].
CTAN	Comprehensive TeX Archive Network	The central repository for TeX-related software [20].

Table 3 – continued from previous page

Acronym / Symbol	Full Name / Meaning	Definition and Context
DTP	Definition-Theorem-Proof	A fundamental structural pattern in mathematical exposition.
IMRaD	Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion	Common structure for empirical science papers [10].
QED	Quod Erat Demonstrandum	Latin for "what was to be shown." Marks the end of a proof.
WFF	Well-Formed Formula	A syntactically correct string of symbols in a formal language [2, 5].
ZFC	Zermelo–Fraenkel + Choice	The standard axiomatic system for modern mathematics [5, 7].
$\forall$	Universal Quantifier	Logical symbol meaning "for all" or "for every."
$\exists$	Existential Quantifier	Logical symbol meaning "there exists."
$\vdash$	Turnstile	Denotes provability or entailment. $T \vdash \phi$ means ϕ is provable from T [2, 5].
$\cong$	Isomorphism	A structure-preserving map with a structure-preserving inverse.
$\perp$	Perpendicular / Orthogonal	Denotes orthogonality or zero correlation [54].
$\amalg$ or $\sqcup$	Coproduct / Disjoint Union	The categorical dual of the product.
$\otimes$	Tensor Product	A universal construction for combining vector spaces.
$\times$	Categorical Product	Generalizes the Cartesian product of sets.
$\perp\!\!\!\perp$	Double Up Tack	Symbol for statistical independence [31, 54].

Table 2: Analysis of Representational Choices for Operation $\odot$

Representational Aspect	**Infix Notation** ($A \odot B$)	**Prefix Notation** ($\odot AB$)	**Postfix Notation** ($AB\odot$)
Clarity & Readability	High for human readers due to familiarity with standard arithmetic.	Low for human readers; requires mental parsing to determine operands.	**Chosen:** Low for human readers, but ideal for the target application.
Lack of Ambiguity	Requires explicit parentheses or precedence rules to resolve ambiguity (e.g., $A \odot B \oplus C$).	Inherently unambiguous; the operator always precedes its fixed number of arguments.	**Chosen:** Inherently unambiguous; enables straightforward parsing.
Computational Amenability	Requires conversion to an abstract syntax tree or postfix notation before evaluation by a simple algorithm.	Easily processed by a recursive descent parser.	**Chosen:** Can be processed efficiently by a simple stack-based algorithm, which is critical for our implementation.
Justification Summary			The chosen postfix notation, while less conventional for human reading, was selected because its lack of ambiguity and amenability to efficient stack-based computation are paramount for the intended application in a compiler backend.

References

[1] theory, theorems and axioms - formal systems. *Math Stack Exchange*. https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/872772/theory-theorems-and-axioms

[2] Basic notions of formal systems and proofs. *Proof Theory Class*. https://library.fiveable.me/proof-theory/unit-1/basic-notions-formal-systems-proofs/study-guide/vcBzzuksvFfjKx5a

[3] Mastering Formal Systems in Math Logic. *Number Analytics*. https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/mastering-formal-systems-in-math-logic

[4] Mastering Formal Systems in Proof Theory. *Number Analytics*. https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/mastering-formal-systems-in-proof-theory

[5] formal system. *PlanetMath.org*. https://planetmath.org/formalsystem

[6] Formal system. *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Formal_system

[7] Independence (mathematical logic). *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Independence_(mathematical_logic)

[8] J. Rickert. Writing a Research Paper in Mathematics. *MIT*. https://web.mit.edu/jrickert/www/mathadvice.html

[9] I. Pak. How to write math papers clearly. *Igor Pak's blog*. https://igorpak.wordpress.com/2017/07/12/how-to-write-math-papers-clearly/

[10] Mathematical papers and the IMRaD-structure. *Academia Stack Exchange*. https://academia.stackexchange.com/questions/204285/mathematical-papers-and-the-imrad-structure-how-comparable-are-they-with-each-o

[11] B. C. Berndt. HOW TO WRITE MATHEMATICAL PAPERS. https://alozano.clas.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/490/2020/08/berndt.pdf

[12] Structure Your Paper. *IEEE Author Center Conferences*. https://conferences.ieeeauthorcenter.ieee.org/write-your-paper/structure-your-paper/

[13] D. D. Long. Writing a Mathematics Research Paper. *Zimmer Web Pages*. https://zimmer.fresnostate.edu/~doreendl/uresearch/handouts/write_math_paper.pdf

[14] J. N. Tsitsiklis. A few tips on writing papers with mathematical content. *MIT*. https://www.mit.edu/~jnt/Papers/R-20-write-v5.pdf

[15] How to Effectively Write a Mathematics Research Paper. *Enago Academy*. https://www.enago.com/academy/effectively-write-mathematical-research-paper/

[16] Lessons (tips) for writing a compelling conference paper. *Reddit r/MachineLearning*. https://www.reddit.com/r/MachineLearning/comments/1axxyh1/d_lessons_tips_for_writing_a_compelling/

[17] AMS Citation Style Guide (American Mathematical Society) Overview. *UT Tyler*. https://www.uttyler.edu/academics/colleges-schools/graduate/files/american-mathematical-society-format-guide.pdf

[18] AMS STYLE: GENERAL FORMAT FOR MANUSCRIPT. *CSU Channel Islands*. https://www.csuci.edu/wmc/pdf/citations/ams-style-guide-revised2020.pdf

[19] Author Resource Center. *American Mathematical Society*. https://www.ams.org/arc/

[20] AMS-LaTeX. *American Mathematical Society*. https://www.ams.org/tex/amslatex.html

[21] Using the amsthm Package. *TeXDoc*. https://texdoc.org/serve/amsthm/0

[22] Theorems and proofs. *Overleaf*. https://www.overleaf.com/learn/latex/Theorems_and_proofs

[23] A GRADUATE STUDENT'S GUIDE TO LATEX AND AMS-LATEX. *Tennessee Tech University*. https://www.tntech.edu/cas/pdf/math/techreports/TR-2003-1.pdf

[24] Template for the AMS article style. *University of South Carolina*. https://people.math.sc.edu/howard/Classes/790/amsart.html

[25] How to Format Math and Equations. *ProofreadingPal*. https://proofreadingpal.com/proofreading-pulse/essays/how-to-format-math-and-equations/

[26] K. P. Lee. A Guide to Writing Mathematics. *UC Davis*. https://web.cs.ucdavis.edu/~amenta/w10/writingman.pdf

[27] Numbers and Equations in Writing. *CHEC: Cornell Help for Engineering Communication*. https://chec.engineering.cornell.edu/writing-numbers-and-equations/

[28] Mathematical notation. *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical_notation

[29] SMBC: The universality of mathematics, but not notation. *SelfAwarePatterns*. https://selfawarepatterns.com/2015/11/01/smbc-the-universality-of-mathematics-but-not-notation/

[30] Mathematical Notation and its importance. *Math Stack Exchange*. https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/663419/mathematical-notation-and-its-importance

[31] J. D. Cook. Conditional independence notation. *Applied Mathematics Consulting*. https://www.johndcook.com/blog/2020/03/27/conditional-independence-notation/

[32] G. Ghiasi et al. Representation-Agnostic Shape Fields. *arXiv:2203.10259*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.10259

[33] C. Lu. The Agnostic Hypothesis: A Unifying View of Machine Learning. https://causallu.com/2020/10/24/the-agnostic-hypothesis-a-unifying-view-of-machine-learning/

[34] S. Hanneke et al. Representation Preserving Multiclass Agnostic to Realizable Reduction. *ICML 2020*. https://icml.cc/virtual/2020/poster/5931

[35] How far can I develop representation theory from category theory? *Math Stack Exchange*. https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/2100333/how-far-can-i-develop-representation-theory-from-category-theory

[36] D. I. Spivak, R. E. Kent. Ologs: A Categorical Framework for Knowledge Representation. *PLOS One*. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0024274

[37] P. J. G. Liseth et al. Foundations of reusable and interoperable facet models using category theory. *PMC*. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5145200/

[38] A unified representation and transformation of multi-model data using category theory. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360350685_A_unified_representation_and_transformation_of_multi-model_data_using_category_theory

[39] Level-Agnostic Representations of Interacting Agents. *MDPI*. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7390/12/17/2697

[40] Universal property. *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_property

[41] Universal property. *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_property

[42] Mastering Universal Property: A Math Logic Guide. *Number Analytics*. https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/mastering-universal-property-math-logic-guide

[43] B. Hepler. Universal Properties: a Prelude. https://brainhelper.wordpress.com/2012/09/04/universal-properties-a-prelude/

[44] J. Cyphert. Limits and Universal Properties. https://pages.cs.wisc.edu/~jcyphert/categoryTheoryNotes/universalproperties/1_Universals_Limits.pdf

[45] Comparative Analysis: Methods, Tips, and Examples. *ChartExpo*. https://chartexpo.com/blog/comparative-analysis-example

[46] Why Adding a Table of Comparison in Research Papers is Crucial. *YouTube*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OKzJO_h6Uzs

[47] How to Write a Comparative Analysis. *Harvard College Writing Center*.

[48] Chapter 5. Tables. *Agronomy Journal*. https://www.agronomy.org/files/publications/style/chapter-05.pdf

[49] Sample tables. *APA Style*. https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/tables-figures/sample-tables

[50] C. Beiranvand et al. Best Practices for Comparing Optimization Algorithms. *arXiv:1709.08242*. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1709.08242

[51] A. Gretton et al. A comparison of three frameworks for measuring knowledge for teaching mathematics. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313309594_A_comparison_of_three_frameworks_for_measuring_knowledge_for_teaching_mathematics

[52] A comparison of three frameworks for measuring knowledge for teaching mathematics. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313309594_A_comparison_of_three_frameworks_for_measuring_knowledge_for_teaching_mathematics

[53] What Is a Glossary? — Definition, Templates, & Examples. *Scribbr*. https://www.scribbr.com/dissertation/glossary-of-a-dissertation/

[54] What is the correct notation for stating that random variables X and Y are independent? *Stats Stack Exchange*. https://stats.stackexchange.com/questions/117996/what-is-the-correct-notation-for-stating-that-random-variables-x-and-y-are-indep