Appendix

Hereinafter, for a set of functors F, $\mathrm{Graph}(F)$ stands for the set of every graph G s.t. $\mathrm{Funct}(G) \subseteq F$.

Proposition 1. For LMNtal rule $r = T \,{:}\!-\, U$, $G' \xrightarrow{r} G \Leftrightarrow G \xrightarrow{r^{\mathrm{inv}}} G'$

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) We will prove by structural induction on the last-used reduction relation rule.

- Case (R1): We assume that $G' = P, Q$, $G = P', Q$ and $P \xrightarrow{r} P'$. By the induction hypothesis, $P' \xrightarrow{r^{\mathrm{inv}}} P$. By (R1), $P', Q \xrightarrow{r^{\mathrm{inv}}} P, Q$. Therefore, $G \xrightarrow{r^{\mathrm{inv}}} G'$.
- Case (R3): We assume that $G' \equiv P$, $P' \equiv G$, $P \xrightarrow{r} P'$. By the induction hypothesis, $P' \xrightarrow{r^{\mathrm{inv}}} P$. By (R3) and $G' \equiv P$, $P' \equiv G$, we obtain $G \xrightarrow{r^{\mathrm{inv}}} G'$.
- Case (R6) is self-evident by (R6).

Hence $G' \xrightarrow{r} G \Rightarrow G \xrightarrow{r^{\mathrm{inv}}} G'$.

($\Leftarrow$) follows from $\left(r^{\mathrm{inv}}\right)^{\mathrm{inv}} = r$ and ($\Rightarrow$). $\square$

Lemma 1. For an extensive ShapeType $\tau = (t/m, P, N)$, its weighting function w, and an LMNtal graph $G, G' \in \mathrm{Graph}(\mathrm{Funct}(\tau))$,

$$G' \xrightarrow{P} G \Rightarrow w(G) \geq w(G')$$

Proof. By $G' \xrightarrow{P} G$, let $p = \alpha \,{:}\!-\, \beta$ be a rule s.t. $G' \xrightarrow{p} G$. We will show $w(G) \geq w(G')$ by structural induction on the last-used reduction relation rule.

- Case (R1): We assume that $G' = G'_1, G_2$, $G = G_1, G_2$ and $G'_1 \xrightarrow{p} G_1$. Then $w(G_1) \geq w(G'_1)$ by the induction hypothesis. We have $w(G') = w(G'_1) + w(G_2)$, $w(G) = w(G_1) + w(G_2)$, therefore $w(G) \geq w(G')$ holds.
- Case (R3): We assume that $G'_1 \equiv G'$, $G \equiv G_1$, $G'_1 \xrightarrow{p} G_1$. Then $w(G_1) \geq w(G'_1)$ by the induction hypothesis. We have $w(G_1) = w(G)$, $w(G'_1) = w(G')$, therefore $w(G) \geq w(G')$ holds.
- Case (R6): We assume that $G' = \alpha$, $G = \beta$. Since the type $(t/m, P, N)$ is extensive, we have $w(\alpha) \leq w(\beta)$ i.e. $w(G) \geq w(G')$. $\square$

Lemma 2. For an extensive ShapeType $\tau = (t/m, P, N)$, its weighting function w, a non-negative integer n, and a finite set of links L, the number of LMNtal graph G satisfying following formula is *finite* regarding structurally congruent graphs as the same.

$$G \in \mathrm{Graph}(\mathrm{Funct}(\tau)) \wedge w(G) = n \wedge \mathrm{FLink}(G) = L$$

Proof. The number of functors occurring in G is finite and also the number of atoms (excluding non-global connectors) occurring in G is less than n because of $w(G) = n$. Since the number of graphs consisting of finite kinds of functors and finite atoms is finite, the number of G is finite. $\square$

Lemma 3. For any LMNtal graph X, an extensive ShapeType $(t/m, P, N)$, and a finite set of LMNtal graphs G, $\textsc{GGCheck}(X, (t/m, P, N, G))$ terminates.

Proof. Let the weighting function of type $(t/m,P,N)$ be w. Y given to the first argument of recursive call at line 5 of GGCHECK satisfies $Y \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} X$. By Lemma 1, $w(X) \geq w(Y)$. By this and Lemma 2, the number of possible Y is finite (regarding structurally congruent graphs are the same). Also, it is verified at line 3 of GGCHECK that structurally congruent graphs cannot be given again to the argument of recursive calls, so that recursive calls occur finite times at most. Therefore GGCHECK$(X,(t/m,P,N),G)$ terminates. $\square$

Theorem 1 (Termination of graph type checking)**.** For any LMNtal graph X and an extensive ShapeType τ, GCHECK(X,τ) terminates.

Proof. This follows by Lemma 3 and the fact that Funct(X) and N are finite. $\square$

Lemma 4. For any LMNtal graph X, a ShapeType $(t/m,P,N)$, and a finite set of LMNtal graphs G, if GGCHECK$(X,(t/m,P,N),G)$ returns **true**, $X \lhd t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$ holds.

Proof. We will show by induction on the maximum number n of times of recursive calls (i.e. the depth of recursion) of GGCHECK.

- If $n=0$, **true** is returned at line 2. Also, we have $X \equiv t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$. Then it is clear by the definition that $X \lhd t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$.
- If $n=k+1$ $(k \geq 0)$, **true** is returned at line 5 since recursive calls occur one or more times. We have $Y \xrightarrow{P} X$ by the line 3 and $Y \lhd t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$ by the induction hypothesis. Then $t(L_1,\ldots,L_m) \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} Y$ follows by the definition of production relations. By $Y \xrightarrow{P} X$, we have $Y \xrightarrow{P} X$, so that $t(L_1,\ldots,L_m) \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} X$. Therefore $X \lhd t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$ holds. $\square$

Theorem 2 (Soundness of graph type checking)**.** For any LMNtal graph X and a ShapeType $(t/m,P,N)$, if GCHECK$(X,(t/m,P,N))$ returns **true**, $X : t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$ holds.

Proof. GCHECK$(X,(t/m,P,N))$ returns **true** only when $\exists f \in \mathrm{Funct}(X).\ f \in N$ does not hold and then it just returns the returned value from GGCHECK$(X,(t/m,P,N),\varnothing)$, so that GGCHECK$(X,(t/m,P,N),\varnothing)$ returns **true**. By Lemma 4, we have $X \lhd t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$. Since $\neg\exists f \in \mathrm{Funct}(X).\ f \in N$ holds, we have $\forall f \in \mathrm{Funct}(X).\ f \notin N$. Therefore $\mathrm{Funct}(X) \cap N = \varnothing$ holds. Hence we have $X : t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$. $\square$

Lemma 5. For an LMNtal graph X and a ShapeType $(t/m,P,N)$, if $X \lhd t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$, GGCHECK$(X,(t/m,P,N),\varnothing)$ returns **true**.

Proof. By $X \lhd t(L_1,\ldots,L_m)$, for certain $X_0,\ldots,X_n$ $(n \geq 0)$, the following holds:

$$t(L_1,\ldots,L_m) = X_n \xrightarrow{P} \ldots \xrightarrow{P} X_1 \xrightarrow{P} X_0 = X$$

Note that X_i is not the start symbol for every i $(i<n)$ and $i \neq j \Rightarrow X_i \not\equiv X_j$ holds (i.e. no loops in the path). Consider the case when GGCHECK$(Y_i,(t/m,P,N),G_i)$ is called for i $(i<n)$, Y_i s.t. $Y_i \equiv X_i$, and a certain G_i. Since X_i is not the start symbol, Y_i is also not the start symbol, so that the condition of the if statement at line 2 does not hold. Then we have $X_{i+1} \xrightarrow{P} Y_i$ by $X_{i+1} \xrightarrow{P} X_i$ and (R3).

- If $\nexists Y_{i+1} \in G_i.\ X_{i+1} \equiv Y_{i+1}$, the for-loop from the line 3 is executed for $Y \leftarrow X_{i+1}$, and then GGCHECK$(X_{i+1},(t/m,P,N),G_{i+1})$ is called for a certain G_{i+1} at line 5.
- If $\exists Y_{i+1} \in G_i.\ X_{i+1} \equiv Y_{i+1}$, GGCHECK$(Y_{i+1},(t/m,P,N),G_{i+1})$ has been called for a certain G_{i+1} elsewhere.

Therefore GGCHECK($Y_{i+1},(t/m,P,N),G_{i+1}$) is called for Y_{i+1} s.t. $Y_{i+1} \equiv X_{i+1}$ and a certain G_{i+1} somewhere in the recursive calls.

From the above reasons, when GGCHECK($X,(t/m,P,N),\varnothing$) is called, GGCHECK($Y_n,(t/m,P,N),G_n$) is also called for Y_n s.t. $Y_n \equiv X_n$ and a certain G_n. This call returns **true** at line 2 because of $Y_n \equiv X_n = t\,(L_1\,,\,\ldots\,,L_m)$.

Therefore GGCHECK($X,(t/m,P,N),\varnothing$) returns **true** since GGCHECK returns **true** if one or more recursive calls in it return **true**. □

Theorem 3 (Completeness of graph type checking)**.** For any LMNtal graph X and an extensive ShapeType $(t/m,P,N)$, if $X : t\,(L_1\,,\,\ldots\,,L_m)$ holds, GCHECK($X,(t/m,P,N)$) returns **true**.

Proof. By $X : t\,(L_1\,,\,\ldots\,,L_m)$, we have $X \lhd t\,(L_1\,,\,\ldots\,,L_m)$ and $\mathrm{Funct}(X) \cap N = \varnothing$. Therefore $\forall f \in Funct(X).\ f \notin X$, so that the condition of the if statement at line 2 of GCHECK does not hold. Then GCHECK($X,(t/m,P,N)$) just returns the returned value from GGCHECK($X,(t/m,P,N),\varnothing$). By $X \lhd t\,(L_1\,,\,\ldots\,,L_m)$ and Lemma 5, GGCHECK($X,(t/m,P,N),G$) returns **true**. Therefore GCHECK($X,(t/m,P,N)$) returns **true**. □

Definition 1. A transition relation $\mathscr{T}$ between LMNtal rules α_1 :- β_1 and α_2 :- β_2 is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha_1 :\!-\, \beta_1 \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}} \alpha_2 :\!-\, \beta_2\\
&\quad \text{iff} \quad \exists \alpha_p :\!-\, \beta_p \in P.\ \exists \gamma, \gamma'.\\
&\qquad \alpha_2 \xrightarrow{\alpha_p :-\, \beta_p} \alpha_1\,,\gamma \,\wedge\, \beta_2 \equiv \beta_1\,,\gamma\\
&\qquad \wedge\, \beta_p \equiv \gamma,\gamma' \,\wedge\, \gamma' \not\equiv \mathbf{0}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we define a labeling function $\mathscr{L} : \mathscr{W} \to 2^{\{\mathtt{s},\mathtt{r}\}}$ as follows, where $\mathscr{W}$ is the whole set of LMNtal rules:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathtt{s} \in \mathscr{L}(\alpha :\!-\, \beta) &\quad \text{iff} \quad \alpha \equiv T\\
\mathtt{r} \in \mathscr{L}(\alpha :\!-\, \beta) &\quad \text{iff} \quad \alpha \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathtt{r} \in \mathscr{L}(\alpha :\!-\, \beta)$, we say $\alpha :\!-\, \beta$ is *reducible*. Then we consider a Kripke structure $\mathscr{S} = (\mathscr{W}, \mathscr{T}, \mathscr{L})$ which represents the state space of the rule type checking algorithm.

Lemma 6. If $\alpha :\!-\, \beta$ is reducible and $\alpha :\!-\, \beta \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}} \alpha' :\!-\, \beta'$, then $\alpha' :\!-\, \beta'$ is reducible.

Proof. By the assumption, we have $\alpha \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta$. By the definition of $\mathscr{T}$, we have $\exists \gamma.\ \alpha' \xrightarrow{P} \alpha\,,\gamma \beta' \equiv \beta\,,\gamma$. Then we have $\alpha' \xrightarrow{P} \alpha\,,\gamma \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta\,,\gamma \equiv \beta'$, and $\alpha' \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta'$ holds. □

Lemma 7. If $P\,,Q \equiv R\,,S$ holds, $P \equiv A_1\,,A_2$, $Q \equiv A_3\,,A_4$, $R \equiv A_1\,,A_3$, $S \equiv A_2\,,A_4$ holds for certain graphs A_1,A_2,A_3,A_4.

Proof. This follows by the rules of structural congruence. □

Lemma 8. If $P \xrightarrow{\alpha :-\, \beta} Q$ holds, there exists a graph C that satisfies $P \equiv C\,,\alpha$, $Q \equiv C\,,\beta$.

Proof. This follows by the rules of structural congruence and reduction relation. □

Lemma 9. If $X \xrightarrow{p} Y \equiv \alpha\,,C$ $(p = \alpha_p :\!-\, \beta_p \in P)$ holds, one of the followings holds:

- $\forall \beta.\ \exists \alpha', \beta', C_1, C_2.\ \alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}} \alpha' \mathrel{:-} \beta' \ \wedge\ C \equiv C_1\,, C_2 \wedge X \equiv \alpha'\,, C_2 \wedge \beta' \equiv \beta\,, C_1$
- $\exists C'.\ X \equiv \alpha\,, C' \wedge C' \xrightarrow{p} C$

Proof. By $X \xrightarrow{p} Y$ and Lemma 8, there exists C_p s.t. $X \equiv \alpha_p\,, C_p$, $Y \equiv \beta_p\,, C_p$. Then we have $Y \equiv \beta_p\,, C_p \equiv \alpha\,, C$ and, by Lemma 7, there exist C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 s.t. $C \equiv C_1\,, C_2,\ \alpha \equiv C_3\,, C_4,\ \beta_p \equiv C_1\,, C_3,\ C_p \equiv C_2\,, C_4$.

Case 1: $C_3 \not\equiv \mathbf{0}$

Let $\alpha' = \alpha_p\,, C_4,\ \beta' = \beta\,, C_1$. Then we have $\alpha' \equiv \alpha_p\,, C_4 \xrightarrow{p} \beta_p\,, C_4 \equiv C_1\,, C_3\,, C_4 \equiv \alpha\,, C_1$. Here we consider C_1, C_3 as γ, γ' in the definition $\mathscr{T}$ respectively, and we have $\alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}} \alpha' \mathrel{:-} \beta'$. Also, we have $X \equiv \alpha_p\,, C_p \equiv \alpha_p\,, C_2\,, C_4 \equiv \alpha'\,, C_2$.

Case 2: $C_3 \equiv \mathbf{0}$

By $C_1 \equiv \beta_p$, we have $C \equiv \beta_p\,, C_2$. Therefore $\alpha_p\,, C_2 \xrightarrow{p} C$ holds. Here we consider C' s.t. $C' \equiv \alpha_p\,, C_2$, then $C' \xrightarrow{p} C$ holds. Besides, by $\alpha \equiv C_4$, we have $C_p \equiv C_2\,, \alpha$. Then we have $X \equiv \alpha_p\,, C_p \equiv \alpha_p\,, C_2\,, \alpha \equiv \alpha\,, C'$. □

Lemma 10. If $\mathscr{S}, r \models \neg \mathtt{s}\, \mathsf{W}\, \mathtt{r}$ holds, r preserves the type T.

Proof. We assume $G \lhd T$, $G \xrightarrow{r} G'$, and $\mathscr{S}, r \models \neg \mathtt{s}\, \mathsf{W}\, \mathtt{r}$, and we will prove $G' \lhd T$.

By $G \lhd T$, we have $\forall i < n.\ X_{i+1} \xrightarrow{p_i} X_i$ for a certain non-negative integer n, graphs $X_0, \ldots, X_n$ ($X_0 = G, X_n = T$), and $p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1} \in P$. By $G \xrightarrow{r} G'$, there exists $C \in \mathscr{G}(N \cup \Sigma)$ s.t. $G \equiv \alpha\,, C,\ G' \equiv \beta\,, C$ where $r = \alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta$.

Next, we will show that, if $X_i \equiv \alpha_i\,, C_i$ holds, there exist $\alpha_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1}, C_{i+1}$ such that:

$$\alpha_i \mathrel{:-} \beta_i \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}}{}^{*} \alpha_{i+1} \mathrel{:-} \beta_{i+1} \ \wedge\ X_{i+1} \equiv \alpha_{i+1}\,, C_{i+1} \ \wedge\ \beta_{i+1}\,, C_{i+1} \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta_i\,, C_i$$

By $X_{i+1} \xrightarrow{p_i} X_i$ and Lemma 9, one of the following holds:

1. $\exists \alpha_{i+1}, \beta_{i+1}, C'_i, C_{i+1}.\ \alpha_i \mathrel{:-} \beta_i \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}} \alpha_{i+1} \mathrel{:-} \beta_{i+1} \wedge C_i \equiv C'_i\,, C_{i+1} \wedge X_{i+1} \equiv \alpha_{i+1}\,, C_{i+1} \wedge \beta_{i+1} \equiv \beta_i\,, C'_i$
2. $\exists C_{i+1}.\ X_{i+1} \equiv \alpha_i\,, C_{i+1} \wedge C_{i+1} \xrightarrow{p_i} C_i$

If 1. holds, it is obvious since we have $\beta_{i+1}\,, C_{i+1} \equiv \beta_i\,, C'_i\,, C_{i+1} \equiv \beta_i\,, C_i$. On the other hand, if 2. holds, it is obvious when we consider $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i,\ \beta_{i+1} = \beta_i$.

Thus, there exist α_n, β_n, C_n s.t. $\alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}}{}^{*} \alpha_n \mathrel{:-} \beta_n$, $T \equiv \alpha_n\,, C_n$, and $\beta_n\,, C_n \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta\,, C$. Since T consists only of one atom of the start symbol (with no self loops), we have $T \equiv \alpha_n$. Then $\mathtt{s} \in \mathscr{L}(\alpha_n \mathrel{:-} \beta_n)$ holds.

By $r \xrightarrow{\mathscr{T}}{}^{*} \alpha_n \mathrel{:-} \beta_n$, $\mathscr{S}, r \models \neg \mathtt{s}\, \mathsf{W}\, \mathtt{r}$, and Lemma 6, we also have $\mathtt{r} \in \mathscr{L}(\alpha_n \mathrel{:-} \beta_n)$. Therefore we have $\alpha_n \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta_n$. Thus we have $T \equiv \alpha_n \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta_n \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} \beta\,, C \equiv G'$, that is, $G' \lhd T$. □

Theorem 4 (Soundness of rule type checking)**.** For an LMNtal rule $\alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta$, a ShapeType $(t/m, P, N)$, and a sequence of links $L_1, \ldots, L_m$, if $\textsc{RCheck}(\alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta, (t/m, P, N))$ returns **true**, the following formula (the rule preserving property) holds:

$$\forall G : t(L_1, \ldots, L_m).\quad G \xrightarrow{\alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta} G' \Rightarrow G' : t(L_1, \ldots, L_m)$$

Proof. Since $\textsc{RCheck}(\alpha \mathrel{:-} \beta, (t/m, P, N))$ returns **true**, on all the paths from the target rule to the start symbol, there exists a state $L \mathrel{:-} R$ such that $\textsc{Reduce}(R, L, P, \varnothing)$ returns **true**. Therefore we have $\mathscr{S}, r \models \neg \mathtt{s}\, \mathsf{W}\, \mathtt{r}$, and the rule preserving property holds by Lemma 10. □

Theorem 5. For a set of production rules $P = P_T \cup P_{t_1} \cup \cdots \cup P_{t_n} \cup \{T \mathrel{:-} F\,,t_1\,,\,\ldots\,,t_n\}$, and a set of nonterminal symbols $N = N_T \cup N_{t_1} \cup \cdots \cup N_{t_n}$, if every rule $r \in R$ preserves type (S_T, P, N), $t_1, \ldots, t_n \vdash_R F : T$ holds.

Proof. $F\,,G_{t_1}\,,\,\ldots\,,G_{t_n}$ has the type (S_T, P, N) because P includes the production rule $T \mathrel{:-} F\,,t_1\,,\,\ldots\,,t_n$ and T is the start symbol. Let G be a graph s.t. $F\,,G_{t_1}\,,\,\ldots\,,G_{t_n} \xrightarrow{R}{}^{*} G$. Then G has the type (S_T, P, N) because every rule $r \in R$ preserves the type. Here we assume that G contains no f/m atoms. By $G : (S_T, P, N)$, there exists a production path s.t. $S_T \xrightarrow{P}{}^{*} G$. Since G contains no f/m atoms, the production rule $T \mathrel{:-} F\,,t_1\,,\,\ldots\,,t_n$ has not been applied in the production path. Also the nonterminal symbols of the types $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ do not appear in the production path because they can appear only after the production rule $T \mathrel{:-} F\,,t_1\,,\,\ldots\,,t_n$ is applied. Therefore the production rules of the types $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ have not been applied in the production path, so that the nonterminal symbols $N_{t_1}, \ldots, N_{t_n}$ and the production rules $P_{t_1}, \ldots, P_{t_n}$ are redundant in the production path. Hence we have $G : (S_T, P_T, N_T) = T$. By the definition of functional property, $t_1, \ldots, t_n \vdash_R F : T$ holds. $\square$