

For the next case, we will need the following lemma.

which proves that if a statement is true,

it remains true even if you add some hypothesis

In terms of semantics, if q is true, then $p \rightarrow q$ is also true

because if the right hand side of \rightarrow is true, then the implication is true

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$

If we have a proof of q

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

we can modify it to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q ,

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1 \mid \dots (\dots)$

A proof of q would have many steps

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$		$\dots (\dots)$
n		$q (\dots)$

of which the last line would be q

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$$\begin{array}{l|l} n-1 & \dots (\dots) \\ n & q (\dots) \\ n+1 & q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q) \text{ (FL1)} \end{array}$$

Now we simply use FL1

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots	(\dots)
n	q	(\dots)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$	(FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$	(MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

to give what we need using Modus Ponens

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (...)
n	q (...)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

We now return to the proof of case 2

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (...)
n	q (...)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule,

We consider the case where q was deduced using a replacement rule instead of Modus Ponens

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots	(\dots)
n	q	(\dots)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$	(FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$	(MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

So a proof would look like this

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ *implies* $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (...)
n	q (...)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots	(\dots)
n	q	(\dots)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$	(FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$	(MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof

looks like

$0 \mid p$ (Given)

It would start with the hypothesis

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (...)
n	q (...)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof

looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	\vdots (...)
m	r (...)

and arrive at a proof of some statement r

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (...)
n	q (...)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof

looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	\dots (...)
m	r (...)
\dots	\dots (...)
\dots	\dots (...)
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

which would have been used to prove q by some replacement rule

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (...)
n	q (...)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	\vdots (...)
m	r (...)
\dots	\vdots (...)
\dots	\vdots (...)
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

We will use this proof and induction to generate a proof for $\vdash p \rightarrow q$

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$

Notice that r follows from p

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\vdots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

and q follows from r

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (...)
n	q (...)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	\dots (...)
m	r (...)
\dots	\dots (...)
\dots	\dots (...)
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

because the highlighted subproof of $p \vdash r$ is smaller than k by Induction we know that there is a proof of $p \rightarrow r$

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

Similarly, we know by induction that there is a proof of $r \rightarrow q$

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

\dots	\vdots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	\vdots (\dots)
n	q (\dots)
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	\vdots (\dots)
m	r (\dots)
\dots	\vdots (\dots)
\dots	\vdots (\dots)
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\vdots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

Again, the highlighted part shows $r \vdash q$ so by induction we have some proof of $r \rightarrow q$

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

This time, to apply FL2, we will need to use the lemma to claim that if $r \rightarrow q$ is true then $p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ is true

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

We quote the version of FL2 we will need

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

Then use Modus Ponens to get something that allows us to use the highlighted part

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

by applying Modus Ponens again to the last statement

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

If you check carefully, you will find that we have implicitly assumed that the proofs have at least 3 statements

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

Let us consider the case where the proof has 2 steps

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)

so the proof will look like this

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)

Note that there is no chance of Modus Ponens with only 2 steps

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)

Note that this is a very special case.

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)

q is in some senses equivalent to p

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)

because it is obtained by replacing a sub-expression of p with something allowed by the replacement rule

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)

So note that we will prove this from the axioms alone

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)

Particularly the FL1 axiom, but with $\neg q$ so that double negation will get rid of it

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)

Now the same replacement rule that turned p into q

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)

can change one of the p 's to q but we leave the other one intact

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)

Then we use the rule that convert \rightarrow in terms of \vee

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)

and finally with double negation

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n-1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n+1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n+2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n+1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n+1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k+2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n+3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k+1, k+3$)
$n+4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k+1, k+4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)
4	$p \rightarrow q$

and simplification will yield this

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)
4	$p \rightarrow q$

Case 4: Concluded q with 1 step,

Now we have only one case left, where there is just one step

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)
4	$p \rightarrow q$

Case 4: Concluded q with 1 step, i.e. $p = q$

in that case q has to be p

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)
4	$p \rightarrow q$

Case 4: Concluded q with 1 step, i.e. $p = q$

0	$p \rightarrow (\neg p \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
---	----------------------------------------------

so plugging it in FL1 yields

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)
4	$p \rightarrow q$

Case 4: Concluded q with 1 step, i.e. $p = q$

0	$p \rightarrow (\neg p \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg p \vee p)$ (Material implication)

and then using the usual material implication

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)
4	$p \rightarrow q$

Case 4: Concluded q with 1 step, i.e. $p = q$

0	$p \rightarrow (\neg p \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg p \vee p)$ (Material implication)
2	$p \rightarrow (p \vee p)$ (Double negation)

and double negation

Lemma 1 $\vdash_* q$ implies $\vdash_* p \rightarrow q$

Proof Assuming a proof of q , extend to a proof of $p \rightarrow q$

$n - 1$	$\dots (\dots)$
n	$q (\dots)$
$n + 1$	$q \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (FL1)
$n + 2$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on n & $n + 1$)

□

Continuing with proof of $p \vdash q \iff \vdash p \rightarrow q$

Case 2: Concluded q using replacement rule, i.e. proof looks like

0	p (Given)
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
m	$r (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
\dots	$\dots (\dots)$
k	q (Replacement rule on m)

By induction hypothesis: $\vdash_* p \rightarrow r$ & $\vdash_* r \rightarrow q$

\dots	\dots
m	$p \rightarrow r$

\dots	\dots
n	$r \rightarrow q$ (Induction)
$n + 1$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q)$ (Lemma)
$k + 2$	$p \rightarrow (r \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q))$ (FL2)
$n + 3$	$p \rightarrow r \rightarrow (p \rightarrow q)$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 3$)
$n + 4$	$p \rightarrow q$ (MP on $k + 1, k + 4$)

Case 3: Concluded q with 2 steps

0	p (Given)
1	q (Replacement rule on 0)
0	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg q \rightarrow q)$ (Same replacement rule as in 1)
2	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg q \vee q)$ (Material implication)
3	$p \rightarrow (q \vee q)$ (Double negation)
4	$p \rightarrow q$

Case 4: Concluded q with 1 step, i.e. $p = q$

0	$p \rightarrow (\neg p \rightarrow p)$ (FL1)
1	$p \rightarrow (\neg \neg p \vee p)$ (Material implication)
2	$p \rightarrow (p \vee p)$ (Double negation)
3	$p \rightarrow p$ (Simplification)

and simplification yields the final answer