# ROY DYCKHOFF WAS A RARE NONCONFORMIST 

## Alessio Guglielmi

Bath

Journeys in Computational Logic: Tributes to Roy Dyckhoff - London, 3 September 20।9
Talk available from my home page and at http://cs.bath.ac.uk/ag/t/RDWARNC.pdf

## Paper submission to JACM - December I 999

First submission of my paper A System of Interaction and Structure, over which deep inference is based.
Result - October 2000: rejected. First words in the superficial review:
I have read the introduction and the conclusion of this paper to understand the claims made, and how it is connected with related work. From that I cannot make up my mind. Quite possibly it is brilliant, but [...]
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I have read the introduction and the conclusion of this paper to understand the claims made, and how it isconnected with related work. From that I cannot make up my mind. Quite possibly it is brilliant, but [...]

## Paper submission to ACM TOCL－September 2002

Resubmission with modest changes．
62 technical pages of eccentric ideas．
Five years of work without publishing anything－for the dominating
neo－liberalism my measure was zero and I should have perished but ．．
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## Review by Roy - October 2003

Resubmission.
Result: accepted. First sentence in Roy's in-depth review:
This is an interesting and unusual paper, which I recommend be accepted following attention to my comments below---they are lengthy, but it is a lengthy paper.


## Review by Roy - October 2003

## Resubmission.

Result: accepted. First sentence in Roy'sin-depthreview:
nonconformist
This is an interesting and unusual paper, which I recommend be accepted following attention to my comments below---they are lengthy, but it is a lengthy paper.

|  |  | Paragraph 3, "which observe negation"---what does that mean? Do you mean " take account of negation ? <br>  $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  <br>  Despite the suggestion on this pape, I Iheve ent found the graph representation of structures help fui to my understand ing. <br>  2.1.1 I commend the practice, not here observed, of using Latex's faciity troadd after the word Definition the names of concepts bein defined at least you have the terms emphasised; but you can do better! If sas is an atom, and $\varsigma \backslash$ overbar nenative atom? (rou are mudd $i n g$ the grammar. <br> What are carefuly $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  <br> $\stackrel{r}{\text { pase }} 8$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i.e. on the representative of the equivalence class? Surely they are fact, "occurrence" needs much more careful definition, art Are they positions in a tree? I think not. What ARE they? Note again the problem about whether sloverbar\{a\}s neation of an atom. -------------- <br>  $\qquad$ $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  $\qquad$ $\qquad$ <br> independent of the choice of normal form $\qquad$ <br> Page 11 <br>  <br> The proposition makes it clearer, once one reflects that b and c are the 'atoms in a substructure' and 'a' is an 'atom surrounding them'. But tit would be eeven clearer as "given two twom occurrences a and b in A . | ,indern <br> P--.-.-- 16 "sort of $\qquad$ <br> Page 17 <br>  <br>  <br> according to which a proof has no 'topmost' structure, since it beinh oith an of inf inference without a preniss. You need to define the notions lengt and premiss etc of derivation rather as follows <br> A $\{$ lem der ivation of length sos\} consists of a single struct its $\{\backslash$ em premi ss $\}$ and $\{\backslash$ lem conclusion\} are that structure <br> A \{lem derivation of length $s n$ o 0 S\} consists of a a chain of Sns inference, the conclusion of each being the premiss of the <br> next $\begin{aligned} & \text { it the first inference has a premiss, then that is the }\{\backslash \text { em } \\ & \text { premss) } \\ & \text { ofs the derivation; if the last inference has a conclusion, then } \\ & \text { that is }\end{aligned}$ <br> that the $--------~$ <br> See previous comments about 'top-down' and 'bottom-up'. These two views are also the 'synthetic' and 'analytic' vieupoint respectively (see <br> the Helsinki thesis by Petri Maenpaa). |  |  <br>  Page------- 'amount of $\qquad$ -------------1 e' 'number of e'; put 'cool $\qquad$ 'cooling down a structure'; put 'cooling' in quotes 3.3.1 Omit the first sentence of the definition, prevents the validity of " $=>$ 'di sall lons" $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ Page 31 $\qquad$ ---------- $\qquad$ <br>  Page 36 Line 6, wh $\qquad$ |
| Page 37 At this point, it would be helpful to present some simple results about divivability in BV, e.g. (I use horizontal arrows for convenien one if one has proofs of $R$ and of $T$, $R ; T\rangle$, and has proofs of $R$ and of $T$, then one can construct each of $(R, T) \Rightarrow\langle R ; T\rangle$ and $\langle R ; T\rangle \Rightarrow[R, T]$ is derivable. <br> These and similar ideas are used without comment in some of the proofs below. <br> Page 39 Mention in <br> The cases reference ten $\qquad$ $\qquad$ <br> Reference to use of 4.1 .2 should be made where used, g. in "is triviailly proved [by 4.1 .2$]$ ". <br>  $\qquad$ <br> P-...----- Pate "The foll $\qquad$ thate the ase <br>  <br> Pages 44--.-.-.- <br> Let me put aside all the above trivia here is where the paper gets technical $\qquad$ |  | 5 <br> Page 47 Nice that the admissisiinity argument gets rid of bad inferences in each sted rather than just replacing them by similar inferences of lower rank! Page 48 Give the $\qquad$ $\qquad$ Page 50 Again, exp $\qquad$ <br> Most, but not al1, cut-free sequent systems have <br> see 2 26 ' for an example, C4ip. that do you mean by 'connectives that **split** formulae'? $\qquad$ <br> Page 51 Where is the relation ' $=$ ' on formulae 'defined above'? <br> I regret the misuse of turnstile " $\mid-$ " to construct sequents from Int tisets of formulae; ; it is unnecessary, and Frege's original usage degraded. <br> Page 52 $\qquad$ |  |
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## My relationship with Roy

We met about ten times on professional occasions and we exchanged about three hundred emails. He helped me when my job was insecure.
He helped my students with technical feedback and recommendation letters.
I am sure he reviewed several of our other papers.
Until the end, he encouraged our research on deep inference.
But, most importantly,
without Roy's accurate and bold review deep inference (and I) would not exist.
Note: Roy encouraged the method (taking risks by pursuing eccentric ideas) not necessarily the ideas themselves (maybe deep inference will turn out to be a bad idea after all).
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## What I learned from Roy

It is possible to resist neo-liberalism and be a happy researcher.
Nonconformists like Roy are rare and therefore precious - at the very least they keep hope alive.
Those are important pieces of information that helped me survive and that I try to transfer to all my students.

