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Preface

This informal proceedings volume contains the contributions to the 4\textsuperscript{th} Women in Logic Workshop, that took part on 30 June 2020, as a satellite event of "Paris Nord Summer of LoVe 2020", a joint event on Logic and Verification at Universit Paris 13. The Women in Logic workshop (WiL) provides an opportunity to increase awareness of the valuable contributions made by women in the area of logic in computer science. Its main purpose is to promote the excellent research done by women, with the ultimate goal of increasing their visibility and representation in the community. Our aim is to: provide a platform for female researchers to share their work and achievements; increase the feelings of community and belonging, especially among junior faculty, post-docs and students through positive interactions with peers and more established faculty; establish new connections and collaborations; foster a welcoming culture of mutual support and growth within the logic research community. We believe these aspects will benefit women working in logic and computer science, particularly early-career researchers.

The WiL program featured two invited talks, given by Maribel Fernández (Kings College London) and Alexandra Silva (University College London), fifteen contributed talks and six posters.

WiL 2020 was a very successful event, despite the challenging circumstances facing this edition, and we would like to thank all the people involved. First, we would like to thank the invited speakers, Maribel Fernández and Alexandra Silva, for their inspiring talks. We thank all the authors for submitting their contributions and for presenting their work at WiL. We are indebted to the program committee members: Amy Felty (University of Ottawa), Delia Kesner (Université de Paris), Koko Muroya (RIMS Kyoto University), Daniele Nantes (University of Brasília), Valeria de Paiva (Samsung Research America), Brigitte Pientka (McGill University) and Sonja Smets (ILLC - University of Amsterdam). We are very grateful to the local organizers: Giulio Manzonetto (Workshop Chair), Stefano Guerrini (FSCD Conference Chair) and Kaustuv Chaudhuri (IJCAR Conference Chair) for the overall organization and in particular for their efforts in keeping the virtual meeting running smoothly. We thank our sponsors: the Special Interest Group of the ACM for Logic (SIGLOG), the Vienna Center for Logic and Algorithms (VCLA) and the Institute of Logic, Language and Computation of the University of Amsterdam (ILLC). Finally, we thank all of the workshop participants that help us in achieving a full day of interesting discussions within a positive and constructive atmosphere.

Sandra Alves, Sandra Kiefer and Ana Sokolova

WiL 2020 PC co-chairs
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Maribel Fernández (Kings College London)

Title: Nominal Syntax with Atom Substitutions

Abstract: Unification and matching algorithms are essential components of logic and functional programming languages and theorem provers. Nominal extensions have been developed to deal with syntax involving binding operators: Nominal syntax is a generalisation of first-order syntax that includes names, a notion of name binding and an elegant axiomatisation of alpha-equivalence, based on nominal set theory. However, it does not take into account non-capturing atom substitution, which is not a primitive notion in nominal syntax.

We consider an extension of nominal syntax with non-capturing atom substitutions and show that matching is decidable and finitary but unification is undecidable in general. The proof of undecidability of unification is obtained by reducing Hilbert’s tenth problem to unification of extended nominal terms. We provide a general matching algorithm and characterise a class of problems for which matching is unitary, giving rise to expressive and efficient notions of rewriting.

This is joint work with Jesus Dominguez.

Alexandra Silva (University College London)

Title: An algebraic framework to reason about concurrency

Abstract: Kleene algebra with tests (KAT) is an algebraic framework for reasoning about the control flow of sequential programs. Hoare, Struth, and collaborators proposed a concurrent extension of Kleene Algebra (CKA) as a first step towards developing algebraic reasoning for concurrent programs. Completing their research program and extending KAT to encompass concurrent behaviour has however proven to be more challenging than initially expected. The core problem appears because when generalising KAT to reason about concurrent programs, axioms native to KAT in conjunction with expected axioms for reasoning about concurrency lead to an unexpected equation about programs. In this talk, we will revise the literature on CKA(T) and explain the challenges and solutions in the development of an algebraic framework for concurrency.

The talk is based on a series of papers joint with Tobias Kapp, Paul Brunet, Bas Luttik, Jurriaan Rot, Jana Wagemaker, and Fabio Zanasi. Detailed references can be found on the CoNeCo project website: https://coneoco-project.org/.
Applying Optimization Modulo Theory, Mathematical Programming and Symmetry Breaking for Automatic Deployment in the Cloud of Component-based Applications

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Mădălina Eraşcu, Flavia Micota, and Daniela Zaharie
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In this paper we summarize our recent work on the problem of provisioning Cloud resources for component-based applications. It consists in the allocation of virtual machines (VMs) offers from various Cloud Providers to a set of applications such that the constraints induced by the interactions between components and by the components hardware/software requirements are satisfied and the performance objectives are optimized (e.g. costs are minimized).

The problem is similar to the classical bin-packing, however:

- bins (VMs) can have different capacity, which depends on the VMs offers;
- the placement of items (components) in bins is limited not only by the capacity constraints, but also by the constraints induced by the components interactions;
- the number of items is not known a priori (for component-based applications, several instances of a component can be deployed, depending on specific constraints on the number of instances);
- the smallest cost (optimality criteria) is not necessarily obtained by minimizing the number of bins.

It can be formulated as a constraint optimization problem (COP) and solved, in principle, by state-of-the-art mathematical programming (MP) and optimization modulo theories (OMT) tools. While the application of MP techniques for solving COPs has a long tradition, the usage of OMT is recent. Our motivation for using the OMT approach lies in the tremendous advances of methods and tools in this domain in the last decade, applications in artificial intelligence and formal methods for hardware and software development have greatly benefited from these [1, 4, 6].

The performance of MP and OMT tools is highly dependent on the way the problem is formalized as this determines the size of the search space. In the case when the number of VMs offers is large, a naive encoding which does not exploit the symmetries of the underlying problem leads to a huge search space making the optimization problem intractable. We overcame this issue by reducing the search space by:

- systematically analyzing the symmetries which appear in the context of Cloud deployment applications;
- design and integrate with state-of-the-art MP (CPLEX [5]) and OMT (Z3 [2]) tools static symmetry breakers for speeding-up the solution process.
Applications of OMT, MP and symmetry breaking

As a result, the combination of a variable reduction strategy with a column-wise symmetry breaker leads to a scalable deployment solution, when OMT is used to solve the resulting optimization problem. This was achieved by:

1. formalizing the Cloud deployment problem by abstracting away the particularities of several realistic case studies (Secure Web Container, Secure Billing Email, Oryx2, Wordpress);

2. presenting a methodology analyzing the particularities of the problem with the aim of identifying search space reduction methods; these are methods exploiting the symmetries of the general Cloud deployment problem, respectively methods utilizing the graph representation (cliques) of each application;

3. assessing the performance and comparing two tools based on different theoretical background, namely mathematical programming (CPLEX [5]) and computational logic (Z3 [3]) with the aim of identifying limits in their scalability and applying search space reduction methods aiming to improve their performance.

We checked the effectiveness of our methodology on various case studies (Secure Web Container, Secure Billing Email Service, Wordpress, Oryx 2) which exemplify the following aspects:

- different component characteristics and the rich interactions type in between;
- the kind of linear constraints used to express these interactions;
- the kind of solution we are searching for.
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How to reason with inconsistent probabilistic information?

Marta Bělková¹, Sabine Frittella², Ondrej Majer³, and Sajad Nazari²

¹ Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Computer Science, Prague
² INSA Centre Val de Loire, Univ. Orleans, LIFO EA 4022, France,
³ Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Philosophy, Prague

To form beliefs about the world we typically collect and process data from multiple sources of various origins, providing information that is mostly incomplete, uncertain and often conflicting concerning the issues we wish to resolve. It seems obvious that we need to understand how to reason correctly to reach the most relevant conclusions and take responsible decisions, even when our beliefs are based on incomplete or uncertain information, and therefore we need adequate logical tools to capture such reasoning. A recent line of research has developed around epistemic logics based on information or evidence [1, 4, 5]. Among them, Bělková et al. [4] understand belief as based on potentially incomplete and contradictory information confirmed by a reliable source. However, the nature of sources on which belief is founded, their reliability, the way belief is formed and the uncertain nature of information, remained undeveloped. We follow up on these ideas to propose a framework where the information about potentially complex and not fully determined facts comes from multiple possibly conflicting sources and is of a probabilistic nature. We wish to model large diversity of situations:

(i) **Agents’ computational abilities:** On one hand, a company has access to a huge amount of heterogeneous data from various sources and to software to analyse these data. Hence, it is an agent with rather strong computational abilities. On the other hand, a human has limited computational abilities and will also possibly have cognitive bias in her analyses of a situation.

(ii) **Nature of sources:** Sources naturally are incomplete and potentially also inconsistent (both internally and mutually). Moreover, one might have doubts about the honesty of a source, but also about its reliability.

(iii) **Nature of information:** The information might be factual, probabilistic (e.g. based on a survey) or fuzzy by nature. For instance, while evaluating if consumers consider car X as being a ‘family car’, we are trying to understand how car X is perceived by the population through the concept ‘family car’. Concepts are usually fuzzy by nature and people often do not reason classically with them.

The logical models of reasoning with inconsistent uncertain information we propose within this contribution are motivated by demand for more realistic models of human agency and, methodologically, will be accomplished with developing and merging the approaches of alternative models of probability and methods coming from areas of non-classical logics.

**Epistemic logics over alternative models of uncertainty.** The logical framework we propose merges the following ingredients:

- As classical logic does not allow us to derive nontrivial conclusions from conflicting assumptions, we employ Belnap-Dunn logic BD to reason about potentially incomplete and inconsistent information [2]. In BD a formula might not only be true or false as in the classical case, but can also be neither or both, and the logic allows for reasoning under contradictory assumptions.

- As classical rationality postulates are too strong and idealized, we use non-standard probabilities [7] to capture uncertainty of information. One of the background assumptions behind the BD approach is that having information about truth of a proposition \( \varphi \) is
distinct from the information about its falsity. This assumption is naturally applicable in
the probabilistic framework. We distinguish positive probability of a claim \( \varphi \) represent-
ing uncertainty of information supporting \( \varphi \) and negative probability of \( \varphi \) represent-
ing uncertainty of information rejecting \( \varphi \).

- We propose epistemic logics in the form of two-layer modal logics [6]. This formalism
  combines two logical systems: a lower logic for non-modal formulas which allows to ge-
nerate atomic modal formulas just by prefixing them with a modality operator, and an
  upper logic that generates modal formulas from atomic modal formulas. The lower layer
  of logics we propose is that of events or facts, represented by probabilistic information
  provided by sources available to an agent, and we use the logic BD on this layer. The
  modalities connecting the lower layer to the upper layer encode the belief of the agent
  (e.g. about an event taking place). Semantically, belief is based on the (probabilistic)
  information from the available sources by means of various kinds of aggregation. The top
  layer is the logic of thus formed beliefs (in our proposal, BD, extensions of Lukasiewicz
  logic, or a bi-lattice logic based on the standard MV algebra.) We provide axiomatization
  and prove completeness of thus resulting logics.

We have laid the foundations for a modular framework to model reasoning with inconsistent
probabilistic heterogeneous information in a preprint [3]. Future lines of research, we have
started to work on, cover:

- The agent strategies to aggregate information from different sources. We have studied
  simple strategies such as the weighted average, a cautious aggregation using only the
  information all sources agree upon, and a trustful aggregation using all the available in-
  formation. Another natural aggregation strategy would be to adapt Dempster-Shafer (DS)
  combination rule and to investigate the link between belief functions and non-standard
  probabilities. As DS combination rule is problematic in cases of high conflict and pro-
  vides counter intuitive results, generalizing DS combination rule to BD should provide a
  mathematical environment where high conflict can be handled in a more intuitive manner.

- Sources. A source does not often give an opinion about each formula of the language and
  hence we need to account for sources providing partial probability maps. In addition, the
  sources’ reasoning might be based on different logical principles: one source might reason
  classically, while another one might use a very weak logic and refuse (or not be able) to
give an opinion about complex statements. This raises further questions of which logic(s)
one should use to model sources. Another quest is to capture dynamics of information
and belief given by updates on the level of sources (e.g. adding a source).

- The agents’ reasoning. One needs to pick the appropriate logic to model the agents’
  reasoning. For an agent with strong computational abilities relevant logic might be ade-
  quate, whereas a weaker logic might be better to model human reasoning. The next step
  is to generalize the framework to the multi agent setting, involving group modalities and
dynamics of belief. Specifically, forming group belief, including common and distributed
belief, will involve communication and/or sharing and pooling of sources. It might also
call for a use of modalities inside the upper logic to account for reflected beliefs, in contrast
to the beliefs grounded directly in the sources.
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On the Semi-Inversion of Conditional Term Rewriting Systems [Extended Abstract]

Maja H. Kirkeby\textsuperscript{1} and Robert Glück\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark, kirkebym@acm.org
\textsuperscript{2} University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark, glueck@acm.org

We present a polyvariant semi-inversion algorithm for conditional constructor term rewriting systems. Program inversion is an elementary program transformation, which given the specification of the known input and output arguments of a program, inverts the program into a program that depends only on the known arguments. There are three kinds of program inversion, namely full inversion, partial inversion and semi-inversion, where semi-inversion is the most general one. If \( p \) is a program with two inputs \((x, y)\) and two outputs \((u, v)\), then the three forms of inversion can be illustrated as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
  p(x, y) &= (u, v) & \text{full} & \Rightarrow & p(u, v) &= (x, y) \\
  p(x, y) &= (u, v) & \text{partial} & \Rightarrow & p(x, u, v) &= (y) \\
  p(x, y) &= (u, v) & \text{semi} & \Rightarrow & p(x, v) &= (u, y)
\end{align*}
\]

Full inversion swaps the entire input and output, partial inversion swaps parts of the input and the entire output, and semi-inversion allows parts of the input and output to be swapped. Important applications include the full inversion of lossless encoders, e.g., \( \text{encode}(\text{data}) = \text{code} \) into \( \text{decode}(\text{code}) = \text{data} \) [6], and the partial inversion of symmetric encrypters, inverting, e.g., \( \text{encrypt}(\text{key}, \text{data}) = \text{code} \) into \( \text{decrypt}(\text{key}, \text{code}) = \text{data} \) [8]. This presentation is based on the publication [8] and concerns the most general case of inversion, namely, semi-inversion. This talk explains the principles behind the algorithm and discusses future work.

Program inversion, e.g., [4, 5, 6, 12, 2, 10], and inverse interpretation, e.g., [9, 1] have been studied for more than fifty years in various programming languages. Of those, only Nishida et al. [12] and Almendros-Jiménez et al. [2] have considered term rewriting systems, where the latter constrained the systems such that terms have a unique normal form, i.e., the systems express functional input-output relations. Mogensen [10], who developed a semi-inversion algorithm, did so for a deterministic guarded equational language, i.e., with functional input-output relations. This algorithm [8] fills a gap in our knowledge by semi-inverting general relations.

We are using a subclass of oriented conditional constructor term rewriting systems, called pure constructor CTRS [11]. The main advantage is that they can model both logic and functional languages [3], and, thus, functional logical languages [7]. Using these systems enables us to focus on the essence of semi-inversion without considering language-specific details. The semantics of functions and relations can be expressed and efficiently calculated in the same formalism.

\textbf{Semi-inversion algorithm – An overview} The semi-inverter makes use of local inversion and a simple but effective heuristic. The main loop of the semi-inversion algorithm controls the application of inversion to rewrite rules. It keeps track of the functions (defined symbols) that have been semi-inverted and those pending. For each of the pending functions it applies inversion to each of the defining rules. Afterwards, the pending tasks are updated by removing the inverted function and adding any new dependencies. When no pending functions exists, it returns a CCS containing the semi-inverted function and all its dependencies. The algorithm semi-inverts each rule in two steps:
1. it uses a heuristic that reorders the conditions recursively according to the highest percentage of known parameters, i.e., parameters where all variables occur either on the left-hand side of the rule or in a previous condition.

2. it annotates each function symbol with two new index sets with the indices of the known parameters, and it locally inverts the rule head and every condition, such that the parameters of the index sets occur in the left-hand side and the rest on the right-hand side.

Semi-inversion is polyvariant as the inverted system may include several different semi-inversions of the same rule. The algorithm is implemented and proven correct.

Applications We consider a discrete simulation of an object that falls through a vacuum and use the semi-inversion algorithm to generate three new programs, each solving a different aspect.

At time \( t \), the object has a height in meters \( h_t \) and a downwards velocity in meters per second \( v_t \); they are defined by \( v_t = v_{t-1} + g \) and \( h_t = h_{t-1} - v_t + g/2 \), where \( g \approx 10 m/s^2 \) is the approximate gravitational acceleration. Given the height from which the object drops \( h_0 \), the initial velocity \( v_0 \) and the time \( t \) then \( \text{fall} \) outputs the final height and velocity after the time has passed.

\[
\text{fall}(v, h, 0) \rightarrow (v, h)
\]
\[
\text{fall}(v_0, h_0, s(t)) \rightarrow (v, h) \iff add(v_0, s^{\text{inv}}(0)) \rightarrow (v, h) \land \text{height}(h_0, v_0) \rightarrow (h) \land \text{fall}(v_n, h_n, t) \rightarrow (v, h)
\]
\[
\text{height}(h_0, v_0) \rightarrow (h) \iff add(h_0, s^{\text{inv}}(0)) \rightarrow (h) \land \text{sub}(h_{\text{temp}}, v_0) \rightarrow (h)
\]

The inverted functions are annotated with two index sets describing which of the original inputs and, respectively, outputs that are now input. The inputs of the full inversion \( \text{fall}^{0(1,2)} \) are the final height and velocity, i.e., the first and second output of \( \text{fall} \), and is a relation yielding the possible triples of time, initial height and velocity, whereas the partial inversion, \( \text{fall}^{3(1,2)} \), has also time as input and is a function. The semi-inversion is different; it is a function that given the final height and the initial velocity and height, calculates the time that will pass and the velocity with which the object will collide with the ground.

\[
\text{fall}^{1(2)}(v, h, h) \rightarrow (0, v)
\]
\[
\text{fall}^{1(2)}(v_0, h_0, h) \rightarrow (s(t), v) \iff add(v_0, s^{\text{inv}}(0)) \rightarrow (v, h) \land \text{height}(h_0, v_0) \rightarrow (h) \land \text{fall}^{1(2)}(v_n, h_n, h) \rightarrow (t, v)
\]
\[
\text{height}(h_0, v_0) \rightarrow (h) \iff add(h_0, s^{\text{inv}}(0)) \rightarrow (h) \land \text{sub}(h_{\text{temp}}, v_0) \rightarrow (h)
\]

Other example applications include the inversion of a simple encrypter and of a program inverter for a reversible programming language [8].

Future work This algorithm makes inversion more broadly applicable and gives new insights into inversion algorithms across different methods and language paradigms. In regard to future work, it could be interesting to vary the heuristics and to capture and to investigate properties of different forms of inversions and other inversion algorithms in this term-rewriting formalism.
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OCaml-Flat on the Ocsigen Framework
Extended Abstract∗

Rita Macedo
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1 Introduction

Given the mathematical and formal character of the topics covered in subjects such as Languages and Automata, its teaching and learning processes are demanding and challenging. Several studies have confirmed these difficulties and evaluated the use of some applications [13, 18, 16, 14]. It is important to support students’ autonomous work with interactive tools that allow them to experiment with examples and solve exercise. There are a lot of applications that aim to overcome the difficulties mentioned by using various solutions. While some are quite complete, they are Desktop applications and not available everywhere. Others can be used via a web browser, although they are underdeveloped.

The objective of this project is to develop an application serving as an experimental lab on Formal Languages and Automata Theory, FLAT, available through a browser. The idea is to create a tool that represents and animates graphically classical mechanisms and algorithms. It is also intended that this tool should be adapted to the course of Computational Theory [17] taught at NOVA School of Science and Technology and that it includes not only exercises evaluated automatically and providing feedback, but also allowing students to create their own exercises.

The application is being developed in Ocsigen Framework, which allows the creation of web application written in OCaml. By capitalizing of the features of OCaml, it is possible to obtain fully functional and less error-prone web pages. Ocsigen also facilitates the creation of web tools, as it allows to write client-side and server-side code in the same source file using the same language, thus facilitating system programming.

2 Related Work

The development of tools related to FLAT has been done since the beginning of the 60’s [12]. The article Fifty Years of Automata Simulation: A Review [12] also argues that although there are already many tools, the scientific community continues to produce new ones because each one has its own principles and often new uses. In addition, each tool is influenced by the development tools currently available.

It is important to highlight the most significant applications: JFlap [7], because it is probably the most complete tool available; Automaton Simulator[3] for being a tool that allows the study of FA, verifying the acceptance of sentences; FSM Simulator, Regular Expression Gym and FSM2Regex [5, 9, 6] or also being web applications and allowing the study of FA and RE and their conversions; Automata Tutor v2.0 [1] because it has an evaluation and feedback system;

∗Work partially supported by the Tezos Foundation through the FACTOR project (http://www-ctp.di.fct.unl.pt/FACTOR/) and by national funds through FCT - Foundation for Science and Technology, I.P., within the scope of NOVA LINCS through the project UID/CEC/04516/2019.
and Automate [2] because it is a tool with similar objectives as this project and it is being developed at the same time.

Each application has their own focus and emphasizes different functionalities - most of them not allowing going backwards in the visualization of algorithms and giving more importance to automata at the expense of regular expressions - but most of them are still incomplete and excluding the AutomataTutor none of them allows the lecturers to create exercises in order to use the tool both in class and as a student assessment system.

3 Approach

Since the base library is written in OCaml, because it enables the algorithms to be the most similar to the mathematical definitions in the "classical" literature of FLAT [19, 15], we decided, as a proof of concept, to try to create a web tool completely in OCaml. The goal is to develop the application using the Ocsigen Framework. This framework allows the creation of interactive web systems, entirely written in OCaml [8, 10, 11]. One of its great advantages is to compile the client’s OCaml code for JavaScript, which makes it possible to work together with this language and thus use a wide number of libraries available.

Since the Ocsigen Framework allows the joint work of OCaml with JavaScript, it was decided to use Cytoscape.js graph Library [4] for the graphical part of drawing automata and the syntax trees. The main reason was that while having a complete and easy to use library to draw the graphs we could focus on other more important issues of the projects, like how to animate, how to show and how to organize all the information and not about the representation of the graphs.

4 Presentation of the Application

Even though the application is still under development, it has already a running version that allows students to work with Finite Automata and Regular Expressions and to create simple exercises. It can be accessed in http://ctp.di.fct.unl.pt/FACTOR/OFLAT and the code can be seen in https://gitlab.com/releaselab/factor/oflat.

As far as the user interface is concerned, the OFlat application is a very simple and clean web page with a menu on the left side and a white box, where the graphics are drawn. In the page the user can import examples from filesystem or create new ones step-by-step (in the case of the Automata).

The automata are represented as is usual in the literature and after they are created we can make conversions, minimizations and generation of words. All of these operations representing the results side by side with the original, allowing the user to compare them and understand the changes made. It is also possible to visualize the acceptance of a word as an animation or step by step (with the possibility of going backward).

The regular expressions are graphically shown not only as a sentence but also as a syntax tree. There is also the option of testing the acceptance of a word by the regular expression, which is, generally, not found in applications but is an important functionality. It is also possible to make conversion into an Automaton and generation of words in the regular expression.

An “exercise” corresponds to the statement of a problem where the user is asked to define a language by means of a finite automaton or a regular expression. The statement is accompanied by a set of unit tests that are used to verify the solution. After an exercise is imported the user can create an automata or regular expression to answer it.
The application, thanks to the framework used has a centralized client-server code and is also structured and extensible which makes it easy to keep adding new mechanisms. It is also prepared to integrate the Learn OCaml system\(^1\), thanks to the way the code is organized and the fact that both of the applications are written in OCaml and making use of the Js_of_ocaml (component of the Ocsigen Framework) to create the web application. It will allow teachers to create classroom and assessment exercises.

The web page about the project that includes a video demonstration can be accessed in \url{https://release.di.ubi.pt/factor/oflatocsigen.html}.

5 Conclusions

In this project it was proposed to develop a Web application in OCaml that allows the students to study different topics of Formal Languages and Automata Theory.

Although a JavaScript library was used to display the graphs, we have achieved the proof of concept by showing that it is possible to create a web page almost completely in OCaml. We were able to have a complete interaction with the support library, and to maintain all the core programming, like decisions and verifications, in the OCaml side of the code, using the cytoscape.js library only to show what in OCaml is decided to be shown.

In the end, and despite the fact that the application does not cover all the mechanisms taught in the course of Computational Theory, we have built a version which is finalized and being used in class and is also prepared to easily add new mechanisms and improvements in the design.
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Forgetting Agent Awareness: a Partial Semantics Approach
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Abstract

Partial Dynamic Epistemic Logic allows agents to have different knowledge representations about the world through agent awareness. Agents use their own vocabularies to reason and talk about the world and raise their awareness when confronted with new vocabulary. Through raising awareness the vocabularies of agents are extended, suggesting there is a dual, inverse operator for forgetting awareness that decreases vocabularies. In this paper, we discuss such an operator. Unlike raising awareness, this operator may induce an abstraction on models that removes evidence while preserving conclusions. This is useful to better understand how agents with different knowledge representations communicate with each other, as they may forget the justifications that led them to their conclusions.

1 Introduction

Agents use different ways to represent their knowledge about the world. This causes problems when they try to communicate: how do the agents translate their knowledge, expressed in their vocabulary, to the knowledge of other agents, which could be expressed in different vocabularies? When we require that agents are fully aware of each other’s vocabularies, we can model their interactions with Dynamic Epistemic Logic (DEL). This has been achieved in the context of ontologies (a formal knowledge representation) and alignments (translations between different ontologies) in [8]. However, full awareness is not desirable nor realistic for open multi-agent systems where agents are continuously required to adapt their knowledge representations.

The problem with the modeling in DEL is that, on DEL, agents can only revise their knowledge and beliefs via dynamic upgrades such as announcements (changing knowledge), conservative and radical upgrades (changing beliefs). These eliminate or reorganize (some) worlds of the model. However, this also means that whatever may be learned in the future and whatever vocabulary may be acquired, should already be available in the present situation. This prevents agents to expand their vocabularies as is required in an open, dynamic setting.

To loosen this requirement, agent unawareness has been modeled for Dynamic Epistemic Logic using partial valuations [9]. This provides us with a richer framework because partial valuations allow propositions to be true, false or undefined and, when a proposition is undefined, agents are unaware of it. Whenever agents are confronted with new vocabulary, they raise their awareness via an “awareness raising” operator $+p$ [9].

Once provided with such an awareness raising operator it is natural to think of a dual, inverse operator for forgetting awareness. In this paper, we discuss such an operator. In particular, unlike raising awareness, forgetting awareness requires to understand what to do with consequences obtained from removed evidence. They may be forgotten as well or preserved. In the latter case, forgetting awareness induces an abstraction on models that may delete justifications while preserving their conclusions.

Besides its theoretical interest, this operator allows us to better understand how agents with different knowledge representations communicate and improve their alignments. Indeed, simple agents may forget the examples that led them to induce or discard more abstract conclusions [1, 2]. Hence, a full logical model of these agents [8] could take advantage of such a forgetting operator.
2 Related Work

Partial semantics have been introduced before for modal logic [6, 5, 10, 4], yet the connection with agent awareness was never explored. Instead, awareness and unawareness of agents have been studied from an epistemic logic perspective by adding an awareness operator to the language $A\phi$ [3]. A complete dynamic awareness logic with dynamics for increasing and decreasing awareness was developed in [13, 11, 7, 12].

However, in awareness logic, raising awareness of a proposition $p$ comes equipped with disclosing the truth value of $p$. This is because all the propositions an agent may become aware of in the future are already specified in the initial setting and only awareness is considered as a partial function. We consider these two as different acts: becoming aware of a proposition and learning its truth value. In this way, unlike in awareness logic, models are truly open to evolve.

3 Forgetting

To raise awareness of a proposition $p$, $+p$, the valuation function is extended: $p$ is added to the worlds of the model in which it was initially undefined [9]. Formally, this means that, in the model, all the worlds (globally), or all the accessible worlds for an agent (locally), in which $p$ was initially undefined are duplicated and $p$ is defined as true in one world and false in the other, while accessibility to and from duplicated worlds is preserved. This means that agents unaware of $p$ become uncertain about $p$ after raising awareness of $p$.

Similarly, to forget awareness of $p$, $-p$, we may delete the valuations of $p$ from all the worlds in the model (globally), or from all the accessible worlds for an agent (locally). Worlds that are similar up to bisimilarity may be merged. This forces models on which awareness of $p$ is raised and subsequently forgotten to be bisimilar to the original situation, see Figure 1.

However, this also raises a question what happens if awareness of $p$ is raised, then $p$ is used to learn something about another proposition $q$, and finally $p$ is forgotten again. Consider, for example, the upgrade $+p; +q; ![p \rightarrow q]; -p$ as illustrated in Figure 2. When we apply $-p$ and remove the valuations of $p$ from the worlds in the model, the truth value of $q$ remains untouched: $q$ will still be true even though its justification, $p$ (because $p \rightarrow q$ was announced, linking the truth value of $q$ to that of $p$), is removed. This means that this type of forgetting awareness induces an abstraction on models: removing evidence while preserving conclusions.

The question is then: is this feature of the forgetting awareness operator desirable? Should agents remember the conclusions drawn from forgotten evidence? Indeed, simple agents may forget the examples that led them to induce or discard more abstract conclusions [1, 2] because the conclusions enable them to successfully communicate without referring to the examples.

4 Conclusion

We have discussed a forgetting awareness operator for partial dynamic epistemic logic that removes valuations of the proposition that is to be forgotten from the worlds of the model. We have then shown that this type of forgetting awareness induces an abstraction on models that removes evidence while preserving conclusions.

Forgetting awareness is useful to better understand how agents with different knowledge representations communicate with each other and improve their alignments because simple agents may forget the justification for their drawn conclusions, without effecting the communication to take place successfully [1, 2]. Therefore, this could benefit a full logical model of such agents [8].
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Appendix: Figures

Figure 1: Raising awareness of \( p \), \(+p\) (left to right, the red dashed lines indicate how the worlds are mapped from the model on the left to the model on the right) and \( \neg p \) (right to left, the blue dashed lines indicate how the worlds are mapped from the model on the right to the model on the left), where the worlds are merged up to bisimilarity. We have that \( M^{+p;\neg p} \) and \( M \) are bisimilar.

Figure 2: The figure illustrates the steps of the complex upgrade \(+p; +q; !p; !(p \rightarrow q); \neg p\) applied to the “empty model” (where no propositions are defined), from left to right. For simplicity, the reflexive arrows are omitted and the dashed lines indicate how the worlds are mapped from the initial model (on the left) to the resulting model (on the right) where red stands for an awareness raise upgrade, green for an announcement and blue for a forgetting awareness upgrade. In the resulting model, on the right, \( q \) is known, but not justified anymore.
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Abstract

The aim of this talk is to develop six implicative expansions of the well-known Anderson and Belnap’s First Degree Entailment Logic that verify Routley and Meyer’s logic B and endow them with a Belnap-Dunn type bivalent semantics.

1 Introduction and preliminary notions

The aim of this talk is to define six (hopefully) interesting implicative expansions of the well-known Anderson and Belnap’s First Degree Entailment Logic (FDE). In particular, I will focus on two already developed expansions of FDE – the logics BN4 and E4, which can be considered respectively as the 4-valued logic of the relevant conditional and (relevant) entailment – and investigate the implicative variants of these two logics which verify Routley and Meyer’s logic B. Moreover, I will endow them with a Belnap-Dunn semantics.

In the first place, I set out some basic notions.

Definition 1.1 (Languages) The propositional language consists of a denumerable set of propositional variables \( P \) 0, \( P \) 1, ..., \( P \) n, ... and some or all of the following connectives →, ∧, ∨, ¬. The biconditional and the set of wffs \( F \) are defined in the customary way. \( A \), \( B \) are metalinguistic variables.

Definition 1.2 (Logics) A logic \( L \) is a structure \(< L, \vdash_L >\) where \( L \) is a propositional language and \( \vdash_L \) is a (proof-theoretical) consequence relation defined on \( L \) by a set of axioms and a set of rules of derivation. The notions of proof and theorem are understood as it is customary in Hilbert-style axiomatic systems (\( \Gamma \vdash_L A \) means that \( A \) is derivable from the set of wffs \( \Gamma \) in \( L \); and \( \vdash_L A \) means that \( A \) is a theorem of \( L \)).

Definition 1.3 (Extensions and expansions) Let \( L \) be a logic formulated with axioms \( a_1, ..., a_n \) and rules of derivation \( r_1, ..., r_m \). A logic \( L' \) includes \( L \) iff \( a_1, ..., a_n \) are theorems of \( L' \) and rules \( r_1, ..., r_m \) are provable in \( L' \). We shall generally refer to logics including \( L \) by \( EL \)-logics. Notice that an \( EL \)-logic can be an extension of \( L \) (i.e., a strengthening of \( L \) in the language of \( L \)) or an expansion of \( L \) (i.e., a strengthening of \( L \) in an expansion of the language of \( L \)).

2 Anderson and Belnap’s FDE and Routley and Meyer’s basic logic B

Anderson and Belnap developed the logic known as First Degree Entailment (cf. Definition 2.1 below) in the seventies within the context of relevance logics. This logic is considered a
core non-classical system among many-valued and relevance logics (cf. [8]). The logic FDE is
categorized by Belnap and Dunn’s matrix MB4 (cf. Definition 2.2) —as a matter of fact, FDE
can be also referred to as B4. The matrix MB4 could be considered as the origin of the Belnap-
Dunn semantics which was originally created to treat inconsistent and incomplete information
[2]. Furthermore, MB4 is also the smallest bilattice, according to Ginsberg [6].

**Definition 2.1 (FDE)** The logic FDE\(^1\) can be axiomatized with axioms A1 \((A \land B)\rightarrow A /
(A \land B)\rightarrow B, A2 A\rightarrow (A \lor B) / B \rightarrow (A \lor B), A3 [A \land (B \lor C)] \rightarrow (A \land (B \lor C)), A4
\neg \neg A \rightarrow A, A5 A \rightarrow \neg \neg A and Transitivity \((A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C \Rightarrow A \rightarrow C), CI\land (A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C \Rightarrow A \rightarrow (B \land C)), EV (A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow C \Rightarrow (A \lor B) \rightarrow C)\) and Contraposition (CON; \(A \rightarrow \neg B \Rightarrow \neg A\)) as rules of inference.

**Definition 2.2 (Belnap and Dunn’s matrix MB4)** The propositional language \(L\) consists
of the connectives \(\land, \lor\) and \(\neg\). Belnap and Dunn’s matrix MB4 is the structure \(<V, D, F>\),
where (i) \(V\) is \(\{0, 1, 2, 3\}\) and it is partially ordered as shown in the following lattice:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
2 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 \\
3 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\lor & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 \\
2 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 3 \\
3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

Regarding the intuitive meaning of the four values, it is worth to mention that 0, 1, 2 and
3 can be interpreted in MB4 as follows. Let \(T\) and \(F\) represent truth and falsity. Then, \(0 = F,\)
\(1 = N(\text{either}), 2 = B(\text{both})\) and \(3 = T\). Or, in terms of subsets of \(\{T, F\}\), we have: 0 = \(\{F\}\),
1 = \(\emptyset\), 2 = \(\{T, F\}\) and 3 = \(\{T\}\). Consequently, the term “bivalent semantics” refers to the fact
that there are only two values and the possibility of assigning both or neither to propositions
(cf. [2]).

On the other hand, Routley and Meyer’s basic logic B is a central system in the family of
relevance logics and a proper extension of FDE.

**Definition 2.4 (Routley and Meyer’s logic B)** The logic B is generally axiomatized with
axioms A1- A5 of FDE in addition to the axiomatic versions of the rules CI\land\ and EV\lor\ displayed
in Definition 2.1. As for the rules of inference, B has the rules Adjunction (ADJ; \(A, B \Rightarrow A \land B\)),

\[^1\text{Although the logic FDE is more usually presented as a Gentzen-style system or a Natural Deduction system (cf. [8]), for the purposes of this talk, I display its axiomatic version (cf. [1, p. 159]).}\]
Modus Ponens (MP; $A, A \rightarrow B \Rightarrow B$), Prefixing (PREF; $A \rightarrow B \Rightarrow (C \rightarrow A) \rightarrow (C \rightarrow B)$), Suffixing SUF; $(A \rightarrow B \Rightarrow (B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C))$ and CON.

It is worth to mention that all the logics considered in this paper are extensions of B and therefore extensions of FDE too.

3 The logics BN4 and E4 and their alternatives

The implicative expansions of FDE we shall define are developed upon some variations on the implicative function of the matrices which characterize the logics BN4 and E4 (cf. Definition 3.1 below). In other words, I've taken the systems BN4 and E4 as a starting point to develop the rest of the expansions.

Definition 3.1 (Brady’s matrix MB4 and Robles and Méndez’s matrix ME4) The propositional language $L$ consists of the connectives $\rightarrow, \land, \lor$ and $\neg$. Brady’s matrix MBN4 and Robles and Méndez’s matrix ME4 are the structures $< V, D, F >$, where $V, D, f_\land, f_\lor$ and $f_\neg$ are defined as in MB4 (cf. Definition 2.2) and $f_\rightarrow$ is defined according to the following table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1 (BN4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t5 (E4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what follows, I aim to briefly explain the interest of the logics built upon these matrices.

In 1982, Brady defined the logic BN4 [5], a system closely related to Belnap and Dunn’s logic B4. As a matter of fact, BN4 can be viewed as a strengthening of B4 obtained by implicatively expanding the latter. On the other hand, BN4 can also be seen as a 4-valued extension of Routley and Meyer’s basic logic B. Regarding the importance of BN4, Meyer et al. maintained that BN4 is the correct logic for the 4-valued situation where the extra values are to be interpreted in the both and neither senses [7, p. 25]. Similarly, Slaney stated [10, p. 289] that BN4 has the truth-functional implication most naturally associated with the logic FDE referred to above. Furthermore, BN4 is a central many-valued logic: the strong implication of the bilattice logic GLB (cf. [3, 4]) of considerable importance in artificial intelligence is actually the conditional of BN4.

The logic E4 was developed by Robles and Méndez [9] and was built upon a modification of Brady’s matrix MBN4. They presented the logic E4 as a companion to the system BN4 worthy of consideration. They believe that E4 is related to BN4 in a similar way to which two of the most important relevance logics are related –Anderson and Belnap’s logics E and R, these are, the logic of entailment and the logic of relevant implication (cf. [1] about these systems).

Robles and Méndez’s research results arise the question of whether there are other companions (or alternatives) to BN4. Now, let us keep the main structure of the conditional tables of MBN4 and ME4, i.e., let us preserve unchanged only those cases where $f_\rightarrow$ receives a designated value. Then, as Robles and Méndez already suggested (cf. [9]), there are only six other conditional functions (apart from those which characterize BN4 and E4) that verify Routley and Meyer’s logic B while maintaining one of the conditional structures referred to.
Definition 3.2 (Variants of MBN4 and ME4 considered in this paper) Each Mt (1 ≤ i ≤ 8) is the structure (V, D, f) where V, D, fA, fB, and fC, are defined as in MBN4 and ME4 (cf. Definition 3.1) and fA is defined according to the corresponding ti below (t1 and t5 are left out here to refer to BN4 and E4, respectively):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the six variants of MBN4 and ME4 that verify the logic B. The six logics determined by those matrices together with BN4 and E4 will be all the systems I will consider for the purposes of this investigation and I will refer to them as Lt-logics, this is, as the logics determined by the table i (1 ≤ i ≤ 8).

4 Expansions of FDE: the Lti-logics

In what follows, we shall axiomatize the Lti-logics, each one of them being determined by the matrix Mt (1 ≤ i ≤ 8). I start by presenting the basic logic b4. This system is a basic sublogic contained in the eight systems I’ve developed. In other words, b4 has an instrumental purpose: establishing the shared core of all the Lti-logics.

Definition 4.1 (b4) The logic b4 is axiomatized by means of the rules Adj., MP, dMP (C ∨ A, C ∨ (A → B) ⇒ C ∨ B), dPREF (C ∨ (A → B) ⇒ C ∨ ((D → A) → (D → B))), dSUF (C ∨ (A → B) ⇒ C ∨ ((B → D) → (A → D))), dCON (C ∨ (A → B) ⇒ C ∨ (¬B → ¬A)), dCTE (C ∨ (A ∧ ¬B) ⇒ C ∨ (¬(A → B))) and the following axioms:

A1. A → A
A2. (A ∧ B) → A / (A ∧ B) → B
A3. [(A → B)∧(A→C)] → [A→(B∧C)]
A4. A→(A ∨ B) / B → (A ∨ B)
A5. [(A→C)∧(B→C)] → [(A∨B)→C]
A6. [A∧(B∨C)] → [(A∧B)∨(A∧C)]

A7. ¬¬A → A
A8. A → ¬¬A
A10. B → [¬B ∨ (A → B)]
A11. (A ∨ ¬B) ∨ (A → B)
A12. (A → B) ∨ [(¬A ∧ B) → (A → B)]

---

2 t1 and t5 are the conditional tables for BN4 and E4 shown before. Tables t2 through t4 are the variants of the table of BN4 and tables t6 through t8 are the variants of E4.

3 I provide alternative axiomatizations for the logics BN4 and E4—different from the original ones (cf. [5, 9])—in order to use a single core of axioms and rules shared by the eight Lti-logics.

4 The system b4 is the result of adding the axioms A9 through A12 and the rule disjunctive Counterexample to the disjunctive version of Routley and Meyer’s logic B. We shall explain later the particular technical reason to use the disjunctive version of the rules of B (cf. Section 6).
Next, I display the list of axioms on which the extensions of \( b4 \) are based.

A13. \((A \land \neg B) \rightarrow [(A \land \neg B) \rightarrow \neg(A \rightarrow B)]\)
A14. \( A \lor \neg (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow A \)
A15. \( \neg B \lor \neg (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow \neg B \)
A16. \([A \land (A \rightarrow B)] \rightarrow B \)
A17. \([(A \rightarrow B) \land \neg B] \rightarrow \neg A \)
A18. \( A \rightarrow [B \lor \neg (A \rightarrow B)] \)
A19. \( \neg B \rightarrow [\neg A \lor \neg (A \rightarrow B)] \)
A20. \( [(A \rightarrow B) \land \neg A] \rightarrow A \)
A21. \( (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \lor \neg B) \)
A22. \( [(A \rightarrow B) \land B] \rightarrow \neg B \)
A23. \( B \rightarrow [(B \land \neg (A \rightarrow B)] \rightarrow A \)
A24. \( (A \rightarrow B) \lor \neg (A \rightarrow B) \)
A25. \( \neg A \lor B \lor \neg (A \rightarrow B) \)
A26. \([A \rightarrow B] \land (A \land \neg B) \rightarrow \neg (A \rightarrow B) \)
A27. \( A \rightarrow B \lor [(A \land \neg B) \rightarrow \neg (A \rightarrow B)] \)
A28. \( [(\neg(A \rightarrow B) \land \neg A) \rightarrow \neg B] \lor \neg B \)
A29. \( [(\neg(A \rightarrow B) \land B] \lor A \)

**Definition 4.2 (Extensions of b4 considered in this paper –Lt\( i \)-logics)**

We refer by Lt\( i \) (\( 1 \leq i \leq 8 \)) to the eight extensions of b4 considered in this paper, these are, BN4 (Lt1), E4 (Lt5) and the implicative variants of each of them (Lt2-Lt4 and Lt6-Lt8, respectively). Each Lt\( i \)-logic is the result of adding the following axioms to b4:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lt1:} & \quad A13-A15 \\
\text{Lt2:} & \quad A16-A22 \\
\text{Lt3:} & \quad A13, A14, A17, A18, A21-A23 \\
\text{Lt4:} & \quad A15, A16, A19-A21 \\
\text{Lt5:} & \quad A16-A20, A22, A24-A26 \\
\text{Lt6:} & \quad A16, A19, A20, A22, A25, A27, A28 \\
\text{Lt7:} & \quad A13, A17, A18, A20, A22, A25, A29 \\
\end{align*}
\]

5 Bellnap-Dunn semantics for the Lt\( i \)-logics

We begin by defining Lt\( i \)-models, this is, models for each Lt\( i \)-logic. We can define those models in a general way for all the Lt\( i \)-logics, except for one case: when \( F \) belongs to the interpretation of a conditional. In this case, a specific condition is needed for each Lt\( i \)-logic, as it is shown below.

**Definition 5.1 (Lt\( i \)-models)**

An Lt\( i \)-model is a structure \((K4, I)\) where (i) \( K4 = \{\{T\}, \{F\}, \{T, F\}, \emptyset\}\) and (ii) \( I \) is an Lt\( i \)-interpretation from \( F \) to \( K4 \) defined according to the following conditions for all \( p \in P \) and \( A, B \in F \): (1) \( I(p) \in K4 \); (2a) \( T \in I(\neg A) \) iff \( F \in I(A) \); (2b) \( F \in I(\neg A) \) iff \( T \in I(A) \); (3a) \( T \in I(A \land B) \) iff \( T \in I(A) \) & \( T \in I(B) \); (3b) \( F \in I(A \land B) \) iff \( F \in I(A) \) or \( F \in I(B) \); (4a) \( T \in I(A \lor B) \) iff \( T \in I(A) \) or \( T \in I(B) \); (4b) \( F \in I(A \lor B) \) iff \( F \in I(A) \) & \( F \in I(B) \); (5a) \( T \in I(A \rightarrow B) \) iff \( (T \notin I(A)) \) or \( T \in I(B) \) \& \( (F \in I(A) \) or \( F \notin I(B) \)).

Clause (5b) for each one of the Lt\( i \)-models is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lt1-models:} & \quad (5b) \quad F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \text{ iff } T \in I(A) \land F \in I(B) \\
\text{Lt2-models:} & \quad (5b) \quad F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \text{ iff } (T \in I(A) \land T \notin I(B)) \text{ or } (F \notin I(A) \land F \in I(B)) \text{ or } (T \in I(A) \land F \in I(B)) \\
\text{Lt3-models:} & \quad (5b) \quad F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \text{ iff } (T \in I(A) \land T \notin I(B)) \text{ or } (T \in I(A) \land F \in I(B)) \\
\text{Lt4-models:} & \quad (5b) \quad F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \text{ iff } (F \notin I(A) \land F \in I(B)) \text{ or } (T \in I(A) \land F \in I(B)).
\end{align*}
\]
Lt5-models: (5b) \( F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \) iff \((T \in I(A) \text{ or } F \notin I(A)) \text{ & } (T \notin I(B) \text{ or } F \in I(B))\).
Lt6-models: (5b) \( F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \) iff \((F \notin I(A) \text{ & } T \notin I(B)) \text{ or } (T \in I(A) \text{ & } F \in I(B))\).
Lt7-models: (5b) \( F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \) iff \((T \in I(A) \text{ & } T \notin I(B)) \text{ or } (F \notin I(A) \text{ & } T \notin I(B)) \text{ or } (T \in I(A) \text{ & } F \in I(B))\).
Lt8-models: (5b) \( F \in I(A \rightarrow B) \) iff \((F \notin I(A) \text{ & } T \notin I(B)) \text{ or } (T \in I(A) \text{ & } F \in I(B))\).

Complementary definitions of truth and validity are also needed (but they are omitted due to space limitations). Then, the proof of soundness proceeds in a standard way. First, we prove that, for any \( L\)-logic, the interpretation in the corresponding matrix and the interpretation in the Belnap-Dunn semantics are coextensive. Then, soundness is trivial. The reader can find the proofs for BN4 and E4 fully developed in [5, 9].

6 Completeness of the \( L\)-logics

The fundamental preliminary notions of completeness are those of an \( E\)-4-theory (this is, a set of formulas closed under Adjunction and Entailment), the types of \( E\)-4-theories of interest in the paper and the notion of full regularity\(^5\). Furthermore, a series of properties concerning the connectives maintained by the prime full regular \( E\)-4-theories have to be proved. When it comes to negation, conjunction, disjunction and positive conditionals in \( E\)-4-theories, proofs are similar to those in [5, 9]. However, properties related to the negated conditional cannot be proved for \( E\)-4-logics in general but have to be proved for a specific \( L\)-logic. Therefore, those properties are specified and a sketch of the proof is provided in Lemma 6.1.

**Lemma 6.1 (Negated conditionals in \( L\)-logics)** Let \( L\) be an \( L\)-logic and let \( \mathcal{T} \) be a prime and fully regular \( L\)-theory. We have: \( \neg(A \rightarrow B) \in \mathcal{T} \) iff
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lt1:} & \quad A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}.
\text{Lt2:} & \quad (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}).
\text{Lt3:} & \quad (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}).
\text{Lt4:} & \quad (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}).
\text{Lt5:} & \quad (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg A \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (B \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}).
\text{Lt6:} & \quad (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}).
\text{Lt7:} & \quad (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}).
\text{Lt8:} & \quad (A \notin \mathcal{T} \text{ & } B \notin \mathcal{T}) \text{ or } (A \in \mathcal{T} \text{ & } \neg B \in \mathcal{T}).
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** The proofs of BN4 (Lt1) and E4 (Lt5) are already available in the literature (cf. [5, 9]).
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lt2.} & \quad (\Rightarrow) \text{ by A20, A21 and A22; (\Leftarrow) by A18, A19 and the fact that } \mathcal{T} \text{ is closed under CTE.}
\text{Lt3.} & \quad (\Rightarrow) \text{ by A14 and A21-A23; (\Leftarrow) by A13 and A18.}
\text{Lt4.} & \quad (\Rightarrow) \text{ by A15, A20 and A21; (\Leftarrow) by A19 and the fact that } \mathcal{T} \text{ is closed under CTE.}
\text{Lt5.} & \quad (\Rightarrow) \text{ by A20, A22 and A28; (\Leftarrow) by A19, A25 and A27.}
\text{Lt6.} & \quad (\Rightarrow) \text{ by A20, A22 and A29; (\Leftarrow) by A13, A18, A25.}
\text{Lt7.} & \quad (\Rightarrow) \text{ by A20, A22 and A29; (\Leftarrow) by A13 and A25.}
\text{Lt8.} & \quad (\Rightarrow) \text{ by A20, A22, A28 and A29; (\Leftarrow) by A13 and A25.}
\end{align*}
\]

Due to space restrictions, we shall only explain here the main guidelines of the completeness proof for the \( L\)-logics. Strong completeness with respect to the Belnap-Dunn semantics can be proved by means of a canonical model construction. The concept of a canonical \( L\)-model is based upon the notion of a \( \mathcal{T}\)-interpretation, this is, a function built upon prime, fully regular

\(^5\)An \( L\)-theory is fully regular whenever it is a regular theory closed by the rules of \( L\).
and non-trivial Eb4-theories. Once canonical Lti-models are shown Lti-models, it can be proved that if a wff A is not derivable from a set \( \Gamma \) in a Lti-logic, then that wff A does not follow from \( \Gamma \) in some canonical Lti-model.

An essential part of the preliminary lemmas in the completeness proof is what we call “extension lemmas”, a series of definitions and lemmas by means of which we are able to prove that any Eb4-maximal set is a prime fully regular Eb4-theory (cf. [5, 9]). Nevertheless, a necessary condition to apply this method to a given logic L is that it is possible to build up prime fully regular theories closed under the primitive rules of inference of L. It has been shown that these kinds of L-theories are available if in addition to being closed by \( r \), either L has the thesis form of that rule or L is also closed under the disjunctive version of \( r \). Consequently, any of the Lti-logics with any (or all) the rules MP, SUF, PREF, CON and CTE as primitive rules of inference can be given a Belnap-Dunn semantics whenever the disjunctive version or the thesis form of these primitive rules is added\(^6\).

7 Some properties of the Lti-logics

We limit ourselves to mention very few main properties. More specific definitions and proofs have to be left out due to the lack of space.

First, it is worth to mention that all the Lti-logics are paraconsistent, i.e., the rule ECQ \( (A, \neg A \Rightarrow B) \) is not valid in any Lti-logic. As a matter of fact, they do not validate neither the law of non-contradiction \((\neg (A \land \neg A))\) nor the principle of excluded middle \((A \lor \neg A)\).

On the other hand, regarding their relation to relevance logics, the Lti-logics lack the well-known variable sharing property (VSP) –a necessary property for any relevant logic, according to Anderson and Belnap (cf. [1, p. 33])– but they do have the quasi-relevant property (QRP) –another property characteristic of logics such as R-Mingle (cf. [1, p. 417]).
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\(^6\)It is worth underlining that the main guideline followed to axiomatize the Lti-logics in this paper was to maintain a common axiomatic base as wide as possible (i.e., the system b4). However, we can obtain more conspicuous and economical axiomatizations for each Lti-logic. In particular, disjunctive rules are not mandatory for all Lti-logics to be axiomatized but only for those cases when the Lti-logic lacks the corresponding axiom to any of its rules.
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The Cohesiveness Principle over RCA∗
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We report on joint work with Leszek Kołodziejczyk, which grows out of a larger project joint with Tin Lok Wong and Keita Yokoyama on some problems in Reverse Mathematics.

Reverse Mathematics is a research programme in mathematical logic which aims at classifying mathematical theorems according to their logical strength. Specifically, one looks for axioms necessary and sufficient to prove a given theorem over some weak base theory. The traditional setting for this program is second order arithmetic with its language $L_2 = \{0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq, \in\}$. Structures described by $L_2$ are of the form $(M, S)$, where $M$ is the first order universe, thought of as natural numbers, and $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M)$ is the second order universe. The usual base theory is RCA$_0$, which consists of (i) basic first order axioms describing the algebraic structure of the natural numbers, (ii) axioms asserting the existence of computable sets and (iii) the principle of mathematical induction for computably enumerable properties, $\Sigma^0_1$.

The early years of reverse mathematical research gave a very clear picture [6]. Many mathematical theorems turned out to be provable in RCA$_0$ or equivalent to one of only four other arithmetical theories: WKL$_0$, ACA$_0$, ATR$_0$ and $\Pi^1_1$-CA$_0$. However, quickly some elusive exceptions were discovered, Ramsey’s Theorem for pairs and two colors (RT$_2^2$) being the most significant one. RT$_2^2$ says that for every colouring of unordered pairs of natural numbers with two colours there exists a set which the colouring is constant. On the one hand, RT$_2^2$ has a simple formulation and is a very useful tool in proving theorems in combinatorics. On the other hand, for many years logicians have been trying to discover its exact logical strength, obtaining only partial results. One of the most fruitful methods in this research has been decomposing RT$_2^2$ into some weaker principles and then studying them separately. In their seminal paper [2] Cholak, Jockusch and Slaman gave the first good approximation of the first order consequences of RT$_2^2$ using the fact that RCA$_0 \vdash$ RT$_2^2 \iff$ SRT$_2^2 + \text{COH}$. Here SRT$_2^2$ stands for the Stable Ramsey’s Theorem, which only asserts the existence of a homogeneous set for stable colourings (a colouring is stable if for each number $x$ the colours of $(x, y_1)$ and $(x, y_2)$ are the same for sufficiently large $y_1$ and $y_2$). COH is the Cohesiveness Principle, which says that for each sequence of sets of natural numbers $R_0, R_1, R_2, \ldots$ there exists a set $C$ such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the set $C$ is almost contained either in $R_i$ or in its complement. These and other Ramsey-type principles were crucial in proving more recent breakthrough results on the strength of RT$_2^2$ (Chong et al. [3], Patey and Yokoyama [5]) and they have also become an interesting research topic in their own right.

Cholak et al. also showed in [2] that COH is $\Pi^1_1$-conservative over RCA$_0$, that is for every sentence $\varphi$ with just one block of universal quantifiers over sets, followed by quantification only over numbers, if RCA$_0 + \text{COH} \vdash \varphi$ then already RCA$_0 \vdash \varphi$.

In [1] Belanger provided a general method for proving conservativity results for COH. In his approach he had to weaken the base theory from RCA$_0$ to RCA$_0^*$, which is obtained from RCA$_0$ by replacing $\exists \Sigma^0_1$, the induction scheme for c.e. properties, by $\Pi^0_1$, the induction scheme for computable properties only. RCA$_0^*$ was introduced by Simpson and Smith in [6] and since then it serves as a base theory for studying weak principles – $\Pi^1_1$-conservative over or even provable
in RCA\textsubscript{0}. In [1] Belanger proved $\Pi_1^1$-conservativity of COH over I$\Sigma^0_n$ and I$\Delta^0_n$ for $n \geq 2$ but left open a question about the behaviour of COH over I$\Delta^0_1$, i.e. RCA\textsubscript{*0}.

We answer Belanger’s question and show that unlike in other above mentioned cases COH is not arithmetically conservative over RCA\textsubscript{*0}, i.e. there exists a sentence $\sigma$ without any set quantifiers nor set parameters such that RCA\textsubscript{*0} + COH $\vdash \sigma$ but RCA\textsubscript{*0} $\nvdash \sigma$. In fact, even a principle CRT\textsubscript{2} weaker than COH is not arithmetically conservative over RCA\textsubscript{*0}. To show this we work with a model $(M, S) \models$ RCA\textsubscript{*0} + $\neg$ IΣ\textsubscript{0\textsubscript{1}} in which a proper computably enumerable cut is available, that is there exists a c.e. set $I \subseteq M$ such that it is an initial segment of $M$ and is closed under the successor function. Our sentence $\sigma$ says that every proper c.e. cut satisfies CRT\textsubscript{2}. Finally we construct a model of RCA\textsubscript{*0} + CRT\textsubscript{2} with a proper c.e. cut in which CRT\textsubscript{2} is false.

Our second result is that RT\textsubscript{2} does not imply COH over RCA\textsubscript{*0}. We adopt the proof from Belanger [1] to show that over RCA\textsubscript{*0} it still holds that COH implies the $\Sigma^0_2$-separation principle, which says that any two disjoint $\Sigma^0_2$ sets can be separated by a $\Delta^0_2$ set (where $\Sigma^0_2$ and $\Delta^0_2$ sets are understood in the boldface sense, that is their definitions can involve set parameters). This principle is false in a purely lightface setting, that is when restricted to sets definable without any set parameters. We prove our theorem by taking a model of RCA\textsubscript{*0} + RT\textsubscript{2} in which the second order universe consists only of computable sets ($\Delta^0_1$-definable without parameters), so it does not satisfy the $\Sigma^0_2$-separation principle. Such models of RT\textsubscript{2} are ruled out in RCA\textsubscript{0} by an argument of Jockusch [4], but their existence is consistent with RCA\textsubscript{*0}.
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Uniform interpolation has recently been shown to be a powerful property in the study of the existence of proof systems [7, 8]. Uniform interpolation is a very strong version of Craig interpolation. Craig interpolation states that for any implication \( A \rightarrow B \) an interpolant \( C \) can be found such that \( A \rightarrow C, C \rightarrow B \) and \( C \) only uses the shared language of \( A \) and \( B \). Craig interpolation is important in computer science for consistency proofs and model checking. Uniform interpolation is much stronger, roughly saying that the interpolant only depends on the formula of one side of the implication.

So-called negative results are established by Iemhoff, saying that whenever a certain logic does not have uniform interpolation, that logic cannot have a sequent calculus with certain ‘nice’ properties. Since uniform interpolation is a very strong property and thus not admitted by many logics, these negative results are powerful in the field of proof theory. The negative results are obtained from the contraposition of a constructive proof method of uniform interpolation: if a logic has a sequent calculus with ‘nice’ properties, then uniform interpolation follows. Such theorems have been proved for several intermediate logics and classical modal logics [7, 8]. Interestingly, the same methods can be applied to intuitionistic modal logics as well, such as \( iK \) and \( iKD \) with only \( \Box \) in the language [8].

One very important ‘nice’ property is termination. Terminating proof systems are essential in the constructive proof method. This method originates from Pitts’ proof of uniform interpolation for intuitionistic propositional logic IPC [9]. Later, the method is applied to several classical modal logics, including GL, by Bilková [2]. The uniform interpolants are recursively defined on the basis of a proof system. Termination ensures that the recursion eventually stops and that the interpolants are well defined. Standard sequent calculi for intuitionistic (modal) logic are not terminating in general because of the left implication rule. Dyckhoff [3] and Hudelmaier [6], independently, developed a terminating proof system for IPC that is used in Pitts’ proof. Extending their idea for the modal case makes it possible to define terminating proof systems for several intuitionistic modal logics.

In the same line of research, I tried to apply the method for the intuitionistic modal logics \( iGL \) (intuitionistic Gödel-Löb logic) and \( iSL \) (strong Löb logic). Logic \( iGL \) consists of all intuitionistic tautologies, \( K \)-axiom \( \Box(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow \Box A \rightarrow \Box B \) and the Gödel-Löb axiom \( \Box(\Box A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \Box A \) and is closed under the rules modus ponens and necessitation. Logic \( iSL \) is an extension of \( iGL \) with the so-called completeness axiom \( A \rightarrow \Box A \). These logics are interesting to study, because they have close connections to provability in Heyting Arithmetic, where \( \Box \) is interpreted as provability. Interestingly, it is a big open problem what the provability logic for Heyting Arithmetic is. Recently, Ardeshir and Mojtahedi found the \( \Sigma_1 \)-provability logic for Heyting Arithmetic [1] in which \( iSL \) plays an important role. There is also a provability interpretation for \( iSL \), known as slow provability [10].

Although we developed terminating sequent calculi for these logics [4, 5], it seems that the existing constructive method for uniform interpolation is not sufficient for \( iGL \) and \( iSL \), and the question whether these logics admit uniform interpolation remains open. One reason why we cannot easily apply the method applied for \( iK \) and \( iKD \) in [8] is that the termination for \( iGL \) and \( iSL \) depends on a different well-ordering having other properties. The question arises what other important ‘nice’ properties one should require next to termination of the calculus.
The method to show so-called negative results using uniform termination is promising for further research. The case studies of iGL and iSL show that the method to establish negative results may be refined, since we consider the calculi for iGL and iSL as nice proof systems. It is also interesting to think about wider applications of constructive proofs for uniform interpolation, such as for hypersequents or nested sequents. This would be a first step in establishing so-called negative results for these kinds of calculi.

I would like to thank Roman Kuznets and Raheleh Jalali for fruitful discussions about uniform interpolation in nested sequents and hypersequents. I also want to thank Rosalie Iemhoff for her great support.
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Uniform interpolation is a reasoning technique that allows us to express a theory using a subset of its symbols while maintaining our understanding of the theory. Much research efforts have been put into investigating different aspects of the uniform interpolation problem in propositional logic, first-order logic and description logics. Research in the area of modal logic has been mainly concentrated on uncovering theoretical results.

It was shown that the modal logic $K$ is closed under uniform interpolation in [3]. It was proved that the modal logic $S5$ has the uniform interpolation property in [6]. A method that was designed to show that the modal logics $K$, $D$, $T$, $K45$ and $KD45$ have the uniform interpolation property is given in [2]. Additionally, it is known that $S4$ and $K4$ are not closed under uniform interpolation [3].

In this work, our main focus is to develop practical implementable systems that may be beneficial for application purposes. Huge potential uniform interpolation holds for applications. It has been used for information hiding [4], abductive reasoning [1], computing logical differences [5], knowledge-base debugging and summarisation. Modal logic is the logical formalism that is behind many multi-agent systems. Uniform interpolation can aid in communication between agent systems that lack trust or that speak different languages. Additionally, agent systems that have limited memory may use uniform interpolation to seek space for new knowledge. Another application scenario is agent systems that are expected to use their knowledge to make quick decisions as in self-driving cars and drone system applications.

Our method for solving the uniform interpolation problem follows a resolution approach. The inference system underlying our method contains rules that can be viewed as special applications of the rules of the resolution calculus from first-order logic. The idea behind the elimination process is to exhaustively compute consequences and subsequently eliminate those that contain symbols outside the interpolation signature. We are currently in the process of publishing the details of our practical uniform interpolation method for the basic modal logic $K$. We verified via generating constructive proofs that our method is sound, terminating and refutation complete.

As far as the authors know, our method is the first practical method to solve the uniform interpolation problem for local satisfiability in the modal logic $K$ defined over Kripke frames. We are currently working on extending our system to modal logics with restrictions on their accessibility relation, and providing a proof-of-concept implementation.
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**Abstract**

We present **MOILab**, a prototype Prolog theorem prover implementing a labelled sequent calculus for IK, the basic system in the intuitionistic modal logics family. **MOILab** builds upon **MOIN**, a theorem prover implementing nested sequent calculi (both single-conclusion and multi-conclusion) for all the logics in the modal intuitionistic cube. With respect to the nested implementations, **MOILab** offers a straightforward countermodel construction in case of proof search failure.

1 Introduction

We tackle the problem of defining automated theorem provers for intuitionistic modal logics. As the name says, intuitionistic modal logics are an intuitionistic version of (classical, normal) modal systems. We here consider the intuitionistic modal systems introduced in [3, 11] and studied in Simpson’s Ph.D. thesis [12]. In analogy to what happens with modal logics, the basic system of intuitionistic modal logics (IK) can be extended with a set of axioms, generating 15 logics organised into the intuitionistic modal logic “cube” [13]. In this paper, however, we are concerned only with IK. Several proof systems for intuitionistic modal logics have been defined, among which, single-conclusion (or Gentzen-style) nested sequents, [13, 9, 2], multi-conclusion (or Maehara-style) nested sequents [5] and labelled calculi [8].

In [4] is presented a SWI Prolog theorem prover for classical and intuitionistic modal logics, called **MOIN**\(^1\). The prover implements nested proof systems: nested sequents from [1] for classical modal logics and, for the logics in the intuitionistic modal cube, it implements both single-conclusion nested sequents from [13] and multi-conclusion nested sequents from [5]. There are several other Prolog prover implementing nested sequents: refer to [7, 6] for a Prolog implementation of nested sequents for non-normal modal logics, and to [10] for normal conditional logics. **MOIN** implementation is slightly different, in that the data structure chosen to represent nested sequents is a list of lists instead of a tree of lists. For the systems whose decidability is known, **MOIN** terminates\(^2\).

We here present a prototype Prolog prover extending **MOIN** and implementing a labelled sequent calculus for IK, the basic system of intuitionistic modal logics. The prover is called **MOILab**, for **MOdal and Intuitionistic Labelled sequents**\(^3\). The labelled proof system, introduced in [8], internalises the semantic information from bi-relational models for intuitionistic modal logics into the sequent calculus syntax. As a result, the calculus is equipped with two relation

---

\(^1\) **MOIN** stands for **MOdal and Intuitionistic Nested sequents**. The prover is available here: [http://www.lix.polytechnique.fr/Labo/Lutz.Strassburger/Software/Moin/MoinProver.html](http://www.lix.polytechnique.fr/Labo/Lutz.Strassburger/Software/Moin/MoinProver.html)

\(^2\) For the record, all systems of intuitionistic modal logics are decidable, except for IK4, ID4 and IS4 [12].

\(^3\) **MOILab** is available here: [http://mariannagirlando.com/MOILab.html](http://mariannagirlando.com/MOILab.html)
symbols, one for the accessibility relation from Kripke semantics for modal logics and one for the preorder relation from Kripke semantics for intuitionistic propositional logic.

With respect to the nested systems for intuitionistic modal logics, the labelled calculus offers two main advantages: since all its rules are invertible, no backtrack points need to be introduced in proof search, and a countermodel can be easily extracted from the upper sequent of a failed branch. This motivates the introduction of MOILab. As for now, the theorem prover is a prototype: only the basic logic IK is implemented, and proof search might not terminate on some sequents.

The paper is organised as follows: Section 2 introduces the syntax and semantics of intuitionistic modal logic IK, and Section 3 presents the main features of MOILab. For a presentation of the labelled sequent calculus, the reader is referred to [8].

2 Intuitionistic modal logic IK

The language of intuitionistic modal logics extends the language of intuitionistic propositional logic with the modal operators □ and ◇. Lacking the De Morgan duality, there are several variants of the distributivity axiom that are classically but not intuitionistically equivalent. An intuitionistic variant of modal logic K, called IK, is obtained by adding to an axiomatization of intuitionistic propositional logic the necessitation rule of K and the following axioms:\footnote{We employ the coloured syntax from [8]: variables for labels are blue and formulas are green. The aim is to improve readability.}

\[\begin{align*}
  k_1: & \quad \Box(A \lor B) \supset (\Box A \lor \Box B) \\
  k_2: & \quad \Box(A \lor B) \supset (\Diamond A \lor \Diamond B) \\
  k_3: & \quad \Diamond(A \lor B) \supset (\Diamond A \lor \Diamond B) \\
  k_4: & \quad (\Diamond A \lor \Box B) \supset \Box(A \lor B) \\
  k_5: & \quad \bot \supset \bot
\end{align*}\]

\text{Bi-relational models} for IK\footnote{\cite{3, 11, 12}} are defined by adding a valuation for atomic formulas to a bi-relational frame (refer to \cite{8} for details):

\begin{definition}
A bi-relational frame \(F\) is a triple \(\langle W, R, \leq \rangle\) of a set of worlds \(W\) equipped with an accessibility relation \(R\) and a preorder \(\leq\) (i.e. a reflexive and transitive relation) satisfying:

(\(F_1\)) For all \(u, v, v' \in W\), if \(uRv\) and \(v \leq v'\), there exists \(u'\) s.t. \(u \leq u'\) and \(u'Rv'\).

(\(F_2\)) For all \(u, u', v \in W\), if \(uRv\) and \(u \leq u'\), there exists \(v'\) s.t. \(u'Rv'\) and \(v \leq v'\).

\end{definition}

The accessibility relation \(R\) comes from Kripke frames for modal logics, and \(xRy\) is usually interpreted as "world \(y\) is accessible from world \(x\)". The preorder relation \(\leq\) comes from Kripke frames for intuitionistic propositional logic, and can be interpreted as expressing a time relation between worlds: \(x \leq y\) can be read as "world \(y\) is a future of world \(x\)".

Reflecting the definition of bi-relational models, the sequents of the labelled calculus \(\text{lablK}_{\leq}\) defined in [8] are equipped with two relation symbols, one for \(R\) and one for \(\leq\).
Definition 2.2. A two-sided intuitionistic labelled sequent is of the form $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ where $\mathcal{R}$ denotes a set of relational atoms $x \mathcal{R} y$ and preorder atoms $x \leq y$, and $\Gamma$ and $\Delta$ are multi-sets of labelled formulas $x:A$ (for $x$ and $y$ variables for labels and $A$ intuitionistic modal formula).

The rules of the labelled calculus for $\text{IK}$, called $\text{labIK}_\leq$, can be found in [8]. Moreover, in [8] it is proved that all $\text{labIK}_\leq$ rules are invertible (Lemma 6.4), and that the cut rule is admissible (Theorem 6.1). The rules needed to extend $\text{labIK}_\leq$ to logics whose axiomatization extends $\text{IK}$ by one-sided intuitionistic Scott-Lemmon axioms, i.e., axioms of the form $\Box^k \Diamond^l A \supset \Box^m \Diamond^n A$, for $k, l, m, n$ natural numbers, are also defined.

Termination of proof search with $\text{labIK}_\leq$ is not proved in [8]. As it is often the case with labelled proof systems, proving termination presents some difficulties: since all the rules are invertible, the sequent grows when going from the conclusion to the premiss(es) of each rule, and one cannot check for repetition of whole sequents in a proof search branch. Moreover, while the unlabelled formulas occurring in proof search are finitely many, and all are subformulas of the (unlabelled) formula at the root, these formulas could be labelled with infinite ever-changing labels, thus giving rise to infinite branches. As a consequence, completeness of the calculus is established in [8] by means of cut-admissibility, and not by means of a countermodel construction from failed proof search.

3 Towards a labelled theorem prover

MOILab implements the labelled sequent calculus $\text{labIK}_\leq$ from [8]. The prover is composed of a set of clauses, each implementing a rule of the labelled sequent calculus. The only exception is the rule of reflexivity, which does not have a dedicated clause and is instead applied together with the rules introducing (backwards) a new label.

Overall, MOILab builds upon the structure of MOIN: labelled sequents are represented by means of Prolog lists, in which each element is a pair comprising a label (an integer) and a formula. Separate lists store the accessibility relations and the preorder relations among labels.

Propositional variables are represented in MOILab syntax as Prolog atoms $a, b, \ldots; \bot$ and $\top$ are Prolog false and true, and the connectives $\neg, \land, \lor, \supset, \Box$ and $\Diamond$ are respectively represented by $\neg, \land, \lor, \supset, \Box$ and $\Diamond$. Labelled sequents are represented by means of a list of four Prolog lists: $[\text{Put}, \text{Rel}, \text{Gamma}, \text{Delta}]$. Gamma and Delta are lists of integers for labels, $\text{Put}$ is either $\bot$ or $\top$. Rules can only be applied to formulas with a positive sign, while formulas with a negative sign are used for book-keeping. $\text{Put}$ and $\text{Rel}$ are lists of pairs $(X, Y)$ of integers for labels, respectively representing the preorder relation and the accessibility relation between labels.

Proof search is invoked by the predicate $\text{derive}(F)$, where $F$ is the formula to be checked. For instance, $\text{derive}(((?a)\rightarrow ((!b)) \rightarrow (((a\rightarrow b))))$ triggers the derivation of axiom $k_4$ in $\text{labIK}_\leq$. The predicate $\text{derive}$ queries the predicate $\text{prove}_{\text{lab}}\backslash A$, responsible of the actual proof search. The predicate is recursively invoked and generates the proof-search tree for the formula. The application of $\text{prove}$ to a branch stops when an axiom clause is reached (success), or when no clause succeeds, producing a failed branch. However, since a full termination strategy is missing, it might happen that proof search never stops. If proof search stops and produces a success, MOILab gives in output a $\LaTeX$ file containing the derivation. If proof search stops producing a failure, MOILab prints out a countermodel in a $\LaTeX$ file.

\footnote{For unlabelled formula we mean a labelled formula in which we ignore the label: thus, the unlabelled formula corresponding to $x:A$ is $A$.}
Termination is still an issue: as for now, MOILab implements the naive strategy of not applying a rule to a labelled formula if the labelled formula to be introduced already occurs in the sequent. This is not enough to ensure termination of proof search, and it might be case that, on some formulas, proof search goes on forever.

Strategies ensuring termination of proof search do exists for nested calculi (both single- and multi-conclusion) for $\text{IK}$: in fact, proof search in MOIN, the prover implementing these nested proof systems, terminates for $\text{IK}$. The termination strategy for nested sequents basically checks for repetition of sequents in a derivation branch (refer to [4] for details on the termination strategy implemented in MOIN). However, this strategy cannot be directly applied to the labelled calculus, where each formula has a label: it might happen that the same formula is labelled by infinite different labels. Moreover, since all rules of the labelled calculus are invertible, the sequent always grows when applying bottom-up rules of the calculus. Thus, the check for repetition needs to be performed within the same sequent, and taking the labels of formulas into account. A more refined termination strategy is currently under study.

Thanks to invertibility of the $\text{labIK}\leq$ rules, backtrack points do not need to be introduced in proof search. The countermodel construction is straightforward, since no information is lost in going from the conclusion to the premiss(es) of the rules, and only the upper sequent of a failed derivation branch needs to be considered. With nested calculi, not all the rules are invertible, and the process of countermodel construction from failed proof search requires some more work: in addition to the upper sequent of a failed branch, one needs to take into account all the sequents in the branch occurring as conclusion of non-invertible rules.

4 Conclusions

The most important missing feature of MOILab is termination of proof search, which is object of current study. Our immediate goal is to define and implement a termination strategy for $\text{labIK}\leq$ which is general enough to be applied, modulo some modification, to labelled calculi for extensions of $\text{IK}$.

Our long term goal is to define a theorem prover modularly implementing labelled calculi for logics extending $\text{IK}$. These systems comprise both the extensions of $\text{IK}$ by means of one-sided intuitionistic Scott-Lemmon axioms, whose labelled rules are defined in [8], and extensions of $\text{IK}$ with intuitionistic variants of modal axioms $d$, $t$, $b$, 4 and 5 [13], which correspond to the logics in the intuitionistic modal cube.
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For this work, my aim is to give a philosophical reading of bilateralism by means of probabilism. Bilateralism is a philosophical view that understands acceptance and rejection as two basic and irreducible attitudes towards a proposition. When facing an inference, a bilateralist would say that if it is valid, it is incoherent to accept all the premises and reject all its conclusions. Probabilism, on the other hand, is a philosophical interpretation of rationality in terms of probabilities, which consists of the idea that it is possible to model degrees of belief as probability functions. The aim of my work then is to interpret the main concepts of bilateralism: acceptance, rejection, and incoherence in terms of the probabilistic notions of credence and coherence.

In order to achieve this goal, we need both an interpretation of the concept of incoherence coined by the bilateralism as well as an interpretation of acceptance and rejection. I will show that the literature already gave a good interpretation of the notion of incoherence. Then, I will give an interpretation of acceptance and rejection in terms of degrees of belief. In particular, I will show that it is possible to interpret these concepts in accordance with Locke’s thesis. Locke’s thesis states that it is possible to find some threshold \( r \), so that if you believe a proposition \( p \) in a degree equal or higher than \( r \), then you accept \( p \). Unfortunately, Locke’s thesis is usually haunted by the epistemic paradoxes. I will show that it possible to give an interpretation of acceptance and rejection that complies with Locke’s thesis and that does not fall into these paradoxes.

The first step on building this interpretation is already available in Field’s paper “What is logical validity?” [3], where he proposes an interpretation of bilateralism in terms of probabilism when facing beliefs interpreted as full beliefs\(^1\). My goal is to extend this project also to partial belief. That is to define the exact degree of belief \( r \) that we need to have in certain proposition in order to accept it or to reject it, in accordance with Locke’s thesis. The obvious limitations to this work are the epistemic paradoxes, which will stand as a barrier in order to define this general threshold for acceptance and rejection. In order to solve this problem, I will appeal to Leitgeb’s P-stability theory [4], a theory that allows an agent to settle a threshold for acceptance of propositions contextually to each valid inference. I will redefine it to make it suitable for a bilateralist approach.

Inferentialism is a philosophical stance that understands the meaning of logical constants in terms of their inferential role [2] [8]. One type of inferentialist view that has been salient in the last few years is so-called “bilateralism” (see [7] [5] [6]). Bilateralism understands the meaning of logical constants in terms of their acceptance and rejection conditions. It opposes to unilateralism by stating that rejecting a statement cannot be defined in terms of accepting its negation.\(^2\) That means that given a proposition \( p \), one can either accept it or reject it. Nevertheless, accepting \( \neg p \) - and here is how it opposes to unilateralism - is not necessarily the

\(^1\)There is a lot written in the literature about the difference between full belief and partial belief. While full belief implies acting as if you believe in a premise in degree 1 or 0, partial belief needs the agent to assign a concrete number between 0 and 1 to every proposition according to its credences.

\(^2\)It is also, usually acknowledge that acceptance and rejection have their speech act counterpart, assertion and denial, which are propositional attitudes. Usually, no different treatment is made for acceptance and assertion.
same as rejecting $p$, for there might be a case where you neither want to accept it nor reject it. Rejection, in this view, has its own force, different and irreducible to acceptance. This philosophical stance becomes quite useful when trying to understand logical consequences, for it gives us a different approach to valid inferences. Let’s take an arbitrary valid inference, $X \vdash Y$, what some bilateralist would say is that it is incoherent to accept every member of $X$ and reject every member of $Y$.

Yet, because acceptance and rejection are taken as primitives, its precise comprehension turns a bit fuzzy. One could be inclined to understand these concepts by means of degrees of belief. That is, aiming to answer the question “when is it that an agent can accept (or reject) certain proposition according to how certain she is in the truth (or the falsity) of this proposition?”. A reasonable way to define them in these terms could be by means of Locke’s theses. Locke’s thesis states that it is possible to find some degree of belief $r$, so that for every belief $p$ we have, if we believe $p$ in that degree $r$ or higher- that is if we take degrees of belief as probabilities, $Pr(p) \geq r$- then we accept $p$. It would be nice if we could define both acceptance and rejection by means of Locke’s thesis. But the problem is that under certain minimal conditions it is easy to show how epistemic paradoxes arrive, such as the preface paradox and the lottery paradox. In this work I will argue that by merging Hartry Field’s and Hannes Leitgeb’s works it is possible to set some threshold for acceptance and rejection for every proposition in accordance to Locke’s thesis without falling into paradoxes. As a result of this work, we will be able to understand acceptance and rejection in terms of degrees of belief in a probabilistic fashion.

As I already said, defining incoherence in terms of probabilism is an easy task, mainly because it is already done satisfactorily in the literature. The idea is posed by Field in [3] where he proposes to read acceptance as full belief and rejection as full disbelief. Then bilateralism would tell us that an agent is incoherent when given a valid inference $X_1, \ldots, X_n \Rightarrow Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$, she fully believes all the $X_i$ while fully disbelieves all the $Y_j$. But he also points out that he decides to stick to full belief and full disbelief (and not to address the problem of partial belief in this bilateralist setting) because otherwise, the proposal would fall into the epistemic paradoxes.

He then develops a theory on how to understand acceptance and rejection as full belief and full disbelief in light of Adams’ theorem [1]. Adams’ result states that given a valid inference there is a consistent probability function that can be interpreted in terms of degree of belief, where the degree of disbelief in the conclusion is equal or higher to the sum of the disbelief of the premises (where a disbelief function is defined in terms of the probability function). But even thou these results quantify over the range of all rational numbers between 0 and 1, Field only focuses on full belief and full disbelief. The aim of my work is to extend Field’s and Adams’ work to partial belief to make it fit Locke’s thesis while avoiding the epistemic paradoxes. The idea is to propose a model of acceptance and rejection where these notions can be understood in terms of partial belief and show how to avoid epistemic paradoxes in the context by means of $P$-stability.

$P$-stability is a notion that allows an agent to find one (or several) thresholds of acceptance for any valid inference. A proposition $p_1$ is $P$-stable if and only if learning any other proposition $p_n$ compatible with $p_1$ does not lower the agent’s belief in $p_1$ to a degree less than $\frac{1}{2}$. That it $Pr(p_1|p_n) \geq \frac{1}{2})$. Given an agent’s degrees of belief in the propositions in the context of some inference, there will be at least one $P$-stable formula. I will show how this notion allows us to address Locke’s thesis and settle a threshold $r$ for acceptance that avoids paradoxes. Finally I

and denial and rejection when discussing what it is incoherent to do in a bilateralist context. As far as my work concerns, I will stick to “acceptance” and “rejection” to avoid confusions.
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will dig into the different ways of defining rejection in this context to keep the bilateralist spirit.
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Abstract

The discussion about how to put together Gentzen’s systems for classical and intuitionistic logic in
a single unified system is back in fashion. Indeed, recently Prawitz and others have been discussing
the so called Ecumenical Systems, where connectives from these logics can co-exist in peace. In Prawitz’
system, the classical logician and the intuitionistic logician would share the universal quantifier,
conjunction, negation, and the constant for the absurd, but they would each have their own existential
quantifier, disjunction, and implication, with different meanings. Prawitz’ main idea is that these
different meanings are given by a semantical framework that can be accepted by both parties. In a recent
work, Ecumenical sequent calculi and a nested system were presented, and some very interesting proof
theoretical properties of the systems were established. In this work we extend Prawitz’ Ecumenical
idea to alethic K-modalities.

1 Introduction

In [Pra15] Dag Prawitz proposed a natural deduction system for what was later called Ecumenical
logic (EL), where classical and intuitionistic logic could coexist in peace. In this system, the classical
logician and the intuitionistic logician would share the universal quantifier, conjunction, negation, and
the constant for the absurd (the neutral connectives), but they would each have their own existential
quantifier, disjunction, and implication, with different meanings. Prawitz’ main idea is that these
different meanings are given by a semantical framework that can be accepted by both parties. While proof-theoretical aspects
were also considered, his work was more focused on investigating the philosophical significance of the
fact that classical logic can be translated into intuitionistic logic.

In this work, we propose an extension of EL with the alethic modalities of necessity and possibility.
There are many choices to be made and many relevant questions to be asked, e.g.: what is the ecumenical
interpretation of Ecumenical modalities? Should we add classical, intuitionistic, or neutral versions for
modal connectives? What is really behind the difference between the classical and intuitionistic notions
of truth?

We propose an answer for these questions in the light of Simpson’s meta-logical interpretation of
modalities [Sim94] by embedding the expected semantical behavior of the modal operator into the
Ecumenical first-order logic.

\textsuperscript{*}This work was partially financed by CNPq and CAPES/Brazil - Finance Code 001.
Initial and structural rules

\[
A, \Gamma \Rightarrow A \quad \text{init} \\
\Gamma \Rightarrow \bot \quad W
\]

Propositional rules

\[
\frac{A, B, \Gamma \Rightarrow C}{A \land B, \Gamma \Rightarrow C} \quad \wedge L \\
\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \land B} \quad \wedge R \\
\frac{A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C \quad B, \Gamma \Rightarrow C}{A \lor B, \Gamma \Rightarrow C} \quad \lor L \\
\frac{\Gamma, A \Rightarrow B \quad \Gamma, B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \bot}{\Gamma, A \Rightarrow \bot} \quad \lor R
\]

\[
\frac{A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \bot}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \bot} \quad \bot L \\
\frac{\Gamma, A \Rightarrow B}{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \rightarrow B} \quad \rightarrow L \\
\frac{\Gamma, A \Rightarrow B \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \bot}{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \rightarrow \bot} \quad \rightarrow R
\]

Quantifiers

\[
\frac{A[y/x], \forall x.A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C}{\forall x.A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C} \quad \forall L \\
\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A[y/x]}{\forall x.A \Rightarrow C} \quad \forall R
\]

\[
\frac{\exists x.A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C}{\exists x.A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C} \quad \exists L \\
\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \exists x.A}{} \quad \exists R
\]

Figure 1: Ecumenical sequent system LEci. In rules \(\forall R, \exists L, \exists L\), the eigenvariable \(y\) is fresh.

2 The system LEci

The language \(L\) used for Ecumenical systems is described as follows. We will use a subscript \(c\) for the classical meaning and \(i\) for the intuitionistic, dropping such subscripts when formulae/connectives can have either meaning.

Classical and intuitionistic \(n\)-ary predicate symbols \((P_c, P_i, \ldots)\) co-exist in \(L\) but have different meanings. The neutral logical connectives \(\bot, \lor, \land, \forall\) are common for classical and intuitionistic fragments, while \(\rightarrow, \lor, \exists\) and \(\rightarrow, \vee, \exists\) are restricted to intuitionistic and classical interpretations, respectively.

The sequent system LEci (Fig. 1) was presented in [PPdP20] as the sequent counterpart of Prawitz natural deduction system. Observe that the rules \(R_c\) and \(L_c\) describe the intended meaning of a classical predicate \(P_c\) from an intuitionistic predicate \(P_i\).

The following are easily provable in LEci:

1. \(\vdash_{\text{LEci}} (A \land B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)\);

2. \(\vdash_{\text{LEci}} (A \rightarrow B) \leftrightarrow (\neg A \land \neg B)\);

3. \(\vdash_{\text{LEci}} (\exists x.A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C) \leftrightarrow (\forall x.\neg A)\);

4. \(\vdash_{\text{LEci}} \forall x.A \rightarrow \neg \exists x.\neg A\) but \(\vdash_{\text{LEci}} \neg \exists x.\neg A \rightarrow \forall x.A\) in general.

Theorems (1) to (3) are of interest since they relate the classical and the neutral operators: the classical connectives can be defined using negation, conjunction, and the universal quantifier. Observe that (3) and (4) reveal the asymmetry between definability of quantifiers: while the classical existential can be defined from the universal quantification, the other way around is not true, in general.
3 Ecumenical modalities

The language of \((propositional, normal)\) modal formulas consists of a denumerable set \(\mathcal{P}\) of propositional symbols and a set of propositional connectives enhanced with the unary modal operators \(\square\) and \(\Diamond\) concerning necessity and possibility, respectively \([BRV01]\).

We will follow the approach in \([Sim94]\), where a modal logic is characterized by the respective interpretation of the modal model in the meta-theory (called \(meta\)-\(logical\) \(characterization\)).

Formally, given a variable \(x\), we recall the standard translation \([\_]_x\) from modal formulas into first-order formulas with at most one free variable \(x\): for any \(P \in \mathcal{P}\), a unary predicate symbol \(P\) is associated to it and \([P]_x := P(x)\); \([\bot]_x := \bot\); for any binary connective \(\star\), \([A \star B]_x := [A]_x \star [B]_x\); for the modal connectives

\[
\begin{align*}
[\square A]_x &:= \forall y(R(x, y) \rightarrow [A]_y) \\
[\Diamond A]_x &:= \exists y(R(x, y) \land [A]_y)
\end{align*}
\]

where \(R(x, y)\) is a binary predicate.

The object modal logic \(ML\) is then interpreted in the first-order meta logic \(FOL\) as

\[
\vdash_{ML} A \iff \vdash_{FOL} \forall x.[A]_x
\]

Hence, if \(FOL\) is classical, the former definition characterizes the classical modal logic \(K\) \([BRV01]\), while if it is intuitionistic, it characterizes the intuitionistic modal logic \(IK\) \([Sim94]\).

In this work, we will adopt first-order \(EL\) as the meta-theory (given by the system \(LEci\)), hence characterizing what we will defined as the ecumenical modal logic \(EK\).

3.1 An Ecumenical view of modalities

The language of \(Ecumenical\) modal formulas consists of a denumerable set \(\mathcal{P}\) of (Ecumenical) propositional symbols and the set of Ecumenical connectives enhanced with unary \(Ecumenical\) modal operators. There is no canonical definition of constructive or intuitionistic modal logics. Here we will mostly follow the approach in \([Sim94]\) for justifying our choices for the Ecumenical interpretation for possibility and necessity.

The ecumenical translation \([\_]_x^\circ\) from propositional ecumenical formulas into \(LEci\) is defined in the same way as the modal translation \([\_]_x\), in the last section. For the case of modal connectives, our proposal is that the box modality is a neutral connective, while the diamond has two possible interpretations: classical and intuitionistic, as its leading connective is an existential quantifier. Hence we should consider the ecumenical modalities: \(\square, \Diamond_i, \Diamond_e\), determined by the translations

\[
\begin{align*}
[\square A]_x^\circ &:= \forall y(R(x, y) \rightarrow_i [A]_y^\circ) \\
[\Diamond_i A]_x^\circ &:= \exists y(R(x, y) \land_i [A]_y^\circ) \\
[\Diamond_e A]_x^\circ &:= \exists y(R(x, y) \land_e [A]_y^\circ)
\end{align*}
\]

Observe that, due to equivalence (3), we have \(\Diamond_i A \leftrightarrow_i \neg \square \neg A\). We will denote by \(EK\) the Ecumenical modal logic meta-logically characterized by \(LEci\) via \([\_]_x^\circ\).

4 A labeled system for \(EK\)

One of the advantages of having an Ecumenical framework is that some well known classical/intuitionistic systems arise as fragments \([PPdP20]\). In the following, we will seek such systems by proposing a labeled sequent system for Ecumenical modalities.
Initial and structural rules

\[ \frac{x : A, \Gamma \vdash x : A}{init} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash y : \bot}{W} \]

Propositional rules

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{x : A, x : B, \Gamma \vdash z : C}{x \vdash A \land B, \Gamma \vdash z : C} & & \land L \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash x : A \quad \Gamma \vdash x : B}{\Gamma \vdash x : A \land B} & & \land R \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash x : A}{\Gamma \vdash x : A \lor B} & & \lor L \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash x : A \quad \Gamma \vdash x : B}{\Gamma \vdash x : A \lor B} & & \lor R \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A, y : \bot \vdash z : C}{\Gamma, y : A, z : C \vdash x : \bot} & & \land_i \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash y : \bot}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash y : A} & & \lor_i \\
\frac{x : A \rightarrow B, \Gamma \vdash x : A}{x \vdash A \rightarrow B, \Gamma \vdash x : \bot} & & \rightarrow L \\
\frac{x : A \rightarrow B, \Gamma \vdash x : B}{x \vdash A \rightarrow B, \Gamma \vdash x : \bot} & & \rightarrow R \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A \rightarrow B \vdash x : A}{\Gamma \vdash x : A \rightarrow B} & & \rightarrow_e \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A \rightarrow B \vdash x : B}{\Gamma \vdash x : A \rightarrow B} & & \rightarrow_e \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : P_i \vdash x : \bot}{\Gamma \vdash x : P_i} & & P_i \\
\frac{\Gamma, x : P_e \vdash x : \bot}{\Gamma \vdash x : P_e} & & P_e \\
\end{align*}
\]

Modal rules

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{xRy, y : A, x : \square A, \Gamma \vdash z : C}{xRy, \Gamma \vdash y : A} & & \square L \\
\frac{xRy, y : A, \Gamma \vdash z : C}{x \vdash \diamond A, \Gamma \vdash z : C} & & \square R \\
\frac{xRy, \Gamma \vdash y : A}{x \vdash \diamond A, \Gamma \vdash \bot} & & \Diamond L \\
\frac{xRy, y : A, \Gamma \vdash z : \bot}{x \vdash \square A, \Gamma \vdash \bot} & & \Diamond R \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 2: Ecumenical modal system labEK. In rules \(\square R, \Diamond L, \Diamond R\), the eigenvariable \(y\) is fresh.

The basic idea behind labeled proof systems for modal logic is to internalize elements of the associated Kripke semantics (namely, the worlds of a Kripke structure and the accessibility relation between them) into the syntax. Labeled sequents have the form \(\Gamma \vdash z : C\), where \(\Gamma\) is a multiset containing labeled formulas of the form \(x : A\) and relational atoms of the form \(xRy\), where \(x, y\) range over a set of variables and \(A\) is a modal formula.

Following [Sim94], the meta-logical soundness and completeness theorems are proved via a translation between rule applications in labEK and derivations in LEci.

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \(\Gamma\) be a multiset of labeled modal formulas and denote \([\Gamma]\) = \{\(R(x, y) \mid xRy \in \Gamma\) \cup \{[B]_\Gamma\} \mid x : B \in \Gamma\}. The following are equivalent:

1. \(\Gamma \vdash x : A\) is provable in labEK.
2. \([\Gamma]_\vee\) is provable in LEci.

Finally, observe that, when restricted to the intuitionistic and neutral operators, labEK matches exactly Simpson’s sequent system \(L_{\odot 0}\) [Sim94].

## 5 Discussion and conclusion

This is a short version of the text available at [https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14325](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14325). There, the interested reader may find: all the proofs; an axiomatic and semantical interpretation of Ecumenical modalities; and an extension of the discussion to relational systems with the usual restrictions on the relation in the Kripke model.

Some questions naturally arise with respect to ecumenical systems: what (really) are ecumenical systems? What are they good for? Why should anyone be interested in ecumenical systems? What is the...
real motivation behind the definition and development of ecumenical systems? Based on the specific case of the ecumenical system that puts classical logic and intuitionist logic coexisting in peace in the same codification, we would like to propose three possible motivations for the definition, study and development of ecumenical systems.

**Philosophical motivation**  This was the motivation of Prawitz. Inferentialism, and in particular, logical inferentialism, is the semantical approach according to which the meaning of the logical constants can be specified by the rules that determine their correct use. According to Prawitz [Pra15],

> “Gentzen’s introduction rules, taken as meaning constitutive of the logical constants of the language of predicate logic, agree, as is well known, with how intuitionistic mathematicians use the constants. On the one hand, the elimination rules stated by Gentzen become all justified when the constants are so understood because of there being reductions, originally introduced in the process of normalizing natural deductions, which applied to proofs terminating with an application of elimination rules give canonical proofs of the conclusion in question. On the other hand, no canonical proof of an arbitrarily chosen instance of the law of the excluded middle is known, nor any reduction that applied to a proof terminating with an application of the classical form of reductio ad absurdum gives a canonical proof of the conclusion.”

But what about the use classical mathematicians make of the logical constants? Again, according to Prawitz,

> “What is then to be said about the negative thesis that no coherent meaning can be attached on the classical use of the logical constants? Gentzen’s introduction rules are of course accepted also in classical reasoning, but some of them cannot be seen as introduction rules, that is they cannot serve as explanations of meaning. The classical understanding of disjunction is not such that A ∨ B may be rightly asserted only if it is possible to prove either A or B, and hence Gentzen’s introduction rule for disjunction does not determine the meaning of classical disjunction.”

As an alternative, in a recent paper [Mur18] Murzi presents a different approach to the extension of inferentialism to classical logic. There are some natural (proof-theoretical) inferentialist requirements on admissible logical rules, such as harmony and separability (although harmonic, Prawitz’ rules for the classical operators do not satisfy separability). According to Murzi, our usual logical practice does not seem to allow for an inferentialist account of classical logic (unlike what happens with respect to intuitionistic logic). Murzi proposes a new set of rules for classical logical operators based on: absurdity as a punctuation mark, and Higher-level rules [Sch14]. This allows for a “pure” logical system, where negation is not used in premises.

**Mathematical/computational motivation**  (This was actually the original motivation for proposing ecumenical systems.) The first ecumenical system (as far as we know) was defined by Krauss in a technical report of the University of Kassel [Kra92] (the text was never published in a journal). The paper is divided in two parts: in the first part, Krauss’ ecumenical system is defined and some properties proved. In the second part, some theorems of basic algebraic number theory are revised in the light of this (ecumenical) system, where constructive proofs of some “familiar classical proofs” are given (like the proof of Dirichlet’s Unit Theorem). The same motivation can be found in the final passages of the paper [Dow16], where Dowek examines what would happen in the case of axiomatizations of mathematics. Dowek gives a simple example from Set Theory, and ends the paper with this very interesting remark:
“Which mathematical results have a classical formulation that can be proved from the axioms of constructive set theory or constructive type theory and which require a classical formulation of these axioms and a classical notion of entailment remains to be investigated.”

Logical motivation  In a certain sense, the logical motivation naturally combines certain aspects of the philosophical motivation with certain aspects of the mathematical motivation. According to Prawitz, one can consider the so-called classical first order logic as “an attempted codification of a fragment of inferences occurring in [our] actual deductive practice”. Given that there exist different and even divergent attempts to codify our (informal) deductive practice, it is more than natural to ask about what relations are entertained between these codifications. Ecumenical systems may help us to have a better understanding of the relation between classical logic and intuitionistic logic. But one could say that, from a logical point of view, there’s nothing new in the ecumenical proposal: Based on translations, the new classical operators could be easily introduced by “explicit definitions”. Let us consider the following dialogue between a classical logician (CL) and an intuitionistic logician (IL), a dialogue that may arise as a consequence of the translations mentioned above:

• IL: if what you mean by \((A \lor B)\) is \(\neg(\neg A \land \neg B)\), then I can accept the validity of \((A \lor \neg A)\)!

• CL: but I do not mean \(\neg(\neg A \land \neg \neg A)\) by \((A \lor \neg A)\). One must distinguish the excluded-middle from the the principle of non-contradiction. When I say that Goldbach’s conjecture is either true or false, I am not saying that it would be contradictory to assert that it is not true and that it is not the case that it is not true!

• IL: but you must realize that, at the end of the day, you just have one logical operator, the Sheffer stroke (or the Quine’s dagger).

• CL: But this is not at all true! The fact that we can define one operator in terms of other operators does not imply that we don’t have different operators! We do have 16 binary propositional operators (functions). It is also true that we can prove \(\vdash (A \lor_c B) \leftrightarrow \neg(\neg A \land \neg B)\) in the ecumenical system, but this does not mean that we don’t have three different operators, \(\neg\), \(\lor_c\) and \(\land\).

Maybe we can resume the logical motivation in the following (very simple) sentence:

Ecumenical systems constitute a new and promising instrument to study the nature of different (maybe divergent!) logics.

Now, what can we say about modal ecumenical systems? Regarding the philosophical view, in [PPdP20] we have used invertibility results in order to obtain a sequent system for Prawitz’ ecumenical logic with a minimal occurrences of negations, moving then towards a “purer” ecumenical system. Nevertheless, negation still plays an important rôle on interpreting classical connectives. This is transferred to our definition of ecumenical modalities, where the classical possibility is interpreted using negation. We plan to investigate what would be the meaning of classical possibility without impure rules. For the mathematical view, our use of intuitionistic/classical/neutral connectives allows for a more chirurgical detection of the parts of a mathematical proof that are intrinsically intuitionistic, classical or independent. We now bring this discussion to modalities. There is an interesting aspect of this expansion, that would be the ecumenical interpretation of relational formulas. Finally, concerning the logical view, it would be interesting to explore some relations between general results on translations and ecumenical systems.

Finally, we observe that there is an obvious connection between the Ecumenical approach and Gödel-Gentzen’s double-negation translations of classical logic into intuitionistic logic. This could lead to the erroneous conclusion that the ecumenical refinement of classical logic is essentially the same refinement produced by such translation. But a closer inspection shows that this is not true! Indeed,
classical mathematical practice does not require that every occurrence of $\lor$ in real mathematical proofs be replaced by its Gödel-Gentzen translation. For example, there is no reason to translate the occurrence of $\lor$ in the theorem $(A \rightarrow (A \lor B))$. Given that the Gödel-Gentzen translation function systematically and globally eliminates every occurrence of $\lor$ and $\exists$ from the language of classical logic, one may say that the ecumenical system reflects more faithfully the “local” necessary uses of classical reasoning.

That is, the ecumenical refinement “interpolates” the Gödel-Gentzen-translation function. And this is extended, in our work, to reasoning with modalities.

We end the present text by justifying some choices taken for allowing such a project. The first one is the inevitable proximity with Simpson’s view of what a intuitionistic modal system should be and/or behave. This based in what it appears to be a common sense in the proof theory community that this is the more reasonable approach for modalities and intuitionism. From that, the choice of a labeled proof system for EK seems only natural. But labeled systems have a very unfortunate feature: it is really tricky (sometimes maybe even impossible) to define an interpretation of sequents into the logical language. In fact, we believe the problem with translating general labeled sequents is that the context may not be a tree-like graph, in particular it may not have a root. This problem often disappears when moving to nested-like systems [Brü09, Pog09, Str13, Le15], exactly since the nestings keep the tree-structure information, matching exactly the history of a backwards proof search in an ordinary sequent calculus. Also, having an ecumenical nested system would most probably allow for a comparison, in one system, between the nested sequent for IK [Str13] and for CK [ADS15, KS19]. Hence this is a path worth pursuing. There are also other labelled sequent systems for intuitionistic modal logics, specially the recent ones proposed in [MMS19] and [DGO19]. We plan to investigate better the relationship between such labeled systems and the one proposed in this work.
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1 Extended Abstract

Developing efficient tools and techniques for propositional satisfiability (SAT) solving has long been recognized as impactful pursuit. Advances in SAT directly translate to model checking, planning and scheduling, automatic test-case generation, combinatorial equivalence checking, graph coloring, software verification, and more [3]. Annual SAT competitions rate a plethora of propositional satisfiability tools in a number of different categories; the extension of SAT to include theory solvers that translate the results to a wide variety of additional mathematical domains, Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT), enjoys its own annual competition series; SAT has its own long-standing conference series; so does SMT.

Temporal logic satisfiability checking, for example for Linear Temporal Logic (LTL) and its many derivatives such as Mission-time LTL (MLTL) [8, 6] has received considerably less attention. In 2007, we noted that, while there were no devoted LTL satisfiability solvers, we can use LTL model checking against a universal model as a proxy for LTL satisfiability solving [11]. We surveyed all publicly-available translators of LTL to either explicit or symbolic automata that could serve as inputs to LTL model checker and discovered (1) that LTL satisfiability-as-explicit-model-checking does not scale and is highly error prone (with not a single solver generating 100% correct results); and (2) that LTL satisfiability-as-symbolic-model-checking was less error prone and more scalable but still limited [12]. We devised scalable LTL satisfiability benchmarks including encoding binary counters as LTL formulas (e.g., uniquely satisfiable formulas satisfied exactly by an $n$-bit binary counter with overflow). LTL symbolic satisfiability checking could not scale to handle 12-bit binary counter formulas [12]! From 1997[1] to 2011[13] there was only one encoding for LTL to symbolic automata, which then enabled symbolic LTL satisfiability checking. Through defining and benchmarking 29 additional encodings of LTL-to-symbolic-automata, we unleashed performance improvements that were up to exponentially better for some classes of formulas [13].

The historic lack of attention to temporal logic satisfiability is surprising because it is impactful in a wide variety of domains, including those impacted by SAT and SMT. For example, model checking benefits from better encodings of LTL formulas, e.g., derived from satisfiability solving [14]. Planning and scheduling problems are often best-specified by logics like the popular LTLf (LTL over finite traces)[2]; improving satisfiability for that logic has impacted the AI planning domain [7]. Perhaps one of the most wide-reaching applications of temporal logic satisfiability is specification debugging [11, 12]. Checking the satisfiability of each specification, its negation, and the conjunction of all specifications for a given system ensures that no requirement is accidentally unsatisfiable or valid, and that all requirements can be true of the same (reactive) system at the same time. Since specification is arguably the biggest bottleneck to the application of formal methods [9], there is a need for efficient tools to ensure the quality of
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specifications. Finding specification bugs early in the system design lifecycle, before systems are built off of faulty specifications, can have financial impacts in the millions of dollars [4].

The runtime verification (RV) problem asks whether the current system run, \( \pi \), upholds its specification, \( \varphi \). Stream-based RV asks for all \( i \) during the mission, whether \( \pi, i \models \varphi \): does the trace starting from time \( i \) satisfy \( \varphi \). RV algorithms would be improved by faster, more efficient temporal logic satisfiability solvers. Furthermore, such solvers are desperately needed for verification of RV engines, for example, via generating RV benchmarks consisting of \( \pi, \varphi \), and an “oracle” verdict stream indicating, for all \( i \), \( \pi, i \models \varphi \) [10]. Such a benchmark could be constructed, for example, using a satisfiability solver for a popular RV logic like MLTL [6], and a formula progression algorithm [5].

In current and future work, we look to improve algorithms for satisfiability of LTL and its related logics and encourage competitions centered around this goal, e.g., through further benchmark generation. We look to fuel the fledgling Runtime Verification competition through better benchmark generation and solving tools. In RV in particular, past-time variants of linear temporal logics have had historical appeal: unlike with future-time logics, there is always a verdict (true or false) at the current time and it is only a question of how fast we can find it. Yet there is currently no tool devoted to past-time LTL (or MLTL) satisfiability solving; we look to fill that gap.
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Our research refers to the problem of constructing the universal proof systems for all versions of propositional many-valued logics (MVLs) such that any propositional proof system for every variant of MVL can be presented in described form. We presented three types of such universal systems, and investigated some properties of them. The first introduced system \textbf{UE} is based on the generalization of the notion of determinative disjunctive normal form [1], the second system \textbf{UGS} is based on the generalization of splitting method, described in [2] and the third one \textbf{US} is a Gentzen-like system [1].

Let \( E_k \) be the set \( \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{k-1}, \ldots, \frac{k-2}{k-1}, 1 \right\} \). We use the well-known notions of propositional \( k \)-valued formula, defined as usual from propositional variables with values from \( E_k \), (may also be propositional constants) and logical connectives, each of which can be defined by different well known modes. For propositional variable \( p \) and \( \delta = \frac{i}{k-1} \) \((0 \leq i \leq k-1)\) we defined additionally “exponent” functions: (1) exponent \( p \) as \( (p \supset \delta) \) \& \( (\delta \supset p) \) with Lukasiewicz’s implication and (2) exponent \( p^\delta \) as \( p \) with \( (k-1)i \) cyclically permuting negation. Then we introduced the additional notion of formula: for every formulas \( A \) and \( B \) the expression \( A^B \) (for both modes) is also formula. In every MVL either only \( 1 \) or every of the values \( \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{i}{k-1} \leq 1 \) can be fixed as \textbf{designated values}. A formula \( \varphi \) with variables \( p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n \) is called \textbf{\( k \)-tautology} if for every \( \delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots, \delta_n) \in E^n_k \) assigning \( \delta_j \) \((1 \leq j \leq n)\) to each \( p_j \) gives the value 1 (or every of the values \( \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{i}{k-1} \leq 1 \)) \( \varphi \). For every propositional variable \( p \) and \( \delta \in E_k \) \( p^\delta \) in sense of both exponent modes is the \textbf{literal}. The conjunct \( K \) (term) can be represented simply as a set of literals (no conjunct contains a variable with different measures of exponents simultaneously).

\textbf{Definition 1}. Given \( \delta = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m) \in E^m_k \), the conjunct \( K^\sigma = \{ p_{i_1}^{\sigma_1}, p_{i_2}^{\sigma_2}, \ldots, p_{i_m}^{\sigma_m} \} \) is called \( \frac{1}{k-1} \)-determinative \((0 \leq i \leq k-1)\), if assigning \( \sigma_j \) \((1 \leq j \leq m)\) to each \( p_{i_j} \), we obtain the value \( \frac{1}{k-1} \) of \( \varphi \) independently of the values of the remaining variables.

\textbf{Definition 2}. A \textbf{DNF} \( D = \{ K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_j \} \) is called \textbf{determinative DNF} (dDNF) for \( \varphi \) if \( \varphi = D \) and if “1” \((\text{every of the values } \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{i}{k-1} \leq 1)\) is \((\text{are})\) fixed as designated value, then every conjunct \( K_i \) \((1 \leq i \leq j)\) is \( \frac{1}{k-1} \)-determinative \((\frac{1}{k-1} \)-determinative) for \( \varphi \).

\textbf{Definition of universal elimination system UE} [1]. The axioms of Elimination systems \( \textbf{UE} \) aren’t fixed, but for every \( k \)-\textbf{valued formula} \( \varphi \) each conjunct from some dDNF of \( \varphi \) can be considered as an axiom. For \( k \)-valued logic the inference rule is elimination rule \((\varepsilon\text{-rule})\)

\[
\frac{K_0 \cup \{p^0\}, K_1 \cup \{p^{\frac{1}{k-1}}\}, \ldots, K_{k-2} \cup \{p^{\frac{k-2}{k-1}}\}, K_{k-1} \cup \{p^1\}}{K_0 \cup K_1 \cup \ldots \cup K_{k-2} \cup K_{k-1}}
\]

where mutually supplementary literals \((\text{variables with corresponding } (1 \text{ or } 2 \text{) exponents})\) are eliminated. Following [1], a finite sequence of conjuncts such that every conjunct in the sequence is one of the axioms of \( \textbf{UE} \) or is inferred from earlier conjuncts in the sequence by \( \varepsilon \text{-rule}\) is called a proof in \( \textbf{UE} \). A DNF \( D = \{ K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_l \} \) is \( k \)-tautological if the empty conjunct \((\emptyset)\) can be proved by using \( \varepsilon \text{-rule}\) from the axioms \( \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_l\} \).
Definition of universal systems UGS \[2\]. Let \( \varphi \) be some formula and \( p \) be some of its variables. Results of splitting method of formula \( \varphi \) by variable \( p \) (splinted variable) are the formulas \( \varphi[p^\delta] \) for every \( \delta \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{k-1}, \ldots, \frac{k-2}{k-1}, 1\right\} \), which are obtained from \( \varphi \) by assigning \( \delta \) to each occurrence of \( p \). Generalization of splitting method allows to associate with each formula \( \varphi \) some tree with root, nodes of which are labeled by formulas and edges, labeled by literals. The root itself is labeled by formula \( \varphi \). If some node is labeled by formula \( v \) and \( \alpha \) is some of its variable, then all of \( k \) edges, which are going out from this node, are labeled by one of literals \( \alpha^\delta \) for every \( \delta \) from the set \( \left\{0, \frac{1}{k-1}, \ldots, \frac{k-2}{k-1}, 1\right\} \), and each of \( k \) “sons” of this node is labeled by corresponding formula \( v[\alpha^\delta] \). Each of the tree’s leafs is labeled with some constant from the set \( \left\{0, \frac{1}{k-1}, \ldots, \frac{k-2}{k-1}, 1\right\} \). The proof system UGS can be defined as follows: for every formula \( \varphi \) some splitting tree must be constructed and if all tree’s leafs are labeled by the value 1 (or by some value \( \frac{1}{k-1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \)), then formula \( \varphi \) is \( 1 - k \)-tautology (\( \leq 1/2 - k \)-tautology), and therefore we can consider each of pointed constants as the axioms, and if \( v \) is formula, which is label of some splitting tree node, and \( p \) is its splinted variable, then the following figure
\[
\begin{array}{c}
v[p^0], v[p^1], \ldots, v[p^{k-2}], v[p^1]
\end{array}
\]
can be considered as some inference rule, hence every above described splitting tree can be consider as some proof of the formula \( \varphi \) in the system UGS.

Definition of universal systems US \[1\]. For every literal \( C \) and for any set of literals \( \Gamma \) the axiom scheme of propositional system US is \( \Gamma, C \rightarrow C \). For every formulas \( A, B \), for any set of literals \( \Gamma \), for each \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma \) from the set \( E_k \) and for \(* \in \{\& , \lor, \supset\}\) the logical rules of US are:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\Gamma \rightarrow A^\sigma_1 \text{ and } \Gamma \rightarrow B^\sigma_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Gamma \rightarrow A^\sigma_1 \text{ and } \Gamma \rightarrow B^\sigma_2, \\
&\Gamma \rightarrow (A \supset B)^{\varphi_\sigma(A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Gamma \rightarrow (A \supset B)^{\varphi_{\exp}(A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)}, \\
&\Gamma \rightarrow A^\sigma \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Gamma \rightarrow \neg A^\sigma, \\
&\Gamma, p^0 \vdash A, \Gamma, p^{k-1} \vdash A, \ldots, \Gamma, p^{0 \cdots k-2} \vdash A, \Gamma, p^1 \vdash A, \Gamma \vdash A,
\end{align*}
\]

where many-valued functions \( \varphi_\sigma(A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2), \varphi_{\exp}(A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) \) and \( \varphi_{\neg}(A, \sigma) \), must be defined individually for each version of MVL such, that (a) formulas \( A^\sigma_1 \supset (B^\sigma_2 \supset (A \& B)^{\varphi_\sigma(A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)}, A^\sigma_1 \supset (B^{\sigma_2})^{\varphi_{\exp}(A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)} \) and \( A^\sigma \supset (\neg A)^{\varphi_{\neg}(A, \sigma)} \) must be \( k \)-tautology in this version and (b) if for some \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma \) the value of \( \sigma_1 \& \sigma_2 \) (\( \sigma^{\sigma_12}_2 \), \( \neg \sigma \)) is one of designed values in this version of MVL, then \( (\sigma_1 \& \sigma_2) \varphi_{\sigma}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma, \sigma) = \sigma_1 \& \sigma_2, (\sigma^{\sigma_12}_1) \varphi_{\exp}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \sigma^{\sigma_12}_1, (\neg \sigma) \varphi_{\neg}(\sigma, \sigma) = \neg \sigma \).

Some algorithm for constructing of these formulas is given.

Theorem. The systems UE, UGS and US are complete and sound and for every version of MVL some propositional proof system can be presented in every of mentioned types.

We compare the proof complexities of the same formulas in described systems, compare in each of them the proof complexities of minimal tautologies and results of substitution in them and as well as many other interesting properties.
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Examples of US presentations for some versions of MVL.

Here we give the US presentations for some systems MVL.

a) For the first of the constructed systems \(LN_k\) (Łukasiewicz’s negation ) with fixed “1” as the designated value, uses conjunction, disjunction, (1) implication, (1) negation and (1) exponent, and as well as constants \(\delta = \frac{1}{k-1}\) (1 \(\leq i \leq k - 2\) for using (1) exponent the functions \(\varphi_+ (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2), \varphi_{\exp} (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2), \varphi_- (A, \sigma)\) are defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varphi_+ (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \sigma_1 \ast \sigma_2, \\
\varphi_{\exp} (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \sigma_1^{\sigma_2}, \\
\varphi_- (A, \sigma) &= \neg \sigma.
\end{align*}
\]

b) For the second systems \(CN_3\) (cyclically permuting negation) with fixed “1” as the designated value, uses conjunction, disjunction,(2) implication, (2) negation and (2) exponent the functions \(\varphi_+ (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2), \varphi_{\exp} (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2), \varphi_- (A, \sigma)\) are defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varphi_\succ (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= (\sigma_1 \triangleright \sigma_2) \& \neg (A \triangleright \bar{A}) \triangleright (B \triangleright B) \triangleright \bar{A} \triangleright \neg (B \triangleright \bar{B}), \\
\varphi_\preceq (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= (\sigma_1 \triangleright \sigma_2) \triangleright [(A \triangleright \bar{A}) \& \neg (B \triangleright \bar{B})] \triangleright \bar{A} \triangleright (B \triangleright \bar{B}), \\
\varphi_\cdot (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= (\sigma_1 \& \sigma_2) \triangleright ((A \& \bar{A}) \& \neg (B \& \bar{B})) \triangleright ((A \& \bar{A}) \& (B \& \bar{B})) \\
\varphi_{\exp} (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \sigma_1^{\sigma_2} \& \neg (\sigma_1^{\sigma_2}) \& \neg (A^{\sigma_1} \& B^{\sigma_2}) \& \neg (A^{\sigma_1} \& B^{\sigma_2}), \\
\varphi_- (A, \sigma) &= \neg \sigma.
\end{align*}
\]

c) For \(LN_{3,2}\) – Łukasiewicz’s logic with fixed “1/2” and “1” as the designated value, which uses conjunction, disjunction, (1) implication, (1) negation and (1) exponent, and as well as constants 0, 1/2 and 1 for using (1) exponent the functions \(\varphi_+ (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2), \varphi_{\exp} (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2), \varphi_- (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)\) are defined as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varphi_\succ (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \bar{A} \triangleright B \triangleright \bar{\sigma_1} \triangleright \sigma_2, \\
\varphi_\preceq (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= A \triangleright B \triangleright \sigma_1 \triangleright \sigma_2, \\
\varphi_\cdot (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= (A \triangleright \sigma_1 \triangleright B^{\sigma_2}) \& (B \triangleright \sigma_2 \triangleright A^{\sigma_1}), \\
\varphi_{\exp} (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= A^{\sigma_2} \& \sigma_1^{\sigma_2}, \\
\varphi_- (A, B, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) &= \bar{A} \triangleright \bar{\sigma_1}.
\end{align*}
\]
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The minimal tautologies play main role in the proof complexity area. In fact all propositional formulae, proof complexities of which are investigated in many well known papers, are minimal tautologies. There is a traditional assumption that minimal tautology shouldn’t be more complicated than any substitution in it, that is must be some monotonicity of proofs. This idea was first raised by Anikeev in [1]. He has given two types of not complete propositional proof systems, in the first of which the proof lines of all minimal tautologies are not more, than the proof lines for every results of substitutions in them, and the second one, in which the proof lines of substituted formulas can be less than the proof lines of some corresponding minimal tautologies.

At first we showed that for classical, intuitionistic, Johansson’s, monotone two-valued logics of size \(n\) can be exponential function in \(n\). Then for some propositional proof systems of mentioned logics we investigate the relations between the lines (\(l\)-complexities) and sizes (\(l\)-complexities) of proofs for minimal tautologies of this logic and for results of a substitutions in them. We introduced the notions of \textit{monotonous} and \textit{strongly monotonous} properties for the proof systems and investigated these properties for many well known propositional proof systems of different two-valued and many-valued logics, as well as for some new systems, constructed for mentioned logics by us.

**Definition 1.** A tautology is called \textbf{minimal in this logic} if replacement result of all occurrences for each its non-elementary subformulas by some new variable is not a tautology of this logic.

Let \(A_n = p \land (p \land (p \land \ldots \land (p \land \ldots) \ldots))\). For tautologies \(B_n = p \supset (p \lor p) \lor A_n\), the following tautologies \(C_n = p \supset q \lor A_n\) and \(D_n = p \supset (p \lor p) \lor r\) are minimal (for monotone logic the sequents \(B_n = p \rightarrow (p \lor p) \lor A_n\), \(C_n = p \rightarrow q \lor A_n\) and \(D_n = p \rightarrow (p \lor p) \lor r\) accordingly). It is not difficult to see, that tautologies \(C_n\) are “harder” than \(D_n\) and \(B_n\).

For every minimal tautology \(\varphi\) of fixed logic, by \(S(\varphi)\) is denoted the set of all tautologies, which are results of a substitution in \(\varphi\).

For any proof system \(\phi\) and tautology \(\varphi\) we denote by \(t^\phi(\varphi)\) (\(l^\phi(\varphi)\)) the minimal possible value of lines (sizes) for all \(\phi\)-proofs of tautology \(\varphi\).

**Definition 2.** The proof system \(\phi\) of some logic is called \textbf{\(t\)-monotonous} /\(t - m/\) \(\textbf{(l\text{-}monotonous} /\(l - m/\)), if for every non-minimal tautology \(\psi\) of this logic there is a minimal tautology \(\varphi\) of the same logic such that \(\psi \in S(\varphi)\) and \(t^\phi(\psi) = t^\phi(\varphi)\) (\(l^\phi(\psi) = l^\phi(\varphi)\)).

**Definition 3.** The proof system \(\phi\) of some logic is called \textbf{\(t\)-strongly monotonous} /\(t - sm/\) \(\textbf{(l\text{-}strongly monotonous} /\(l - sm/\)), if for every tautology \(\psi\) of this logic there is no minimal tautology \(\varphi\) of the same logic such that, \(\psi \in S(\varphi)\) and \(t^\phi(\varphi) > t^\phi(\psi)\) (\(l^\phi(\varphi) > l^\phi(\psi)\)).

We investigated the above properties for different well-known propositional proof systems of classical two-valued logic (CL), intuitionistic, Johansson’s, monotone two-valued logics (II,
On monotonous and strongly monotonous properties (MVL) and for some new systems, constructed for mentioned logics by us (the definitions of these systems are in Appendix).

Our main results:

1. The systems, based on generalization of splitting method for CL and MVL, as well as eliminations systems, based on the determinative normal forms for CL, IL, JL and MVL are neither \( t - m (l - m) \) and therefore not \( t - sm (l - sms) \) \([2, 3]\).

2. The resolution systems for CL, IL, JL, and cut-free sequent systems for CL, IL, JL and MonL are \( t - m (l - m) \), but not \( t - sm (l - sms) \) \([4, 5]\).

3. The sequent systems with cut rule and Frege systems for CL, IL, JL are neither \( t - m \) and therefore not \( t - sm \): it is showed that for each logic there is a sequence of tautologies \( \psi_n \), every of which has unique minimal tautology \( \varphi_n \) such, that for every \( n \) the proofs lines of \( \varphi_n \) in pointed systems are by order more than the the proofs lines of \( \psi_n \) in these systems \([6, 7, 8, 9]\).

4. All complete well known systems of the above mentioned logics are not \( t - sm (l - sms) \).
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Appendix

Here we give the definitions of two systems, mentioned above. Following the usual terminology we call the variables and negated variables \textit{literals}. The conjunct \( K \) (term) can be represented simply as a set of literals (no conjunct contains a variable and its negation simultaneously).

Let \( \varphi \) be a propositional formula, \( P = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n\} \) be the set of all variables of \( \varphi \), and \( P' = \{p_{i1}, p_{i2}, \ldots, p_{im}\} \) \((1 \leq m \leq n)\) be some subset of \( P \).

\textbf{Definition 1.1.} Given \( \sigma = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m\} \subset E^m \), the conjunct \( K^\sigma = \{p_{i1}^{\sigma_1}, p_{i2}^{\sigma_2}, \ldots, p_{im}^{\sigma_m}\} \) is called \( \varphi \) \(-1\)-determinative \((\varphi \text{-}0\text{-determinative})\) if assigning \( \sigma_j \) \((1 \leq j \leq m)\) to each \( p_{ij} \) we obtain the value of \( \varphi \) \((1 \text{ or } 0)\) independently of the values of the remaining variables.

\textbf{Definition 1.2.} DNF \( D = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_j\} \) is called determinative DNF \((\text{DDNF})\) for \( \varphi \) if \( \varphi = D \) and every conjunct \( K_i \) \((1 \leq i \leq j)\) is \(-1\)-determinative for \( \varphi \).

\textbf{Elimination system for PC (EC)}

The axioms of EC aren’t fixed, but for every formula \( \varphi \) each conjunct from some dDNF of \( \varphi \) can be considered as an axiom. The \textit{elimination rule} \((e\text{-rule})\) infers \( K' \cup K'' \) from conjuncts \( K' \cup \{p\} \) and \( K' \cup \{\bar{p}\} \), where \( K' \) and \( K'' \) are conjuncts and \( p \) is a variable. The proof in EC is a finite sequence of conjuncts such that every conjunct in the sequence is one of the axioms of EC or is inferred from earlier conjuncts in the sequence by \( e\text{-rule}. \) DNF \( D = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_i\} \) is tautology if using \( e\text{-rule} \) the empty conjunction \((\emptyset)\) can be proved from the axioms \( \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_i\} \). It is obvious that the system EC is complete.

\textbf{Generalised Splitting system GS.}

Let \( \varphi \) be some formula and \( p \) be some of its variable. Results of splitting method of formula \( \varphi \) by variable \( p \) \((\text{splinted variable})\) are the formulas \( \varphi[p^\delta] \) for every \( \delta \) from the set \( \{0, 1\} \), which are obtained from \( \varphi \) by assigning \( \delta \) to each occurrence of \( p \) and successively using the elementary equivalences of logical functions. Note that, in some cases, the formulas \( \varphi[p^\delta] \) can remain after pointed transformation occurrences of the constant \( \delta \) as well. The generalization of splitting method allow as associate with every formula \( \varphi \) some tree with root, nodes of which are labeled by formulas and edges, labeled by literals. The root is labeled by itself formula \( \varphi \). If some node is labeled by formula \( v \) and \( \alpha \) is some its variable, then both edges, which going out from this node, are labeled by one of literals \( \alpha^\delta \) for every \( \delta \) from the set \( \{0, 1\} \), and every of 2 “sons” of this node is labeled by corresponding formula \( v[\alpha^\delta] \). Each of the trees leafs is labeled with some constant from the set \( \{0, 1\} \). The tree, which is constructed for formula \( \varphi \) by described method, we will call \textit{splitting tree} of \( \varphi \) in future.

The GS proof system can be defined as follows: for every formula \( \varphi \) must be constructed some splitting tree and if all tree’s leafs are labeled by the value 1, then formula \( \varphi \) is tautology and therefore we can consider the pointed constant 1 as an axiom, and for every formula \( v \), which is label of some splitting tree node, and \( p \) is its splinted variable, then as some inference rule can be consider the following figure \( v[p^\delta], v[p^1] \vdash v \), therefore every above described splitting tree can be consider as some proof of \( \varphi \) in the system GS.
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Free logics are a family of nonclassical logics that are free of existential presuppositions in general and with respect to atomic terms in particular. Therefore, unlike classical logics, where every object is necessarily existing, free logics allow for nonexistent objects and partial functions. The family can roughly be divided into four different types: positive [34, 18, 19, 20, 22], negative [32, 33], neutral [24, 25, 26], and supervaluational [3, 4, 5] free logic. Each type has a characteristic way of evaluating formulas that contain terms whose referents either do not exist or are not known to. For positive free logic, atomic formulas with terms that do not refer to anything existing can be evaluated to true but do not have to be. In negative free logic, atomic formulas containing terms referring to nonexistent objects are strictly denied. In neutral free logic, these formulas are regarded as indeterminate and hence are neither true nor false but truth-valueless, which, in turn, results in a logic where most classical logical truths are no longer valid. By cleverly mixing multiple evaluation functions, supervaluational free logic accommodates the trivalent nature of neutral free logic while still preserving the principles of classical reasoning. As shown by the author, the semantics of a higher-order logic that has the property to be free in the sense of one of these four fundamentally different notions can be determined by employing a so-called dual-domain approach. The dual-domain approach combines two domains where one domain contains only the existing objects, and the other domain the nonexisting (and possibly also the existing) ones [23, 28, 14]. Additionally, following an idea proposed by Farmer [15, 16], the evaluation function mapping terms of free higher-order logic to objects in one of the two domains can remain total by introducing fixed objects with a special meaning that allow for an artificial partial function or predicate application whenever needed by the underlying free logic. This approach not only has the advantage of being straightforward and easy to understand but – more importantly – it requires only a few changes to the framework of classical higher-order logic (HOL) and thus enables easy application of the shallow semantical embedding approach. By shallowly embedding a nonclassical logic as free logic into classical higher-order logic, one can benefit from the strength of powerful state-of-the-art higher-order interactive and automated theorem provers like, e.g., Isabelle/HOL [29] for the formalization and verification of theories in free logic. The shallow semantical embedding approach is a technique that has quite far-reaching roots [17, 31], though, in recent years, especially Benzmüller has achieved great results with embeddings of modal logics [11, 12, 13], intuitionistic logics [8], dyadic deontic logics [6, 7], and many more. A shallow semantical embedding of two-valued free higher-order logic into classical higher-order logic can be realized by simply introducing a certain unary predicate which separates the existent objects from the nonexistent ones [27]. With such a kind of embedding, the author was able to capture the fine differences between positive and negative free higher-order logic and, founded on the semantics defined using the previously described dual-domain approach, also prove the embedding to be faithful. Furthermore, neutral free higher-order logic as logic with technically three truth values can be embedded into classical two-valued higher-order logic by applying a combination of both a shallow and deep embedding. Conversely, an embedding of supervaluational free higher-order logic can be obtained by pursuing a proposal given by Barba Escribá [1, 2], in
which supervaluational semantics is interpreted modally and hence embedded into modal logic based on a neutral free logic.

In conclusion, it is indeed able to successfully automate all different types of free higher-order logic, and even combinations of these types, through a shallow and/or deep embedding adapted to one’s needs. In the past, embeddings of free first-order logic have already been developed and implemented in Isabelle/HOL and shown to work nicely for establishing the correctness of free logical theories [9, 10, 35]. The definition and automation of free higher-order logic has recently been pioneered by the author [27].
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1 Proof complexity.

Proof complexity is an area connecting computational complexity theory and mathematical logic. The main object in proof complexity is a propositional proof system: a functional propositional proof system is any polynomial time function \( P : \{0,1\}^* \rightarrow \{0,1\}^* \) whose range is exactly TAUT. Any string \( \pi \) such that \( P(\pi) = \alpha \) is called \( P \)-proof of \( \alpha \).

One of the most fundamental open problems in logic is formulated by the following theorem:

**Theorem 1** (Cook and Reckhow 1979). There exists a propositional proof system \( P \) in which every tautology has a polynomial size proof if and only if the class \( NP \) is closed under complementation: \( NP = coNP \).

2 CSP and the \( H \)-coloring problem.

The constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) is a computational problem. The problem is in finding an assignment of values to a set of variables, such that this assignment satisfies some specified feasibility conditions. If such assignment exists, we call an instance (that is a triple of a set of variables, a finite domain and a finite list of constraints) of CSP satisfiable and unsatisfiable otherwise. One can also define CSP through the homomorphism between relational structures: in the constraint satisfaction problem associated with a structure \( H \), denoted by \( CSP(H) \) the question is, given a structure \( G \) over the same vocabulary, whether there exists a homomorphism from \( G \) to \( H \).

The \( H \)-coloring problem is essentially \( CSP(H) \) on relational structures that are undirected graphs: an \( H \)-coloring of a graph \( G \) is just a homomorphism from \( G \) to \( H \).

3 The dichotomy theorems.

It turns out, that all CSPs can be classified with only two complexity classes: there are either polynomial-time CSPs, or \( NP \)-complete CSPs. This dichotomy was conjectured by Feder and Vardi in 1998 [2] and recently proved by Zhuk [4] and Bulatov [1].

**Theorem 2** (Dichotomy of CSP). \( CSP(H) \) is either tractable or \( NP \)-complete.

Computational complexity of the \( H \)-coloring problem was investigated years ago and the Dichotomy theorem for the \( H \)-coloring problem was proved by Hell and Neetil [3] in 1990.

**Theorem 3** (Dichotomy of the \( H \)-coloring problem). If \( H \) is bipartite then the \( H \)-coloring problem is in \( P \). Otherwise the \( H \)-coloring problem is \( NP \)-complete.

There is an easy \( H \)-colorability test when \( H \) is bipartite: for all graphs \( G, H \) if \( H \) is bipartite, then \( G \) is \( H \)-colorable if and only if \( G \) is bipartite graph.

∗This work has been supported by Charles University Research Centre program No.UNCE/SCI/022.
4 Resolution refutation.

The DNF-resolution (denoted by DNF-R) is a proof system extending the resolution system R. DNF-R has the following inference rules:

\[
\frac{C \cup \{\wedge_j l_j\} \quad D \cup \{\neg l'_1, \ldots, \neg l'_t\}}{C \cup D}
\]

if \( t \geq 1 \) and all \( l'_i \) occur among \( l_j \), and

\[
\frac{C \cup \{\wedge_j l_j\} \quad D \cup \{\wedge_{s<j} l_j\}}{C \cup D \cup \{\wedge_{i<s} l_i\}}.
\]

If we manage to derive the empty clause \( \emptyset \) from the initial set of clauses \( C \), the clauses in the set \( C \) are not simultaneously satisfiable. Thus, the resolution systems can be interpreted as a refutation proof systems: instead of proving that a formula is a tautology, they prove that a set of clauses \( \mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_n\} \) is not satisfiable, and therefore the formula \( \alpha = \lor_{i=1}^n \neg C_i \) is a tautology.

Let \( f: \mathbb{N}^+ \to \mathbb{N}^+ \) be a non-decreasing function. Define the \( R(f) \)-size of a DNF-R refutation \( \pi \) to be the minimum \( s \) such that:

- \( \pi \) has at most \( s \) steps, and
- every logical term occurring in \( \pi \) has size at most \( f(s) \).

Thus, a size \( s \) \( R(\log) \)-refutation may contain terms of the size up to \( \log(s) \). We denote by \( R^*(\log) \) its tree-like version.

5 Proof complexity of CSP.

Instances of CSP(\( \mathcal{H} \)) can be expressed by propositional formulas. For any sets \( V_\mathcal{G} \) and \( V_\mathcal{H} \) by \( V(V_\mathcal{G}, V_\mathcal{H}) \) denote a set of propositional variables: for every \( v \in V_\mathcal{G} \) and every \( u \in V_\mathcal{H} \) there is a variable \( x_{v,u} \) in the set \( V(V_\mathcal{G}, V_\mathcal{H}) \). A variable \( x_{v,u} \) is assigned the truth value 1 if and only if the vertex \( v \) is mapped to vertex \( u \). To every graph \( \mathcal{G} = (V_\mathcal{G}, E_\mathcal{G}) \) one can assign a set of clauses \( CNF(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) \) over the variables in \( V(V_\mathcal{G}, V_\mathcal{H}) \) in such a way that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the truth valuations of the variables in \( V(V_\mathcal{G}, V_\mathcal{H}) \) satisfying this set and the homomorphisms from \( \mathcal{G} \) to \( \mathcal{H} \):

- a clause \( \lor_{u \in V_\mathcal{H}} x_{v,u} \) for each \( v \in V_\mathcal{G} \);
- a clause \( \neg x_{v,u_1} \lor \neg x_{v,u_2} \) for each \( v \in V_\mathcal{G} \) and \( u_1, u_2 \in V_\mathcal{H} \) with \( u_1 \neq u_2 \);
- a clause \( \neg x_{v_1,u_1} \lor \neg x_{v_2,u_2} \) for every adjacent vertices \( v_1, v_2 \in V_\mathcal{G} \) and non-adjacent vertices \( u_1, u_2 \in V_\mathcal{H} \).

If the instance of CSP is unsatisfiable, then \( \neg CNF(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}) \) is a tautology (for the \( \mathcal{H} \)-coloring problem we get a tautology every time we consider a bipartite graph \( \mathcal{H} \) and a non-bipartite graph \( \mathcal{G} \)). From this point of view it is natural to ask about its proof complexity.

6 Bounded Arithmetic.

Common way to investigate the proof complexity of a problem is to formalize it as a sentence in some theory of bounded arithmetic (which are weak fragments of Peano arithmetic, and in
which the \textit{Induction axioms} are restricted to so-called \textit{bounded formulas}), and first prove that this universal statement is valid in all finite structures. Then it could be translated (with well-known translation of bounded formulas) into a family of propositional tautologies, that will have short proofs in the corresponding proof system. The simpler the theory is, the weaker propositional proof system will be.

7 Results.

We show that the decision algorithm in the \(p\)-time case of the \(H\)-coloring problem (that is, the case where \(H\) is a bipartite graph) can be formalized in a relatively weak two-sorted theory \(V^0\), which is quite convenient for formalizing sets of vertices and relations between them.

Using only basic axioms of \(V^0\) we define (with definable relations) the notions of a graph, bipartite and non-bipartite graphs and a homomorphism between graphs in the vocabulary of \(V^0\). Then we prove in the theory \(V^0\) the universal statement about \(p\)-decidable case of the \(H\)-coloring problem, that is there is no homomorphism from a non-bipartite graph to a bipartite graph.

\textbf{Theorem 4} \textit{(The main universal statement)}. \textit{For all non-bipartite graphs} \(G\) \textit{and bipartite graphs} \(H\), \(V^0\) \textit{proves that there is no homomorphism from} \(G\) \textit{to} \(H\).

Tautologies expressing the negative instances for such \(H\) hence have short proofs in propositional proof system \(R^*(\log)\). In fact, when the formulas are expressed as unsatisfiable sets of clauses they have \(p\)-size resolution proofs.

\textbf{Theorem 5} \textit{(The main result)}. \textit{For any non-bipartite graph} \(G\) \textit{and bipartite graph} \(H\) \textit{the propositional family} \(|\neg HOM(G, H)|\) \textit{has polynomial size} \(R^*(\log)\)-\textit{refutation in} \(R^*(\log)\) \textit{system.}
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As an implementation of the Knowledge Base Paradigm, the IDP system combines a logic based language with separate inference methods to solve computational problems [2]. IDP stands for Imperative Declarative Programming, which refers to the combination of a declarative Knowledge Base (KB) and an imperative shell for applying different inference algorithms. The KB is expressed in the IDP language, which extends First Order Logic with arithmetic, sorts and definitions. The KB is typically compact and well-readable, which facilitates its validation. It can be flexibly used as input for multiple related tasks in the problem domain. This paper presents a prototype that integrates an IDP application with a Natural Language interface to easily create a knowledge base [1].

The advantages of a Knowledge Base System (KBS) are important when it comes to calculating valid solutions in complex situations, as is the case with the selection of eligible collateral. Collateral is a financial product that has the purpose of mitigating the non-repayment risk of interbank loans. It consists of financial assets that are considered robust enough to keep their value if the lender needs to market them. The eligibility of a specific collateral depends on a plethora of interfering rules and constraints. To automate collateral selection, these rules and constraints are typically formulated in lengthy programs that contain a lot of enumerations, repetitions, and complex nesting of if-then clauses and exceptions that need to be followed in the right order. This makes each creation of a collateral selection program a complex and time consuming task, and the result is hard to validate. In our research we formulate these rules in the IDP language and assemble all of the rules in a declarative IDP KB. Consecutively we demonstrate how this knowledge can be used by different inference methods to multiple tasks on the same problem domain.

For the management and exchange of the collateral, often an intermediate third party is used. Typically, it receives a description of the collateral profile in natural language instead of the collateral agreement that has been signed between the parties. We propose a system that consists of a controlled natural language interface and a reasoning engine. The end client (typically the collateral giver) can enter their selection criteria in controlled natural language in the interface, that subsequently translates it to the IDP language for use in the IDP-system. The IDP language is a very expressive language, and if you know the language, its formulas can be read quite naturally. Although the language is easy to learn, companies don’t want to impose this overhead on their clients. Therefore we created a user interface on top of it that is both intuitive for users and can automatically translate controlled natural language to IDP sentences.

An IDP specification consists of three sections: a vocabulary $V$ which contains the ontology of the domain, a theory $T$ which contains formulas to describe the relation between different
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elements of the ontology, and a structure \( I_p \) which assigns an interpretation to some of the symbols in \( V \). We also say that the structure contains the partial interpretation of the vocabulary. When all the elements of the vocabulary have exactly one value, we say that it has a total interpretation. If the total interpretation satisfies all the formulas of \( T \), it is a valid model of the specification. A specification may have multiple valid models.

The KB can be flexibly used by different inference methods to find solutions for multiple related problems. For example, the inference task of model expansion can be used to decide on the eligibility of a specific asset for the collateral profile. Given a vocabulary \( V \), a theory \( T \) (that contains the rules of eligibility), and a partial interpretation \( I_p \) (that contains the characteristics of the asset), the model expansion inference calculates a total interpretation \( I_t \) that satisfies all of the conditions specified in \( T \). As a first application, we are interested in the values of the proposition Eligible(Asset), i.e.; we want to know if this asset is accepted as collateral. Consider the following highly simplified theory. If an asset has a triple A rating, it is an investment asset. If the asset is investment grade and is issued in Belgium, it is eligible:

\[
\forall \text{ Asset} \colon \text{ Rating(Asset) = AAA } \Rightarrow \text{ Investment(Asset)}. \\
\forall \text{ Asset} \colon \text{ InvestmentGrade(Asset) \& Country(Asset) = BE } \iff \text{ Eligible(Asset)}. 
\]

If the partial interpretation contains that \( \text{ Rating(Asset) = AAA} \), three examples of possible models are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ Rating(Asset) = AAA} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Rating(Asset) = AA} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Rating(Asset) = AAA} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ Investment(Asset) = true} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Investment(Asset) = true} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Investment(Asset) = true} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ Country(Asset) = BE} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Country(Asset) = BE} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Country(Asset) = FR} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ Eligible(Asset) = true} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Eligible(Asset) = true} )</td>
<td>( \text{ Eligible(Asset) = false} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we have a list of eligible assets, the optimize inference is used to optimize the combination of eligible assets that is exchanged as collateral. To this end we create an additional term \( t \) that calculates the associated cost to use assets as collateral. Given a vocabulary \( V \), a theory \( T \) (that contains the rules to effectively select collateral on top of the eligibility rules) and partial interpretation \( I_p \), the optimize inference will look for a total interpretation \( I_t \) that satisfies \( T \) and minimizes the value of the given term \( t \). This is, it will select the assets with the lowest associated cost.

Our system is well suited to provide additional services that are linked, but not core to collateral selection. They often start with the propagation inference that computes a set of facts that are consequences of \( T \) given \( I_p \), i.e.; that hold in all model expansion of \( T \) given \( I_p \). In other words, \( I_p \) contains not only the interpreted values from \( I_p \), but also values that are certainly implied by them. In the example above, where the partial interpretation contains \( \text{ Rating(Asset) = AAA} \), than the value \( \text{ Investment(Asset) = true} \) is propagated. This means that it will be true in every possible model. Nothing can be derived on the value of \( \text{ Eligible(Asset)} \). In the developed prototype, the propagation works interactively: as soon as one value is selected, or a new rule is created, the impact on the other atoms is immediately shown.

The explanation inference traces the implied values from \( I_p \) back to the given values of \( I_p \). With the propagation inference described above, the system calculates the impact of the choice of one specific atom on the value of other atoms, at least when the value of the other atom becomes certainly true or certainly false because of the partial interpretation. The explanation inference task allows the user to click on a propagated value and see immediately which atom was on the basis of a decision. It helps to explain unexpected propagated values, for example in case an asset is not eligible, where the client expected that it would be. In the running example, the explanation of \( \text{ Investment(Asset) = true} \), is that \( \text{ Rating(Asset) = AAA} \).

To smoothen the creation of the collateral profile, an automated comparison of the profiles of the collateral giver and collateral taker is helpful. With an existing model expansion inference the logical
equivalence of two theories can be checked by merging one theory with the negation of the other. If no model is found, the two theories are equivalent.

In short, the prototype that we have developed strongly reduces the operational risk linked to the translation of legal documents to a computer program. Moreover, it does not only select assets to assemble a collateral amount, it offers the opportunity to interactively manage the collateral process, from the negotiation of eligible assets between counterparties, over the optimisation of the haircut, to explaining unexpected results.
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