



**HAL**  
open science

## The logic of conditional beliefs: neighbourhood semantics and sequent calculus

Marianna Girlando, Sara Negri, Nicola Olivetti, Vincent Risch

### ► To cite this version:

Marianna Girlando, Sara Negri, Nicola Olivetti, Vincent Risch. The logic of conditional beliefs: neighbourhood semantics and sequent calculus. *Advances in Modal Logics 2016*, L. Beklemishev, S. Demri and A. Máté, Aug 2016, Budapest, Hungary. pp.322-341. hal-01794369

**HAL Id: hal-01794369**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01794369v1>**

Submitted on 17 May 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The Logic of Conditional Beliefs: Neighbourhood Semantics and Sequent Calculus

Marianna Girlando<sup>a</sup>, Sara Negri<sup>b</sup>, Nicola Olivetti<sup>a</sup>, Vincent Risch<sup>a</sup> <sup>1</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, ENSAM, Université de Toulon, LSIS UMR  
7296, Marseille, France

<sup>b</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of Helsinki, Finland

---

## Abstract

The logic of Conditional Beliefs has been introduced by Board, Baltag and Smets to reason about knowledge and revisable beliefs in a multi-agent setting. It is shown that the semantics of this logic, defined in terms of plausibility models, can be equivalently formulated in terms of neighbourhood models, a multi-agent generalisation of Lewis' spheres models. On the base of this new semantics, a labelled sequent calculus for this logic is developed. The calculus has strong proof-theoretic properties, in particular cut and contraction are admissible and that the calculus provides a direct decision procedure for this logic. Further, its semantic completeness is used to obtain a constructive proof of the finite model property of the logic.

*Keywords:* Epistemic logic, conditional logic, neighbourhood semantics, sequent calculus, decision procedure

---

## 1 Introduction

Modal epistemic logic has been studied for a long time in formal epistemology, computer science, and notably in artificial intelligence. In this logic, to each agent  $i$  is associated a knowledge modality  $K_i$ , so that the formula  $K_i A$  expresses that “the agent  $i$  knows  $A$ .” Through agent-indexed modal operators, epistemic logic can be used to reason about the mutual knowledge of a set of agents. The logic has been further extended by other modalities to encode various types of combined knowledge of agents (e.g. common knowledge). However, knowledge is not the only propositional attitude, and belief is equally significant to reason about epistemic interaction among agents. Board [5], and

---

<sup>1</sup> marianna.girlando@lsis.org,sara.negri@helsinki.fi,nicola.olivetti@univ-amu.fr,  
vincent.risch@univ-amu.fr

then Baltag and Smets [2], [3], [4] have proposed a logic called *CDL* (Conditional Doxastic Logic) for modelling both belief and knowledge in a multi-agent setting. The essential feature of beliefs is that they are *revisable* whenever the agent learns new information. To capture the revisable nature of beliefs, *CDL* contains the conditional belief operator  $Bel_i(C|B)$ , the meaning of which is that agent  $i$  believes  $C$  if she learnt  $B$ . Thus the conditional belief has a hypothetical meaning: if agent  $i$  learnt  $B$ , she would believe that  $C$  was true in the state of the world *before* the act of learning  $B$ . For this reason Baltag and Smets qualify this logic as “static” in contrast to “dynamic” epistemic logic, where the very act of learning (by some form of announcement) may change the agent’s beliefs. The logic *CDL* in itself is used as the basic formalism to study further dynamic extensions of epistemic logics, determined by several kinds of epistemic/doxastic actions. Notice that both unconditional beliefs and knowledge can be defined in *CDL*:  $Bel_i B$  (agent  $i$  believe  $B$ ) as  $Bel_i(B|\top)$ ,  $K_i B$  (agent  $i$  knows  $B$ ) as  $Bel(\perp|\neg B)$  the latter meaning that  $i$  considers impossible (inconsistent) to learn  $\neg B$ .

To exemplify the language, consider a variant of the three-wise-men puzzle, where agent  $a$  may initially believes that she has a white hat,  $Bel_a W_a$ . However, if  $a$  learns that agent  $b$  knows the colour of the hat  $b$  herself wears, she might change her beliefs and be convinced that she is wearing a black hat instead,  $Bel_a(B_a|K_b(W_b \wedge B_b))$ . The example shows that the conditional operator is non-monotonic in the sense that  $Bel_i(C|A)$  does not entail  $Bel_i(C|A \wedge B)$  (here  $A = \top$ ).

The axiomatization of the operator  $Bel_i$  in *CDL* internalises the well-known AGM postulates of belief revision (however, we cannot mention here the vast literature on the relation between belief revision, conditional logics, the Ramsey Test, and Gärdenfors Triviality Result).

The semantic interpretation of *CDL* is defined in terms of so-called epistemic plausibility models. In these models, each agent  $i$  is associated with an equivalence relation  $\sim_i$ , used to interpret knowledge, and a well-founded pre-order  $\preceq_i$  on worlds. The relation  $\preceq_i$  assesses the relative plausibility of worlds according to an agent  $i$  and it is used to interpret conditional beliefs:  $i$  believes  $B$  conditionally on  $A$  in a world  $x$  if  $B$  holds in *the most plausible worlds* accessible from  $x$  in which  $A$  holds, the “most plausible worlds” for an agent  $i$  being the  $\preceq_i$ -minimal ones. This semantic approach has been dominant in the studies of *CDL*; in addition to [5] and [3] we mention works by Pacuit [14], Van Ditmarsch et al. [15] and Demay [6].

In this paper, we first provide an alternative semantics based on neighbourhood models for *CDL*. These models are often used in the interpretation of non-normal modal logics. In the present setting they can be seen as a multi-agent generalization of Lewis’ spheres models for counterfactual logics. In these models to each world  $x$  and agent  $i$  is associated a set  $I_i(x)$  of nested sets of worlds; each set  $\alpha \in I_i(x)$  represents, so to say, a relevant piece of information that can be used to establish the truth of an epistemic/doxastic statement. The interpretation of the conditional belief operator  $Bel_i$  then coincides with Lewis’

semantics of the counterfactual operator. The equivalence between plausibility models and neighbourhood models does not come as totally unexpected: for the mono-agent case, it was suggested or stated without proof by Board [5], Pacuit [14], Marti et al [8], and it is based on an old result about the correspondence between partial orders and Alexandroff topologies [1]. We will detail the correspondence for the multi-agent case.

We believe that neighbourhood models provide by themselves a terse interpretation of the epistemic and doxastic modalities, abstracting away the relational information specified in plausibility models. Moreover, it is worth noticing that in these models the interpretation of unconditional beliefs and knowledge results in the standard universal/existential neighbourhood modalities.

Up to this moment, the logic *CDL* has been studied only from a semantic point of view, and no proof-system or calculus is known for it. Our main goal is to provide one. On the basis of neighbourhood semantics we develop a labelled sequent calculus called **G3CDL**. We follow the general methodology of [9] to develop labelled calculi for modal logics. Similarly to [11], the calculus **G3CDL** makes use of world and neighbourhood labels, thereby importing the semantics, limited to the essential, into the syntax. In **G3CDL**, each connective is handled by symmetric left/right rules, whereas the properties of neighbourhood models are handled by additional rules independent of the language of *CDL*. The resulting calculus is analytical and enjoys strong proof-theoretical properties, the most important being admissibility of cut and contraction that we prove syntactically. Through the adoption of a standard strategy, we show that the calculus **G3CDL** provides a decision procedure for *CDL*. We will also prove the semantic completeness of the calculus: it is possible to extract from a failed derivation a finite countermodel of the initial formula. This result combined with the soundness of the calculus yields a constructive proof of the finite model property of *CDL*<sup>2</sup>.

## 2 The logic of conditional beliefs: Axiomatization and semantics

The language of *CDL* is defined from a denumerable set of atoms *Atm* by means of propositional connectives and the conditional operator  $Bel_i$ , where  $i$  ranges in a set of agents  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the following,  $P$  denotes an atom and  $i$  an agent. The formulas of the language are generated according to the following definition:

$$A := P \mid \perp \mid \neg A \mid A \wedge A \mid A \vee A \mid A \supset A \mid Bel_i(A|A)$$

The conditional belief operator  $Bel_i(C|B)$  is read “agent  $i$  believes  $B$ , given  $C$ .” As mentioned in the introduction, we may define unconditional belief and the knowledge operator in terms of conditional belief as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Bel_i A &=_{def} Bel_i(A|\top) \text{ (belief)} \\ K_i A &=_{def} Bel_i(\perp|\neg A) \text{ (knowledge)} \end{aligned}$$

<sup>2</sup> Full proofs can be found in [http://www.helsinki.fi/~negri/conbel\\_aim116.pdf](http://www.helsinki.fi/~negri/conbel_aim116.pdf)

An axiomatization of *CDL* has been discussed in [5], [14], [3]. We present below Board's axiomatization, which is formulated using only the conditional belief operator. Equivalent axiomatizations that make also use of the belief operator and the knowledge operator have been given by Baltag and Smets [2], [4], [3], and Pacuit [14]. The axiomatization of *CDL* extends the classical propositional calculus by the following axioms and rules:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (1) If $\vdash B$ , then $\vdash Bel_i(B A)$                              | (6) $\neg Bel_i(\neg B A) \supset$                     |
| (2) If $\vdash A \supset B$ , then $\vdash Bel_i(C A) \supset Bel_i(C B)$ | $(Bel_i(C A \wedge B) \supset Bel_i(B \supset C A))$   |
| (3) $(Bel_i(B A) \wedge Bel_i(B \supset C A)) \supset Bel_i(C A)$         | (7) $Bel_i(B A) \supset Bel_i(Bel_i(B A) C)$           |
| (4) $Bel_i(A A)$  | (8) $\neg Bel_i(B A) \supset Bel_i(\neg Bel_i(B A) C)$ |
| (5) $Bel_i(B A) \supset (Bel_i(C A \wedge B) \supset Bel_i(C A))$         | (9) $A \supset \neg Bel_i(\perp A)$                    |

In terms of Belief Revision, the above axioms may be understood as a sort of epistemic and internalized version of the AGM postulates. Some quick remarks (refer to [5] for a deeper discussion): The distribution axiom (3) and the epistemization rule (2) express deductive closure of beliefs. The success axiom (4) ensures that the learned information is included in the set of beliefs. Axioms (5) and (6) encode the *minimal change principle*, a basic assumption of belief revision (see the correspondence with AGM postulates K\*7 and K\*8). Axiom (9) ensures that learning a true information cannot lead to inconsistent beliefs (it roughly corresponds to AGM K\*5). (7) and (8) are the axioms of positive and negative introspection for belief. Observe that from the above axioms, it is possible to derive the standard S5 characterization of knowledge:

$$K_i A \supset A \quad K_i A \supset K_i K_i A \quad \neg K_i A \supset K_i \neg K_i A$$

The semantics of *CDL* is defined in terms of *epistemic plausibility models* (*P*-models for short; they were originally called Belief Revision Structures by Board). These are Kripke structures that comprise both an equivalence relation for each agent over worlds for defining knowledge (as in standard epistemic models) and a plausibility relation for each agent, which is used to define beliefs. The intuition is that the beliefs of an agent are the propositions that hold in the worlds that the agent considers the most plausible ones.

A *pre-order*  $\preceq$  over a set  $W$  is a reflexive and transitive relation over  $W$ . Given  $S \subseteq W$ ,  $\preceq$  is *connected* over  $S$  if for all  $x, y \in S$  either  $x \preceq y$  or  $y \preceq x$ . An *infinite descending  $\preceq$ -chain* over  $W$  is a sequence of elements of  $W$   $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  such that for all  $n$ ,  $x_{n+1} \preceq x_n$  but  $x_n \not\preceq x_{n+1}$ . We say that  $\preceq$  is *well-founded* over  $W$  if there are no infinite descending  $\preceq$ -chains over  $W$ . Given  $S \subseteq W$ , let  $Min_{\preceq}(S) \equiv \{u \in S \mid \forall z \in S (z \preceq u \text{ implies } u \preceq z)\}$ . Observe that whenever  $\preceq$  is connected over  $S$  the definition  $Min_{\preceq}(S)$  can be simplified to  $Min_{\preceq}(S) = \{u \in S \mid \forall z \in S u \preceq z\}$ . Finally, the well-foundedness property can be equivalently stated as: for each  $S \subseteq W$  if  $S \neq \emptyset$  then  $Min_{\preceq}(S) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Definition 2.1** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of agents; an *epistemic plausibility model*  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{\sim_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \{\preceq_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket \rangle$  consists of a nonempty set  $W$  of elements called “worlds” or “states”; for each  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ , an equivalence relation  $\sim_i$  over  $W$  (with  $[x]_{\sim_i} \equiv \{w \mid w \sim_i x\}$ ); for each  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ , a well founded pre-order  $\preceq_i$  over  $W$ ; a valuation function  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : Atm \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W)$ . We assume  $\preceq_i$  to satisfy the following

properties:

- *Plausibility implies possibility*: If  $w \preceq_i v$  then  $w \sim_i v$
- *Local connectedness*: If  $w \sim_i v$  then  $w \preceq_i v$  or  $v \preceq_i w$  (in other words,  $\preceq_i$  is connected over every equivalence class of  $\sim_i$ ).

The truth conditions for formulas of the language are given by inductively extending the evaluation function  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$  as follows:

- For the Boolean case we have the standard clauses,  $\llbracket A \wedge B \rrbracket \equiv \llbracket A \rrbracket \cap \llbracket B \rrbracket$ ,  $\llbracket \neg A \rrbracket \equiv W - \llbracket A \rrbracket$ , etc.
- $\llbracket Bel_i(B|A) \rrbracket \equiv \{x \in W \mid Min_{\preceq_i}([x]_{\sim_i} \cap \llbracket A \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket B \rrbracket\}$ .

We say that a formula  $A$  is *valid* in a model  $\mathcal{M}$  if  $\llbracket A \rrbracket = W$  and that  $A$  is *valid in the class of epistemic plausibility models* if  $A$  is valid in every epistemic plausibility model.

**Notational convention:** We often write  $\mathcal{M}, x \Vdash A$  to mean  $x \in \llbracket A \rrbracket$ . The notation is further shortened to  $x \Vdash A$  whenever  $\mathcal{M}$  is unambiguous.

The axiomatization of *CDL* is sound and complete w.r.t. *EP*-models [5].

**Theorem 2.2 (Completeness of the axiomatization)** *A formula  $A$  is a theorem of CDL if and only if it is valid in the class of epistemic plausibility models.*

The following proposition, proved by unfolding the definitions, gives an equivalent formulation of the truth condition of the conditional operator  $Bel_i$  given in Definition 2.1. From now on, we shall use this formulation.

**Proposition 2.3** *Given any  $P$ -model  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{\sim_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \{\preceq_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket \rangle$ , with  $x \in W$  we have that  $\mathcal{M}, x \Vdash Bel_i(B|A)$  iff: either for all  $y$ ,  $y \sim_i x$  implies  $y \Vdash \neg A$  or there is  $y$  with  $y \sim_i x$  such that  $y \Vdash A$  and  $\forall z, z \preceq_i y$  implies  $z \Vdash A \supset B$ .*

We introduce an alternative semantics based on neighbourhood models (or *N*-models for short). As explained in the introduction, these are a multi-agent version of spheres models introduced by Lewis for counterfactual logic.

**Definition 2.4** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a set of agents; a *multi-agent neighbourhood model* has the form  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{I_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket \rangle$  where:

$W$  is a non empty set of elements called worlds; for each  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $I_i : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(W))$ ;  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket : Atm \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W)$  is the propositional evaluation.

For  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $x \in W$ ,  $I_i$  satisfies the following properties:

- *Non-emptiness*:  $\forall \alpha \in I_i(x), \alpha \neq \emptyset$
- *Nesting*:  $\forall \alpha, \beta \in I_i(x), \alpha \subseteq \beta$  or  $\beta \subseteq \alpha$
- *Total reflexivity*:<sup>3</sup>  $\exists \alpha \in I_i(x)$  such that  $x \in \alpha$
- *Local absoluteness*: If  $\alpha \in I_i(x)$  and  $y \in \alpha$  then  $I_i(x) = I_i(y)$
- *Closure under intersection*: If  $S \subseteq I_i(x)$  and  $S \neq \emptyset$  then  $\bigcap S \in S$ .

<sup>3</sup> Total reflexivity entails  $\forall x \in W, I_i(x) \neq \emptyset$ .

The truth conditions for Boolean combinations of formulas are the standard ones (like in  $P$ -models), for conditional belief we have:

$$x \in \llbracket Bel_i(B|A) \rrbracket \text{ iff } \forall \alpha \in I_i(x) \alpha \cap \llbracket A \rrbracket = \emptyset \text{ or } \exists \beta \in I_i(x) \text{ such that } \beta \cap \llbracket A \rrbracket \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \beta \subseteq \llbracket A \supset B \rrbracket$$

A formula  $A$  is *valid* in  $\mathcal{M}$  if  $\llbracket A \rrbracket = W$ . We say that  $A$  is *valid in the class of neighbourhood models* if  $A$  is valid in every neighbourhood  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Observe that closure under intersection always holds in finite models, because of non-emptiness and nesting. To simplify the notation, we use the local forcing relations introduced in [10]:

$$\alpha \Vdash A \text{ iff } (\forall y \in \alpha, y \Vdash A) \text{ and } \alpha \Vdash \exists A \text{ iff } (\exists y \in \alpha, y \Vdash A)$$

With this notation, the truth condition of conditional belief  $Bel_i$  becomes:  $x \Vdash Bel_i(B|A)$  iff  $(\forall \alpha \in I_i(x), \alpha \Vdash \neg A)$  or  $(\exists \beta \in I_i(x), \beta \Vdash \exists A$  and  $\beta \Vdash A \supset B)$

It is worth noticing that with the notation just introduced, the semantic definition of unconditional belief and knowledge operators can be stated as follows:

$$x \Vdash Bel_i B \text{ iff } \exists \beta \in I_i(x), \beta \Vdash B \text{ and } x \Vdash K_i B \text{ iff } \forall \beta \in I_i(x), \beta \Vdash B$$

The operators of unconditional belief and knowledge correspond to standard modalities in neighbourhood models.

We now show the equivalence between neighbourhood models and epistemic plausibility models. The proofs make use of the basic correspondence between partial orders and topologies recalled in Marti and Pinosio [8] and Pacuit [13] that dates back to Alexandroff [1]. However, the result must be adapted to the present setting of multi-agent epistemic and neighbourhood models.

**Theorem 2.5** *A formula  $A$  is valid in the class  $P$ -models if and only if it is valid in the class of multi-agent  $N$ -models.*

**Proof.** We first define the measure of *weight* of a  $CDL$  formula as follows:  $w(P) = w(\perp) = 1$ ;  $w(A \circ B) = w(A) + w(B) + 1$  for  $\circ = \{\wedge, \vee, \supset\}$ ;  $w(Bel_i(B|A)) = w(A) + w(B) + 3$  (cf. Definition 3.2).

[**only if**] Given a  $N$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_N$  we build an  $P$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_P$  and we show that for any formula  $A$ , if  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_P$  then  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_N$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}_N = \langle W, \{I\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, [ ] \rangle$  be a multi-agent  $N$ -model. We construct an  $P$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_P = \langle W, \{\sim_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \{\preceq_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, [ ] \rangle$ , by stipulating:

- $x \sim_i y$  iff  $\exists \alpha \in I_i(x), y \in \alpha$
- $x \preceq_i y$  iff  $\forall \alpha \in I_i(y)$ , if  $y \in \alpha$  then  $x \in \alpha$ .

We can easily show that  $\sim_i$  is an equivalence relation and that  $\preceq_i$  satisfies properties of reflexivity, transitivity, and plausibility implies possibility. Properties of local connectedness and well-foundedness for  $\preceq_i$  require some additional work. *Local connectedness*: suppose that  $x \sim_i y$  but neither  $x \preceq_i y$  nor  $y \preceq_i x$  hold. By definition of  $\preceq_i$  we have for some  $\beta \in I_i(y)$ ,  $y \in \beta$  and  $x \notin \beta$  and for some  $\gamma \in I_i(x)$ ,  $x \in \gamma$  and  $y \notin \gamma$ . Since  $x \sim_i y$ , by reflexivity  $\exists \alpha \in I_i(x), y \in \alpha$ , whence by local absoluteness  $I_i(y) = I_i(x)$ . Thus both  $\beta, \gamma \in I_i(x)$  and by

nesting  $\beta \subseteq \gamma$  or  $\gamma \subseteq \beta$  holds. If the former holds we get  $y \in \gamma$ , if the latter holds  $x \in \beta$ , in both cases we have a contradiction.

*Well-foundedness:* If  $\mathcal{M}_N$  is finite there is nothing to prove. Suppose then that  $\mathcal{M}_N$  is *infinite*. Suppose that there is an infinite descending chain:  $\{z_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  wrt.  $\preceq_i$ , with all  $z_k \in W$ , so that for all  $k$  it holds that  $z_{k+1} \preceq_i z_k$  and  $z_k \not\preceq_i z_{k+1}$ . Observe that by definition of  $\preceq_i$ , plausibility implies possibility and local absoluteness we obtain that for all  $k, h \geq 0$ , it holds  $I_i(z_k) = I_i(z_h) = \dots = I_i(z_0)$ . Thus by definition of  $\preceq_i$ , for all  $k \geq 0$  since  $z_k \not\preceq_i z_{k+1}$ , we get that for all  $z_k \in \{z_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  there exists  $\beta_{z_{k+1}} \in I_i(z_0)$  such that:  $(*) z_{k+1} \in \beta_{z_{k+1}}$  and  $z_k \notin \beta_{z_{k+1}}$ . Consider the set  $T = \{\beta_{z_{k+1}} \mid z_k \in \{z_k\}_{k \geq 0}\}$ .  $T$  is non-empty; thus by closure under intersection it follows that  $\bigcap T \in T$ , and also  $\bigcap T \neq \emptyset$ . Obviously, we have that  $(**)$  for all  $\beta \in T$ ,  $\bigcap T \subseteq \beta$ . Since  $\bigcap T \in T$  it must be  $\bigcap T = \beta_{z_{t+1}}$  for some  $z_t \in \{z_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ . But by using  $(*)$  *twice* (namely for  $z_{t+1}$  and for  $z_{t+2}$ ) we have  $z_{t+1} \in \beta_{z_{t+1}}$  and  $z_{t+1} \notin \beta_{z_{t+2}}$ , thus  $\bigcap T = \beta_{z_{t+1}} \not\subseteq \beta_{z_{t+2}}$  against  $(**)$ .

We now prove that for any  $x \in W$  and formula  $A$  it holds that (a)  $\mathcal{M}_N, x \Vdash A$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_P, x \Vdash A$ . We proceed by induction on the weight of  $A$ . The base case ( $A$  atomic) holds by definition, since  $\llbracket \_ \rrbracket$  is the same in the two models. For the inductive propositional cases,  $A = B \wedge C, B \vee C, B \supset C$ , statement (a) follows easily by inductive hypothesis. We consider only the case  $A = Bel_i(C|B)$ . To simplify notation we write  $u \Vdash_P B$  instead of  $\mathcal{M}_P, u \Vdash B$  and  $u \Vdash_N B$  instead of  $\mathcal{M}_N, u \Vdash B$ . Direction  $\Rightarrow$  of statement (a) easily follows from the definitions. As for the opposite direction, suppose that  $x \Vdash_P Bel_i(C|B)$  holds. This means that either  $\forall y y \sim_i x$  implies  $y \Vdash_P \neg B$  or there exists  $w$  such that  $w \sim_i x$  and  $w \Vdash_P B$  and  $\forall z, z \preceq_i w$  implies  $z \Vdash_P B \supset C$ .

There are two cases to consider. If the first disjunct holds, by definition and by inductive hypothesis statement (a) is met. We explicitly prove the case in which the second disjunct holds. Suppose that there exists  $w$  such that  $w \sim_i x$  and  $w \Vdash_P B$  and  $\forall z, z \preceq_i w$  implies  $z \Vdash_P B \supset C$ . From  $w \sim_i x$  (hypothesis) it follows by definition that  $\exists \alpha \in I(x), w \in \alpha$ . By local absoluteness,  $I(x) = I(w)$ . Now consider the set  $S = \{\beta \in I(x) \mid w \in \beta\}$ . It holds that  $\alpha \in S$ , and that  $S \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\gamma = \bigcap S$ . By closure under intersection,  $\gamma \in S \subseteq I_i(x)$ , thus  $\gamma \in I_i(x)$ . But  $w \in \gamma$  and since we have  $w \Vdash_P B$ , we also have  $w \Vdash_N B$  by inductive hypothesis. We have obtained that  $\gamma \Vdash^\exists B$ . We still have to prove that  $\gamma \Vdash^\forall B \supset C$ . Given  $u \in \gamma$ , we want to prove that  $u \Vdash_N B \supset C$ . We first show that  $u \preceq_i w$ . To this purpose (by definition of  $\preceq_i$ ), let  $\delta \in I(w)$  with  $w \in \delta$  we have to show that  $u \in \delta$ : since  $I(x) = I(w)$ , also  $\delta \in I(x)$ , whence,  $\delta \in S$ , so that  $\gamma \subseteq \delta$ , and therefore  $u \in \delta$ . Since  $u \preceq_i w$  by the hypothesis we have  $u \Vdash_P B \supset C$  and finally by induction hypothesis  $u \Vdash_N B \supset C$ .

Next, we show that if  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_P$  then  $A$  is also valid in  $\mathcal{M}_N$ . Suppose that  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_P$ , this means that for all  $w \in W$ , we have  $w \Vdash_P A$ , thus by (a) we have also  $w \Vdash_N A$  for all  $w \in W$ , which means that  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_N$ . Finally, let  $A$  be valid in the class of  $P$ -models. We want to show that  $A$  is also valid in the class of  $N$ -models. Given a  $N$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_N$ , we build an  $P$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_P$  as above. By hypothesis  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_P$  and for what we have



just shown  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_N$ .

[**If**] Given an  $P$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_P$  we build an  $N$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_N$  and we show that for any  $A$ , if  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_N$  then  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_P$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_P = \langle W, \{\sim_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \{\preceq_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \llbracket \rrbracket \rangle$  be an  $P$ -model. We build an  $N$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_N$  as follows. Let  $u \in W$ , and define its downward closed set  $\downarrow^{\preceq_i} u$  according to  $\preceq_i$  as  $\downarrow^{\preceq_i} u = \{v \in W \mid v \preceq_i u\}$ . We now define the model  $\mathcal{M}_N = \langle W, \{I_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \llbracket \rrbracket \rangle$ , where the neighbourhood for any  $x \in W$  is  $I_i(x) = \{\downarrow^{\preceq_i} u \mid u \sim_i x\}$ .

It can be easily proved that  $\mathcal{M}_N$  satisfies all the properties of an  $N$ -model; we show only the case of *closure under intersection*. In the finite case, this property immediately follows from properties of non-emptiness and nesting. Let us consider the infinite case. Let  $S \subseteq I_i(x)$ ,  $S \neq \emptyset$ , with  $S$  countable so that  $S = \{\alpha_h \mid h \geq 0\}$  where  $\alpha_h = \downarrow^{\preceq_i} x_h$  for  $x_h \sim_i x$ . We prove that (\*)  $\exists \alpha_h \in S$  such that  $\forall \alpha_k \in S, \alpha_h \subseteq \alpha_k$ . If (\*) holds then  $\alpha_h = \bigcap S$  and  $\alpha_h \in S$  and the proof is over. Suppose by contradiction that (\*) does not hold. This means that 1)  $\forall \alpha_h \in S \exists \alpha_k \in S, \alpha_h \not\subseteq \alpha_k$ . Thus, by the property of spheres nesting 2)  $\forall \alpha_h \in S \exists \alpha_k \in S, \alpha_k \subset \alpha_h$ . From 2), by denumerable dependent choice we build an infinite (strictly decreasing) chain of neighbourhoods  $\alpha_1 \supset \alpha_2 \supset \alpha_3 \supset \dots$ . For every  $n \geq 1$  we have by definition that  $\alpha_n = \downarrow^{\preceq_i} u_n$ . Let  $v_n \in \alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}$ ,  $v_{n+1} \in \alpha_{n+1} - \alpha_{n+2}$ , etc. We have  $v_{n+1} \preceq_i u_{n+1}$  by construction and it is enough to prove that  $u_{n+1} \preceq_i v_n$  to conclude by transitivity that  $v_{n+1} \preceq_i v_n$ . By construction, we have  $v_n \not\preceq_i u_{n+1}$  and therefore by local connectedness,  $u_{n+1} \preceq_i v_n$ . Moreover by  $v_n \not\preceq_i u_{n+1}$  it also follows that  $v_n \not\preceq_i v_{n+1}$ . We have thus an infinitely descending  $\preceq_i$ -chain of worlds  $\{v_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ , against the assumption of well-foundedness of  $W$ . We reached a contradiction from the negation of (\*); therefore, (\*) holds.

We now have to prove that for any  $x \in W$  and formula  $A$ , it holds that (b)  $\mathcal{M}_P, x \Vdash A$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_N, x \Vdash A$ . The proof strategy is the same as employed in the previous case; then, as above, we show that if  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_N$  then  $A$  is also valid in  $\mathcal{M}_P$ . Finally, let  $A$  be valid in the class of  $N$ -models. We want to show that  $A$  is also valid in the class of  $P$ -models. Given an  $P$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_P$ , we build an  $N$ -model  $\mathcal{M}_N$  as above. By hypothesis  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_N$  and by what we have just shown  $A$  is valid in  $\mathcal{M}_P$ . □

**Corollary 2.6** *A formula  $A$  is a theorem of CDL if and only if it is valid in the class of neighbourhood models.*

### 3 Sequent calculus

The labelled sequent calculus **G3CDL** displays two kinds of labels: labels for worlds  $x, y, \dots$  and labels for neighbourhoods  $a, b, \dots$ , as in the ground calculus for neighbourhood semantics introduced in [10].

The meaning of the expressions employed in the calculus is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a \Vdash^\exists A &\equiv \exists x(x \in a \wedge x \Vdash A); & a \Vdash^\forall A &\equiv \forall x(x \in a \supset x \Vdash A) \\ x \Vdash_i B \mid A &\equiv \exists c(c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^\exists A, c \Vdash^\forall A \supset B) \end{aligned}$$

$$x : Bel_i(B|A) \equiv \forall a \in I_i(x)(a \Vdash \neg A) \text{ or } \exists b \in I_i(x)(b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset B)$$

Here  $\Vdash$  denotes the forcing condition of relational semantics; to distinguish the semantic notion and its syntactic counterpart and for the sake of a more compact notation, we use a colon in the labelled calculus. The propositional rules of **G3CDL**, the basic labelled modal system, are as in [9] and the rules for the local forcing relation are as in [10].

---

**Initial sequents**

$$x : P, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : P$$

**Rules for local forcing**

$$\frac{x \in a, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : A}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \Vdash^{\forall} A} \text{R}\Vdash^{\forall} \text{ (x fresh)} \qquad \frac{x : A, x \in a, a \Vdash^{\forall} A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{x \in a, a \Vdash^{\forall} A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{L}\Vdash^{\forall}$$

$$\frac{x \in a, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : A, a \Vdash^{\exists} A}{x \in a, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \Vdash^{\exists} A} \text{R}\Vdash^{\exists} \qquad \frac{x \in a, x : A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{a \Vdash^{\exists} A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{L}\Vdash^{\exists} \text{ (x fresh)}$$

**Propositional rules: rules of G3K**
**Rules for conditional belief**

$$\frac{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : Bel_i(B|A)} \text{RB (a fresh)}$$

$$\frac{a \in I_i(x), x : Bel_i(B|A), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \quad x \Vdash_i B|A, a \in I_i(x), x : Bel_i(B|A), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{a \in I_i(x), x : Bel_i(B|A), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{LB}$$

$$\frac{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \quad a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A, a \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset B}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A} \text{RC}$$

$$\frac{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A, a \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset B, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{x \Vdash_i B|A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{LC (a fresh)}$$

**Rules for inclusion**

$$\frac{a \subseteq a, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{Ref} \qquad \frac{c \subseteq a, c \subseteq b, b \subseteq a, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{c \subseteq b, b \subseteq a, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{Tr}$$

$$\frac{x \in a, a \subseteq b, x \in b, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{x \in a, a \subseteq b, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{L}\subseteq$$

**Rules for semantic conditions**

$$\frac{a \subseteq b, a \in I_i(x), b \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad b \subseteq a, a \in I_i(x), b \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{a \in I_i(x), b \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{S}$$

$$\frac{x \in a, a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{T (a fresh)}$$

$$\frac{a \in I_i(x), y \in a, b \in I_i(x), b \in I_i(y), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{a \in I_i(x), y \in a, b \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{A}_1 \qquad \frac{a \in I_i(x), y \in a, a \in I_i(y), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{a \in I_i(x), y \in a, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{A}_2$$

---

Table 1

Each semantic condition on neighbourhood models (Definition 2.4) is in correspondence with a rule in the calculus. Rule (S) corresponds to property of nesting in Definition 2.4; (T) corresponds to total reflexivity, and (A<sub>1</sub>) and (A<sub>2</sub>) to local absoluteness<sup>4</sup>. As for non-emptiness, the property is expressed

---

<sup>4</sup> Rule (A<sub>2</sub>) is needed in order to ensure admissibility of contraction in the case in which  $b = a$ . Thus, the rule has a purely syntactical motivation, and it does not interfere with the

by the rules for local forcing. The property of closure under intersection needs not be expressed, because the property holds in finite models and we show that the logic has the *finite model property*.

**Example 3.1** We show a derivation of the left-to-right direction of axiom (6). We omit the derivable left premisses of rule  $(RC)$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  and of rule  $(LB)$  in the final derivation.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{D} : \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{y : A \cdots \Rightarrow \dots y : A \quad y : B \cdots \Rightarrow \dots y : B}{y : A, y : B, y \in b, c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \in I_i(x) \cdots \Rightarrow \dots y : A \wedge B} R\wedge}{y : A, y : B, y \in b, c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \in I_i(x) \cdots \Rightarrow \dots b \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B} R\Vdash^{\exists}}{\frac{y \in b, c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \in I_i(x) \cdots \Rightarrow \dots b \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, y : A \supset \neg B}{c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \in I_i(x) \cdots \Rightarrow \dots b \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset \neg B} R\supset, R\rightarrow}}{\frac{c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \in I_i(x) \cdots \Rightarrow \dots b \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset \neg B}{c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \in I_i(x) \cdots \Rightarrow \dots b \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, x \Vdash_i \neg B | A} RC} RB} \\
\frac{b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset C, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B \cdots \Rightarrow \dots x : Bel_i(\neg B | A), b \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B}{\dots} \\
\mathcal{E} : \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{z : A \cdots \Rightarrow \dots z : A \quad z : c \cdots \Rightarrow \dots z : C}{z : A \supset C, z : A, z : B, z \in b, b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset C, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, \dots \Rightarrow \dots z : C} L\supset}{z : A, z : B, z \in b, b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset C, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B \cdots \Rightarrow \dots z : C} R\supset, L\wedge}{z \in b, b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset C, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B \cdots \Rightarrow \dots z : (A \wedge B) \supset C} R\supset, L\wedge}}{\frac{z \in b, b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset C, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B \cdots \Rightarrow \dots z : (A \wedge B) \supset C}{b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset C, a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B \cdots \Rightarrow \dots b \Vdash^{\forall} (A \wedge B) \supset C} R\supset, L\wedge}} \\
\frac{\dots}{\dots} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset C, a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, x : Bel_i(C | A) \Rightarrow x : Bel_i(\neg B | A), x \Vdash_i C | A \wedge B}{x \Vdash_i C | A, a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, x : Bel_i(C | A) \Rightarrow x : Bel_i(\neg B | A), x \Vdash_i C | A \wedge B} RC}{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A \wedge B, x : Bel_i(C | A) \Rightarrow x : Bel_i(\neg B | A), x \Vdash_i C | A \wedge B} LB} \\
\frac{x : Bel_i(C | A) \Rightarrow x : Bel_i(\neg B | A), x : Bel_i(C | A \wedge B)}{x : \neg(Bel_i(\neg B | A)), x : Bel_i(C | A) \Rightarrow x : Bel_i(C | A \wedge B)} L\rightarrow} \\
\end{array}$$

### Rules for knowledge and simple belief

The modal operators of knowledge and simple belief can be defined semantically in terms of the conditional belief operator:  $K_i A = Bel_i(\perp | \neg A)$  and  $Bel_i A = Bel_i(A | \top)$ . By adopting these definitions, we can extend **G3CDL** with the rules displayed below that correspond to the interpretation of these two operations in the neighbourhood semantics.

---

Rules for knowledge and simple belief	
$\frac{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \Vdash^{\forall} A}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : K_i A} LK \text{ (a new)}$	$\frac{a \in I_i(x), x : K_i A, a \Vdash^{\forall} A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{a \in I_i(x), x : K_i A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} RK$
$\frac{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : Bel_i A, a \Vdash^{\forall} A}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : Bel_i A} LSB$	$\frac{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\forall} A \Rightarrow \Delta}{x : Bel_i A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} RSB \text{ (a new)}$

---

Table 2

semantics. For this reason, in the following we shall consider only rule  $(A_1)$ .

These rules are *admissible* in **G3CDL**, i.e., whenever the premiss is derivable, also the conclusion is. This is shown through a derivation that uses rules of **G3CDL** and other rules (such as weakening and cut) shown admissible later. We show just admissibility of (*LK*), the other rules being obtained in a similar way. In the following derivation, we omit writing the left premiss of (*RC*),  $a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} \neg A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i \perp | \neg A, a \Vdash^{\exists} \neg A$  that is derivable.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \Vdash^{\forall} A}{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} \neg A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i \perp | \neg A, a \Vdash^{\forall} A} \text{WK}}{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} \neg A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i \perp | \neg A} \text{RC}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : Bel_i(\perp | \neg A)} \text{RB}}$$

### Structural properties

We define the weight of a labelled formula (cf the Appendix):

**Definition 3.2** The label of formulas of the form  $x : A$  is  $x$ . The label of formulas of the form  $a \Vdash^{\forall} A$  and  $a \Vdash^{\exists} A$  is  $a$ . The label of a formula  $\mathcal{F}$  will be denoted by  $l(\mathcal{F})$ . The pure part of a labelled formula  $\mathcal{F}$  is the part without the label and without the forcing relation, either local ( $\Vdash^{\exists}, \Vdash^{\forall}$ ) or worldwide ( $\cdot$ ) and will be denoted by  $p(\mathcal{F})$ .

The *weight of a labelled formula*  $\mathcal{F}$  is given by the pair  $(\mathfrak{w}(p(\mathcal{F})), \mathfrak{w}(l(\mathcal{F})))$  where

- For all world labels  $x$  and all neighbourhood labels  $a$ ,  $\mathfrak{w}(x) = 0$  and  $\mathfrak{w}(a) = 1$ .
- $\mathfrak{w}(P) = \mathfrak{w}(\perp) = 1$ ;  $\mathfrak{w}(A \circ B) = \mathfrak{w}(A) + \mathfrak{w}(B) + 1$  for  $\circ$  conjunction, disjunction, or implication;  $\mathfrak{w}(B|A) = \mathfrak{w}(A) + \mathfrak{w}(B) + 2$ ;  $\mathfrak{w}(Bel_i(B|A)) = \mathfrak{w}(B|A) + 1$ .

Weights of labelled formulas are ordered lexicographically.

From the definition of weight it is clear that the weight gets decreased if we move from a formula labelled by a neighbourhood label to the same formula labelled by a world label, or if we move (regardless the label) to a formula with a pure part of strictly smaller weight. The following lemma is proved by induction on formula weights:

**Lemma 3.3** *Sequents of the following form are derivable in **G3CDL** for arbitrary neighbourhoods labels  $a, b$  and formulas  $A$  and  $B$ :*

- (i)  $a \subseteq b, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \subseteq b$  (ii)  $a \Vdash^{\forall} A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \Vdash^{\forall} A$  (iii)  $a \Vdash^{\exists} A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, a \Vdash^{\exists} A$   
 (iv)  $x \Vdash_i B|A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A$  (v)  $x : A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : A$

The definition of substitution of labels given in [9] can be extended in an obvious way – that need not be pedantically detailed here – to all the formulas of our language and to neighbourhood labels. We will have, for example,  $(a \Vdash^{\exists} A)(b/a) \equiv b \Vdash^{\exists} A$ , and  $(x \Vdash_i B|A)(y/x) \equiv y \Vdash_i B|A$ .

We denote by  $\vdash_n \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  a derivation whose endsequent is  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  and which has height  $n$ , where the height of a derivation is the number of nodes occurring in the longest derivation path. The calculus is routinely shown to enjoy the

property of height preserving (hp for short) substitution both of world and neighbourhood labels:

**Proposition 3.4** (i) *If  $\vdash_n \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ , then  $\vdash_n \Gamma(y/x) \Rightarrow \Delta(y/x)$ ;*  
(ii) *If  $\vdash_n \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ , then  $\vdash_n \Gamma(b/a) \Rightarrow \Delta(b/a)$ .*

Hp-admissibility of weakening and contraction are obtained by an easy induction on derivation height:

**Proposition 3.5** *The rules of left and right weakening are hp-admissible in G3CDL.*

**Theorem 3.6** *All the rules of G3CDL are hp-invertible, i.e. for every rule of the form  $\frac{\Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$ , if  $\vdash_n \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  then  $\vdash_n \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'$ , and for every rule of the form  $\frac{\Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta' \quad \Gamma'' \Rightarrow \Delta''}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}$  if  $\vdash_n \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  then  $\vdash_n \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'$  and  $\vdash_n \Gamma'' \Rightarrow \Delta''$ .*

The rules of contraction of G3CDL have the following form, where  $\mathcal{F}$  is either a “relational” atom of the form  $a \in I(x)$  or  $x \in a$  or a labelled formula of the form  $x \Vdash_i A$ ,  $a \Vdash^\forall A$ ,  $a \Vdash^\exists A$  or a formula of the form  $x \Vdash_i B|A$  or  $x : Bel_i(B|A)$ :

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\mathcal{F}, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} LCtr \qquad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \mathcal{F}} RCtr$$

**Theorem 3.7** *The rules of left and right contraction are hp-admissible in G3CDL.*

**Theorem 3.8** *Cut is admissible in G3CDL.*

**Proof.** By double induction, with primary induction on the weight of the cut formula and subinduction on the sum of the heights of derivations of the premisses of cut. The cases in which the premisses of cut are either initial sequents or obtained through the rules for  $\&$ ,  $\vee$ , or  $\supset$  follow the treatment of Theorem 11.9 of [12]. For the cases in which the cut formula is a side formula in at least one rule used to derive the premisses of cut, the cut reduction is dealt with in the usual way by permutation of cut, with possibly an application of hp-substitution to avoid a clash with the fresh variable in rules with variable condition. In all such cases the cut height is reduced.

For space limitations, we treat only the cases in which the cut formula is principal in both premisses and has the form  $x \Vdash_i B|A$ ,  $x : Bel_i(B|A)$ .

1. The cut formula is  $x \Vdash_i B|A$ , principal in both premisses of cut

$$\frac{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A, a \Vdash^\exists A \quad a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A, a \Vdash^\forall A \supset B}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A} RC$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{D} \quad b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^\exists A, b \Vdash^\forall A \supset B, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{x \Vdash_i B|A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'} LC$$

The conclusion of the cut is the sequent  $a \in I_i(x), \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'$ . The deriva-

tion is converted into the following:

$$\frac{\frac{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A, a \Vdash^\exists A \quad x \Vdash_i B|A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta', a \Vdash^\exists A} \text{Cut}_1 \quad (1)}{\frac{a \in I_i(x)^3, \Gamma^2, \Gamma'^3 \Rightarrow \Delta^2, \Delta'^3}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'} \text{Ctr}^*} \text{Cut}_4$$

Here (1) is the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A, a \Vdash^\forall A \supset B \quad x \Vdash_i B|A, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta', a \Vdash^\forall A \supset B} \text{Cut}_2 \quad \frac{\mathcal{D}(a/b)}{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^\exists A, a \Vdash^\forall A \supset B, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'} \text{Cut}_3}{a \in I_i(x)^2, a \Vdash^\exists A, \Gamma, \Gamma'^2 \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'^2} \text{Cut}_3$$

Observe that all four cuts are of reduced height ( $\text{Cut}_1$  and  $\text{Cut}_2$ ) or reduced weight ( $\text{Cut}_3$  and  $\text{Cut}_4$ ) because  $\mathfrak{w}(a \Vdash^\exists A) < \mathfrak{w}(a \Vdash^\forall A \supset B) < \mathfrak{w}(x \Vdash_i B|A)$ .

2. The cut formula is  $x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A)$ , principal in both premisses of cut

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{D}}{b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^\exists A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A} \text{RB}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A)} \text{RB}}{\frac{a \in I_i(x), x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A), \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta', a \Vdash^\exists A \quad a \in I_i(x), x \Vdash_i B|A, x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A), \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{a \in I_i(x), x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A), \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'} \text{LB}}$$

The conclusion is the sequent  $a \in I_i(x), \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'$ . The cut is converted to four smaller cuts as follows:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A) \quad a \in I_i(x), x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A), \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta', a \Vdash^\exists A}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta', a \Vdash^\exists A} \text{Cut}_2 \quad (2)}{\frac{a \in I_i(x)^3, \Gamma^3, \Gamma'^2 \Rightarrow \Delta^3, \Delta'^2}{a \in I_i(x), \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'} \text{Ctr}^*} \text{Cut}_4$$

Here (2) is the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{\mathcal{D}(a/b)}{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^\exists A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x \Vdash_i B|A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A) \quad a \in I_i(x), x \Vdash_i B|A, x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A), \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta'}{a \in I_i(x), x \Vdash_i B|A, \Gamma, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta, \Delta'} \text{Cut}_1}{a \in I_i(x)^2, a \Vdash^\exists A, \Gamma^2, \Gamma' \Rightarrow \Delta^2, \Delta'} \text{Cut}_3$$

$\text{Cut}_1$  and  $\text{Cut}_2$  have reduced height and the other cuts are on formulas of reduced weight because  $\mathfrak{w}(a \Vdash^\exists A) < \mathfrak{w}(x \Vdash_i B|A) < \mathfrak{w}(x : \text{Bel}_i(B|A))$ .  $\square$

## 4 Soundness, termination, and completeness

We first show the soundness of the calculus. We need to interpret labelled sequents in neighbourhood models, and to this purpose we define the notion of realization.

**Definition 4.1** Let  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{I\}_{i \in \mathcal{A}}, \llbracket \rrbracket \rangle$  be a neighbourhood model,  $S$  a set of world labels, and  $N$  a set of neighbourhood labels. An  $SN$ -realization over  $\mathcal{M}$  consists of a pair of functions  $(\rho, \sigma)$  such that

- $\rho : S \rightarrow W$  is a function that assigns to each  $x \in S$  an element  $\rho(x) = w \in W$ ;

- $\sigma : N \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W)$ , i.e. a function that assigns to each  $a \in N$  an element  $\sigma(a) \in I(w)$ , for some  $w \in W$ .

Given a sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ , with  $S, N$  as above, and  $(\rho, \sigma)$  an  $SN$ -realization, we say that  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is satisfiable in  $\mathcal{M}$  under the  $SN$ -realization  $(\rho, \sigma)$  if the following conditions hold:

- $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} a \in I_i(x)$  if  $\sigma(a) \in I_i(\rho(x))$  and  $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} a \subseteq b$  if  $\sigma(a) \subseteq \sigma(b)$ ;
- $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} x : A$  if  $\rho(x) \Vdash A$ ;
- $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} a \Vdash^{\exists} A$  if  $\sigma(a) \Vdash^{\exists} A$  and  $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} a \Vdash^{\forall} A$  if  $\sigma(a) \Vdash^{\forall} A$ ;
- $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} x \Vdash_i B|A$  if for some  $c \in I_i(\rho(x))$ ,  $c \Vdash^{\exists} A$  and  $c \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset B$ ;
- $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} x \Vdash_i Bel_i(B|A)$  if for all  $a \in I_i(\rho(x))$ ,  $a \Vdash^{\forall} A$  or  $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} x \Vdash_i B|A$ ;
- $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  if either  $\mathcal{M} \not\models_{\rho, \sigma} F$  for some formula  $F \in \Gamma$  or  $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} G$  for some formula  $G \in \Delta$ .

Then, define  $\mathcal{M} \models \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models_{\rho, \sigma} \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  for every  $SN$ -realization  $(\rho, \sigma)$ . A sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is said to be *valid* if  $\mathcal{M} \models \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  holds for every neighbourhood model  $\mathcal{M}$ , i.e. if  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is satisfied for every model  $\mathcal{M}$  and for every  $SN$ -realization  $(\rho, \sigma)$ .

**Theorem 4.2 (Soundness)** *If a sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is derivable in the calculus, then it is valid in the class of multi-agent neighbourhood models.*

We now show that, by adopting a suitable proof search strategy, the calculus yields a decision procedure for  $CDL$ . We also prove the completeness of the calculus under the same strategy. The adoption of the strategy is not strictly necessary for completeness, but it ensures that we can extract a finite-countermodel from an open or failed derivation branch. Although the termination proof has some similarity with the one in [11], for **G3CDL** it is more difficult because of specific semantic rules, in particular local absoluteness.

As often happens with *labelled* calculi, the calculus **G3CDL** in itself is non-terminating in the sense that a root-first (i.e. upwards) construction of a derivation may generate infinite branches. Here below is an example (we omit writing the derivable left premisses of  $LB$ ):

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \vdots \\
 \frac{c \in I_i(x), c \Vdash^{\exists} A, c \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset B \dots x : Bel_i(B|A) \Rightarrow x \Vdash_i C|A}{x \Vdash_i B|A, b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset B, a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A, x : Bel_i(B|A) \Rightarrow x \Vdash_i C|A} \quad LC \\
 \frac{b \in I_i(x), b \Vdash^{\exists} A, b \Vdash^{\forall} A \supset B, a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A, x : Bel_i(B|A) \Rightarrow x \Vdash_i C|A}{x \Vdash_i B|A, a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A, x : Bel_i(B|A) \Rightarrow x \Vdash_i C|A} \quad LB \\
 \frac{a \in I_i(x), a \Vdash^{\exists} A, x : Bel_i(B|A) \Rightarrow x \Vdash_i C|A}{x : Bel_i(B|A) \Rightarrow x : Bel_i(C|A)} \quad RB
 \end{array}$$

The loop is generated by the application of rules  $(LB)$  and  $(LC)$ . Our aim is to specify a strategy which ensures termination by preventing any kind of loop. The main point is to avoid redundant (backwards) applications of rules. To precisely define this notion we need saturation conditions associated to each rule.

**Definition 4.3** Given a derivation branch  $\mathcal{B}$  of the form  $\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Delta_0, \dots, \Gamma_k \Rightarrow \Delta_k, \Gamma_{k+1} \Rightarrow \Delta_{k+1}, \dots$  where  $\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Delta_0$  is the sequent  $\Rightarrow x_0 : A$ , let  $\downarrow \Gamma_k / \downarrow \Delta_k$

denote the union of the antecedents/succedents occurring in the branch from the root  $\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Delta_0$  up to  $\Gamma_k \Rightarrow \Delta_k$ .

We say that a sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  *satisfies the saturation condition for a rule*  $(R)$  if, whenever  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  contains the principal formulas in the denominator of  $(R)$ , then it also contains the formulas introduced by *one* of the premisses of  $(R)$ . We report the specific conditions for each rule.

For rule  $(L\wedge)$ , if  $x : A \wedge B \in \Gamma$ , then  $x : A \in \downarrow \Gamma$  and  $x : B \in \downarrow \Gamma$ . The other propositional conditions are similar, and can be found in [11]. Conditions for the other rules are the following: (Rf) if  $a$  is in  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Delta$  then  $a \subseteq a$  is in  $\Gamma$ ; (Tr) if  $a \subseteq b$  and  $b \subseteq c$  are in  $\Gamma$ , then  $a \subseteq c$  is in  $\Gamma$ ;  $(L\subseteq)$  if  $x \in a$  and  $a \subseteq b$  are in  $\Gamma$ , then  $x \in b$  is in  $\Gamma$ ;  $(R\Vdash^\forall)$  if  $a \Vdash^\forall A$  is in  $\downarrow \Delta$ , then for some  $x$  there is  $x \in a$  in  $\Gamma$  and  $x : A$  in  $\downarrow \Delta$ ;  $(L\Vdash^\forall)$  if  $x \in a$  and  $a \Vdash^\forall A$  are in  $\Gamma$ , then  $x : A$  is in  $\Gamma$ ;  $(R\Vdash^\exists)$  if  $x \in a$  is in  $\Gamma$  and  $a \Vdash^\exists A$  is in  $\Delta$ , then  $x : A$  is in  $\downarrow \Delta$ ;  $(L\Vdash^\exists)$  if  $a \Vdash^\exists A$  is in  $\downarrow \Gamma$ , then for some  $x$  there is  $x \in a$  in  $\Gamma$  and  $x : A$  is in  $\downarrow \Gamma$ ; (RB) if  $x : Bel_i(B|A)$  is in  $\downarrow \Delta$ , then for some  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  and for some  $a$ ,  $a \in I_i(x)$  is in  $\Gamma$ ,  $a \Vdash^\exists A$  is in  $\downarrow \Gamma$  and  $x \Vdash_i B|A$  is in  $\downarrow \Delta$ ; (LB) if  $a \in I_i(x)$  and  $x : Bel_i(B|A)$  are in  $\Gamma$ , then either  $a \Vdash^\exists A$  is in  $\downarrow \Delta$  or  $x \Vdash_i B|A$  is in  $\downarrow \Gamma$ ; (RC) if  $a \in I_i(x)$  is in  $\Gamma$  and  $x \Vdash_i B|A$  is in  $\Delta$ , then either  $a \Vdash^\exists A$  or  $a \Vdash^\forall A \supset B$  are in  $\downarrow \Delta$ ; (LC) if  $x \Vdash_i B|A$  is in  $\downarrow \Gamma$ , then for some  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  and for some  $a$ ,  $a \in I_i(x)$  is in  $\Gamma$ ,  $a \Vdash^\exists A$  and  $a \Vdash^\forall A \supset B$  are in  $\downarrow \Gamma$ ; (T) for all  $x$  occurring in  $\downarrow \Gamma \cup \downarrow \Delta$ , for all  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  there is an  $a$  such that  $a \in I_i(x)$  and  $x \in a$  are in  $\Gamma$ ; (S) If  $a \in I_i(x)$  and  $b \in I_i(x)$  are in  $\Gamma$ , then  $a \subseteq b$  or  $b \subseteq a$  are in  $\Gamma$ ; (A) If  $a \in I_i(x)$  and  $y \in a$  are in  $\Gamma$ , then if  $b \in I_i(x)$  is in  $\Gamma$  also  $b \in I_i(y)$  is in  $\Gamma$ ; If  $b \in I_i(y)$  is in  $\Gamma$  also  $b \in I_i(x)$  is in  $\Gamma$ .

Furthermore,  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is *saturated* if

(Init) There is no  $x : P$  in  $\Gamma \cap \Delta$ ;

$(L\perp)$  there is no  $x : \perp$  in  $\Gamma$ ;

$\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  satisfies *all* saturation conditions (listed in the Appendix).

To analyse the interdependencies between labels in a sequent we introduce the following:

**Definition 4.4** Given a branch  $\mathcal{B}$  as in Definition 4.3, let  $a$  be neighbourhood label and  $x, y$  be world labels all occurring in  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$ , we define:

- $k(x) = \min\{t \mid x \text{ occurs in } \Gamma_t\}$ ; we similarly define  $k(a)$ .
- $x \rightarrow_g a$  (read “ $x$  generates  $a$ ”) if for some  $t \leq k$  and  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $k(a) = t$  and  $a \in I_i(x)$  occurs in  $\Gamma_t$ .
- $a \rightarrow_g x$  (read “ $a$  generates  $x$ ”) if for some  $t \leq k$  and  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $k(x) = t$  and  $x \in a$  occurs in  $\Gamma_t$ .
- $x \xrightarrow{w} y$  (read “ $x$  generates  $y$ ”) if for some  $a$  it holds that  $x \rightarrow_g a$  and  $a \rightarrow_g y$ .

**Lemma 4.5** *Given a branch  $\mathcal{B}$  as in Definition 4.3, we have that (a) the relation  $\xrightarrow{w}$  is acyclic and forms a tree with root  $x_0$  and (b) all world labels occurring in  $\mathcal{B}$  are nodes of the tree, that is letting  $\xrightarrow{w^*}$  be the transitive closure of  $\xrightarrow{w}$ , if  $u$  occurs in  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$ , then  $x_0 \xrightarrow{w^*} u$ .*



**Proof.** (a) immediately follows from the definition of relation  $\rightarrow_g$  and from the sequent calculus rules, (b) easily proven by induction on  $k(u) \leq k$ .  $\square$

We can now define the proof-search strategy. A rule ( $R$ ) is said to be *applicable* to a world label  $x$  if  $R$  is applicable to a labelled formula with label  $x$  occurring in the denominator of a rule. In case of rule ( $A$ ) of local absoluteness, we say the rule is applied to  $x$  (rather than to  $y$ ).

**Definition 4.6** When constructing root-first a derivation tree for a sequent  $\Rightarrow x_0 : A$ , apply the following strategy:

- (i) No rule can be applied to an initial sequent;
- (ii) If  $k(x) < k(y)$  all rules applicable to  $x$  are applied before any rule applicable to  $y$ .
- (iii) Rule ( $T$ ) is applied as the first one to each world label  $x$ .
- (iv) Rules which do not introduce a new label (static rules) are applied *before* the rules which do introduce new labels (dynamic rules), with the exception of ( $T$ ), as in the previous item;
- (v) Rule ( $RB$ ) is applied *before* rule ( $LC$ );
- (vi) A rule ( $R$ ) cannot be applied to a sequent  $\Gamma_i \Rightarrow \Delta_i$  if  $\downarrow \Gamma_i$  and / or  $\downarrow \Delta_i$  satisfy the saturation condition associated to ( $R$ ).

It follows from the strategy that if  $x \xrightarrow{w} y$ , if every rule applicable to  $x$  is applied before any every rule applicable to  $y$ . In the example above, the loop would have been stopped at the second application (root-first) of ( $LB$ ), because the application of ( $LB$ ) would violate condition (vi): the branch already satisfies the saturation condition for ( $LB$ ), because  $x \Vdash_i B|A$  is already in  $\downarrow \Gamma$ .

As an easy consequence of conditions (ii) and (iv) of the strategy, we have:

**Lemma 4.7** *Let us consider a branch  $\mathcal{B}$  as in Definition 4.3 and two labels  $x, y$  such that  $x \xrightarrow{w^*} y$ . Then for all  $b$ , if  $b \in I_i(x) \in \Gamma_k$  then also  $b \in I_i(y) \in \Gamma_k$ .*

As usual, the size of a formula  $A$ , denoted by  $|A|$ , is the number of symbols occurring in  $A$ . The size of a sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is the sum of all the sizes of the formulas occurring in it.

**Lemma 4.8** *Given a branch  $\mathcal{B}$  as in Definition 4.3 and a world label  $x$ , we define  $N(x) = \{a \mid x \rightarrow_g a\}$  as the set of neighbourhood labels generated by  $x$ , and  $W(x) = \{y \mid x \xrightarrow{w} y\}$  as the set of world labels generated by  $x$ . The size of  $N(x)$  and  $W(x)$  is finite, more precisely:  $|N(x)| = O(n)$  and  $|W(x)| = O(n^2)$ .*

**Proof.** We first prove that  $|N(x)| = O(n)$ . By definition,  $a \in N(x)$  iff  $x \rightarrow_g a$ , i.e. if there exists  $t$  and there exists  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $a$  does not occur in  $\Gamma_s$  for all  $s \leq t$  and  $a \in I_i(x)$  belongs to  $\Gamma_t$ . This means that label  $a$  has been introduced either by ( $RB$ ) or by ( $LC$ ). Therefore  $x$  may create as many neighbourhood labels  $a$  as there are formulas  $x : Bel_i(B|C)$  occur in  $\downarrow \Gamma_k \cup \downarrow \Delta_k$  (plus 1 neighbourhood introduced by ( $T$ ) total reflexivity) and the number of these formulas is  $O(n)$ .

We now prove  $|W(x)| = O(n^2)$ . By definition  $y \in W(x)$  iff  $x \xrightarrow{w} y$ , i.e. iff for some  $b$  it holds that  $x \rightarrow_g b$  and  $b \rightarrow_g y$ . We have just shown that for each

$x$ , the number of neighbourhood labels generated by  $x$  is  $O(n)$ . Let us consider  $b \rightarrow_g y$ . By definition, this means that there exists  $t < k$ , and there exists an  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ , such that  $y$  does not occur in  $\Gamma_s$  for  $s \leq t$  and  $y \in b$  occurs in  $\Gamma_{t+1}$ . There are several ways in which a formula  $y \in b$  can be introduced:

*Case 1.*  $y \in b$  is introduced by a formula  $b \Vdash^\exists C$  belonging to  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$  by application of rule  $(L \Vdash^\exists)$ . There are two subcases, according to how formula  $b \Vdash^\exists C$  has been derived: (a)  $b \Vdash^\exists C$  has been introduced by  $(RB)$  applied to a formula  $x : Bel_i(D|C)$  belonging to  $\downarrow \Delta_k$  and (b)  $b \Vdash^\exists C$  has been introduced by  $(LC)$  applied to a formula  $x \Vdash_i (D|C)$  belonging to  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$ . In turn, this formula has been introduced by  $(LB)$  applied to a formula  $x : Bel_i(D|C)$  belonging to  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$ . In case (a), we notice again that  $(RB)$  can be applied only *once* to each formula  $x : Bel_i(D|C)$  occurring in the consequent, and it generates exactly *one* new neighbourhood label  $b$  and one formula  $b \Vdash^\exists C$ . Similarly in case (b)  $(LC)$  can be applied only *once* to  $x \Vdash_i D|C$  generating *one* new neighbourhood label  $b$  and *one* formula  $b \Vdash^\exists C$ . But each formula  $x \Vdash_i D|C$  in turn is introduced by  $(LB)$  applied only *once* to one formula  $x : Bel_i(D|C)$  occurring in  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$ . Now each rule  $(L \Vdash^\exists)$  generates exactly *one* new world label for each  $b \Vdash^\exists C$  occurring in  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$  and, as we have just shown the number of such formulas is bounded by the number of formulas of type  $x : Bel_i(D|C)$  occurring in  $\downarrow \Gamma_k$  which is  $O(n)$ . Therefore we can conclude that the number of new world labels introduced in this case is  $O(n)$ .

*Case 2.*  $y \in b$  is introduced by a formula  $b \Vdash^\forall C$  belonging to  $\downarrow \Delta_k$  by application of rule  $(R \Vdash^\forall)$ . But a formula  $b \Vdash^\forall C$  may be introduced only by an application of  $(RC)$  to a formula  $u \Vdash_i F|E$ , where  $C = E \supset F \in \downarrow \Delta_k$ . In turn, a formula of type  $u \Vdash_i F|E$  may be introduced only by an application of  $(RB)$ . Let us consider the set  $S_b$  of formulas  $C$  such that  $S_b = \{C \parallel b \Vdash^\forall C$  belongs to  $\downarrow \Delta_k\}$ . It holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} S_b &= \{C \mid b \Vdash^\forall C \text{ belongs to } \downarrow \Delta_k\} \\ &= \{E \supset F \mid \exists u \exists i. u \Vdash_i F|E \text{ belongs to } \downarrow \Delta_k\} \\ &= \{E \supset F \mid \exists u \exists i. u : Bel_i(F|E) \text{ belongs to } \downarrow \Delta_k\} \\ &= \{Bel_i(F|E) \mid \exists u. u : Bel_i(F|E) \text{ belongs to } \downarrow \Delta_k\} \end{aligned}$$

We obtain that for each  $b \in W(x)$ ,  $|S_b| = O(n)$ . Thus in this case, each  $b \in W(x)$  generates  $O(n)$  labels.

Putting together the two results, since  $|N(x)| = O(n)$  we finally get that  $|W(x)| = O(n^2)$ . □

**Proposition 4.9** *Any derivation branch  $\mathcal{B} = \Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Delta_0, \dots, \Gamma_k \Rightarrow \Delta_k, \Gamma_{k+1} \Rightarrow \Delta_{k+1}, \dots$  of a derivation that starts from  $\Gamma_0 \Rightarrow \Delta_0$  where  $\Gamma_0$  is empty,  $\Delta_0$  consists of  $x_0 : A_0$ , and which is built in accordance with the Strategy is finite.*

**Proof.** Let us consider a branch  $\mathcal{B}$ . Suppose by contradiction that  $\mathcal{B}$  is not finite, let  $\Gamma^* = \bigcup_k \Gamma_k$  and  $\Delta^* = \bigcup_k \Delta_k$ . Then  $\Gamma^*$  is infinite. All formulas occurring with a label in  $\Gamma^*$  are subformulas of  $A_0$ , but the subformulas of  $A_0$  are finitely many (namely they are  $O(n)$ , where  $n$  is the length of  $A_0$ ). Thus  $\Gamma^*$  must contain infinitely many labels. In the light of Lemma 4.8, in

particular  $\Gamma^*$  must contain infinitely many *world* labels, since each world label  $x$  generates only  $O(n)$  neighbourhood labels. Let us consider now the tree determined by the relation  $\xrightarrow{w^*}$  with root  $x_0$ . By Lemma 4.5, each label in any  $\Gamma_k$  occurs in that tree, therefore the tree determined by  $\xrightarrow{w^*}$  is infinite. But by previous lemma, every label in the tree has  $O(n^2)$  successors, thus a finite number. By König's lemma, the tree must contain an *infinite path*:  $x_0 \xrightarrow{w} x_1 \xrightarrow{w} \dots \xrightarrow{w} x_t \xrightarrow{w} x_{t+1} \dots$ , with all  $x_t$  being different. We observe that (a) infinitely many  $x_t$  must be generated by dynamic rules using some subformulas of  $A_0$ , but (b) these formulas are finitely many, thus there must be a subformula of  $A_0$  which is used infinitely many times to “generate” world labels (or better to generate a neighbourhood label from which a further world label is generated). There are two cases: this subformula is of type  $Bel_i(D|C)$  occurring in  $\Delta^*$  or it is of type  $\Vdash_i B|A$  occurring in  $\Gamma^*$  (in this latter case it is not properly a subformulas of  $A_0$  but it comes from one of them). In the first case the situation is the following, for some  $x_t$  we have that  $x_t : Bel_i(D|C)$  occurs in some  $\Delta_{s(x_t)}$  and for some  $a$ , such that  $k(a) = s(x_t) + 1$ , we have that  $a \in I_i(x_t), a \Vdash^\exists C \in \Gamma_{s(x_t)+1}$  and  $x_t \Vdash_i D|C \in \Delta_{s(x_t)+1}$ . Moreover, we have  $a \rightarrow_g x_{t+1}$ . But at the same time there must be in the sequence an  $x_r$  with  $r > t$ , such that  $x_r : Bel_i(D|C)$  occurs in some  $\Delta_{s(x_r)}$  and for a new  $b$ , that is with  $k(b) = s(x_r) + 1$ , we have that  $(*) b \in I_i(x_r), b \Vdash^\exists C \in \Gamma_{s(x_r)+1}$  and  $x_r \Vdash_i D|C \in \Delta_{s(x_r)+1}$  and  $b \rightarrow_g x_{t+1}$ . By Lemma 4.7, we have that  $a \in I_i(x_r)$ , thus  $a$  itself fulfils the saturation condition for (RB) applied to  $x_r : Bel_i(D|C) \in \Delta_{s(x_r)}$ , thus step  $(*)$  violates the strategy and we get a contradiction.

In the second case the situation is similar: for some  $t$ ,  $x_t \Vdash_i D|C$  occurs in some  $\Gamma_{s(x_t)}$  and for a new  $a$ , with  $k(a) = s(x_t) + 1$ , we have that  $a \in I_i(x_t), a \Vdash^\exists C \in \Gamma_{s(x_t)+1}$  and  $a \Vdash^\forall C \supset D \in \Gamma_{s(x_t)+1}$ . Moreover, we have that  $a \rightarrow_g x_{t+1}$ . Similarly there must be an  $x_r$  in the sequence with  $r > t$ , such that  $x_r \Vdash_i D|C$  occurs in some  $\Gamma_{s(x_r)}$  and for a new  $b$ , with  $k(b) = s(x_r) + 1$ , we have that we have that  $(**) b \in I_i(x_r), b \Vdash^\exists C \in \Gamma_{s(x_r)+1}$  and  $b \Vdash^\forall C \supset D \in \Gamma_{s(x_r)+1}$ . By Lemma 4.7, we have that  $a \in I_i(x_r)$ , thus  $a$  itself fulfils the saturation condition for (LC) applied to  $x_r \Vdash_i D|C \in \Gamma_{s(x_r)}$ , so that step  $(**)$  violates the strategy. In both cases we get a contradiction.  $\square$

Termination of proof search under the strategy is then an obvious consequence:

**Theorem 4.10** *Proof search for any sequent of the form  $\Rightarrow x_0 : A$  always comes to an end after a finite number of steps. Furthermore, each sequent that occurs as a leaf of the derivation tree is either an initial sequent or a saturated sequent.*

The above provides a decision procedure for *CDL*. Even without a precise analysis of its complexity, it is easy to see that each proof branch may have an exponential size, depending on the size of the formula  $A_0$  at the root of the derivation. The exact complexity of logic *CDL* has not been determined.

However, since  $S5_n$ , the multi-agent version of  $S5$ , is embeddable in  $CDL$  via the definition of the knowledge operator  $K_i$ , by the results in [7] we get that PSPACE is a lower bound for the complexity of  $CDL$ . We strongly conjecture that this is also its upper bound. This will be the object of future research, together with a strategy to obtain from **G3CDL** an optimal decision procedure for  $CDL$ .

The calculus is complete under the terminating strategy.

**Theorem 4.11** *Let  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  be the upper sequent of a saturated branch  $\mathcal{B}$  in a derivation tree. Then there exists a finite countermodel  $\mathcal{M}$  to  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  that satisfies all formulas in  $\downarrow \Gamma$  and falsifies all formulas in  $\downarrow \Delta$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  be the upper sequent of a saturated branch  $\mathcal{B}$ , by theorem 4.10  $\mathcal{B}$  is finite. We construct a model  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$  and an  $SN_{\mathcal{B}}$ -realization  $(\rho, \sigma)$ , and show that it satisfies all formulas in  $\downarrow \Gamma$  and falsifies all formulas in  $\downarrow \Delta$ .

Let  $S_{\mathcal{B}} = \{x \mid x \in (\downarrow \Gamma \cup \downarrow \Delta)\}$  and  $N_{\mathcal{B}} = \{a \mid a \in (\downarrow \Gamma \cup \downarrow \Delta)\}$ . Then, associate to each  $a \in N_{\mathcal{B}}$  a neighbourhood  $\alpha_a$ , such that  $\alpha_a = \{y \in S_{\mathcal{B}} \mid y \in a \text{ belongs to } \Gamma\}$ , thus  $\alpha_a \subseteq S_{\mathcal{B}}$ . We define a neighbourhood model  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}} = \langle W, I_i, \llbracket \rrbracket \rangle$  as

- $W = S_{\mathcal{B}}$ , i.e. the set  $W$  consists of all the labels occurring in the saturated branch  $\mathcal{B}$ ;
- For each  $x \in W$ ,  $I_i(x) = \{\alpha_a \mid a \in I_i(x) \text{ belongs to } \downarrow \Gamma\}$ ;
- For  $P$  atomic,  $\llbracket P \rrbracket = \{x \in W \mid x : P \text{ belongs to } \downarrow \Gamma\}$ .

By the saturation conditions we can easily prove that if  $a \subseteq b$  belongs to  $\Gamma$ , then  $\alpha_a \subseteq \alpha_b$  and that  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$  satisfies all properties of a multi-agent neighbourhood model, namely non-emptiness, total reflexivity, nesting, and local absoluteness (closure under intersection then follows from finiteness). Define a realization  $(\rho, \sigma)$  such that  $\rho(x) = x$  and  $\sigma(a) = \alpha_a$ . We now prove that [**Claim 1**] if  $\mathcal{F}$  is in  $\downarrow \Gamma$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}} \vDash \mathcal{F}$  and [**Claim 2**] If  $\mathcal{F}$  is in  $\downarrow \Delta$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}} \not\vDash \mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes any formula of the language, i.e.  $\mathcal{F} = a \in I_i(x), x \in A, a \subseteq b, x \Vdash^{\forall} A, x \Vdash^{\exists} A, x \Vdash_i B \mid A, x : A$ . The two claim are proved by cases, by induction on the weight of the formula  $\mathcal{F}$ . All cases are prove easily by the definition of the model, the fact that  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is saturated and by the induction hypothesis, whenever needed.

□

The completeness of the calculus is an obvious consequence:

**Theorem 4.12** *If  $A$  is valid then it is provable in **G3CDL**.*

Theorem 4.11 together with the soundness of **G3CDL** provides a constructive proof of the *finite model property* of the  $CDL$ : if  $A$  is satisfiable in a model ( $= \neg A$  is not valid), then by the soundness of **G3CDL**  $\neg A$ , is not provable, thus by 4.11 we can build a finite countermodel that falsifies  $\neg A$ , i.e., that satisfies  $A$ .

## 5 Conclusions and further research

We have proposed an alternative semantics for the logic *CDL* of doxastic conditional beliefs, based on neighbourhood models, a multi-agent version of Lewis' spheres models. On the basis of the neighbourhood semantics, following the methodology of [9], [10], [11], we developed the labelled sequent calculus **G3CDL** for it. The calculus **G3CDL** is analytical and enjoys cut elimination and admissibility of the other structural rules as well as invertibility of all its rules. Moreover, on the basis of this calculus, we obtain a decision procedure for the logic under a natural strategy of proof search. The completeness of the calculus is proved by a finite countermodel construction extracted from a failed (or open) branch of a derivation. The finite countermodel construction provides in itself a constructive proof of the finite model property of the logic. A number of issues are open to further investigation. On the semantical side, other doxastic operators have been considered in the literature, such as *safe* belief and *strong* belief [3]. We conjecture that also these operators can be naturally interpreted in neighbourhood models and consequently captured by extensions of the calculus **G3CDL**. Furthermore, *CDL* is the “static” logic that underlies dynamic extensions by *doxastic actions* [3]. It should be worth studying if our calculus can be extended to deal also with the dynamic extensions. Finally, from a computational side, to the best of our knowledge the exact complexity of *CDL* is not known. We conjecture its upper bound to be PSPACE; however, further investigations are needed to confirm this result. Moreover, some optimization of the search strategy is possible, in particular to reduce the number of labels generated in a derivation. We aim to deal with all these topics in future research.

## References

- [1] Alexandroff, P., *Diskrete Räume*, Mat.Sb. (NS) **2** (1937), pp. 501–519.
- [2] Baltag, A. and S. Smets, *Conditional doxastic models: A qualitative approach to dynamic belief revision*, Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science **165** (2006), pp. 5–21.
- [3] Baltag, A. and S. Smets, *A qualitative theory of dynamic interactive belief revision*, Logic and the foundations of game and decision theory (LOFT 7) **3** (2008), pp. 9–58.
- [4] Baltag, A., S. Smets et al., *The logic of conditional doxastic actions*, Texts in Logic and Games, Special Issue on New Perspectives on Games and Interaction **4** (2008), pp. 9–31.
- [5] Board, O., *Dynamic interactive epistemology*, Games and Economic Behavior **49** (2004), pp. 49–80.
- [6] Demey, L., *Some remarks on the model theory of epistemic plausibility models*, Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics **21** (2011), pp. 375–395.
- [7] Halpern, J. Y. and Y. Moses, *A guide to completeness and complexity for modal logics of knowledge and belief*, Artificial intelligence **54** (1992), pp. 319–379.
- [8] Marti, J. and R. Pinosio, *Topological semantics for conditionals*, The Logica Yearbook (2013).
- [9] Negri, S., *Proof analysis in modal logic*, Journal of Philosophical Logic **34** (2005), pp. 507–544.
- [10] Negri, S., *Analytic proof theory for logical systems based on neighbourhood semantics*, ms (2015).

- [11] Negri, S. and N. Olivetti, *A sequent calculus for preferential conditional logic based on neighbourhood semantics*, in: *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods*, Springer, 2015 pp. 115–134.
- [12] Negri, S. and J. von Plato, “Proof analysis: a contribution to Hilbert’s last problem,” Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [13] Pacuit, E., *Neighborhood semantics for modal logic*, Notes of a course on neighborhood structures for modal logic: <http://ai.stanford.edu/~epacuit/classes/esslli/nbhdesslli.pdf> (2007).
- [14] Pacuit, E., *Dynamic epistemic logic I: Modeling knowledge and belief*, *Philosophy Compass* **8** (2013), pp. 798–814.
- [15] van Ditmarsch, H., W. van Der Hoek and B. Kooi, *Dynamic epistemic logic*, Springer Science & Business Media (2008).