

ANGELO GILIO
GIUSEPPE SANFILIPPO

Conditional random quantities and compounds of conditionals

Abstract. In this paper we consider finite conditional random quantities and conditional previsions assessments in the setting of coherence. We use a suitable representation for conditional random quantities; in particular the indicator of a conditional event $E|H$ is looked at as a three-valued quantity with values 1, or 0, or p , where p is the probability of $E|H$. We introduce a notion of iterated conditional random quantity of the form $(X|H)|K$ defined as a suitable conditional random quantity, which coincides with $X|HK$ when $H \subseteq K$. Based on a recent paper by S. Kaufmann, we introduce a notion of conjunction of two conditional events and then we analyze it in the setting of coherence. We give a representation of the conjoined conditional and we show that this new object is a conditional random quantity. We examine some cases of logical dependencies, by also showing that the conjunction may be a conditional event; moreover, we introduce the negation of the conjunction and by De Morgan's Law the operation of disjunction. Finally, we give the lower and upper bounds for the conjunction and the disjunction of two conditional events, by showing that the usual probabilistic properties continue to hold.

Keywords: Conditional events, conditional random quantities, coherence, conjunction, negation, disjunction.

1. Introduction

Probabilistic reasoning under coherence allows a consistent treatment of uncertainty in many applications of statistics, economy, decision theory and artificial intelligence; in particular, it is useful for a flexible numerical approach to inference rules in nonmonotonic reasoning and for the psychology of uncertain reasoning (see, e.g., [16, 22, 35, 36]). The methods of coherence could also be useful to deepen some theoretical aspects related with the comparison among four well-known nonmonotonic reasoning systems made in [39] by means of simulations. In probability theory and in probability logic a relevant problem, largely discussed by many authors, is that of suitably defining logical operations among conditional events. The study of logical operations, such as conjunction and disjunction, among conditionals represents also a basic aspect in many sectors of artificial intelligence.

Presented by **Name of Editor**; *Received* October 31, 2012

We recall that a pioneering paper concerning the conjunction, negation and disjunction of conditional events is that one written in 1935 by de Finetti ([11]), where it is proposed a three-valued logic which coincides with that one of Lukasiewicz. An interesting survey of the contributions by different authors (such as Adams, Belnap, Calabrese, de Finetti, Dubois, van Fraassen, McGee, Goodman, Lewis, Nguyen, Prade, Schay) to the study of three-valued logics and compounds of conditionals is given in [34]; an extensive study of conditionals has been made in [15]; see also [33]. Among the many works concerning logical operations on conditional events we recall for instance [1, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 28, 29, 38]. A comparison with aspects studied in some of the above papers (with a deepening of the notion of conditional hyperprobability) has been made in [27]. Logical operations among conditional events have been studied also in [8], where a generalized notion of atoms for conditional events has been proposed; moreover, a comparison between classical logic and three-valued logic for conditional events has been made in [2]. As we will show in this paper, the problem of suitably defining logical operations among conditional events has a natural relation with the role of coherence in probabilistic reasoning. In a recent paper by Kaufmann ([31]) a theory for the compounds of conditionals has been proposed; in this paper we develop a similar theory in the framework of coherence. In literature the usual approach to the compounds of conditionals has been that of defining them as suitable conditionals. In this work, starting with the paper by Kaufmann, we show that conjunction and disjunction of conditional events in general are not conditional events but *conditional random quantities*. Based on the betting scheme of de Finetti ([12]), if we assess $\mathbb{P}(X|H) = \mu$ for a conditional random quantity $X|H$, then we represent $X|H$ as a numerical quantity which coincides with X , or μ , according to whether H is true, or false. In particular, if we assess $P(E|H) = p$ for a conditional event $E|H$, then we represent (the indicator of) $E|H$ as a numerical quantity with set of possible values $\{1, 0, p\}$. We recall that the problem of suitably defining the third value for the indicators of conditional events has been carefully examined in many papers by Coletti and Scozzafava (see, e.g., [10]). Based on the representation of $X|H$, we obtain some results on finite conditional random quantities. Moreover, we give a meaning for the iterated conditional random quantity of the form $(X|H)|K$ as a suitable conditional random quantity which coincides in particular with $X|HK$ when $H \subseteq K$. Then, by exploiting our representation of conditional events, we suitably define the conjunction $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$ of two conditional events $A|H, B|K$. We show cases of logical dependencies in which the conjunction reduces to a conditional event. Based on the usual definition of negation, we introduce

a notion of negation for the conjoined conditional; then, based on De Morgan's Law, we define the disjunction of two conditional events. Finally, by exploiting the methods of coherence, we obtain the lower and upper bounds for the coherent extensions of a probability assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$ to their conjunction $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$ and their disjunction $(A|H) \vee (B|K)$. Interestingly, the usual probabilistic properties continue to hold in terms of previsions and this aspect, in our opinion, confirms that the most suitable framework for a right approach to compounds of conditionals is that of conditional random quantities in the setting of coherence. We observe that for the scope of our paper it is enough to consider finite random quantities.

2. Preliminary notions and results

In this section we recall some basic notions and results on coherence for conditional probability assessments and for conditional prevision assessments.

2.1. Coherent conditional probability assessments

In our approach an event A represents an uncertain fact described by a (non ambiguous) logical proposition; hence we look at A as a two-valued logical entity which can be true (T), or false (F). The indicator of A , denoted by the same symbol, is a two-valued numerical quantity which is 1, or 0, according to whether A is true, or false. The sure event is denoted by Ω and the impossible event is denoted by \emptyset . Moreover, we denote by $A \wedge B$ (resp., $A \vee B$) the logical conjunction (resp., logical disjunction). In many cases we simply denote the conjunction between A and B as the product AB . By the symbol A^c we denote the negation of A . Given any events A and B , we simply write $A \subseteq B$ to denote that A logically implies B , that is AB^c is the impossible event \emptyset . We recall that n events are logically independent when the number of atoms, or constituents, generated by them is 2^n . In case of some logical dependencies among the events, the number of atoms is less than 2^n . Given any events A and B , with $A \neq \emptyset$, the conditional event $B|A$ is looked at as a three-valued logical entity which is true (T), or false (F), or void (V), according to whether AB is true, or AB^c is true, or A^c is true. *Interpretation with the betting scheme.* We recall that, using the betting scheme of de Finetti ([12]), if you assess $P(B|A) = p$, then you agree to pay an amount p , by receiving 1, or 0, or p , according to whether AB is true, or AB^c is true, or A^c is true (bet called off). Then, the random gain associated with the assessment $P(B|A) = p$ is $\mathcal{G} = sH(E - p)$, where s is a non zero real number. More in general, let be given a real function

$P : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, where \mathcal{F} is an arbitrary family of conditional events. Given any subfamily $\mathcal{F}_n = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, the restriction of P to \mathcal{F}_n is the vector $\mathcal{P}_n = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$, where $p_i = P(E_i|H_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. We denote by \mathcal{H}_n the disjunction $H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$. As $E_i H_i \vee E_i^c H_i \vee H_i^c = \Omega$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, by expanding the expression $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (E_i H_i \vee E_i^c H_i \vee H_i^c)$, we can represent Ω as the disjunction of 3^n logical conjunctions, some of which may be impossible. The remaining ones are the atoms, or constituents, generated by the family \mathcal{F}_n and, of course, are a partition of Ω . We denote by C_1, \dots, C_m the constituents contained in \mathcal{H}_n and (if $\mathcal{H}_n \neq \Omega$) by C_0 the remaining constituent $\mathcal{H}_n^c = H_1^c \dots H_n^c$, so that

$$\mathcal{H}_n = C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_m, \quad \Omega = \mathcal{H}_n^c \vee \mathcal{H}_n = C_0 \vee C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_m, \quad m+1 \leq 3^n.$$

With $(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ we associate the random gain $\mathcal{G} = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i H_i (E_i - p_i)$, where s_1, \dots, s_n are n arbitrary real numbers, which is the difference between the amount that you receive, $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i (E_i H_i + p_i H_i^c)$, and the amount that you pay, $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i p_i$. The quantity \mathcal{G} represents the net gain from engaging each transaction $H_i (E_i - p_i)$ at the scale and direction specified by the coefficient s_i . Let g_h be the value of \mathcal{G} when C_h is true; of course $g_0 = 0$. Denoting by $\mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n}$ the set of possible values of \mathcal{G} restricted to \mathcal{H}_n , it is $\mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n} = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$. Then, we have

DEFINITION 1. The function P defined on \mathcal{F} is coherent if and only if, for every integer n , for every finite sub-family $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and for every s_1, \dots, s_n , one has: $\min \mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max \mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n}$.

As shown by Definition 1, a probability assessment is coherent if and only if, in any finite combination of n bets, it may not happen that the values g_1, \dots, g_m are all positive, or all negative (*no Dutch Book*).

Given any integer n we set $J_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$; for each $h \in J_m$ with the constituent C_h we associate a point $Q_h = (q_{h1}, \dots, q_{hn})$, where $q_{hj} = 1$, or 0, or p_j , according to whether $C_h \subseteq E_j H_j$, or $C_h \subseteq E_j^c H_j$, or $C_h \subseteq H_j^c$. Denoting by \mathcal{I} the convex hull of Q_1, \dots, Q_m , based on the penalty criterion, it can be proved ([18, Thm. 4.4], see also [19, 24])

THEOREM 1. The function P is coherent if and only if, for every finite subfamily $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, one has $\mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{I}$.

The condition $\mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{I}$ is equivalent to the solvability of the following system (Σ) in the unknowns $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$

$$\Sigma : \quad \sum_{h=1}^m q_{hj} \lambda_h = p_j, \quad j \in J_n; \quad \sum_{h=1}^m \lambda_h = 1; \quad \lambda_h \geq 0, \quad h \in J_m.$$

We say that system Σ is associated with the pair $(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$. Notice that, by a suitable alternative theorem ([17, Thm 2.9]), solvability of system Σ amounts to condition $\min \mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max \mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n}$. Hence, Theorem 1 provides a geometrical meaning for the notion of coherence given in Definition 1.

2.2. Coherence Checking

Given the assessment \mathcal{P}_n on \mathcal{F}_n , let S be the set of solutions $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ of the system Σ . Then, assuming $S \neq \emptyset$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_j(\Lambda) &= \Phi_j(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) = \sum_{r: C_r \subseteq H_j} \lambda_r, \quad j \in J_n; \Lambda \in S; \\ M_j &= \max_{\Lambda \in S} \Phi_j(\Lambda), \quad j \in J_n; \quad I_0 = \{j : M_j = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that, assuming \mathcal{P}_n coherent, each solution $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ of system Σ is a coherent extension of the assessment \mathcal{P}_n on \mathcal{F}_n to the family $\{C_1|\mathcal{H}_n, \dots, C_m|\mathcal{H}_n\}$. Then, by the additive property, the quantity $\Phi_j(\Lambda)$ is the conditional probability $P(H_j|\mathcal{H}_n)$ and the quantity M_j is the upper probability $P^*(H_j|\mathcal{H}_n)$ over all the solutions Λ of system Σ . Of course, $j \in I_0$ if and only if $P^*(H_j|\mathcal{H}_n) = 0$. Notice that $I_0 \subset J_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We denote by $(\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{P}_0)$ the pair associated with I_0 . Given the pair $(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ and a subset $J \subset J_n$, we denote by $(\mathcal{F}_J, \mathcal{P}_J)$ the pair associated with J and by Σ_J the corresponding system. We observe that Σ_J is solvable if and only if $\mathcal{P}_J \in \mathcal{I}_J$, where \mathcal{I}_J is the convex hull associated with the pair $(\mathcal{F}_J, \mathcal{P}_J)$. Then, we have ([20, Thm 3.2]; see also [3, 21])

THEOREM 2. Given a probability assessment \mathcal{P}_n on the family \mathcal{F}_n , if the system Σ associated with $(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ is solvable, then for every $J \subset J_n$, such that $J \setminus I_0 \neq \emptyset$, the system Σ_J associated with $(\mathcal{F}_J, \mathcal{P}_J)$ is solvable too.

The previous result says that the condition $\mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{I}$ implies $\mathcal{P}_J \in \mathcal{I}_J$ when $J \setminus I_0 \neq \emptyset$. We observe that, if $\mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{I}$, then for every nonempty subset J of $J_n \setminus I_0$ it holds that $J \setminus I_0 = J \neq \emptyset$; hence, by Theorem 1, the subassessment $\mathcal{P}_{J_n \setminus I_0}$ on the subfamily $\mathcal{F}_{J_n \setminus I_0}$ is coherent. In particular, when I_0 is empty, coherence of \mathcal{P}_n amounts to solvability of system (Σ) , that is to condition $\mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{I}$. When I_0 is not empty, coherence of \mathcal{P}_n amounts to the validity of both conditions $\mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{I}$ and \mathcal{P}_0 coherent, as shown below ([20, Thm 3.3]).

THEOREM 3. The assessment \mathcal{P}_n on \mathcal{F}_n is coherent if and only if the following conditions are satisfied: (i) $\mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{I}$; (ii) if $I_0 \neq \emptyset$, then \mathcal{P}_0 is coherent.

2.3. Coherent conditional prevision assessments

Given an event $H \neq \emptyset$ and a finite random quantity (r.q.) X , we denote by $X|_H$, the set of possible values of X restricted to H and we set

$X|_H = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r\}$. In the setting of coherence, agreeing to the betting metaphor the prevision of "*X conditional on H*" (also named "*X given H*"), $\mathbb{P}(X|H)$, is defined as the amount μ you agree to pay, by knowing that you will receive the amount X if H is true, or you will receive back the amount μ if H is false (bet called off). In what follows we define the conditional random quantity (c.r.q.) "*X given H*", denoted by $X|H$, as the amount that you receive when you stipulate a bet on X conditional on H . Then, it holds that $X|H = XH + \mu H^c$, where $\mu = \mathbb{P}(X|H)$, so that we can look at the c.r.q. $X|H$ as the *unconditional* r.q. $XH + \mu H^c$. We observe that, if $\mu \notin X|_H$, then $X|H \in \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r, \mu\}$. Moreover, denoting by A_i the event $(X = x_i)$, $i \in J_r$, the family $\{A_1H, \dots, A_rH, H^c\}$ is a partition of Ω and we have

$$X|H = XH + \mu H^c = x_1 A_1 H + \dots + x_r A_r H + \mu H^c.$$

In particular, when X is an event A , the prevision of $X|H$ is the probability of $A|H$ and, if you assess $P(A|H) = p$, then for the indicator of $A|H$, denoted by the same symbol, we have $A|H = AH + p H^c \in \{1, 0, p\}$. We observe that the choice of p as the value of $A|H$ when H is false has been also considered in some previous works ([10, 18, 30, 32, 33, 40, 41]). One peculiarity of our coherence-based approach is that we avoid ad-hoc (and may be inconsistent) evaluations like $P(A|H) = 1$ when $P(H) = 0$; in this way, some basic probabilistic formulas, such as $P(H^c|H) = 0$ and $P(A|H) + P(A^c|H) = 1$, are satisfied in all cases included that one where $P(H) = 0$.

Given a prevision function \mathbb{P} defined on an arbitrary family \mathcal{K} of finite conditional random quantities, let $\mathcal{F}_n = \{X_i|H_i, i \in J_n\}$ be a finite subfamily of \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{M}_n the vector $(\mu_i, i \in J_n)$, where $\mu_i = \mathbb{P}(X_i|H_i)$ is the assessed prevision for the conditional random quantity $X_i|H_i$. With the pair $(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{M}_n)$ we associate the random gain $\mathcal{G} = \sum_{i \in J_n} s_i H_i (X_i - \mu_i)$. Then, using the *betting scheme* of de Finetti, we have

DEFINITION 2. The function \mathbb{P} defined on \mathcal{K} is coherent if and only if, $\forall n \geq 1$, $\forall \mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, $\forall s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathbb{R}$, it holds that: $\min \mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max \mathcal{G}_{|\mathcal{H}_n}$.

REMARK 1. We observe that, for $\mathcal{K} = \{X|H\}$, with $\mathbb{P}(X|H) = \mu$ and $X|_H = \{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$, by the previous definition we have that μ is coherent if and only if $\min X|_H \leq \mu \leq \max X|_H$. In particular, if $X|_H = \{c\}$, then $X|H = cH + \mu H^c$ and μ is coherent if and only if $\mu = c$. Of course, for $X = H$ (resp. $X = H^c$) it holds that $\mu = 1$ (resp. $\mu = 0$) and hence $H|H = 1$, $H^c|H = 0$.

Given a family $\mathcal{F}_n = \{X_1|H_1, \dots, X_n|H_n\}$, for each $i \in J_n$ we denote by $\{x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ir_i}\}$ the set of possible values for the restriction of X_i to H_i ;

then, for each $i \in J_n$ and $j = 1, \dots, r_i$, we set $A_{ij} = (X_i = x_{ij})$. Of course, for each $i \in J_n$, the family $\{H_i^c, A_{ij}H_i, j = 1, \dots, r_i\}$ is a partition of the sure event Ω . Then, the constituents generated by the family \mathcal{F}_n are (the elements of the partition of Ω) obtained by expanding the expression $\bigwedge_{i \in J_n} (A_{i1}H_i \vee \dots \vee A_{ir_i}H_i \vee H_i^c)$. We set $C_0 = H_1^c \cdots H_n^c$ (it may be $C_0 = \emptyset$); moreover, we denote by C_1, \dots, C_m the constituents contained in $\mathcal{H}_n = H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$. Hence $\bigwedge_{i \in J_n} (A_{i1}H_i \vee \dots \vee A_{ir_i}H_i \vee H_i^c) = \bigvee_{h=0}^m C_h$. With each C_h , $h \in J_m$, we associate a vector $Q_h = (q_{h1}, \dots, q_{hn})$, where

$$q_{hi} = \begin{cases} x_{i1}, & C_h \subseteq A_{i1}H_i, \\ \dots & \dots\dots\dots \\ x_{ir_i}, & C_h \subseteq A_{ir_i}H_i, \\ \mu_i, & C_h \subseteq H_i^c. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In more explicit terms, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, r_i\}$ the condition $C_h \subseteq A_{ij}H_i$ amounts to $C_h \subseteq A_{i1}^c \cdots A_{i,j-1}^c A_{ij} A_{i,j+1}^c \cdots A_{ir_i}^c H_i$. We observe that the vector Q_h is the value of the random vector $(X_1|H_1, \dots, X_n|H_n)$ when C_h is true; moreover, if C_0 is true, then the value of such a random vector is $\mathcal{M}_n = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$. Denoting by \mathcal{I}_n the convex hull of Q_1, \dots, Q_m , the condition $\mathcal{M}_n \in \mathcal{I}_n$ amounts to the existence of a vector $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ such that: $\sum_{h \in J_m} \lambda_h Q_h = \mathcal{M}_n$, $\sum_{h \in J_m} \lambda_h = 1$, $\lambda_h \geq 0$, $\forall h$; in other words, $\mathcal{M}_n \in \mathcal{I}_n$ is equivalent to solvability of the following system Σ associated with the pair $(\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{M}_n)$, in the nonnegative unknowns $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$,

$$\Sigma: \quad \sum_{h \in J_m} \lambda_h q_{hi} = \mu_i, \quad i \in J_n; \quad \sum_{h \in J_m} \lambda_h = 1; \quad \lambda_h \geq 0, \quad h \in J_m. \quad (2)$$

Given a subset $J \subseteq J_n$, we set $\mathcal{F}_J = \{X_i|H_i, i \in J\}$, $\mathcal{M}_J = (\mu_i, i \in J)$; then, we denote by Σ_J , where $\Sigma_{J_n} = \Sigma$, the system like (2) associated with the pair $(\mathcal{F}_J, \mathcal{M}_J)$. Then, it can be proved the following ([4])

THEOREM 4. [*General characterization of coherence*]. Given a family of n conditional random quantities $\mathcal{F}_n = \{X_1|H_1, \dots, X_n|H_n\}$ and a vector $\mathcal{M}_n = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$, the conditional prevision assessment $\mathbb{P}(X_1|H_1) = \mu_1, \dots, \mathbb{P}(X_n|H_n) = \mu_n$ is coherent if and only if, for every subset $J \subseteq J_n$, defining $\mathcal{F}_J = \{X_i|H_i, i \in J\}$, $\mathcal{M}_J = (\mu_i, i \in J)$, the system Σ_J associated with the pair $(\mathcal{F}_J, \mathcal{M}_J)$ is solvable.

A characterization of coherence of conditional prevision assessments by non dominance with respect to proper scoring rules has been given in [5]. Given the assessment $\mathcal{M}_n = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ on $\mathcal{F}_n = \{X_1|H_1, \dots, X_n|H_n\}$, let S be the set of solutions $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ of the system Σ defined in (2).

For any given event A and for any vector $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ we simply denote by $\sum_A \lambda_h$ the quantity $\sum_{h: C_h \subseteq A} \lambda_h$. Then, assuming the system Σ solvable, i.e. $S \neq \emptyset$, we define

$$\Gamma_0 = \{i : \max_{\Lambda \in S} \sum_{H_i} \lambda_h > 0\}; \quad I_0 = J_n \setminus \Gamma_0 = \{i : \max_{\Lambda \in S} \sum_{H_i} \lambda_h = 0\};$$

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{X_i | H_i, i \in I_0\}; \quad \mathcal{M}_0 = (\mu_i, i \in I_0).$$

Then, we have ([4, Thm 3])

THEOREM 5. [*Operative characterization of coherence*] A vector of prevision assessment $\mathcal{M}_n = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ on the family $\mathcal{F}_n = \{X_1 | H_1, \dots, X_n | H_n\}$ is coherent if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

(i) the system Σ defined in (2) is solvable; (ii) if $I_0 \neq \emptyset$, then \mathcal{M}_0 is coherent.

REMARK 2. Notice that, if system (2) is solvable, then it could be proved that the sub-assessment \mathcal{M}_{Γ_0} on the subfamily \mathcal{F}_{Γ_0} is coherent.

Based on Theorem 5 the following algorithm for coherence checking has been given in [4, see Remark 2].

ALGORITHM 1. Let be given the triplet $(J_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{M}_n)$.

1. Construct the system (2) and check its solvability;
2. If the system (2) is not solvable then \mathcal{M}_n is not g-coherent and the procedure stops, otherwise compute the set I_0 ;
3. If $I_0 = \emptyset$ then \mathcal{M}_n is g-coherent and the procedure stops, otherwise set $(J_n, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{M}_n) = (I_0, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{M}_0)$ and repeat steps 1-3.

3. Some results on conditional random quantities

We first deepen some aspects on conditional random quantities; then, by also exploiting linearity of prevision, we give a simple proof of the general compound prevision theorem.

THEOREM 6. Given any quantity a , any event $H \neq \emptyset$ and any random quantities X and Y , we have

$$(i) (aX)|H = a(X|H), \quad (ii) X|H + Y|H = (X + Y)|H. \quad (3)$$

PROOF. (i) We set $\mathbb{P}(X|H) = \mu$, so that $\mathbb{P}[(aX)|H] = a\mu$; then, $(aX)|H = aXH + a\mu H^c = a(X|H)$ and we can simply write $aX|H$.

(ii) We set $\mathbb{P}(X|H) = \mu$, $\mathbb{P}(Y|H) = \nu$, $\mathbb{P}[(X + Y)|H] = \eta$, with (μ, ν, η) coherent; then, we have

$$X|H = XH + \mu H^c, \quad Y|H = YH + \nu H^c, \quad (X + Y)|H = XH + YH + \eta H^c.$$

It follows

$$X|H + Y|H - (X + Y)|H = 0 \cdot H + (\mu + \nu - \eta)H^c;$$

hence, $X|H + Y|H - (X + Y)|H$ is a c.r.q. $Z|H$, with $Z|H = \{0\}$. Then, by Remark 1, $\mu + \nu - \eta = 0$ and hence $X|H + Y|H = (X + Y)|H$. ■

By the same reasoning, it follows: $aX|H + bY|H = (aX + bY)|H$.

THEOREM 7. Given two c.r.q.'s $X|H, Y|K$, with $\mathbb{P}(X|H) = \mu$, $\mathbb{P}(Y|K) = \nu$ and with (μ, ν) coherent, assume that $X|H = Y|K$ when the disjunction $H \vee K$ is true. Then $X|H = Y|K$.

PROOF. We observe that $X|H = XH + \mu H^c = XH + \mu H^c K + \mu H^c K^c$ and $Y|K = YK + \nu K^c = YK + \nu H K^c + \nu H^c K^c$; then, the hypothesis amounts to the equality: $XH + \mu H^c K = YK + \nu H K^c$. Now, let C_1, \dots, C_m be the constituents contained in $H \vee K$ and Q_1, \dots, Q_m be the corresponding points associated with $(\{X|H, Y|K\}, (\mu, \nu))$. For each $Q_h = (q_{h1}, q_{h2})$ it holds that $q_{h1} = q_{h2}$, $h \in J_m$. Moreover, by coherence, the point (μ, ν) belongs to the convex hull of Q_1, \dots, Q_m ; then, it follows $\mu = \nu$; therefore $X|H = XH + \mu H^c K + \mu H^c K^c = Y|K$. ■

By the previous result it immediately follows

COROLLARY 1. Given any event $H \neq \emptyset$ and any random quantities X and Y , we have

$$XH = YH \implies X|H = Y|H. \quad (4)$$

Given any c.r.q.'s $X|H$ and $Y|K$, with $\mathbb{P}(X|H) = \mu$, $\mathbb{P}(Y|K) = \nu$ and with (μ, ν) coherent, we have $X|H + Y|K = XH + \mu H^c + YK + \nu K^c$; then we obtain

THEOREM 8. Given any c.r.q.'s $X|H$ and $Y|K$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X|H + Y|K) = \mathbb{P}(X|H) + \mathbb{P}(Y|K). \quad (5)$$

PROOF. By linearity of prevision, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X|H + Y|K) &= \mathbb{P}(XH + \mu H^c + YK + \nu K^c) = \\ &= \mathbb{P}(XH + \mu H^c) + \mathbb{P}(YK + \nu K^c) = \mathbb{P}(X|H) + \mathbb{P}(Y|K). \end{aligned}$$

■

We recall that, agreeing to the betting metaphor, the prevision μ for a c.r.q. $X|H$ is what should be paid in order to receive the amount $X|H$; then by linearity of prevision

$$\mathbb{P}(X|H) = \mu = x_1P(E_1H) + \cdots + x_nP(E_nH) + \mu P(H^c) = \mathbb{P}(XH) + \mu P(H^c)$$

from which it follows: $\mathbb{P}(XH) = P(H)\mathbb{P}(X|H)$. More in general, we have

THEOREM 9. Given two events $H \neq \emptyset, K \neq \emptyset$ and a r.q. X , let (x, y, z) be a coherent assessment on $\{H|K, X|HK, XH|K\}$. Then: (i) $X|HK = (XH + yH^c)|K$; (ii) $z = xy$; that is: $\mathbb{P}(XH|K) = P(H|K)\mathbb{P}(X|HK)$.

PROOF. (i) First of all we observe that $HK \vee K = K$; moreover

$$X|HK = XHK + y(HK)^c = XHK + yK^c + yH^cK = (XH + yH^c)K + yK^c,$$

and, by setting $\mathbb{P}[(XH + yH^c)|K] = \mu$, we have $(XH + yH^c)|K =$

$$= (XH + yH^c)K + \mu K^c = XHK + yH^cK + \mu K^c = X|HK + (\mu - y)K^c.$$

Hence $X|HK = (XH + yH^c)|K$ for $K = 1$. Then, by Theorem 7, $y = \mu$ and $X|HK = (XH + yH^c)|K$.

(ii) By linearity of prevision:

$$y = \mathbb{P}(X|HK) = \mathbb{P}[(XH + yH^c)|K] = \mathbb{P}(XH|K) + yP(H^c|K) = z + y(1 - x);$$

hence: $z = xy$, which represents the *general compound prevision theorem*. ■

We observe that, given two r.q.'s $X|H, Y|H$, from condition (ii) in Theorem 9, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(XH|H) = P(X|H)P(H|H) = \mathbb{P}(X|H), \quad \mathbb{P}(YH|H) = P(Y|H)P(H|H) = \mathbb{P}(Y|H)$$

and, assuming $XH = YH$, it follows $\mathbb{P}(Y|H) = \mathbb{P}(YH|H) = \mathbb{P}(XH|H) = \mathbb{P}(X|H)$; hence $X|H = Y|H$, which is the result given in Corollary 1.

We now give a definition for the symbol $(X|H)|K$; we will show that its meaning is different from $X|HK$. We recall that $X|H = XH + xH^c$, where $x = \mathbb{P}(X|H)$.

DEFINITION 3. Given any events H, K , with $H \neq \emptyset, K \neq \emptyset$, and a finite r.q. X , with $x = \mathbb{P}(X|H)$, we define $(X|H)|K = (XH + xH^c)|K$.

We have two remarks:

(a) In condition (i) of Theorem 9 the value y is (not the prevision x of $X|H$ but) the prevision of $X|HK$; hence

$$X|HK = (XH + yH^c)|K \neq (X|H)|K = (XH + xH^c)|K.$$

In other words, $X|HK \neq (X|H)|K$; but, under the hypothesis $H \subseteq K$, we have $X|HK = X|H$ and $y = \mathbb{P}(X|HK) = \mathbb{P}(X|H) = x$; then

$$X|H = X|HK = (XH + yH^c)|K = (XH + xH^c)|K = (X|H)|K. \quad (6)$$

We observe that, given any events A, H, K , we have $A|HK \neq (A|H)|K$; therefore, in agreement with [1, 31], in our approach the Import-Export Principle of McGee ([33]) does not hold. To illustrate by an example that the Import-Export Principle is not valid in general, assume that $K = H^c \vee A$, which is the material conditional associated with $A|H$; moreover assume that $AH = \emptyset$, so that $P(A|H) = 0$. Then the Import-Export Principle cannot be applied because $A|HK = A|AH = A|\emptyset$; on the contrary, as $H^c \vee A = H^c$, by Definition 3 we have

$$(A|H)|K = (A|H)|(H^c \vee A) = (A|H)|H^c = (AH + 0 \cdot H^c)|H^c = 0|H^c = 0;$$

therefore (in agreement with the intuition) $\mathbb{P}[(A|H)|K] = P(A|H) = 0$, while $P(H^c \vee A)$ could be high. A probabilistic analysis of constructive and non-constructive inferences from the material conditional $A \vee B$ to the associated conditional $B|A^c$ has been given in [22].

(b) Given any c.r.q.'s $X|H, Y|K$, and a coherent assessment $\mathbb{P}(X|H) = x$, $\mathbb{P}(Y|K) = y$, as $H = H(H \vee K)$, $K = K(H \vee K)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X|H &= X|H(H \vee K) = (X|H)|(H \vee K) = (XH + xH^c)|(H \vee K), \\ Y|K &= Y|K(H \vee K) = (Y|K)|(H \vee K) = (YK + yK^c)|(H \vee K). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Then, by (3), we obtain

$$X|H + Y|K = (XH + xH^c + YK + yK^c)|(H \vee K), \quad (8)$$

which shows that $X|H + Y|K$ coincides with the c.r.q. $Z|(H \vee K)$, where $Z = XH + xH^c + YK + yK^c$, with $\mathbb{P}[Z|(H \vee K)] = x + y$.

4. Conjunction of conditional events

Some authors look at the conditional “if A then C ”, denoted $A \rightarrow C$, as the event $A^c \vee C$ (*material conditional*), but since some years it is becoming standard to look at $A \rightarrow C$ as the conditional event $C|A$ (see e.g. [22, 37]). A theory of the compounds of conditionals is a not easy and controversial topic of research; it has been studied by many researchers in many fields, such as mathematics, philosophical logic, artificial intelligence, nonmonotonic reasoning, psychology. A very general discussion of the different aspects which concern conditionals has been given in [15, 34].

4.1. Compounds of conditionals in the approach of Kaufmann

The probabilistic theory of conditionals proposed in [31] is based on the model theory proposed in [41] and on the assignment of truth values to complex conditionals suggested in [40]. In particular, Kaufmann uses the notion of *Stalnaker Bernoulli space* to build a complex procedure by means of which probabilistic formulas are obtained which suggest how to assign values to conditionals. To illustrate such a procedure, consider a conditional $A \rightarrow C$ and the associated conditional event $C|A$, with $P(A) > 0$, so that $P(C|A) = \frac{P(AC)}{P(A)}$. Now, let us consider an infinite sequence of pairs of events $(A_1, C_1), (A_2, C_2), \dots, (A_n, C_n), \dots$, with the events in each pair stochastically independent from the events in the other ones, and with $P(A_i) = P(A)$, $P(A_i C_i) = P(AC)$, $\forall i$, so that $P(C_i|A_i) = P(C|A)$, $\forall i$. In the approach of Kaufmann, in order to assign the value to $A \rightarrow C$, the pairs in the sequence are observed *until the first time* the antecedent, say A_i , is true; then the value of the consequent, C_i , is assigned to $A \rightarrow C$. In other words, by considering the partition of Ω obtained by expanding the expression

$$(A_1 C_1 \vee A_1 C_1^c \vee A_1^c) \wedge \dots \wedge (A_n C_n \vee A_n C_n^c \vee A_n^c) \wedge \dots = H_0 \vee H_1 \vee H_2 \vee H_3,$$

where $H_1 = A_1 C_1$, $H_2 = \bigvee_{n=2}^{\infty} A_1^c \dots A_{n-1}^c A_n C_n$, $H_3 = A_1^c A_2^c \dots A_n^c \dots$, $H_0 = H_1^c H_2^c H_3^c$. By definition, in the paper of Kaufmann it holds that:

$$(A \rightarrow C) \wedge A = 1 \iff H_1 = 1; (A \rightarrow C) \wedge A^c = 1 \iff H_2 = 1;$$

hence $(A \rightarrow C) = 1 \iff H_1 \vee H_2 = 1$. Then, in the Stalnaker Bernoulli space a probability P^* is constructed such that

$$\begin{aligned} P^*[(A \rightarrow C) \wedge A] &= P(H_1) = P(A_1 C_1) = P(AC); \\ P^*[(A \rightarrow C) \wedge A^c] &= P(H_2) = P(A_1^c)P(A_2 C_2) + P(A_1^c)P(A_2^c)P(A_3 C_3) + \dots = \\ &= P(AC)P(A^c)[1 + P(A^c) + \dots + [P(A^c)]^n + \dots] = \frac{P(AC)P(A^c)}{P(A)}; \\ P^*(A \rightarrow C) &= P^*[(A \rightarrow C) \wedge A] + P^*[(A \rightarrow C) \wedge A^c] = P(H_1) + P(H_2) = \\ &= P(AC) + \frac{P(AC)P(A^c)}{P(A)} = \frac{P(AC)[P(A) + P(A^c)]}{P(A)} = \frac{P(AC)}{P(A)} = P(C|A). \end{aligned}$$

Then, as suggested by the result above, Kaufmann shows that, by defining the truth value of $A \rightarrow C$ as:

$$V(A \rightarrow C) = \begin{cases} 1, & AC \text{ true} \\ 0, & AC^c \text{ true} \\ P(C|A), & A^c \text{ true} \end{cases}$$

it follows: $P(A \rightarrow C) = P(C|A)$. With the approach of Kaufmann, the conditional $A \rightarrow C$ is indeterminate if and only if H_3 is true, which has probability $P(H_3) = P(A_1^c) \cdots P(A_n^c) \cdots = P(A^c) \cdots P(A^c) \cdots = 0$.

By a similar reasoning, for the conjoined conditional $(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (C \rightarrow D)$, assuming $P(A \vee C) > 0$, Kaufmann obtains the formula

$$P[(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (C \rightarrow D)] = \frac{P(ABCD) + P(B|A)P(A^cCD) + P(D|C)P(ABC^c)}{P(A \vee C)}.$$

Based on this result, Kaufmann suggests a natural way of defining the values of conjoined conditionals.

REMARK 3. In the setting of coherence, if $P(C|A) = z$, then $C|A = AC + zA^c$ and, assuming $P(A) > 0$, by linearity of prevision (by iteratively replacing z) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} z &= P(AC) + zP(A^c) = P(AC) + P(A^c)[P(AC) + zP(A^c)] = \\ &= P(AC)[1 + P(A^c)] + zP(A^c)^2 = \cdots = \\ &= P(AC)[1 + P(A^c) + \cdots + P(A^c)^{n-1}] + zP(A^c)^n = \cdots = \\ &= P(AC)[1 + P(A^c) + \cdots + P(A^c)^{n-1} + \cdots] = P(AC) \cdot \frac{1}{P(A)} = \frac{P(AC)}{P(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

The previous iterative scheme can be associated to a sequence of conditional bets, where the bet is repeated each time it is called off; the process ends the first time the bet is not called off.

4.2. Some critical comments

We think that the approach of Kaufmann opens an interesting perspective; it produces very nice results and preserves, as we will show, well known probabilistic properties which hold in the classical setting. At the same time, we think that, in the setting of coherence, we can obtain (and we can generalize) such results in a direct and simpler way. As a first comment, we observe that to avoid ambiguities in his construction Kaufmann should refer to the sequence of pairs of events $(A_1, C_1), (A_2, C_2), \dots, (A_n, C_n), \dots$, and not simply to the pair (A, C) . The iterative procedure introduced by Kaufmann can also be used in our approach:

- given any integer n , let us consider the pairs $(A_1, C_1), (A_2, C_2), \dots, (A_n, C_n)$, and the partition $\{H_0, \dots, H_3\}$, where

$$H_1 = A_1C_1, H_2 = \bigvee_{k=2}^n A_1^c \cdots A_{k-1}^c A_k C_k, H_3 = A_1^c \cdots A_n^c, H_0 = H_1^c H_2^c H_3^c;$$

- then, let us consider the conditional event $E|K$, where $E = H_1 \vee H_2$ and $K = H_0 \vee H_1 \vee H_2 = A_1 \vee \dots \vee A_n$, with $P(E|K) = z$. We have

$$E|K = \begin{cases} 1, & H_1 \vee H_2 = 1, \\ 0, & H_0 = 1, \\ z, & H_3 = 1. \end{cases}$$

We recall that $P(A_i) = P(A) > 0$, $P(A_i C_i) = P(AC)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$; then

$$\begin{aligned} P(H_1) &= P(AC), \quad P(H_2) = P(AC)[P(A^c) + \dots + P(A^c)^{n-1}], \\ P(H_1 \vee H_2) &= P(H_1) + P(H_2) = P(AC)[1 + P(A^c) + \dots + P(A^c)^{n-1}] = \\ &= P(AC) \frac{1 - P(A^c)^n}{1 - P(A^c)} = P(C|A)[1 - P(A^c)^n], \\ P(H_3) &= P(A_1^c \dots A_n^c) = P(A^c)^n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P(E|K) &= z = 1 \cdot P(H_1 \vee H_2) + 0 \cdot P(H_0) + z \cdot P(H_3) = \\ &= P(C|A)[1 - P(A^c)^n] + zP(A^c)^n; \end{aligned}$$

hence: $z[1 - P(A^c)^n] = P(C|A)[1 - P(A^c)^n]$; so that: $z = P(C|A)$, $\forall n$.

The probability of the event " $E|K$ true or $E|K$ false" tends to 1, when $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the probability z is constant, $z = P(C|A)$, $\forall n$.

A basic aspect: if we only assess $P(B|A) = x$, $P(D|C) = y$, how can we check the consistency of the extension $P[(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (C \rightarrow D)] = z$?

In our setting $(A \rightarrow B) \wedge (C \rightarrow D)$ is looked at as a *conditional random quantity* $(B|A) \wedge (D|C)$; hence, we speak of *previsions* (and not of probabilities) of conjoined conditionals. Moreover, we can manage without problems the case $P(A \vee C) = 0$ and, by starting with the assessment $P(B|A) = x$, $P(D|C) = y$, we can determine the values $z = \mathbb{P}[(B|A) \wedge (D|C)]$ which are coherent extensions of (x, y) on $\{B|A, D|C\}$.

4.3. Conjunction of conditionals in the setting of coherence

We introduce the notion of conjunction, by first giving some logical and probabilistic remarks. Given any events A, B, H , with $H \neq \emptyset$, let us consider the conjunction AB , or the conjunction $(A|H) \wedge (B|H) = AB|H$. In terms of indicators we have

$$AB = \min \{A, B\} = A \cdot B, \quad AB|H = \min \{A, B\}|H = (A \cdot B)|H;$$

moreover, if we assess $P(A|H) = x$, $P(B|H) = y$, then

$$A|H = AH + xH^c = \begin{cases} A, & \text{if } H = 1, \\ x, & \text{if } H = 0, \end{cases} \quad B|H = BH + yH^c = \begin{cases} B, & \text{if } H = 1, \\ y, & \text{if } H = 0. \end{cases}$$

As we see, *conditionally on H being true*, i.e. $H = 1$, we have:

$$AB|H = \min \{A, B\}|H = \min \{A|H, B|H\}|H \in \{0, 1\}.$$

We set $Z = \min \{A|H, B|H\} = \min \{AH + xH^c, BH + yH^c\}$; we have $Z \in \{1, 0, x, y\}$ and, defining $\mathbb{P}(Z|H) = z$, we have $Z|H = ZH + zH^c$, with $Z|H \in \{1, 0, z\}$. We observe that $ZH = ABH$; then, by Corollary 1, we have $Z|H = AB|H$. In other words, $\min \{A|H, B|H\}|H$ and $AB|H$ are the same conditional random quantity.¹ Then

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|H) = \min \{A|H, B|H\} | H = \min \{A|H, B|H\} | (H \vee H). \quad (9)$$

Based on formula (9), we introduce below the notion of conjunction among conditional events.

DEFINITION 4 (Conjunction). Given any pair of conditional events $A|H$ and $B|K$, with $P(A|H) = x, P(B|K) = y$, we define their conjunction as

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = \min \{A|H, B|K\} | (H \vee K).$$

Notice that, defining $Z = \min \{A|H, B|K\}$, the conjunction $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$ is the c.r.q. $Z | (H \vee K)$. Moreover, defining $T = (A|H) \cdot (B|K)$, by Corollary 1 it holds that $Z | (H \vee K) = T | (H \vee K)$, while $Z \neq T$. Then, we have

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = (A|H) \cdot (B|K) | (H \vee K). \quad (10)$$

Interpretation with the betting scheme. By assessing $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = z$, you agree to pay the amount z by receiving the amount $\min \{A|H, B|K\}$ if $H \vee K = 1$, or the amount z if the bet is *called off* ($H \vee K = 0$). That is, you pay z , by receiving the amount

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = \begin{cases} 1, & AHBK = 1, \\ 0, & A^cH \vee B^cK = 1, \\ x, & H^cBK = 1, \\ y, & AHK^c = 1, \\ z, & H^cK^c = 1; \end{cases}$$

therefore, *operatively*, for $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$ we obtain the *representation*

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = 1 \cdot AHBK + x \cdot H^cBK + y \cdot AHK^c + z \cdot H^cK^c. \quad (11)$$

¹In particular, for $B = A$, in agreement with Definition 3 we have $Z = A|H, Z|H = (A|H)|H = A|H, z = x$; the equality $(A|H)|H = A|H$ still holds from the viewpoint of iterated conditionals introduced in [25].

Then, by *linearity* of prevision, it follows

$$\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = z = P(AHBK) + xP(H^cBK) + yP(AHK^c) + zP(H^cK^c),$$

and we obtain: $zP(H \vee K) = P(AHBK) + xP(H^cBK) + yP(AHK^c)$.

In particular, if $P(H \vee K) > 0$, we obtain the result of Kaufmann

$$\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = \frac{P(AHBK) + P(A|H)P(H^cBK) + P(B|K)P(AHK^c)}{P(H \vee K)}.$$

Some particular cases. We examine below the conjunction of $A|H$ and $B|K$ for special assessments (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$ and/or when there are some logical dependencies among A, B, H, K . We set $P(A|H) = x$, $P(B|K) = y$, $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = z$.

1. If $x = y = 1$, then $(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = 1 \cdot AHBK + 1 \cdot H^cBK + 1 \cdot AHK^c + z \cdot H^cK^c = (AH \vee H^c) \wedge (BK \vee K^c) | (H \vee K) = \mathcal{C}(A|H, B|K)$, where $\mathcal{C}(A|H, B|K)$ is the *quasi conjunction* of $A|H$ and $B|K$.
2. $K = AH$. From (10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (A|H) \wedge (B|AH) &= [(A|H) \cdot (B|AH)]|H = \\ &= [(AH + xH^c)(ABH + y(AH)^c)]|H = (ABH + xyH^c)|H = \\ &= ABH|H + xyH^c|H = AB|H = \mathcal{C}(A|H, B|AH). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|AH)] = P(AB|H) = P(A|H)P(B|AH) = \mathbb{P}(A|H)\mathbb{P}(B|AH),$$

that is: $z = xy$. On the other hand

$$AB|H = ABH + zH^c = ABH + xyH^c = (A|H) \cdot (B|AH);$$

therefore $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \cdot (B|AH)] = \mathbb{P}(A|H)\mathbb{P}(B|AH)$, which means, as discussed in [25], that $A|H$ and $B|AH$ are uncorrelated (see the next case). In particular, for $H = \Omega$, we have $(B|A) \wedge A = AB$ and

$$\mathbb{P}[(B|A) \wedge A] = \mathbb{P}[(B|A) \cdot A] = P(AB) = P(B|A)P(A).$$

3. Let be given any conditional events $A|H, B|K$, with $HK = \emptyset$ and with $P(A|H) = x, P(B|K) = y$. As H and K are logically incompatible, the assessment (x, y) is coherent for every $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$; moreover, it can be verified that the assessment $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = z$ is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z = xy$. We have

$(A|H) \cdot (B|K) = (AH + xH^c)(BK + yK^c) = xH^cBK + yAHK^c + xyH^cK^c$;
moreover

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = (A|H) \cdot (B|K) | (H \vee K) = xH^cBK + yAHK^c + zH^cK^c.$$

From $z = xy$, it follows $(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = (A|H) \cdot (B|K)$; that is, the conjunction is the *product* of the *conditional random quantities* $A|H, B|K$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \cdot (B|K)] = P(A|H)P(B|K) = \mathbb{P}(A|H)\mathbb{P}(B|K); \quad (12)$$

that is, the *provision of the product* coincides with the *product of provisions*, which means that, under the hypothesis $HK = \emptyset$, the random quantities $A|H, B|K$ are uncorrelated. As discussed in [25], the equality (12) does not mean that $A|H$ and $B|K$ are stochastically independent.

4. We recall that from $A \subseteq B$, it follows $AB = A$. This property *still holds for conditional events*; that is, under the hypothesis $A|H \subseteq B|K$, where the symbol \subseteq denotes the well known inclusion relation of Goodman and Nguyen ([28]), we can verify that $(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = A|H$. Indeed, the relation $A|H \subseteq B|K$ amounts to $AH \subseteq BK$ and $B^cK \subseteq A^cH$ and coherence requires $x \leq y$. In terms of indicators the inclusion relation implies $A|H \leq B|K$; hence $\min\{A|H, B|K\} = A|H$. Then, by (7), $A|H = A|H(H \vee K) = (AH + xH^c)|(H \vee K) = (A|H)|(H \vee K)$; hence

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = \min\{A|H, B|K\} | (H \vee K) = (A|H) | (H \vee K) = A|H.$$

We remark that $A|H \wedge B|K = A|H$ does not imply $A|H \subseteq B|K$; for instance, given any events H, B, K , with $H^cB^cK \neq \emptyset$, it holds that $H^c|H \wedge B|K = H^c|H$, but $H^c|H \not\subseteq B|K$; in fact, if H^cB^cK is true, then $B|K$ is false, while $H^c|H$ is void.

5. Lower and upper bounds for $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$

We will now determine the coherent extensions of the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$ to the conjunction $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$. We recall that the extension $z = P(AB|H)$ of the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|H\}$, with A, B, H logically independent, is coherent if and only if: $\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} \leq z \leq \min\{x, y\}$. *The next theorem show that the same results holds for $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$.*

THEOREM 10. Given any coherent assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$, with A, H, B, K logically independent, and with $H \neq \emptyset, K \neq \emptyset$, the extension

$z = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]$ is coherent if and only if the Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds are satisfied, that is

$$\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} = z' \leq z \leq z'' = \min\{x, y\}. \quad (13)$$

PROOF. First of all we observe that, by logical independence of A, H, B, K , the assessment (x, y) is coherent for every $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$. We will determine the values z', z'' by the geometrical approach described in Subsection 2.3. The constituents associated with the family $\mathcal{F} = \{A|H, B|K, (A|H) \wedge (B|K)\}$ and contained in $H \vee K$ are

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= AHBK, & C_2 &= AHB^cK, & C_3 &= A^cHBK, & C_4 &= A^cHB^cK, \\ C_5 &= AHK^c, & C_6 &= A^cHK^c, & C_7 &= H^cBK, & C_8 &= H^cB^cK. \end{aligned}$$

The associated points Q_h 's are

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= (1, 1, 1), & Q_2 &= (1, 0, 0), & Q_3 &= (0, 1, 0), & Q_4 &= (0, 0, 0), \\ Q_5 &= (1, y, y), & Q_6 &= (0, y, 0), & Q_7 &= (x, 1, x), & Q_8 &= (x, 0, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Considering the convex hull \mathcal{I} of Q_1, \dots, Q_8 , the coherence of prevision assessment $\mathcal{M} = (x, y, z)$ on \mathcal{F} requires that the condition $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{I}$ be satisfied, which amounts to solvability of the following system

$$(S) \quad \mathcal{M} = \sum_{h=1}^8 \lambda_h Q_h, \quad \sum_{h=1}^8 \lambda_h = 1, \quad \lambda_h \geq 0, \quad \forall h.$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_5 &= yQ_1 + (1 - y)Q_2, & Q_6 &= yQ_3 + (1 - y)Q_4, \\ Q_7 &= xQ_1 + (1 - x)Q_3, & Q_8 &= xQ_2 + (1 - x)Q_4; \end{aligned}$$

then, the convex hull \mathcal{I} is the tetrahedron with vertices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 . Thus, (S) is equivalent to the system

$$(S') \quad \mathcal{P} = \sum_{h=1}^4 \lambda'_h Q_h, \quad \sum_{h=1}^4 \lambda'_h = 1, \quad \lambda'_h \geq 0, \quad \forall h,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_1 &= \lambda_1 + y\lambda_5 + x\lambda_7, & \lambda'_2 &= \lambda_2 + (1 - y)\lambda_5 + x\lambda_8, \\ \lambda'_3 &= \lambda_3 + y\lambda_6 + (1 - x)\lambda_7, & \lambda'_4 &= \lambda_4 + (1 - y)\lambda_6 + (1 - x)\lambda_8. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{I}$ if and only if (S') is solvable. We observe that (S') can be written as

$$(S') \quad \lambda'_1 + \lambda'_2 = x, \quad \lambda'_1 + \lambda'_3 = y, \quad \lambda'_1 = z, \quad \lambda'_1 + \lambda'_2 + \lambda'_3 + \lambda'_4 = 1, \quad \lambda'_h \geq 0, \quad \forall h;$$

that is

$$(S') \quad \lambda'_1 = z, \lambda'_2 = x - z, \lambda'_3 = y - z, \lambda'_4 = z - (x + y - 1), \lambda'_h \geq 0, \forall h.$$

As it can be easily verified, (S') is solvable if and only if

$$\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} = z' \leq z \leq z'' = \min\{x, y\}.$$

Moreover, for each solution $(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3, \lambda'_4)$ of (S') the vector $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_8) = (\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \lambda'_3, \lambda'_4, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ is a solution of (S) such that

$$\sum_{r: C_r \subseteq H} \lambda_r = \sum_{r: C_r \subseteq K} \lambda_r = \sum_{r: C_r \subseteq H \vee K} \lambda_r = 1 > 0,$$

and hence $I_0 = \emptyset$; then, by Theorem 5, the solvability of (S) is also sufficient for the coherence of \mathcal{M} . Therefore, the extension $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = z$ of the assessment (x, y) , with $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$, is coherent if and only if

$$\max\{P(A|H) + P(B|K) - 1, 0\} \leq \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] \leq \min\{P(A|H), P(B|K)\}.$$

■

We remark that for the quasi conjunction $\mathcal{C}(A|H, B|K)$ only holds the inequality on the lower bound; indeed, the extension $P[\mathcal{C}(A|H, B|K)] = \gamma$ of the assessment (x, y) is coherent if and only if $\gamma' \leq \gamma \leq \gamma''$, where $\gamma' = z' = \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}$ and $\gamma'' = \frac{x+y-2xy}{1-xy}$ if $(x, y) \neq (1, 1)$; $\gamma'' = 1$ if $(x, y) = (1, 1)$. We observe that: $\gamma'' \geq \max\{x, y\} \geq \min\{x, y\} = z''$.

A probabilistic analysis of the lower and upper bounds for the quasi conjunction, in terms of t-norms and t-conorms, has been given in [23, 26].

6. Negation and Disjunction

Given any coherent assessment (x, y, z) on $\{A|H, B|K, (A|H) \wedge (B|K)\}$, it holds that $(A|H) \wedge (B|K) \in \{1, 0, x, y, z\} \subset [0, 1]$. We recall that for conditional events the negation is usually defined as $(E|H)^c = E^c|H = (1 - E)|H$. In our approach we have $(1 - E)|H = 1 - E|H$; hence $(E|H)^c = 1 - E^c|H$. Then, for the conjunction of two conditional events, we give the following

DEFINITION 5. Given any conditional events $A|H, B|K$, the negation of the conjunction $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$ is defined as

$$[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]^c = 1 - (A|H) \wedge (B|K).$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} [(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]^c &= 1 - \min\{A|H, B|K\} | (H \vee K) = \\ &= (1 - \min\{A|H, B|K\}) | (H \vee K) = \max\{A^c|H, B^c|K\} | (H \vee K). \end{aligned}$$

Then, based on the relation $A \vee B = (A^c B^c)^c$ (De Morgan's Law), for the disjunction of two conditional events we give the following

DEFINITION 6. Given any conditional events $A|H, B|K$, the disjunction $(A|H) \vee (B|K)$ is defined as: $(A|H) \vee (B|K) = [(A^c|H) \wedge (B^c|K)]^c$.

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (A|H) \vee (B|K) &= 1 - \min\{A^c|H, B^c|K\} | (H \vee K) = \\ &= (1 - \min\{A^c|H, B^c|K\}) | (H \vee K) = \max\{A|H, B|K\} | (H \vee K). \end{aligned}$$

If we assess $P(A|H) = x, P(B|K) = y, \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)] = \gamma$, then

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = 1 \cdot (AH \vee BK) + x \cdot H^c B^c K + y \cdot A^c H K^c + \gamma \cdot H^c K^c.$$

Prevision sum rule. The classical formula $P(A \vee B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(AB)$ still holds for conjunction and disjunction of conditional events. In fact, by recalling (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (A|H) \vee (B|K) + (A|H) \wedge (B|K) &= [\min\{A|H, B|K\} + \max\{A|H, B|K\}] | (H \vee K) = \\ &= (A|H + B|K) | (H \vee K) = (A|H) | (H \vee K) + (B|K) | (H \vee K) = A|H + B|K. \end{aligned}$$

Then: $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)] = \mathbb{P}(A|H) + \mathbb{P}(B|K) - \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]$. Finally, assuming A, H, B, K logically independent and defining $P(A|H) = x, P(B|K) = y, \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = z, \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)] = \gamma$, it holds that $\gamma = x + y - z$ and from (13) we obtain $\max\{x, y\} \leq z \leq \min\{x + y - 1, 1\}$, that is

$$\max\{P(A|H), P(B|K)\} \leq \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)] \leq \min\{P(A|H) + P(B|K) - 1, 1\}.$$

7. Conclusions

In this paper we have given some results on finite conditional random quantities and conditional prevision assessments in the setting of coherence. We have proposed a suitable representation for conditional random quantities which includes in particular the case of the (indicators of) conditional events represented as numerical quantities, with values 1, or 0, or p , where p is the

probability assessment for the given conditional event. By this representation we have given a meaning to the (iterated) conditional random quantity $(X|H)|K$ as a suitable conditional random quantity, by showing that $(X|H)|K \neq X|HK$, with $(X|H)|K = X|HK$ if $H \subseteq K$. Then, we have examined for two conditional events the logical operation of conjunction, its negation and by De Morgan's Law the associated disjunction. We recall that this problem has been largely studied by many authors in literature, especially in the field of artificial intelligence. Based on the recent paper by S. Kaufmann, we have shown that in the setting of coherence the logical operations can be defined in a natural way; moreover, the result of a conjunction or a disjunction of two conditional events is a conditional random quantity. In our paper we have obtained, in a simple and direct way, the results on conjunction by Kaufmann and other general results. In particular we have determined the lower and upper bounds for the conjunction and disjunction of two conditional events, by showing that the classical properties valid for the conjunction and disjunction of two unconditional events continue to hold. In a future work we will deepen the study of conditional random quantities in the setting of coherence and we will analyze in general the operation of iterated conditioning given in [25].

References

- [1] ADAMS, E. W., *The logic of conditionals*, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1975.
- [2] BAIOLETTI, M., and A. CAPOTORTI, 'A comparison between classical logic and three-valued logic for conditional events', in *Proc. of the Sixth Int. Conf. on Information Processing and Management of Uncertainty in Knowledge-Based Systems, IPMU '96*, 1996, pp. 1217–1222.
- [3] BIAZZO, V., A. GILIO, and G. SANFILIPPO, 'Coherence checking and propagation of lower probability bounds', *Soft Comput.*, 7 (2003), 5, 310–320.
- [4] BIAZZO, V., A. GILIO, and G. SANFILIPPO, 'Generalized coherence and connection property of imprecise conditional previsions', in *Proc. of 12th Information Processing and Management of Uncertainty in Knowledge-Based Systems Conference, IPMU'08, Malaga, Spain, June 22 - 27, 2008*, pp. 907–914.
- [5] BIAZZO, V., A. GILIO, and G. SANFILIPPO, 'Coherent conditional previsions and proper scoring rules', in S. Greco, B. Bouchon-Meunier, G. Coletti, M. Fedrizzi, B. Matarazzo, and R. R. Yager, (eds.), *Advances in Computational Intelligence*, vol. 300 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, Springer, 2012, pp. 146–156.
- [6] BRUNO, G., and A. GILIO, 'Confronto fra eventi condizionati di probabilità nulla nell'inferenza statistica bayesiana', *Rivista di Matematica per le Scienze Economiche e Sociali*, 2 (1985), 141–152.
- [7] CALABRESE, P., 'An algebraic synthesis of the foundations of logic and probability', *Information Sciences*, 42 (1987), 3, 187 – 237.

- [8] CAPOTORTI, A., ‘Generalized concept of atoms for conditional events’, in G. Coletti, D. Dubois, and R. Scozzafava, (eds.), *Mathematical models for handling partial knowledge in artificial intelligence*, Plenum Press, New York, NY, USA, 1995.
- [9] CAPOTORTI, A., and B. VANTAGGI, ‘A general interpretation of conditioning and its implication on coherence’, *Soft Comput.*, 3 (1999), 3, 148–153.
- [10] COLETTI, G., and R. SCOZZAFAVA, *Probabilistic logic in a coherent setting*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2002.
- [11] DE FINETTI, B., ‘La logique de la probabilité’, in *Actes du Congrès International de Philosophie Scientifique, Paris, 1935*, Hermann et Cie, Paris, 1936, pp. IV 1–IV 9.
- [12] DE FINETTI, B., *Teoria delle probabilità*, Ed. Einaudi, 2 voll., Torino, 1970. English version: *Theory of Probability 1 (2)*, Chichester, Wiley, 1974 (1975).
- [13] DUBOIS, D., and H. PRADE, ‘Conditioning, non-monotonic logic and non-standard uncertainty models’, in I. R. Goodman, M. M. Gupta, H. T. Nguyen, and G. S. Rogers, (eds.), *Conditional Logic in Expert Systems*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1991, pp. 115–158.
- [14] DUBOIS, D., and H. PRADE, ‘Conditional objects as nonmonotonic consequence relationships’, *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on*, 24 (1994), 12, 1724–1740.
- [15] EDGINGTON, D., ‘On conditionals’, *Mind*, 104 (1995), 414, 235–329.
- [16] FUGARD, A. J. B., N. PFEIFER, B. MAYERHOFER, and G. D. KLEITER, ‘How people interpret conditionals: Shifts toward the conditional event.’, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 37 (2011), 3, 635–648.
- [17] GALE, D., *The theory of linear economic models*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.
- [18] GILIO, A., ‘Criterio di penalizzazione e condizioni di coerenza nella valutazione soggettiva della probabilità’, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.*, 4-B (1990), 3, Serie 7, 645–660.
- [19] GILIO, A., ‘ C_0 -Coherence and Extension of Conditional Probabilities’, in J. M. Bernardo, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid, and A. F. M. Smith, (eds.), *Bayesian Statistics 4*, Oxford University Press, 1992, pp. 633–640.
- [20] GILIO, A., ‘Probabilistic consistency of knowledge bases in inference systems’, in M. Clarke, R. Kruse, and S. Moral, (eds.), *ECSQARU*, vol. 747 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 1993, pp. 160–167.
- [21] GILIO, A., ‘Algorithms for precise and imprecise conditional probability assessments’, in G. Coletti, D. Dubois, and R. Scozzafava, (eds.), *Mathematical Models for Handling Partial Knowledge in Artificial Intelligence*, Plenum Press, New York, 1995, pp. 231–254.
- [22] GILIO, A., and D. OVER, ‘The psychology of inferring conditionals from disjunctions: A probabilistic study’, *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 56 (2012), 2, 118–131.
- [23] GILIO, A., and G. SANFILIPPO, ‘Quasi Conjunction and p-entailment in nonmonotonic reasoning’, in C. Borgelt, G. Rodríguez, W. Trutschnig, M. Lubiano, M. Gil, P. Grzegorzewski, and O. Hryniewicz, (eds.), *Combining Soft Computing and Statistical Methods in Data Analysis*, vol. 77 of *Advances in Intelligent and Soft Computing*, Springer-Verlag, 2010, pp. 321–328.
- [24] GILIO, A., and G. SANFILIPPO, ‘Coherent conditional probabilities and proper scoring rules’, in F. Coolen, G. de Cooman, T. Fetz, and M. Oberguggenberger, (eds.), *ISIPTA’11: Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium on Imprecise Prob-*

- ability: Theories and Applications*, SIPTA, Innsbruck, 2011, pp. 189–198.
- [25] GILIO, A., and G. SANFILIPPO, ‘Conjunction, Disjunction and Iterated Conditioning of Conditional Events’, in R. Kruse, M. R. Berthold, C. Moewes, M. A. Gil, P. Grzegorzewski, and O. Hryniewicz, (eds.), *Synergies of Soft Computing and Statistics for Intelligent Data Analysis*, vol. 190 of *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, pp. 399–407.
- [26] GILIO, A., and G. SANFILIPPO, ‘Quasi conjunction, quasi disjunction, t-norms and t-conorms: Probabilistic aspects’, *Information Sciences*, (2013). Doi 10.1016/j.ins.2013.03.019.
- [27] GILIO, A., and R. SCOZZAFAVA, ‘Conditional events in probability assessment and revision’, *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on*, 24 (1994), 12, 1741–1746.
- [28] GOODMAN, I., and H. NGUYEN, ‘Conditional objects and the modeling of uncertainties’, in M. Gupta, and T. Yamakawa, (eds.), *Fuzzy Computing*, North-Holland, 1988, pp. 119–138.
- [29] GOODMAN, I. R., H. T. NGUYEN, and E. A. WALKER, *Conditional Inference and Logic for Intelligent Systems: A Theory of Measure-Free Conditioning*, North-Holland, 1991.
- [30] JEFFREY, R., ‘Matter-of-fact conditionals’, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume*, 65 (1991), 161–183.
- [31] KAUFMANN, S., ‘Conditionals right and left: Probabilities for the whole family’, *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 38 (2009), 1–53.
- [32] LAD, F., *Operational Subjective Statistical Methods*, Wiley, 1996.
- [33] MCGEE, V., ‘Conditional probabilities and compounds of conditionals’, *Philosophical Review*, 98 (1989), 4, 485–541.
- [34] MILNE, P., ‘Bruno de Finetti and the Logic of Conditional Events’, *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 48 (1997), 2, 195–232.
- [35] PFEIFER, N., and G. D. KLEITER, ‘Inference in conditional probability logic’, *Kybernetika*, 42 (2006), 391–404.
- [36] PFEIFER, N., and G. D. KLEITER, ‘Framing human inference by coherence based probability logic’, *Journal of Applied Logic*, 7 (2009), 2, 206–217.
- [37] PFEIFER, N., and G. D. KLEITER, ‘The conditional in mental probability logic’, in M. Oaksford, and N. Chater, (eds.), *Cognition and conditionals: Probability and logic in human thought*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, pp. 153–173.
- [38] SCHAY, G., ‘An algebra of conditional events’, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 24 (1968), 334–344.
- [39] SCHURZ, G., and P. D. THORN, ‘Reward versus risk in uncertain inference: Theorems and simulations’, *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, (2012).
- [40] STALNAKER, R., and R. JEFFREY, ‘Conditionals as random variables’, in E. Eells, and B. Skyrms, (eds.), *Probability and Conditionals: Belief Revision and Rational Decision*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 1994, pp. 31–46.
- [41] VAN FRAASSEN, B., ‘Probabilities of conditionals’, in W. Harper, R. Stalnaker, and G. Pearce, (eds.), *Foundations of probability theory, statistical inference, and statistical theories of science*, vol. 1, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1976, pp. 261–308.

ANGELO GILIO
Dipartimento di Scienze di Base e Applicate per l'Ingegneria
University of Rome "La Sapienza"
Via A. Scarpa, 16 - 00161 Roma, Italy
angelo.gilio@sbai.uniroma1.it

GIUSEPPE SANFILIPPO
University of Palermo
Viale delle Scienze, ed. 13 - 90128 Palermo, Italy
giuseppe.sanfilippo@unipa.it