

ARTICLE

# Two-layered logics for probabilities and belief functions over Belnap–Dunn logic

Marta Bílková, Sabine Frittella, Daniil Kozhemiachenko, and Ondrej Majer

Institute of Computer Science, The Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague

[bilkova@cs.cas.cz](mailto:bilkova@cs.cas.cz)

INSA Centre Val de Loire, Univ. Orléans, LIFO EA 4022, France

[sabine.frittella@insa-cvl.fr](mailto:sabine.frittella@insa-cvl.fr)

Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR 5800

[daniil.kozhemiachenko@u-bordeaux.fr](mailto:daniil.kozhemiachenko@u-bordeaux.fr)

Institute of Philosophy, The Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague

[majer@flu.cas.cz](mailto:majer@flu.cas.cz)

(Received xx xxx xxx; revised xx xxx xxx; accepted xx xxx xxx)

## Abstract

This paper is an extended version of Bílková et al. (2023b). We discuss two-layered logics formalising reasoning with probabilities and belief functions that combine the Łukasiewicz  $[0, 1]$ -valued logic with Baaz  $\Delta$  operator and the Belnap–Dunn logic.

We consider two probabilistic logics —  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$  (introduced in Bílková et al. (2023)) and  $4\text{Pr}^{k\Delta}$  (from Bílková et al. (2023b)) — that present two perspectives on the probabilities in the Belnap–Dunn logic. In  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$ , every event  $\phi$  has independent positive and negative measures that denote the likelihoods of  $\phi$  and  $\neg\phi$ , respectively. In  $4\text{Pr}^{k\Delta}$ , the measures of the events are treated as partitions of the sample into four exhaustive and mutually exclusive parts corresponding to pure belief, pure disbelief, conflict and uncertainty of an agent in  $\phi$ .

In addition to that, we discuss two logics for the paraconsistent reasoning with belief and plausibility functions from Bílková et al. (2023) —  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$  and  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}$ . Both these logics equip events with two measures (positive and negative) with their main difference being that in  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$ , the negative measure of  $\phi$  is defined as the *belief in*  $\neg\phi$  while in  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}$ , it is treated independently as *the plausibility of*  $\neg\phi$ .

We provide a sound and complete Hilbert-style axiomatisation of  $4\text{Pr}^{k\Delta}$  and establish faithful translations between it and  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$ . We also show that the satisfiability problem in all the logics is NP-complete.

**Keywords:** two-layered logics; Łukasiewicz logic; non-standard probabilities; non-standard belief functions; paraconsistent logics

## 1. Introduction

Classical probability and Dempster–Shafer theories study probability measures and belief functions. These are maps from the set of events of a sample space  $W$  (i.e., from  $2^W$ ) to  $[0, 1]$  that are monotone w.r.t.  $\subseteq$  with the following additional conditions: probability measures satisfy the (finite or countable) additivity condition:

$$\mu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} E_i \right) = \sum_{i \in I} \mu(E_i) \quad (\forall i, j \in I : i \neq j \Rightarrow E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset)$$

and belief functions its weaker version (*total monotonicity* in the terminology of Zhou (2013))

$$\text{bel}(W) = 1 \quad \text{bel} \left( \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} E_i \right) \geq \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\} \\ J \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|J|+1} \cdot \text{bel} \left( \bigcap_{j \in J} E_j \right) \quad \text{bel}(\emptyset) = 0$$

Above, the disjointness of  $E_i$  and  $E_j$  can be construed as their incompatibility. Most importantly, if a propositional formula  $\phi$  is associated with an event  $\|\phi\|$  (and interpreted as a statement about it), then

$$\mu(\|\phi \wedge \neg\phi\|) = \text{bel}(\|\phi \wedge \neg\phi\|) = 0$$

(since  $\|\phi\|$  and  $\|\neg\phi\|$  are incompatible) and  $\|\phi \vee \neg\phi\|$  exhausts the entire sample space, whence

$$\mu(\|\phi \vee \neg\phi\|) = \text{bel}(\|\phi \vee \neg\phi\|) = 1$$

*Paraconsistent* uncertainty theory, on the other hand, assumes that the measure of an event represents not the likelihood of it happening but an agent's certainty therein which they infer from the information given by the sources. In this respect, it is close to the classical Dempster–Shafer theory that can also be considered as a generalisation of the subjective probability theory.

The main difference between the classical and paraconsistent approaches is the treatment of negation. Dempster–Shafer theory usually deals with contradictions *between different sources*. However, it is reasonable to assume that even a *single source* can give contradictory information (or give no information at all). Thus, a ‘contradictory’ event  $\|\phi \wedge \neg\phi\|$  can have a positive probability or belief assignment and that  $\|\phi \vee \neg\phi\|$  does not necessarily exhaust the sample space. Thus, a logic describing events should allow them to be both true and false (if the source gives contradictory information) or neither true nor false (when the source does not give information). Formally, this means that  $\neg$  does not correspond to the complement in the sample space.

### 1.1 Belnap–Dunn logic

As one can see from the previous paragraph, we need a very special kind of negation: the one that allows for true contradictions (and thus, rejects the principle of explosion), and, additionally, invalidates the law of excluded middle. Thus, the following principles are no longer valid

$$\text{EFQ} : p \wedge \neg p \models q$$

$$\text{LEM} : p \models q \vee \neg q$$

The logics that lack EFQ are called *paraconsistent*, those that do not have LEM are *paracomplete*, and those that fail both principles are *paradefinite* or *paranormal* (cf., e.g., Arieli and Avron (2017) for the terminology).

The simplest paradefinite logic to represent reasoning about information provided by sources is the Belnap–Dunn logic (BD) from Dunn (1976) and Belnap (1977, 2019). Originally, BD was presented as a four-valued propositional logic in the  $\{\neg, \wedge, \vee\}$  language. The values (which we will henceforth call *Belnapian values*) represent different accounts a source can give regarding a statement  $\phi$ :

- **T** stands for ‘the source only says that  $\phi$  is true’;
- **F** stands for ‘the source only says that  $\phi$  is false’;
- **B** stands for ‘the source says both that  $\phi$  is false and that  $\phi$  is true’;
- **N** stands for ‘the source does not say that  $\phi$  is false nor that it is true’.

The interpretation of the truth values allows for reformulating BD semantics in terms of *two classical but independent valuations*. Namely,

	is true when	is false when
$\neg\phi$	$\phi$ is false	$\phi$ is true
$\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$	$\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ are true	$\phi_1$ is false or $\phi_2$ is false
$\phi_1 \vee \phi_2$	$\phi_1$ is true or $\phi_2$ is true	$\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ are false

It is easy to see that there are no universally true nor universally false formulas in BD. Thus, BD satisfies the desiderata outlined above. Moreover, even if we define  $\phi \Rightarrow \chi$  as  $\neg\phi \vee \chi$ , it is clear that neither modus ponens, nor the Deduction theorem will hold for  $\Rightarrow$ . I.e., BD lacks the (definable) implication (cf. (Omori and Wansing, 2017, §5.1) for a detailed discussion of the implication in BD). This, however, is not problematic since we are going to use BD only to represent events and conditional statements which are usually formalised with an implication do not correspond to descriptions of events.

### 1.2 Probabilities and belief functions in BD

The original interpretation of the Belnapian truth values that we gave above is presented in terms of the information one has. In this approach, however, the information is assumed to be crisp. Theories of uncertainty over BD were introduced to formalise situations where one has access to graded information. For instance, the first source could tell that  $p$  is true with the likelihood 0.4 and the second that  $p$  is false with probability 0.7. If one follows BD and treats positive and negative evidence independently, one needs a non-classical notion of uncertainty measures to represent this information.

To the best of our knowledge, the earliest formalisation of probability theory in terms of BD was provided by Mares (1997). The formalisation is very similar to the one that we are going to use in this paper but bears one significant distinction. Namely, (Mares, 1997, §2) uses *normalised* measures (i.e., those where  $\mu(W) = 1$  and  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ ). This requirement, however, is superfluous since BD lacks universally (in)valid formulas.

Another formalisation is given in Dunn (2010). Dunn proposes to divide the sample space into four exhaustive and mutually exclusive parts depending on the Belnapian value of  $\phi$ . An alternative approach was proposed in Klein et al. (2021). There, the authors propose two equivalent interpretations based on the two formulations of semantics. The first option is to give  $\phi$  two *independent probability measures*: the one determining the likelihood of  $\phi$  to be true and the other the likelihood of  $\phi$  to be false. The second option follows Dunn and also divides the sample space according to whether  $\phi$  has value **T**, **B**, **N**, or **F** in a given state. Note that in both cases, the probabilities are interpreted *subjectively*.

The main difference between these two approaches is that in Dunn (2010), the probability of  $\phi \wedge \phi'$  is entirely determined by those of  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$  which makes it compositional. On the other hand, the paraconsistent probabilities proposed in Klein et al. (2021) are not compositional w.r.t. conjunction. In this paper, we choose the latter approach since it can be argued (cf. Dubois (2008) for the details) that belief is not compositional when it comes to contradictory information.

A similar approach to paraconsistent probabilities was proposed by, e.g., Bueno-Soler and Carnielli (2016) and Rodrigues et al. (2021). There, probabilities are defined over an extension of BD with classicality and non-classicality operators. It is worth mentioning that the proposed axioms of probability are very close to those from Klein et al. (2021): e.g., both allow measures  $p$  s.t.  $p(\phi) + p(\neg\phi) < 1$  (if the information regarding  $\phi$  is incomplete) or  $p(\phi) + p(\neg\phi) > 1$  (when the information is contradictory).

Belief functions over BD were first defined in Zhou (2013). There, they were presented on the ordered sets of states. Each formula  $\phi$  in this approach corresponds to *two* sets of states:  $|\phi|^+$  (states where  $\phi$  has value **T** or **B**) and  $|\phi|^-$  (states where it is evaluated at **B** or **F**). Moreover,

a logic formalising reasoning with belief functions was presented. A similar treatment of (non-normalised or *general* in the terminology of the paper) belief functions in BD was given in Bílková et al. (2023). The main difference between the two interpretations of belief functions was that in Bílková et al. (2023), two options for interpreting  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^-)$  were given: the first one was to treat it as the belief of  $\neg\phi$ , and the second one — as *the plausibility* of  $\neg\phi$ . Another distinction was in the formalisation: Zhou (2013) constructs a logic for reasoning about belief functions following Fagin et al. (1990): i.e., incorporating the arithmetical operations and inequalities containing them into the language. In Bílková et al. (2023), a different approach was utilised: instead of using arithmetic inequalities, the reasoning about belief functions is conducted in a different logic — a paraconsistent expansion of the Łukasiewicz logic  $\mathbb{L}$  — that is capable of expressing arithmetic operations on  $[0, 1]$ .

### 1.3 Two-layered logics for uncertainty

Reasoning about uncertainty can be formalised via modal logics where the modality is interpreted as a measure of an event. The concrete semantics of the modality can be defined in two ways. First, using a modal language with Kripke semantics where the measure is defined on the set of states as done by, e.g., Gärdenfors (1975); Delgrande and Renne (2015); Delgrande et al. (2019) for qualitative probabilities, by Dautović et al. (2021) for the quantitative ones, and by Rodriguez et al. (2022) for the possibility and necessity measures. Second, employing a two-layered formalism (cf. Fagin et al. (1990); Fagin and Halpern (1991), Hájek et al. (1995), Baldi et al. (2020), and Bílková et al. (2023,a,b) for examples). There, the logic is split into two levels: the inner layer describes events, and the outer layer describes the reasoning with the measure defined on events. The measure is a *non-nesting* modality  $M$ , and the outer-layer formulas are built from ‘*modal atoms*’ — formulas of the form  $M\phi$  with  $\phi$  being an inner-layer formula. The outer-layer formulas are then equipped with the semantics of a fuzzy logic that permits necessary operations (e.g., Łukasiewicz for the quantitative reasoning and Gödel for the qualitative).

An alternative to the two-layered logics is to use the language of linear inequalities to reason about measures of events. This is done by Fagin et al. (1990) for the classical reasoning about probabilities and by Zhou (2013) for the reasoning with the belief functions over BD. In both cases, it is established that the logics with inequalities and the two-layered logics are equivalent — cf. Baldi et al. (2020) for the case of classical probabilities and Bílková et al. (2023) for the reasoning with belief functions and probabilities over BD.

We choose the two-layered approach. First, it is more modular than the usual Kripke semantics: as long as the logic of the event description is chosen, we can define different measures on top of it using different upper-layer logics. Second, the completeness proof is very simple since one only needs to translate the axioms of the given measure into the outer-layer logic. Third, the techniques that are used to establish the decidability of the outer-layer logic can be applied to the decidability proof of the two-layered logic. Finally, even though the traditional Kripke semantics is more expressive than two-layered logics, this expressivity is not necessary in many contexts. Indeed, people rarely say something like ‘it is probable that it is probable that  $\phi$ ’. Moreover, it is considerably more difficult to motivate the assignment of truth values in the nesting case, in particular, when the same measure is applied both to a propositional and modalised formula as in, e.g.,  $M(p \wedge Mq)$ .

We will also be dealing with the formalisation of the *quantitative* reasoning. Formally, this means that we assume that the agents can assign numerical values to their certainty in a given proposition or say something like ‘I think that rain is twice more likely than snow’. Thus, we need a logic that can express the paraconsistent counterparts of the additivity condition as well as basic arithmetic operations. We choose the Łukasiewicz logic ( $\mathbb{L}$ ) for the outer layer since it can define (truncated) addition and subtraction on  $[0, 1]$ .

### 1.4 Plan of the paper

This paper is an extended version of an earlier conference submission Bílková et al. (2023b). The novel contribution of this manuscript is the proof of the NP-completeness of the two-layered logics for belief functions from Bílková et al. (2023). As such, we continue the study of uncertainty via paraconsistent logics proposed in Bílková et al. (2020) and continued in Bílková et al. (2023), Bílková et al. (2023a), and Bílková et al. (2023). The overarching goal of the project is to study logics that can express the following properties of beliefs.

- (1) Given two statements  $\phi$  and  $\chi$ , one can be more certain in  $\phi$  than in  $\chi$  but still, neither believe in  $\phi$  *completely* nor consider  $\chi$  completely impossible.
- (2) Given two trusted sources, one can still prefer one source to the other.
- (3) One can believe in a contradiction but still not believe in something else.
- (4) Given two statements, it is possible that one cannot always compare their degrees of certainty in them (if, e.g., these statements have no common content).

The remainder of the text is structured as follows. In Section 2, we recall two approaches to probabilities over BD from Klein et al. (2021). In Section 3, we provide the semantics and axiomatisations of two-layered logics for probabilities and establish their NP-completeness. In Section 4, we recall two treatments of belief functions over BD that were presented in Bílková et al. (2023). In Section 5, we discuss the two-layered logics for belief functions and show their NP-completeness. Finally, we summarise our results and set goals for future research in Section 6.

## 2. Probabilities over BD

In the previous section, we gave an informal presentation of BD as a four-valued logic. Since we are going to use it to describe events, we will formulate its semantics in terms of sets of states. The language of BD is given by the following grammar (with  $\text{Prop}$  being a countable set of propositional variables).

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}} \ni \phi := p \in \text{Prop} \mid \neg\phi \mid (\phi \wedge \psi) \mid (\phi \vee \psi)$$

**Convention 1** (Notation). In what follows,  $\text{Prop}(\phi)$  denotes the set of variables occurring in  $\phi$  and  $\text{Lit}(\phi)$  stands for the set of *literals* (i.e., variables or their negations) occurring in  $\phi$ . Moreover,  $\text{Sf}(\phi)$  is the set of all subformulas of  $\phi$ . The *length* (i.e., the number of symbols) of  $\phi$  is denoted with  $\ell(\phi)$ .

We are also going to use two kinds of formulas: the single- and the two-layered ones. To make the differentiation between them simpler, we use Greek letters from the end of the alphabet ( $\phi, \chi, \psi$ , etc.) to designate the first kind and the letters from the beginning of the alphabet ( $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \dots$ ) for the second kind.

Furthermore, we use  $v$  (with indices) to stand for the valuations of single-layered formulas and  $e$  (with indices) for the two-layered formulas.

**Definition 2** (Set semantics of BD). Let  $\phi, \phi' \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}}$ ,  $W \neq \emptyset$ , and  $v^+, v^- : \text{Prop} \rightarrow 2^W$ . For a model  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^- \rangle$ , we define notions of  $w \models^+ \phi$  and  $w \models^- \phi$  for  $w \in W$  as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ll} w \models^+ p \text{ iff } w \in v^+(p) & w \models^- p \text{ iff } w \in v^-(p) \\ w \models^+ \neg\phi \text{ iff } w \models^- \phi & w \models^- \neg\phi \text{ iff } w \models^+ \phi \\ w \models^+ \phi \wedge \phi' \text{ iff } w \models^+ \phi \text{ and } w \models^+ \phi' & w \models^- \phi \wedge \phi' \text{ iff } w \models^- \phi \text{ or } w \models^- \phi' \\ w \models^+ \phi \vee \phi' \text{ iff } w \models^+ \phi \text{ or } w \models^+ \phi' & w \models^- \phi \vee \phi' \text{ iff } w \models^- \phi \text{ and } w \models^- \phi' \end{array}$$

We denote the positive and negative extensions of a formula as follows:

$$|\phi|^+ := \{w \in W \mid w \models^+ \phi\} \quad |\phi|^- := \{w \in W \mid w \models^- \phi\}.$$

A sequent  $\phi \vdash \chi$  is satisfied on  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^- \rangle$  (denoted,  $\mathfrak{M} \models [\phi \vdash \chi]$ ) iff  $|\phi|^+ \subseteq |\chi|^+$ . A sequent  $\phi \vdash \chi$  is BD-valid ( $\phi \models_{\text{BD}} \chi$ ) iff it is satisfied on every model. In this case, we will say that  $\phi$  entails  $\chi$  in BD.

Now, we can use the above semantics to define probabilities on the models. We adapt the definitions from Klein et al. (2021).

**Definition 3** (BD models with  $\pm$ -probabilities). A BD model with a  $\pm$ -probability is a tuple  $\mathfrak{M}_{\pm} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \mu \rangle$  with  $\mathfrak{M}$  being a BD model and  $\mu : 2^W \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying:

**mon:** if  $X \subseteq Y$ , then  $\mu(X) \leq \mu(Y)$ ;

**neg:**  $\mu(|\phi|^-) = \mu(|\neg\phi|^+)$ ;

**ex:**  $\mu(|\phi \vee \chi|^+) = \mu(|\phi|^+) + \mu(|\chi|^+) - \mu(|\phi \wedge \chi|^+)$ .

To facilitate the presentation of the four-valued probabilities defined over BD models, we introduce additional extensions of  $\phi$  defined via  $|\phi|^+$  and  $|\phi|^-$ .

**Convention 4.** Let  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^- \rangle$  be a BD model,  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}}$ . We set

$$|\phi|^b = |\phi|^+ \setminus |\phi|^- \quad |\phi|^d = |\phi|^- \setminus |\phi|^+ \quad |\phi|^c = |\phi|^+ \cap |\phi|^- \quad |\phi|^u = W \setminus (|\phi|^+ \cup |\phi|^-)$$

We call these extensions, respectively, *pure belief*, *pure disbelief*, *conflict*, and *uncertainty* in  $\phi$ , following Klein et al. (2021).

One can observe that these extensions correspond to the Belnapian values of  $\phi$ :

- *pure belief extension* of  $\phi$  is the set of states where  $\phi$  has value **T**;
- *pure disbelief extension* of  $\phi$  is the set of states where  $\phi$  has value **F**;
- *conflict extension* of  $\phi$  is the set of states where  $\phi$  has value **B**;
- *uncertainty extension* of  $\phi$  is the set of states where  $\phi$  has value **N**.

**Definition 5** (BD models with 4-probabilities). A BD model with a 4-probability is a tuple  $\mathfrak{M}_4 = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \mu_4 \rangle$  with  $\mathfrak{M}$  being a BD model and  $\mu_4 : 2^W \rightarrow [0, 1]$  satisfying:

**part:**  $\mu_4(|\phi|^b) + \mu_4(|\phi|^d) + \mu_4(|\phi|^u) + \mu_4(|\phi|^c) = 1$ ;

**neg:**  $\mu_4(|\neg\phi|^b) = \mu_4(|\phi|^d)$ ,  $\mu_4(|\neg\phi|^c) = \mu_4(|\phi|^c)$ ;

**contr:**  $\mu_4(|\phi \wedge \neg\phi|^b) = 0$ ,  $\mu_4(|\phi \wedge \neg\phi|^c) = \mu_4(|\phi|^c)$ ;

**BCmon:** if  $\mathfrak{M} \models [\phi \vdash \chi]$ , then  $\mu_4(|\phi|^b) + \mu_4(|\phi|^c) \leq \mu_4(|\chi|^b) + \mu_4(|\chi|^c)$ ;

**BCex:**  $\mu_4(|\phi|^b) + \mu_4(|\phi|^c) + \mu_4(|\psi|^b) + \mu_4(|\psi|^c) = \mu_4(|\phi \wedge \psi|^b) + \mu_4(|\phi \wedge \psi|^c) + \mu_4(|\phi \vee \psi|^b) + \mu_4(|\phi \vee \psi|^c)$ .

**Convention 6** (Naming the probabilities). We will utilise the following naming convention:

- we use the term ‘ *$\pm$ -probability*’ to stand for  $\mu$  from Definition 3;
- we call  $\mu_4$  from Definition 5 a ‘*4-probability*’ or a ‘*four-valued probability*’.





### 3. Logics for paraconsistent probabilities

In this section, we provide two-layered logics that are (weakly) complete w.r.t. BD models with  $\pm$ - and **4**-probabilities. Since conditions on measures contain arithmetic operations on  $[0, 1]$ , we choose an expansion of Łukasiewicz logic, namely, Łukasiewicz logic with  $\Delta$  ( $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$ ), for the outer layer. Furthermore,  $\pm$ -probabilities work with both positive and negative extensions of formulas, whence it is reasonable to use  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  — a paraconsistent expansion of  $\mathfrak{L}$  (cf. BÍlková et al. (2020) and BÍlková et al. (2021) for details) with two valuations —  $v_1$  (support of truth) and  $v_2$  (support of falsity) — on  $[0, 1]$ .

#### 3.1 Languages, semantics, and equivalence

Let us first recall the semantics of  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$  and  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ . To facilitate the presentation, we begin with the definition of the standard  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$  algebra on  $[0, 1]$  that we will then use to define the semantics of both  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$  and  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ .

**Definition 8.** *The standard  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$  algebra is a tuple  $\langle [0, 1], \sim_\mathfrak{L}, \Delta_\mathfrak{L}, \wedge_\mathfrak{L}, \vee_\mathfrak{L}, \rightarrow_\mathfrak{L}, \odot_\mathfrak{L}, \oplus_\mathfrak{L}, \ominus_\mathfrak{L} \rangle$  with the operations are defined as follows.*

$$\sim_\mathfrak{L} a := 1 - a \qquad \Delta_\mathfrak{L} a := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} a \wedge_\mathfrak{L} b &:= \min(a, b) & a \vee_\mathfrak{L} b &:= \max(a, b) & a \rightarrow_\mathfrak{L} b &:= \min(1, 1 - a + b) \\ a \odot_\mathfrak{L} b &:= \max(0, a + b - 1) & a \oplus_\mathfrak{L} b &:= \min(1, a + b) & a \ominus_\mathfrak{L} b &:= \max(0, a - b) \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 9** ( $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$ ). *The language of  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$  is given via the following grammar*

$$\mathcal{L}_\Delta \ni \phi := p \in \text{Prop} \mid \sim \phi \mid \Delta \phi \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid (\phi \rightarrow \phi) \mid (\phi \odot \phi) \mid (\phi \oplus \phi) \mid (\phi \ominus \phi)$$

We will also write  $\phi \leftrightarrow \chi$  as a shorthand for  $(\phi \rightarrow \chi) \odot (\chi \rightarrow \phi)$ .

A valuation is a map  $v : \text{Prop} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that is extended to the complex formulas as expected:  $v(\phi \odot \chi) = v(\phi) \odot_\mathfrak{L} v(\chi)$ .

$\phi$  is  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$ -valid iff  $v(\phi) = 1$  for every  $v$ .  $\Gamma$  entails  $\chi$  (denoted  $\Gamma \models_{\mathfrak{L}_\Delta} \chi$ ) iff for every  $v$  s.t.  $v(\phi) = 1$  for all  $\phi \in \Gamma$ , it holds that  $v(\chi) = 1$  as well.

**Definition 10** ( $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ ). *The language is constructed using the following grammar.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2} \ni \phi := p \in \text{Prop} \mid \neg \phi \mid \sim \phi \mid \Delta \phi \mid (\phi \rightarrow \phi)$$

The semantics is given by two valuations  $v_1$  (support of truth) and  $v_2$  (support of falsity)  $v_1, v_2 : \text{Prop} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  that are extended as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(\neg \phi) &= v_2(\phi) & v_2(\neg \phi) &= v_1(\phi) \\ v_1(\sim \phi) &= \sim_\mathfrak{L} v_1(\phi) & v_2(\sim \phi) &= \sim_\mathfrak{L} v_2(\phi) \\ v_1(\Delta \phi) &= \Delta_\mathfrak{L} v_1(\phi) & v_2(\Delta \phi) &= \sim_\mathfrak{L} \Delta_\mathfrak{L} \sim_\mathfrak{L} v_2(\phi) \\ v_1(\phi \rightarrow \chi) &= v_1(\phi) \rightarrow_\mathfrak{L} v_1(\chi) & v_2(\phi \rightarrow \chi) &= v_2(\chi) \ominus_\mathfrak{L} v_2(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

We say that  $\phi$  is  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ -valid iff for every  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , it holds that  $v_1(\phi) = 1$  and  $v_2(\phi) = 0$ .

**Convention 11.** When there is no risk of confusion, we will use  $v(\phi) = (x, y)$  to stand for  $v_1(\phi) = x$  and  $v_2(\phi) = y$ .



**Remark 12.** Note that  $\sim$  and  $\rightarrow$  can be used to define all other connectives in  $\mathcal{L}_\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \vee \chi &:= (\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \chi & \phi \wedge \chi &:= \sim(\sim\phi \vee \sim\chi) & \phi \oplus \chi &:= \sim\phi \rightarrow \chi \\ \phi \odot \chi &:= \sim(\phi \rightarrow \sim\chi) & \phi \ominus \chi &:= \phi \odot \sim\chi & \phi \leftrightarrow \chi &:= (\phi \rightarrow \chi) \odot (\chi \rightarrow \phi) \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to present our two-layered logics for paraconsistent probabilities:  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}$  — the logic of  $\mathbf{4}$ -probabilities, and  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  — the logic of  $\pm$ -probabilities.

**Definition 13** ( $\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}$ : language and semantics). *The language of  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}$  is constructed via the following grammar:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}} \ni \alpha := \text{Bl}\phi \mid \text{Db}\phi \mid \text{Cf}\phi \mid \text{Uc}\phi \mid \sim\alpha \mid \Delta\alpha \mid (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \quad (\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}})$$

A  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}$  model is a tuple  $\mathbb{M} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \mu_4, e \rangle$  s.t.

- $\langle \mathfrak{M}, \mu_4 \rangle$  is a BD model with  $\mathbf{4}$ -probability;
- $e$  is a  $\mathcal{L}_\Delta$  valuation induced by  $\mu_4$ , i.e.:
  - $e(\text{Bl}\phi) = \mu_4(|\phi|^b)$ ,  $e(\text{Db}\phi) = \mu_4(|\phi|^d)$ ,  $e(\text{Cf}\phi) = \mu_4(|\phi|^c)$ ,  $e(\text{Uc}\phi) = \mu_4(|\phi|^u)$ ;
  - values of complex  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}}$ -formulas are computed via Definition 9.

We say that  $\alpha$  is  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}$  valid iff  $e(\alpha) = 1$  in every model. A set of formulas  $\Gamma$  entails  $\alpha$  ( $\Gamma \models_{\mathbf{4Pr}^{\Delta}} \alpha$ ) iff there is no  $\mathbb{M}$  s.t.  $e(\gamma) = 1$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  but  $e(\alpha) \neq 1$ .

**Definition 14** ( $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$ : language and semantics). *The language of  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  is given by the following grammar*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}} \ni \alpha := \text{Pr}\phi \mid \sim\alpha \mid \neg\alpha \mid \Delta\alpha \mid (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha) \quad (\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}})$$

A  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  model is a tuple  $\mathbb{M} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \mu, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  s.t.

- $\langle \mathfrak{M}, \mu \rangle$  is a BD model with  $\pm$ -probability;
- $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  valuations induced by  $\mu$ , i.e.:
  - $e_1(\text{Pr}\phi) = \mu(|\phi|^+)$ ,  $e_2(\text{Pr}\phi) = \mu(|\phi|^-)$ ;
  - the values of complex  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}}$  formulas are computed following Definition 10.

We say that  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  valid iff  $e(\alpha) = (1, 0)$  in every model. A set of formulas  $\Gamma$  entails  $\alpha$  ( $\Gamma \models_{\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}} \alpha$ ) iff there is no  $\mathbb{M}$  s.t.  $e(\gamma) = (1, 0)$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  but  $e(\alpha) \neq (1, 0)$ .

The following property of  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  will be useful further in the section.

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}}$ . Then,  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  valid iff  $e_1(\alpha) = 1$  in every  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  model.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  be a  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{\Delta}$  model s.t.  $e_2(\alpha) \neq 0$ . We construct a model  $\mathbb{M}^* = \langle W, (v^*)^+, (v^*)^-, \mu, e_1^*, e_2^* \rangle$  where  $e_1^*(\alpha) \neq 1$ . To do this, we define new BD valuations  $(v^*)^+$  and  $(v^*)^-$  on  $W$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} w \in v^+(p), w \notin v^-(p) &\text{ then } w \in (v^*)^+(p), w \notin (v^*)^-(p) \\ w \in v^+(p), v^-(p) &\text{ then } w \notin (v^*)^+(p), (v^*)^-(p) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} w \notin v^+(p), v^-(p) \text{ then } w \in (v^*)^+(p), (v^*)^-(p) \\ w \notin v^+(p), w \in v^-(p) \text{ then } w \notin (v^*)^+(p), w \in (v^*)^-(p) \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily checked by induction on  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}}$  that

$$|\phi|_{\mathbb{M}}^+ = W \setminus |\phi|_{\mathbb{M}^*}^- \quad |\phi|_{\mathbb{M}}^- = W \setminus |\phi|_{\mathbb{M}^*}^+ \quad (1)$$

Now, since we can w.l.o.g. assume that  $\mu$  is a (classical) probability measure on  $W$  (recall Example 7), we have that

$$e^*(\text{Pr}\phi) = (1 - \mu(|\phi|^-), 1 - \mu(|\phi|^+)) = (1 - e_2(\text{Pr}\phi), 1 - e_1(\text{Pr}\phi)) \quad (2)$$

Observe that if  $e(\alpha) = (x, y)$ , then  $e(\neg\sim\alpha) = (1 - y, 1 - x)$ . Furthermore, it is straightforward to verify that the following formulas are valid.

$$\begin{aligned} \neg\sim\neg\alpha &\leftrightarrow \neg\neg\sim\alpha & \neg\sim\sim\alpha &\leftrightarrow \sim\neg\sim\alpha \\ \neg\sim\Delta\alpha &\leftrightarrow \Delta\neg\sim\alpha & \neg\sim(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha') &\leftrightarrow \neg\sim\alpha \rightarrow \neg\sim\alpha' \end{aligned}$$

From here, it will follow that  $e^*(\alpha) = (1 - e_2(\alpha), 1 - e_1(\alpha))$  for every  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}\Delta^2}$ .

We consider only the last case and show that  $e(\neg\sim(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha')) = e(\neg\sim\alpha \rightarrow \neg\sim\alpha')$ .

$$\begin{aligned} e_1(\neg\sim(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha')) &= e_2(\sim(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha')) \\ &= 1 - e_2(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha') \\ &= 1 - \max(0, e_2(\alpha') - e_2(\alpha)) \\ &= \min(1, 1 - e_2(\alpha') + e_2(\alpha)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} e_1(\neg\sim\alpha \rightarrow \neg\sim\alpha') &= \min(1, 1 - e_1(\neg\sim\alpha) + e_1(\neg\sim\alpha')) \\ &= \min(1, 1 - e_2(\sim\alpha) + e_2(\sim\alpha')) \\ &= \min(1, 1 - (1 - e_2(\alpha)) + (1 - e_2(\alpha'))) \\ &= \min(1, e_2(\alpha) + 1 - e_2(\alpha')) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} e_2(\neg\sim(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha')) &= e_1(\sim(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha')) \\ &= 1 - e_1(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha') \\ &= 1 - \min(1, 1 - e_1(\alpha) + e_1(\alpha')) \\ &= \max(0, e_1(\alpha) - e_1(\alpha')) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} e_2(\neg\sim\alpha \rightarrow \neg\sim\alpha') &= \max(0, e_2(\neg\sim\alpha') - e_2(\neg\sim\alpha)) \\ &= \max(0, e_1(\sim\alpha') - e_1(\sim\alpha)) \\ &= \max(0, (1 - e_1(\alpha')) - (1 - e_1(\alpha))) \\ &= \max(0, e_1(\alpha') - e_1(\alpha)) \end{aligned}$$

The result follows.  $\square$

**Example 16** (Values of formulas in models). Consider Fig. 3 with a classical probability  $\mu$ . Let us compute the values of the following (atomic) formulas:  $\text{Pr}(p \wedge \neg q)$ ,  $\text{Db}(p \wedge \neg q)$ , and  $\text{Bl}(q \vee \neg q)$ .

We have  $|p \wedge \neg q|^+ = \{w_1\}$  and  $|p \wedge \neg q|^- = \{w_1, w_3\}$ . Thus,  $\mu(|p \wedge \neg q|^+) = \frac{1}{3}$  and  $\mu(|p \wedge \neg q|^-) = \frac{1}{2}$  which gives us  $e(\text{Pr}(p \wedge \neg q)) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$ . Moreover,  $|p \wedge \neg q|^d = \{w_3\}$ , whence  $\text{Db}(p \wedge \neg q) = \frac{1}{6}$ . For  $q \vee \neg q$ , we have  $|q \vee \neg q|^b = \{w_2\}$ , and thus,  $e(\text{Bl}(q \vee \neg q)) = \frac{1}{2}$ .

$$w_1 : p^+, q^\pm \quad w_2 : \cancel{p}, q^- \quad w_3 : p^-, \cancel{q}$$

**Figure 3.**  $\mu(\{w_1\}) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\mu(\{w_2\}) = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\mu(\{w_3\}) = \frac{1}{6}$ .

Before establishing faithful translations between  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{k^2}$  and  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{k\Delta}$ , let us recall that in the [Introduction](#), we mentioned that quantitative statements about uncertainty expressed in the natural language may sound like ‘I think that rain is twice more likely than snow’. We show how to formalise this statement.

**Example 17** (Formalisation).

*twice*: I think that rain is twice more likely than snow.

We are going to translate this statement into  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{4Pr}^{k\Delta}}$  and interpret ‘I am certain’ as pure belief. We denote ‘it is going to rain’ with  $r$  and ‘it is going to snow’ with  $s$ . It remains to write down a formula  $\phi_{\text{twice}}$  that has value 1 iff  $e(\text{Bl}r) = 2 \cdot e(\text{Bl}s)$ . Consider the following formula

$$\phi_{\text{twice}} = \Delta((\text{Bl}r \ominus \text{Bl}s) \leftrightarrow \text{Bl}s)$$

Note that a more intuitive formalisation —  $\Delta(\text{Bl}r \leftrightarrow (\text{Bl}s \oplus \text{Bl}s))$  — would not work:  $\oplus$  is a *truncated sum*, whence it, e.g., does not exclude the situation with both  $\text{Bl}r$  and  $\text{Bl}s$  having value 1.

It is also clear that desiderata (1), (3), and (4) listed in [Section 1.4](#) are satisfied by both  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{k\Delta}$  and  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{k^2}$ . It is less straightforward, however, to see how we can formalise preferring one source to another (desideratum (2)). We explain this in the following remark.

**Remark 18.** To represent different sources, one can consider BD models with *several measures*, each representing a source, and, accordingly, expand the language with other modalities corresponding to these new measures. We can state, for example, that one source ( $s_1$ ) considers  $\phi$  to be more likely than the other source ( $s_2$ ) does. In  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{k\Delta}$  we can interpret this as the value of  $\text{Bl}_{s_1}\phi$  being *smaller than* the value of  $\text{Bl}_{s_2}\phi$ . This is formalised as follows:

$$\sim\Delta(\text{Bl}_{s_2}\phi \rightarrow \text{Bl}_{s_1}\phi)$$

Unfortunately, there seems to be no direct way of representing the *degrees of trust* the agent assigns to  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  using only modalities interpreted as measures in the Łukasiewicz setting. A traditional way (cf., e.g., (Shafer, 1976, p.252)) of accounting for the degree of trust in a given source is to multiply the value a mass function gives to  $X \subseteq W$  by some  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Thus, to model this approach, one would need a combination of Rational Pavelka and Product logics. Another option would be to redefine  $e(\text{Bl}_s\phi) = (\text{tr}_s \odot_\mathbb{k} \mu(|\phi|^b))$  and similarly for other modalities (with  $\text{tr}_s \in [0, 1]$  standing for the trust in source  $s$ ). It is unclear, however, how to axiomatise this logic.

It is possible, though, to make different modalities stand for different types of measures (e.g.,  $\text{Bl}_{s_1}$  can be generated by a 4-probability while  $\text{Bl}_{s_2}$  by a belief function). This represents the *different ways of aggregating the data* the agent can have.

We finish the section by establishing faithful embeddings of  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{k\Delta}$  and  $\text{Pr}_\Delta^{k^2}$  into one another. First, we introduce some technical notions that will simplify the proof.

**Convention 19.** We say that  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_\Delta^{k^2}}$  is *outer- $\neg$ -free* when  $\neg$ ’s appear only inside modal atoms.

**Definition 20.** Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}}$ .  $\alpha^\neg$  is produced from  $\alpha$  by successively applying the following transformations.

$$\begin{array}{lll} \neg\text{Pr}\phi \rightsquigarrow \text{Pr}\neg\phi & \neg\neg\alpha \rightsquigarrow \alpha & \neg\sim\alpha \rightsquigarrow \sim\neg\alpha \\ \neg(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha') \rightsquigarrow \sim(\neg\alpha' \rightarrow \neg\alpha) & \neg\Delta\alpha \rightsquigarrow \sim\Delta\sim\alpha & \end{array}$$

It is easy to check using Definitions 10 and 14 that  $e(\alpha) = e(\alpha^\neg)$  in every  $\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}$  model.

**Definition 21.** Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}}$  be outer- $\neg$ -free, we define  $\alpha^4 \in \mathcal{L}_{4\text{Pr}^{\Delta}}$  as follows.

$$\begin{array}{l} (\text{Pr}\phi)^4 = \text{Bl}\phi \oplus \text{Cf}\phi \\ (\heartsuit\alpha)^4 = \heartsuit\alpha^4 \\ (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha')^4 = \alpha^4 \rightarrow \alpha'^4 \end{array} \quad (\heartsuit \in \{\Delta, \sim\})$$

Let  $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_{4\text{Pr}^{\Delta}}$ . We define  $\beta^\pm$  as follows.

$$\begin{array}{l} (\text{Bl}\phi)^\pm = \text{Pr}\phi \ominus \text{Pr}(\phi \wedge \neg\phi) \\ (\text{Cf}\phi)^\pm = \text{Pr}(\phi \wedge \neg\phi) \\ (\text{Uc}\phi)^\pm = \sim\text{Pr}(\phi \vee \neg\phi) \\ (\text{Db}\phi)^\pm = \text{Pr}\neg\phi \ominus \text{Pr}(\phi \wedge \neg\phi) \\ (\heartsuit\beta)^\pm = \heartsuit\beta^\pm \\ (\beta \rightarrow \beta')^\pm = \beta^\pm \rightarrow \beta'^\pm \end{array} \quad (\heartsuit \in \{\Delta, \sim\})$$

**Theorem 22.**  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}}$  is  $\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}$  valid iff  $(\alpha^\neg)^4$  is  $4\text{Pr}^{\Delta}$  valid.

*Proof.* Let w.l.o.g.  $\mathbb{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  be a BD model with  $\pm$ -probability where  $\mu$  is a classical probability measure and let  $e(\alpha) = (x, y)$ . We show that in the BD model  $\mathbb{M}_4 = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu, e_1 \rangle$  with four-probability  $\mu$  and  $e^4$  induced by  $\mu$ ,  $e^4((\alpha^\neg)^4) = x$ . This is sufficient to prove the result because if  $\alpha^\neg$  is not  $\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}$  valid, then  $\alpha$  is not  $\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}$  valid either.

We proceed by induction on  $\alpha^\neg$ . For the basis case, we have that

$$\begin{array}{l} e_1(\text{Pr}\phi) = \mu(|\phi|^+) \\ = \mu(|\phi|^b \cup |\phi|^c) \\ = \mu(|\phi|^b) \cup \mu(|\phi|^c) \quad (|\phi|^b \text{ and } |\phi|^c \text{ are disjoint}) \\ = e_4(\text{Bl}\phi) + e_4(\text{Cf}\phi) \quad (e_4 \text{ is induced by } \mu) \\ = e_4(\text{Bl}\phi \oplus \text{Cf}\phi) \quad (e_4(\text{Bl}\phi) + e_4(\text{Cf}\phi) \leq 1) \end{array}$$

The cases of connectives can be obtained by an application of the induction hypothesis.

Conversely, since the support of truth conditions in  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  coincide with the semantics of  $\mathbf{k}_\Delta$  (cf. Definitions 9 and 10) and since  $\alpha^\neg$  is outer- $\neg$ -free, if  $e(\alpha^\neg) < 1$  for some  $4\text{Pr}^{\Delta}$  model  $\mathbb{M}_4 = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu, e \rangle$ , then  $e_1(\alpha^\neg) < 1$  for  $\mathbb{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  with  $e = e_1$ .

We proceed by induction on  $\alpha^\neg$  (recall that  $e(\alpha) = e(\alpha^\neg)$  in all  $\text{Pr}^{\Delta^2}$  models). If  $\alpha = \text{Pr}\phi$ , then  $e_1(\text{Pr}\phi) = \mu(|\phi|^+) = \mu(|\phi|^b \cup |\phi|^c)$ . But  $|\phi|^b$  and  $|\phi|^c$  are disjoint, whence  $\mu(|\phi|^b \cup |\phi|^c) = \mu(|\phi|^b) + \mu(|\phi|^c)$ , and since  $\mu(|\phi|^b) + \mu(|\phi|^c) \leq 1$ , we have that  $e_1(\text{Bl}\phi \oplus \text{Cf}\phi) = \mu(|\phi|^b) + \mu(|\phi|^c) = e_1(\text{Pr}\phi)$ , as required.

The induction steps are straightforward since the semantic conditions of support of truth in  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}^2$  coincide with the semantics of  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}$  (cf. Definitions 10 and 9).  $\square$

**Theorem 23.**  $\beta \in \mathcal{L}_{4Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}}}$  is  $\mathcal{L}_{4Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}}}$  valid iff  $\beta^{\pm}$  is  $Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}^2}$  valid.

*Proof.* Assume w.l.o.g. that  $\mathbb{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu_4, e \rangle$  is a BD model with a 4-probability where  $\mu_4$  is a classical probability measure and  $e(\beta) = x$ . It suffices to define a BD model with  $\pm$ -probability  $\mathbb{M}^{\pm} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu_4, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  and show that  $e_1(\beta^{\pm}) = x$ . If  $e(\beta) < 1$ , then  $e(\beta^{\pm}) < 1$  (and thus, is not valid). If  $\beta^{\pm}$  is not valid, we have that  $e_1(\beta^{\pm}) < 1$  by Lemma 15, whence  $e(\beta) < 1$ , as well.

We proceed by induction on  $\beta$ . If  $\beta = \text{Bl}\phi$ , then  $e(\text{Bl}\phi) = \mu_4(|\phi|^b)$ . Now observe that  $\mu_4(|\phi|^+) = \mu(|\phi|^b \cup |\phi|^c) = \mu_4(|\phi|^b) + \mu_4(|\phi|^c)$  since  $|\phi|^b$  and  $|\phi|^c$  are disjoint. But  $\mu_4(|\phi|^+) = e_1(\text{Pr}\phi)$  and  $\mu_4(|\phi|^c) = \mu_4(|\phi \wedge \neg\phi|^+)$  since  $|\phi \wedge \neg\phi|^+ = |\phi|^c$ . Thus,  $\mu_4(|\phi|^b) = e_1(\text{Pr}\phi \ominus \text{Pr}(\phi \wedge \neg\phi))$  as required.

Other basis cases of  $\text{Cf}\phi$ ,  $\text{Uc}\phi$ , and  $\text{Db}\phi$  can be tackled similarly. The induction steps are straightforward since the support of truth in  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}^2$  coincides with semantical conditions in  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Axiomatisations

In this section, we present Hilbert-style calculi  $\mathcal{H}Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}^2}$  and  $\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}}$  that axiomatise  $Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}^2}$  and  $4Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}}$ . The completeness of  $\mathcal{H}Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}^2}$  w.r.t. finite theories ( $\mathfrak{L}$  is not compact, whence there are no finite calculi for expansions of  $\mathfrak{L}$  complete w.r.t. countable theories) was established in Bílková et al. (2023). Here, we prove the completeness of  $\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}}$ .

To construct the calculi we translate the conditions on measures from Definitions 3 and 5 into  $\mathcal{L}_{Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}^2}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{4Pr^{\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}}}$  formulas. We then use these translated conditions as additional axioms that extend Hilbert-style calculi for  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}$  and  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ .

To facilitate the presentation, we recall these Hilbert calculi for  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}$ . The axiomatisation of  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}$  can be obtained by adding  $\Delta$  axioms and rules from Baaz (1996), (Hájek, 1998, Definition 2.4.5), or (Běhounek et al., 2011, Chapter I,2.2.1) to the Hilbert-style calculus for  $\mathfrak{L}$  from (Metcalfe et al., 2008, §6.2).

**Definition 24** ( $\mathcal{H}\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}$  — the Hilbert-style calculus for  $\mathfrak{L}_{\Delta}$ ). *The calculus contains the following axioms and rules.*

$$\mathbf{w}: \phi \rightarrow (\chi \rightarrow \phi).$$

$$\mathbf{sf}: (\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow ((\chi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\phi \rightarrow \psi)).$$

$$\mathbf{waj}: ((\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow ((\chi \rightarrow \phi) \rightarrow \phi).$$

$$\mathbf{co}: (\sim\chi \rightarrow \sim\phi) \rightarrow (\phi \rightarrow \chi).$$

$$\mathbf{MP}: \frac{\phi \quad \phi \rightarrow \chi}{\chi}.$$

$$\Delta 1: \Delta\phi \vee \sim\Delta\phi.$$

$$\Delta 2: \Delta\phi \rightarrow \phi.$$

$$\Delta 3: \Delta\phi \rightarrow \Delta\Delta\phi.$$

$$\Delta 4: \Delta(\phi \vee \chi) \rightarrow \Delta\phi \vee \Delta\chi.$$

$$\Delta 5: \Delta(\phi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow \Delta\phi \rightarrow \Delta\chi.$$

$$\Delta\text{nec: } \frac{\phi}{\Delta\phi}.$$

**Proposition 25** (Finite strong completeness of  $\mathcal{H}\mathbf{L}_\Delta$ ). *Let  $\Gamma$  be finite. Then  $\Gamma \models_{\mathbf{L}_\Delta} \phi$  iff  $\Gamma \vdash_{\mathcal{H}\mathbf{L}_\Delta} \phi$ .*

The calculus for  $\mathbf{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  is acquired by adding the axioms for  $\neg$ .

**Definition 26** ( $\mathcal{H}\mathbf{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  — Hilbert-style calculus for  $\mathbf{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ ). *The calculus expands  $\mathcal{H}\mathbf{L}_\Delta$  with the following axioms and rules.*

$$\neg\neg: \neg\neg\phi \leftrightarrow \phi.$$

$$\neg\sim: \neg\sim\phi \leftrightarrow \sim\neg\phi.$$

$$\sim\neg\rightarrow: (\sim\neg\phi \rightarrow \sim\neg\chi) \leftrightarrow \sim\neg(\phi \rightarrow \chi).$$

$$\neg\Delta: \neg\Delta\phi \leftrightarrow \sim\Delta\sim\neg\phi.$$

$$\text{conf: } \frac{\phi}{\sim\neg\phi}.$$

The completeness of  $\mathcal{H}\mathbf{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  was shown in (Bílková et al., 2023, Lemma 4.16) (there, the logic is called  $\mathbf{L}^2$ ).

The calculi for  $\text{Pr}\mathbf{L}_\Delta^2$  and  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{\mathbf{L}_\Delta}$  are as follows.

**Definition 27** ( $\mathcal{H}\text{Pr}_\Delta^2$  — a Hilbert-style calculus for  $\text{Pr}\mathbf{L}_\Delta^2$ ). *The calculus has the following axioms and rules.*

$\mathbf{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ :  $\mathbf{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ -valid formulas and  $\mathcal{H}\mathbf{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  rules instantiated in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}\mathbf{L}_\Delta^2}$ ;

$$\pm\text{mon: } \text{Pr}\phi \rightarrow \text{Pr}\chi \text{ if } \phi \models_{\text{BD}} \chi;$$

$$\pm\text{neg: } \text{Pr}\neg\phi \leftrightarrow \neg\text{Pr}\phi;$$

$$\pm\text{ex: } \text{Pr}(\phi \vee \chi) \leftrightarrow ((\text{Pr}\phi \ominus \text{Pr}(\phi \wedge \chi)) \oplus \text{Pr}\chi).$$

**Definition 28** ( $\mathcal{H}\mathbf{4Pr}^{\mathbf{L}_\Delta}$  — Hilbert-style calculus for  $\mathbf{4Pr}^{\mathbf{L}_\Delta}$ ). *The calculus  $\mathcal{H}\mathbf{4Pr}^{\mathbf{L}_\Delta}$  consists of the following axioms and rules.*

$\mathbf{L}_\Delta$ :  $\mathbf{L}_\Delta$ -valid formulas and sound rules instantiated in  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{4Pr}^{\mathbf{L}_\Delta}}$ .

$$\mathbf{4equiv: } X\phi \leftrightarrow X\chi \text{ for every } \phi, \chi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}} \text{ s.t. } \phi \dashv\vdash \chi \text{ is BD-valid and } X \in \{\text{Bl}, \text{Db}, \text{Cf}, \text{Uc}\}.$$

$$\mathbf{4contr: } \sim\text{Bl}(\phi \wedge \neg\phi); \text{Cf}\phi \leftrightarrow \text{Cf}(\phi \wedge \neg\phi).$$

$$\mathbf{4neg: } \text{Bl}\neg\phi \leftrightarrow \text{Db}\phi; \text{Cf}\neg\phi \leftrightarrow \text{Cf}\phi.$$

$$\mathbf{4mon: } (\text{Bl}\phi \oplus \text{Cf}\phi) \rightarrow (\text{Bl}\chi \oplus \text{Cf}\chi) \text{ for every } \phi, \chi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}} \text{ s.t. } \phi \vdash \chi \text{ is BD-valid.}$$

$$\mathbf{4part1: } \text{Bl}\phi \oplus \text{Db}\phi \oplus \text{Cf}\phi \oplus \text{Uc}\phi.$$

$$\mathbf{4part2: } ((X_1\phi \oplus X_2\phi \oplus X_3\phi \oplus X_4\phi) \ominus X_4\phi) \leftrightarrow (X_1\phi \oplus X_2\phi \oplus X_3\phi) \quad \text{with } X_i \neq X_j, \quad X_i \in \{\text{Bl}, \text{Db}, \text{Cf}, \text{Uc}\}.$$

$$\mathbf{4ex: } (\text{Bl}(\phi \vee \chi) \oplus \text{Cf}(\phi \vee \chi)) \leftrightarrow ((\text{Bl}\phi \oplus \text{Cf}\phi) \ominus (\text{Bl}(\phi \wedge \chi) \oplus \text{Cf}(\phi \wedge \chi))) \oplus (\text{Bl}\chi \oplus \text{Cf}\chi).$$

As one can see, the axioms in the calculi above are translations of properties from Definitions 3 and 5. In  $\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\triangle}$ , we split **4part** in two axioms to ensure that the values of  $Bl\phi$ ,  $Db\phi$ ,  $Cf\phi$ , and  $Uc\phi$  sum up exactly to 1. Note, moreover, that **4mon** and **4ex** are translations of  $\pm mon$  and  $\pm ex$  (cf. Definition 21).

In the remainder of this section, we prove the completeness of  $\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\triangle}$  w.r.t. finite theories.

**Theorem 29.** *Let  $\Xi \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{4Pr^{\triangle}}$  be finite. Then  $\Xi \models_{4Pr^{\triangle}} \alpha$  iff  $\Xi \vdash_{\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\triangle}} \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* Soundness can be established by the routine check of the validity of the axioms. E.g., for **4equiv**, observe that if  $\phi$  and  $\chi$  are equivalent in BD, then  $|\phi|^+ = |\chi|^+$  and  $|\phi|^- = |\chi|^-$ , whence  $|\phi|^x = |\chi|^x$  for every  $x \in \{b, d, c, u\}$ . Thus,  $e(X\phi) = e(X\chi)$  for each  $X \in \{Bl, Db, Cf, Uc\}$ , from where  $X\phi \leftrightarrow X\chi$  is valid. **4contr**, **4neg**, and **4mon** are straightforward translations of **contr**, **neg**, and **BCmon**. **4ex** is the translation of  $\pm ex$ , whence are valid by Theorem 22.

Last, consider **4part1** and **4part2**. We have  $\sum_{x \in \{b, d, c, u\}} |\phi|^x = 1$ . Hence,  $\sum_{X \in \{Bl, Db, Cf, Uc\}} e(X\phi) = 1$ .

Thus, we have that **4part1** and **4part2** are valid.

Let us now prove the completeness. We reason by contraposition. Assume that  $\Xi \not\vdash_{\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\triangle}} \alpha$ . Now, observe that  $\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\triangle}$  proofs are, actually,  $\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}$  proofs with additional probabilistic axioms. Let  $\Xi^*$  stand for  $\Xi$  extended with probabilistic axioms built over all pairwise non-equivalent  $\mathcal{L}_{BD}$  formulas constructed from  $\text{Prop}[\Xi \cup \{\alpha\}]$ . Clearly,  $\Xi^* \not\vdash_{\mathcal{H}4Pr^{\triangle}} \alpha$  either. Moreover,  $\Xi^*$  is finite as well since BD is tabular (and whence, there exist only finitely many pairwise non-equivalent  $\mathcal{L}_{BD}$  formulas over a finite set of variables). Now, by the weak completeness of  $\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}$  (Proposition 25), there exists an  $\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}$  valuation  $e$  s.t.  $e[\Xi^*] = 1$  and  $e(\alpha) \neq 1$ .

It remains to construct a  $4Pr^{\triangle}$ -model  $\mathbb{M}$  falsifying  $\Xi^* \models_{4Pr^{\triangle}} \alpha$  using  $e$ . We proceed as follows. First, we set  $W = 2^{\text{Lit}[\Xi^* \cup \{\alpha\}]}$ , and for every  $w \in W$  define  $w \in v^+(p)$  iff  $p \in w$  and  $w \in v^-(p)$  iff  $\neg p \in w$ . We extend the valuations to  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{BD}$  in the usual manner. Then, for  $X\phi \in \text{Sf}[\Xi^* \cup \{\alpha\}]$ , we set  $\mu_4(|\phi|^x) = e(X\phi)$  according to modality  $X$ .

It remains to extend  $\mu_4$  to the whole  $2^W$ . Observe, however, that any map from  $2^W$  to  $[0, 1]$  that extends  $\mu_4$  is, in fact, a **4**-probability. Indeed, all requirements from Definition 5 concern *only the extensions of formulas*. But the model is finite, BD is tabular, and  $\Xi^*$  contains all the necessary instances of probabilistic axioms and  $e[\Xi^*] = 1$ , whence all constraints on the formulas are satisfied.  $\square$

### 3.3 Complexity

Let us now establish the complexity of  $Pr_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}^2}$  and  $4Pr^{\triangle}$ . Namely, we prove their NP-completeness. Since the mutual embeddings given in Definition 21 result in an at most linear increase in the size of the formulas, it suffices to consider only one of them. In this section, we choose to give a non-deterministic polynomial algorithm for  $Pr_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}^2}$  since it contains only one modality which will simplify the presentation. Note, furthermore, that  $\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}$  (and thus,  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ ) are NP-hard, thus,  $Pr_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}^2}$  and  $4Pr^{\triangle}$  are NP-hard as well. Thus, we only need to establish the upper bound.

For the proof, we adapt constraint tableaux for  $\mathbf{k}_{\Delta}^2$  defined in Bílková et al. (2021) and expand them with rules for  $\Delta$ . We then adapt the NP-completeness proof of  $\text{FP}(\mathbf{k}_{\Delta})$  from Hájek and Tulipani (2001) to establish our result.

**Definition 30** (Constraint tableaux for  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  —  $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2)$ ). *Branches contain labelled formulas of the form  $\phi \leq_1 i$ ,  $\phi \leq_2 i$ ,  $\phi \geq_1 i$ , or  $\phi \geq_2 i$ , and numerical constraints of the form  $i \leq j$  with  $i$  and  $j$  (labels) being linear polynomials over  $[0, 1]$ . Each branch can be extended by an application*



of a rule below.

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
\neg \leq_1 \frac{\neg \phi \leq_1 i}{\phi \leq_2 i} & \neg \leq_2 \frac{\neg \phi \leq_2 i}{\phi \leq_1 i} & \neg \geq_1 \frac{\neg \phi \geq_1 i}{\phi \geq_2 i} & \neg \geq_2 \frac{\neg \phi \geq_2 i}{\phi \geq_1 i} \\
\sim \leq_1 \frac{\sim \phi \leq_1 i}{\phi \geq_1 1-i} & \sim \leq_2 \frac{\sim \phi \leq_2 i}{\phi \geq_2 1-i} & \sim \geq_1 \frac{\sim \phi \geq_1 i}{\phi \leq_1 1-i} & \sim \geq_2 \frac{\sim \phi \geq_2 i}{\phi \leq_2 1-i} \\
\Delta \geq_1 \frac{\Delta \phi \geq_1 i}{i \leq 0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi \geq_1 j \\ j \geq 1 \end{array} \right.} & \Delta \leq_1 \frac{\Delta \phi \leq_1 i}{i \geq 1 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi \leq_1 j \\ j < 1 \end{array} \right.} & \Delta \leq_2 \frac{\Delta \phi \leq_2 i}{i \geq 1 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi \leq j \\ j \leq 0 \end{array} \right.} & \Delta \geq_2 \frac{\Delta \phi \geq_2 i}{i \leq 0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi \geq j \\ j > 0 \end{array} \right.} \\
\rightarrow \leq_1 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \leq_1 i}{i \geq 1 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi_1 \geq_1 1-i+j \\ \phi_2 \leq_1 j \\ j \leq i \end{array} \right.} & \rightarrow \leq_2 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \leq_2 i}{\phi_1 \geq_2 j \\ \phi_2 \leq_2 i+j} & \rightarrow \geq_1 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \geq_1 i}{\phi_1 \leq_1 1-i+j \\ \phi_2 \geq_1 j} & \rightarrow \geq_2 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \geq_2 i}{i \leq 0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi_1 \leq_2 j \\ \phi_2 \geq_2 i+j \\ j \leq 1-i \end{array} \right.}
\end{array}$$

Let  $i$ 's be linear polynomials that label the formulas in the branch and  $x$ 's be variables ranging over  $[0, 1]$ . We define the translation  $\mathcal{t}$  from labelled formulas to linear inequalities as follows:

$$\mathcal{t}(\phi \leq_1 i) = x_\phi^L \leq i; \quad \mathcal{t}(\phi \geq_1 i) = x_\phi^L \geq i; \quad \mathcal{t}(\phi \leq_2 i) = x_\phi^R \leq i; \quad \mathcal{t}(\phi \geq_2 i) = x_\phi^R \geq i$$

Let  $\nabla \in \{\leq_1, \geq_1, \leq_2, \geq_2\}$ . A tableau branch

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\phi_1 \nabla i_1, \dots, \phi_m \nabla i_m, k_1 \leq l_1, \dots, k_q \leq l_q\}$$

is closed if the system of inequalities

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{t}} = \{\mathcal{t}(\phi_1 \nabla i_1), \dots, \mathcal{t}(\phi_m \nabla i_m), k_1 \leq l_1, \dots, k_q \leq l_q\}$$

does not have solutions. Otherwise,  $\mathcal{B}$  is open. If no rule application adds new entries to  $\mathcal{B}$ , it is called complete. A tableau is closed if all its branches are closed.  $\phi$  has a  $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2)$  proof if the tableau beginning with  $\{\phi \leq_1 c, c < 1\}$  is closed.

**Remark 31.** Note that our tableaux rules are *necessarily branching* in contrast to the rules proposed by Hähnle (1992, 1994). This is because all connectives of  $\mathbf{k}$  are continuous. On the other hand,  $\Delta$  is not continuous, hence, there cannot be a non-branching rule for it.

**Definition 32** (Satisfying valuation of a branch). Let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  valuations.  $v_1$  satisfies a labelled formula  $\phi \leq_1 i$  ( $v_2$  satisfies  $\phi \geq_2 i$ ) iff  $v_1(\phi) \leq i$  (resp.,  $v_2(\phi) \geq i$ ).  $v_1$  satisfies a branch  $\mathcal{B}$  iff  $v_1$  satisfies any labelled formula in  $\mathcal{B}$  (and similarly for  $v_2$ ). A branch  $\mathcal{B}$  is satisfiable iff there is a pair of valuations  $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle$  that satisfies it.

**Theorem 33** (Completeness of tableaux).

- (1)  $\phi$  is  $\mathbf{k}_\Delta$  valid iff it has a  $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2)$  proof.
- (2)  $\phi$  is  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  valid iff it has a  $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2)$  proof.

*Proof.* The proof follows (BÍlková et al., 2021, Theorem 1). For soundness, we show that if  $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle$  satisfies the premise of a rule, then it also satisfies one of its conclusions. We consider the case of  $\Delta \geq_1$  (the rules for other connectives are tackled in BÍlková et al. (2021); the remaining rules for  $\Delta$  can be dealt with analogously).

Let  $\Delta\phi \geq_1 i$  be satisfied by  $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle$ . Then,  $v_1(\Delta\phi) \geq i$ . We have two cases: (i)  $i = 0$  and (ii)  $i > 0$ . In the first case, the left conclusion is satisfied. In the second case,  $v_1(\Delta\phi) = 1$ . Hence,  $v_1(\phi) = 1$ , i.e., the right conclusion is satisfied.

For completeness, note from (Bílková et al., 2021, Proposition 1) that  $\phi$  is  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ -valid iff  $v_1(\phi) = 1$  for every  $v$ . Let us now show that every complete open branch can be satisfied. Assume that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a complete open branch. We construct the satisfying valuation as follows. Let  $\nabla \in \{\leq_1, \geq_1, \leq_2, \geq_2\}$  and  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  be the propositional variables appearing in the atomic labelled formulas in  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Let  $\{p_1 \nabla j_1, \dots, p_m \nabla j_n\}$  and  $\{k_1 \leq l_1, \dots, k_q \leq l_q\}$  be the sets of all atomic labelled formulas and all numerical constraints in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Notice that one variable might appear in many atomic labelled formulas, hence we might have  $m \neq n$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is complete and open, the following system of linear inequalities over the set of variables  $\{x_{p_1}^L, x_{p_1}^R, \dots, x_{p_m}^L, x_{p_m}^R\}$  must have at least one solution under the constraints listed:

$$\mathfrak{t}(p_1 \nabla i_1), \dots, \mathfrak{t}(p_m \nabla i_n), k_1 \leq l_1, \dots, k_q \leq l_q$$

Let  $c = (c_1^L, c_1^R, \dots, c_m^L, c_m^R)$  be a solution to the above system of inequalities such that  $c_j^L$  ( $c_j^R$ ) is the value of  $x_{p_j}^L$  ( $x_{p_j}^R$ ). Define valuations as follows:  $v_1(p_j) = c_j^L$  and  $v_2(p_j) = c_j^R$ .

It remains to show by induction on  $\phi$  that all formulas present at  $\mathcal{B}$  are satisfied by  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . The basis case of variables holds by the construction of  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . We consider the case of  $\Delta\phi \geq_1 i$  (the cases of other variables can be dealt with similarly).

Assume that  $\Delta\phi \geq_1 i \in \mathcal{B}$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is complete and open, we have that either (i)  $i \leq 0 \in \mathcal{B}$  or (ii)  $\{\phi \geq_1 j, j \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . In the first case, since there is a solution for  $\mathcal{B}^\mathfrak{t}$ , we have that  $i = 0$ , and thus  $\Delta\phi \geq_1 i$  is satisfied by any  $v_1$ . In the second case, we have that  $\{\phi \geq_1 j, j \geq 1\}$  is satisfied by the induction hypothesis, whence  $v_1(\phi) = 1$ , and thus,  $v_1(\Delta\phi) = 1$ , as required.  $\square$

**Definition 34** (Mixed-integer problem). *Let  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  be variables,  $A$  and  $B$  be integer matrices and  $h$  an integer vector, and  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  be a  $k + m$ -place linear function.*

- (1) A general MIP is to find  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  s.t.  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \min\{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) : A\mathbf{x} + B\mathbf{y} \geq h\}$ .
- (2) A bounded MIP (bMIP) is to find all solutions that belong to  $[0, 1]$ .

**Proposition 35.** *Bounded MIP is NP-complete.*

**Remark 36.** The proof of  $\mathfrak{L}$  NP-completeness by Hähnle (1992, 1994) uses the reduction of a Łukasiewicz formula  $\phi$  to one instance of a bMIP of the size  $O(\ell(\phi))$ . This is because the rules are linear. In our case (cf. Remark 31), we cannot avoid branching. This, however, does not affect the complexity of  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$  and  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ : indeed, bMIP is in NP, and we can just non-deterministically guess one branch of our tableau and then guess the solution. It is easy to see that the lengths of branches are polynomial in  $\ell(\phi)$ , and thus, we can verify the guessed solution in polynomial time, as required. If the solution is correct, the branch is open. Thus,  $\mathfrak{L}_\Delta$  and  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  are also NP-complete.

Let us now proceed to the proof of NP-completeness of  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{\mathfrak{L}^2}$ . First, we show that we can completely remove  $\neg$ 's from  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{\mathfrak{L}^2}}$  formulas while preserving their satisfiability.

**Lemma 37.** *For any outer- $\neg$ -free  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{\mathfrak{L}^2}}$ , there exists  $\alpha^*$  where  $\neg$  does not occur at all s.t.  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{\mathfrak{L}^2}$ -satisfiable iff  $\alpha^*$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{\mathfrak{L}^2}$ -satisfiable.*

*Proof.* We construct  $\alpha^*$  as follows. First, we take every modal atom  $\text{Pr}\phi$  and replace  $\phi$  with its  $\neg$ -NNF. Second, we replace every literal  $\neg p$  occurring in  $\text{Pr}(\text{NNF}(\phi))$  with  $p^*$ . Outer-layer connectives remain the same. Observe, that this transformation increases the number of symbols in  $\alpha$  at most linearly. It remains to check that satisfiability is preserved.

Let  $e(\alpha) = (1, 0)$  at some  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$ -model. By Lemma 15, this is equivalent to  $e_1(\alpha) = 1$  in some  $\mathbb{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu, e_1, e_2 \rangle$ . Now, let  $\mathbb{M}^* = \langle W, v^{*+}, v^{*-}, \mu, e_1^*, e_2^* \rangle$  and, in particular,  $v^-(p) = v^{*+}(p^*)$ . It suffices to show that  $e_1(\alpha) = e_1^*(\alpha^*)$ .

We proceed by induction on  $\alpha$ . Let  $\alpha = \text{Pr}\phi$  for some  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}}$ . We have that  $e_1(\alpha) = \mu(|\phi|^+) = \mu(|\text{NNF}(\phi)|^+)$ . We check that  $|\text{NNF}(\phi)|^+ = |\text{NNF}(\phi)^*|^+$  by induction on  $\text{NNF}(\phi)$ . The basis cases of variables and literals hold by the construction of  $\mathbb{M}^*$ . The cases of  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  hold by the induction hypothesis. It follows now that  $|\text{NNF}(\phi)|^+ = |\text{NNF}(\phi)^*|^+$  and thus,  $e_1(\text{Pr}\phi) = e_1^*(\text{Pr}(\text{NNF}(\phi)^*))$ . The cases of  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  connectives can be proven by a straightforward application of the induction hypothesis.

For the converse, assume that  $\alpha^*$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$ -satisfiable. Hence,  $e_1(\alpha^*) = 1$  in some model  $\mathbb{M} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \mu, e_1, e_2 \rangle$ . We define  $\mathbb{M}' = \langle W, v'^+, v'^-, \mu, e'_1, e'_2 \rangle$  with  $v'^-(p) = v^+(p^*)$  and  $v'^+(p) = v^+(p)$ . We can now show that  $e_1(\alpha) = e_1^*(\alpha^*)$  as in the previous case. The result follows.  $\square$

We can now apply this lemma to adapt the proof of the NP-completeness of  $\text{FP}(\mathcal{L})$ .

**Theorem 38.** *Satisfiability of  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$  and  $4\text{Pr}^{k_{\Delta}}$  is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* Recall that  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$  and  $4\text{Pr}^{k_{\Delta}}$  can be linearly embedded into one another (Theorems 22 and 23). Thus, it remains to provide a non-deterministic polynomial algorithm for one of these logics. We choose  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$  since it has only one modality.

Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}}$  be over modal atoms  $\text{Pr}\phi_1, \dots, \text{Pr}\phi_n$ . By Lemma 37, we can w.l.o.g. assume that  $\alpha$  does not contain  $\neg$ . We show how to construct a satisfying  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$ -valuation for  $\alpha$ .

First, we replace every modal atom  $\text{Pr}\phi_i$  with a fresh variable  $q_{\phi_i}$ . Denote the new formula  $\alpha^-$ . It is clear that  $\ell(\alpha^-)$  is at most linearly greater than  $\ell(\alpha)$ . We construct a  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$  tableau beginning with  $\{\alpha^- \geq_1 c, c \geq 1\}$ . As  $\alpha^-$  does not contain  $\neg$ , every branch gives us an instance of a bMIP (recall Definition 34) equivalent to the  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ -satisfiability of  $\alpha^-$ :  $\alpha^-$  is  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ -satisfiable iff at least one instance of a bMIP has a solution. Clearly, if  $\alpha^-$  is not  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ -satisfiable, it is not  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k_2}$ -satisfiable either.

Now let  $\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{r} = \{\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_w\}$  be the set of all open branches in the  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2)$  tableau for  $\alpha^-$ . We guess a  $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{r}$  and consider the following instance of bMIP:

$$z_1 \nabla t_1, \dots, z_n \nabla t_n, k_1 \leq k'_1, \dots, k_r \leq k'_r, m_1 \geq 1, \dots, m_s \geq 1, m'_1 \leq 0, \dots, m'_t \leq 0 \quad ([\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathfrak{B}})$$

Here,  $z_i$ 's correspond to the values of  $q_{\phi_i}$ 's in  $\alpha^-$ , and  $t_i$ 's are linear polynomials that label  $q_{\phi_i}$ 's. Numerical constraints give us  $k$ 's,  $k'$ 's,  $m$ 's and  $m'$ 's. Denote the number of inequalities and the number of variables in  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathfrak{B}}$  with  $l_1$  and  $l_2$ , respectively. It is clear that  $l_1 = O(\ell(\alpha^-))$  and  $l_2 = O(\ell(\alpha^-))$ .

We need to check whether  $z_i$ 's are coherent as probabilities of  $\phi_i$ 's. Recall again that because of (Klein et al., 2021, Theorem 4), we can assume that the probabilities are *classical*. Moreover, we can assume that there are  $n$  propositional variables in  $\alpha$  (we can always add new superfluous variables or modal atoms to  $\alpha$  to make their numbers equal).

Now, introduce  $2^n$  variables  $u_v$ , indexed by  $n$ -letter words over  $\{0, 1\}$ . These denote whether the variables of  $\phi_i$ 's are true under  $v^+$  and thus, correspond to subsets of  $\text{Prop}(\alpha)$ . E.g., if  $\text{Prop}(\alpha) = \{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4\}$ , then  $u_{1001}$  encodes  $\{p_1, p_4\}$ . Note that  $\neg$  does not occur in  $\alpha^-$  and thus we care

only about  $e_1$  and  $v^+$ . Furthermore, while  $n$  is the number of  $\phi_i$ 's, we can add extra modal atoms or variables to make it also the number of variables. We let  $a_{i,v} = 1$  when  $\phi_i$  is true under  $v^+$  and  $a_{i,v} = 0$  otherwise. Now add new equalities to  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}}$ , namely

$$\sum_v u_v = 1 \qquad \sum_v (a_{i,v} \cdot u_v) = z_i \qquad ([\text{MIP}(2 \text{ exp})]^{\mathcal{B}})$$

The new problem —  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ exp})]^{\mathcal{B}}$  — has a solution over  $[0, 1]$  iff  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$ -satisfiable since  $[\text{MIP}(2 \text{ exp})]^{\mathcal{B}}$  encodes a measure on  $\text{Prop}(\alpha)$  while the existence of a solution for  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}}$  ensures that  $\alpha$  is  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ -satisfiable. Furthermore, although there are  $l_2 + 2^n + n$  variables in  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ exp})]^{\mathcal{B}}$ , it has no more than  $l_1 + n + 1$  (in)equalities. Thus by (Fagin et al., 1990, Lemma 2.5), it has a solution with at most  $l_1 + n + 1$  non-zero entries. We guess a list  $L$  of at most  $l_1 + n + 1$  words  $v$  (its size is  $n \cdot (l_1 + n + 1)$ ). We can now compute the values of  $a_{i,v}$ 's for  $i \leq n$  and  $v \in L$  and obtain a new bMIP

$$\sum_{v \in L} u_v = 1 \qquad \sum_{v \in L} (a_{i,v} \cdot u_v) = z_i \qquad ([\text{MIP}(2 \text{ poly})]^{\mathcal{B}})$$

It is clear that  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ poly})]^{\mathcal{B}}$  is of polynomial size w.r.t.  $\ell(\alpha^-)$  and thus, can be solved in the nondeterministic polynomial time. Moreover,  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ poly})]^{\mathcal{B}}$  has a solution iff the values of  $\text{Pr}\phi_i$ 's occurring on  $\mathcal{B}$  are coherent as probabilities. If there is no solution for  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ poly})]^{\mathcal{B}}$ , we guess another open branch from the tableau and repeat the procedure. If there is no open branch  $\mathcal{B}' \in \mathfrak{B}r$  s.t. its corresponding system of inequalities  $[\text{MIP}(1)]^{\mathcal{B}'} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ poly})]^{\mathcal{B}'}$  has a solution, then  $\alpha^-$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$ -unsatisfiable, and hence,  $\alpha$  is not  $\text{Pr}_{\Delta}^{k^2}$ -satisfiable either by Lemma 37.  $\square$

#### 4. Belief and plausibility functions over BD

In this section, we introduce BD-models with belief and plausibility functions. We adapt the definitions from Zhou (2013) and Bílková et al. (2023).

**Definition 39** (Belief function). A belief function on  $W \neq \emptyset$  is a map  $\text{bel} : 2^W \rightarrow [0, 1]$  s.t.

- $\text{bel}$  is monotone w.r.t.  $\subseteq$ : if  $X \subseteq Y$ , then  $\text{bel}(X) \leq \text{bel}(Y)$ ;
- for every  $X_1, \dots, X_k \subseteq W$ , it holds that

$$\text{bel} \left( \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} X_i \right) \geq \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\} \\ J \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|J|+1} \cdot \text{bel} \left( \bigcap_{j \in J} X_j \right)$$

- $\text{bel}(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\text{bel}(W) = 1$ .

**Definition 40** (Plausibility function). A plausibility function on  $W \neq \emptyset$  is a map  $\text{pl} : 2^W \rightarrow [0, 1]$  s.t.

- $\text{pl}$  is monotone w.r.t.  $\subseteq$ ;
- for every  $X_1, \dots, X_k \subseteq W$ , it holds that

$$\text{pl} \left( \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} X_i \right) \leq \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\} \\ J \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|J|+1} \cdot \text{pl} \left( \bigcup_{j \in J} X_j \right)$$

- $\text{pl}(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\text{pl}(W) = 1$ .

Recall that every plausibility function  $\text{pl}$  on  $W$  gives rise to a belief function  $\text{bel}_{\text{pl}}$  and vice versa: given a belief function  $\text{bel}$  on  $W$ , one can construct a plausibility function  $\text{pl}_{\text{bel}}$ .

$$\text{pl}_{\text{bel}}(X) = 1 - \text{bel}(W \setminus X) \quad \text{bel}_{\text{pl}}(X) = 1 - \text{pl}(W \setminus X) \quad (3)$$

Moreover, it was shown in (BÍlková et al., 2023, Lemmas 2.10 and 2.11) that a similar statement holds for BD-models. I.e., belief and plausibility functions can be defined via one another even without set-theoretic complements.

$$\text{pl}_{\text{bel}}(|\phi|^+) = 1 - \text{bel}(|\phi|^-) \quad \text{bel}_{\text{pl}}(|\phi|^+) = 1 - \text{pl}(|\phi|^-) \quad (4)$$

In what follows, we will be using two kinds of BD models with belief functions introduced in BÍlková et al. (2023): in the first one, belief and plausibility will be interdefinable via (4); in the second one, we will assume them to be independent.

**Definition 41** (BD  $\text{bel}$ -models). A BD  $\text{bel}$ -model is a tuple  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{bel}} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \text{bel} \rangle$  with  $\mathfrak{M}$  being a BD model (recall Definition 2) and  $\text{bel}$  a belief function on  $W$ .

**Definition 42** (BD  $\text{bel}/\text{pl}$ -models). A BD  $\text{bel}/\text{pl}$ -model is a tuple  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{bel}/\text{pl}} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \text{bel}, \text{pl} \rangle$  with  $\mathfrak{M}$  being a BD model (recall Definition 2),  $\text{bel}$  a belief function on  $W$ , and  $\text{pl}$  a plausibility function on  $W$ .

Observe from Definitions 39 and 40 that the traditional axiomatisation of belief and plausibility functions is infinite. In the classical case, this can be circumvented following Godo et al. (2001, 2003) if we define belief in  $\phi$  as *the probability of*  $\Box\phi$  (with  $\Box$  being the **S5** modality). Then, we can use (3) to define the plausibility of  $\phi$  as *the probability of*  $\Diamond\phi$  since  $\Diamond\phi \equiv \sim\Box\sim\phi$  (here,  $\equiv$  is the classical equivalence and  $\sim$  is the classical negation). In the remainder of the section, we show that the same can be done in BD.

Let us first recall the classical result.

**Definition 43.** A classical uncertainty model is a tuple  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, v, \mu \rangle$  with  $W \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\mu : 2^W \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , and  $v : \text{Prop} \rightarrow 2^W$  extended to the satisfaction relation  $\mathfrak{M}, w \models \phi$  as follows.

$$\mathfrak{M}, w \models p \text{ iff } w \in v(p) \quad \mathfrak{M}, w \models \sim\phi \text{ iff } \mathfrak{M}, w \not\models \phi \quad \mathfrak{M}, w \models \phi \wedge \chi \text{ iff } \mathfrak{M}, w \models \phi \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}, w \models \chi$$

If  $\mu$  is a belief function, plausibility, probability, etc., we call  $\mathfrak{M}$  belief, plausibility, probabilistic, etc. model.

The extension of a formula  $\phi$  is defined as  $\|\phi\| = \{w : \mathfrak{M}, w \models \phi\}$ .

**Definition 44** (Classical probabilistic Kripke model). A classical probabilistic Kripke model is a tuple  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, R, v, \pi \rangle$  with  $W \neq \emptyset$ ,  $R$  being an equivalence relation on  $W$ ,  $\pi$  being a classical probability measure on  $W$  and  $v : \text{Prop} \rightarrow 2^W$  extended to the satisfaction relation  $\mathfrak{M}, w \models \phi$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}, w \models p \text{ iff } w \in v(p) \\ \mathfrak{M}, w \models \sim\phi \text{ iff } \mathfrak{M}, w \not\models \phi & \quad \mathfrak{M}, w \models \phi \wedge \chi \text{ iff } \mathfrak{M}, w \models \phi \text{ and } \mathfrak{M}, w \models \chi \\ \mathfrak{M}, w \models \Box\phi \text{ iff } \forall w' : wRw' \Rightarrow \mathfrak{M}, w' \models \phi & \quad \mathfrak{M}, w \models \Diamond\phi \text{ iff } \exists w' : wRw' \ \& \ \mathfrak{M}, w' \models \phi \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 45** ((Godo et al., 2001, Theorem 1)). Let  $\phi$  be a propositional classical formula and let  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{bel}} = \langle W, v, \text{bel} \rangle$  and  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, v, \text{pl} \rangle$  be, respectively, a belief and plausibility models, then:

- (i) there is a classical probabilistic model  $\mathfrak{M}_{\Box} = \langle W_{\Box}, R_{\Box}, v_{\Box}, \pi_{\Box} \rangle$  s.t.  $\pi_{\Box}(\|\Box\phi\|) = \text{bel}(\|\phi\|)$ ;
- (ii) there is a classical probabilistic model  $\mathfrak{M}_{\Diamond} = \langle W_{\Diamond}, R_{\Diamond}, v_{\Diamond}, \pi_{\Diamond} \rangle$  s.t.  $\pi_{\Diamond}(\|\Diamond\phi\|) = \text{pl}(\|\phi\|)$ .

We draw the attention of our readers to the fact that  $\Box$  and  $\Diamond$  do not have to be **S5**: it suffices that the underlying modal logic be normal. Moreover, originally, only (i) is proven in Godo et al. (2001, 2003). Observe, however, that (ii) can be obtained from (i) by (3) since

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi(\|\Diamond\phi\|) &= \pi(\|\sim\Box\sim\phi\|) \\
 &= 1 - \pi(\|\Box\sim\phi\|) \\
 &= 1 - \text{bel}(\|\sim\phi\|) \\
 &= 1 - \text{bel}(W \setminus \|\phi\|) \\
 &= \text{pl}_{\text{bel}}(\|\phi\|)
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us now introduce probabilistic models for modal BD formulas. We borrow the definition of modalities in BD from Odintsov and Wansing (2017).

**Definition 46** (BD probabilistic Kripke models). *A BD probabilistic Kripke model is a tuple  $\mathfrak{M} = \langle W, R, v^+, v^-, \pi \rangle$  with  $W \neq \emptyset$ ,  $R$  being an equivalence relation on  $W$ ,  $\pi$  being a classical probability measure on  $W$  and  $v^+, v^- : \text{Prop} \rightarrow 2^W$  extended to  $\mathfrak{M}$ ,  $w \models^+ \phi$  and  $\mathfrak{M}, w \models^- \phi$  as in Definition 2 for propositional connectives and as below for modalities.*

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 w \models^+ \Box\phi \text{ iff } \forall w' : wRw' \Rightarrow w' \models^+ \phi & w \models^+ \Diamond\phi \text{ iff } \exists w' : wRw' \ \& \ w' \models^+ \phi \\
 w \models^- \Box\phi \text{ iff } \exists w' : wRw' \ \& \ w' \models^- \phi & w \models^- \Diamond\phi \text{ iff } \forall w' : wRw' \Rightarrow w' \models^- \phi
 \end{array}$$

Positive and negative extensions of  $\phi$  are as in Definition 2.

**Remark 47.** Since  $\models^+$  conditions for  $\Box$  and  $\Diamond$  in the classical logic and in BD coincide, it is clear (cf. Hájek (1996) for details) that given a probability  $\pi$  on a Kripke model  $\mathfrak{M}$ , there are a belief and plausibility functions  $\text{bel}$  and  $\text{pl}$  on  $\mathfrak{M}$  s.t.  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^+) = \pi(|\Box\phi|^+)$  and  $\text{pl}(|\phi|^+) = \pi(|\Diamond\phi|^+)$  for every  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}}$ .

**Theorem 48.** *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}}$  and consider a BD  $\text{bel}$ -model  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{bel}} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \text{bel} \rangle$  and a BD  $\text{bel}/\text{pl}$ -model  $\mathfrak{M}'_{\text{bel}/\text{pl}} = \langle \mathfrak{M}', \text{bel}', \text{pl}' \rangle$ . Then, there exist*

- (1) a BD probabilistic Kripke model  $\mathfrak{M}_{\Box} = \langle W_{\Box}, R_{\Box}, v_{\Box}^+, v_{\Box}^-, \pi_{\Box} \rangle$  with  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^+) = \pi_{\Box}(|\Box\phi|^+)$ ;
- (2) a BD probabilistic Kripke model  $\mathfrak{M}_{\Box, \Diamond} = \langle W_{\Box, \Diamond}, R_1, R_2, v_{\Box, \Diamond}^+, v_{\Box, \Diamond}^-, \pi_{\Box, \Diamond} \rangle$  with  $\text{bel}'(|\phi|^+) = \pi_{\Box, \Diamond}(|\Box_1\phi|^+)$  and  $\text{pl}'(|\phi|^+) = \pi_{\Box, \Diamond}(|\Diamond_2\phi|^+)$  (here,  $\Box_1$  and  $\Diamond_2$  are associated to  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , respectively).

*Proof.* We prove (1) as (2) can be dealt with in the same manner. Let w.l.o.g.  $\phi$  be in NNF and denote  $\phi^*$  the result of replacing every negated variable  $\neg p$  occurring in  $\phi$  with a fresh variable  $p^*$ . Consider  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{bel}} = \langle W, v^+, v^-, \text{bel} \rangle$  and  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{bel}}^*$  (cf. the proof of Lemma 37). It is easy to see that  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^+) = \text{bel}(|\phi^*|^+)$ .

Now define a classical belief model  $\mathfrak{M}_{\text{bel}}^{\text{cl}} = \langle W, v^{\text{cl}}, \text{bel} \rangle$  with  $v^{\text{cl}}(q) = v^+(q)$  for every  $q \in \text{Prop}$ . Clearly,  $\text{bel}(|\phi^*|^+) = \text{bel}(\|\phi^*\|)$  for all  $\phi^*$ 's. Thus, by Theorem 45, we have that there is a classical Kripke probabilistic model  $\mathfrak{M}_{\Box} = \langle W_{\Box}, R_{\Box}, v_{\Box}, \pi_{\Box} \rangle$  s.t.  $\pi_{\Box}(\|\Box\phi^*\|) = \text{bel}(\|\phi^*\|)$ . It remains to construct a suitable BD probabilistic Kripke model.

We define  $\mathfrak{M}_{\Box}^{\text{BD}} = \langle W_{\Box}, R_{\Box}, v_{\Box}^+, v_{\Box}^-, \pi_{\Box} \rangle$  with  $v_{\Box}^+(p) = v_{\Box}(p)$  and  $v_{\Box}^-(p) = v_{\Box}(p^*)$ . One can show by induction on  $\phi^*$  that  $\|\phi^*\| = |\phi|^+$ , and thus  $\|\Box\phi^*\| = |\Box\phi|^+$ : indeed, cf. semantical conditions for  $\Box$  in Definitions 44 and 46. Hence,  $\pi_{\Box}(\|\Box\phi^*\|) = \pi_{\Box}(|\Box\phi|^+)$ , as required.  $\square$

## 5. Logics for belief and plausibility functions over BD

In this section, we recall two-layered logics  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}$  and  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$  for reasoning with belief and plausibility functions over BD that were presented in BÍlková et al. (2023). We then combine the technique of Hájek and Tulipani (2001) with the results of Godo et al. (2001, 2003) and Theorem 48 to obtain the NP-completeness of  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}$  and  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$ .

### 5.1 Languages and semantics

**Definition 49** ( $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}$ : language and semantics). *The language of  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}$  is constructed using the grammar below.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}} \ni \alpha := \text{B}\phi \mid (\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}}) \mid \neg\alpha \mid \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \mid \sim\alpha \mid \Delta\alpha$$

A  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}$  model is a tuple  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{bel}} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \text{bel}, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  with

- $\langle \mathfrak{M}, \text{bel} \rangle$  being a BD  $\text{bel}$ -model (cf. Definition 41);
- $e_1$  and  $e_2$  being  $\text{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  valuations induced by  $\text{bel}$ :
  - $e_1(\text{B}\phi) = \text{bel}(|\phi|^+)$ ,  $e_2(\text{B}\phi) = \text{bel}(|\phi|^-)$ ;
  - values of complex  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}}$ -formulas are computed via Definition 10.

We say that  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}$ -valid iff  $e_1(\alpha) = 1$  and  $e_2(\alpha) = 0$  in all models. A set of formulas  $\Gamma$  entails  $\alpha$  ( $\Gamma \models_{\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}} \alpha$ ) iff there is no  $\mathbb{M}_{\text{bel}}$  s.t.  $e(\gamma) = (1, 0)$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  but  $e(\alpha) \neq (1, 0)$ .

**Remark 50.** Note that we cannot utilise the technique from Lemma 15 to reduce  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{k}^2}$  validity to checking whether  $e_1(\alpha) = 1$  in every model. This is because belief functions are *not additive*. Thus, even though we can construct  $(v^*)^+$  and  $(v^*)^-$  s.t. (1) holds, we cannot use it to infer the following counterpart of (2):

$$e^*(\text{B}\phi) = (1 - \text{bel}(|\phi|^-), 1 - \text{bel}(|\phi|^+)) = (1 - e_2(\text{B}\phi), 1 - e_1(\text{Pr}\phi)) \quad (5)$$

Indeed, (5) does not hold in general since it is not necessarily the case that  $\text{bel}(W \setminus X) = 1 - \text{bel}(X)$  for  $X \subseteq W$ .

$\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$  uses a different paraconsistent expansion of Łukasiewicz logic ( $\text{Nk}$ ) that is inspired by Nelson's paraconsistent logic from Nelson (1949). The logic was introduced in BÍlková et al. (2021) and further investigated in BÍlková et al. (2023). We recall its language and semantics below.

**Definition 51** ( $\text{Nk}$ : language and semantics). *The language is constructed via the following grammar.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Nk}} \ni \phi := p \mid \sim_{\text{N}}\phi \mid \neg\phi \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \rightarrow \phi)$$

The support of truth and support of falsity conditions are given by the following extensions of  $v_1, v_2 : \text{Prop} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  ( $\text{Nk}$  valuations) to the complex formulas.

$$\begin{array}{ll} v_1(\neg\phi) = v_2(\phi) & v_2(\neg\phi) = v_1(\phi) \\ v_1(\sim_{\text{N}}\phi) = \sim_{\text{k}}v_1(\phi) & v_2(\sim_{\text{N}}\phi) = v_1(\phi) \\ v_1(\phi \wedge \chi) = v_1(\phi) \wedge_{\text{k}} v_1(\chi) & v_2(\phi \wedge \chi) = v_2(\phi) \vee_{\text{k}} v_2(\chi) \\ v_1(\phi \rightarrow \chi) = v_1(\phi) \rightarrow_{\text{k}} v_1(\chi) & v_2(\phi \rightarrow \chi) = v_1(\phi) \odot_{\text{k}} v_2(\chi) \end{array}$$



We say that  $\phi$  is  $\mathbf{Nk}$ -valid iff  $v_1(\phi) = 1$  for every  $v_1$ .  $\Gamma$  entails  $\chi$  ( $\Gamma \models_{\mathbf{Nk}} \chi$ ) iff there is no  $v_1$  s.t.  $v_1(\phi) = 1$  for every  $\phi \in \Gamma$  and  $v_1(\chi) \neq 1$ .

**Definition 52** ( $\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$ : language and semantics). *The language is given by the grammar below.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}} \ni \alpha := \mathbf{B}\phi \ (\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}}) \mid \mathbf{Pl}\phi \mid \neg\alpha \mid \alpha \wedge \alpha \mid \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \mid \sim\mathbf{N}\alpha$$

A  $\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$  model is a tuple  $\mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{bel}/\mathbf{p1}} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{bel}, \mathbf{p1}, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  with

- $\langle \mathfrak{M}, \mathbf{bel}, \mathbf{p1} \rangle$  being a  $\mathbf{BD}$   $\mathbf{bel}/\mathbf{p1}$ -model (cf. Definition 42);
- $e_1$  and  $e_2$  being  $\mathbf{Nk}$  valuations induced by  $\mathbf{bel}$  and  $\mathbf{p1}$ :
  - $e_1(\mathbf{B}\phi) = \mathbf{bel}(|\phi|^+)$ ,  $e_2(\mathbf{B}\phi) = \mathbf{p1}(|\phi|^-)$ ,  $e_1(\mathbf{Pl}\phi) = \mathbf{p1}(|\phi|^+)$ ,  $e_2(\mathbf{Pl}\phi) = \mathbf{bel}(|\phi|^-)$ ;
  - values of complex  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}}$ -formulas are computed via Definition 51.

We say that  $\alpha$  is  $\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$ -valid iff  $e_1(\alpha) = 1$  for every  $\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$  model.  $\Gamma$  entails  $\alpha$  ( $\Gamma \models_{\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}} \alpha$ ) iff there is no model s.t.  $e_1(\gamma) = 1$  for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and  $e_1(\alpha) \neq 1$ .

Note that using (4), we can define a plausibility operator  $\mathbf{Pl}_B$  in  $\mathbf{Bel}_{\Delta}^2$  as  $\mathbf{Pl}_B\phi := \sim\mathbf{B}\neg\phi$ . The main difference between it and  $\mathbf{Pl}$  in  $\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$  is that the latter is *independent of belief*. We refer readers to Bílková et al. (2023) for a more detailed discussion of differences between  $\mathbf{Bel}_{\Delta}^2$  and  $\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$ .

In the previous section, we showed (Theorem 48) that belief and plausibility in  $\mathbf{BD}$  can be represented as probabilities of modal formulas. We are going to introduce two logics —  $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  and  $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$  — that deal with those and show that  $\mathbf{Bel}_{\Delta}^2$  and  $\mathbf{Bel}^{\mathbf{Nk}}$  can be embedded into them.

To simplify the presentation, we first construct three modal languages. There, all variables are in the scope of modalities, and modalities do not nest nor are mixed in one formula (i.e., we forbid formulas such as  $\Box_1 p \wedge \Diamond_2 q$ ).

**Definition 53.** *The first language is as follows.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}_{\Box}} \ni \sigma := \heartsuit\phi \ (\heartsuit \in \{\Box, \Diamond\}, \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}}) \mid \neg\sigma \mid \sigma \wedge \sigma \mid \sigma \vee \sigma$$

*The second and third languages are built in the same way but have explicit indexing of modalities.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}_{\Box_1}} \ni \sigma := \heartsuit_1\phi \ (\heartsuit \in \{\Box, \Diamond\}, \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}}) \mid \neg\sigma \mid \sigma \wedge \sigma \mid \sigma \vee \sigma$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}_{\Box_2}} \ni \tau := \heartsuit_2\phi \ (\heartsuit \in \{\Box, \Diamond\}, \phi \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}}) \mid \neg\tau \mid \tau \wedge \tau \mid \tau \vee \tau$$

**Definition 54** ( $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ : language and semantics). *The language is constructed as follows.*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}} \ni \alpha := \mathbf{Pr}\sigma \ (\sigma \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{BD}_{\Box}}) \mid \sim\alpha \mid \neg\alpha \mid \Delta\alpha \mid (\alpha \rightarrow \alpha)$$

A  $\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  model is a tuple  $\mathbb{M}_{\pi} = \langle \mathfrak{M}, \pi, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  s.t.

- $\langle \mathfrak{M}, \pi \rangle$  is a  $\mathbf{BD}$  probabilistic Kripke model;
- $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  valuations induced by  $\pi$ :
  - $e_1(\mathbf{Pr}\sigma) = \pi(|\sigma|^+)$ ,  $e_2(\mathbf{Pr}\sigma) = \pi(|\sigma|^-)$ ;
  - values of complex  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}}$ -formulas are computed via Definition 10.

We say that  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ -valid iff  $e_1(\alpha) = 1$  and  $e_2(\alpha) = 0$  in all models. A set of formulas  $\Gamma$  entails  $\alpha$  ( $\Gamma \models_{\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}} \alpha$ ) iff there is no  $\mathbb{M}_\pi$  s.t.  $e(\gamma) = (1, 0)$  for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  but  $e(\alpha) \neq (1, 0)$ .

The next statements can be proven in the same manner as Lemma 15 and 37.

**Lemma 55.** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}}$ . Then  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  valid iff  $e_1(\alpha) = 1$  in all  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  models.*

**Lemma 56.** *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}}$ . Then there is  $\alpha^*$  where  $\neg$  does not occur at all s.t.  $\alpha^*$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ -satisfiable iff  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ -satisfiable.*

**Definition 57** ( $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nk}}$ : language and semantics). *The language is generated by the following grammar:*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nk}}} \ni \alpha := \text{Pr}_1 \sigma \ (\sigma \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}_{\square_1}^1}) \mid \text{Pr}_2 \tau \ (\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}_{\square_2}^1}) \mid \neg \alpha \mid \alpha \wedge \alpha \mid \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \mid \sim_{\text{N}} \alpha$$

A  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nk}}$  model is a tuple  $\mathbb{M}_{\pi_1, \pi_2}^{\text{Nk}} = \langle W, R_1, R_2, v^+, v^-, \pi_1, \pi_2, e_1, e_2 \rangle$  s.t.

- $\langle W, R_1, R_2, v^+, v^-, \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle$  is a BD probabilistic Kripke model with two relations and two measures;
- $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are  $\text{Nk}$  valuations induced by  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ :
  - $e_1(\text{Pr}_1 \sigma) = \pi_1(|\sigma|^+)$ ,  $e_2(\text{Pr}_1 \sigma) = \pi_1(|\sigma|^-)$ ;
  - $e_1(\text{Pr}_2 \tau) = \pi_2(|\tau|^+)$ ,  $e_2(\text{Pr}_2 \tau) = \pi_2(|\tau|^-)$ ;
  - values of complex  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nk}}}$ -formulas are computed via Definition 51.

## 5.2 Embedding of belief logics into probabilistic logics

Theorem 48 shows that beliefs can be represented as probabilities of modal formulas. In this section, we use this result to prove that we can faithfully embed  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}^2}$  and  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$  into  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  and  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nk}}$ . To simplify the presentation, observe that all  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}^2}}$ - and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}}$ -formulas can be transformed into an outer- $\neg$ -free form since  $\mathbf{k}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  and  $\text{Nk}$  permit NNF's and since the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned} e(\neg B\phi) &= e(B\neg\phi) && \text{(in Bel}_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}^2}) \\ e(\neg B\phi) &= e(\text{PI}\neg\phi) && e(\neg \text{PI}\phi) = e(B\neg\phi) && \text{(in Bel}^{\text{Nk}}) \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 58** (Embedding of  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}^2}$  into  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ ). *Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\mathbf{k}^2}}$  be outer- $\neg$ -free, we define  $\alpha^{\boxplus}$  and  $\alpha^{\boxminus}$  as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned} (B\phi)^{\boxplus} &= \text{Pr}(\Box\phi) && (B\phi)^{\boxminus} &= \text{Pr}(\Box\neg\phi) \\ (\Delta\beta)^{\boxplus} &= \Delta(\beta^{\boxplus}) && (\Delta\beta)^{\boxminus} &= \sim\Delta\sim(\beta^{\boxplus}) \\ (\sim\beta)^{\boxplus} &= \sim(\beta^{\boxplus}) && (\sim\beta)^{\boxminus} &= \sim(\beta^{\boxplus}) \\ (\beta \rightarrow \gamma)^{\boxplus} &= \beta^{\boxplus} \rightarrow \gamma^{\boxplus} && (\beta \rightarrow \gamma)^{\boxminus} &= \gamma^{\boxplus} \ominus \beta^{\boxplus} \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 59** (Embedding of  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}$  into  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nt}}$ ). Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}}$  be outer- $\neg$ -free, we define  $\alpha^{\square, \diamond}$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{B}\phi)^{\square, \diamond} &= \text{Pr}_1(\square_1\phi) & (\text{Pl}\phi)^{\square, \diamond} &= \text{Pr}_2(\diamond_2\phi) \\ (\sim_{\text{N}}\beta)^{\square, \diamond} &= \sim_{\text{N}}(\beta^{\square, \diamond}) & (\beta \circ \gamma)^{\square, \diamond} &= \beta^{\square, \diamond} \circ \gamma^{\square, \diamond} \quad (\circ \in \{\wedge, \rightarrow\}) \end{aligned}$$

We can now prove the following statement.

**Theorem 60.**

- (1)  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}}$  is  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}$ -valid iff (a)  $e_1(\alpha^{\boxplus}) = 1$  in every  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  model and (b)  $e_1(\alpha^{\boxminus}) = 0$  in every  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  model.  
 (2)  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}}$  is  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}$ -valid iff  $\alpha^{\square, \diamond}$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nt}}$ -valid.

*Proof.* We begin with (1). Consider the ‘only if’ direction: we assume that either (i)  $e_1(\alpha^{\boxplus}) = x < 1$  in some  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  model or (ii)  $e_1(\alpha^{\boxminus}) = y > 0$  in some  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  model. We prove by induction that in this case, there are some  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}$  models where  $e'_1(\alpha) = x$  or  $e'_2(\alpha) = y$ , respectively.

Let  $\alpha^{\boxplus} = \text{Pr}(\square\phi)$  and  $e_1(\text{Pr}(\square\phi)) = x < 1$ . This means that  $\pi(|\text{Pr}(\square\phi)|^+) = x$ . Using Remark 47, we obtain that there is a belief function  $\text{bel}$  s.t.  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^+) = x < 1$ . Thus,  $e_1^{\text{bel}}(\text{B}\phi) = x < 1$  for the evaluation  $e_1^{\text{bel}}$  induced by  $\text{bel}$ , as required. The induction steps can be obtained by a simple application of the induction hypothesis since  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  and  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}$  use  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^{\text{t}^2}$  as their outer-layer logic. Thus, (i) is tackled.

For (ii), we proceed similarly. Let  $\alpha^{\boxminus} = \text{Pr}(\square\neg\phi) = y > 0$ . Again, we obtain that there is a belief function  $\text{bel}$  s.t.  $\text{bel}(|\neg\phi|^+) = x > 0$  (i.e.,  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^-) = y > 0$ ). Hence,  $e_2^{\text{bel}}(\text{B}\phi) = x > 0$  for the evaluation induced by  $\text{bel}$ . The cases of propositional connectives can be tackled similarly, so, we only consider  $\alpha^{\boxminus} = \gamma^{\boxminus} \ominus \beta^{\boxminus}$ . Let  $e_1(\gamma^{\boxminus} \ominus \beta^{\boxminus}) = y > 0$ . Thus,  $z = e_1(\gamma^{\boxminus}) > e_1(\beta^{\boxminus}) = z'$  with  $z - z' = y$ . Applying the induction hypothesis, we have that  $e'_2(\gamma) = z$ ,  $e'_2(\beta) = z'$ , and  $z - z' = y$ . Hence,  $e'_2(\beta \rightarrow \gamma) = y > 0$ .

Let us now deal with the ‘if’ direction. Assume that  $\alpha$  is not  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}$ -valid, i.e., either (i) there is a  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}$  model where  $e_1(\alpha) = x < 1$  or (ii) there is a model where  $e_2(\alpha) = y > 0$ . We prove by induction that there is a  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  model s.t.  $e'_1(\alpha^{\boxplus}) = x < 1$  or  $e'_1(\alpha^{\boxminus}) = y > 0$ .

First, if  $\alpha = \text{B}\phi$  and  $e_1(\text{B}\phi) = x < 1$  in some  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}$  model, then we have that there is a BD  $\text{bel}$ -model s.t.  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^+) = x$ . Hence, by Theorem 48, there is a BD probabilistic Kripke model s.t.  $\pi(|\square\phi|^+) = x$ , and thus,  $e_1^{\pi}(\text{Pr}(\square\phi)) = x < 1$  for the induced valuation  $e_1^{\pi}$ . In the second case, we have  $e_2(\text{B}\phi) = y > 0$  in some  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\text{t}^2}$  model. Thus,  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^-) = y$  which is equivalent to  $\text{bel}(|\neg\phi|^+) = x$ . Again, applying Theorem 48, we obtain that there is a probabilistic Kripke model with  $\pi(|\square\neg\phi|^+) = y > 0$ . Hence,  $e_1^{\pi}(\text{Pr}(\square\neg\phi)) = y > 0$ , as required. The cases of propositional connectives can be obtained by simple applications of the induction hypothesis as in the ‘only if’ direction.

(2) can be shown similarly. Assume that  $e_1(\alpha^{\square, \diamond}) = x < 1$  in some  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nt}}$  model. Applying Remark 47, one can show by induction that there is a  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}$  model with  $e'_1(\alpha) = x$ . Conversely, using Theorem 48, one obtains that if  $\alpha$  is not  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nt}}$ -valid, then  $\alpha^{\square, \diamond}$  is not  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nt}}$ -valid either.  $\square$

### 5.3 Complexity

Theorem 60 gives us the reduction from validity (and satisfiability) in  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^{\mathbb{L}^2}$  and  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$  to  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  and  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{\text{Nk}}$ . It is, thus, sufficient to prove the NP-completeness of  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  and  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{\text{Nk}}$ . Recall that in the proof of Theorem 38, we used canonical models of BD built over the powerset of all literals occurring in a formula which we encoded via  $u_v$  variables. We define canonical models for BD with **S5** modalities.

**Definition 61** (Canonical model for BD with **S5**  $\square$ ). *Let  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\text{BD}\square}$  be finite with  $\text{Lit}[\Gamma] = \{l_1, \dots, l_n\}$ . The canonical model of  $\Gamma$  is the following structure:*

$$\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDS5}} = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\mathbb{B}_n} \left\langle 2^{\text{Lit}[\Gamma]}, R_i, v^+, v^- \right\rangle$$

with  $\mathbb{B}_n$  being the  $n$ 'th Bell's number (i.e., the number of all equivalence relations on the set with  $n$  elements),  $R_i$ 's corresponding to all possible equivalence relations on  $2^{\text{Lit}[\Gamma]}$ , and valuations defined as follows:

$$\forall w \in 2^{\text{Lit}[\Gamma]} : w \in v^+(p) \Leftrightarrow p \in w \text{ and } w \in v^-(p) \Leftrightarrow \neg p \in w$$

It is clear that  $|\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDS5}}| = \mathbb{B}_n \cdot 2^n$  which is significantly below  $2^{n^2+n}$  for  $|\Gamma| = n$ . Likewise, if we need two equivalence relations (as in  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$ ), the size of  $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDS5}}$  will be bounded from above by  $2^{2n^2+n}$ . Since BD with **S5** modalities is locally tabular, it is also easy to check that if there is a BD probabilistic Kripke model  $\mathfrak{M}$  with

$$\pi(\sigma_1) = x_1, \dots, \pi(\sigma_m) = x_m \quad (6)$$

then there is a probability measure  $\pi^{\text{C}}$  on  $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDS5}}$  s.t.

$$\pi^{\text{C}}(\sigma_1) = x_1, \dots, \pi^{\text{C}}(\sigma_m) = x_m \quad (7)$$

Indeed, a probabilistic model  $\mathfrak{M}$  satisfying (6) can be w.l.o.g. assumed to be finite and, in addition, to be a submodel of  $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDS5}}$  (since BD with **S5** modalities is locally tabular). But then, the measure on  $\mathfrak{M}$  can be extended to a measure on  $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDS5}}$ .

The proof of NP-completeness of  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  and  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{S5}}^{\text{Nk}}$  mostly follows that of Theorem 38. Thus, we need a tableaux calculus for  $\text{Nk}$ . It was given by BÍlková et al. (2021) and we recall it here. All notions — open and closed branches, interpretations of entries, and satisfying valuations of branches — are the same as in  $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2)$  (cf. Definitions 30 and 32), so we only list the rules in the next definition.

**Definition 62** ( $\mathcal{T}(\text{Nk})$ ) — the tableau calculus for  $\text{Nk}$ ). *The rules are as follows.*

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \neg \leq_1 \frac{\neg \phi \leq_1 i}{\phi \leq_2 i} & \neg \leq_2 \frac{\neg \phi \leq_2 i}{\phi \leq_1 i} & \neg \geq_1 \frac{\neg \phi \geq_1 i}{\phi \geq_2 i} & \neg \geq_2 \frac{\neg \phi \geq_2 i}{\phi \geq_1 i} \\ \sim \text{N} \leq_1 \frac{\sim \text{N} \phi \leq_1 i}{\phi \geq_1 1-i} & \sim \text{N} \leq_2 \frac{\sim \text{N} \phi \leq_2 i}{\phi \leq_1 i} & \sim \text{N} \geq_1 \frac{\sim \text{N} \phi \geq_1 i}{\phi \leq_1 1-i} & \sim \text{N} \geq_2 \frac{\sim \text{N} \phi \geq_2 i}{\phi \geq_2 i} \\ \rightarrow \leq_1 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \leq_1 i}{\phi_1 \geq_1 1-i+j} & \rightarrow \leq_2 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \leq_2 i}{\phi_1 \leq_2 i+j} & \rightarrow \geq_1 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \geq_1 i}{\phi_1 \leq_1 1-i+j} & \rightarrow \geq_2 \frac{\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \geq_2 i}{\phi_1 \geq_2 i+j} \\ i \geq 1 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi_2 \leq_1 j \\ j \leq i \end{array} \right. & \phi_2 \leq_1 1-j & \phi_2 \geq_1 j & i \leq 0 \left| \begin{array}{l} \phi_2 \geq_1 1-j \\ j \leq 1-i \end{array} \right. \end{array}$$

$$\wedge \leq_1 \frac{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \leq_1 i}{\phi_1 \leq_1 i \mid \phi_2 \leq_1 i} \quad \wedge \leq_2 \frac{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \leq_2 i}{\phi_1 \leq_2 i \quad \phi_2 \leq_2 i} \quad \wedge \geq_1 \frac{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \geq_1 i}{\phi_1 \geq_1 i \quad \phi_2 \geq_1 i} \quad \wedge \geq_2 \frac{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \geq_2 i}{\phi_1 \geq_2 i \mid \phi_2 \geq_2 i}$$

**Remark 63.** Note that all connectives in  $\mathbf{N}\mathcal{L}$  are continuous and thus all rules of  $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{N}\mathcal{L})$  can be linearised. This will require the introduction of another sort of variables that range over  $\{0, 1\}$ . To make the presentation of both tableaux calculi uniform, however, we decided against the linear version of the tableau rules.

**Theorem 64.** *Satisfiability in  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$  and  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{SS}}^{\mathbf{N}\mathcal{L}}$  is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  and  $\mathbf{N}\mathcal{L}$  are NP-hard, we focus on the NP-membership proof. Let us begin with  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ .

We show how to check the satisfiability of  $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}}$  in nondeterministic polynomial time.

Assume that  $\alpha$  is built over  $\text{Pr}\sigma_1, \dots, \text{Pr}\sigma_n$  and assume w.l.o.g. that  $|\text{Lit}(\alpha)| = n$  (just as in Theorem 38, we can add superfluous modal atoms to make their number equal to the number of literals in  $\alpha$ ) and that  $\alpha$  is outer- $\neg$ -free (this holds because  $e(\neg \text{Pr}\sigma) = e(\text{Pr}\neg\sigma)$  in every model).

We begin with substituting all modal atoms of  $\alpha$  with fresh variables  $q_{\sigma_i}$  and construct a  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2)$  constraint tableau beginning with  $\{\alpha^- \leq_1 c, c < 1\}$ . We can check in nondeterministic polynomial time whether this tableau is closed. If it is,  $\alpha^-$  is not satisfiable (cf. Lemma 55) in  $\mathcal{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$ , whence  $\alpha$  is not  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ -satisfiable. Otherwise, we consider the set  $\mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{r} = \{\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_w\}$  of all open branches of the tableau, guess some  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathfrak{B}\mathfrak{r}$ , and consider its corresponding instance of the bMIP.

$$z_1 \nabla t_1, \dots, z_n \nabla t_n, k_1 \leq k'_1, \dots, k_r \leq k'_r, m_1 \geq 1, \dots, m_s \geq 1, m'_1 \leq 0, \dots, m'_t \leq 0 \quad ([\text{MIP}(1)\square]^\mathcal{B})$$

Here,  $z_i$ 's correspond to the values of  $q_{\sigma_i}$ 's in  $\alpha^-$ , and  $t_i$ 's are linear polynomials that label  $q_{\sigma_i}$ 's. Numerical constraints give us  $k$ 's,  $k'$ 's,  $m$ 's and  $m'$ 's. Denote the number of inequalities and the number of variables in  $[\text{MIP}(1)\square]^\mathcal{B}$  with  $l_1$  and  $l_2$ , respectively. It is clear that  $l_1 = O(\ell(\alpha^-))$  and  $l_2 = O(\ell(\alpha^-))$ .

We need to check whether  $z_i$ 's are coherent as probabilities of  $\sigma_i$ 's. To do this, we introduce  $\mathbb{B}_n \cdot 2^n$  new variables of the form  $u_v^j$  with  $j \in \{1, \dots, \mathbb{B}_n\}$  and  $v \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Here,  $j$  indexes copies of  $2^{\text{Lit}(\alpha)}$  with different equivalence relations thereon and  $v$  encodes the valuation of literals of  $\alpha$  in the corresponding state of the canonical model (cf. Definition 61). Additionally, we put  $a_{i,v}^j = 1$  if  $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDSS}}, (v, j) \models^+ \sigma_i$  and  $a_{i,v}^j = 0$ , otherwise. Here,  $(v, i)$  stands for the state in the  $j$ 'th copy of  $2^{\text{Lit}(\alpha)}$  that makes true the literals denoted by  $v$ : e.g., for  $\text{Lit}(\alpha) = \{p_1, \neg p_1, p_2, \neg p_2\}$ ,  $u_{1100}^2$  encodes the state  $\{p_1, \neg p_1\}$  in the second copy of  $2^{\text{Lit}(\alpha)}$ . Note that since modalities do not nest and since  $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDSS}}$  is a disjoint union of models, it takes only deterministic polynomial time to check whether  $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{BDSS}}, (v, j) \models^+ \sigma_i$ .

We then add the following equalities.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\mathbb{B}_n} \sum_v u_v^j = 1 \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\mathbb{B}_n} \sum_v (a_{i,v}^j \cdot u_v^j) = z_i \quad ([\text{MIP}(2 \text{ exp})\square]^\mathcal{B})$$

Again, just as in Theorem 38,  $[\text{MIP}(1)\square]^\mathcal{B} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ exp})\square]^\mathcal{B}$  has a solution over  $[0, 1]$  iff  $\alpha$  is  $\text{Pr}_{\mathbf{SS}}^{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}$ -satisfiable. Moreover, the number of (in)equalities in this system is  $l_1 + n + 1 = O(\ell(\alpha))$ . Thus we can apply the result of (Fagin et al., 1990, Lemma 2.5) and obtain that  $[\text{MIP}(1)\square]^\mathcal{B} \cup [\text{MIP}(2 \text{ exp})\square]^\mathcal{B}$  has a solution with at most  $l_1 + n + 1$  non-zero entries. We then

guess a list  $L$  of at most  $l_1 + n + 1$  pairs  $(v, j)$ . The size of  $L$  is  $n \cdot \lceil \log j \rceil \cdot (l_1 + n + 1) = O(n^4)$  since  $j \leq \mathbb{B}_n < 2^{n^2}$ . We compute the values of  $a_{i,v}^j$ 's for  $i \leq n$  and  $(v, j) \in L$  which gives us the following bMIP.

$$\sum_{(v,j) \in L} u_v^j = 1 \qquad \sum_{(v,j) \in L} (a_{i,v}^j \cdot u_v^j) = z_i \qquad ([\text{MIP}(2\text{poly})\square]^{\mathcal{B}})$$

Since the size of  $[\text{MIP}(1)\square]^{\mathcal{B}} \cup [\text{MIP}(2\text{poly})\square]^{\mathcal{B}}$  is polynomial in  $\ell(\alpha^-)$ , the rest of the proof is identical to that of Theorem 38.

The NP-membership proof for  $\text{Pr}_{\text{SS}}^{\text{Nk}}$  is mostly the same. The main differences are as follows. First of all, there are two modalities —  $\text{Pr}_1$  and  $\text{Pr}_2$ ; this is why, when transforming  $\alpha$  into  $\alpha^-$ , we replace  $\text{Pr}_1 \sigma_i$ 's with  $q_{\sigma_1}$ 's and  $\text{Pr}_2 \sigma_i$ 's with  $q_{\sigma_2}$ 's. Thus, we introduce two sorts of  $z$ 's ( $z_1$ 's and  $z_2$ 's) in the bMIP corresponding to an open branch in the  $\mathcal{T}(\text{Nk})$  tableau for  $\alpha^-$ . Second, when introducing  $u_v^j$ 's we let  $j$  range over  $\{1, \dots, \mathbb{B}_n^2\}$  (i.e., up to the square of the  $n$ 'th Bell's number). Third, when we guess the list  $L$  of pairs  $(v, j)$ , we have that  $j \leq \mathbb{B}_n^2 < 2^{2n^2}$ . This, however, still produces the list of the size  $n \cdot \lceil \log j \rceil \cdot (l_1 + n + 1) = O(n^4)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 65.** *Satisfiability in  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^2$  and  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$  is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathfrak{L}_{(\Delta, \rightarrow)}^2$  and  $\text{Nk}$  are NP-hard, the statement follows immediately from Lemma 55 and Theorems 60 and 64.  $\square$

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we considered several two-layered logics for reasoning with probability measures and belief functions defined in the BD-framework. In particular, we established that the logics of  $\mathbf{4}$ - and  $\pm$ -probabilities can be faithfully embedded into one another (Theorems 22 and 23), constructed a complete Hilbert axiomatisation for the logic of  $\mathbf{4}$ -probabilities (Theorem 29). We also established NP-completeness for logics of  $\pm$ - and  $\mathbf{4}$ -probabilities as well as for logics of belief and plausibility functions in BD (Theorem 38 and Corollary 65). Still, several important questions remain open.

First of all, our belief and plausibility functions are close to  $\pm$ -probabilities because they assign each statement  $\phi$  two measures: the measure of its positive extension and the measure of its negative extension. It is thus, instructive to define  $\mathbf{4}$ -valued belief and plausibility functions that will assign measures to  $\phi$  according to the pure belief, pure disbelief, conflict and uncertainty extensions (cf. Convention 4). This is not a trivial task since belief and plausibility functions are not additive, whence, the measures of these extensions cannot be directly obtained from  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^+)$  and  $\text{bel}(|\phi|^-)$ .

Second, observe that axiomatisations of  $\text{Bel}_{\Delta}^2$  and  $\text{Bel}^{\text{Nk}}$  by BÍlková et al. (2023) are *infinite*. In the case of belief functions over the classical logic, Godo et al. (2001, 2003) show how to produce a *finite* axiomatisation for the two-layered logics of belief functions in the classical case using the representation of  $\text{bel}(\|\phi\|)$  as  $\pi(\|\square\phi\|)$ . Recall that a similar property (Theorem 48) holds for the BD as well. Can we use it to obtain a finite axiomatisation of belief and plausibility functions over BD?

Third and finally, in BÍlková et al. (2023a), we proposed two-layered logics for *qualitative reasoning* about different uncertainty measures. In particular, we constructed logics for qualitative reasoning with belief functions and probabilities. These logics utilised the bi-Gödel logic (biG) in the outer layer. Since biG is also NP-complete the question arises whether we can apply the technique of Hájek and Tulipani (2001) to prove the NP-completeness of two-layered logics for qualitative reasoning about uncertainty.

**Acknowledgements.** The first author was supported by grant №22-01137S of Grantová Agentura České Republiky. The second and third authors were supported by grant ANR-19-CE48-0006 of Agence Nationale de la Recherche. The third author was also supported by grant ANR-19-CHIA-0014 of Agence Nationale de la Recherche. The paper is a part of the MOSAIC project financed by the European Union’s Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant №101007627.

**Conflict of interest.** No conflict of interest to declare.

## References

- Arieli, O. and Avron, A. 2017. Four-valued parafinite logics. *Studia Logica*, 105(6):1087–1122.
- Baaz, M. 1996. Infinite-valued Gödel logics with 0-1-projections and relativizations. In *Gödel’96: Logical foundations of mathematics, computer science and physics—Kurt Gödel’s legacy, Brno, Czech Republic, August 1996, proceedings*, volume 6, pp. 23–34. Association for Symbolic Logic.
- Baldi, P., Cintula, P., and Noguera, C. 2020. Classical and fuzzy two-layered modal logics for uncertainty: Translations and proof-theory. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, 13(1):988–1001.
- Belnap, N. 1977. A Useful Four-Valued Logic. In Dunn, J. M. and Epstein, G., editors, *Modern Uses of Multiple-Valued Logic*, pp. 5–37. Dordrecht. Springer Netherlands.
- Belnap, N. 2019. How a computer should think. In Omori, H. and Wansing, H., editors, *New Essays on Belnap-Dunn Logic*, volume 418 of *Synthese Library (Studies in Epistemology, Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science)*. Springer, Cham.
- Bílková, M., Frittella, S., and Kozhemiachenko, D. 2021. Constraint tableaux for two-dimensional fuzzy logics. In Das, A. and Negri, S., editors, *Automated Reasoning with Analytic Tableaux and Related Methods*, volume 12842 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 20–37. Springer International Publishing.
- Bílková, M., Frittella, S., Kozhemiachenko, D., and Majer, O. 2023a. Qualitative reasoning in a two-layered framework. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 154:84–108.
- Bílková, M., Frittella, S., Kozhemiachenko, D., and Majer, O. 2023b. Two-layered logics for paraconsistent probabilities. In Hansen, H., Scedrov, A., and de Queiroz, R., editors, *Logic, Language, Information, and Computation. WoLLIC 2023*, volume 13923 of *Lecture notes in computer science*, pp. 101–117. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham.
- Bílková, M., Frittella, S., Kozhemiachenko, D., Majer, O., and Manoorkar, K. 2023. Describing and quantifying contradiction between pieces of evidence via Belnap–Dunn logic and Dempster–Shafer theory. In Miranda, E., Montes, L., Quaeghebeur, E., and Vantaggi, B., editors, *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Symposium on Imprecise Probability: Theories and Applications*, volume 215 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 37–47. PMLR.
- Bílková, M., Frittella, S., Kozhemiachenko, D., Majer, O., and Nazari, S. 2023. Reasoning with belief functions over Belnap–Dunn logic. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 103338.
- Bílková, M., Frittella, S., Majer, O., and Nazari, S. 2020. Belief based on inconsistent information. In *International Workshop on Dynamic Logic*, pp. 68–86. Springer.
- Bueno-Soler, J. and Carnielli, W. 2016. Paraconsistent probabilities: Consistency, contradictions and Bayes’ theorem. *Entropy (Basel)*, 18(9):325.
- Běhounek, L., Cintula, P., and Hájek, P. 2011. Introduction to Mathematical Fuzzy Logic. In Cintula, P., Hájek, P., and Noguera, C., editors, *Handbook of Mathematical Fuzzy Logic*, volume 37 of *Studies in logic*, pp. 1–102. College Publications.
- Dautović, Š., Doder, D., and Ognjanović, Z. 2021. An epistemic probabilistic logic with conditional probabilities. In *Logics in Artificial Intelligence. JELIA 2021*, volume 12678 of *Lecture notes in computer science*, pp. 279–293. Springer International Publishing, Cham.
- Delgrande, J. and Renne, B. 2015. The logic of qualitative probability. In *Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Delgrande, J., Renne, B., and Sack, J. 2019. The logic of qualitative probability. *Artificial Intelligence*, 275:457–486.
- Dubois, D. 2008. On ignorance and contradiction considered as truth-values. *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, 16(2):195–216.
- Dunn, J. 1976. Intuitive semantics for first-degree entailments and ‘coupled trees’. *Philosophical Studies*, 29(3):149–168.
- Dunn, J. 2010. Contradictory information: Too much of a good thing. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 39:425–452.
- Fagin, R. and Halpern, J. 1991. Uncertainty, belief, and probability. *Computational Intelligence*, 7(3):160–173.
- Fagin, R., Halpern, J. Y., and Megiddo, N. 1990. A logic for reasoning about probabilities. *Information and Computation*, 87:78–128.
- Gärdenfors, P. 1975. Qualitative probability as an intensional logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, pp. 171–185.
- Godó, L., Hájek, P., and Esteva, F. 2001. A Fuzzy Modal Logic for Belief Functions. In Nebel, N., editor, *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2001, Seattle, Washington, USA, August 4-10, 2001*, pp. 723–732. Morgan Kaufmann.
- Godó, L., Hájek, P., and Esteva, F. 2003. A fuzzy modal logic for belief functions. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 57(2–4):127–146.



- Hähnle, R.** 1992. A new translation from deduction into integer programming. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Symbolic Mathematical Computing*, pp. 262–275. Springer.
- Hähnle, R.** 1994. Many-valued logic and mixed integer programming. *Annals of mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 12(3-4):231–263.
- Hájek, P.** 1996. Getting belief functions from Kripke models. *International Journal of General Systems*, 24(3):325–327.
- Hájek, P.** 1998. *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*, volume 4 of *Trends in Logic*. Kluwer.
- Hájek, P., Godo, L., and Esteva, F.** 1995. Fuzzy logic and probability. In **Besnard, P. and Hanks, S.**, editors, *UAI '95: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, August 18-20, 1995*, pp. 237–244. Morgan Kaufmann.
- Hájek, P. and Tulipani, S.** 2001. Complexity of fuzzy probability logics. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 45(3):207–213.
- Klein, D., Majer, O., and Rafiee Rad, S.** 2021. Probabilities with gaps and gluts. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 50(5):1107–1141.
- Mares, E.** 1997. Paraconsistent probability theory and paraconsistent bayesianism. *Logique et analyse*, pp. 375–384.
- Metcalfe, G., Olivetti, N., and Gabbay, D.** 2008. *Proof Theory for Fuzzy Logics*. Applied Logic Series 36. Springer.
- Nelson, D.** 1949. Constructible falsity. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 14(1):16–26.
- Odintsov, S. and Wansing, H.** 2017. Disentangling FDE-Based Paraconsistent Modal Logics. *Studia Logica*, 105(6):1221–1254.
- Omori, H. and Wansing, H.** 2017. 40 years of FDE: An introductory overview. *Studia Logica*, 105(6):1021–1049.
- Rodrigues, A., Bueno-Soler, J., and Carnielli, W.** 2021. Measuring evidence: a probabilistic approach to an extension of Belnap–Dunn logic. *Synthese*, 198(S22):5451–5480.
- Rodriguez, R., Tuyt, O., Esteva, F., and Godo, L.** 2022. Simplified Kripke semantics for K45-like Gödel modal logics and its axiomatic extensions. *Studia Logica*, 110(4):1081–1114.
- Shafer, G.** 1976. *A mathematical theory of evidence*. Princeton university press.
- Zhou, C.** 2013. Belief functions on distributive lattices. *Artificial Intelligence*, 201:1–31.