# Normalization and cut-elimination theorems for some logics of evidence and truth<sup>\*</sup>

Marcelo E. Coniglio <sup>a</sup> Martín Figallo <sup>b</sup> Abilio Rodrigues <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Centre for Logic, Epistemology and the History of Science (CLE), and Institute of Philosophy and the Humanities (IFCH), University of Campinas (UNICAMP). Campinas, Brazil

<sup>b</sup>Departamento de Matemática and Instituto de Matemática (INMABB), Universidad Nacional del Sur (UNS), Bahía Blanca, Argentina.

<sup>c</sup>Department of Philosophy, Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Belo Horizonte, Brazil

#### Abstract

In this paper, we investigate proof-theoretic aspects of the logics of evidence and truth  $LET_J$  and  $LET_F$ . These logics extend, respectively, Nelson's logic  $N_4$  and the logic of first-degree entailment (FDE), also known as Belnap-Dunn four-valued logic, with a classicality operator  $\circ$  that recovers classical logic for formulas in its scope. We will present natural deduction and sequent systems for  $LET_J$  and  $LET_F$ , together with proofs of normalization and cut-elimination theorems, respectively. As a corollary, we obtain decidability for both logics.

Keywords: Logics of evidence and truth, Gentzen systems, Normalization theorems, Cut-elimination theorems

# 1 Introduction

Logics of evidence and truth (*LETs*) are paracomplete and paraconsistent logics that extend the logic of first degree entailment (*FDE*), also known as Belnap-Dunn fourvalued logic [3, 10], with a classicality operator  $\circ$  that recovers classical negation for sentences in its scope by means of the following inferences:

(1)  $\circ A, A, \neg A \vdash B$ ,

<sup>\*</sup>The authors are grateful to N. Kamide for helpful discussions on his paper [11]. The first author acknowledges support from the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq, Brazil), grants 309830/2023-0 and 408040/2021-1. He was also supported by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP, Brazil), thematic project *Rationality, logic and probability – RatioLog,* grant 2020/16353-3. The research of the second author was partially supported by the visiting researcher award program funded by FAPESP, grant 2022/03862-2. The third author acknowledges support from CNPq, Brazil, grants 310037/2021-2 and 408040/2021-1, and Minas Gerais State Agency for Research and Development (FAPEMIG, Brazil), grant APQ-02093-21.

(2)  $\circ A \vdash A \lor \neg A$ .

LETs developed from logics of formal inconsistency (LFIs, see [6, 4]), and both LETs and LFIs are part of an evolutionary line that begins in the 1960s with da Costa's work on paraconsistency [9]. The intended intuitive interpretation of LETs can be in terms of evidence, which can be either conclusive or non-conclusive, or in terms of information. In the latter case, the intuitive reading of a formula  $\circ A$  is that the information conveyed by A, positive or negative, is reliable, and when  $\circ A$  does not hold, it means that there is no reliable information about A. LETs, thus, can be interpreted as information-based logics, i.e. logics that are suitable for processing information, in the sense of taking a database as a set of premises and drawing conclusions from those premises in a sensible way, an idea that can be traced back to Belnap-Dunn's papers of the 1970s, in particular to [3, pp. 35-36].<sup>1</sup>

The logic  $LET_J$ , introduced in [7], extends Nelson's logic  $N_4$  [1] with the inferences (1) and (2) above.  $N_4$  extends FDE with a constructive implication: Peirce's law does not hold, but the equivalence between  $\neg(A \rightarrow B)$  and  $A \land \neg B$  holds. The logic  $LET_F$ , introduced in [15], extends FDE with (1) and (2) above plus the following inferences:

- (3)  $\circ A, \neg \circ A \vdash B$ ,
- (4)  $B \vdash \circ A \lor \neg \circ A$ .

Natural deduction systems for  $LET_J$  and  $LET_F$  together with sound and complete valuation semantics have been presented in [7] and [15], respectively, and Kripke semantics for both logics in [2].

In this paper, we investigate the proof theory of the logics  $LET_J$  and  $LET_F$ . Section 2 presents the natural deduction systems  $NLET_J$  and  $NLET_F$ , and in Section 3 we prove normalization theorems for both systems. In Sections 4 and 5 we present a sequent calculus system for  $LET_J$  and the corresponding cut-elimination theorem, and in Section 6 these results are extended to  $LET_F$ .

# 2 Natural deduction systems

The language  $\mathcal{L}_J$  of  $LET_J$  is composed of denumerably many sentential letters  $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ , the unary connectives  $\circ$  and  $\neg$ , the binary connectives  $\land$ ,  $\lor$ , and  $\rightarrow$ , and parentheses. The set of formulas of  $\mathcal{L}_J$ , which we will also denote by  $\mathcal{L}_J$ , is inductively defined in the usual way. Roman capitals  $A, B, C, \ldots$  will be used as metavariables for the formulas of  $\mathcal{L}_J$ , while Greek capitals  $\Gamma, \Delta, \Sigma, \ldots$  will be used as metavariables for sets of formulas.

The proof system  $NLET_J$  will be defined following the notational conventions given in [18]. Deductions in the system of natural deduction are generated as follows.

**Definition 1.** (The system  $NLET_J$ )

Deductions in  $NLET_J$  are inductively defined as follows:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For historical and conceptual aspects of LETs see [14, 16].

Basis: The proof-tree with a single occurrence of an assumption A with a marker is a deduction with conclusion A from open assumption A.

Inductive step: Let  $\mathcal{D}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_2$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_3$  be deductions. Then, they can be extended by one of the following rules below. The classes  $[\neg A]^u$ ,  $[\neg B]^v$ ,  $[A]^u$ ,  $[B]^v$  below contain open assumptions of the deductions of the premises of the final inference, but are closed in the whole deduction.

The notions of *major* and *minor* premises of the  $\circ$ -free rules are defined as usual.  $\circ A$  is the major premise of  $PEM^{\circ}$ , the other premises are minor premises. There are no notions of major and minor premises of  $EXP^{\circ}$ .

Let  $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$  be a set of formulas of  $\mathcal{L}_J$ . We say that the conclusion A is derivable from a set  $\Gamma$  of premises,  $\Gamma \vdash_{NLET_J} A$ , if and only if there is a deduction in  $NLET_J$  with final formula A and whose open assumptions are in  $\Gamma$ . **Remark 2.** Note that we can consider the symbol  $\perp$  (it behaves here as an arbitrary unprovable propositional constant) as an abbreviation of  $\circ A \wedge \neg A \wedge A$ , for any formula A. Then, it is clear that the following rule is derivable in  $NLET_J$ :

$$\frac{\perp}{B}$$
 ( $\perp$ )

Now we turn to the logic  $LET_F$ . The natural deduction system  $NLET_F$  can be defined by adding to the implication-free fragment of  $LET_J$  rules corresponding to the inferences (3) and (4) mentioned in the introduction.

**Definition 3.** (The system  $NLET_F$ )

Let  $\mathcal{L}_F$  be the language obtained from  $\mathcal{L}_J$  by dropping the binary connective  $\rightarrow$ . The calculus  $NLET_F$  results from adding the following rules to the rules of  $NLET_J$  and dropping the rules  $\rightarrow$ I and  $\rightarrow$ E:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_1 & \mathcal{D}_2 & & [\circ A]^u & [\neg \circ A]^v \\ \underline{\circ A} & \neg \circ A \\ \hline & B \end{array} CONS & \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D}_1 & \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \mathcal{D}_1 & \mathcal{D}_2 \\ \underline{B} & \underline{B} \\ B \end{array} COMP, u, v \end{array}$$

We will use  $\vdash_{LET_F}$  to denote the derivability relation generated by  $NLET_F$ .

### **3** Normalization theorems for $NLET_J$ and $NLET_F$

We use the term *del-rule* (from "disjunction-elimination-like") as in [18]. We consider rules  $\lor E$ ,  $\neg \land E$ ,  $PEM^{\circ}$  and COMP as del-rules.

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a deduction in  $LET_J$ . Recall that a *segment* (of length n) in the deduction of  $\mathcal{D}$  is a sequence  $A_1, \ldots, A_n$  of consecutive occurrences of a formula A in  $\mathcal{D}$  such that:

- (i) for  $1 < n, i < n, A_i$  is a minor premise of a del-rule application in  $\mathcal{D}$ , with conclusion  $A_{i+1}$ ,
- (ii)  $A_n$  is not a minor premise of a del-rule application,
- (iii)  $A_1$  is not the conclusion of a del-rule application.

A segment is maximal, or a cut (segment) if  $A_n$  is the major premise of an elimination rule (E-rule), and either n > 1, or n = 1 and  $A_1$  is  $A_n$  and  $A_n$  is the conclusion of an introduction rule (I-rule) or  $EXP^\circ$ . The cutrank  $cr(\sigma)$  of a maximal segment  $\sigma$  with formula A is the complexity of A, |A|. The cutrank  $cr(\mathcal{D})$  of a deduction  $\mathcal{D}$  is the maximum of the cutranks of cuts in  $\mathcal{D}$ . If there is no cut, the cutrank of  $\mathcal{D}$  is zero. A critical cut of  $\mathcal{D}$  is a cut of maximal cutrank among all cuts in  $\mathcal{D}$ . We shall use  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma'$  to designate segments. A given deduction  $\mathcal{D}$  is normal if it contains no cuts.

### Detour conversions

We first show how to eliminate cuts of length 1. The conversions for the connectives  $\land, \lor$  and  $\rightarrow$  are the same as those for the respective connectives in the natural deduction system for intuitionistic logic.

 $\neg \wedge \text{-} conversion$ 

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
\mathcal{D}_i & [\neg A_1] & [\neg A_2] & & \mathcal{D}_i \\
\hline
\frac{\neg A_i}{\neg (A_1 \land A_2)} & \mathcal{D}_1' & \mathcal{D}_2' & & \\
\hline
C & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{array}$$
converts to
$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{D}_i & & \\
\neg A_i & \\
\mathcal{D}_i' & \\
\mathcal{D}_i' & \\
C & & \\
\end{array}$$

 $\neg \lor$ -conversion

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{D}_1 & \mathcal{D}_2 \\
\neg A_1 & \neg A_2 \\
\hline
 \hline
 \neg (A_1 \lor A_2) \\
\hline
 \neg A_i
\end{array}$$
converts to
$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{D}_i \\
\neg A_i
\end{array}$$

 $\neg \rightarrow$ -conversion

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{D}_1 & \mathcal{D}_2 \\
\underline{A_1 & \neg A_2} \\
\hline
\neg (A_1 \to A_2) \\
\hline
A_1
\end{array}$$
converts to
$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{D}_1 \\
A_1
\end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{D}_1 & \mathcal{D}_2 \\
\underline{A_1} & \neg A_2 \\
\hline
\neg (A_1 \to A_2) \\
\hline
\neg A_2
\end{array}$$
converts to
$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{D}_2 \\
\neg A_2
\end{array}$$

 $EXP^{\circ}$ -conversion

CONS-conversion

#### Permutation conversions

In order to remove cuts of length > 1, we permute *E*-rules upwards over minor premises of  $\vee E$  and  $\neg \wedge E$ . The  $\vee$ -permutation conversion is the same as the respective permutation conversion in the intuitionistic logic.

 $\lor$ -permutation conversion

 $\neg \land$ -permutation conversion

 $PEM^{\circ}$ -conversion

COMP-conversion

Simplification conversions

As usual, applications of  $\vee E$  with major premise  $A_1 \vee A_2$ , where at least one of  $[A_1], [A_2]$  is empty in the deduction of the first or second minor premise, are redundant.

Similarly, an application of  $\neg \land E$ ,  $PEM^{\circ}$  with major premise  $\neg(A_1 \land A_2)$ ,  $\circ A$  (respectively) where at least one of  $[\neg A_1]$ ,  $[\neg A_2]$  and  $[\neg A]$ , [A], (respectively) is empty in the deduction of the first or second minor premise, is redundant. Redundant applications of  $\lor E$  can be removed as in the intuitionistic case. Similarly, redundant applications of  $\neg \land E$  can be remove easily as follows

where no assumptions are discharged by  $\neg \land E$  in  $\mathcal{D}_i$ . The other cases are treated similarly.

### Lemma 4.

Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a deduction of A from  $\Gamma$  (in  $LET_J$ ). Then, there is a deduction  $\mathcal{D}'$  of A from  $\Gamma$  in which the consequence of every application of  $EXP^{\circ}$  is either a literal (i.e. an atomic formula or its negation) or a formula of the form  $\circ B$  or  $\neg \circ B$ .

*Proof.* Let c be the highest complexity of a consequence of an application of  $EXP^{\circ}$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let B be the consequence of an application of  $EXP^{\circ}$  of complexity c and that no consequence of an application of  $EXP^{\circ}$  en  $\mathcal{D}$  that stands above B, is of complexity c. Then,  $\mathcal{D}$  has the form

$$egin{array}{cccc} \mathcal{D}_1 & \mathcal{D}_2 & \mathcal{D}_3 & & \ \circ A & A & 
egne{array}{ccccc} & \mathcal{D}' & & \ & \mathcal{D}'' & & \ & \mathcal{D}'' & & \ \end{array}$$

Suppose that B is not a literal and that it is not of the form  $\circ C$  nor  $\neg \circ C$ . Then, B is of the form  $C \wedge D$ ,  $C \vee D$ ,  $C \to D$ ,  $\neg (C \wedge D)$ ,  $\neg (C \vee D)$ ,  $\neg \neg C$ . We remove this application of  $EXP^{\circ}$  easily as follows. If B is  $C \wedge D$  the

$\Pi D I$	SUND	une		Φ	Τ	Ð	Τ	Τ	Ð
$\mathcal{D}_1$	$\mathcal{D}_2$	$\mathcal{D}_{2}$		$\mathcal{D}_1$	$\mathcal{D}_2$	$\mathcal{D}_3$	$\mathcal{D}_1$	$D_2$	$D_3$
- 1	- 2	- 1		$\circ A$	A	$\neg A$	٥A	A	$\neg A$
ΟA	$\frac{A}{C \wedge D}$	$\neg A$	converts to		C			D ,	т
	$C \wedge D$			$\overline{C \land D} \land 1$					
	$D_4$					$\mathcal{I}$	$\mathcal{D}_{A}$		
							7		
				$\mathcal{D}_1$	$\mathcal{D}_{0}$	$\mathcal{D}_{2}$			
${\mathcal D}_1$	$\mathcal{D}_2$	$\mathcal{D}_3$		- 1	1	23			
$\circ A$	A	$\neg A$		٥A	$\frac{A}{C}$	$\neg A$	-		
$\neg(C \land D)$ $\mathcal{D}_4$			converts to	$\frac{\neg C}{\neg \land \Box}$ $\neg \land I$					
				$\neg(C \land D)$					
					$\mathcal{D}_4$				
					1				

In this last proof the set of assumptions [C] is empty. The rest of the cases are similar. So, the new applications of  $EXP^{\circ}$  that arise from these transformations have consequence with complexity < c. Thus, by successively repeating the transformation we obtain a proof fulfilling the desired properties.

**Theorem 5.** (Normalization for  $LET_J$ )

Each derivation  $\mathcal{D}$  in  $LET_J$  reduces to a normal derivation.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a deduction fulfilling the conditions of Lemma 4 and such that every redundant application of any del-rule as well as detours with maximal formula has been removed as indicated in the *simplification conversions* section. As usual, the proof is by double induction on the cutrank n of  $\mathcal{D}$  and the sum of lengths of all critical cuts, m, in  $\mathcal{D}$ . By a suitable choice of the critical cut to which we apply a conversion we can achieve that either n decreases, or that n remains constant but m decreases.

We say that  $\sigma$  is a *top critical cut* in  $\mathcal{D}$  if no critical cut occurs in a branch of  $\mathcal{D}$ , above  $\sigma$ . Let  $\sigma$  be the rightmost top critical cut of  $\mathcal{D}$  with formula A. If the length of  $\sigma$  is 1 and it is the only maximal segment in  $\mathcal{D}$ , we apply a conversion to  $\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  obtaining a new deduction  $\mathcal{D}'$  that has a lower cutrank. If the length of  $\sigma$  is 1 but it is not the only maximal segment of  $\mathcal{D}$ , then the cutrank of  $\mathcal{D}'$  is equal to the cutrank of  $\mathcal{D}$  but the sum of lengths of all critical cuts in  $\mathcal{D}'$  is lower than the same sum in  $\mathcal{D}$ . If the length of  $\sigma$  is > 1, we apply a permutation conversion to  $\mathcal{D}$  obtaining the deduction  $\mathcal{D}'$  which has the same cutrank as  $\mathcal{D}$ , but with a lower value for m.

Similarly, it is possible to eliminate cuts of any derivation in  $LET_F$ .

**Theorem 6.** (Normalization for  $NLET_F$ )

Each derivation  $\mathcal{D}$  in  $LET_F$  reduces to a normal derivation.

*Proof.* We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 5. Details are left to the reader.  $\Box$ 

# 4 Sequent calculus for $LET_J$

Let us start by considering the following single-conclusion sequent calculus, which is a sort of 'direct translation' of the rules of  $NLET_J$  into sequent rules, where the rule  $EXP^{\circ}$  of  $NLET_J$  corresponds to an axiom with the same name. As usual  $\Gamma, \Delta$ , etc. are finite sets of formulas. Besides, we shall identify the sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow$  with the sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \bot$ .

### Definition 7.

The sequent calculus GB consists of the following axiom and rules:

Axioms:

$$\overline{A \Rightarrow A} \ Id \qquad \overline{\circ A, A, \neg A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C} \ EXP^{\circ}$$

Structural rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow C}{A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C} LW \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow}{\Gamma \Rightarrow A} RW$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A}{\Gamma \Rightarrow C} Cut$$

Logical rules:

We will see that the system GB, although equivalent to  $NLET_J$ , does not enjoy the cut-elimination property.

Note 8. If G is a sequent calculus and (r) is an arbitrary sequent rule, we shall denote by G+(r) the sequent calculus obtained by adding the rule (r) to the rules of G. Similarly, we denote  $G+(r_1)+\cdots+(r_n)$  the calculus obtained from G by adding the rules  $(r_1), \ldots, (r_n)$ . Similarly, if (r) is a rule (or axiom) of G we denote G-(r) the system obtained from G by dropping (r). Then,

#### Lemma 9.

Let  $\Gamma \cup \{C\}$  a set of formula. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i)  $\Gamma \Rightarrow C$  is provable in GB,
- (ii) there is a deduction of C from  $\Gamma$  in  $NLET_J$ .

*Proof.* (i) implies (ii). Let **P** a proof of  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  in *GB*. We shall use induction on the number n of rule applications in  $\mathbf{P}$ ,  $n \ge 0$ .

If n = 0 then we have that  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  is (1)  $A \Rightarrow A$  or (2)  $\circ A, \neg A, A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C$ . In case (1), it is clear that  $A \vdash_{NLET_{I}} A$ . In case (2),

$$\frac{\circ A \quad \neg A \quad A}{C} EXP^{\circ}$$

is a deduction of C from  $\{\circ A, \neg A, A\}$ . Then, using the rules  $\land I$  and  $\land E$ , we can construct a deduction of C from  $\Gamma \cup \{\circ A, \neg A, A\}$ .

Now, (I.H.) suppose that "(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii)" holds for  $n < k, k \ge 0$ . Let n = k, that is **P** is a derivation in  $GLET_J$  with last rule (r) of the form

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}(r)$$

If (r) is left weakening, then the last rule of **P** has the form  $\frac{\Gamma' \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma'. A \Rightarrow C}(r)$ . By (I.H.), there exists a deduction  $\mathcal{D}$  of C from  $\Gamma'$ , then

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}}{\frac{C \wedge A}{C} \wedge \mathbf{E}} \wedge \mathbf{E}$$

is a deduction of C from  $\Gamma' \cup \{A\}$ . If (r) is right weakening, then (r) has the form  $\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow}{\Gamma \Rightarrow C}(r), \text{ then by (I.H.) there is a deduction } \mathcal{D} \text{ of } \bot \text{ from } \Gamma. \text{ Then, using } \land E \text{ and } EXP^{\circ}, \text{ we can construct the desired deduction.}$ If (r) is the cut rule, then (r) is  $\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A}{\Gamma \Rightarrow B} cut.$  By (I.H.), there are deductions  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  of A from  $\Gamma$  and B from  $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$ , respectively. Then

$$\mathcal{D}_1$$
  
 $A$   
 $\mathcal{D}_2$   
 $B$ 

is a deduction of B from  $\Gamma$ .

If (r) is any of the logical rules  $R \lor, L \lor, R \land, L \land, R \to, L \to, R \lor, R \neg \lor, L \neg \lor, R \neg \land, L \neg \land, R \neg \to \text{and } L \neg \to;$  it is not difficult to find the desired deduction. We shall show it just for  $L \neg \to$  and  $R \neg \to$ . If the last rule application is  $\frac{\Gamma, A, \neg B \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, \neg(A \to \neg B) \Rightarrow C} L \neg \to$ . Then, by (I.H), we have a deduction  $\mathcal{D}$  of C from  $\Gamma \cup \{A, \neg B\}$ . Then

$$\frac{\neg (A \to B)}{A} \neg \to E \qquad \frac{\neg (A \to B)}{\neg B} \neg \to E$$
$$\frac{\mathcal{D}}{C}$$

is a deduction of C from  $\Gamma \cup \{\neg (A \to \neg B)\}$ . Finally, suppose that (r) is  $PEM^{\circ}$ ,  $\frac{A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C}{\circ A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C} PEM^{\circ}$ . Then, by (I.H.), we have deductions  $\mathcal{D}_1$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2$  of C from  $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$  and C from  $\Gamma \cup \{\neg A\}$ . Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} A \end{bmatrix}^{u} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} \neg A \end{bmatrix}^{v} \\ \mathcal{D}_{1} \qquad \mathcal{D}_{2} \\ \hline \frac{\circ A \qquad C \qquad C}{C} \qquad PEM^{\circ}, u, v \end{bmatrix}$$

is a deduction of C from  $\Gamma \cup \{\circ A\}$ .

(ii) implies (i). Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a deduction of C from  $\Gamma$  in  $NLET_J$ . As before, we use induction on the number n of rule instances in the deduction  $\mathcal{D}$ . If n = 0 the proof is trivial. (I.H.) Suppose that "(ii) implies (i)" holds for n < k, k > 0; and let (r) the last rule instance in  $\mathcal{D}$ . Suppose that (r) is one of the introduction/elimination rule of  $\land I, \land E, \neg \land I, \neg \land E,$  $\lor I, \lor E, \neg \lor I, \neg \lor E, \neg \dashv I, \neg \land E, \neg \neg I$  or  $\neg \neg E$ . We shall show the construction of the desired sequent proof just for  $\neg \land E$ 

By (I.H.), the sequents  $\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \neg (A \land B)$ ,  $\Gamma_2, \neg A \Rightarrow C$  and  $\Gamma_3, \neg B \Rightarrow C$  are probable in GB where  $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3 = \Gamma$ . Then,  $\Gamma \Rightarrow C$  is also probable. Indeed,

$$\frac{\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \neg (A \land B)}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg (A \land B)} LW \qquad \frac{\frac{\Gamma_2, \neg A \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, \neg A \Rightarrow C} LW}{\frac{\Gamma, \neg A \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, \neg B \Rightarrow C}} LW \qquad \frac{\Gamma_3, \neg B \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, \neg B \Rightarrow C} LW \qquad L\neg \land$$

If (r) is  $EXP^{\circ}$ , then  $\mathcal{D}$  is of the form

By (I.H.), we know that the sequents  $\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \circ A$ ,  $\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \neg A$  and  $\Gamma_3 \Rightarrow A$  are probable in GB, where  $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3 = \Gamma$ . Then,  $\Gamma \Rightarrow C$  is also probable in GB. Indeed,

$$\begin{array}{c} \hline \Gamma_{3} \Rightarrow A \\ \hline \Gamma \Rightarrow A, C \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \hline \Gamma_{2} \Rightarrow \neg A \\ \hline A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \neg A, C \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \hline \Gamma_{1} \Rightarrow \circ A \\ \hline \neg A, A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \circ A, C \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \hline \circ A, \neg A, A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C \\ \hline \neg A, A, \Gamma \Rightarrow C \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} EXP^{\circ} \\ cut \end{array} \\ \hline cut \end{array} \\ \hline \hline \Gamma \Rightarrow C \end{array} \\ \end{array}$$

If (r) is  $PEM^{\circ}$ , then the proof goes similarly to the previous case.

#### Remark 10.

The system GB does not enjoy the cut-elimination property. Indeed, the following probable sequent does not have a cut-free proof:

$$\circ(p \land q), p, q, \neg p \Rightarrow$$

where p and q are propositional variables.

The last rule in any proof of it has to be an instance of cut.

Now, we replace the sequent rule  $EXP^{\circ}$  with the rule  $EXP_{1}^{\circ}$  below, obtaining a system equivalent to GB, which is equivalent to  $NLET_{J}$ , but enjoys cut-elimination.

#### Proposition 11.

Let G be a sequent calculus containing the structural rules of (left and right) weakening and the cut rule and consider the rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \neg A}{\circ A, \Gamma \Rightarrow} \ EXP_1^\circ$$

Then,  $EXP^{\circ}$  is derivable in  $G + EXP_1^{\circ}$  and  $EXP_1^{\circ}$  is derivable in  $G + EXP^{\circ}$ .

Proof.

$$\begin{array}{c} \hline \hline A \Rightarrow A & Id & \hline \neg A \Rightarrow \neg A & Id \\ \hline \neg A, A \Rightarrow A & LW & \hline \neg A, A \Rightarrow \neg A & LW \\ \hline \circ A, \neg A, A \Rightarrow & EXP_1^\circ \end{array}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg A}{\circ A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \neg A} LW \qquad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A}{\circ A, \neg A, \Gamma \Rightarrow A} LW \qquad \overline{\circ A, \neg A, A, \Gamma \Rightarrow} EXP^{\circ} \\ cut, A \\ cut, A \\ cut, A \\ cut, \neg A \\ cut, \neg A \\ \Box$$

**Definition 12.** (Sequent calculus for  $LET_J$ ) The sequent calculus  $GLET_J$  is the calculus  $(GB - EXP^\circ) + EXP_1^\circ$ . That is,  $GLET_J$  is the system obtained from GB by dropping the axiom  $EXP^\circ$  and adding the rule:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \neg A}{\circ A, \Gamma \Rightarrow} \ EXP_1$$

Therefore, we have the following:

**Corollary 13.** Let  $\Gamma \cup \{C\}$  a set of formula. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (i) the sequent  $\Gamma \Rightarrow C$  is probable in  $GLET_J$ ,
- (ii) there is a deduction of the C from  $\Gamma$  in  $NLET_J$ .

**Remark 14.** The sequent considered in Remark 10 has a cut-free proof for  $\circ(p \land q), p, q, \neg p \Rightarrow$  in  $GLET_J$ . Indeed,

$$\frac{\overline{p \Rightarrow p} Id}{p,q,\neg p \Rightarrow p} LW \qquad \frac{\overline{q \Rightarrow q} Id}{p,q,\neg p \Rightarrow q} LW \qquad \frac{\overline{\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p} Id}{p,q,\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p} LW \\
\underline{p,q,\neg p \Rightarrow p \land q} R \land \qquad \underline{p,q,\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p} LW \\
\underline{p,q,\neg p \rightarrow p} LW \\
\underline{p,q,\neg p} \\
\underline{p,$$

# 5 Cut–elimination and applications

In this section we shall prove the admissibility of the cut rule in the system  $GLET_J$ . Recall that a *literal* is an atomic formula or a negated atomic formula.

#### Definition 15.

- 1. The *weight* of a formula is defined as follows:
  - (a) w(l) = 0, where l is a literal;
  - (b)  $w(\neg \neg A) = w(A) + 1;$
  - (c) w(A \* B) = w(A) + w(B) + 1, for  $* \in \{\rightarrow, \land, \lor\}$ ;

- (d)  $w(\neg(A * B)) = w(\neg A) + w(\neg B) + 1$ , for  $* \in \{\rightarrow, \land, \lor\}$ ;
- (e)  $w(\circ A) = w(A) + w(\neg A) + 1;$
- (f)  $w(\neg \circ A) = w(\circ A) + 1$ .

#### 2. Generalized subformula

- (a) A is a generalized subformula of  $\neg A$ ;
- (b) A and B are generalized subformulas of both A \* B,  $* \in \{\rightarrow, \lor, \land\}$ ;
- (c)  $\neg A$  and  $\neg B$  are generalized subformulas of  $\neg (A * B), * \in \{\rightarrow, \lor, \land\};$
- (d) A and  $\neg A$  are generalized subformulas of  $\circ A$ .

In the sequel, we shall prove that  $GLET_J$  enjoys the cut-elimination property, following the proof given by Gentzen (see [17]). It is easy to check that the following version of the cut rule is equivalent to the one stated in  $GLET_J$ .

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A \qquad \Pi \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, \Pi_A \Rightarrow C} cut, A$$

where  $A \in \Pi$  and  $\Pi_A = \Pi - \{A\}$ ; A is said to be the *cut formula*.

Let **P** be a proof which contains only a cut in the last inference, we refer the left and right upper sequents as  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , respectively, and to the lower sequent as S.

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots}{S_1}}{S} \frac{\frac{\vdots}{S_2}}{S} cut, A$$

We call a *left thread* of  $\mathbf{P}$  (*right thread*) to any thread of  $\mathbf{P}$  which contains the sequent  $S_1$  ( $S_2$ ). As usual, the *rank* of a left (right) thread is the number of consecutive sequents (counting upward from  $S_1$  ( $S_2$ )) which contains the mix formula in its succedent (antecedent). We call  $rank_l(\mathbf{P})$  ( $rank_r(\mathbf{P})$ ) to the maximum of all ranks of left (right) threads in  $\mathbf{P}$ ; and let  $rank(\mathbf{P}) = rank_l(\mathbf{P}) + rank_r(\mathbf{P})$ . Note that  $rank(\mathbf{P}) \ge 2$ . Besides, we call the weight of  $\mathbf{P}$ , noted  $w(\mathbf{P})$ , to the weight of the mix formula.

**Lemma 16.** If  $\mathbf{P}$  is a proof of the sequent S which contains only a cut in the last inference, then there is a proof of S without any cut.

*Proof.* We use double induction on the weight n, and the rank m of  $\mathbf{P}$  (i.e., transfinite induction on  $\omega \cdot n + m$ ).

**Case I** : m = 2. That is to say,  $rank_l(\mathbf{P}) = 1 = rank_r(\mathbf{P})$ .

Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  the left and right upper sequent of the mix in **P**. We shall analyze different subcases.

(a) If  $S_1$  (or  $S_2$ ) is an initial sequent (an instance of (Id)), it is clear that the theorem holds.

$$\frac{A \Rightarrow A}{A, \Pi_A \Rightarrow C} \frac{\Pi \Rightarrow C}{cut, A}$$

This proof can be replaced by the next cut-free proof  $(\alpha, \Pi_A \text{ is } \Pi, \text{ since } A \in \Pi)$ 

$$\vdots \\ \Pi \Rightarrow C$$

(b)  $S_2$  is an initial sequent. Analogous to (a).

(c) Then, suppose that neither  $S_1$  nor  $S_2$  is an initial sequent. If  $S_1$  (or  $S_2$ ) is the lower sequent of weakening, it is easy to check that the theorem holds. Since  $rank_l(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ ,  $\alpha$  cannot appear in the succedent of the upper sequent of the weakening, therefore,  $\mathbf{P}$  has the form

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow}{\Gamma \Rightarrow A} RW \qquad \vdots \\ \hline \Gamma, \Pi_A \Rightarrow C cut$$

Then, we can eliminate this cut as follows:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow}{\Gamma, \Pi_A \Rightarrow C} LW's - RW$$

(d) Suppose that both  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are the lower sequents of logical inferences. Since  $rank_l(\mathbf{P}) = 1 = rank_r(\mathbf{P})$  we know that the mix formula on each side must be the principal formula of the logical inference. Let A be the mix formula of  $\mathbf{P}$ . If A is of the form  $B \wedge D$  or  $B \vee D$  or  $B \rightarrow D$  the proof goes as in the classical case. Suppose that A is of the form  $\neg(B \vee D)$ , then  $\mathbf{P}$  is as follows.

$$\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg B} \frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg D} R \neg \lor \frac{\neg B, \neg D, \Pi \Rightarrow C}{\neg B, \neg D, \Pi \Rightarrow C} L \neg \lor$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg (B \lor D)}{\Gamma, \Pi \Rightarrow C} L \neg \lor$$

where  $\neg(B \lor D) \notin \Pi$ . Then, we can construct the following proof  $\mathbf{P}_1$ :

$$\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg B} \xrightarrow{\neg B, \neg D, \Pi \Rightarrow C} cut, \neg B$$
$$\frac{\Box, \neg D, \Pi \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, \neg D, \Pi \Rightarrow C} cut, \neg B$$

Since  $w(\mathbf{P}_1) < w(\mathbf{P})$ , by (I.H.) we know that there exists a cut-free proof  $\mathbf{P}'_1$  of  $\Gamma, \neg D, \Pi_{\neg B} \Rightarrow C$ . Then, in turn, we can construct the following proof  $\mathbf{P}_2$ :

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_{1}'}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg D} \xrightarrow{\Gamma, \neg D, \Pi_{\neg B} \Rightarrow C} cut, \neg D$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \neg D, \Pi_{\neg B} \Rightarrow C}{\Gamma, \Gamma, D, (\Pi, D), D \Rightarrow C} cut, \neg D$$

That is,  $\mathbf{P}_2$  is a proof of the sequent  $\Gamma, \Pi - \{\neg B, \neg D\} \Rightarrow C$ . Since  $w(\mathbf{P}_2) < w(\mathbf{P})$ , by (I.H), there exists a cut-free proof  $\mathbf{P}_3$  of  $\Gamma, \Pi - \{\neg B, \neg D\} \Rightarrow C$ , and by means of weakening, there exists a cut-free proof of  $\Gamma, \Pi \Rightarrow C$ .

If A is of the form  $\neg(B \land D)$ ,  $\neg(B \to D)$  or  $\neg\neg B$ , the proof is analogous. Note that if A has the form  $\circ B$ , then the sequent  $S_1$  has to be the lower sequent of RW, since no logical rule in  $GLET_J$  introduce  $\circ$  in the succedent; and this case has been already analyzed in (c). This same happens if A is of the form  $\neg \circ B$ .

**Case II** : m > 2. Then,  $rank_l(\mathbf{P}) > 1$  and /or  $rank_r(\mathbf{P}) > 1$ . Here,  $S_1$  is  $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$  and  $S_2$  is  $\Pi \Rightarrow \Lambda$ . We analyze different subcases.

(I.1)  $rank_r(\mathbf{P}) > 1$ 

(I.1.1) If  $A \in \Gamma$  or A is C, then the construction of the desired proof is immediate. Indeed, we construct the desired proof as follows, respectively.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{if } A \in \Gamma & \text{if } A \text{ is } C \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline \underline{\Pi \Rightarrow C} \\ \hline A, \overline{\Pi_A \Rightarrow C} \\ \hline \Gamma, \overline{\Pi_A \Rightarrow C} \\ \end{array} LW's & \begin{array}{c} \underline{\Gamma \Rightarrow A} \\ \hline \underline{\Gamma \Rightarrow C} \\ \hline \Gamma, \overline{\Pi_A \Rightarrow C} \\ \end{array} LW's$$

(I.1.2) If  $S_2$  is the lower sequent of an application of a rule (r) which is not a logical rule with main formula A. Then, **P** looks like:

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \hline \underline{\Gamma \Rightarrow A} \\ \hline \Pi \\ \hline \Gamma, \Pi_A \Rightarrow C \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \hline \Pi' \Rightarrow C' \\ \hline \Pi \Rightarrow C \\ cut, A \end{array}$$

Since  $rank_r(\mathbf{P}) > 1$ ,  $A \in \Pi'$ . Then, the following proof  $\mathbf{P}$ 

$$\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow A} \frac{\vdots}{\Pi' \Rightarrow C'} cut, A$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, \Pi'_A \Rightarrow C'}{\Gamma, \Pi'_A \Rightarrow C'} cut, A$$

contains only a cut in the last inference and  $w(\mathbf{P}) = w(\mathbf{P}')$  but  $rank(\mathbf{P}) < rank(\mathbf{P}')$ . (Indeed,  $rank_d(\mathbf{P}') = rank_d(\mathbf{P}) - 1$ ). By the (I.H.), there is a cut-free proof of the sequent  $\Gamma, \Pi'_A \Rightarrow C'$ . Then, using the rule (r) we can construct the desired proof.

(I.1.3) We can assume that  $A \notin \Gamma$  and  $S_2$  is the lower sequent of a logical inference whose principal formula is A. If the A is of the form  $B \wedge D$ ,  $B \vee D$  or  $B \to D$  the proof goes as in the classical case. Suppose that A is of the form  $\neg(B \to D)$ , then **P** looks like

$$\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg (B \to D)} \frac{\overline{\Pi, B, \neg D \Rightarrow C}}{\Pi, \neg (B \to D) \Rightarrow C} L_{\neg \to} \Gamma, \Pi_{\neg (B \to D)} \Rightarrow C$$

Since  $rank_r(\mathbf{P}) > 1$ ,  $\neg(B \rightarrow D) \in \Pi$ . Then, we can construct proof  $\mathbf{P}_1$ .

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg (B \to D)} \qquad \frac{\vdots}{\Pi, B, \neg D \Rightarrow C}}{\Gamma, \Pi_{\neg (B \to D)}, B, \neg D \Rightarrow C} cut, \neg (B \to D)$$

Clearly,  $w(\mathbf{P}_1) = w(\mathbf{P})$  but  $rank(\mathbf{P}_1) = rank(\mathbf{P}) - 1$ . By the (I.H.), there is a cut-free proof  $\mathbf{P}'_1$  of the sequents  $\Gamma, \Pi_{\neg(B \to D)}, B, \neg D \Rightarrow C$ . Then, consider the following proof  $\mathbf{P}_2$ 

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}_{1}'}{\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \neg(B \to D)}} \frac{\overline{\Gamma, \Pi_{\neg(B \to D)}, B, \neg D \Rightarrow C}}{\Gamma, \Pi_{\neg(B \to D)}, \neg(B \to D) \Rightarrow C} L_{\neg \to} C_{\Gamma, \Gamma, \Pi_{\neg(A \to B)} \Rightarrow C}$$

Then,  $w(\mathbf{P}_2) = w(\mathbf{P})$  but  $rank_d(\mathbf{P}'') = 1 < rank_d(\mathbf{P})$ . By the (I.H.), there is a cut-free proof of  $\Gamma, \Pi_{\neg(A \rightarrow B)} \Rightarrow C$ .

(I.2)  $rank_r(\mathbf{P}) = 1$  and the  $rank_l(\mathbf{P}) > 1$ . This case is proved in the same way as (I.1) above.

#### Theorem 17.

 $GLET_J$  admits cut-elimination.

*Proof.* By induction on the number of applications of the cut rule in a given  $LET_{J}$ -proof.

Some consequences of the cut-elimination theorem are the following.

Corollary 18. (Generalized subformula property)

In a cut-free proof  $\mathbf{P}$  in  $GLET_J$  all the formulas which occur in it are generalized subformulas of formulas occurring in the end sequent.

*Proof.* By induction on the number of inferences in the cut-free proof  $\mathbf{P}$ .

Corollary 19.  $LET_J$  is decidable.

# **6** Sequent calculus for $LET_F$

In this section we shall introduce a sequent calculus for  $LET_F$  in the language  $\{\lor, \land, \neg, \circ\}$ .

### Definition 20.

The sequent calculus  $GLET_F$  consists of the following axiom and rules.

Axioms:

$$\overline{A \Rightarrow A} \ Id$$

Structural rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} LW \qquad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow A, \Delta} RW$$
$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow A, \Delta \quad A, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} Cut$$

Logical rules:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{A,B,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta}{A\wedge B,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\wedge & \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,\Delta\quad\Gamma\RightarrowB,\Delta}{\Gamma\RightarrowA\wedge B,\Delta} R\wedge \\ \frac{A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta\quad B,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta}{A\vee B,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\wedge & \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,B,\Delta}{\Gamma\RightarrowA\vee B,\Delta} R\vee \\ \frac{-A,\neg B,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta}{\neg(A\vee B),\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\neg \vee & \frac{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg A,\Delta\quad\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg B,\Delta}{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg(A\vee B),\Delta} R\neg \vee \\ \frac{-A,\Gamma\RightarrowC\quad \neg B,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta}{\neg(A\wedge B),\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\neg \wedge & \frac{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg A,\neg B,\Delta}{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg(A\wedge B),\Delta} R\neg \wedge \\ \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,\Delta\quad\Gamma\Rightarrow-A,\Delta}{\circ A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\circ_1 & \frac{A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta\quad \neg A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta}{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg\neg A,\Delta} L\circ_2 \\ \frac{A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta}{\neg\circ A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\neg \wedge & \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,\Delta}{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg\neg A,\Delta} R\neg \neg \\ \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,\Delta}{\neg\circ A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\neg \wedge & \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,\Delta}{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg\neg A,\Delta} R\neg \neg \\ \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,\Delta}{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg A,\Gamma\Rightarrow\Delta} L\neg \wedge & \frac{\Gamma\RightarrowA,\Delta}{\Gamma\Rightarrow\neg\neg A,\Delta} R\neg \neg \\ \end{array}$$

Note that  $GLET_F$  has left and right rules for the negation connective  $\neg$  interacting with each connective and that the weight of the lower sequent of every rule us less that the weight of the upper(s) sequent. This is a desired property for a syntactic proof of the cut elimination property. So, the cut-elimination property for  $GLET_F$  can be proved in a similar way to what was done for  $LET_J$ .

# Theorem 21.

 $GLET_F$  admits cut-elimination.

*Proof.* Analogous to the case  $GLET_J$ .

Corollary 22. (Generalized subformula property)

In a cut-free proof  $\mathbf{P}$  in  $GLET_F$  all the formulas which occur in it are generalized subformulas of formulas occurring in the end sequent.

### Corollary 23.

 $LET_F$  is decidable.

# 7 Final remarks

The logics  $LET_J$  and  $LET_F$  were originally presented in [7] and [15] in the form of natural deduction systems. The main reason for this was to emphasize that the intended approach was syntactic rather than semantic, since the motivation was to formalize argumentative contexts in which people make inferences with evidence, both conclusive and non-conclusive [7, pp. 3793f.]. In [15, Sect. 2.2.1] this intuitive interpretation was extended to reliable and unreliable information. In addition, the semantics proposed so far for  $LET_J$  and  $LET_F$  are non-compositional, and therefore unable to provide adequate explanations of the meanings of their formulas. The prospect of explaining the meanings of the expressions of  $LET_J$  by means of an inferential semantics was indeed mentioned in [8], which makes obtaining normalization all the more desirable.

Presenting natural deduction systems without the corresponding normalization theorems has indeed the flavor of an unfinished task. In this paper, the first strictly dedicated to the proof theory of LETs, we fill this gap and also pave the way for further investigations, including the proof theory of other logics equipped with recovery operators.

Decision procedures for the logic  $LET_F$  were already provided by its valuation semantics [15] and by analytic tableaux [5], but a decision procedure for  $LET_J$  had not yet been presented. Decidability by means of sequent calculus also fills this gap.

Normalization theorems for the  $\circ$ -free fragments of  $LET_J$  and  $LET_F$ , namely N4 and FDE, have already been presented (see e.g. [13]), as well as cut-elimination theorems (see e.g. [12]). The central point here was how to deal with the rules for the operator  $\circ$ . More precisely, the treatment given by Kamide in [11] for explosion and excluded middle rules inspired us to obtain a suitable normalization theorem. On the other hand, its is worth noting that a direct translation of the natural deduction version to sequent system of both logics produced systems which do not enjoy the cut-elimination property. The corresponding rules for explosion and excluded middle laws in a cut-free sequent system turn out to be left introduction rules of the  $\circ$  connective. Note that this fits with the fact that there is no introduction rule for  $\circ$  in the natural deduction systems, which is motivated by the ideia that the information about realiability of a formula comes always from outside the formal system.

# References

- A. Almukdad and D. Nelson. Constructible falsity and inexact predicates. The Journal of Symbolic Logic, 49(1):231–233, 1984.
- [2] H. Antunes, W. Carnielli, A. Kapsner, and A. Rodrigues. Kripke-style models for logics of evidence and truth. Axioms, 9(3), 2020.
- [3] N.D. Belnap. How a computer should think. In G. Ryle, editor, Contemporary Aspects of Philosophy. Oriel Press, 1977. Reprinted in New Essays on Belnap-Dunn Logic, Springer, 2019, pages 35-55.
- [4] W. Carnielli, M.E. Coniglio, and J. Marcos. Logics of formal inconsistency. In D. Gabbay and F. Guenthner, editors, *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*, volume 14, pages 1–93. Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- [5] W. Carnielli, L. Frade, and A. Rodrigues. Analytic proofs for logics of evidence and truth. South American Journal of Logic, 6(2):325–345, 2020.
- [6] W. Carnielli and J. Marcos. A taxonomy of C-systems. In W. Carnielli, M. E. Coniglio, and I. M. L. D'Ottaviano, editors, *Paraconsistency: The Logical Way to the Inconsistent*. Marcel Dekker, New York, 2002.
- [7] W. Carnielli and A. Rodrigues. An epistemic approach to paraconsistency: a logic of evidence and truth. Synthese, 196:3789–3813, 2017.
- [8] W. Carnielli and A. Rodrigues. Inferential semantics, paraconsistency, and preservation of evidence. In C. Başkent and T. M. Ferguson, editors, *Graham Priest on Dialetheism and Paraconsistency*. Springer, 2019.
- [9] N. da Costa. Sistemas Formais Inconsistentes (Inconsistent Formal Systems, in Portuguese). Habilitation thesis, Universidade do Paraná, Curitiba, 1963. Republished by Editora UFPR, Brazil, 1963.
- [10] J.M. Dunn. Intuitive semantics for first-degree entailments and 'coupled trees'. *Philosophical Studies*, 29:149–168, 1976. Reprinted in [?].
- [11] N. Kamide. Natural deduction with explosion and excluded middle. In J. Nolt, editor, 2023 IEEE 53rd International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic (ISMVL), pages 24–29. 2023. doi:10.1109/ISMVL57333.2023.00016.
- [12] N. Kamide and H. Wansing. Proof Theory of N4-Related Paraconsistent Logics. College Publications, 2015.
- [13] N. Kürbis and Y. Petrukhin. Normalisation for some quite interesting many-valued logics. Logic and Logical Philosophy, 30(3):493–534, 2021.
- [14] A. Rodrigues and H. Antunes. First-order logics of evidence and truth with constant and variable domains. *Logica Universalis*, 16:419–449, 2022.

- [15] A. Rodrigues, J. Bueno-Soler, and W. Carnielli. Measuring evidence: a probabilistic approach to an extension of Belnap-Dunn Logic. *Synthese*, 198:5451–5480, 2020.
- [16] A. Rodrigues and W. Carnielli. On Barrio, Lo Guercio, and Szmuc on logics of evidence and truth. Logic and Logical Philosophy, 31:313–338, 2022.
- [17] G. Takeuti. Proof Theory. North-Holland, 1987.
- [18] A. Troelstra and H. Schwichtenberg. Basic Proof Theory. Cambridge University Press, 1996.