

Twist Sequent Calculi for S4 and its Neighbors

Norihiro Kamide

School of Data Science, Nagoya City University, Aichi, Japan

drnkamide08@kpd.biglobe.ne.jp

Two Gentzen-style twist sequent calculi for the normal modal logic S4 are introduced and investigated. The proposed calculi, which do not employ the standard logical inference rules for the negation connective, are characterized by several twist logical inference rules for negated logical connectives. Using these calculi, short proofs can be generated for provable negated modal formulas that contain numerous negation connectives. The cut-elimination theorems for the calculi are proved, and the subformula properties for the calculi are also obtained. Additionally, Gentzen-style twist (hyper)sequent calculi for other normal modal logics including S5 are considered.

1 Introduction

Reasoning about negative information or knowledge, especially when involving negations and modalities, holds significant importance in the field of philosophical logic [5, 34, 23, 31, 4]. For instance, Fitch’s paradox, a fundamental issue in philosophical logic, has been analyzed through reasoning about negative information within the context of negations and modalities [34]. Effective reasoning in this area requires the development of a robust proof system, such as a Gentzen-style sequent calculus, tailored for standard modal logics like the normal modal logic S4. This Gentzen-style sequent calculus should efficiently manage the interactions between negations and modalities.

The primary objective of this study is to develop an alternative cut-free and analytic Gentzen-style sequent calculus for S4. Specifically, the sequent calculus proposed in this study aims to effectively handle negative information involving negations and modalities. In other words, our focus is on constructing a sequent calculus capable of managing formulas that include both modal operators and multiple negation connectives. The proposed sequent calculi are intended to have the ability to generate relatively short and compact “shortcut (or abbreviated) proofs” for provable negated modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives.

The concept of a “shortcut (or abbreviated) proof” is defined as a proof that incorporates “twist logical inference rules.” These twist rules are considered “shortcut (or abbreviated) rules” specifically in relation to negations. To explain these twist rules, we now examine the following twist logical inference rule for negated modal operators, which is included in one of the proposed calculi, gTS4:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \alpha}{\neg\Box\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\Box\text{left}^T).$$

This rule is derivable in a standard sequent calculus as follows:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \alpha}{\Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \Box\alpha} (\Box\text{right}^k)$$
$$\vdots (\neg\text{left}), (\neg\text{right})$$
$$\neg\Box\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2$$

where $(\neg\text{left})$, $(\neg\text{right})$, and $(\Box\text{right}^k)$ ¹ are defined as follows:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha}{\neg\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\neg\text{left}) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg\alpha} (\neg\text{right}) \quad \frac{\Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta, \alpha}{\Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta, \Box\alpha} (\Box\text{right}^k).$$

In this case, we can observe that the applications of the rules $(\neg\text{left})$, $(\neg\text{right})$, and $(\Box\text{right}^k)$ are encapsulated within the single rule $(\neg\Box\text{left}^T)$. Specifically, $(\neg\Box\text{left}^T)$ serves as a shortcut (or abbreviated) rule for the applications of $(\neg\text{left})$, $(\neg\text{right})$, and $(\Box\text{right}^k)$. In other words, many applications of $(\neg\text{left})$ and $(\neg\text{right})$ in a proof can be abbreviated by a single application of $(\neg\Box\text{left}^T)$. Therefore, if there are many occurrences of \neg in a given provable sequent, we can obtain a significantly shorter shortcut (or abbreviated) proof for the sequent compared to using the standard calculus. In this sense, gTS4 is effective in proving negated modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives.

In this study, we introduce two cut-free and analytic Gentzen-style twist sequent calculi for the modal logic S4, named ITS4 and gTS4. These calculi handle negation differently: locally in ITS4 and globally in gTS4. Both ITS4 and gTS4 avoid using standard logical inference rules for negation. Instead, they incorporate several twist logical inference rules, which serve as shortcut (or abbreviated) rules specifically designed for handling negated logical connectives. These twist rules are constructed by integrating the standard logical inference rules for the logical connectives $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \neg$ and the modal operators \Box, \Diamond with those for \neg .

Due to these twist logical inference rules, ITS4 and gTS4 can generate relatively short and compact shortcut (or abbreviated) proofs for provable negated modal formulas containing multiple negation connectives. This makes ITS4 and gTS4 particularly effective in handling negated modal formulas. Indeed, the proofs produced by ITS4 and gTS4 for the sequents that include negated modal formulas containing numerous negation connective are shorter than those generated by a standard Gentzen-style sequent calculus for S4. Thus, we can understand that ITS4 and gTS4 have the ability to provide effective (shortcut or abbreviated) reasoning in this context.

In this study, we establish the cut-elimination theorems for both ITS4 and gTS4, confirming that they are cut-free. Additionally, we demonstrate the subformula properties for these calculi, ensuring that ITS4 and gTS4 are analytic. Furthermore, we extend similar results to some Gentzen-style twist sequent calculi designed for classical logic and other normal modal logics, including K, KT, and S5. Specifically, a Gentzen-style twist sequent calculus for classical logic, called TCL, is obtained as the common fragment of ITS4 and gTS4 when the modal operators \Box and \Diamond are omitted.

We now examine some closely related traditional and recently proposed Gentzen-style sequent calculi for S4. A cut-free and analytic Gentzen-style sequent calculus for S4 was initially introduced and investigated by Ohnishi and Matsumoto in [24, 25]. Another cut-free and analytic Gentzen-style sequent calculus, referred to here as GS4, was presented by Kripke in [14] (p. 91). Kripke's calculus GS4 was developed by adapting Ohnishi and Matsumoto's calculus to handle the modal operators \Box and \Diamond simultaneously. Grigoriev and Petrukhin introduced and explored some extensions of GS4 in [9], wherein some multilattice extensions of GS4 and its S5 version were studied.

Cut-free (though non-analytic) Gentzen-style sequent calculi NS4, DS4, and SS4 for S4, which are regarded as falsification-aware calculi, have been introduced by Kamide in [12], based on GS4. Furthermore, cut-free (though non-analytic) Gentzen-style sequent calculi GS4₁, GS4₂, and GS4₃ for S4, which are compatible with a Gentzen-style sequent calculus for Avron's self-extensional parafinite logic, have also recently been introduced by Kamide in [13], based on GS4.

¹ $(\Box\text{right}^k)$ was originally introduced by Kripke in [14] (p. 91).

The original calculi introduced by Ohnishi and Matsumoto and by Kripke were cut-free and analytic systems, yet they were not effective in proving negated modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives. While NS4, DS4, and SS4 were suitable for falsification-aware reasoning and GS4₁, GS4₂, and GS4₃ were compatible with paraconsistent reasoning, they were not effective for proving negated modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives. Moreover, NS4, DS4, GS4₁, GS4₂, and GS4₃ lacked analyticity (i.e., these calculi lacked the subformula property).

In contrast to these calculi, the proposed twist calculi, ITS4 and gTS4, are cut-free, analytic, and effective in proving negated modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives. For more general information on sequent calculi for modal logics including S4, see, for example, [35, 6, 27, 21, 10, 18, 19, 17] and the references therein. For information on sequent calculi for S5, see, for example, [9, 12, 27, 17, 18, 19, 10] and the references therein. For a very short survey of recent works on sequent calculi for S5, see Section 6 of the present paper.

The structure of this paper is addressed as follows.

In Section 2, we introduce ITS4 and gTS4 and prove some basic propositions for ITS4 and gTS4.

In Section 3, we define Kripke's calculus GS4, establish the equivalence among GS4, ITS4, and gTS4, and observe a comparison among proofs generated by ITS4, gTS4, and GS4.

In Section 4, we prove some basic theorems for ITS4 and gTS4. First, we show the classical-negation-elimination and classical-converse-negation-elimination theorems for ITS4 and gTS4. Second, we prove the cut-elimination theorems for ITS4 and gTS4, relying on key lemmas concerning the cut-free provabilities of ITS4, gTS4, and GS4. Finally, we obtain the subformula properties for ITS4 and gTS4 as a consequence of the cut-elimination theorems.

In Section 5, we introduce Gentzen-style twist sequent calculi for other normal modal logics, including K, KT, and S5. Furthermore, we introduce a twist hyper-sequent calculus for S5. We also show the cut-elimination theorems and subformula properties for these calculi.

In Section 6, we conclude this study, offer some remarks on the potential applications of the proposed calculi to logic programming, and outline prospective future works.

2 Twist sequent calculi for S4

We construct *formulas* of normal modal logic S4 from countably many propositional variables by \wedge (conjunction), \vee (disjunction), \rightarrow (implication), \neg (negation), \Box (box), and \Diamond (diamond). We use small letters p, q, \dots to denote propositional variables, Greek small letters α, β, \dots to denote formulas, and Greek capital letters Γ, Δ, \dots to represent finite (possibly empty) sets of formulas. For any set A of symbols (i.e., alphabet), we use the notation A^* to represent the set of all words of finite length of the alphabet A . For any $\natural \in \{\neg, \Box, \Diamond\}^*$, we use an expression $\natural\Gamma$ to denote the set $\{\natural\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\}$. We use the symbol \equiv to denote the equality of symbols. A *sequent* is an expression of the form $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$. We use an expression $\alpha \Leftrightarrow \beta$ to represent the abbreviation of the sequents $\alpha \Rightarrow \beta$ and $\beta \Rightarrow \alpha$. We use an expression $L \vdash S$ to represent the fact that a sequent S is provable in a sequent calculus L . We say that two sequent calculi L_1 and L_2 are *theorem-equivalent* if $\{S \mid L_1 \vdash S\} = \{S \mid L_2 \vdash S\}$. We say that a rule R of inference is *admissible* in a sequent calculus L if the following condition is satisfied: For any instance $\frac{S_1 \dots S_n}{S}$ of R , if $L \vdash S_i$ for all i , then $L \vdash S$. Furthermore, we say that R is *derivable* in L if there is a derivation from S_1, \dots, S_n to S in L . We remark the fact that a rule R of inference is admissible in a sequent calculus L if and only if two sequent calculi L and $L + R$ are theorem-equivalent. Since the logics discussed in this study are formulated as Gentzen-style sequent calculi, we will sometimes identify the logic with a Gentzen-style sequent calculus determined by it.

We introduce a Gentzen-style local twist sequent calculus ITS4 for S4.

Definition 2.1 (ITS4) *The initial sequents of ITS4 are of the form: For any propositional variable p ,*

$$p \Rightarrow p \quad \neg p \Rightarrow \neg p \quad \neg p, p \Rightarrow \quad \Rightarrow \neg p, p.$$

The structural inference rules of ITS4 are of the form:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \alpha \quad \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (cut)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (we-left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha} \text{ (we-right)}.$$

The non-twist logical inference rules of ITS4 are of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\alpha, \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\alpha \wedge \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\wedge left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \wedge \beta} \text{ (\wedge right)} \\ \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\alpha \vee \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\vee left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha, \beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \vee \beta} \text{ (\vee right)} \\ \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\alpha \rightarrow \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\rightarrow left)} \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \rightarrow \beta} \text{ (\rightarrow right)} \\ \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Box \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\Box left)} \quad \frac{\Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2, \alpha}{\Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2, \Box \alpha} \text{ (\Box right)} \\ \frac{\alpha, \Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2}{\Diamond \alpha, \Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2} \text{ (\Diamond left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \Diamond \alpha} \text{ (\Diamond right)}. \end{array}$$

The (local) twist logical inference rules (or twist rules for short) of ITS4 are of the form:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg \neg left')} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg \alpha} \text{ (\neg \neg right')} \\ \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta}{\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg \wedge left')} \quad \frac{\alpha, \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha \wedge \beta)} \text{ (\neg \wedge right')} \\ \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha, \beta}{\neg(\alpha \vee \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg \vee left')} \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha \vee \beta)} \text{ (\neg \vee right')} \\ \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta}{\neg(\alpha \rightarrow \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg \rightarrow left')} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} \text{ (\neg \rightarrow right')} \\ \frac{\Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2, \alpha}{\neg \Box \alpha, \Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2} \text{ (\neg \Box left')} \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg \Box \alpha} \text{ (\neg \Box right')} \\ \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha}{\neg \Diamond \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg \Diamond left')} \quad \frac{\alpha, \Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2}{\Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2, \neg \Diamond \alpha} \text{ (\neg \Diamond right')}. \end{array}$$

Remark 2.2

1. ITS4 has no standard logical inference rules for \neg used in Gentzen's sequent calculus LK [8]:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha}{\neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg left)} \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg \alpha} \text{ (\neg right)}.$$

Instead, we use the twist logical inference rules in ITS4. (\rightarrow left) and (\rightarrow right) are internalized in the twist logical inference rules.

2. The twist logical inference rules of ITS4 are constructed by integrating the (non-twist or standard) logical inference rules for $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \neg, \Box$, and \Diamond with the standard logical inference rules for \neg .
3. $(\neg\neg\text{left}^t)$ and $(\neg\neg\text{right}^t)$ are also constructed by integrating $(\neg\text{left})$ with $(\neg\text{right})$. Thus, $(\neg\neg\text{left}^t)$ and $(\neg\neg\text{right}^t)$ are also said to be twist logical inference rules.
4. Let ITS4* be the system that is obtained from ITS4 by replacing $(\neg\Box\text{left}^t)$ and $(\neg\Diamond\text{right}^t)$ with the simple twist rules of the form:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta, \alpha}{\neg\Box\alpha, \Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta} (\neg\Box\text{left}^{t*}) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta}{\Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta, \neg\Diamond\alpha} (\neg\Diamond\text{right}^{t*}).$$

Then, the sequents of the form $\neg\Box p \Rightarrow \neg\Box p$ and $\neg\Diamond p \Rightarrow \neg\Diamond p$ for any propositional variable p cannot be proved in cut-free ITS4*. Thus, we adopt $(\neg\Box\text{left}^t)$ and $(\neg\Diamond\text{right}^t)$ in ITS4.

5. $(\Box\text{right})$ and $(\Diamond\text{left})$ in ITS4 are considered to be compatible with $(\neg\Diamond\text{right}^t)$ and $(\neg\Box\text{left}^t)$, respectively, in ITS4. Actually, $(\neg\Diamond\text{right}^t)$ and $(\neg\Box\text{left}^t)$ are constructed by integrating $(\Box\text{right})$ and $(\Diamond\text{left})$ with $(\neg\text{left})$ and $(\neg\text{right})$. $(\Box\text{right})$ and $(\Diamond\text{left})$ are required for proving some basic properties. Thus, $(\Box\text{right})$ and $(\Diamond\text{left})$ also cannot be replaced with the following simple rules:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta, \alpha}{\Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta, \Box\alpha} (\Box\text{right}^k) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta}{\Diamond\alpha, \Box\Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta} (\Diamond\text{left}^k),$$

which were used in Kripke's Gentzen-style sequent calculus (for S4) originally introduced in [14] (p. 91).

6. Let TCL be the system that is obtained from ITS4 by deleting the logical inference rules concerning \Box and \Diamond (i.e., TCL is the $\{\Box, \Diamond\}$ -less fragment of ITS4). Then, TCL is theorem-equivalent to Gentzen's sequent calculus LK [8] for propositional classical logic, and hence TCL is a Gentzen-style twist sequent calculus for propositional classical logic.

Next, we introduce a Gentzen-style global twist sequent calculus gTS4 for S4.

Definition 2.3 (gTS4) gTS4 is obtained from ITS4 by replacing $(\Box\text{right})$, $(\Diamond\text{left})$, $(\neg\Box\text{left}^t)$, and $(\neg\Diamond\text{left}^t)$ with the (global) twist logical inference rules of the form:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \alpha}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \Box\alpha} (\Box\text{right}^T) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2}{\Diamond\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\Diamond\text{left}^T)$$

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \alpha}{\neg\Box\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\Box\text{left}^T) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha} (\neg\Diamond\text{right}^T).$$

Remark 2.4 We now address a comparison between ITS4 and gTS4. In a sense, ITS4 is a local calculus for handling \neg and gTS4 is a global calculus for handling \neg . On the one hand, the twist logical inference rules for $\neg\Box$ and $\neg\Diamond$ in ITS4 are applied only for the principal formulas $\neg\Box\alpha$ and $\neg\Diamond\alpha$ of the twist rules. Namely, the occurrences of \neg in the non-principal contexts of the lower sequents of the twist rules are retained in the upper sequents (i.e., \neg is handled locally). On the other hand, the upper sequents of the twist rules for $\neg\Box$ and $\neg\Diamond$ in gTS4 have no \neg . Namely, all the occurrences of \neg in the contexts of the lower sequents of the twist rules are deleted in the upper sequents (i.e., \neg is handled globally). Thus, we call ITS4 and gTS4 local and global twist calculi, respectively.

Proposition 2.5 Let L be ITS4 or gTS4. The following sequents are provable in cut-free L : For any formula α ,

1. $\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$,
2. $\alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow$,
3. $\Rightarrow \alpha, \neg\alpha$.

Proof. We only prove the proposition for ITS4, because the proposition for gTS4 can be proved similarly. We now prove the statements 1 and 2 for ITS4. The statement 3 for ITS4 can be proved in a similar way as that for 2. Thus, the proof of the statement 3 for ITS4 is omitted.

1. We prove the statement 1 by induction on α . We distinguish the cases according to the form of α and show only the case $\alpha \equiv \neg\beta$. In this case, we distinguish the cases according to the form of β and show some cases.

- (a) Case $\beta \equiv \beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2$: We obtain the required proof:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Ind. hyp.}}{\beta_1 \Rightarrow \beta_1} \text{ (we-right)}}{\beta_1 \Rightarrow \beta_2, \beta_1} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Ind. hyp.}}{\beta_2 \Rightarrow \beta_2} \text{ (we-left)}}{\beta_2, \beta_1 \Rightarrow \beta_2} \text{ (}\neg\rightarrow\text{right}'\text{)}}{\beta_1 \Rightarrow \neg(\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2), \beta_2} \text{ (}\neg\rightarrow\text{left}'\text{)}}{\neg(\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2) \Rightarrow \neg(\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2)}$$

- (b) Case $\beta \equiv \Box\beta_1$: We can obtain the required proof:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Ind. hyp.}}{\beta_1 \Rightarrow \beta_1} \text{ (}\neg\Box\text{right}'\text{)}}{\Rightarrow \neg\Box\beta_1, \beta_1} \text{ (}\neg\Box\text{left}'\text{)}}{\neg\Box\beta_1 \Rightarrow \neg\Box\beta_1}$$

We remark that we cannot prove this case using the simple rule ($\neg\Box\text{left}^{t*}$) considered in Remark 2.2.

2. We prove the statement 2 by induction on α . We distinguish the cases according to the form of α and show only the following cases. We have to prove some cases by using the statement 1.

- (a) Case $\alpha \equiv \beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2$: We obtain the required proof:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Prop. 2.5(1)}}{\beta_1 \Rightarrow \beta_1} \text{ (we-right)}}{\beta_1 \Rightarrow \beta_1, \beta_2} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Prop. 2.5(1)}}{\beta_2 \Rightarrow \beta_2} \text{ (we-left)}}{\beta_1, \beta_2 \Rightarrow \beta_2} \text{ (}\rightarrow\text{left)}}{\beta_1, \beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2 \Rightarrow \beta_2} \text{ (}\neg\rightarrow\text{left}'\text{)}}{\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2, \neg(\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2) \Rightarrow}$$

- (b) Case $\alpha \equiv \Box\beta$: We obtain the required proof:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots \text{Prop. 2.5(1)}}{\beta \Rightarrow \beta} \text{ (}\Box\text{left)}}{\Box\beta \Rightarrow \beta} \text{ (}\neg\Box\text{left}'\text{)}}{\Box\beta, \neg\Box\beta \Rightarrow}$$

■

3 Equivalence and comparison among calculi

In this section, we define Kripke's Gentzen-style sequent calculus GS4 for S4 and show the theorem-equivalence among GS4, ITS4, and gTS4.

Definition 3.1 (GS4) GS4 is obtained from ITS4 by replacing $(\Box\text{right})$, $(\Diamond\text{left})$, all the twist logical inference rules, and the negated initial sequents of the form $(\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p)$, $(\neg p, p \Rightarrow)$, and $(\Rightarrow \neg p, p)$ with the logical inference rules of the form:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha}{\neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\neg\text{left}) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg \alpha} (\neg\text{right}) \quad \frac{\Box \Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta, \alpha}{\Box \Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta, \Box \alpha} (\Box\text{right}^k) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Box \Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta}{\Diamond \alpha, \Box \Gamma \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta} (\Diamond\text{left}^k).$$

Remark 3.2

1. Strictly speaking, GS4 is regarded as a non-essential and small modification of Kripke's original Gentzen-style sequent calculus (for S4) introduced in [14] (p. 91) to deal with \Box and \Diamond simultaneously. The original system by Kripke has the formula-based initial sequents of the form $\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$ for any formula α instead of the propositional-variable-based initial sequents. This original system was introduced by modifying Ohnishi and Matsumoto's Gentzen-style sequent calculus (for S4) introduced in [24, 25]. Some extensions and modifications of the system of this type have been recently introduced and studied by Grigoriev and Petrukhin in [9] and by Kamide in [12].
2. The difference between Kripke's system (and its small modification GS4) and Ohnishi and Matsumoto's system is the form of $(\Box\text{right}^k)$ and $(\Diamond\text{left}^k)$. Ohnishi and Matsumoto's system has no $\Diamond \Delta$ in $(\Box\text{right}^k)$ and $\Box \Gamma$ in $(\Diamond\text{left}^k)$. Using the rules of GS4, we can show that the sequents of the form $\Box \alpha \Leftrightarrow \neg \Diamond \neg \alpha$ and $\Diamond \alpha \Leftrightarrow \neg \Box \neg \alpha$ for any formula α are provable in cut-free GS4. These sequents cannot be proved in Ohnishi and Matsumoto's system. For more information on these characteristic rules, see [14, 9, 12].
3. The sequents of the form $\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$ for any formula α are provable in cut-free GS4. This fact can be shown by induction on α . Thus, we can take the sequents of the form $\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$ for any formula α as initial sequents of GS4.
4. The following rules are derivable in GS4 using (cut):

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg \alpha}{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\neg\text{left}^{-1}) \quad \frac{\neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha} (\neg\text{right}^{-1}).$$

5. The cut-elimination and Kripke-completeness theorems hold for Kripke's original system. Thus, the same theorems also hold for GS4. For more information on these theorems, see [14, 9].

Theorem 3.3 (Equivalence among ITS4, gTS4, and GS4) Let L be ITS4 or gTS4. The systems L and GS4 are theorem-equivalent.

Proof. We only prove the theorem for ITS4, because the proof of the theorem for gTS4 can be obtained similarly. Obviously, the negated initial sequents of ITS4 are provable in cut-free GS4, and the negated logical inference rules of ITS4 are derivable in GS4. For example, the derivability of $(\neg\Box\text{left}^t)$ in GS4 is shown as follows.

$$\begin{array}{c} \Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2, \alpha \\ \vdots (\neg\text{left}^{-1}), (\neg\text{right}^{-1}) \\ \frac{\Box \Gamma_1, \Box \Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \Diamond \Gamma_2, \alpha}{\Box \Gamma_1, \Box \Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \Diamond \Gamma_2, \Box \alpha} (\Box\text{right}) \\ \vdots (\neg\text{left}), (\neg\text{right}) \\ \neg \Box \alpha, \Box \Gamma_1, \neg \Diamond \Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond \Delta_1, \neg \Box \Delta_2 \end{array}$$

where $(\neg\text{left}^{-1})$ and $(\neg\text{right}^{-1})$ are derivable in GS4 using (cut). Conversely, $(\neg\text{left})$ and $(\neg\text{right})$ in GS4 are derivable in ITS4 using (cut) by:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \alpha, \neg\alpha \Rightarrow}{\neg\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (cut)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \quad \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg\alpha} \text{ (cut)}.$$

Therefore, ITS4 and GS4 are theorem-equivalent. ■

Remark 3.4 *The proofs generated by ITS4 and gTS4 are shorter than those of GS4. Furthermore, both the proofs generated by ITS4 and gTS4 are composed of subformulas of the formulas included in the last sequent. If \neg appears many times in a given provable sequent, then the generated proofs by ITS4 or gTS4 are quite shorter than those generated by GS4. Thus, ITS4 and gTS4 are regarded as effective systems for proving negated modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives. We will illustrate a comparison among proofs generated by ITS4, gTS4, and GS4.*

Example 3.5 *We consider the provable sequent $\neg\neg\neg\neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow \neg\diamond\neg\neg\neg\neg p$ with a propositional variable p . The proofs of this sequent in ITS4, gTS4, and GS4 are addressed as follows. First, we show the short proof generated by ITS4 using the twist rules $(\neg\neg\text{left}')$, $(\neg\diamond\text{left}')$, and $(\neg\diamond\text{left}')$ and the negated initial sequent $\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p$.*

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p}{\neg p, \neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow} (\neg\diamond\text{left}')} {\neg\neg\neg p, \neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow} (\neg\neg\text{left}')} {\diamond\neg\neg\neg p, \neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow} (\diamond\text{left})} {\neg\neg\diamond\neg\neg\neg p, \neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow} (\neg\neg\text{left}')} {\neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow \neg\diamond\neg\neg\neg\neg p} (\neg\diamond\text{right}')} {\neg\neg\neg\neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow \neg\diamond\neg\neg\neg\neg p} (\neg\neg\text{left}').$$

Next, we show the short proof generated by gTS4 using the twist rules $(\neg\neg\text{left}')$, $(\neg\diamond\text{right}^T)$, and $(\diamond\text{left}^T)$ and the negated initial sequent $\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p}{\neg p \Rightarrow \diamond\neg p} (\diamond\text{right})} {\neg\neg\neg p \Rightarrow \diamond\neg p} (\neg\neg\text{left}')} {\diamond\neg\neg\neg p \Rightarrow \diamond\neg p} (\diamond\text{left}^T)} {\neg\neg\diamond\neg\neg\neg p \Rightarrow \diamond\neg p} (\neg\neg\text{left}')} {\neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow \neg\diamond\neg\neg\neg\neg p} (\neg\diamond\text{right}^T)} {\neg\neg\neg\neg\diamond\neg p \Rightarrow \neg\diamond\neg\neg\neg\neg p} (\neg\neg\text{left}').$$

Finally, we show the usual (long) proof generated by GS4 using the standard logical inference rules

(\neg -left) and (\neg -right).

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{p \Rightarrow p}{\Rightarrow \neg p, p} \text{ (\neg -right)} \\
\frac{\Rightarrow \neg p, p}{\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p} \text{ (\neg -left)} \\
\frac{\neg p \Rightarrow \neg p}{\Rightarrow \neg p, \neg \neg p} \text{ (\neg -right)} \\
\frac{\Rightarrow \neg p, \neg \neg p}{\neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \neg p} \text{ (\neg -left)} \\
\frac{\neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \neg p}{\neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p} \text{ (\diamond -right)} \\
\frac{\neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p}{\diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p} \text{ (\diamond -left^k)} \\
\frac{\diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p}{\Rightarrow \diamond \neg p, \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p} \text{ (\neg -right)} \\
\frac{\Rightarrow \diamond \neg p, \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p}{\neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p} \text{ (\neg -left)} \\
\frac{\neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p}{\diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p} \text{ (\diamond -left^k)} \\
\frac{\diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \diamond \neg p}{\neg \diamond \neg p, \diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow} \text{ (\neg -left)} \\
\frac{\neg \diamond \neg p, \diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow}{\diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \neg \neg \diamond \neg p} \text{ (\neg -right)} \\
\frac{\diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow \neg \neg \diamond \neg p}{\neg \neg \neg \diamond \neg p, \diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow} \text{ (\neg -left)} \\
\frac{\neg \neg \neg \diamond \neg p, \diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p \Rightarrow}{\neg \neg \neg \diamond \neg p \Rightarrow \neg \diamond \neg \neg \diamond \neg \neg \neg p} \text{ (\neg -right)}.
\end{array}$$

4 Cut-elimination and subformula property

In this section, we prove some basic theorems for ITS4 and gTS4.

Theorem 4.1 (Classical-negation-elimination for ITS4 and gTS4) *Let L be ITS4 or gTS4. The rules (\neg -left) and (\neg -right) are admissible in cut-free L .*

Proof. We show only the admissibility of (\neg -left), because the admissibility of (\neg -right) can be shown similarly. We consider the proof of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ P \\ \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \end{array}}{\neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ (\neg -left)}.$$

Then, we prove the theorem by induction on P . We distinguish the cases according to the last inference of P and show some cases.

1. Case (\rightarrow -right): The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \alpha_1, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_2 \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2} \text{ (\rightarrow -right)}$$

where $\alpha \equiv \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \alpha_1, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_2 \end{array}}{\neg(\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} \text{ ($\neg \rightarrow$ -left^t)}.$$

2. Case ($\neg \rightarrow$ -right^t): The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \alpha_2, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \end{array}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2)} \text{ ($\neg \rightarrow$ -right^t)}$$

where $\alpha \equiv \neg(\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2)$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_1 \quad \alpha_2, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\rightarrow\text{left})}{\neg\neg(\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\neg\neg\text{left}^t).$$

3. Case (\Box right) for ITS4: The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \alpha_1}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \Box\alpha_1} (\Box\text{right})$$

where $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha$ is $\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \Box\alpha_1$ and $\alpha \equiv \Box\alpha_1$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \alpha_1}{\neg\Box\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\Box\text{left}^t).$$

4. Case ($\neg\Diamond$ right^t) for ITS4: The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha_1} (\neg\Diamond\text{right}^t)$$

where $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha$ is $\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha_1$ and $\alpha \equiv \neg\Diamond\alpha_1$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\frac{\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2}{\Diamond\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\Diamond\text{left})}{\neg\neg\Diamond\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\neg\text{left}^t).$$

5. Case (\Box right^T) for gTS4: The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \alpha_1}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \Box\alpha_1} (\Box\text{right}^T)$$

where $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha$ is $\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \Box\alpha_1$ and $\alpha \equiv \Box\alpha_1$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \alpha_1}{\neg\Box\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\Box\text{left}^T).$$

6. Case ($\neg\Diamond$ right^T) for gTS4: The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha_1} (\neg\Diamond\text{right}^T)$$

where $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha$ is $\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha_1$ and $\alpha \equiv \neg\Diamond\alpha_1$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2} (\Diamond\text{left}^T)}{\Diamond\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\neg\text{left}^t)}{\neg\neg\Diamond\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\neg\text{left}^t).$$

■

Next, we show the following theorem using Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.2 (Classical-converse-negation-elimination for ITS4 and gTS4) *Let L be ITS4 or gTS4. The following rules are admissible in cut-free L :*

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg\alpha}{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\neg\text{left}^{-1}) \quad \frac{\neg\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha} (\neg\text{right}^{-1}).$$

Proof. We only prove the theorem for ITS4. We show only the admissibility of $(\neg\text{left}^{-1})$. The admissibility of $(\neg\text{right}^{-1})$ can be shown similarly. We consider the proof of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots P}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg\alpha}}{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\neg\text{left}^{-1}).$$

Then, we prove the theorem by induction on P . We distinguish the cases according to the last inference of P and show some cases.

1. Case $(\neg\neg\text{right}^t)$: The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_1}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg\neg\alpha_1} (\neg\neg\text{right}^t)$$

where $\alpha \equiv \neg\alpha_1$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_1}}{\neg\alpha_1, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\neg\text{left})$$

where $(\neg\text{left})$ is admissible in cut-free ITS4 by Theorem 4.1.

2. Case $(\neg\rightarrow\text{right}^t)$: The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_1} \quad \frac{\vdots}{\alpha_2, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2)} (\neg\rightarrow\text{right}^t)$$

where $\alpha \equiv \alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\frac{\vdots}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha_1} \quad \frac{\vdots}{\alpha_2, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}}{\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} (\rightarrow\text{left}).$$

3. Case ($\neg\Diamond$ right^t): The last inference of P is of the form:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2 \end{array}}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha_1} (\neg\Diamond\text{right}^t)$$

where $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha$ is $\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha_1$ and $\alpha \equiv \Diamond\alpha_1$. We then obtain the required fact:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2 \end{array}}{\Diamond\alpha_1, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\Diamond\text{left}).$$

In this case, we note that (\Diamond left) in ITS4 cannot be replaced with (\Diamond left^k) in GS4. ■

Next, we show the following lemma using Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.3 *Let L be ITS4 or gTS4. For any sequent S , if S is provable in cut-free GS4, then S is provable in cut-free L .*

Proof. We only prove the theorem for ITS4. Suppose that a sequent $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ is provable in cut-free GS4. Then, we show this lemma by induction on the cut-free proofs P of $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$. We distinguish the cases according to the last inference of P and show only the cases for (\neg left) and (\neg right). The proofs of these cases can be obtained using (\neg left) and (\neg right), which are admissible in cut-free ITS4 by Theorem 4.1. ■

We show the following cut-elimination theorem using Lemma 4.3.

Theorem 4.4 (Cut-elimination for ITS4 and gTS4) *Let L be ITS4 or gTS4. The rule (cut) is admissible in cut-free L .*

Proof. We only prove the theorem for ITS4. Suppose that a sequent S is provable in ITS4. Then, S is provable in GS4 by Theorem 3.3. Thus, S is provable in cut-free GS4 by the cut-elimination theorem for GS4. Thus, S is provable in cut-free ITS4 by Lemma 4.3. ■

Theorem 4.5 (Subformula property for ITS4 and gTS4) *Let L be ITS4 or gTS4. The system L has the subformula property. Namely, if a sequent S is provable in L , then there is a proof P of S such that all formulas appear in P are subformulas of some formula in S .*

Proof. By a consequence of Theorem 4.4. ■

Remark 4.6 *ITS4 and gTS4 are conservative extensions of the Gentzen-style twist sequent calculus TCL for propositional classical logic, which was considered in Remark 2.2. This fact is obtained by Theorem 4.4. The cut-elimination theorem and subformula property also hold for TCL.*

5 Twist sequent calculi for K, KT, and S5

First, we introduce Gentzen-style global twist sequent calculi gTK, gTKT, and gTS5 for K, KT, and S5, respectively.

Definition 5.1 (gTK, gTKT, and gTS5)

1. gTK is obtained from gTS4 by replacing $(\Box\text{left})$, $(\Box\text{right}^T)$, $(\Diamond\text{left}^T)$, $(\Diamond\text{right})$, $(\neg\Box\text{left}^T)$, $(\neg\Box\text{right}^T)$, $(\neg\Diamond\text{left}^T)$, and $(\neg\Diamond\text{right}^T)$ with the following global twist logical inference rules:

$$\frac{\Gamma_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Delta_1, \Gamma_2, \alpha}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \Box\alpha} (\Box\text{K-right}^T)$$

$$\frac{\alpha, \Gamma_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Delta_1, \Gamma_2}{\Diamond\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\Diamond\text{K-left}^T)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Delta_1, \Gamma_2, \alpha}{\neg\Box\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\Box\text{K-left}^T)$$

$$\frac{\alpha, \Gamma_1, \Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Delta_1, \Gamma_2}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha} (\neg\Diamond\text{K-right}^T).$$

2. gTKT is obtained from gTK by adding $(\Box\text{left})$, $(\Diamond\text{right})$, and the logical inference rules $(\neg\Box\text{right}^T)$ and $(\neg\Diamond\text{left}^T)$.
3. gTS5 is obtained from gTS4 by replacing $(\Box\text{right}^T)$, $(\Diamond\text{left}^T)$, $(\neg\Box\text{left}^T)$, $(\neg\Diamond\text{right}^T)$ with the following global twist logical inference rules:

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Diamond\Delta_2, \Box\Lambda_2 \Rightarrow \Box\Delta_1, \Diamond\Lambda_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \alpha}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Box\Delta_1, \neg\Diamond\Delta_2, \Diamond\Lambda_1, \neg\Box\Lambda_2, \Box\alpha} (\Box\text{S5-right}^T)$$

$$\frac{\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \Diamond\Sigma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \Box\Sigma_2}{\Diamond\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2, \Diamond\Sigma_1, \neg\Box\Sigma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\Diamond\text{S5-left}^T)$$

$$\frac{\Box\Gamma_1, \Diamond\Sigma_1, \Box\Delta_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2, \Box\Sigma_2, \alpha}{\neg\Box\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2, \Diamond\Sigma_1, \neg\Box\Sigma_2 \Rightarrow \Diamond\Delta_1, \neg\Box\Delta_2} (\neg\Box\text{S5-left}^T)$$

$$\frac{\alpha, \Box\Gamma_1, \Diamond\Delta_2, \Box\Lambda_2 \Rightarrow \Box\Delta_1, \Diamond\Lambda_1, \Diamond\Gamma_2}{\Box\Gamma_1, \neg\Diamond\Gamma_2 \Rightarrow \Box\Delta_1, \neg\Diamond\Delta_2, \Diamond\Lambda_1, \neg\Box\Lambda_2, \neg\Diamond\alpha} (\neg\Diamond\text{S5-right}^T).$$

Remark 5.2 We can also consider the local-type twist sequent calculi ITKT and ITS5. However, we cannot consider the local-type twist sequent calculus ITK. The Kripke-style non-twist sequent calculi for K, KT, and S5 were introduced and studied in [12]. On the one hand, the cut-elimination theorems for the Gentzen-style twist sequent calculi ITS5 and gTS5 do not hold. A counter example sequent for this fact is $p \Rightarrow \Box\neg\Box\neg p$ where p is a propositional variable. This counterexample sequent was given by Takano in [33] for the cut-elimination theorem for a standard Gentzen-style sequent calculus for S5, introduced by Ohnishi and Matsumoto. On the other hand, we can show the cut-elimination theorem for a twist hypersequent calculus, HTS5, for S5. The cut-elimination theorem for HTS5 will be shown. In HTS5, there is no distinction between local and global. For more information on hypersequent calculi for S5, see e.g., [28, 1, 30, 26, 15, 16, 3, 9, 12] and the references therein.

Next, we introduce a twist hypersequent calculus HTS5 for S5. We call an expression of the form $\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_1 \mid \cdots \mid \Gamma_n \Rightarrow \Delta_n$ hypersequent. We define the hypersequent $\Gamma_1 \Rightarrow \Delta_1 \mid \cdots \mid \Gamma_n \Rightarrow \Delta_n$ as a finite multiset of sequents $\Gamma_k \Rightarrow \Delta_k$ ($1 \leq k \leq n$). We use capital letters H, G, \dots to represent hypersequents.

Definition 5.3 (HTS5) *The initial hypersequents of HTS5 are of the form: For any propositional variable p ,*

$$p \Rightarrow p \quad \neg p \Rightarrow \neg p \quad p, \neg p \Rightarrow \quad \Rightarrow p, \neg p.$$

The structural inference rules of HTS5 are of the form:

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H \quad \alpha, \Sigma \Rightarrow \Pi \mid G}{\Gamma, \Sigma \Rightarrow \Delta, \Pi \mid H \mid G} \text{ (cut)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid \Sigma \Rightarrow \Pi \mid H}{\Gamma, \Sigma \Rightarrow \Delta, \Pi \mid H} \text{ (merge)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} \text{ (in-we-left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H} \text{ (in-we-right)}$$

$$\frac{H}{\alpha \Rightarrow \mid H} \text{ (ex-we-left)} \quad \frac{H}{\Rightarrow \alpha \mid H} \text{ (ex-we-right)}.$$

The non-twist logical inference rules of HTS5 are of the form:

$$\frac{\alpha, \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\alpha \wedge \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} \text{ (\wedge left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta \mid G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \wedge \beta \mid H \mid G} \text{ (\wedge right)}$$

$$\frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid G}{\alpha \vee \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H \mid G} \text{ (\vee left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha, \beta \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \vee \beta \mid H} \text{ (\vee right)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid G}{\alpha \rightarrow \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H \mid G} \text{ (\rightarrow left)} \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \rightarrow \beta \mid H} \text{ (\rightarrow right)}$$

$$\frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\Box \alpha \Rightarrow \mid \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} \text{ (\Box left)} \quad \frac{\Rightarrow \alpha \mid H}{\Rightarrow \Box \alpha \mid H} \text{ (\Box right)}$$

$$\frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \mid H}{\Diamond \alpha \Rightarrow \mid H} \text{ (\Diamond left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid \Rightarrow \Diamond \alpha \mid H} \text{ (\Diamond right)}.$$

The twist logical inference rules of HTS5 are of the form:

$$\frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\neg \neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} \text{ (\neg\neg left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg \neg \alpha \mid H} \text{ (\neg\neg right)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H \quad \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta \mid G}{\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H \mid G} \text{ (\neg\wedge left)} \quad \frac{\alpha, \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \mid H} \text{ (\neg\wedge right)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha, \beta \mid H}{\neg(\alpha \vee \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} \text{ (\neg\vee left)} \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha \vee \beta) \mid H \mid G} \text{ (\neg\vee right)}$$

$$\frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \beta \mid H}{\neg(\alpha \rightarrow \beta), \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} \text{ (\neg\rightarrow left)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H \quad \beta, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid G}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \mid H \mid G} \text{ (\neg\rightarrow right)}$$

$$\frac{\Rightarrow \alpha \mid H}{\neg \Box \alpha \Rightarrow \mid H} \text{ (\neg\Box S5-left}^h) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid \Rightarrow \neg \Box \alpha \mid H} \text{ (\neg\Box S5-right}^h)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H}{\neg \Diamond \alpha \Rightarrow \mid \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} \text{ (\neg\Diamond S5-left}^h) \quad \frac{\alpha \Rightarrow \mid H}{\Rightarrow \neg \Diamond \alpha \mid H} \text{ (\neg\Diamond S5-right}^h).$$

Theorem 5.4 (Cut-elimination for gTK, gTKT, and HTS5) *Let L be gTK, gTKT, or HTS5. The rule (cut) is admissible in cut-free L .*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 4.4. For the case of HTS5, we use a cut-free (non-twist) hypersequent calculus for S5, that includes the following standard logical inference rules for \neg :

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \alpha \mid H}{\neg \alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H} (\neg\text{-left}) \quad \frac{\alpha, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta \mid H}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \neg \alpha \mid H} (\neg\text{-right}).$$

For more information on this standard hypersequent calculus, see [30, 9, 12]. ■

Theorem 5.5 (Subformula property for gTK, gTKT, and HTS5) *Let L be gTK, gTKT, or HTS5. The system L has the subformula property.*

Proof. By a consequence of Theorem 5.4. ■

6 Concluding remarks

In this study, we introduced and investigated the cut-free and analytic Gentzen-style local and global twist sequent calculi, ITS4 and gTS4, for the normal modal logic S4. In these calculi, negations are handled locally in ITS4 and globally in gTS4. Unlike standard calculi, ITS4 and gTS4 do not include standard logical inference rules for negation. Instead, they employ several twist logical inference rules, which serve as “shortcut (or abbreviated)” rules specifically for negated logical connectives. As a result, ITS4 and gTS4 can generate relatively short “shortcut (or abbreviated)” proofs for provable modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives.

We proved the cut-elimination theorems for ITS4 and gTS4 and obtained the subformula properties for them. Additionally, we observed that if a given provable modal formula contains numerous negation connectives, the lengths of the proofs generated by ITS4 and gTS4 are shorter than those generated by the standard Gentzen-style sequent calculus GS4. Thus, we have identified a method for generating short proofs for modal formulas containing numerous negation connectives. We also obtained similar results for the Gentzen-style twist sequent calculi, gTK and gTKT, for the normal modal logics K and KT, respectively. Additionally, we obtained a similar result for the twist hypersequent calculus, HTS5, for the normal modal logic S5.

On the one hand, as mentioned in Section 5, we could construct the cut-free twist hypersequent calculus HTS5 for S5, in a similar way to those in [9, 12]. On the other hand, we have not yet considered other types of twist sequent calculi for S5 based on *tree-hypersequent calculi* studied by Poggiolesi and Lellmann [27, 17], *2-sequent calculi* studied by Martini, Masini, and Zorzi [18, 19], or *bisequent calculi* studied by Indrzejczak [10]. Additionally, in this study, we have not yet considered twist-style calculi in the usual sequent, hypersequent, tree-hypersequent, 2-sequent, or bisequent formats for non-normal modal logics. These issues are left as future work.

As mentioned in Section 1, reasoning about negative information or knowledge involving both negations and modalities holds significant importance in the field of philosophical logic. This type of reasoning is also crucial in computer science, particularly in logic programming and knowledge representation. Modal logic programming and knowledge representation involving modalities and negations have been extensively studied [29, 2, 22, 32, 7]. In these areas, an effective proof system that can efficiently handle both modalities and negations simultaneously is required.

We believe that the proposed Gentzen-style twisted sequent calculi are useful for implementing a sequent calculus-based goal-directed logic programming language, known as a uniform proof-based abstract logic programming language, which was originally developed by Miller, Nadathur, Pfenning, and Scedrov [20]. In relation to this, abstract paraconsistent logic programming with uniform proof was

studied by Kamide in [11], where a uniform proof-theoretic foundation for that programming language, along with its applications, was proposed. Therefore, a promising future direction is to develop a uniform proof-theoretic abstract modal logic programming framework based on the proposed twisted sequent calculi, focusing on negations and modalities.

We also believe that shortcut (or abbreviated) reasoning, based on the proposed twist calculi, plays a crucial role in logic programming involving modalities and negations. This is because true negative information (or knowledge) in logic programming, represented by provable negated modal formulas containing modal operators and multiple negation connectives, often arises in real-world situations [2, 22, 32, 7]. In such cases, the proofs, which are often lengthy, are regarded as evidence. This evidence should be concise and ideally represented by short and compact shortcut (or abbreviated) proofs. In this context, short proofs are valuable and necessary for explaining evidence concisely.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank the anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions. This research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K10990.

References

- [1] Arnon Avron (1996): *The method of hypersequents in the proof theory of propositional non-classical logic*. In: *Logic: from Foundations to Applications*, pp. 1-32, doi:10.1093/oso/9780198538622.003.0001.
- [2] Chitta Baral & Michael Gelfond (1994): *Logic programming and knowledge representation*. *Journal of Logic Programming* 19/20, pp. 73-148, doi:10.1016/0743-1066(94)90025-6.
- [3] Kaja Bednarska & Andrzej Indrzejczak (2015): *Hypersequent calculi for S5: The methods of cut elimination*. *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 24 (3), pp. 277-311, doi:10.12775/LLP.2015.018.
- [4] Sergey Drobyshevich & Heinrich Wansing (2020): *Proof systems for various FDE-based modal logics*. *Review of Symbolic Logic* 13(4), pp. 720-747, doi:10.1017/S1755020319000261.
- [5] Melvin Fitting (1991): *Many-valued modal logics*. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 15, pp. 235-254, doi:10.3233/FI-1991-153-404.
- [6] Melvin Fitting (2007): *Modal proof theory*. In: *Handbook of Modal Logic (Studies in Logic and Practical Reasoning 3)*, pp. 85-138, doi:10.1016/S1570-2464(07)80005-X.
- [7] Michael Gelfond, Jorge Fandinno & Evgenii Balai (2023): *Embracing background knowledge in the analysis of actual causality: An answer set programming approach*. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 23 (4), pp. 715-729, doi:10.1017/S1471068423000248.
- [8] Gerhard Gentzen (1969): *Collected papers of Gerhard Gentzen*. M.E. Szabo (ed.), *Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics*, North-Holland (English translation), doi:10.2307/2272429.
- [9] Oleg Grigoriev & Yaroslav Petrukhin (2019): *On a multilattice analogue of a hypersequent S5 calculus*. *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 28, pp. 683-730, doi:10.12775/LLP.2019.031.
- [10] Andrzej Indrzejczak (2019): *Two is enough - Bisequent calculus for S5*. *Proceedings of the 12th International Symposium on Frontiers of Combining Systems (FroCoS 2019)*, pp. 277-294, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-29007-8_16.
- [11] Norihiro Kamide (2007): *A uniform proof-theoretic foundation for abstract paraconsistent logic programming*. *Journal of Functional and Logic Programming* 2007, pp. 1-36.
- [12] Norihiro Kamide (2023): *Falsification-aware calculi and semantics for normal modal logics including S4 and S5*. *Journal of Logic, Language, and Information* 32 (3), pp. 395-440, doi:10.1007/S10849-022-09386-7.
- [13] Norihiro Kamide (2024): *Alternative cut-free sequent calculi for S4 that are compatible with parafinite four-valued logic*. *Journal of Applied Logics*, to appear.

- [14] Saul Aaron Kripke (1963): *Semantical analysis of modal logic I Normal modal propositional calculi*. *Zeitschr. math. Logik und Grundlagen d. Math.* Bd. 9, S. pp. 67-96, doi:10.1002/ma1q.19630090502.
- [15] Hidenori Kurokawa (2013): *Hypersequent calculi for modal logics extending $S4$* . In: *New Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 8417*, pp. 51-68, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-10061-6_4.
- [16] Ori Lahav (2013): *From frame properties to hypersequent rules in modal logics*. *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pp. 408-417, doi:10.1109/LICS.2013.47.
- [17] Björn Lellmann & Francesca Poggiolesi (2024): *Nested sequent or tree-hypersequents: A survey*. *Saul Kripke on Modal logic (Outstanding Contributions to Logic 30)*, R. Padro and Y. Weiss (eds.), Springer.
- [18] Simone Martini, Andrea Masini & Margherita Zorzi (2021): *From 2-sequents and linear nested sequents to natural deduction for normal modal logics*. *ACM Transaction on Computational Logic* 22 (3), pp. 19:1-19:29, doi:10.1145/3461661.
- [19] Simone Martini, Andrea Masini & Margherita Zorzi (2023): *Cut-elimination for extended sequent calculi*. *Bulletin of the Section of Logic* 52 (4), pp. 459-495, doi:10.18778/0138-0680.2023.22.
- [20] Dale Miller, Gopalan Nadathur, Frank Pfenning & Andre Scedrov (1991): *Uniform proofs as a foundation for logic programming*. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 51, pp. 125-157, doi:10.1016/0168-0072(91)90068-w.
- [21] Sara Negri (2011): *Proof theory for modal logic*. *Philosophy Compass* 6 (8), pp. 523-538, doi:10.1111/j.1747-9991.2011.00418.x.
- [22] Linh Anh Nguyen (2009): *Modal logic programming revisited*. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics* 19 (2), pp. 167-181, doi:10.3166/janc1.19.167-181.
- [23] Sergei P. Odintsov & Heinrich Wansing (2010): *Modal logics with Belnapian truth values*. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics* 20, pp. 279-301, doi:10.3166/JANCL.20.279-301.
- [24] Masao Ohnishi & Kazuo Matsumoto (1957): *Gentzen method in modal calculi*. *Osaka Mathematical Journal* 9, pp. 113-130.
- [25] Masao Ohnishi & Kazuo Matsumoto (1959): *Gentzen method in modal calculi II*. *Osaka Mathematical Journal* 11, pp. 115-120.
- [26] Francesca Poggiolesi (2008): *A cut-free simple sequent calculus for modal logic $S5$* . *Review of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1), pp. 3-15, doi:10.1017/S1755020308080040.
- [27] Francesca Poggiolesi (2010): *Gentzen Calculi for Modal Propositional Logic*. *Trends in Logic* 32, Springer.
- [28] Garrel Pottinger (1983): *Uniform cut-free formulations of T , $S4$ and $S5$ (abstract)*. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 48, p. 900.
- [29] Vaughan R. Pratt (1980): *Application of modal logic to programming*. *Studia Logica* 39 (2/3), pp. 257-274, doi:10.1007/BF00370324.
- [30] Greg Restall (2007): *Proofnets for $S5$: Sequents and circuits for modal logic*. *Proceedings of Logic Colloquium 2005, Lecture Notes in Logic* 28, pp. 151-172, Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Umberto Rivieccio, Achim Jung & Ramon Jansana (2017): *Four-valued modal logic: Kripke semantics and duality*. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 27, pp. 155-199, doi:10.1093/LOGCOM/EXV038.
- [32] Yi-Dong Shen & Thomas Eiter (2016): *Evaluating epistemic negation in answer set programming*. *Artificial Intelligence* 237, pp. 115-135, doi:10.1016/J.ARTINT.2016.04.004.
- [33] Mitio Takano (1992): *Subformula property as a substitute for cut-elimination in modal propositional logics*. *Mathematica japonica* 37, pp. 1129-1145.
- [34] Heinrich Wansing (2002): *Diamonds are a philosopher's best friends*. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 31(6), pp. 591-612, doi:10.1023/A:1021256513220.
- [35] Heinrich Wansing (2002): *Sequent systems for modal logics*. In: *Gabbay, D.M., Guentner, F. (eds), Handbook of Philosophical Logic* 8, pp 61-145.