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Nested sequent calculi and theorem proving for normal conditional logics: The theorem prover NESCOND

Nicola Olivetti and Gian Luca Pozzato

Abstract. In this paper we focus on proof methods and theorem proving for normal conditional logics, by describing nested sequent calculi as well as a theorem prover for them. We first present some nested sequent calculi, recently introduced, for the basic conditional logic CK and some of its significant extensions with axioms ID, MP and CEM. We also describe a calculus for the flat fragment of the conditional logic CK+CSO+ID, which corresponds to Kraus, Lehmann and Magidor’s cumulative logic C. The calculi are internal, cut-free and analytic. Next, we describe NESCOND, a Prolog implementation of these calculi in the style of leanTAP. We finally present an experimental comparison between our theorem prover NESCOND and other known theorem provers for conditional logics. Our tests show that the performances of NESCOND are promising and in all cases better, with the only exception of systems including CEM, than those of the other provers. The program NESCOND, as well as all the Prolog source files, are available at http://www.di.unito.it/~pozzato/nescond/.
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1. Introduction

Conditional logics are extensions of classical logic by a conditional operator \( \Rightarrow \). They can be seen as a generalization of (multi)modal logics, where the modality \( \Rightarrow \) is indexed by a formula of the same language. Conditional logics have a long history [27, 28]. They have been introduced in order to formalize a kind of hypothetical reasoning, where a conditional formula \( A \Rightarrow B \) is used to formalize a sentence like “if \( A \) were the case then \( B \)” that cannot be captured by classical logic with material implication. One original motivation was to formalize counterfactual sentences, i.e. conditionals of the form “if \( A \) were the case then \( B \) would be the case”, where \( A \) is false [16].

Over the years, conditional logics have been studied in various fields of artificial intelligence and knowledge representation. Just to mention a few, they have been used:

- to reason about prototypical properties and defeasible inheritance [11]: the understanding of a conditional \( A \Rightarrow B \) is “the \( A \)s have typically the \( B \) property” or “normally, the \( A \)s are \( B \)s”. In the conditional logic introduced in [11] one can consistently express, for instance, that birds typically fly, whereas penguins are birds that do not fly, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\forall x (\text{Bird}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Fly}(x)) \\
\forall x (\text{Penguin}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Bird}(x)) \\
\forall x (\text{Penguin}(x) \Rightarrow \neg \text{Fly}(x))
\end{align*}
\]
It is easy to observe that the knowledge base obtained from the one above by replacing the conditional operator $\Rightarrow$ with the classical implication $\rightarrow$, that is to say by replacing $\forall x \text{Bird}(x) \Rightarrow \text{Fly}(x)$ with $\forall x \text{Bird}(x) \rightarrow \text{Fly}(x)$, is consistent only if there are no penguins;

- to provide an axiomatic foundation of nonmonotonic reasoning [8, 26]: in this context, a conditional $A \Rightarrow B$ is read as “in normal circumstances, if $A$ then $B$”. More in detail, in [26] the authors propose an axiomatization of the properties of a nonmonotonic consequence relation: their system comprises nonmonotonic assertions of the form $A \Rightarrow B$, interpreted as “$B$ is a plausible conclusion of $A$”. It turns out that all forms of inference studied in [26] are particular cases of well-known conditional axioms [10] (in this respect the language of [26] is just a fragment of conditional logics);

- to model database update [18, 22] and belief change and revision [17] in [22] the authors present a conditional logic, more precisely a variant of the logic VCU introduced in [27], to formalize knowledge-update as defined by Katsuno and Mendelzon in [25]; in [18] the authors show a tight correspondence between AGM revision systems [14] and a specific conditional logic, called BCR.

The connection between revision/update and conditional logics can be intuitively explained in terms of the so-called Ramsey Test (RT): $A \Rightarrow B$ holds in a knowledge base $K$ if and only if $B$ holds in the knowledge base $K$ revised/updated with $A$.

- to reason about access control policies [15]; in this context, the statement $A$ says $B$, intuitively meaning that a user/program $A$ asserts $B$ to hold in the system, can be naturally expressed by a conditional $A \Rightarrow B$. In [15] it is shown that constructive conditional logics can also be used to reason about transfer of authority from one principal to another, in particular, the fact that a principal $A$ speaks for another principal $B$, can be defined as $B \Rightarrow A$;

- to model hypothetical queries in deductive databases and logic programming [13]: the logic CCG+ID is the basis of the logic programming language CondLP, in which one can express hypothetical goals of the form\(^1\) $\text{Load\_Gun} \Rightarrow (\text{Shoot} \Rightarrow \text{Dread})$, and the idea is that the hypothetical goal succeeds if $\text{Dread}$ succeeds in the state “revised” first by $\text{Load\_Gun}$ and then by $\text{Shoot}$;

- to formalize causal inference and reasoning about action execution in diagnosis [16, 29] and planning [33, 20]: in this context, a conditional formula $A \Rightarrow B$ is interpreted as “$A$ causes $B$”;

- to formalize causal causation, and in some kind of epistemic “games” [3, 7]: here, each conditional operator expresses the “conditional beliefs” of an agent.

All conditional logics enjoy a possible world semantics, with the intuition that a conditional formula $A \Rightarrow B$ is true in a world $w$ if $B$ is true in the set of worlds that are most similar to closest to as normal as $w$ given the formula $A$. Since there are different ways of formalizing “the set of worlds similar/closest...” to a given world, there are essentially rather different semantics for conditional logics, from the most general selection function semantics to the stronger sphere semantics.

In this work we focus our attention on the more general selection function semantics: models are equipped by an accessibility relation (called selection function) for each formula of the language, with the restriction that logically equivalent formulas have the same accessibility relation. Here a conditional formula $A \Rightarrow B$ is true in a world $w$ if $B$ is true in all the worlds selected by the accessibility relation/selection function for $w$.

In general, another principal $B$ speaks for another principal $A$, can be defined as $B \Rightarrow A$; in [26] the authors show a tight correspondence between AGM revision systems [14] and a specific conditional logic, called BCR.

The logic BCR is the basic system of conditional logics based on the selection function semantics: it plays the same role of the system K in modal logics. Extensions of CK are obtained by assuming suitable properties on the selection function. The axiom

\[ MP \ (A \Rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \Rightarrow B) \]

captures a conditional modus ponens, stating a relation between the material implication and the conditional one. Systems allowing MP are those whose models are such that if a formula $A$ holds in a world $w$, then $w$ is always closest to $w$ itself given $A$. The axiom

\[ ID \ A \Rightarrow A \]

captures the idea that the result of supposing $A$ is always successful. In systems allowing ID, if it is imposed that, given a formula $A$, $A$ holds in all the worlds more similar to $w$ given $A$. The axiom

\[ CEM \ (A \Rightarrow B) \lor (A \Rightarrow \sim B) \]

\[ ^1 \text{The example is inspired by the classic Yale’s Shooting problem.} \]
is the conditional excluded middle. Models of systems allowing CEM are those whose selection function selects at most one world given a formula \( A \). The axiom
\[
\text{CSO} (\langle A \to B \rangle \times \langle B \to A \rangle) \to (\langle A \to C \rangle \to \langle B \to C \rangle)
\]
captures a kind of conditional independence of the antecedent of a conditional formula. In models of systems allowing CSO, if both \( A \to B \) and \( B \to A \) hold in a world \( w \), the worlds closest to \( w \) are the same given both \( A \) and \( B \). As mentioned before, the fragment of the logic \( \text{CK+CSO+ID} \) not allowing nested conditionals corresponds to the logic \( C \) introduced in [26] by Kraus, Lehmann and Magidor (KLM) in order to formalize the basic properties of nonmonotonic reasoning. Their work, that has been early recognized as a landmark, led to a classification of nonmonotonic consequence relations, determining a hierarchy of stronger and stronger systems. The so called KLM properties have been widely accepted as the “conservative core” of default reasoning. The role of KLM logics is similar to the role of AGM postulates in Belief Revision [14]: they give a set of postulates for default reasoning that any concrete reasoning mechanism should satisfy. As an example, in the conditional logic \( \text{CK+CSO+ID} \), if we know that normally Italian people love soccer, and that Italian people loving soccer usually watch soccer matches on television, we can infer that typical Italian people watch soccer matches on television, that is to say the following formula is valid:
\[
\langle \text{Italian} \to \text{SoccerLover} \rangle \land \langle \text{Italian} \land \text{SoccerLover} \to \text{WatchSoccerOnTV} \rangle \to \langle \text{Italian} \to \text{WatchSoccerOnTV} \rangle.
\]

Despite their relevance, from the point of view of proof-theory and automated deduction, conditional logics have not achieved a state of the art comparable with, say, the one of modal logics, where there are well-established calculi, whose proof-theoretical and computational properties are well-understood, and efficient theorem provers have been implemented.

In this work we first describe nested sequent calculi \( \text{NS} \) for propositional conditional logics, recently introduced in [1, 2], nested sequent calculi [9, 12, 21, 24] are a natural generalization of ordinary sequent calculi where sequents are allowed to occur within sequents. A nested sequent always corresponds to a formula of the language, so that we can think of the rules as operating “inside a formula”, combining subformulas rather than just combining outer occurrences of formulas as in ordinary sequent calculi. Since the calculi stay within the language, they can be classified as “internal”, as opposed to “external” calculi which make use of additional ingredients (e.g. labels and relations among them) to encode the semantics into the syntax.

The calculi \( \text{NS} \) are rather natural and all rules have a fixed number of premises. Moreover, they can be used to obtain a decision procedure for the respective logics by imposing some restrictions preventing redundant applications of rules. In all cases, we get a \( \text{PSpace} \) upper bound, a bound that for \( \text{CK} \) and its extensions with ID and MP is optimal (but not for \( \text{CK+CEM} \) that is known to be \( \text{coNP} \)). For flat \( \text{CK+CSO+ID} = \text{cumulative logic C} \) we also get a \( \text{PSpace} \) bound, we are not aware of a better upper bound for this logic.

Furthermore, we introduce an implementation of \( \text{NS} \), called \( \text{NESCOND} \), inspired by the methodology introduced by the system \( \text{TAP} \) [5], even if it does not fit its style in a strict sense. The basic idea is that each axiom or rule of the nested sequent calculus is implemented by a Prolog clause of the program. The resulting code is therefore simple and compact: the implementation of \( \text{NESCOND} \) for \( \text{CK} \) consists of only 6 predicates, 24 clauses and 34 lines of code.

We finally provide extensive experimental results by comparing \( \text{NESCOND} \) with \( \text{CondLean} \) [30] and GOALID/\( \text{CK} \) [31], to the best of our knowledge the only existing provers for conditional logics, as well as with CoLoSS [23], a generic-purpose theorem prover for coalgebraic modal logics which can handle also basic conditional logics. Concerning the logic \( \text{CK+CSO+ID} \), we have also compared the performances of \( \text{NESCOND} \) with KLM Lean [19], a theorem prover for the cumulative logic \( \text{C} \).

Performances of \( \text{NESCOND} \) are promising, in all cases superior to those of the other provers, with the exception of systems supporting CEM. We can conclude that nested sequent calculi are not only a useful proof theoretical tool, but they can be the basis of efficient theorem proving for conditional logics.

This paper is an extended and revised version of the work in [32], where we have proposed a preliminary presentation of \( \text{NESCOND} \), not including the description of the systems with CEM and for the cumulative logic \( \text{C} \), and reporting only basic experimental results.

2. Normal conditional logics

We consider a propositional conditional language \( \mathcal{L} \) over a set \( \text{ATM} \) of propositional variables. Formulas of \( \mathcal{L} \) are built as usual: \( \bot, \top \) and the propositional variables
in ATP are atomic formulas; if A and B are formulas, then \( \land A \) and \( A \otimes B \) are compound formulas, where \( \otimes \in \{ \land, \lor, \rightarrow, \Rightarrow \} \). Atomic formulas and compound formulas are formulas of \( L \).

We adopt the selection function semantics. We consider a non-empty set of possible worlds \( W \). Intuitively, the selection function \( f \) selects, for a world \( w \) and a formula \( A \), the set of worlds of \( W \) which are closest to \( w \) given the information \( A \). A conditional formula \( A \rightarrow B \) holds in a world \( w \) if the formula \( B \) holds in all the worlds selected by \( f \) for \( w \) and \( A \).

**Definition 1.** ([Selection function semantics]) A model is a triple \( M = (W, f, \models) \), where:
- \( W \) is a non-empty set of worlds;
- \( f : W \times 2^W \rightarrow 2^W \) is the selection function;
- \( \models \) is the evaluation function, which assigns to an atomic formula \( P \in \text{ATM} \) the set of worlds where \( P \) is true, and is extended to compound formulas inductively as follows:
  - \( \models [T] = W; \)
  - \( \models [\mathit{false}] = \emptyset; \)
  - \( \models \neg A = W - [A]; \)
  - \( \models A \land B = [A] \cap [B]; \)
  - \( \models A \lor B = [A] \cup [B]; \)
  - \( \models A \rightarrow B = [B] \cup (W - [A]); \)
  - \( \models A \Rightarrow B = \{w \in W | f(w, [A]) \subseteq [B]\} \).

A formula \( F \in L \) is valid in a model \( M = (W, f, \models) \) if \( \models F \) for every \( M \). A formula \( F \in L \) is valid, and we write \( \models F \), if it is valid in every model, that is to say \( M \models F \) for every \( M \).

We have defined \( f \) taking \([A]\) rather than \( A \) (i.e. \( f(w, [A]) \) rather than \( f(w, A) \)) as an argument; this is equivalent to define \( f \) on formulas, i.e. \( f(w, A) \) but imposing that if \([A] = [A']\) in the model, then \( f(w, A) = f(w, A') \). This condition is called normality.

The semantics above characterizes the basic conditional system, called CK, where no specific properties of the selection function are assumed. An axiomatization of CK is given by (\( \vdash \) denotes provability in the axiom system):
- any axiomatization of the classical propositional calculus (prop)
- if \( \vdash A \) then \( \vdash A \rightarrow B \) (Modus Ponens) (RCK)
- if \( \vdash A \rightarrow B \) then \( \vdash (A \rightarrow C) \Leftrightarrow (B \rightarrow C) \) (RCEA)
- if \( \vdash (A_1 \land \cdots \land A_n) \rightarrow B \) then \( \vdash (C \rightarrow A_1 \land \cdots \land C \Rightarrow A_n) \rightarrow (C \Rightarrow B) \) (RCE)
- if \( \vdash \) is a nested sequent then \( \vdash \) is also a nested sequent
- if \( \vdash \) is a nested sequent, then \( \vdash \Rightarrow \) is also a nested sequent
- if \( \vdash \Rightarrow \) is a nested sequent, then \( \vdash \Rightarrow \Rightarrow \) is also a nested sequent

Moreover, we consider the standard extensions of the basic system CK shown in Fig. 1.

### 3. Nested sequent calculi \( \Lambda S \) for conditional logics

In this section, we recall nested sequent calculi \( \Lambda S \) introduced in [1]. \( S \) is an abbreviation for \( \text{CK} + \{X\} \), and \( X \in \{\text{CEM}, \text{ID}, \text{MP}, \text{ID+MP}, \text{CEM+ID}\} \).

The specificity of nested sequent calculi is to allow inferences that apply within sequents. A nested sequent \( \Gamma \) is defined inductively as follows:
- a formula \( A \in L \) is a nested sequent;
- if \( A \) is a formula and \( \Gamma \) is a nested sequent, then \( [A, \Gamma] \) is a nested sequent;
- a finite multiset of nested sequents is a nested sequent.

A nested sequent can be displayed as

\[
A_1, \ldots, A_n, [B_1 : \Gamma_1], \ldots, [B_n : \Gamma_n],
\]

where \( n, m \geq 0, A_1, \ldots, A_n, B_1, \ldots, B_n \) are formulas and \( \Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_n \) are nested sequents.

"A nested sequent can be directly interpreted as a formula, just replace \( \Rightarrow \) by \( \models \) and \( \models \) by \( \models \). More explicitly, the interpretation of a nested sequent

\[
A_1, \ldots, A_n, [B_1 : \Gamma_1], \ldots, [B_n : \Gamma_n]
\]

is inductively defined by the formula

\[
\text{J}(\Gamma) = 1 \lor \ldots \lor A_n \lor (B_1 \Rightarrow \text{J}(\Gamma_1)) \lor \ldots \lor (B_n \Rightarrow \text{J}(\Gamma_n)).
\]

In order to introduce the rules of the calculus, we need the notion of context. Intuitively a context denotes a "hole", a unique empty position, within a sequent that can be filled by a nested sequent. We use the symbol ( ) to denote the empty context. A context is defined inductively as follows:
- if \( \Sigma \) is a context, then \( \Sigma(\ ) = \Lambda, [A : \Sigma(\ )] \) is a context,
- where \( \Lambda \) is a nested sequent and \( A \) is a formula. Finally, we define the result of filling "the hole" of a context by a sequent. Let \( \Gamma(\ ) \) be a context and \( \Delta \) be a sequent, then the sequent obtained by filling the context by \( \Delta \), denoted by \( \Gamma(\Delta) \) is defined as follows:
Fig. 1. Some standard extensions of CK.

Fig. 2. The nested sequent calculi NS.

Fig. 3. A derivation of the axiom ID in NCK+ID. Thanks to the modularity of the NS calculi, the same derivation can also be obtained in NCK+ID+MP, in NCK+CEM+ID, and in NCKLM.

Fig. 4. A derivation of the axiom MP in NCK+MP and NCK+ID+MP.

As usual, we say that a nested sequent $\Gamma$ is derivable in NS if it admits a derivation. A derivation is a tree whose nodes are nested sequents. A branch is a sequence of nodes $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \ldots, \Gamma_n$ such that each node $\Gamma_i$ is obtained from its immediate successor $\Gamma_{i-1}$ by applying backward a rule of NS, having $\Gamma_{i-1}$ as the conclusion and $\Gamma_i$ as one of its premises. A branch is closed if one of its nodes is an instance of axioms (AX), ($\top$-AX), ($\bot$-AX), otherwise it is open. We say that a tree is closed if all its branches are closed. A nested sequent $\Gamma$ has a derivation in NS if there is a closed tree having $\Gamma$ as the root.
In Figs. 3, 4 and 5 we show derivations in the calculi \( NCK \) of the axioms (ID), (MP), and (CEM), respectively. Figure 6 shows a derivation of the CK valid formula \((A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B \wedge C)) \rightarrow (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B))\) found by the theorem prover NESCOND described in Section 4.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\vdash (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B \wedge C)) \rightarrow (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B)) \\
\vdash (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B \wedge C)) \rightarrow (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B)) \\
\vdash (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B \wedge C)) \rightarrow (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B))
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 6. A derivation of \((A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B \wedge C)) \rightarrow (A \Rightarrow (D \Rightarrow B))\) in \( NCK \) provided by the theorem prover NESCOND.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\vdash \neg (A \Rightarrow B), \neg (B \Rightarrow A), \neg (A \Rightarrow C), [A : A] \\
\vdash \neg (A \Rightarrow B), \neg (B \Rightarrow A), [A : A] \\
\vdash \neg (A \Rightarrow B), \neg (B \Rightarrow A), [A : A]
\end{array}
\]

Fig. 7. A derivation of the axiom CSO. Notice that the sequent \(\neg (A \Rightarrow B), \neg (B \Rightarrow A), \neg (A \Rightarrow C), [A : A]\) occurs twice as a premise of the application of the rule (CSO) in the derivation \( \pi_1 \); therefore, in order to increase readability, we only show it once. This is the reason why the application of (CSO) in \( \pi_1 \) has two premises (and not three). The same for \(\neg (A \Rightarrow B), \neg (B \Rightarrow A), [A : A]\), occurring twice in \( \pi_2 \).
We have also provided a nested sequent calculus for the flat fragment, i.e. without nested conditionals, of CK+CSO+ID, corresponding to Kraus, Lehmann and Magidor’s cumulative logic C [26]. The rules of the calculus, called $\text{NCKLM}$, are those of $\text{ACK+ID}$ (restricted to the flat fragment) where the rule (\(\Rightarrow\)) is replaced by the rule (CSO). In Fig. 7 we show a derivation in $\text{NCKLM}$ of the (CSO) axiom.

Figure 8 summarizes the rules of each nested sequent calculus of NS. Axioms (AX), (AX$\neg$), and (AX$\lor$), as well as rules for propositional connectives, belong to all the systems.

Nested sequent calculus NS are sound and complete with respect to the semantics for the respective logics, a proof can be found in Section 3 in [2].

**Theorem 1.** The nested sequent calculi NS are sound and complete for the respective logics, i.e. a formula $\Gamma\vdash\Delta$ is valid in CK$(+X)$ if and only if it is derivable in $\text{ACK}(+X)$.

### 3.1. Termination and complexity of NS

As usual, in order to obtain a decision procedure for the conditional logics under consideration, we have to control the application of the rules (CSO), (CEM), and (ID) that otherwise may be applied infinitely often in a backward proof search, since their principal formula is copied into the respective premise(s). In detail, we have the following results, whose proofs can be found in [2].

**Proposition 1.** The calculi NS with the following restrictions on the application of the rules:

- (\(\Rightarrow\)) can be applied only once to each formula (\(\Rightarrow\)) can be applied only to each formula (\(\Rightarrow\)) can be applied only once to each formula

= in the system CK+CSO+ID, the rule (CSO) can be applied only once to each formula (\(\Rightarrow\)) with a context (\(\Rightarrow\)) in each branch

are sound, complete and terminating.

For systems with (CEM), we need a more complicated mechanism. Intuitively, the rule is applied only to sequents containing only atomic formulas and negated conditionals to which (\(\Rightarrow\)) has been applied as much as possible. We need the following definitions.

**Definition 2.** Given a nested sequent

$$\Gamma = A_1, \ldots, A_n, \{B_1: \Gamma_1\}, \ldots, \{R_m: \Gamma_m\}$$

and a formula $F$, we define $F \in^* \Gamma$ if either $F = A_i$, for some $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ or $F \in^* \Gamma_j$, for some $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$.

**Definition 3.** (CEM-reduced sequent) Given a nested sequent $\Gamma = A_1, \ldots, A_n, \{B_1: \Gamma_1\}, \ldots, \{R_m: \Gamma_m\}$ occurring in a derivation $\Pi$, we say that $\Gamma$ is CEM-reduced if the following conditions hold:

- for each formula $F$ such that $F \in^* \Gamma$, either $F$ is a literal, i.e. $F = P$ or $F = \neg P$, where $P \in \text{ATOM}$, or $F$ is a negated conditional $\neg(C \Rightarrow D)$;
- for each negated conditional $\neg(C \Rightarrow D) \in^* \Gamma$ and for each (sub)context (\(\Rightarrow\)) occurring in $\Gamma$, if $C, \neg C$ and $C', \neg C'$ are derivable, then the rule (\(\Rightarrow\)) has been applied to $\neg(C \Rightarrow D)$ by using $\{C': \Delta\}$ in $\Pi$.

**Definition 4.** Given two sequents $\Gamma = A_1, \ldots, A_n, \{B_1: \Gamma_1\}, \ldots, \{R_m: \Gamma_m\}$ and $\Delta$, we define $F \subseteq^* \Delta$ if (i) $A_i \in \Delta$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and (ii) there is $\{B_i: \Delta_i\}$ such that $\Gamma_i \subseteq^* \Delta_i$, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$.

For instance, given $\Gamma = C, C, \{D : E, F\}, \{D : E, F, H\}, \{G : \{H : K, M\}\}$, it holds that $F \subseteq^* \Delta$.

In [2] it is shown that:

**Proposition 2.** The calculi NS for systems with CEM with the following restrictions on the application of the rule (CEM) to $\Gamma([A : \Delta], [B : \Sigma])$ are sound, complete and terminating.

- $\Gamma([A : \Delta], [B : \Sigma])$ is CEM-reduced
- $\Delta \subseteq^* \Sigma$

as possible. We need the following definitions.
4. Design of NESCOND

In this section we present a Prolog implementation of the nested sequent calculi $\text{NS}$. The program, called NESCOND (NESted sequent calculi for CONditional logics), is inspired by the "lean" methodology of lean$^3$P [5]. The basic idea is that the Prolog program comprises a set of clauses, each one of which implements a sequent rule or axiom of $\text{NS}$. The proof search is provided for free by the mere depth-first search mechanism of Prolog, without any additional ad hoc mechanism.

NESCOND represents a nested sequent with a Prolog list of the form:

\[
[F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_n, \\
[A_1, Gamma_1], \text{AppliedCond}_1, \ldots, \\
[A_n, Gamma_n], \text{AppliedCond}_n]
\]

where $F_i$ and $A_i$ are formulas of $L$ whereas $\text{Gamma}_i$ are Prolog lists representing nested sequents. Elements of the form

\[
[[A, \text{Gamma}]], \text{AppliedCond}_i]
\]

are pairs where $[A, \text{Gamma}]$ represents a context $[A : \Gamma]$, while $\text{AppliedCond}$ is a Prolog list $\{A_1 \Rightarrow B_1, A_2 \Rightarrow B_2, \ldots, A_k \Rightarrow B_k\}$ used in order to implement the restriction on the application of the rule $(\Rightarrow)$ to ensure termination, by keeping track of the negated conditionals to which the rule $(\Rightarrow)$ has been already applied by using $[A, \text{Gamma}]$ in the current branch.

Symbols $\top$ and $\perp$ are represented by constants $true$ and $false$, respectively, and connectives $\lor, \land, \Rightarrow, \neg$ are represented by $\lor$, $\land$, $\Rightarrow$, and $\neg$.

As an example, the Prolog list

\[
[p, q, !p \Rightarrow q], [[p, q \lor !p], [[p \Rightarrow r]], [[r]], [p \Rightarrow q]], [[q, [p, !p]]]], [[]]
\]

represents the nested sequent

\[
P, Q, \neg P \Rightarrow Q; Q \lor \neg P; P, P \Rightarrow R, \neg R; [Q, P, \neg P]
\]

Furthermore, the list $[p \Rightarrow q]$ in the leftmost context is used to represent the fact that, in a backward proof search, the rule $(\Rightarrow)$ has already been applied to $\neg P \Rightarrow Q$ by using $[P, Q \lor \neg P, [P : P \Rightarrow R], \neg R]$.\]

4.1. Auxiliary predicates

In order to manipulate formulas "inside" a sequent, NESCOND makes use of the three following auxiliary predicates:

- $\text{deepMember}(\text{Formulas}, \text{NS})$ succeeds if and only if the nested sequent $\text{NS}$ contains formulas of $\text{Formulas}$, that is to say either (i) the nested sequent $\text{NS}$ contains formulas in the list $\text{Formulas}$ or (ii) there exists a $\{[A, \text{Gamma}], \text{AppliedConditionals}\}$ in $\text{NS}$ such that $\text{deepMember}(\text{Formulas}, \text{Gamma})$ succeeds.

- $\text{deepProve}(\text{Formulas}, \text{NS}, \text{ResultingNS})$ operates exactly as $\text{deepMember}$, however it removes the formulas of the list $\text{Formulas}$ by replacing them with a placeholder hole; the output term $\text{ResultingNS}$ matches the resulting sequent.

- $\text{setState}(\text{ground}, \text{NS}, \text{hole})$ replaces the formulas in $\text{NS}$ with a placeholder hole; the output term $\text{NewNS}$ replaces the ground $\text{NS}$ with the formulas in the list $\text{Formulas}$. $\text{ResultingNS}$ is the output term matching the result.

4.2. NESCOND for CK

The calculi $\text{NS}$ are implemented by the predicate

\[
\text{prove}(\text{NS}, \text{ProofTree}).
\]

This predicate succeeds if and only if the nested sequent represented by the list $\text{NS}$ is derivable. When it succeeds, the output term $\text{ProofTree}$ matches with a representation of the derivation found by the prover. For instance, in order to prove that the formula $(A \Rightarrow (B \land C)) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow B)$ is valid in CK, one queries $\text{NESCOND}$ with the goal: $\text{prove}([\{a \Rightarrow b \land c\}, \{a \Rightarrow b\}, \text{ProofTree}])$. Each clause of $\text{prove}$ implements an axiom or rule of $\text{NS}$. To search for a derivation of a nested sequent $\Gamma$, $\text{NESCOND}$ proceeds as follows. First of all, if $\Gamma$ is an axiom, the goal will succeed immediately by using one of the following clauses for the axioms:

\[
\text{prove}(\text{NS}, \text{ax}) \leftarrow \text{deepMember}(\text{NS}, \text{ax}), \text{prove}(\text{NS}, \text{ProofTree}).
\]

implementing $(AX)$, $(AX\lor)$ and $(AX\neg)$, respectively. It is worth noticing that NESCOND applies Lemma 3.6 in [2], asserting that, given any formula $F$ and any context $\Gamma$, the sequent $\Gamma(F, \neg F)$ is derivable in $\text{NS}$.
Therefore, the above Prolog clause can be applied to any formula \( F \), generalizing axiom \( (A \Rightarrow B) \) which is restricted to atomic formulas only.

If \( \Gamma \) is not an instance of the axioms, then the first applicable rule will be chosen, e.g. if a nested sequent in \( \Gamma \) contains a formula \( A \lor B \), then the clause implementing the \( (\lor^+) \) rule will be chosen, and NESCOND will be recursively invoked on the unique premise of \( (\lor^+) \). NESCOND proceeds in a similar way for the other rules. The ordering of the clauses is such that the application of the branching rules is postponed as much as possible.

As an example, the clause implementing \( (\Rightarrow^+) \) is as follows:

```
1. prove(NS,tree(condn,A,B,Sub1,Sub2,Sub3)) :-
   deepSelect([[(A => B)],AppliedConditionals],
   [C,Delta],AppliedConditionals],
   prove([C,\[!B\]|Delta]),
   fillTheHole(\[\[A,\[!A|Delta\]\],
   [\[C,\[!B\]|Delta]\],
   [\[(A => B)|AppliedConditionals\]],
   DefNS),
2. prove(NS,tree(id,A,SubTree)) :-
   deepSelect([[A => B]],
   [C,Delta],AppliedConditionals],
   prove([\[C,\[!B\]|Delta]\],
   fillTheHole(\[\[A,\[!A|Delta\]\],
   [\[C,\[!B\]|Delta]\],
   [\[(A => B)|AppliedConditionals\]],
   DefNS),
3. prove(NS,tree(ax)) :-
   prove(NS,tree(axt)),
4. prove(NS,tree(axb)) :-
   prove(NS,tree(axb)),
5. prove(NS,tree(axt)) :-
   true,
```

In line 2, the auxiliary predicate `deepSelect` is invoked in order to find both a negated conditional \( (A \Rightarrow B) \) and a context \( [C : \Delta] \) in the sequent \( \Gamma \) (even in a nested subsequent). In this case, such formulas are replaced by the placeholder `hole`. Line 3 implements the restriction on the application of \( (\Rightarrow^+) \) in order to guarantee termination: the rule is applied only if \( (A \Rightarrow B) \) does not belong to the list `AppliedConditionals` of the selected context. In lines 4, 5 and 7, NESCOND is recursively invoked on the three premises of the rule. In line 7, NESCOND is invoked on the premise in which the context \( [C : \Delta] \) is replaced by \( [C : \Delta, \neg B] \). To this aim, in line 6 the auxiliary predicate `fillTheHole` is invoked to replace the hole introduced by `deepSelect`, with the negated conditional \( (\neg A \Rightarrow B) \), which is copied into the premise, and the context \( [C : \Delta, \neg B] \), whose list of `AppliedConditionals` is updated by adding the formula \( (\neg A \Rightarrow B) \) itself, in order to prevent further, useless applications in the current branch.

As mentioned, the last argument of the predicate `prove` is an output term corresponding to a function `tree` storing information about the derivation found by the prover, that will be used by the graphical interface to display a closed tree of a valid sequent. For axioms, this function just recalls the name of the axioms themselves, namely it is `tree(ax)` for \( (AX_1), tree(axt) \) for \( (AX_2) \) and `tree(axb)` for \( (AX_3) \). In the example of \( (\Rightarrow^+) \), the term is `tree(condn,A,B,Sub1,Sub2,Sub3)`, where:

- the constant `condn` is used to store the name of the applied rule, in this case \( (\Rightarrow^+) \) (conditional-assertion);
- \( A \) and \( B \) represent the principal formula to which the rule is applied, here representing the negated conditional \( (\neg A \Rightarrow B) \);
- `Sub1`, `Sub2` and `Sub3` are the sub-trees of the three premises of the rule, returned by the recursive invocations of `prove`.

Similarly for the other rules. It is worth noticing that, since the rules of the calculi are invertible (see Lemma 3.9 and the discussion following it in [2]), we can use cut \( /\) in line 5 to avoid the creation of a useless backtracking point.

The implementation of the calculi for extensions of CK with axioms ID and MP are similar to the one of CK. The main differences are described in the following sections.

4.3. NESCOND for extensions with ID

In these systems, contexts are triples \([Context,\text{AppliedConditionals},AllowID]\). The third element `AllowID` is a flag used in order to implement the restriction on the application of the rule (ID), namely the rule is applied to a context only if `AllowID=true`, as follows:

```
prove(NS,tree(id,A,SubTree)) :-
   deepSelect([[A,\[\[A,\[\neg A|Delta\]\],
   [\[\neg A|Delta]\],
   [\[A,\[\neg A|Delta\]\]],
   AppliedConditionals,false]],DefNS),
   prove(DefNS,SubTree).
```

When (ID) is applied to

\([Context,\text{AppliedConditionals},\text{true}]\),

then the predicate `prove` is invoked on the unique premise of the rule represented by the list `DefNS`, and the flag is set to `false` in order to avoid multiple applications in a backward proof search.
4.4. NESCOND for extensions with MP

The restriction on the application of the rule (MP) is implemented by equipping the predicate prove by a third argument, a Prolog list called AppliedMP, keeping track of the negated conditionals to which the rule has already been applied in the current branch. The clause of prove implementing (MP) is:

```prolog
1. prove([A, B, Sub1, Sub2]), !.
2. deepSelect([[A => B], NS, NewNS]), !.
3. notSequentIncluded(Delta, Sigma), !.
4. prove([A, !B], Sub2), !.
5. prove([B, !A], Sub3), !.
6. append(Delta, Sigma, ResDelta), !.
7. notSeqList(A, Gamma, List))).
```

The rule is applicable to a formula (A => B) if (A => B) does not belong to AppliedMP (line 3). When (MP) is applied, then A => B is added to AppliedMP in the recursive calls of prove on the premises of the rule (lines 6 and 7).

4.5. NESCOND for extensions with CEM

The implementation of NESCOND for systems allowing the axiom CEM is quite different from the other ones. In particular, these systems implement the much more complicated mechanism needed to ensure termination described in Proposition 2.

Condition (i) in Proposition 2 is guaranteed by the clause implementing (CEM) is as follows:

```prolog
1. prove([A, B, Sub1, Sub2, Sub3]), !.
2. deepSelect([[A => B], NS, NewNS]), !.
3. notSequentIncluded(Delta, Sigma), !.
4. prove([A, B], Sub2), !.
5. prove([A => B], Sub3), !.
6. append([A, B], [A, Sub1, Sub2]), !.
7. fillTheHole(NewNS, [[A, Delta], ApplCond1], NS, NewNS), !.
8. prove([A => B], [A, Sub1, Sub2]), !.
```

In line 3 the following predicate notSequentIncluded is invoked:

```prolog
1. notSequentIncluded(Delta, Sigma), !.
2. partitionNS(Delta, Formulas, Contexts), !.
3. member([F, Formulas, \=member(F, Sigma), !]
4. ;
5. extractSubContexts(Sigma, List),
6. member([\=member(F, Gamma), \=member(F, List)], !).
7. notSeqList([A, Gamma, List])).
```

This predicate ensures condition (ii) in Proposition 2, namely that not Delta \subseteq Sigma. In line 2 the list representing Delta is partitioned into formulas F1, ..., Fn and contexts [A1, Delta1], ..., [An, Delta_n]. Two alternatives are taken into account by the disjunction in line 4.

- in line 3, the theorem prover checks whether there is a formula F\in Delta such that F \notin Sigma. If this is the case, then Delta \notin Sigma and the predicate succeeds;
- otherwise, the predicate tries to find a context [A : Gamma] \in Delta such that, for all contexts [Bi : Sigma_i] \in Sigma, we have that Gamma \notin Sigma_i: this is again enough to conclude that Delta \notin Sigma, and the predicate notSequentIncluded succeeds.

More in detail, an auxiliary predicate extractSubContexts(Sigma, List) first builds the list List of contexts [Bi : Sigma_i] \in Sigma (line 5); then, in line 6 a context [A : Gamma] \in Delta is selected by invoking the standard member predicate. Last, another auxiliary predicate notSegList is invoked to check whether [A : Gamma] is not included in [Bi : Sigma_i] \in Sigma, by recursively invoking notSequentIncluded in order to check whether Gamma \notin Sigma_i.

If the predicate notSequentIncluded (Delta, Sigma) succeeds, i.e. Delta \notin Sigma, then (CEM) is applicable, and the predicate prove is recursively invoked on its three premises (lines 4, 5, and 8).

4.6. NESCOND for NCELM

The implementation of the calculus for the flat fragment of CK+CSO+ID, corresponding to Kraus, Lehmann and Magidor's cumulative logic Differs from the one for CK+ID in three main respects:

1. the rule (\rightarrow \rightarrow) is replaced by (CSO). This does not make use of the predicate deepSelect to "look inside" a sequent to find the principal formulas (\rightarrow (A => B) and C : Delta): since the calculus only deals with the flat fragment of the logic under consideration, the shown principal formulas are directly selected from the current sequent by easy membership tests (standard Prolog predicates member and select), without searching inside other contexts;
2. contexts are pairs
   
   \[[\text{Context}, \text{AllowID}]\]

   rather than triples

   \[[\text{Context}, \text{AppliedConditionals}, \text{AllowID}]\]

   since the control of the application of the (CSO) rule is more complicated and then delegated to a further argument of the prove predicate, see point 3 here below;

3. the predicate prove has three arguments:

   \[
   \text{prove}((R,S),\text{AppliedCSO},\text{ProofTree}).
   \]

   where AppliedCSO is a list of pairs

   \[
   \text{prove}(\text{cso}, \text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}) :- \text{member}(\text{cso}, \Delta), \text{select}(\text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}), \text{prove}(\text{cso}, \text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}), \text{prove}(\text{cso}, \text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}).
   \]

   used in order to control the backward application of the (CSO) rule and representing the fact that (CSO) has been already applied to a context \([C : \Delta]\) in the current branch by using the negated conditional \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B})\) as a principal formula.

   The clause of prove implementing (CSO) is as follows:

   1. prove((R,S),\text{AppliedCSO},

   \[
   \text{prove}((\text{cso}, \text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}) :- \text{member}(\text{cso}, \Delta), \text{select}(\text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}), \text{prove}(\text{cso}, \text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}), \text{prove}(\text{cso}, \text{Sub1}, \text{Sub2}, \text{Sub3}).
   \]

   In line 2 the predicate member checks whether a negated conditional \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B})\) belongs to the current nested sequent; if this is the case, line 3 the select predicate is invoked to select and remove a context \([C : \Delta]\) for building the premise containing \([C : \Delta, \neg\text{B}]\) on which prove is recursively invoked in line 8. Similarly to the implementation of the rule \(\neg(\text{A})\) in the other systems, in lines 6 and 7 the prove predicate is recursively invoked on the other two premises \(\Gamma, \neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [C : A]\) and \(\Gamma, \neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [A : C]\), respectively.

   In line 4 the predicate member invokes \(\text{prove}(\text{cso}, \Delta)\) is invoked in order to check whether the application of (CSO) is useful, by avoiding the situation in which the predicate prove is further invoked in line 8 on the same sequent, namely when \(\neg\text{B}\) already belongs to \(\Delta\), therefore one of the premise of (CSO) is \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [C : \Delta, \neg\text{B}]\), the same as \(\Gamma, \neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [C : \Delta, \neg\text{B}]\) since contraction is admissible (see Lemma 3.11 in [2]). In line 5, the auxiliary predicate excludeCSO is invoked in order to check whether the rule (CSO) can be applied to \([C : \Delta]\), by using \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B})\) as a principal formula. This predicate succeeds if (CSO) has been already applied in the current branch to a context \([C : \Delta]\), such that \(\Delta \subseteq \Delta\), by using the same conditional \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B})\), in other words if there is a pair \(\{(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [\text{C}, \Delta]\}\) in the list AppliedCSO.

   In the implementation of the rule \(\neg(\text{B})\) in CK+ID, this mechanism is implemented by means of the list AppliedConditionals belonging to each context: indeed, as mentioned before, when \(\neg(\text{B})\) is applied to a sequent containing \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [C : \Delta]\), then the prove predicate is recursively invoked on a premise containing \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [C : \Delta], \neg\text{B}\), whose context is such that \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B})\) is added to its list of AppliedConditionals. This is no longer applicable in systems containing the (CSO) rule, because all its three premises include a context, and two contexts are “new” ones, not coming from the context to which the rule is applied. Consider an application of (CSO) to a sequent \(\Gamma, \neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [C : \Delta]\), then the premises contain \([C : A]\) (line 6), \([C : A]\) (line 7) and \([C : \Delta, \neg\text{B}]\) (line 8), respectively. Notice that \([C : A]\) and \([A : C]\) are “new”, they do not include \([C : \Delta]\). The list of negated conditionals already used in order to apply (CSO) to \([C : A]\) should be empty; however, a further (backward) application of (CSO) to \([C : A]\) introduces a “new” context \([C : A]\) in one of the premises, leading to a non-terminating proof search.

   This is why we need a more complicated machinery, making use of a further auxiliary predicate excludeCSO as well as of a third argument AppliedCSO in the prove predicate. It is worth noticing that the pair \(\neg(\text{A} \Rightarrow \text{B}), [C : \Delta]\) is added to the list AppliedCSO in lines 6, 7 and 8, implementing the restriction on the application of (CSO) of Proposition 1.

   NESCOND is available at the web address http://www.di.unito.it/~pozzato/nesccond. It also comprises a graphical user interface corresponding to a web application. In detail, the user can query the theorem prover by means of a php web page, typing in a suitable text box the sequent whose validity is under consideration. The php application asks the SWI Prolog engine (http://www.swi-prolog.org) to check whether such a sequent is valid by invoking
the predicate \texttt{prove} described above. If the sequent is valid, the application builds a pdf file containing a proof tree for the sequent. Some pictures of NESCOND are presented in Figs. 15 and 16.

5. Performance of NESCOND

The performances of NESCOND are promising. We have tested it by running SICStus Prolog 4.0.2 on an Apple MacBook Pro, 2.7 GHz Intel Core i7, 8GB RAM machine\(^2\), by comparing its performances with all the other theorem provers for conditional logics known in the literature.

5.1. NESCOND vs CondLean vs GOALD\(^CK\)

We have compared the performances of NESCOND with the ones of two other provers for conditional logics: CondLean 3.2, implementing labelled sequent calculi [30], and the goal-directed procedure GOALD\(^CK\) [31].

5.1.1. Randomly generated sequents

We have tested the three provers over a set of 6000 randomly generated sequents, obtaining the results shown in Fig. 9. Obviously, in order to obtain a relevant result, we have run the same set of 6000 sequents on all the three theorem provers.

We have first considered sequents whose formulas are built from 15 different atomic variables and have a high level of nesting (10), obtaining results in Fig. 9(a). NESCOND is not able to answer only in 0.05% of cases (1 sequent over 2000) within 10 seconds, whereas both GOALD\(^CK\) and CondLean are not able to conclude anything in more than 3% of cases (60 tests over 2000). If the time limit is extended to 2 minutes, we have obtained the results in Fig. 9(b): NESCOND answers in 100% of cases, whereas its two competitors have still at least the 1.30% of timeouts.

We have then considered sequents with a lower level of nesting (3) and whose formulas contain only 3 different atomic variables, obtaining the results in Fig. 9(c). The difference is surprisingly much more significant: with a time limit of 10 seconds, NESCOND is not able to answer only in 9.05% of cases, whereas both CondLean and GOALD\(^CK\) are not able to conclude in 16.55% and in 51.15% of cases, respectively. This phenomena can be explained by the fact that NESCOND is faster than the other provers to find not valid sequents (against 17 of CondLean and 34 of GOALD\(^CK\)) within the fixed time limit.

5.1.2. Valid sequents

We have tested NESCOND and its two competitors over sets of valid sequents. In absence of a set of acknowledged benchmarks for conditional logics, we have considered known significant structures of valid sequents in CK and all the considered extensions. Concerning CK, we have considered 88 valid formulas obtained by translating K valid formulas, obtained by replacing \(
\Box A
\) with \(\top \Rightarrow A\) and \(\Diamond A\) with \(\neg (\top \Rightarrow \neg A)\). These formulas have been provided by Heuerding and used to test the theorem prover ModLeanTAP [4] by Beckert and Goré.

The experimental results are shown in Fig. 10. The performances of NESCOND are encouraging also in this kind of tests. Considering CK, NESCOND is not able to give an answer in less than 10 seconds only in 5 cases over 88, against the 8 of CondLean and the 12 of GOALD\(^CK\). The number of timeouts drops to 4 if we extend the time limit to 1 minute, whereas this extension has no effect on the competitors (still 8 and 12 timeouts). We have similar results also for extensions of CK as shown in Fig. 11 here we have not included GOALD\(^CK\) since the most formulas adopted do not belong to the fragments admitting goal-directed proofs [31].

These results show that the performances of NESCOND are encouraging, probably better than the ones of the other existing provers for conditional logics, and this also holds for extensions of CK. For systems not allowing CEM, NESCOND gives an answer in 95% of the tests (all of them are valid formulas) in less than 1ms. The performances worsen in systems with CEM because of the overhead of the termination mechanism.

5.2. NESCOND vs CoLoSS

We have also compared the performances of NESCOND with the ones of CoLoSS, the Coalgebraic Logic Satisfiability Solver, a generic-purpose theorem prover for modal logics introduced in [23]. CoLoSS is an Haskell implementation of a uniform polynomial space algorithm to decide satisfiability for modal logics that are amenable to coalgebraic semantics, including

\(^2\) It is worth noticing that the experimental results presented in this section have been obtained by running SICStus Prolog, whereas, as mentioned at the end of Section 4, the Prolog engine which is the core of the web application available at http://www.di.unito.it/~pozzato/nescond/ is implemented in SWI Prolog.
conditional logics. Also in this case, we distinguish tests over randomly generated formulas and tests over significant examples.

5.2.1. Randomly generated sequents

We have tested both NESCOND and CoLoSS over 200 randomly generated CK formulas, corresponding to sequents with only one formula, obtaining the results presented in Fig. 12. For CoLoSS, we have considered an “Optimized” version, using dynamic programming plus a restriction to connected pairs. CoLoSS kills tasks requiring more than 2 minutes. It is easy to observe that the performances of NESCOND are better than the ones of the competitor: it gives an answer for all generated formulas within 5 seconds, whereas CoLoSS in 5 seconds is able to conclude only in 66% of the examples. Furthermore, in some cases (about 5%), CoLoSS either crashes with a stack space overflow exception or reaches the 2 minutes time limit.

5.2.2. Valid sequents

We have tested both NESCOND and CoLoSS over the set of formulas available at CoLoSS web site (http://www.informatik.uni-bremen.de/cofi/CoLoSS/), used by the authors to witness the performances of their prover. In all the available examples, NESCOND answers in less than 1 ms, whereas CoLoSS needs 776 ms on average to conclude its computation (in two examples, CoLoSS requires more than 2 seconds).

5.3. NESCOND for \( NCKLM \) vs KLMLean for cumulative logic \( C \)

Last, we have compared the performances of the implementation of NESCOND for \( NCKLM \) with those of KLMLean 2.0, a SICStus Prolog implementation of a tableau calculus for \( C \) introduced in [19] and available at http://www.di.unito.it/~pozzato/klmlean%202.0/. Again, the performances of NESCOND seem to be significantly better than those ones of its opponent; as in the other cases, we distinguish tests over randomly generated formulas and tests over significant examples.

5.3.1. Randomly generated sequents

We have tested both NESCOND and KLMLean over 4000 randomly generated CK+ID+CSO sequents, corresponding to sets of formulas of \( C \). We have considered different combinations of the following parameters: number of different propositional variables, number of conditional formulas (positive and negative), and fixed time limit. Experimental results are presented in Fig. 13. In tables (a) and (b) we have tested the two provers over formulas with 8 conditionals: they both need at least 5 seconds to obtain a number of timeouts under 90%; NESCOND is not able to answer in 59% of cases, whereas KLMLean needs more time in the 87% of cases. Tables (c) and (d) show the performances over formulas containing 25 conditionals: in this case, we can observe that the performances of NESCOND are significantly better: by extending the time limit to 30 seconds, NESCOND is not able to answer only in 19% of cases, whereas KLMLean has still 88% of timeouts.

5.3.2. Valid sequents

We have tested both NESCOND and KLMLean over a set of valid and significant formulas (Fig. 14). Also in this case, NESCOND is faster than KLMLean: after 5 seconds NESCOND is able to answer in more than 70% of cases, whereas KLMLean is able to answer only in 50% of cases.

![Fig. 9. NESCOND vs CondLean vs GOALD\&CK over a set of 6000 random sequents.](image-url)
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Timeouts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100ms</th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>1m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CondLean</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SealDUCK</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 10. NESCOND vs CondLean timeouts over 88 valid formulas for CK.

Timeouts for extensions of CK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100ms</th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>1m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CondLean</td>
<td>44.60%</td>
<td>30.04%</td>
<td>20.94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>35.44%</td>
<td>29.65%</td>
<td>28.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeouts for systems without CCM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100ms</th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>1m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CondLean</td>
<td>43.26%</td>
<td>31.69%</td>
<td>21.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>8.99%</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeouts for systems CCM and CCM+7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100ms</th>
<th>1s</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>1m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CondLean</td>
<td>67.77%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>47.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>59.02%</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>43.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11. NESCOND vs CondLean timeouts over valid formulas for extensions of CK.

NESCOND vs CoLoSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorem provers</th>
<th>1ms</th>
<th>100ms</th>
<th>5s</th>
<th>1m</th>
<th>2m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoLoSS</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 12. Percentage of answers by NESCOND and CoLoSS over 200 random formulas. Notice that in CoLoSS formulas which take more than 2 minutes are killed.

NESCOND vs KLMLearn 2.0 over random formulas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of tests: 1000</th>
<th>Prop. vars: 5, if conditionals 0, timeout: 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KLMLearn 2.0</td>
<td>9% yes 0% no 100% timeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>0% yes 0% no 95.5% timeout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of tests: 1000</th>
<th>Prop. vars: 5, if conditionals 0, timeout: 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KLMLearn 2.0</td>
<td>9.06% yes 3.75% no 87.19% timeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>37.07% yes 2.50% no 58.69% timeout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 13. Percentage of answers by NESCOND and KLMLearn over 4000 random formulas.

NESCOND vs KLMLearn 2.0 over valid formulas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of tests: 1000</th>
<th>Prop. vars: 10, conditionals: 25, timeout: 25s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KLMLearn 2.0</td>
<td>6.00% yes 5.50% no 86.00% timeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>20.00% yes 2.50% no 60.00% timeout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of tests: 1000</th>
<th>Prop. vars: 10, conditionals: 25, timeout: 25s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KLMLearn 2.0</td>
<td>6.00% yes 4.50% no 86.00% timeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESCOND</td>
<td>18.33% yes 27.33% no 19.34% timeout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 14. Percentage of answers by NESCOND and KLMLearn over valid formulas.
6. Conclusions and future issues

We have recalled nested sequent calculi \( \mathcal{NS} \) for the basic normal conditional logic \( \mathcal{CK} \) and some extensions of it with combinations of \( \text{ID}, \text{MP}, \) and \( \text{CEM} \), namely all combinations except \( \mathcal{CK}+\text{MP}+\text{CEM}+\text{ID} \). The calculi are analytic and they can be used to obtain a decision procedure, in some cases of optimal complexity. We have also recalled a nested sequent calculus, called \( \mathcal{N}_{\text{CLM}} \), for the cumulative logic \( \mathcal{C} \), corresponding to the flat fragment of \( \mathcal{CK}+\text{CSO}+\text{ID} \) for which no internal calculus seem to be known so far.

Moreover, we have presented NESCOND (http://www.di.unito.it/~pozzato/nescond), a theorem
prover implementing nested sequent calculi. We have compared NESCOND to other theorem provers for conditional logics. Statistics obtained so far show that NESCOND performs reasonably well and in all cases (except for logics including CEM) it outperforms the other theorem provers. We can conclude that nested sequent calculi do not only provide elegant and natural calculi for conditional logics, but they are also well-suited for developing efficient theorem provers for them.

In [6] the authors provide a sound and complete embedding of some conditional logics into classical higher-order logic (HOL), allowing to exploit available HOL reasoners for automated theorem proving in conditional logics. Intuitively, the embedding is based on the natural correspondence between the selection function semantics and HOL. The basic system CK and extensions with ID, MP, and CEM are considered, whereas CSO is not taken into account. The results of some experiments, obtained by running different HOL reasoners over few examples, are also provided.

The authors of [6] introduce a methodology to obtain theorem provers for conditional logics, rather than a "concrete" prover ready to be queried by the users: they do not even compare their solution to existing provers CondLean and GOALDOKC; experimental results for systems combining different conditional axioms are not provided; last, the implemented reasoner is not available and cannot be accessed neither for download nor by means of a web application. As the same authors point out, their objective is to show that the proposed theoretical embedding of conditional logics into HOL can have practical benefits, however HOL is, in general, undecidable, and termination/complexity results for the implemented prototype exploiting HOL reasoners are not mentioned.

In future research we aim to extend NS and NESCOND to other systems of conditional logics. To this regard, we strongly conjecture that adding a rule for NESCOND to other systems of conditional logics. In particular, we strongly conjecture that adding a rule for NESCOND to other systems of conditional logics. Intuitively, the embedding is based on the natural correspondence between the selection function semantics and HOL. The basic system CK and extensions with ID, MP, and CEM are considered, whereas CSO is not taken into account. The results of some experiments, obtained by running different HOL reasoners over few examples, are also provided.

The authors of [6] introduce a methodology to obtain theorem provers for conditional logics, rather than a "concrete" prover ready to be queried by the users: they do not even compare their solution to existing provers CondLean and GOALDOKC; experimental results for systems combining different conditional axioms are not provided; last, the implemented reasoner is not available and cannot be accessed neither for download nor by means of a web application. As the same authors point out, their objective is to show that the proposed theoretical embedding of conditional logics into HOL can have practical benefits, however HOL is, in general, undecidable, and termination/complexity results for the implemented prototype exploiting HOL reasoners are not mentioned.

In future research we aim to extend NS and NESCOND to other systems of conditional logics. To this regard, we strongly conjecture that adding a rule for the axiom (CS) \( (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow B)) \) will be enough to cover the whole cube of the extensions generated by axioms (ID), (MP), (CEM) and (CS).
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