

Subjective probability, trivalent logics and compound conditionals

Angelo Gilio¹ and Giuseppe Sanfilippo²

¹ Dept. SBAI, University of Rome “La Sapienza”, Rome, Italy (retired)
 angelo.gilio@sbai.uniroma1.it

² Dept. Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Palermo, Palermo, Italy
 giuseppe.sanfilippo@unipa.it

Abstract. In this work we first illustrate the subjective theory of de Finetti. We recall the notion of coherence for both the betting scheme and the penalty criterion, by considering the unconditional and conditional cases. We show the equivalence of the two criteria by giving the geometrical interpretation of coherence. We also consider the notion of coherence based on proper scoring rules. We discuss conditional events in the trivalent logic of de Finetti and the numerical representation of truth-values. We check the validity of selected basic logical and probabilistic properties for some trivalent logics: Kleene-Lukasiewicz-Heyting-de Finetti; Lukasiewicz; Bochvar-Kleene; Sobocinski. We verify that none of these logics satisfies all the properties. Then, we consider our approach to conjunction and disjunction of conditional events in the setting of conditional random quantities. We verify that all the basic logical and probabilistic properties (included the Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds) are preserved in our approach. We also recall the characterization of p-consistency and p-entailment by our notion of conjunction.

Keywords: Coherence; conditional probability assessments; betting scheme; penalty criterion; convex hulls; trivalent logics; compound conditionals.

1 Introduction

Conditionals play a relevant role in many fields, such as philosophy, psychology of the uncertain reasoning, artificial intelligence, decision making, nonmonotonic reasoning, knowledge representation. In a pioneering paper de Finetti ([13]) introduced conditional events as tri-events and proposed a three-valued logic. Many authors have given important contributions to research on conditionals; see, e.g., [1,9,10,17,19,20,23,29,32,33,43,45,46,47,50,51,52,54,55,60,63,65]. Usually, conjunction and disjunction of conditionals have been defined as suitable conditionals in the setting of trivalent logics; see, e.g., [2,3,4,6,21,42,53,62]. But, in this way, basic logical and probabilistic properties valid for unconditional events are not preserved. For instance, the lower and upper bounds on the probability of the conjunction, or the disjunction, of conditional events do not coincide with the Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds. A more general approach to compound

conditionals, where the result of conjunction or disjunction is no longer a three-valued object has been given in [46,50]. A related theory has been developed in the setting of coherence ([32,33,34,39]), by defining conjoined and disjoined conditionals as suitable *conditional random quantities*, with values in the interval $[0, 1]$. For some applications see, .e.g., [31,59,60]. A further development of this approach to general compound conditionals has been given in [22]. Among various approaches to probability, we use the subjective interpretation of de Finetti which is based on the coherence principle. The theory of de Finetti allows a flexible and gradual probabilistic treatment of uncertainty. Within this theory we can directly assign conditional probabilities on arbitrary families of conditional events, without requiring algebraic structures, and we can coherently extend probabilities to further conditional events (*fundamental theorem of probability* of de Finetti and its generalizations). A further advantage is the possibility of properly managing conditioning events with zero probability. We list below the main aspects considered in the paper.

- We recall the notion of coherence within the betting scheme, the penalty criterion, and proper scoring rules.
- We recall the geometrical interpretation of coherence.
- We discuss in the betting framework the numerical representation of a conditional event $A|H$, by showing that the natural counterpart of the logical values *true*, *false*, and *void* are the numerical values $1, 0, P(A|H)$ of a suitable conditional random quantity (the indicator of $A|H$).
- We consider some basic logical and probabilistic properties valid in the case of unconditional events. Then we examine four trivalent logics and we verify that none of them satisfy all the properties.
- We illustrate the approach to compound conditionals, where conjunctions and disjunctions are defined as suitable conditional random quantities. We verify that in our approach all the basic (and other further) properties are preserved.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the notion of coherence of probability assessments of unconditional events, for both the betting scheme and the penalty criterion. Then, we recall the geometrical characterization of coherence given by de Finetti. In 3 we discuss conditional events in the trivalent logic of de Finetti and the numerical representation of the truth-values, by showing that the numerical counterpart of the logical value *void* for a conditional event $A|H$ is given by $P(A|H)$. Then we illustrate the notion of coherence of conditional probability assessments for the betting scheme and the penalty criterion. We verify the equivalence of the two criteria by showing that the geometrical interpretation of coherence is the same in both criteria. We also briefly discuss the notion of coherence for conditional probability assessments by means of a generic proper scoring rules. In Section 4 we discuss compound conditionals in the setting of trivalent logics. We consider four notion of conjunctions: Kleene-Lukasiewicz-Heyting-deFinetti conjunction (\wedge_K), Lukasiewicz conjunction (\wedge_L); Bochvar internal conjunction, or Kleene weak conjunction (\wedge_B); Sobocinski conjunction, or quasi conjunction (\wedge_S). By De Morgan Law we also consider the associated

disjunctions $\vee_K, \vee_L, \vee_B, \vee_S$. Then, we examine some basic logical and probabilistic properties, valid for unconditional events, and we verify that none of the previous trivalent logics satisfies all the properties. In Section 5 we recall our approach to the conjunction and the disjunction of conditional events, defined in the setting of coherence as suitable conditional random quantities. We verify that, when considering conditional events, all the basic logical and probabilistic properties valid for unconditional events are preserved. Finally, in Section 6 we consider some further properties which are satisfied in our approach to compound conditionals.

2 Coherent probability assessments

Uncertainty is present in almost all real problems, where we have to face facts which will turn out to be true or false. We describe uncertain facts, termed events, by non ambiguous logical propositions. Then, an event E is a two-valued logical entity which can be *true*, or *false*. The indicator of E , denoted by the same symbol, is 1, or 0, according to whether E is true, or false. Thus, a symbol like sE represents the product of the quantity s and the indicator of the event E . The sure event and impossible event are denoted by Ω and \emptyset , respectively. Given two events E_1 and E_2 , we denote by $E_1 \wedge E_2$, or simply by $E_1 E_2$, (resp., $E_1 \vee E_2$) the logical conjunction (resp., the logical disjunction). The negation of E is denoted \bar{E} . We simply write $E_1 \subseteq E_2$ to denote that E_1 logically implies E_2 , that is $E_1 \bar{E}_2 = \emptyset$. We recall that n events E_1, \dots, E_n are said to be logically independent when the number m of constituents, or possible worlds, generated by them is 2^n , that is when the all the 2^n conjunctions $E_1^* \dots E_n^*$, with $E_i^* \in \{E_i, \bar{E}_i\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are not impossible.

In the subjectivistic theory of de Finetti, the probability $P(E)$ that an individual attributes to an event E , in his current state of knowledge, is a measure of its degree of belief on E being true. In order to operatively assess probabilities, de Finetti proposed two (equivalent) criteria: (i) *betting scheme*; (ii) *penalty criterion*. In both criteria, the consistency of the probability assessments is guaranteed by a coherence principle. All probabilistic properties follow from coherence; moreover, if a probability assessment does not satisfy some basic probabilistic property, then it is not coherent.

2.1 Betting Scheme

Within this criterion, to assess $P(E) = p$ means that, for every real number s , you are willing to pay an amount sp and to receive sE , that is to receive s , or 0, according to whether E is true, or E is false, respectively. The random gain is $G = s(E-p) \in \{s(1-p), -ps\}$. The assessment p is said to be *coherent* if, for every s , it does not happen that the values of the random gain are both positive, or both negative. Coherence requires that $P(E) \in [0, 1]$, with $P(\Omega) = 1$ and $P(\emptyset) = 0$. More in general, given an arbitrary family of events \mathcal{K} , a probability assessment on the events in \mathcal{K} is made by specifying a real function $P : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. For each

finite subfamily $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ of \mathcal{K} we denote by $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$, where $p_i = P(E_i)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the probability assessment on \mathcal{F} . Within the betting scheme, for any arbitrary real numbers s_1, \dots, s_n , you agree to pay $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i p_i$, by receiving the random amount $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i E_i$. The random gain G , associated with the pair $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ is the difference between the (random) amount that you receive and the amount that you pay, that is $G = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i E_i - \sum_{i=1}^n s_i p_i = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i (E_i - p_i)$. The random quantity G represents the net gain from engaging each transaction $(E_i - p_i)$, the scaling and meaning (buy or sell) of the transaction being specified by the magnitude and the sign of s_i , respectively. We observe that, by expanding the second member of the equality $\Omega = (E_1 \vee \bar{E}_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n \vee \bar{E}_n)$, we obtain the disjunction of 2^n conjunctions $A_1 \cdots A_n$, where $A_i \in \{E_i, \bar{E}_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. By discarding the conjunctions which coincide with the impossible event \emptyset , the sure event Ω can be represented as a suitable disjunction $\Omega = C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_m$, where C_1, \dots, C_m are the constituents, or possible cases, generated by \mathcal{F} , with $m \leq 2^n$. In the case of logical independence $m = 2^n$.

Example 1. The constituents associated with $\mathcal{F} = \{A, B\}$, where $A \subseteq B$, are $C_1 = AB$, $C_2 = \bar{A}B$ and $C_3 = \bar{A}\bar{B}$.

Denoting by g_h the value of G when C_h is true, it holds that $G \in \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$, with $g_h = \sum_{i: C_h \subseteq E_i} s_i - \sum_{i=1}^n s_i p_i$. Then, within the *betting scheme*, we have

Definition 1. *The function P defined on \mathcal{K} is said to be coherent if and only if, for every integer n , for every finite subfamily \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{K} and for every real numbers s_1, \dots, s_n , one has: $\min G \leq 0 \leq \max G$.*

The condition $\min G \leq 0 \leq \max G$ can be equivalently written as: $\min G \leq 0$, or $\max G \geq 0$. As shown by Definition 1, a probability assessment is coherent if and only if, in any finite combination of n bets, it does not happen that the values g_1, \dots, g_m are all positive, or all negative (*no Dutch Book*).

Remark 1. Given a probability assessment $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ on a finite family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$, the coherence of \mathcal{P} with Definition 1 means that, for every real numbers s_1, \dots, s_n , the condition $\min G \leq 0 \leq \max G$ is satisfied.

Example 2. Let $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, p_2, p_3) = (0.4, 0.3, 0.8)$ be a probability assessment on $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, E_2, E_3\}$, where $E_1 = A$, $E_2 = B$ and $E_3 = A \vee B$, with A, B logically independent. We show that the assessment \mathcal{P} on \mathcal{F} is incoherent. We set $s_1 = s_2 = -s_3 = 1$. The associated random gain is

$$G = (A - 0.4) + (B - 0.3) - (A \vee B - 0.8).$$

The constituents associated with \mathcal{F} are $C_1 = AB$, $C_2 = A\bar{B}$, $C_3 = \bar{A}B$ and $C_4 = \bar{A}\bar{B}$. The possible values g_1, \dots, g_4 of the random gain G , associated with C_1, \dots, C_4 , are

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= (1 - 0.4) + (1 - 0.3) - (1 - 0.8) = .6 + 0.7 - 0.2 = 1.1, \\ g_2 &= (1 - 0.4) + (-0.3) - (1 - 0.2) = 0.6 - 0.3 - 0.2 = 0.1, \\ g_3 &= (-0.4) + (1 - 0.3) - (1 - 0.2) = -0.4 + 0.7 - 0.2 = 0.1, \\ g_4 &= (0 - 0.4) + (0 - 0.3) + (1 - 0.2) = -0.4 - 0.3 + 0.8 = 0.1. \end{aligned}$$

As the possible value of G are all positive, it follows that \mathcal{P} is incoherent, indeed in this case $P(A \vee B) > P(A) + P(B)$, while coherence requires that $\max\{P(A), P(B)\} \leq P(A \vee B) \leq \min\{P(A) + P(B), 1\}$.

2.2 Penalty Criterion

The notion of coherence can be also defined by exploiting a penalty criterion, which is equivalent to the betting scheme. With the assessment $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ on $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ we associate a random loss $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n (E_i - p_i)^2$, which represents the square of the distance between the (binary) random point $(E_1, \dots, E_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and the prevision point \mathcal{P} . Then, within the *penalty criterion*, we have

Definition 2. *The function P defined on \mathcal{K} is said to be coherent if and only if, for every integer n , for every finite subfamily $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ of \mathcal{K} , denoting by $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ the restriction of P to \mathcal{F} , there does not exist $\mathcal{P}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*)$ such that: $\mathcal{L}^* < \mathcal{L}$, where \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}^* are the losses associated with \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}^* , respectively.*

Geometrical interpretation of coherence. In the probabilistic theory of de Finetti coherence is also characterized by a geometrical interpretation. We represent each constituent C_h by a point $Q_h = (q_{h1}, \dots, q_{hn})$, where (for each index i) $q_{hi} = 1$, or $q_{hi} = 0$, according to whether $C_h \subseteq E_i$, or $C_h \subseteq \bar{E}_i$, respectively. Notice that q_{hi} is nothing but the value assumed by the indicator of E_i when C_h is true. We denote by \mathcal{I} the convex hull of the points Q_1, \dots, Q_m .

Remark 2. Given a probability assessment $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ on a finite family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$, the coherence of \mathcal{P} with Definition 2 means that there does not exist $\mathcal{P}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*)$ such that $\mathcal{L}^* < \mathcal{L}$; coherence of \mathcal{P} is also equivalent to the geometrical condition $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ ([15]).

We will show later (see Remark 4) that

$$\min G \leq 0 \leq \max G \iff \mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}. \tag{1}$$

Thus, by Remarks 1 and 2, in order to determine the set of coherent assessments on \mathcal{F} , Definitions 1 and 2 are equivalent.

We recall that, if the function P defined on \mathcal{K} is coherent, then it satisfies all the basic probabilistic properties. Moreover, it can be extended to a finitely additive probability P' on every algebra \mathcal{A} , with $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$.

3 Coherent conditional probability assessments

A more general situation is represented by the case where we want to assess a conditional probability $P(A|H)$, which represents the degree of belief on the event A , by assuming true the event H (and nothing more). $P(A|H)$ is also called the probability of "A given H", or the probability of the conditional event

$A|H$, where $H \neq \emptyset$.

Notice that a large number of philosophers and psychologists, in their research on conditionals, assume valid the *Equation* (see, e.g., [16,20,64]), or *Conditional Probability Hypothesis (CPH)* ([11,54,59]), by judging that the probability of a conditional "if H then A " coincides with the conditional probability $P(A|H)$.

3.1 Numerical representation of truth values

In the theory of de Finetti ([13]) the conditional event $A|H$ is looked at as a three-valued logical entity, with values *true*, or *false*, or *void*, according to whether AH is true, or $\bar{A}H$ is true, or \bar{H} is true.

What is an appropriate way of defining the indicator of $A|H$, i.e. to represent numerically the truth-values of $A|H$?

We observe that, likewise the unconditional case, the numerical counterparts of *true* and *false* are 1 and 0, respectively. Concerning the third value *void*, in the coherence-based approach of de Finetti ([13], see also [14]) the evaluation of $P(A|H)$ is operatively based on the following *conditional bet*:

(Scheme 1). You evaluate $P(A|H)$, say $P(A|H) = x$, when H is uncertain. After H is verified, the bet has effect and you accept to pay the amount sx in order to bet on A , by receiving s if A is true, or 0 if A is false. In the case where H is not verified the bet has no effect. Within this conditional bet, we can say that *if H then I bet that A* , that is a bet on A conditionally on H being true.

Coherence of the assessment $P(A|H) = x$ is checked by (only) considering the cases where the bet is effective, that is H is verified. The random gain when the bet has effect (i.e., when H true) is $G_H = s(A - x) \in \{s(1 - x), -sx\}$. Then, x is coherent if and only if $\min G_H \leq 0 \leq \max G_H$, that is $x \in [0, 1]$, with $x = 1$, or $x = 0$, when $AH = H$, or $AH = \emptyset$, respectively.

The previous conditional bet can be expressed in the following *equivalent form*: (Scheme 2). If you assess $P(A|H) = x$, then (before knowing the truth value of H) you accept to pay sx , by receiving s if AH is true, or 0 if $\bar{A}H$ is true, or sx if \bar{H} is true (the bet is called off). In this scheme $G = sH(A - x)$, with $G \in \{s(1 - x), -sx, 0\}$ and $G_H \in \{s(1 - x), -sx\}$. By definition, for checking coherence only the cases in which the bet is not called off are considered. Thus, coherence of x amounts to $\min G_H \leq 0 \leq \max G_H$, that is

$$\min \{s(1 - x), -sx\} \leq 0 \leq \max \{s(1 - x), -sx\}.$$

3.2 On the third value of conditional events

Focusing on the numerical counterpart of the logical value *void* we recall that, in a bet on an unconditional event A , you pay for instance $P(A)$ by receiving (the value of the indicator) A . Likewise, in the conditional case you pay for instance $P(A|H)$ by receiving $AH + P(A|H)\bar{H}$, which should represent the indicator of the conditional event. Then, the natural way of defining the indicator of $A|H$

(denoted by the same symbol) is (see, e.g. [35, Section 2.2])

$$A|H = AH + x\bar{H} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } AH \text{ is true,} \\ 0, & \text{if } \bar{A}H \text{ is true,} \\ x, & \text{if } \bar{H} \text{ is true,} \end{cases}$$

where $x = P(A|H)$. Thus, the third value of $A|H$, *void*, in numerical terms is the conditional probability $P(A|H)$. The choice of $P(A|H)$, as third value of the indicator when H is false, has been considered in other works (see e.g. [8,27,45,48,49,50,63]). Notice that, as $P(AH) = P(A|H)P(H)$, denoting by $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ the symbol of prevision, for the random quantity $A|H$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(A|H) = \mathbb{P}(AH + x\bar{H}) = P(AH) + xP(\bar{H}) = x[P(H) + P(\bar{H})] = x = P(A|H).$$

Therefore, the conditional bet proposed by de Finetti can be interpreted as a bet on the conditional event $A|H$, or on the conditional *if H then A* . In this respect, the notions of conditional bet and bet on a conditional coincide. Notice that, by using the indicator $A|H$, the random gain $G = sH(A - x)$ can also be written as $G = s(A|H - x) = s(AH + x\bar{H}) - sx$.

There is a further *equivalent scheme* for assessing $P(A|H)$:

(Scheme 3). Let us consider the random quantity $Y = AH + y\bar{H}$, where by definition y is the prevision of Y . In order to assess y , in the betting framework you agree for instance to pay y , by receiving 1, or 0, or y , according to whether AH is true, or $\bar{A}H$ is true, or \bar{H} is true. For the checking of coherence *you discard all the cases where you receive back the amount y that you paid, whatever y be*, that is you discard the case where \bar{H} is true. When the bet is not called off, the difference $Y - A|H$ is zero, therefore its prevision must be 0, that is $\mathbb{P}(Y - A|H) = y - x = 0$; therefore $y = x = P(A|H)$ and $Y = A|H$. In other words, $A|H$ can also be introduced as the random quantity $AH + y\bar{H}$, under the following conditions: (i) $y = \mathbb{P}(AH + y\bar{H})$; (ii) in order to check coherence the case where you receive back the paid amount y , i.e. \bar{H} true, is discarded. In formal terms, under conditions (i) and (ii), it holds that: $AH + y\bar{H} = (AH + y\bar{H})|H = AH|H + y\bar{H}|H = A|H$.

3.3 Betting Scheme for conditional probability assessments

Given an arbitrary family of conditional events \mathcal{K} , a probability assessment on the events in \mathcal{K} is made by specifying a real function $P : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. For each finite subfamily $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$ of \mathcal{K} , the restriction of P to \mathcal{F} is denoted by $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$, where $p_i = P(E_i|H_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Within the betting scheme, the random gain associated with the single assessment p_i is $G_i = s_i H_i (E_i - p_i) = s_i (E_i | H_i - p_i)$, where s_i is an arbitrary real number. The random gain associated with the assessment \mathcal{P} is $G = \sum_{i=1}^n G_i = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i H_i (E_i - p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i (E_i | H_i - p_i)$, where s_1, \dots, s_n are arbitrary real numbers. The random gain G can be looked at as the difference $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i E_i | H_i - \sum_{i=1}^n s_i p_i$, that is the difference between what you receive, $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i E_i | H_i$, and what you pay, $\sum_{i=1}^n s_i p_i$. We set $\mathcal{H}_n = H_1 \vee \dots \vee H_n$ and we denote by $G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$ the restriction of G to \mathcal{H}_n ,

that is the random gain when at least a bet is not called off. We observe that, by expanding the second member of the equality

$$\Omega = (E_1 H_1 \vee \bar{E}_1 H_1 \vee \bar{H}_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (E_n H_n \vee \bar{E}_n H_n \vee \bar{H}_n),$$

we obtain the disjunction of 3^n conjunctions $A_1 \cdots A_n$, where $A_i \in \{E_i H_i, \bar{E}_i H_i, \bar{H}_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. By discarding the conjunctions which coincide with the impossible event \emptyset , the sure event Ω can be represented as a suitable disjunction $\Omega = C_0 \vee C_1 \cdots \vee C_m$, where C_1, \dots, C_m are the constituents which logically imply \mathcal{H}_n , with $m \leq 3^n - 1$. If $\bar{H}_1 \cdots \bar{H}_n \neq \emptyset$, we denote it by C_0 . When C_0 is true, $G = g_0 = 0$ (all the bets are called off). Notice that, for every $h = 1, \dots, m$, the value g_h of $G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$ associated with the constituent C_h is given by $g_h = \sum_{i: C_h \subseteq E_i H_i} s_i(1 - p_i) - \sum_{i: C_h \subseteq \bar{E}_i H_i} p_i s_i$. We give below the definition of coherence.

Definition 3. *The function P defined on an arbitrary family of conditional events \mathcal{K} is said to be coherent if and only if, for every integer n , for every finite subfamily $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$ of \mathcal{K} and for every real numbers s_1, \dots, s_n , one has: $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$.*

The condition $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$ can be equivalently written as: $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0$, or $\max G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \geq 0$. As shown by Definition 3, a probability assessment is coherent if and only if, in any finite combination of n bets, after discarding the case where all the bets are called off, it does not happen that the values g_1, \dots, g_m of the random gain are all positive, or all negative (*no Dutch Book*).

Remark 3. Given a probability assessment $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ on a finite family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$, differently from the unconditional case (see Remark 1), the condition $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$ is necessary but not sufficient for the coherence of \mathcal{P} , as shown in the next example.

Example 3. Let E_1, E_2, H_1, H_2 be four events, with $E_1 H_1 = \emptyset$, $H_1 \neq \emptyset$, $H_2 \neq \emptyset$, $\bar{H}_1 E_2 H_2 \neq \emptyset$. Given the probability assessment $\mathcal{P} = (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ on $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, E_2|H_2\}$, the random gain is $G = s_1 H_1 (E_1 - \frac{1}{2}) + s_2 H_2 (E_2 - 1)$. We observe that when the constituent $\bar{H}_1 E_2 H_2$ is true, it holds that $G_{\mathcal{H}_2} = s_1 \cdot 0 (E_1 - \frac{1}{2}) + s_2 \cdot 1 (1 - 1) = 0$ for every s_1, s_2 . Thus, the condition $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_2}$ is satisfied. However, the assessment \mathcal{P} is incoherent because the condition $\min G_{H_1} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{H_1}$ associated with the subassessment $P(E_1|H_1) = \frac{1}{2}$ is not satisfied. Indeed, as $E_1 H_1 = \emptyset$, it holds that $G = -\frac{1}{2} s_1$, or $G = 0$, according to whether H_1 is true, or false, respectively. Then $G_{H_1} = -\frac{1}{2} s_1 < 0$ for every $s_1 > 0$.

3.4 On axiomatic conditional probability and coherence

We observe that, given a function P defined on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{H}$, where \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{H} are arbitrary families of events, with $H \neq \emptyset$ for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$, P satisfies the properties of a conditional probability if the following conditions hold.

- (i) $P(E|H) \geq 0$ and $P(H|H) = 1$ for every $E \in \mathcal{B}$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}$;
- (ii) $P[(E_1 \vee E_2)|H] = P(E_1|H) + P(E_2|H)$, if $E_1 E_2 H = \emptyset$, $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, $H \in \mathcal{H}$;
- (iii) $P(EH|K) = P(E|HK)P(H|K)$, for every $E, EH, H \in \mathcal{B}$ and $K, HK \in \mathcal{H}$.

We recall that, if P is coherent, then the properties (i), (ii), and (iii) are satisfied; however, these properties are in general not sufficient for coherence of P . We list below some conditions which, together with (i), (ii), and (iii), imply coherence of P (see, e.g., [8,18,25,28,37,44,56,57,61]):

- (a) \mathcal{B} is a boolean algebra and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{B}^0 = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$;
- (b) \mathcal{B} is a boolean algebra and $\mathcal{H} \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is a subalgebra of \mathcal{B} ;
- (c) \mathcal{B} is a boolean algebra and \mathcal{H} is an additive (or P -quasi additive) subset of $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$;
- (d) \mathcal{B} is a boolean algebra, \mathcal{H} is a nonempty subset of $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, and the following condition is satisfied ([12])

$$\prod_{i=1}^n P(E_i|H_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(E_i|H_{i+1}),$$

where $E_i \in \mathcal{B}$, $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$, $E_i \subseteq H_i H_{i+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $H_{n+1} = H_1$.

When P is coherent, it is called a *conditional probability*. In particular, when \mathcal{B} is an algebra and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{B}^0$, P is said a full conditional probability ([18]). Moreover, if a function P defined on an arbitrary family of conditional events \mathcal{K} is coherent, then it can be extended to a full conditional probability P' defined on $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B}^0 \supseteq \mathcal{K}$.

Geometrical representation of coherence. Let $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$, where $p_i = P(E_i|H_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, a probability assessment on $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$. We represent each constituent C_h by a point $Q_h = (q_{h1}, \dots, q_{hn})$, where (for each index i) $q_{hi} = 1$, or $q_{hi} = 0$, or $q_{hi} = p_i$, according to whether $C_h \subseteq E_i$, or $C_h \subseteq \bar{E}_i$, or $C_h \subseteq \bar{H}_i$, respectively. Notice that q_{hi} is the value assumed by the indicator $E_i|H_i$ when C_h is true; then, the possible values of the random vector $(E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n)$ are the points Q_1, \dots, Q_m, Q_0 , with $Q_0 = \mathcal{P}$. The points Q_h 's were introduced in ([27], see also [26]) with the name of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ -atoms, or generalized constituents. For each constituent C_h , the associated value g_h of the random gain $G = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i(E_i|H_i - p_i)$ is given by $g_h = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i(q_{hi} - p_i) = f(Q_h - \mathcal{P}) = f(Q_h) - f(\mathcal{P})$, where the function f is defined as $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = s_1 x_1 + \dots + s_n x_n$. Notice that, for each constant k , the equation $s_1 x_1 + \dots + s_n x_n = k$ describes an hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n . In particular, \mathcal{P} belongs to the hyperplane $\pi_{\mathcal{P}}$ with equation $s_1 x_1 + \dots + s_n x_n = f(\mathcal{P})$; moreover, each Q_h belongs to the hyperplane π_h with equation $s_1 x_1 + \dots + s_n x_n = f(Q_h)$. We observe that the hyperplanes $\pi_{\mathcal{P}}, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_m$ are parallel. We denote by \mathcal{I} the convex hull Q_1, \dots, Q_m ; then, we distinguish two cases: (i) $\mathcal{P} \notin \mathcal{I}$; (ii) $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$. In the case (i), there exists an hyperplane π^* , parallel to $\pi_{\mathcal{P}}, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_m$, which separates \mathcal{P} from \mathcal{I} and hence

$$f(Q_h) > k^* > f(\mathcal{P}), \quad h = 1, \dots, m, \quad \text{or} \quad f(Q_h) < k^* < f(\mathcal{P}), \quad h = 1, \dots, m.$$

Then

$$g_h = f(Q_h) - f(P) > 0, \quad h = 1, \dots, m, \quad \text{or} \quad g_h = f(Q_h) - f(P) < 0, \quad h = 1, \dots, m,$$

that is $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} > 0$, or $\max G_{\mathcal{H}_n} < 0$. Therefore, the condition $\mathcal{P} \notin \mathcal{I}$ implies that the condition of coherence $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$ is not satisfied.

In the case (ii) there exists a vector $\Lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ such that

$$\mathcal{P} = \sum_{h=1}^m \lambda_h Q_h, \quad \sum_{h=1}^m \lambda_h = 1, \quad \lambda_h \geq 0, \quad h = 1, \dots, m.$$

Then

$$\sum_{h=1}^m \lambda_h g_h = \sum_{h=1}^m \lambda_h [f(Q_h) - f(P)] = \sum_{h=1}^m \lambda_h f(Q_h) - f(P) = f(P) - f(P) = 0,$$

and hence: $\min\{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \leq 0 \leq \max\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$; that is, $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ implies that $\min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_n}$. In conclusion, based on the analysis of cases (i) and (ii), it holds that:

$$\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I} \iff \min G_{\mathcal{H}_n} \leq 0 \leq \max G_{\mathcal{H}_n}. \quad (2)$$

Formula (1) also follows by exploiting a suitable alternative theorem ([24, Theorem 2.9], see also [35, Theorem 1]).

Remark 4. We observe that when $H_i = \Omega$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, it holds that $\mathcal{H}_n = \Omega$. Moreover, all points Q_h 's have binary components, that is $Q_h \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $h = 1, \dots, n$. Then, in the particular case where $H_i = \Omega$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, formula (2) becomes formula (1).

Based on Definition 3 and formula (2) we obtain the following geometrical characterization of coherence.

Theorem 1. *The function P defined on an arbitrary family of conditional events \mathcal{K} is coherent if and only if, for every integer n , for every finite subfamily $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$ of \mathcal{K} , denoting by \mathcal{P} the restriction of P to \mathcal{F} , it holds that $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$.*

The next example illustrates the previous characterization.

Example 4. Given four events A, H, B, K , with $H \neq \emptyset, K \neq \emptyset$, assume that $AH\bar{K} = AH\bar{B}K = \bar{H}\bar{B}K = \bar{A}HBK = \emptyset$. Then, the constituents generated by the family $\mathcal{F} = \{A|H, B|K\}$ are

$$C_0 = \bar{H}\bar{K}, \quad C_1 = AHBK, \quad C_2 = \bar{H}BK, \quad C_3 = \bar{A}H\bar{K}, \quad C_4 = \bar{A}\bar{H}\bar{B}K,$$

and, by setting $P(A|H) = x, P(B|K) = y$, the points Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 are

$$Q_1 = (1, 1), \quad Q_2 = (x, 1), \quad Q_3 = (0, y), \quad Q_4 = (0, 0),$$

with $Q_0 = \mathcal{P} = (x, y)$. First of all we observe that, concerning the sub-assessment x (resp., y) on $A|H$ (resp., $B|K$), the condition $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ reduces to $x \in [0, 1]$ (resp., $y \in [0, 1]$); thus $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$. Given any $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$, the condition $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ is satisfied if and only if $x \leq y$. Indeed, if $x = y + a$, with $a > 0$, the line with equation $x = y + \frac{a}{2}$ separates the \mathcal{P} from the convex hull \mathcal{I} and hence \mathcal{P} is not coherent. On the contrary, if $x \leq y$, then $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$. Then, (x, y) is coherent if and only if $0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1$.

Notice that in Example 4 it holds that $A|H \subseteq B|K$, that is $A|H$ true implies $B|K$ true and $B|K$ false implies $A|H$ false (Goodman-Nguyen inclusion relation between two conditional events).

3.5 Penalty Criterion for conditional probability assessments

The notion of coherence can be also defined by exploiting a penalty criterion, which is equivalent to the betting scheme. With the assessment $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ on $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$ we associate a random loss $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(E_i - p_i)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i - p_i)^2$, which represents the square of the distance between the random point $(E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n) \in \{0, 1, p_i\}^n$ and the prevision point \mathcal{P} . More precisely, denoting by L_h the value of \mathcal{L} associated with the constituent C_h , it holds that $L_h = \overline{\mathcal{P}Q_h}^2$, with $L_0 = \overline{\mathcal{P}Q_0}^2 = 0$. Given another prevision point $\mathcal{P}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*)$, we denote by \mathcal{L}^* the loss associated with \mathcal{P}^* . Then, within the *penalty criterion*, we have

Definition 4. A probability assessment $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ on a family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$ is said to be coherent if and only if there does not exist $\mathcal{P}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*)$ such that: $L_h^* \leq L_h$, for every h , with $L_h^* < L_h$ for at least an index h .

Geometrical interpretation of coherence. Given a probability assessment $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ on a family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$, for each subfamily \mathcal{S} of \mathcal{F} , we denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}$ the sub-assessment of \mathcal{P} on \mathcal{S} and by $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}}$ the convex-hull associated with the pair $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}})$. Then, based on Definition 5, it can be verified that [27, Theorem 4.4]

$$\mathcal{P} \text{ is coherent} \iff \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}}, \forall \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}. \quad (3)$$

The general definition of coherence with the penalty criterion is given below

Definition 5. A function P defined on an arbitrary family of conditional events \mathcal{K} is said to be coherent if and only if, for every integer n , for every subfamily $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, denoting by $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ the restriction of P to \mathcal{F} , there does not exist $\mathcal{P}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*)$ such that: $\mathcal{L}^* \leq \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^* \neq \mathcal{L}$, that is $L_h^* \leq L_h$, for every h , with $L_h^* < L_h$ for at least an index h .

Based on formulas (2) and (3), the notions of coherence with the betting scheme and the penalty criterion are equivalent, because in both cases coherence of the function P on \mathcal{K} amounts to ([26],[27])

$$\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}, \quad \text{for every finite subfamily } \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{K}.$$

We observe that the loss \mathcal{L} can be written as $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_i$, where $\mathcal{L}_i = H_i(E_i - p_i)^2$ is the loss associated with the assessment $P(E_i|H_i) = p_i$. A generalization of Definition 5 is obtained if the loss $H_i(E_i - p_i)^2$ is replaced by $H_i s(E_i, p_i)$, where $s(E_i, p_i)$ is a given (strictly) proper scoring rule. A scoring rule for the probability of a given event E_i is a function of the indicator E_i and of the assessed probability $P(E_i) = p_i$. Assume that you were asked to assert $P(E_i)$, knowing that your assertion were to be scored according to the rule $s(E_i, P(E_i))$; moreover, assume that your degree of belief were $P(E) = p$, while you announced instead some other number $P(E) = x$, in the expectation that you would achieve a “better” score. The rule is said to be proper if you cannot expect a better score by specifying a value x different from p . A score may represent a reward or a penalty; we think of scores as penalties, so that to improve the score means to reduce it. The scoring rule $s(E_i, p_i) = (E_i - p_i)^2$, used in Definition 5, is proper and it is called Brier quadratic scoring rule. Then, we have ([38])

Definition 6. *Let s be a proper scoring rule and P be a function defined on an arbitrary family of conditional events \mathcal{K} . For every integer n , for every subfamily $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, we denote by $\mathcal{P} = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ the restriction of P to \mathcal{F} and by $\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i s(E_i, p_i)$ the score associated with \mathcal{P} . The function P is said to be coherent if and only if, for every $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$, there does not exist $\mathcal{P}^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_n^*)$ such that: $\mathcal{L}^* \leq \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^* \neq \mathcal{L}$, where $\mathcal{L}^* = \sum_{i=1}^n H_i s(E_i, p_i^*)$.*

We denote by Π the set of coherent conditional probability assessments P on K and by Π_s the set of coherent conditional probability associated with the proper scoring rule s . Then, it holds that $\Pi_s = \Pi$, for every (bounded continuous strictly) proper scoring rule s ([38, Theorem 4]).

4 Trivalent logics and compound conditionals

In this section we analyze some notions of conjunctions defined in the setting of trivalent logics, where the conjunction is a conditional event with set of truth values $\{\text{true, false, void}\}$ (see, e.g., [5,7]). We check if they satisfy some basic logic and probabilistic properties. In particular, we examine the following conjunctions: Kleene-Lukasiewicz-Heyting conjunction (\wedge_K), or de Finetti conjunction ([13]); Lukasiewicz conjunction (\wedge_L); Bochvar internal conjunction, or Kleene weak conjunction (\wedge_B); Sobocinski conjunction, or quasi conjunction (\wedge_S).

$$\begin{aligned}
- & (A|H) \wedge_K (B|K) = AHBK|(AHBK \vee \overline{A}H \vee \overline{B}K); \\
- & (A|H) \wedge_L (B|K) = AHBK|(AHBK \vee \overline{A}H \vee \overline{B}K \vee \overline{H}\overline{K}); \\
- & (A|H) \wedge_B (B|K) = AHBK|HK = AB|HK; \\
- & (A|H) \wedge_S (B|K) = [(AH \vee \overline{H}) \wedge (BK \vee \overline{K})|(H \vee K) = \\
& = [(A \vee \overline{H}) \wedge (B \vee \overline{K})|(H \vee K)].
\end{aligned}$$

We recall that, given any conditional event $A|H$, the negation $\overline{A|\overline{H}}$ is defined as $\overline{A|\overline{H}} = \overline{A}|H$. Based on De Morgan’s law we give below the list of disjunctions associated with the previous list of conjunctions.

- $(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)$ is the negation of $(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)$, which coincides with $\overline{AH\bar{B}K} | (\overline{AH\bar{B}K} \vee AH \vee BK)$; then

$$(A|H) \vee_K (B|K) = (AH \vee BK) | (\overline{AH\bar{B}K} \vee AH \vee BK);$$

- $(A|H) \vee_L (B|K)$ is the negation of $(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K)$, which coincides with $\overline{AH\bar{B}K} | (\overline{AH\bar{B}K} \vee AH \vee BK \vee \overline{H\bar{K}})$; then

$$(A|H) \vee_L (B|K) = (AH \vee BK) | (\overline{AH\bar{B}K} \vee AH \vee BK \vee \overline{H\bar{K}});$$

- $(A|H) \vee_B (B|K)$ is the negation of $(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K)$, which coincides with $\overline{A\bar{B}HK} | HK = \overline{A\bar{B}} | HK$; then

$$(A|H) \vee_B (B|K) = (A \vee B) | HK.$$

- $(A|H) \vee_S (B|K)$ is the negation of $(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)$, which coincides with $(AH \vee \overline{H}) \wedge (BK \vee \overline{K}) | (H \vee K)$. Then

$$(A|H) \vee_S (B|K) = (AH \vee BK) | (H \vee K).$$

4.1 Some basic logical properties

We consider some basic logical properties and we check if they are satisfied by the previous notions of conjunction. We start by considering the following property: P1. Given two events A and B it holds that

$$A \subseteq B \iff A \wedge B = A.$$

We replace A and B by the conditional events $A|H$ and $B|K$; moreover we use the Goodman-Nguyen inclusion relation among conditional events defined as ([41, formula (3.18)])

$$A|H \subseteq B|K \iff AH \subseteq BK \text{ and } \bar{B}K \subseteq \bar{A}H.$$

Notice that $A|H \subseteq B|K$ amounts to $AH\bar{B}K = AH\bar{K} = \bar{H}BK = \emptyset$.

We will check the validity of P1 for each $\wedge \in \{\wedge_K, \wedge_L, \wedge_B, \wedge_S\}$, by verifying the equality

$$A|H \subseteq B|K \iff (A|H) \wedge (B|K) = A|H.$$

By considering the conjunction \wedge_K , when $A|H \subseteq B|K$, it holds that $AHBK = AH$ and $\bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K = \bar{A}H$; then,

$$(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K) = AHBK | (AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K) = AH | (AH \vee \bar{A}H) = A|H,$$

and hence $A|H \subseteq B|K \implies (A|H) \wedge_K (B|K) = A|H$.

Conversely, if $(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K) = A|H$, then $A|H \subseteq B|K$ because $AH\bar{B}K = AH\bar{K} = \bar{H}BK = \emptyset$. Therefore \wedge_K satisfies property P1, that is (see also [41, formula (3.17)]),

$$A|H \subseteq B|K \iff (A|H) \wedge_K (B|K) = A|H.$$

Concerning the conjunction \wedge_L , when $A|H \subseteq B|K$, it holds that

$$(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K) = AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}) = AH|(H \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}).$$

We observe that, when $\bar{H}\bar{K}$ is true, $(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)$ is false, while $A|H$ is void; therefore $(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K) \neq A|H$. Thus \wedge_L *does not satisfy* the property P1.

Concerning the conjunction \wedge_B , when $A|H \subseteq B|K$, it holds that

$$(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K) = AHBK|HK = A|HK.$$

We observe that, when $\bar{A}H\bar{K}$ is true, $(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)$ is void, while $A|H$ is false; therefore $(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K) \neq A|H$. Thus \wedge_B *does not satisfy* the property P1.

Concerning the conjunction \wedge_S , when $A|H \subseteq B|K$, it holds that

$$(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K) = (AH \vee \bar{H}BK)|(H \vee K).$$

We observe that, when $\bar{H}BK$ is true, $(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)$ is true, while $A|H$ is void; therefore $(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K) \neq A|H$. Thus \wedge_S *does not satisfy* the property P1.

P2. We now consider the following relation between disjunction and conjunction:

$$A = AB \vee A\bar{B} \quad (4)$$

and, when events are replaced by conditional events, we check its validity in the previous trivalent logics. We also observe that the previous equality is related to the distributivity property, because

$$A = A \wedge \Omega = A \wedge (B \vee \bar{B}) = AB \vee A\bar{B}.$$

We will also examine this aspect, when replacing A and B by $A|H$ and $B|K$; in each trivalent logic, associated to a pair (\wedge, \vee) , we will check the validity of the relations

$$A|H = [(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] \vee [(A|H) \wedge (\bar{B}|K)], \quad (5)$$

$$A|H = (A|H) \wedge (K|K), \quad (6)$$

$$(A|H) \wedge [(B|K) \vee (\bar{B}|K)] = [(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] \vee [(A|H) \wedge (\bar{B}|K)]. \quad (7)$$

Concerning \wedge_K and \vee_K , we have to check if it holds that

$$(A|H) = [(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K)] \vee_K [(A|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)].$$

We observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K) = AH\bar{B}K|(AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H \vee BK).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & [(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K)] \vee_K [(A|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)] = \\ & = [AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K)] \vee_K [AH\bar{B}K|(AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H \vee BK)] = \\ & = (AHBK \vee AH\bar{B}K)|(AHBK \vee AH\bar{B}K \vee (\bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K) \wedge (\bar{A}H \vee BK)) = \\ & = AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H) \neq A|H, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

because, for instance, when $AH\bar{K}$ is true, $AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H)$ is void, while $A|H$ is true. Thus, formula (5) *is not satisfied* by \wedge_K and \vee_K . Concerning formula (6), we observe that *it is not satisfied*; indeed

$$(A|H) \wedge_K (K|K) = AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H) \neq A|H,$$

as shown in (8) (notice that $(A|H) \wedge_K (H|H) = A|H$). Concerning formula (7), we observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_K [(B|K) \vee_K (\bar{B}|K)] = (A|H) \wedge_K (\Omega|K) = AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H),$$

which, by recalling (8), coincides with

$$[(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K)] \vee_K [(A|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)].$$

Then, formula (7) *is satisfied* by \wedge_K and \vee_K .

Concerning \wedge_L and \vee_L , we have to check if it holds that

$$(A|H) = [(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)] \vee_L [(A|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K)].$$

We observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K) = AH\bar{B}K|(AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H \vee BK \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}).$$

Then, as it can be verified,

$$\begin{aligned} & [(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)] \vee_L [(A|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K)] = \\ & = [AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K \vee \bar{H}\bar{K})] \vee_L [AH\bar{B}K|(AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H \vee BK \vee \bar{H}\bar{K})] = \\ & = \dots = AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{H}\bar{K} \vee AH\bar{K}) = AHK|(H \vee \bar{K}) \neq A|H, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

because, for instance, when $AH\bar{K}$ is true, $AHK|(H \vee \bar{K})$ is false, while $A|H$ is true. Thus, formula (5) *is not satisfied* by \wedge_L and \vee_L .

Concerning formula (6), we observe that *it is not satisfied*; indeed

$$(A|H) \wedge_L (K|K) = AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}) \neq A|H,$$

because, when $AH\bar{K}$ is true, $A|H$ is true, while $AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{H}\bar{K})$ is void (notice that $(A|H) \wedge_L (H|H) = AH \neq A|H$; more in general $(A|H) \wedge_L (B|H) = ABH$, in particular $(A|H) \wedge_L (A|H) = AH$; thus $(A|H) \wedge_L (A|H) \neq A|H$). Concerning formula (7), we observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_L [(B|K) \vee_L (\bar{B}|K)] = (A|H) \wedge_L (\Omega|K) = AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}),$$

which, by recalling (9), does not coincide with

$$[(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)] \vee_L [(A|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K)] = AHK|(H \vee \bar{K}),$$

because, for instance, when $AH\bar{K}$ is true, $AHK|(H \vee \bar{K})$ is false, while $AHK|(AHK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{H}\bar{K})$ is void. Then, formula (7) *is not satisfied* by \wedge_L

and \vee_L .

Concerning \wedge_B and \vee_B , we have to check if it holds that

$$(A|H) = [(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)] \vee_B [(A|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K)].$$

We observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K) = AB|HK, \quad (A|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K) = A\bar{B}|HK.$$

Then

$$[(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)] \vee_B [(A|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K)] = (AB \vee A\bar{B})|HK = A|HK \neq A|H, \quad (10)$$

because, for instance, when $AH\bar{K}$ is true, $A|HK$ is void, while $A|H$ is true. Thus, formula (5) *is not satisfied* by \wedge_B and \vee_B .

Concerning formula (6), we observe that *it is not satisfied*; indeed

$$(A|H) \wedge_B (K|K) = A|HK \neq A|H,$$

as shown in (10) (notice that $(A|H) \wedge_B (H|H) = A|H$; more in general $(A|H) \wedge_B (B|H) = AB|H$). Concerning formula (7), we observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_B [(B|K) \vee_B (\bar{B}|K)] = (A|H) \wedge_B (\Omega|K) = A|HK,$$

which, by recalling (10), coincides with

$$[(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)] \vee_B [(A|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K)].$$

Then, formula (7) *is satisfied* by \wedge_B and \vee_B .

Concerning \wedge_S and \vee_S , we have to check if it holds that

$$(A|H) = [(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)] \vee_S [(A|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)].$$

We observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K) = (AHBK \vee AH\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}BK)|(H \vee K),$$

and

$$(A|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K) = (AH\bar{B}K \vee AH\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}\bar{B}K)|(H \vee K).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} [(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)] \vee_S [(A|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)] &= (AH \vee \bar{H}K)|(H \vee K) = \\ &= (A \vee \bar{H})|(H \vee K) \neq A|H, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

because, for instance, when $\bar{H}K$ is true, $(A \vee \bar{H})|(H \vee K)$ is true, while $A|H$ is void. Thus, formula (5) *is not satisfied* by \wedge_S and \vee_S .

Concerning formula (6), we observe that *it is not satisfied*; indeed

$$(A|H) \wedge_S (K|K) = (A \vee \bar{H})|(H \vee K) \neq A|H,$$

as shown in (11). (notice that $(A|H) \wedge_S (H|H) = A|H$; more in general $(A|H) \wedge_S (B|H) = AB|H$). Concerning formula (7), we observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge_S [(B|K) \vee_S (\bar{B}|K)] = (A|H) \wedge_S (K|K) = (A \vee \bar{H})|(H \vee K),$$

which, by recalling (11), coincides with

$$[(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)] \vee_S [(A|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)].$$

Then, formula (7) *is satisfied* by \wedge_S and \vee_S .

P3. We now consider the following relation between disjunction and conjunction:

$$A \vee B = A \vee \bar{A}B = B \vee A\bar{B}$$

We observe that, in logical terms, the relation $A \vee B = A + B - AB$ is equivalent to $A \vee B = A \vee \bar{A}B = B \vee A\bar{B}$; we will check this kind of property.

Concerning the conjunction \wedge_K and disjunction \vee_K , we have to check if it holds that

$$(A|H) \vee_K (B|K) = (A|H) \vee_K [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_K (B|K)].$$

We observe that

$$(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_K (B|K) = \bar{A}HBK|(\bar{A}HBK \vee AH \vee \bar{B}K);$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} (A|H) \vee_K [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_K (B|K)] &= (A|H) \vee_K \bar{A}HBK|(\bar{A}HBK \vee AH \vee \bar{B}K) = \\ &= (AH \vee \bar{A}HBK)|(AH \vee \bar{A}HK). \end{aligned}$$

We observe that, when $\bar{H}BK$ is true, $(AH \vee \bar{A}HBK)|(AH \vee \bar{A}HBK \vee \bar{A}H\bar{B}K)$ is void, while $(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)$ is true; therefore

$$(A|H) \vee_K (B|K) \neq (A|H) \vee_K [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_K (B|K)].$$

By a similar reasoning, it can be verified that

$$(A|H) \vee_K (B|K) \neq (B|K) \vee_K [(A|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)].$$

Indeed,

$$(A|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K) = AH\bar{B}K|(AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H \vee BK),$$

and

$$(B|K) \vee_K [(A|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)] = (BK \vee AH\bar{B}K)|(BK \vee AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H\bar{B}K).$$

Then, when $AH\bar{K}$ is true, $(BK \vee AH\bar{B}K)|(BK \vee AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H\bar{B}K)$ is void, while $(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)$ is true. Thus, \vee_K and \wedge_K *do not satisfy* the property P3.

Concerning the conjunction \wedge_L and disjunction \vee_L , we have to check if it holds that

$$(A|H) \vee_L (B|K) = (A|H) \vee_L [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_L (B|K)].$$

We observe that

$$(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_L (B|K) = \bar{A}HBK | (\bar{A}HBK \vee AH \vee \bar{B}K \vee \bar{H}\bar{K});$$

moreover, it can be verified that

$$(A|H) \vee_L [(\bar{A}HBK | (\bar{A}HBK \vee AH \vee \bar{B}K \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}))] = (AH \vee \bar{A}HBK) | (\bar{A}HK \vee AH \vee \bar{H}BK).$$

Then, when $\bar{H}BK$ is true, $(AH \vee \bar{A}HBK) | (\bar{A}HK \vee AH \vee \bar{H}BK)$ is false, while $(A|H) \vee_L (B|K)$ is true. Therefore

$$(A|H) \vee_L (B|K) \neq (A|H) \vee_L [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_L (B|K)].$$

By a similar reasoning, it can be verified that

$$(A|H) \vee_L (B|K) \neq (B|K) \vee_L [(A|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K)].$$

Indeed,

$$(A|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K) = AH\bar{B}K | (AH\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H \vee BK \vee \bar{H}\bar{K});$$

moreover, it can be verified that

$$(B|K) \vee_L [(A|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K)] = (BK \vee AH\bar{B}K) | (H\bar{B}K \vee BK \vee AH\bar{K}).$$

Then, when $AH\bar{K}$ is true, $(BK \vee AH\bar{B}K) | (H\bar{B}K \vee BK \vee AH\bar{K})$ is false, while $(A|H) \vee_L (B|K)$ is true. Thus, \vee_L and \wedge_L *do not satisfy* the property P3.

Concerning the conjunction \wedge_B and disjunction \vee_B , by recalling that $(A|H) \vee_B (B|K) = (A \vee B) | HK$, it holds that

$$(A|H) \vee_B (B|K) = (A|H) \vee_B [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_B (B|K)].$$

Indeed, $(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_B (B|K) = \bar{A}B | HK$; moreover

$$(A|H) \vee_B [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_B (B|K)] = (A|H) \vee_B (\bar{A}B | HK) = (A \vee \bar{A}B) | HK = (A \vee B) | HK.$$

By a similar reasoning, it holds that

$$(A|H) \vee_B (B|K) = (B|K) \vee_B [(A|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K)].$$

Indeed, $(A|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K) = A\bar{B} | HK$; moreover

$$(B|K) \vee_B [(A|H) \wedge_B (\bar{B}|K)] = (B|K) \vee_B (A\bar{B} | HK) = (B \vee A\bar{B}) | HK = (A \vee B) | HK.$$

Thus, \vee_B and \wedge_B *satisfy* the property P3.

Concerning the conjunction \wedge_S and disjunction \vee_S , we have to check if it holds that

$$(A|H) \vee_S (B|K) = (A|H) \vee_S [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_S (B|K)].$$

We observe that

$$(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_S (B|K) = [(\bar{A} \vee \bar{H})(B \vee \bar{K})] | (H \vee K) = (\bar{A}\bar{B} \vee \bar{A}\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}B) | (H \vee K);$$

moreover,

$$(A|H) \vee_S [(\bar{A}\bar{B} \vee \bar{A}\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}B)|(H \vee K)] = (AH \vee \bar{A}BH \vee \bar{A}BK \vee \bar{A}\bar{H}\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}BK)|(H \vee K).$$

When $\bar{A}\bar{H}\bar{K}$ is true, $(AH \vee \bar{A}BH \vee \bar{A}BK \vee \bar{A}\bar{H}\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}BK)|(H \vee K)$ is true, while $(A|H) \vee_S (B|K)$ is false. Therefore

$$(A|H) \vee_S (B|K) \neq (A|H) \vee_S [(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)].$$

By a similar reasoning, it can be verified that

$$(A|H) \vee_S (B|K) \neq (B|K) \vee_S [(A|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)].$$

Indeed,

$$(A|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K) = [(A \vee \bar{H})(\bar{B} \vee \bar{K})|(H \vee K)] = (A\bar{B} \vee A\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}\bar{B})|(H \vee K);$$

moreover, it can be verified that

$$(B|K) \vee_S [(A|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)] = (AH \vee BK \vee \bar{H}\bar{K})|(H \vee K).$$

When $\bar{H}\bar{B}\bar{K}$ is true, $(AH \vee BK \vee \bar{H}\bar{K})|(H \vee K)$ is true, while $(A|H) \vee_S (B|K)$ is false. Thus, \vee_S and \wedge_S *do not satisfy* the property P3.

4.2 Some basic probabilistic properties

We consider some basic probabilistic properties and we check if they are satisfied by the previous notions of conjunction. We consider the following properties, which are valid for unconditional events:

P4. $P(AB) \leq P(A), \quad P(A \vee B) \geq P(A);$

P5. $P(A \vee B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(AB);$

P6. $\max\{P(A) + P(B) - 1, 0\} \leq P(AB) \leq \min\{P(A), P(B)\}.$

We replace A and B by the conditional events $A|H$ and $B|K$; then we check the validity of the properties P4, P5, P6, when using the conjunctions $\wedge_K, \wedge_L, \wedge_B, \wedge_S$ and disjunctions $\vee_K, \vee_L, \vee_B, \vee_S$.

P4. Concerning \wedge_K and \vee_K , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K)] \leq P(A|H), \quad P[(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)] \geq P(A|H). \quad (12)$$

We recall that

$$(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K) = AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}\bar{H} \vee \bar{B}\bar{K}).$$

We set $P(A|H) = x, P[AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}\bar{H} \vee \bar{B}\bar{K})] = y$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1$. We can refer to the partition with constituents: $C_0 = \bar{H}\bar{B}\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}$, $C_1 = AHBK, C_2 = AH\bar{B}\bar{K}, C_3 = AH\bar{K}\bar{K}, C_4 = \bar{A}\bar{H}, C_5 = \bar{H}\bar{B}\bar{K}$, and associated points: $Q_0 = \mathcal{P} = (x, y), Q_1 = (1, 1), Q_2 = (1, 0), Q_3 = (1, y), Q_4 = (0, 0), Q_5 = (x, 0)$. The convex hull \mathcal{I} of Q_1, \dots, Q_5 is the triangle with

vertices Q_1, Q_2, Q_4 and, in order $\mathcal{P} = (x, y)$ be coherent, it must be $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$, that is $y \leq x$. Indeed, this inequality also follows from the inclusion relation

$$AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K) \subseteq A|H.$$

Moreover, as $(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)$ is the negation of $(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)$, it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)] = 1 - P[(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|K)] \geq 1 - P(\bar{A}|H) = P(A|H).$$

Thus, the property P4 *is satisfied* by \wedge_K and \vee_K .

Concerning \wedge_L and \vee_L , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)] \leq P(A|H), \quad P[(A|H) \vee_L (B|K)] \geq P(A|H). \quad (13)$$

We recall that

$$(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K) = AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}).$$

We set $P(A|H) = x$, $P[AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K \vee \bar{H}\bar{K})] = y$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1$. We can refer to the partition with constituents: $C_0 = \bar{H}\bar{B}\bar{K}$, $C_1 = AHBK$, $C_2 = AH\bar{B}\bar{K}$, $C_3 = AH\bar{K}$, $C_4 = \bar{A}H$, $C_5 = \bar{H}\bar{B}\bar{K} \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}$. The points Q_h 's are the same as for the pair (\wedge_K, \vee_K) and hence $\mathcal{P} = (x, y)$ is coherent if and only if $y \leq x$. Indeed, also in this case the inclusion relation holds, that is

$$AHBK|(AHBK \vee \bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K \vee \bar{H}\bar{K}) \subseteq A|H.$$

Moreover

$$P[(A|H) \vee_L (B|K)] = 1 - P[(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_L (\bar{B}|K)] \geq 1 - P(\bar{A}|H) = P(A|H).$$

Thus, the property P4 *is satisfied* by \wedge_L and \vee_L .

Concerning \wedge_B and \vee_B , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)] \leq P(A|H), \quad P[(A|H) \vee_B (B|K)] \geq P(A|H). \quad (14)$$

We recall that $(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K) = AB|HK$ and we set $P(A|H) = x$, $P(AB|HK) = y$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1$. We can refer to the partition with constituents: $C_0 = \bar{H}$, $C_1 = AHBK$, $C_2 = AH\bar{B}\bar{K}$, $C_3 = AH\bar{K}$, $C_4 = \bar{A}H\bar{K}$, $C_5 = \bar{A}H\bar{K}$, and associated points: $Q_0 = \mathcal{P} = (x, y)$, $Q_1 = (1, 1)$, $Q_2 = (1, 0)$, $Q_3 = (1, y)$, $Q_4 = (0, 0)$, $Q_5 = (0, y)$. The convex hull \mathcal{I} of Q_1, \dots, Q_5 is the polygon with vertices Q_1, Q_2, Q_4, Q_5 and the condition $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ is satisfied for every $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$. In other words, the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, AB|HK\}$ is coherent, for every $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$; indeed $AB|HK \not\subseteq A|H$. Moreover, as $(A|H) \vee_B (B|K) = (A \vee B)|HK$, if we set $P(A|H) = x$ and $P[(A \vee B)|HK] = z$, we can refer to the partition with constituents: $C_0 = \bar{H}$, $C_1 = AHK$, $C_2 = AH\bar{K}$, $C_3 = \bar{A}H\bar{B}\bar{K}$, $C_4 = \bar{A}HBK$, $C_5 = \bar{A}H\bar{K}$, and associated points: $Q_0 = \mathcal{P} = (x, z)$, $Q_1 = (1, 1)$, $Q_2 = (1, z)$, $Q_3 = (0, 0)$, $Q_4 = (0, 1)$, $Q_5 = (0, z)$. The convex hull \mathcal{I} is the polygon with vertices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 and

the condition $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ is satisfied for every $(x, z) \in [0, 1]^2$. In other words, the assessment (x, z) on $\{A|H, (A \vee B)|HK\}$ is coherent, for every $(x, z) \in [0, 1]^2$; indeed $A|K \not\subseteq (A \vee B)|H$. Thus, the property P4 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_B and \vee_B . Concerning \wedge_S and \vee_S , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)] \leq P(A|H), \quad P[(A|H) \vee_S (B|K)] \geq P(A|H). \quad (15)$$

We recall that $(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K) = (AH \vee \bar{H})(BK \vee \bar{K})|(H \vee K)$ and we set $P(A|H) = x, P[(AH \vee \bar{H})(BK \vee \bar{K})|(H \vee K)] = y$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1$. We can refer to the partition with constituents: $C_0 = \bar{H}\bar{K}, C_1 = AHBK \vee AH\bar{K}, C_2 = AH\bar{B}K, C_3 = \bar{A}H, C_4 = \bar{H}BK, C_5 = \bar{H}\bar{B}K$, and associated points: $Q_0 = \mathcal{P} = (x, y), Q_1 = (1, 1), Q_2 = (1, 0), Q_3 = (0, 0), Q_4 = (x, 1), Q_5 = (x, 0)$. The convex hull \mathcal{I} of Q_1, \dots, Q_5 is the polygon with vertices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 and the condition $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ is satisfied for every $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$. In other words, the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, (AH \vee \bar{H})(BK \vee \bar{K})|(H \vee K)\}$ is coherent, for every $(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2$; indeed $(AH \vee \bar{H})(BK \vee \bar{K})|(H \vee K) \not\subseteq A|H$. Moreover, as $(A|H) \vee_S (B|K) = (AH \vee BK)|(H \vee K)$, if we set $P(A|H) = x$ and $P[(AH \vee BK)|(H \vee K)] = z$, we can refer to the partition with constituents: $C_0 = \bar{H}\bar{K}, C_1 = AH, C_2 = \bar{A}HBK, C_3 = \bar{A}\bar{H}\bar{B}K \vee \bar{A}H\bar{K}, C_4 = \bar{H}BK, C_5 = \bar{H}\bar{B}K$, and associated points: $Q_0 = \mathcal{P} = (x, z), Q_1 = (1, 1), Q_2 = (1, 0), Q_3 = (0, 0), Q_4 = (x, 1), Q_5 = (x, 0)$. The convex hull \mathcal{I} is the polygon with vertices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 and the condition $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{I}$ is satisfied for every $(x, z) \in [0, 1]^2$. In other words, the assessment (x, z) on $\{A|H, (AH \vee BK)|(H \vee K)\}$ is coherent, for every $(x, z) \in [0, 1]^2$; indeed $A|H \not\subseteq (AH \vee BK)|(H \vee K)$. Thus, the property P4 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_S and \vee_S .

P5. Concerning \wedge_K and \vee_K , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)] = P(A|H) + P(B|K) - P[(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K)], \quad (16)$$

under logical independence of A, H, B, K . We set $P(A|H) = x, P(B|K) = y, P[(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K)] = z$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1, 0 \leq z \leq 1$. Moreover, we recall ([58, Theorem 3]) that z is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z' \leq z \leq z''$, with $z' = 0, z'' = \min\{x, y\}$, and hence the assessment $(x, y, z) = (1, 1, 0)$ is coherent. As a Then, from (16) it would follow

$$P[(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)] = 1 + 1 - 0 = 2,$$

which is incoherent. Actually, in this case $P[(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)] = 1$. Indeed, as $P(\bar{A}|\bar{H}) = P(\bar{B}|\bar{K}) = 0$ the unique coherent extension on $(\bar{A}|\bar{H}) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|\bar{K})$ is $P((\bar{A}|\bar{H}) \wedge_K (\bar{B}|\bar{K})) = 0$. As a consequence, by De Morgan Law the unique coherent extension on $(A|H) \vee_K (B|K)$ is $P((A|H) \vee_K (B|K)) = 1$. Thus, the property P5 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_K, \vee_K .

Concerning \wedge_L and \vee_L , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \vee_L (B|K)] = P(A|H) + P(B|K) - P[(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)], \quad (17)$$

under logical independence of A, H, B, K . We set $P(A|H) = x, P(B|K) = y, P[(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)] = z$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1, 0 \leq z \leq 1$. Moreover, we

recall ([58, Theorem 4]) that z is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z' \leq z \leq z''$, with $z' = 0$, $z'' = \min\{x, y\}$, and hence the assessment $(x, y, z) = (1, 1, 0)$ is coherent. Then, as for the pair (\wedge_K, \vee_k) , the property P5 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_L, \vee_L .

Concerning \wedge_B and \vee_B , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \vee_B (B|K)] = P(A|H) + P(B|K) - P[(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)], \quad (18)$$

under logical independence of A, H, B, K . We set $P(A|H) = x$, $P(B|K) = y$, $P[(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)] = z$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1, 0 \leq z \leq 1$. Moreover, we recall ([58, Theorem 5]) that z is a coherent extension of (x, y) for every $z \in [0, 1]$, and hence the assessment $(x, y, z) = (1, 1, 0)$ is coherent. Then, as for the pair (\wedge_K, \vee_k) , the property P5 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_B, \vee_B .

Concerning \wedge_S and \vee_S , we have to check if it holds that

$$P[(A|H) \vee_S (B|K)] = P(A|H) + P(B|K) - P[(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)], \quad (19)$$

under logical independence of A, H, B, K . We set $P(A|H) = x$, $P(B|K) = y$, $P[(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)] = z$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1, 0 \leq z \leq 1$. Moreover, we recall ([30]) that z is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z' \leq z \leq z''$, with

$$z' = \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}, \quad z'' = \begin{cases} \frac{x+y-2xy}{1-xy}, & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (1, 1), \\ 1, & \text{if } (x, y) = (1, 1). \end{cases}$$

Then, the assessment $P[(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)] = w$ is a coherent extension of the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$ if and only if $\nu' \leq w \leq \nu''$, with

$$\nu' = \max\{1 - x + 1 - y - 1, 0\} = \max\{1 - x - y, 0\},$$

and

$$\nu'' = \begin{cases} \frac{1-x+1-y-2(1-x)(1-y)}{1-(1-x)(1-y)}, & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (0, 0), \\ 1, & \text{if } (x, y) = (0, 0), \end{cases} = \begin{cases} \frac{x+y-2xy}{x+y-xy}, & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (0, 0), \\ 1, & \text{if } (x, y) = (0, 0). \end{cases}$$

In particular, when $x = y = \frac{2}{3}$, we obtain $\nu' = 0, \nu'' = \frac{1}{2}$; then, the assessment $(x, y, w) = (\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ is coherent; moreover, as

$$P[(A|H) \vee_S (B|K)] = 1 - P[(\bar{A}|H) \wedge_S (\bar{B}|K)],$$

it follows that

$$P[(A|H) \vee_S (B|K)] = 1 - \frac{1}{3} = \frac{2}{3} \neq \frac{2}{3} + \frac{2}{3} - \frac{1}{3} = 1 = P(A|H) + P(B|K) - P[(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)].$$

Thus, the property P5 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_S, \vee_S .

P6. Concerning \wedge_K , we have to check if it holds that

$$\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} \leq z \leq \min\{x, y\}, \quad (20)$$

where $x = P(A|H), y = P(B|K), z = P[(A|H) \wedge_K (B|K)]$. Based on ([58, Theorem 3]), z is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z' \leq z \leq z''$, with $z' = 0, z'' = \min\{x, y\}$. As $z' \neq \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}$, the property P6 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_K .

Concerning \wedge_L , we have to check if it holds that

$$\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} \leq z \leq \min\{x, y\}, \quad (21)$$

where $x = P(A|H), y = P(B|K), z = P[(A|H) \wedge_L (B|K)]$. Based on ([58, Theorem 4]), z is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z' \leq z \leq z''$, with $z' = 0, z'' = \min\{x, y\}$. As $z' \neq \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}$, the property P6 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_L .

Concerning \wedge_B , we have to check if it holds that

$$\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} \leq z \leq \min\{x, y\}, \quad (22)$$

where $x = P(A|H), y = P(B|K), z = P[(A|H) \wedge_B (B|K)]$. Based on ([58, Theorem 5]), z is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z' \leq z \leq z''$, with $z' = 0, z'' = 1$. As $z' \neq \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}$ and $z'' \neq \min\{x, y\}$, the property P6 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_B .

Concerning \wedge_S , we have to check if it holds that

$$\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} \leq z \leq \min\{x, y\}, \quad (23)$$

where $x = P(A|H), y = P(B|K), z = P[(A|H) \wedge_S (B|K)]$. We recall ([30]) that z is a coherent extension of (x, y) if and only if $z' \leq z \leq z''$, with

$$z' = \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}, \quad z'' = \begin{cases} \frac{x+y-2xy}{1-xy}, & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (1, 1), \\ 1, & \text{if } (x, y) = (1, 1). \end{cases}$$

As $z'' \neq \min\{x, y\}$, the property P6 *is not satisfied* by \wedge_S .

Remark 5. Notice that, given the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$, the lower and upper bounds on the disjunction can be obtained by exploiting De Morgan Law and the lower and upper bounds on the conjunction of $\bar{A}|H$ and $\bar{B}|K$, that is

$$P[(A|H) \vee (B|K)] = 1 - P[(\bar{A}|H) \wedge (\bar{B}|K)].$$

In Table 1 are given the intervals of coherent extensions of the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$ to their conjunctions and disjunctions. As shown in Table 1 the Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds for the disjunction (i.e., $[\max\{x, y\}, \min\{x + y, 1\}]$) *are not satisfied* by $\vee_K, \vee_L, \vee_B, \vee_S$.

In Table 2 we list the basic properties from P1 to P6 and, for each pair of logical operations, we insert the symbol * if the property is satisfied by the pair.

Logical operations	Intervals of coherent extensions
\wedge_K	$[0, \min\{x, y\}]$
\vee_K	$[\max\{x, y\}, 1]$
\wedge_L	$[0, \min\{x, y\}]$
\vee_L	$[\max\{x, y\}, 1]$
\wedge_B	$[0, 1]$
\vee_B	$[0, 1]$
\wedge_S	$\left[\max\{x + y - 1, 0\}, \begin{cases} \frac{x+y-2xy}{1-xy}, & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (1, 1) \\ 1, & \text{if } (x, y) = (1, 1) \end{cases} \right]$
\vee_S	$\left[\begin{cases} \frac{xy}{x+y-xy}, & \text{if } (x, y) \neq (0, 0) \\ 0, & \text{if } (x, y) = (0, 0) \end{cases}, \min\{x + y, 1\} \right]$
\wedge_{gs}	$[\max\{x + y - 1, 0\}, \min\{x, y\}]$
\vee_{gs}	$[\max\{x, y\}, \min\{x + y, 1\}]$

Table 1. Intervals of coherent extensions of the assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$ to their conjunctions $\wedge_K, \wedge_L, \wedge_B, \wedge_S, \wedge_{gs}$ and their disjunctions $\vee_K, \vee_L, \vee_B, \vee_S, \vee_{gs}$. The symbols \wedge_{gs} and \vee_{gs} refer to conjunction and disjunction illustrated in Section 5.

	Properties	\wedge_K	\wedge_L	\wedge_B	\wedge_S	\wedge_{gs}
		\vee_K	\vee_L	\vee_B	\vee_S	\vee_{gs}
P1	$\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2 \iff \mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C}_1$	*				*
P2	$\mathcal{C}_1 = (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) \vee (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)$					*
	$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C} \wedge (K K)$					*
	$\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge (\mathcal{C}_2 \vee \mathcal{C}_2) = (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) \vee (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)$	*		*	*	*
P3	$\mathcal{C}_1 \vee \mathcal{C}_2 = \mathcal{C}_1 \vee (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) = \mathcal{C}_2 \vee (\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2)$			*		*
P4	$z \leq x \leq w, z \leq y \leq w$	*	*			*
P5	$w = x + y - z$					*
P6	$\max\{x + y - 1, 0\} \leq z \leq \min\{x, y\}$					*
	$\max\{x, y\} \leq w \leq \min\{x + y, 1\}$					*

Table 2. Properties P1—P6 and pairs of logical operations. The symbol * means that the pair satisfies the property. The symbols $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}_1,$ and \mathcal{C}_2 denote conditional events. $P(\mathcal{C}_1) = x, P(\mathcal{C}_2) = y, P(\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \mathcal{C}_2) = z, P(\mathcal{C}_1 \vee \mathcal{C}_2) = w$. For the pair of logical operations (\wedge_{gs}, \vee_{gs}) , illustrated in Section 5, the symbols z and w are the *previsions* of $\mathcal{C}_1 \wedge_{gs} \mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}_1 \vee_{gs} \mathcal{C}_2$, respectively.

5 The conjunction and disjunction in the setting of conditional random quantities

In this section we illustrate the notions of conjunction \wedge_{gs} and disjunction \vee_{gs} , here simply denoted by \wedge and \vee , introduced in the setting of coherence by Gilio and Sanfilippo (see, e.g., [32,33,34,36]). This approach can be related to some works by McGee ([50]) and Kaufman([46]). First of all, we observe that in probabilistic reasoning, as well as in real applications, two main aspects are: (i) the

checking of consistency, or coherence, of probability assessments; (ii) the coherent extension of given initial assessments to further conditional events and/or random quantities. In both these aspects we need to suitably represent in numerical terms the truth values of conditional events. As shown in previous sections, for a conditional event $A|H$ the natural representation of the logical values true, false, void is 1, 0, $P(A|H)$, respectively; this allows to implement useful procedures and algorithms for checking coherence. In addition, by representing the constituents C_h 's by the points Q_h 's, we can develop a geometrical approach to coherence for both the betting scheme and the penalty criterion, as made by de Finetti in the case of unconditional events and random quantities. Based on this motivations, in our approach the notion of conjunction (as well as of disjunction) of two conditional events $A|H$ and $B|K$, $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$, is directly defined as a suitable five-valued conditional random quantity. This numerical approach allows to distinguish three different levels of indeterminacy: (a) H true and K false; (b) H false and K true; (c) H and K both false. More precisely, the value of $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$ is 1, or 0, or $P(A|H)$, or $P(B|K)$, or $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]$ (the prevision of the conjunction), according to whether $AHBK$ is true, or $\bar{A}H \vee \bar{B}K$ is true, or $\bar{H}BK$, or $AH\bar{K}$ is true, or $\bar{H}\bar{K}$ is true, respectively. Within the betting scheme, by starting with a coherent assessment (x, y) on $\{A|H, B|K\}$, if you extend (x, y) (in a coherent way) by adding the assessment $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = z$, then you agree for instance to pay z , by receiving the random amount

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = AHBK + x\bar{H}BK + yAH\bar{K} + z\bar{H}\bar{K} \in \{1, 0, x, y, z\}.$$

Notice that when $\bar{H}\bar{K}$ is true you receive back the paid amount z , then this case must be discarded when checking the coherence of z . Moreover, by recalling the reasoning in Section 3.2 on Scheme 3, the conjunction is a conditional random quantity, as written below.

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) = (AHBK + x\bar{H}BK + yAH\bar{K})|(H \vee K), \quad (24)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] &= \mathbb{P}[(AHBK + x\bar{H}BK + yAH\bar{K})|(H \vee K)] = \\ &= P[AHBK|(H \vee K)] + xP[\bar{H}BK|(H \vee K)] + yP[AH\bar{K}|(H \vee K)]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

More in general, in order to check coherence of any given assessment (x, y, z) on $\{A|H, B|K, (A|H) \wedge (B|K)\}$, we could exploit a suitable version of Theorem 1 for conditional random quantities (see, e.g., [34, Theorem 1]).

Notice that, when $P(H \vee K) > 0$, formula (25) becomes

$$\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = \frac{P(AHBK) + P(A|H)P(\bar{H}BK) + P(B|K)P(AH\bar{K})}{P(H \vee K)}, \quad (26)$$

which is the formula given in [46,50]. In addition, if A, B, H, K are stochastically independent, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &P(AHBK) + P(A|H)P(\bar{H}BK) + P(B|K)P(AH\bar{K}) = \\ &= P(A)P(B)P(H)P(K) + P(A)P(B)P(\bar{H})P(K) + P(A)P(B)P(H)P(\bar{K}) = \\ &= P(A)P(B)P(H \vee K), \end{aligned}$$

and hence formula (26) reduces to $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] = P(A)P(B)$.

By a dual approach, the disjunction $(A|H) \vee (B|K)$ is defined as a conditional random quantity, with values 1, or 0, or $P(A|H)$, or $P(B|K)$, or $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)]$ (the prevision of the disjunction), according to whether $AH \vee BK$ is true, or $\bar{A}H\bar{B}K$ is true, or $\bar{H}\bar{B}K$, or $\bar{A}H\bar{K}$ is true, or $\bar{H}\bar{K}$ is true, respectively. Then

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = AH \vee BK + x\bar{H}\bar{B}K + y\bar{A}H\bar{K} + w\bar{H}\bar{K} \in \{1, 0, x, y, w\},$$

where $x = P(A|H)$, $y = P(B|K)$, $w = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)]$. As for conjunction, the disjunction is a conditional random quantity, as written below.

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = (AH \vee BK + x\bar{H}\bar{B}K + y\bar{A}H\bar{K})|(H \vee K), \quad (27)$$

with $w = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)] = \mathbb{P}[(AH \vee BK + x\bar{H}\bar{B}K + y\bar{A}H\bar{K})|(H \vee K)]$. It can be verified that (a numerical version of) De Morgan's laws are satisfied, that is ([33, Theorem 5])

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = 1 - (\bar{A}|H) \wedge (\bar{B}|K), \quad (A|H) \wedge (B|K) = 1 - (\bar{A}|H) \vee (\bar{B}|K). \quad (28)$$

Now, we will show that the conjunction and disjunction, as defined in our approach, satisfy (in numerical terms) all the properties from P1 to P6. Then, we will illustrate a list of further basic properties, valid for unconditional events, which continue to hold in our approach.

P1. The property $A \subseteq B \iff A \wedge B = B$ in numerical terms becomes

$$A \leq B \iff A \wedge B = B.$$

When replacing A and B by $A|H$ and $B|K$ it holds that ([36, Equation (16)])

$$A|H \leq B|K \iff (A|H) \wedge (B|K) = A|H.$$

Thus, the property P1 is *satisfied* by \wedge . Notice that ([36, Equation (15)])

$$A|H \leq B|K \iff A|H \subseteq B|K, \text{ or } AH = \emptyset, \text{ or } BK = K,$$

then $A|H \subseteq B|K \Rightarrow (A|H) \wedge (B|K) = A|H$.

P2. We will verify that

$$A|H = (A|H) \wedge (K|K), \quad (29)$$

and

$$(A|H) \wedge [(B|K) \vee (\bar{B}|K)] = [(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] + [(A|H) \wedge (\bar{B}|K)]. \quad (30)$$

Concerning formula (29), from (24), as $y = P(K|K) = 1$, it holds that

$$(A|H) \wedge (K|K) = (AHK + x\bar{H}K + AH\bar{K})|(H \vee K) = (AH + x\bar{H}K)|(H \vee K),$$

where $x = P(A|H)$. We observe that $(AH + x\bar{H}K)|(H \vee K) = A|H$ when $H \vee K$ is true, with $(AH + x\bar{H}K)|(H \vee K) = \mathbb{P}[(AH + x\bar{H}K)|(H \vee K)]$ when $H \vee K$ is false. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{P}[(AH + x\bar{H}K)|(H \vee K)] = P[AH|(H \vee K)] + xP[\bar{H}K|(H \vee K)] =$$

$$= x[P[H|(H \vee K)] + P[\bar{H}K|(H \vee K)]] = xP[(H \vee K)|(H \vee K)] = x;$$

thus: $(AH + x\bar{H}K)|(H \vee K)$ coincides with $A|H$ and hence formula (29) is satisfied. Concerning formula (30), we observe that

$$(A|H) \wedge [(B|K) \vee (\bar{B}|K)] = (A|H) \wedge (\Omega|K) = (A|H) \wedge (K|K) = A|H.$$

Moreover, as it can be verified ([34, Theorem 7]),

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) + (A|H) \wedge (\bar{B}|K) = A|H,$$

and hence formula (30) is satisfied. Thus, the property P2 *is satisfied*. Notice that in ([22]) a theory has been proposed on compound conditionals, where formula (30) can be written as

$$(A|H) \wedge [(B|K) \vee (\bar{B}|K)] = [(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] \vee [(A|H) \wedge (\bar{B}|K)].$$

P3. In numerical terms the property $A \vee B = A \vee \bar{A}B$ becomes $A \vee B = A + \bar{A}B$. When replacing A and B by $A|H$ and $B|K$ we can verify that

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = (A|H) + [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge (B|K)]. \quad (31)$$

We observe that $(B|K) = (A|H) \wedge (B|K) + (\bar{A}|H) \wedge (B|K)$; moreover, we recall that ([32, Section 6])

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = A|H + B|K - (A|H) \wedge (B|K). \quad (32)$$

Then,

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = A|H + B|K - (A|H) \wedge (B|K) = (A|H) + (\bar{A}|H) \wedge (B|K).$$

Thus, formula (31) holds, that is the property P3 *is satisfied*.

In the approach proposed in ([22]) the previous formula becomes

$$(A|H) \vee (B|K) = (A|H) \vee [(\bar{A}|H) \wedge (B|K)].$$

P4. We have to check that $\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)] \leq P(A|H) \leq \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)]$. As shown in Table 3,

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) - A|H = -AH\bar{B}K - (1-y)AH\bar{K} - x\bar{H}\bar{B}K + (z-x)\bar{H}\bar{K},$$

where $x = P(A|H)$, $y = P(B|K)$, $z = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]$. Notice that $z - x = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K) - A|H]$; then, by recalling the reasoning on Scheme 3 in Section 3.2, the difference $(A|H) \wedge (B|K) - A|H$ is the following conditional random quantity

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) - A|H = (-AH\bar{B}K - (1-y)AH\bar{K} - x\bar{H}\bar{B}K)|(H \vee K),$$

where $(-AH\bar{B}K - (1-y)AH\bar{K} - x\bar{H}\bar{B}K) \leq 0$. Thus $z - x \leq 0$, that is $z \leq x$. Likewise, $w - x \geq 0$, that is $w \geq x$, where $w = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)]$. Thus, the property P4 *is satisfied* by \wedge and \vee . Notice that the previous results imply that

$$(A|H) \wedge (B|K) \leq A|H \leq (A|H) \vee (B|K).$$

	C_h	$A H$	$B K$	$(A H) \wedge (B K)$	$(A H) \vee (B K)$
C_1	$AHBK$	1	1	1	1
C_2	$AH\bar{B}K$	1	0	0	1
C_3	$AH\bar{K}$	1	y	y	1
C_4	$\bar{A}HBK$	0	1	0	1
C_5	$\bar{A}H\bar{B}K$	0	0	0	0
C_6	$\bar{A}H\bar{K}$	0	y	0	y
C_7	$\bar{H}BK$	x	1	x	1
C_8	$\bar{H}\bar{B}K$	x	0	0	x
C_0	$\bar{H}\bar{K}$	x	y	z	w

Table 3. Numerical values of $A|H$, $B|K$, $(A|H) \wedge (B|K)$, $(A|H) \vee (B|K)$ associated with the constituents C_1, \dots, C_8, C_0 , where $x = P(A|H)$, $y = P(B|K)$, $z = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]$ and $w = \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)]$.

Of course, the same inequalities hold for $B|K$.

P5. From (32) we obtain the following *prevision sum rule*

$$\mathbb{P}[(A|H) \vee (B|K)] = P(A|H) + P(B|K) - \mathbb{P}[(A|H) \wedge (B|K)]. \quad (33)$$

Thus, the property P5 *is satisfied* by \wedge and \vee . Notice that the previous formula is a particular case of the more general inclusion-exclusion formula satisfied by \wedge and \vee ([34]).

P6. In [32] it has been shown that, under logical independence, the set Π of all coherent assessments (x, y, z) on $\{A|H, B|K, (A|H) \wedge (B|K)\}$ is $\{(x, y, z) : (x, y) \in [0, 1], \max\{x + y - 1, 0\} \leq z \leq \min\{x, y\}\}$. Then, the Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds are satisfied when A and B are replaced by $A|H$ and $B|K$, that is

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

Thus, the property P6 *is satisfied* by \wedge . Moreover, by applying (33), we also obtain the dual result for the prevision w of the disjunction $(A|H) \vee (B|K)$

$$\max\{x, y\} \leq w \leq \min\{x + y, 1\}.$$

6 Some further logical and probabilistic properties

We consider below some further properties which are satisfied in our approach.

(a) We can verify that

$$(E|HK) \wedge (H|K) = EH|K. \quad (34)$$

We set $P(E|HK) = x$, $P(H|K) = y$, $\mathbb{P}[(E|HK) \wedge (H|K)] = z$, then from (24) it follows that

$$(E|HK) \wedge (H|K) = (EHK + x(\bar{H} \vee \bar{K})HK + y\bar{K}EHK)|K = EH|K.$$

Therefore property (a) is satisfied; moreover, as by coherence $P(EH|K) = P(E|HK)P(H|K)$, it follows that

$$z = \mathbb{P}[(E|HK) \wedge (H|K)] = P(EH|K) = P(E|HK)P(H|K) = xy.$$

Remark 6. It can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} (E|HK) \wedge_K (H|K) &= EH|K, \\ (E|HK) \wedge_L (H|K) &= EHK \neq EH|K, \\ (E|HK) \wedge_B (H|K) &= E|HK \neq EH|K, \\ (E|HK) \wedge_S (H|K) &= EH|K. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore property (a) is satisfied by \wedge_K and \wedge_S , while it is not satisfied by \wedge_L and \wedge_B . Notice that the property (a) can be equivalently written as

$$(A|B) \wedge (B|C) = A|C, \quad \text{if } A \subseteq B \subseteq C. \quad (35)$$

Indeed, the equality $(E|HK) \wedge (H|K) = EH|K$, can be written as $(EHK|HK) \wedge (HK|K) = EHK|K$, with $EHK \subseteq HK \subseteq K$. Conversely, under the assumption that $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, as $A = AB$, $B = BC$ the equality $(A|B) \wedge (B|C) = A|C$ can be written as $AB|C = (A|BC) \wedge (B|C)$.

We recall that the equality (35) is the axiom C5 in the Boolean algebra of conditionals proposed in [23].

(b) By exploiting the notion of conjunction of n conditional events, as defined in our approach (see, e.g., [34]), we can verify that

$$E_1 \cdots E_n = E_1 \wedge (E_2|E_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (E_n|E_1 \cdots E_{n-1}) \quad (36)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}[E_1 \wedge (E_2|E_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (E_n|E_1 \cdots E_{n-1})] = P(E_1)P(E_2|E_1) \cdots P(E_n|E_1 \cdots E_{n-1}). \quad (37)$$

The operation of conjunction satisfies the associativity and commutativity properties. The conjunction $\mathcal{C}_{1\dots n}$ of $E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n$ is defined as a (conditional) random quantity, with values 1, or 0, or x_S , according to whether, $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n E_i H_i$ is true, or $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \bar{E}_i H_i$ is true, or $(\bigwedge_{i \notin S} E_i H_i) \wedge (\bigwedge_{i \in S} \bar{H}_i)$, where $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $x_S = \mathbb{P}[\bigwedge_{i \in S} (E_i|H_i)]$. In particular, when $S = \{1, \dots, n\}$, it holds that $x_{\{1, \dots, n\}} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{1\dots n})$, which we also denote by $x_{1\dots n}$. In the framework of betting scheme, for instance, $x_{1\dots n}$ is the amount to be paid in order to receive the value assumed by the random quantity $\mathcal{C}_{1\dots n}$. When $\bar{H}_1 \cdots \bar{H}_n$ is true (i.e., $\bigvee_{i=1}^n H_i$ is false), the conditional events are all void and the value of $\mathcal{C}_{1\dots n}$ coincides with the paid amount $x_{1\dots n}$; then, for checking coherence, the case $\bar{H}_1 \cdots \bar{H}_n$ must be discarded. As a consequence, by also recalling the Scheme 3 in Section 3.2, $\mathcal{C}_{1\dots n}$ is a conditional random quantity with conditioning event $\bigvee_{i=1}^n H_i$. By a dual approach the disjunction $\mathcal{D}_{1\dots n}$ of

$E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n$ is defined as a conditional random quantity (with conditioning event $\bigvee_{i=1}^n H_i$), with values 1, or 0, or y_S , according to whether, $\bigvee_{i=1}^n E_i H_i$ is true, or $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \bar{E}_i H_i$ is true, or $(\bigwedge_{i \notin S} \bar{E}_i H_i) \wedge (\bigwedge_{i \in S} \bar{H}_i)$, where $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $y_S = \mathbb{P}[\bigvee_{i \in S} (E_i|H_i)]$. In particular, when $S = \{1, \dots, n\}$, it holds that $y_{\{1, \dots, n\}} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{D}_{1 \dots n})$, which we also denote by $y_{1 \dots n}$. By iteratively applying (34) we obtain

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n E_i = \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} E_i \right) \wedge (E_n | \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-1} E_i) = \dots = E_1 \wedge (E_2 | E_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n | E_1 \dots E_{n-1}).$$

In addition, by recalling that

$$P(E_1 E_2 \dots E_n) = P(E_1) P(E_2 | E_1) \dots P(E_n | E_1 \dots E_{n-1}),$$

it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}[E_1 \wedge (E_2 | E_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n | E_1 \dots E_{n-1})] = P(E_1) P(E_2 | E_1) \dots P(E_n | E_1 \dots E_{n-1}).$$

The equality (37) shows that the prevision of the conjunction of $E_1, E_2 | E_1, \dots, E_n | E_1 \dots E_{n-1}$ is equal to the product of their probabilities.

(c) We recall that, given n logically independent events E_1, \dots, E_n , the best bounds on the probability of their conjunction are the Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds, that is

$$\max\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n P(E_i) - n + 1, 0\right\} \leq P(E_1 \dots E_n) \leq \min\{P(E_1), \dots, P(E_n)\}, \quad (38)$$

and

$$\max\{P(E_1), \dots, P(E_n)\} \leq P(E_1 \vee \dots \vee E_n) \leq \min\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n P(E_i), 1\right\}, \quad (39)$$

These results still hold when replacing each event E_i by the conditional event $E_i|H_i$, under logical independence of all events. In other words, in our approach the best bounds on the previsions of the conjunction and the disjunction of n conditional events $E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n$ are the Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds ([39]):

$$\max\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n P(E_i|H_i) - n + 1, 0\right\} \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i)\right] \leq \min\{P(E_1|H_1), \dots, P(E_n|H_n)\}, \quad (40)$$

and

$$\max\{P(E_1|H_1), \dots, P(E_n|H_n)\} \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\bigvee_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i)\right] \leq \min\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n P(E_i|H_i), 1\right\}. \quad (41)$$

(d) Given n events E_1, \dots, E_n , we recall that by the inclusion-exclusion principle their disjunction can be represented as

$$E_1 \vee \dots \vee E_n = \sum_{i=1}^n E_i - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} E_{i_1} E_{i_2} + \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < i_3} E_{i_1} E_{i_2} E_{i_3} - \dots + (-1)^{n+1} E_1 \dots E_n.$$

This principle still holds in our approach. Given n conditional events $E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n$, it holds that ([34])

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i) - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} (E_{i_1}|H_{i_1}) \wedge (E_{i_2}|H_{i_2}) + \dots + (-1)^{n+1} \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i). \quad (42)$$

We set $P(E_i|H_i) = x_i$, $\mathbb{P}[(E_{i_1}|H_{i_1}) \wedge (E_{i_2}|H_{i_2})] = x_{i_1 i_2}$, $i_1 \neq i_2, \dots$, $\mathbb{P}[\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i)] = x_{1\dots n}$, $\mathbb{P}[\bigvee_{i=1}^n (E_i|H_i)] = y_{1\dots n}$. Then, when $\bar{H}_1 \bar{H}_2 \dots \bar{H}_n$ is true, that is all conditional events $E_i|H_i$ are void, the value of the left side member in (42) is $y_{1\dots n}$, while the value of the right side member is $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} x_{i_1 i_2} + \dots + (-1)^{n+1} x_{1\dots n}$; thus the prevision of $(E_1|H_1) \vee \dots \vee (E_n|H_n)$ is given by

$$y_{1\dots n} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \sum_{i_1 < i_2} x_{i_1 i_2} + \dots + (-1)^{n+1} x_{1\dots n}.$$

(e) Given n events E_1, \dots, E_n , from (38) it holds that

$$P(E_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n \iff P(E_1 \dots E_n) = 1.$$

In the case where $P(E_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n$, is coherent, we can say that the family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ is *p-consistent* and hence this property amounts to the coherence of the assessment $P(E_1 \dots E_n) = 1$. This characterization still holds when replacing each E_i by $E_i|H_i$; indeed, a family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$ is p-consistent when the assessment $P(E_i|H_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n$, is coherent. Moreover, from (40) we obtain

$$P(E_i|H_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n \iff \mathbb{P}[(E_1|H_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n|H_n)] = 1,$$

that is p-consistency of \mathcal{F} amounts to the coherence of the assessment $\mathbb{P}[(E_1|H_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n|H_n)] = 1$.

(f) Given a p-consistent family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ and a further event E_{n+1} , the family \mathcal{F} p-entails the event E_{n+1} if and only if $P(E_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n$, implies that $P(E_{n+1}) = 1$. The p-entailment of E_{n+1} from \mathcal{F} is equivalent to each one of the following properties ([36]):

- (i) $E_1 \dots E_n \subseteq E_{n+1}$, that is $E_1 \dots E_n E_{n+1} = E_1 \dots E_n$;
- (ii) the (indicator of the) conditional event $E_{n+1}|E_1 \dots E_n$ is constant and coincides with 1.

The same characterization holds in the case of conditional events. More precisely, given a p-consistent family $\mathcal{F} = \{E_1|H_1, \dots, E_n|H_n\}$ and a further conditional event $E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}$, we recall that \mathcal{F} p-entails $E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}$ if and only if $P(E_i|H_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n$, implies $P(E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}) = 1$. This notion of p-entailment extends in the setting of coherence the notion introduced by Adams in [1] by using *proper* probability distributions. In ([33, Theorem 18]) it has been shown that the p-entailment of $E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}$ from the p-consistent family \mathcal{F} can be characterized by the following equivalent properties:

- (i) $(E_1|H_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n|H_n) \leq E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}$;
- (ii) $(E_1|H_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n|H_n) \wedge E_{n+1}|H_{n+1} = (E_1|H_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (E_n|H_n)$.

Finally, by introducing a suitable notion of iterated conditional $(E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}) | [(E_1|H_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (E_n|H_n)]$, in [40] it has been shown that

$$\mathcal{F} \text{ p-entails } E_{n+1}|H_{n+1} \iff (E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}) | [(E_1|H_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (E_n|H_n)] = 1, \quad (43)$$

that is the p-consistent family \mathcal{F} p-entails $E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}$ if and only if the iterated conditional $(E_{n+1}|H_{n+1}) | [(E_1|H_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (E_n|H_n)]$ is constant and coincides with 1. The characterization of the p-entailment for several inference rules has been studied in [31,36].

7 Conclusions

In the first part of this work we illustrated the subjective approach to probability of de Finetti. We recalled the coherence principle for both the betting scheme and the penalty criterion, in the unconditional and conditional cases. We showed the equivalence of the two criteria and illustrated the geometrical interpretation of coherence. We also considered the notion of coherence in the framework of proper scoring rules. We discussed the notion of conditional events in the trivalent logic of de Finetti, by focusing on the numerical representation of the truth-values. Then we considered some basic logical and probabilistic properties, valid for unconditional events, by checking their validity in the setting of some trivalent logics for some conjunction and disjunction pairs: (\wedge_K, \vee_K) , (\wedge_L, \vee_L) , (\wedge_B, \vee_B) , (\wedge_S, \vee_S) . We verified that none of these pairs satisfies all the properties; in particular, we observed that for these trivalent logics the Fréchet-Hoeffding probability bounds are not satisfied. Then, we considered our approach to compound conditionals in the setting of coherence and, based on the betting scheme, we have shown that conjunction and disjunction are suitable conditional random quantities. Within this probabilistic logic, we verified that, when considering conditional events, all the basic logical and probabilistic properties valid for unconditional events are preserved. In particular the Fréchet-Hoeffding probability bounds are satisfied. Moreover, we observed that the conjunction $E_1 \cdots E_n$ of n unconditional events coincides with the conjunction $\mathcal{C} = E_1 \wedge (E_2|E_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (E_n|E_1 \cdots E_{n-1})$. As a consequence, in our approach the prevision of \mathcal{C} is the product $P(E_1)P(E_2|E_1) \cdots P(E_n|E_1 \cdots E_{n-1})$. We also recalled the notions of p-consistency and p-entailment by illustrating their characterization by the notion of conjunction given in our approach.

References

1. Adams, E.W.: The logic of conditionals. Reidel, Dordrecht (1975)
2. Baratgin, J., Politzer, G., Over, D., Takahashi, T.: The psychology of uncertainty and three-valued truth tables. *Frontiers in Psychology* **9**, 1479 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01479>
3. Benferhat, S., Dubois, D., Prade, H.: Nonmonotonic reasoning, conditional objects and possibility theory. *Artificial Intelligence* **92**, 259–276 (1997). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702\(97\)00012-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(97)00012-X)

4. Calabrese, P.: An algebraic synthesis of the foundations of logic and probability. *Information Sciences* **42**(3), 187 – 237 (1987). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0255\(87\)90023-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0255(87)90023-5)
5. Ciucci, D., Dubois, D.: Relationships between connectives in three-valued logics. In: Greco, S., Bouchon-Meunier, B., Coletti, G., Fedrizzi, M., Matarazzo, B., Yager, R.R. (eds.) *Advances in Computational Intelligence. IPMU 2012, CCIS, vol. 297*, pp. 633–642. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2012)
6. Ciucci, D., Dubois, D.: A map of dependencies among three-valued logics. *Information Sciences* **250**, 162 – 177 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2013.06.040>
7. Ciucci, D., Dubois, D.: A map of dependencies among three-valued logics. *Information Sciences* **250**, 162 – 177 (2013)
8. Coletti, G., Scozzafava, R.: *Probabilistic logic in a coherent setting*. Kluwer, Dordrecht (2002)
9. Coletti, G., Scozzafava, R., Vantaggi, B.: Coherent conditional probability, fuzzy inclusion and default rules. In: Yager, R., Abbasov, A.M., Reformat, M.Z., Shahbazova, S.N. (eds.) *Soft Computing: State of the Art Theory and Novel Applications*, pp. 193–208. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2013)
10. Coletti, G., Scozzafava, R., Vantaggi, B.: Possibilistic and probabilistic logic under coherence: Default reasoning and System P. *Mathematica Slovaca* **65**(4), 863–890 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ms-2015-0060>
11. Cruz, N.: Deduction from uncertain premises? In: Elqayam, S., Douven, I., Evans, J.S.B.T., Cruz, N. (eds.) *Logic and Uncertainty in the Human Mind: A Tribute to David E. Over*, pp. 27–41. Routledge, Oxon (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315111902-3>
12. Császár, A.: Sur la structure des espaces de probabilité conditionnelle. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica* **6**(3-4), 337–361 (1955). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02024394>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02024394>
13. de Finetti, B.: La Logique de la Probabilité. In: *Actes du Congrès International de Philosophie Scientifique, Paris, 1935*, pp. IV 1–IV 9. Hermann et C.ie, Paris (1936)
14. de Finetti, B.: The logic of probability. *Philosophical Studies* **77**, 181–190 (1936/1995)
15. de Finetti, B.: *Teoria delle probabilità*. Ed. Einaudi, 2 voll., Torino (1970), english version: *Theory of Probability 1* (2), Chichester, Wiley, 1974 (1975)
16. Douven, I., Dietz, R.: A puzzle about Stalnaker’s hypothesis. *Topoi* pp. 31–37 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-010-9082-3>
17. Douven, I., Elqayam, S., Singmann, H., van Wijnbergen-Huitink, J.: Conditionals and inferential connections: toward a new semantics. *Thinking & Reasoning* pp. 1–41 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13546783.2019.1619623>
18. Dubins, L.E.: Finitely additive conditional probabilities, conglomerability and disintegrations. *The Annals of Probability* **3**, 89–99 (1975)
19. Dubois, D., Prade, H.: Conditional objects as nonmonotonic consequence relationships. *IEEE Trans. on Syst. Man and Cybernetics*, **24**(12), 1724 –1740 (dec 1994). <https://doi.org/10.1109/21.328930>
20. Edgington, D.: On conditionals. *Mind* **104**, 235–329 (1995)
21. Égré, P., Rossi, L., Sprenger, J.: De Finettian Logics of Indicative Conditionals Part I: Trivalent Semantics and Validity. *J Philos Logic* (2020). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-020-09549-6>
22. Flaminio, T., Gilio, A., Godo, L., Sanfilippo, G.: Compound conditionals as random quantities and boolean algebras. Submitted (2022)

23. Flaminio, T., Godo, L., Hosni, H.: Boolean algebras of conditionals, probability and logic. *Artificial Intelligence* **286**, 103347 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2020.103347>
24. Gale, D.: *The theory of linear economic models*. McGraw-Hill, New York (1960)
25. Gilio, A.: Classi quasi additive di eventi e coerenza di probabilità condizionate. *Rendiconti dell'Istituto di Matematica dell'Università di Trieste* **XXI**(1), 22–38 (1989)
26. Gilio, A.: Probabilità condizionate C_0 -coerenti. *Rendiconti di Matematica* **9**(VII), 277–295, Roma (1989)
27. Gilio, A.: Criterio di penalizzazione e condizioni di coerenza nella valutazione soggettiva della probabilità. *Bollettino dell'Unione Matematica Italiana* **4–B**, 645–660 (1990)
28. Gilio, A.: Algorithms for precise and imprecise conditional probability assessments. *Mathematical Models for Handling Partial Knowledge in Artificial Intelligence* pp. 231–254 (1995)
29. Gilio, A.: Probabilistic reasoning under coherence in System P. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* **34**, 5–34 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:101442261>
30. Gilio, A.: Generalizing inference rules in a coherence-based probabilistic default reasoning. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **53**(3), 413–434 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2011.08.004>
31. Gilio, A., Pfeifer, N., Sanfilippo, G.: Probabilistic entailment and iterated conditionals. In: Elqayam, S., Douven, I., Evans, J.S.B.T., Cruz, N. (eds.) *Logic and Uncertainty in the Human Mind: A Tribute to David E. Over*, pp. 71–101. Routledge, Oxon (2020). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315111902-6>
32. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: Conditional random quantities and compounds of conditionals. *Studia Logica* **102**(4), 709–729 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11225-013-9511-6>
33. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: Generalized logical operations among conditional events. *Applied Intelligence* **49**(1), 79–102 (Jan 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-018-1229-8>
34. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: Algebraic aspects and coherence conditions for conjoined and disjointed conditionals. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **126**, 98 – 123 (2020)
35. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: Compound conditionals, Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds, and Frank t-norms. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **136**, 168–200 (2021). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2021.06.006>
36. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: On compound and iterated conditionals. *Argumenta* **6**(2), 241–266 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.14275/2465-2334/202112.gil>, <https://www.argumenta.org/article/compound-iterated-conditionals/>
37. Gilio, A., Spezzaferrri, F.: Coherence and extensions of stochastic matrices. *Le Matematiche* **L**(I), 119–135 (1995)
38. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: Coherent conditional probabilities and proper scoring rules. In: Coolen, F., de Cooman, G., Fetz, T., Oberguggenberger, M. (eds.) *ISIPTA'11: Proceedings of the Seventh International Symposium on Imprecise Probability: Theories and Applications*. pp. 189–198. SIPTA, Innsbruck (2011)
39. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: Compound conditionals, Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds, and Frank t-norms. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **136**, 168–200 (2021). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2021.06.006>

40. Gilio, A., Sanfilippo, G.: Iterated conditionals and characterization of p-entailment. In: Vejnarová, J., Wilson, N. (eds.) *Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning with Uncertainty*, ECSQARU 2021, LNCS, vol. 12897, pp. 629–643. Springer International Publishing (2021), <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2109.04776.pdf>
41. Goodman, I.R., Nguyen, H.T.: Conditional Objects and the Modeling of Uncertainties. In: Gupta, M.M., Yamakawa, T. (eds.) *Fuzzy Computing*, pp. 119–138. North-Holland (1988)
42. Goodman, I.R., Nguyen, H.T., Walker, E.A.: *Conditional Inference and Logic for Intelligent Systems: A Theory of Measure-Free Conditioning*. North-Holland (1991), www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a241568.pdf
43. Hailperin, T.: *Sentential probability logic. Origins, development, current status, and technical applications*. Lehigh University Press, Bethlehem (1996)
44. Holzer, S.: On coherence and conditional prevision. *Bollettino dell'Unione Matematica Italiana* **4**(6), 441–460 (1985)
45. Jeffrey, R.: Matter-of-fact conditionals i. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume* **65**, 161–183 (1991)
46. Kaufmann, S.: Conditionals right and left: Probabilities for the whole family. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* **38**, 1–53 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-008-9088-0>
47. Kern-Isberner, G.: *Conditionals in Nonmonotonic Reasoning and Belief Revision – Considering Conditionals as Agents*, vol. 2087. LNAI, Springer (2001)
48. Lad, F.: Coherent prevision as a linear functional without an underlying measure space: the purely arithmetic structure of conditional quantities. In: Coletti, G., et al. (eds.) *Mathematical Models for Handling Partial Knowledge in Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 101–112. Plenum Press, New York (1995)
49. Lad, F.: *Operational subjective statistical methods: A mathematical, philosophical, and historical introduction*. Wiley, New York (1996)
50. McGee, V.: Conditional probabilities and compounds of conditionals. *Philosophical Review* **98**(4), 485–541 (1989). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2185116>
51. Milne, P.: Bruno de Finetti and the Logic of Conditional Events. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **48**(2), 195–232 (1997), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/687745>
52. Mura, A.: Towards a new logic of indicative conditionals. *Logic and Philosophy of Science* **IX**, 17–31 (2011)
53. Nguyen, H.T., Walker, E.A.: A history and introduction to the algebra of conditional events and probability logic. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* **24**(12), 1671–1675 (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1109/21.328924>
54. Over, D., Cruz, N.: Suppositional theory of conditionals and rationality. In: Knauff, M., Spohn, W. (eds.) *Handbook of rationality*, pp. 395–404. MIT press (2021)
55. Pfeifer, N., Sanfilippo, G.: Probabilistic squares and hexagons of opposition under coherence. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **88**, 282–294 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2017.05.014>
56. Regazzini, E.: Finitely additive conditional probabilities. *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano* **55**, 69–89 (1985)
57. Rigo, P.: Un teorema di estensione per probabilità condizionate finitamente additive. *Atti della XXXIV Riunione Scientifica S.I.S.* pp. 27–34 (1988)
58. Sanfilippo, G.: Lower and upper probability bounds for some conjunctions of two conditional events. In: *SUM 2018, LNCS*, vol. 11142, pp. 260–275. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2018)

59. Sanfilippo, G., Gilio, A., Over, D., Pfeifer, N.: Probabilities of conditionals and previsions of iterated conditionals. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **121**, 150 – 173 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2020.03.001>
60. Sanfilippo, G., Pfeifer, N., Over, D., Gilio, A.: Probabilistic inferences from conjoined to iterated conditionals. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* **93**(Supplement C), 103 – 118 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2017.10.027>
61. Sanfilippo, G.: From imprecise probability assessments to conditional probabilities with quasi additive classes of conditioning events. In: *Proc. of the Twenty-Eighth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence (UAI-12)*. pp. 736–745. AUAI Press, Corvallis, Oregon (2012)
62. Schay, G.: An algebra of conditional events. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **24**, 334–344 (1968). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X\(68\)90035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(68)90035-8)
63. Stalnaker, R., Jeffrey, R.: Conditionals as random variables. In: Eells, E., Skyrms, B. (eds.) *Probability and Conditionals: Belief Revision and Rational Decision*, pp. 31–46. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA (1994)
64. Stalnaker, R.C.: Probability and conditionals. *Philosophy of Science* **37**(1), 64–80 (1970)
65. van Fraassen, B.: Probabilities of conditionals. *Foundations of Probability Theory, Statistical Inference, and Statistical Theories of Science* **1**, 261–308 (1976), cited By 89