Xixi Logic Seminar Series Zhejiang University, 26 May 2015

Thomas Ågotnes University of Bergen, Norway, and Zhejiang University, China

joint works with Yi Wang and Dmitry Shkatov





Background: Group Knowledge

We assume given

a finite set $N = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ of agents

a countably infinite set of primitive propositions

Epistemic/doxastic logic

A model is a tuple $M = \langle W, \sim_1, \ldots, \sim_n, V \rangle$:

- W is a set of states
- \sim_i is an epistemic accessibility relation
 - Sometimes assumed to be an equivalence relation (S5)
 - Sometimes assumed to be transitive, euclidian and serial (KD45)
- V is a valuation function, assigning primitive propositions to each state

Epistemic logic

Language: $\phi ::= p \mid K_i \phi \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi_1 \land \phi_2$

Interpretation: $(M, s) \models K_i \phi$ iff for all t s.t. $s \sim_i t$, $(M, t) \models \phi$

$(M,s) \models D_G \phi$ iff $s \sim^D_G t \Rightarrow (M,t) \models \phi$, where $\sim^D_G = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i$

 $(M,s) \models D_G \phi \text{ iff } s \sim^D_G t \Rightarrow (M,t) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^D_G = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models E_G \phi \text{ iff } s \sim^E_G t \Rightarrow (M,t) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim^E_G = \bigcup_{i \in G} (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where } (M,s) \models \phi, \text{ where$

 $(M,s) \models D_G \phi \text{ iff } s \sim_G^D t \Rightarrow (M,t) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim_G^D = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i \\ (M,s) \models E_G \phi \text{ iff } s \sim_G^E t \Rightarrow (M,t) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim_G^E = \bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i \\ (M,s) \models C_G \phi \text{ iff } s \sim_G^C t \Rightarrow (M,t) \models \phi, \text{ where } \sim_G^C = (\bigcup_{i \in G} \sim_i)^*$

Distributed Knowledge: Key Axioms

 $D_A \phi \to D_B \phi$ when $A \subseteq B$ $D_{\{a\}} \phi \leftrightarrow K_a \phi$ The relationship between these notions of group knowledge is not well understood Generalised Distributed Knowledge (based on joint work with Dmitry Shkatov)

Distributed knowledge

$$\sim_G^D = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i$$

Distributed knowledge

$$\sim^D_G = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i$$

- In other words, the group considers a state
 - impossible iff at least one member of the group considers it impossible
 - possible iff all the agents in the group considers it possible

Distributed knowledge

$$\sim^D_G = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i$$

- In other words, the group considers a state
 - impossible iff at least one member of the group considers it impossible
 - possible iff all the agents in the group considers it possible
- For S5 agents this makes sense
 - If an S5 agent considers a state impossible, then it is impossible
 - .. and this is common knowledge

Distributed knowledge for non-S5 agents

$$\sim^D_G = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i$$

- The group considers a state
 - impossible iff at least one member of the group considers it impossible
 - possible iff all the agents in the group considers it possible
- For non-S5 agents, in particular agents without T/reflexivity (e.g., KD45):
 - If one agent considers a state impossible, that agent might in fact be wrong
 - Ruling out a state based on the evidence of a single agent is then a very credulous group attitude
 - Curious asymmetry between the evidence need for possibility vs. impossibility
 - impossibility: every agent is a veto voter, possibility: unanimity

Generalised distributed knowledge

 In this work we look at general definitions of distributed knowledge where we vary the evidence needed for the two cases

Generalised Distributed Knowledge

- The group considers a state
 - impossible iff not at least k agents in the group considers it impossible
 - possible iff at least k agents in the group considers it possible

The generalised distributed knowledge operator

$$M, s \models D_G^{+k} \phi \Leftrightarrow \forall (s, t) \in \sim_G^{+k} M, t \models \phi$$
$$\sim_G^{+k} \bigcup_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} \bigcap_{i \in H} \sim_i$$

Generalised Distributed Knowledge

- The group considers a state
 - impossible iff not at least k agents in the group considers it impossible
 - possible iff at least k agents in the group considers it possible

The generalised distributed knowledge operator

$$M, s \models D_G^{+k} \phi \Leftrightarrow \forall (s,t) \in \sim_G^{+k} M, t \models \phi$$
$$\sim_G^{+k} = \bigcup_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} \bigcap_{i \in H} \sim_i$$
$$\text{E.g., } \sim_G^{maj} = \sim_G^{+\lceil (|G|+1)/2 \rceil}$$

Expressive power and succinctness

 $\phi ::= p \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi \land \phi \mid K_i \phi \mid D_G \phi \mid D_G^{+k} \phi$

Expressive power and succinctness

$$\phi ::= p \mid \neg \phi \mid \phi \land \phi \mid K_i \phi \mid D_G \phi \mid D_G^{+k} \phi$$

$$(M,s) \models D_G^{+k}\phi \Leftrightarrow (M,s) \models \bigwedge_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} D_H\phi$$

Generalised distributed knowledge

- Not more expressive than standard distributed knowledge
- But exponentially more succinct

$$\sim_G^{+k} = \bigcup_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} \bigcap_{i \in H} \sim_i$$

$$\sim_G^{+k} = \bigcup_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} \bigcap_{i \in H} \sim_i$$

- k = |G|: the group considers a state
 - impossible iff at least one member of the group considers it impossible
 - possible iff all the agents in the group considers it possible

$$\sim_G^{+k} = \bigcup_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} \bigcap_{i \in H} \sim_i$$

- k = |G|: the group considers a state
 - impossible iff at least one member of the group considers it impossible
 - possible iff all the agents in the group considers it possible
- k = 1: the group considers a state
 - impossible iff all agents in the group considers it impossible
 - possible at least one agent in the group considers it possible

$$\sim_G^{+k} = \bigcup_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} \bigcap_{i \in H} \sim_i$$



• impossible iff at least one member of the group considers it impossible

 $\sim^{+|G|}_{G} =$

- possible if standard distributed knowledge ble
- k = 1: the group considers a state
 - impossible iff all agents in the group considers it impossible
 - possible at least one agent in the group considers it possible

$$\sim_G^{+k} = \bigcup_{H \subseteq G, |H| \ge k} \bigcap_{i \in H} \sim_i$$



- impossible iff at least one member of the group considers it impossible
- possible if standard distributed knowledge ble
- k = 1: the group considers a state

• impossible iff all agents in the group considers it impossible

possit general knowledge (everybody knows)



 $\sim^{+1}_{C} = \sim^{E}_{C}$

Complexity

• Theorem: the satisfiability problem is PSPACE-complete as long as the underying logic is PSPACE-complete (true for any logic between K and S4, as well as KD45).

Generalised distributed knowledge: conclusions

- Between distributed and general knowledge
 - Intuitively two entirely different concepts
 - But we show that the difference between them can be explained quantitatively rather than qualitatively
 - Specific instances of the same concept, corresponding to which voting threshold is used
 - There is a scale of intermediate concepts between them