## Logic of Agent Communication

Satoshi Tojo (Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology)

LORI VI (Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Japan 2017)

## 1 <u>Who knows what at which time?</u>

Let us consider communication among multi-agents.



George de la Tour: Le Tricheur à l'as de carreau

In the above picture, we can see many aspects of belief change of agents triggered by an informing action by others.

- Public announcement
- Liar
- Belief revision
- Reliability of news source
- Mutual belief
- Method of communication, *i.e.*, channel

How can we formalize this (or more troublesome) situation in logic, in an efficient, scalable and reliable computation system?

## 2 Doxastic Logic with Channel

Let G be a set of agents and Prop be a set of propositional variables. The syntax of PDL-extension of dynamic doxastic logic with channel is defined by simultaneous induction on a program term  $\pi$  and a formula  $\varphi$ :

$$\begin{split} \pi &::= \mathsf{R}_a \mid (\pi \cup \pi) \mid (\pi; \pi) \mid \varphi? \mid \varphi\downarrow_b^a \quad (a \in G) \\ \varphi &::= p \mid \mathsf{c}_{ab} \mid \neg \varphi \mid \varphi \lor \varphi \mid [\pi] \varphi \quad (p \in \mathsf{Prop}, \, a, b \in G) \end{split}$$

- $c_{ab}$ : 'there is a channel from agent a to b.'
- $[\mathsf{R}_a]\varphi$ : 'agent *a* believes that  $\varphi$  holds.'
- $(\pi \cup \pi')$ : 'do  $\pi$  or  $\pi'$ , non-deterministically.'

- $(\pi; \pi')$ : 'do  $\pi$  followed by  $\pi'$ .'
- $\varphi$ ?: 'proceed if  $\varphi$  true, else fail.'
- $[\varphi \downarrow_b^a] \psi$ : 'after agent *a* informs agent *b* of message  $\varphi$  via channel,  $\psi$ .'

Given a model  $\mathfrak{M} = (W, (R_a)_{a \in G}, (C_{ab})_{a,b \in G}, V)$ , the semantics is defined as follows:

$$\begin{split} & \llbracket \mathbf{R}_a \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := R_a, \\ & \llbracket \pi \cup \pi' \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} \cup \llbracket \pi' \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}}, \\ & \llbracket \pi; \pi' \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} \circ \llbracket \pi' \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}}, \\ & \llbracket \varphi ? \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} \circ \llbracket \pi' \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}}, \\ & \llbracket \varphi ? \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := \{(w, v) \mid w = v \text{ and } w \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} \}, \\ & \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := \{(w, v) \mid w = v \text{ and } w \in \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} \}, \\ & \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := C_{ab}, \\ & \llbracket [\pi] \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} & := \{w \in W \mid \llbracket \pi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}}(w) \subseteq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}} \}, \end{split}$$

where  $\llbracket [\mathsf{R}_a] \varphi \rrbracket_{\mathfrak{M}}$  is the truth set  $\{ w \in W \mid \mathfrak{M}, w \models \varphi \}.$ 

As for the semantics of  $[\varphi \downarrow_b^a]\psi$ , if agent *a* resides in  $[\![\varphi]\!]$  and when there is a channel from *a* to *b*, *b* believes that  $\psi$ , otherwise *b* does not change his/her beliefs. That is, if  $a \neq b$ ,

 $R'_{b} := (R_{b} \cap (\llbracket \mathsf{c}_{ab} \land \mathsf{B}_{a} \, \varphi \rrbracket \times \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket)) \cup (R_{b} \cap (\llbracket \neg (\mathsf{c}_{ab} \land \mathsf{B}_{a} \, \varphi) \rrbracket \times W)),$ 

and otherwise  $R'_b := R_b$ . In PDL-format,

$$\pi_b := ((\mathsf{c}_{ab} \land \mathsf{B}_a \,\varphi)?; \mathsf{R}_b; \varphi?) \cup (\neg (\mathsf{c}_{ab} \land \mathsf{B}_a \,\varphi)?; \mathsf{R}_b)$$

## 3 Matrix Representation

Based on [Fitting, 2003], a matrix representation of accessibility relation is defined by  $R^M(i, j) = 1$  if  $(w_i, w_j) \in R$ , otherwise 0. The valuation is  $V(p)^M(i) = 1$  if  $w_i \in V(p)$ , otherwise 0. Thus, we can reformulate the above PDL-format of the semantics into a matrix representation as follows: If a = b,  $R_b^{\prime M} = R_b^M$ . If  $a \neq b$ , we obtain:

$$R_b^{\prime M} = \llbracket (\mathsf{c}_{ab} \land \mathsf{B}_a \varphi)? \rrbracket^M R_b^M \llbracket \varphi? \rrbracket^M + \llbracket \neg (\mathsf{c}_{ab} \land \mathsf{B}_a \varphi)? \rrbracket^M R_b^M.$$

**Example** When agent a sends a piece of information p to b, the first part of a matrix calculation of  $R_b$  becomes:

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\mathsf{c}_{ab} \land \mathsf{B}_{a} \, p)? \end{bmatrix}^{M} R_{b}^{M} \llbracket p? \rrbracket^{M} = \llbracket \mathsf{c}_{ab}? \rrbracket^{M} \llbracket \mathsf{B}_{a} \, p? \rrbracket^{M} R_{b}^{M} \llbracket p? \rrbracket^{M} \\ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The result shows that b comes to believe that p. In order to get the final solution, we also need to calculate the rest of the part, *i.e.*,  $[\neg (c_{ab} \land B_a \varphi)?]^M R_b^M$ , and to combine the both results.

