

---

# COMMONLY KNOWING WHETHER

---

A PREPRINT

Jie Fan\*, Davide Grossi, Barteld Kooi, Xingchi Su\*, Rineke Verbrugge

21st October 2021

## ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the notion of ‘commonly knowing whether’, a non-standard version of standard common knowledge which is defined on the basis of ‘knowing whether’, instead of standard ‘knowing that’. After giving five possible definitions of this notion, we explore the logical relations among them in the single-agent and multi-agent cases. We propose a sound and complete axiomatization. We investigate one of the five definitions in terms of expressivity via a strategy of modal comparison games.

## 1 Introduction

Common knowledge, or ‘commonly knowing that’, as the strongest concept among group epistemic notions, has been studied extensively in various areas such as artificial intelligence, epistemic logic, epistemology, philosophy of language, epistemic game theory, see e.g. [1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10]. Intuitively, a proposition is common knowledge among a group of agents, if the proposition is true, everyone (in the group) knows it, everyone knows everyone knows it, everyone knows everyone knows everyone knows it, and so on ad infinitum.<sup>2</sup> common knowledge is defined based on the notion of ‘knowing that’.

Beyond ‘knowing that’, recent years have witnessed a growing interest in other types of knowledge, such as ‘knowing whether’, ‘knowing what’, ‘knowing how’, ‘knowing why’, ‘knowing who’, see [15] for an excellent overview. Among these notions, ‘knowing whether’ is the closest friend of ‘knowing that’. The notion of ‘knowing whether’ is used frequently to specify knowledge goals and preconditions for actions, see e.g. [8, 11, 12]. Besides, ‘knowing whether’ corresponds to an important notion of philosophy, that is, non-contingency, the negation of contingency, which dates back to Aristotle [3]. An agent *knows whether* a proposition  $\varphi$  holds, if the agent knows that  $\varphi$  is true, or the agent knows that  $\varphi$  is false; otherwise, the agent is ignorant about  $\varphi$ . A proposition  $\varphi$  is *non-contingent*, if it is necessary that  $\varphi$ , or it is impossible that  $\varphi$ ; otherwise,  $\varphi$  is contingent. Just as ‘knowing that’ is the epistemic counterpart of necessity, ‘knowing whether’ is the epistemic counterpart of non-contingency. For an overview of contingency and ‘knowing whether’, we recommend [6].

It is therefore natural to ask what the notion of ‘commonly knowing whether’ is in contrast to the notion of common knowledge based on ‘knowing that’. ‘Commonly knowing whether’ is not equivalent to common knowledge. For instance, suppose you see two people chatting beside a window but you cannot look outside yourself. Then you know that they *commonly know whether* it is sunny outside, but you do not know that they *commonly know that* it is sunny outside since you do not see the weather. There has been no unanimous agreement yet on the formal definition of ‘commonly knowing whether’. As we will show, there are at least five definitions for this notion, which are not logically equivalent over various frame classes.

There has been no unanimous agreement yet on the formal definition of ‘commonly knowing whether’. As we will show, there are at least five definitions for this notion, which are not logically equivalent over various frame classes. Also, we will demonstrate that one of the definitions is *not* expressible with common knowledge.

---

\*Jie Fan and Xingchi Su are main authors of this paper.

<sup>2</sup>This so-called ‘iterate approach’, attributed to [7], is the most common and orthodox view of common knowledge. There are also approaches called ‘the fixed-point approach’ and ‘the shared-environment approach’, see [2] for the comparisons among the three approaches and also for related references.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives five definitions for the notion of ‘commonly knowing whether’, which are based on distinct intuitions. Section 3 compares their implicational powers in the single-agent and also multi-agent cases. Section 4 gives an axiomatization and demonstrates its soundness and completeness. Section 5 explores the relative expressivity of one of the five definitions, via a strategy of modal comparison games. Moreover, we explore some special properties of  $Cw_5$  over binary trees in Section 6. Finally, we conclude with some future work in Section 7.

## 2 Definitions of ‘Commonly Knowing Whether’ ( $Cw$ )

This section presents some definitions for the notion of ‘commonly knowing whether’. To begin with, we fix a denumerable set of propositional variables  $P$  and a nonempty finite set of agents  $G$ . We use  $G^+$  to refer to the set of finite and nonempty sequences only consisting of agents from  $G$ , and  $|G|$  to refer to the number of agents in  $G$ . The languages involved in this paper are defined recursively as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{Cw} & \varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid Kw_i\varphi \mid Ew\varphi \mid Cw\varphi \\ \mathbf{C} & \varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid K_i\varphi \mid E\varphi \mid C\varphi \end{array}$$

where  $p \in P$ , and  $i \in G$ . In this paper, for the sake of simplicity, we only concern  $G$  but not any of its proper subsets.

Intuitively,  $Kw_i\varphi$  is read “agent  $i$  knows whether  $\varphi$ ”,  $Ew\varphi$  is read “everyone knows whether  $\varphi$ ”,  $Cw\varphi$  is read “a set of agents commonly knows whether  $\varphi$ ”, and  $K_i, E, C$  are more familiar operators of individual knowledge, general knowledge, and common knowledge, respectively.

As noted in the introduction, according to the iterate approach, common knowledge is defined as infinite iteration of general knowledge (namely ‘everyone knows’). Similarly, we can give an iterate approach to commonly knowing whether, according to which commonly knowing whether amounts to infinite iteration of ‘everyone knows whether’. For this, we need to define the notion of ‘everyone knowing whether’. One definition for ‘everyone knowing whether’ is similar to the notion of ‘everyone knows’, that is, to say everyone in a group knows whether  $\varphi$ , if every agent in the group knows whether  $\varphi$  (Def. 2). This is seemingly the most natural notion of ‘everyone knowing whether’. Another definition for ‘everyone knowing whether’ is similar to (individual) knowing whether; namely, everyone in a group knows whether  $\varphi$ , if everyone in the group knows that  $\varphi$  is true, or everyone in the group knows that  $\varphi$  is false (Def. 1).

**Definition 1**  $Ew_1\varphi := E\varphi \vee E\neg\varphi$

**Definition 2**  $Ew_2\varphi := \bigwedge_{i \in G} Kw_i\varphi$

It should be easy to check that  $Ew_1$  is stronger than  $Ew_2$ . This can be informally explained as follows: for any agent, if (s)he knows  $\varphi$  or knows  $\neg\varphi$ , then (s)he knows whether  $\varphi$  is true; however, the other direction fails, because it is possible that some agents know that  $\varphi$  is true but others know that  $\varphi$  is false.

Based on the above definitions of ‘everyone knowing whether’ and common knowledge, we propose the following possible definitions for ‘commonly knowing whether’.

**Definition 3**  $Cw_1\varphi := C\varphi \vee C\neg\varphi$

The definition of  $Cw_1$  is structurally similar to that of  $Ew_1$ . Intuitively, it says that a group *commonly knows whether*  $\varphi$ , if the group has either common knowledge of  $\varphi$  or has common knowledge of the negation of  $\varphi$ .  $Cw_1$  corresponds to the notion of ‘commonly knowing whether’ in the sunny weather example in the introduction. Besides, this definition may also find applications in question-answer contexts. suppose that Sue is attending a conference and asking the speaker a question: “Is  $q$  true or false?” No matter whether the speaker says ‘Yes’ or ‘No’, all attendees will *commonly know whether*  $p$ . Since if the speaker says ‘Yes’, then the attendees will commonly know that  $p$  is true; otherwise, the attendees will commonly know that  $p$  is false. The answer of the speaker amounts to an announcement whether  $p$  [13] (depending on the truth value of  $p$ ), which leads to the common knowledge as to the truth value of  $p$ .

**Definition 4**  $Cw_2\varphi := CEw\varphi$

According to this definition, a group *commonly knows whether*  $\varphi$ , if it is common knowledge that everyone knows whether  $\varphi$ . Since there are two different definitions of  $Ew$ , we have also two different definitions of  $Cw_2$ , that is,  $Cw_{21}\varphi := CEw_1\varphi$  and  $Cw_{22}\varphi := CEw_2\varphi$ .

**Definition 5**  $Cw_3\varphi := \bigwedge_{k \geq 1} (Ew)^k\varphi$

This is the iterated approach to commonly knowing whether: a group *commonly knows whether*  $\varphi$ , if everyone (in the group) knows whether  $\varphi$ , everyone knows whether everyone knows whether  $\varphi$ , everyone knows whether everyone knows whether everyone knows whether  $\varphi$ , and so on ad infinitum.  $Cw_3$  corresponds to the notion of ‘commonly knowing whether’ in the muddy children example in the introduction. As indicated in that example, *neither*  $q$  *nor*  $\neg q$  is common knowledge among the single-agent set of the mud child, thus  $Cw_3$  is not stronger than  $Cw_1$ . Again, because there are two different definitions of  $Ew$ , we have also two different definitions of  $Cw_3$ , that is,  $Cw_{31}\varphi := \bigwedge_{k \geq 1} (Ew_1)^k \varphi$  and  $Cw_{32}\varphi := \bigwedge_{k \geq 1} (Ew_2)^k \varphi$ .

**Definition 6**  $Cw_4\varphi := \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbf{G}} Cw_1Kw_i\varphi$ , that is,  $Cw_4\varphi := \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbf{G}} (CKw_i\varphi \vee C\neg Kw_i\varphi)$

According to this definition, a group *commonly knows whether*  $\varphi$ , if for every member (in the group), it is common knowledge that (s)he knows whether  $\varphi$  or it is common knowledge that (s)he does not know whether  $\varphi$ .

**Definition 7**  $Cw_5\varphi := \bigwedge_{s \in \mathbf{G}^+} Kw_s\varphi$ , where  $Kw_s\varphi := Kw_{s_1} \dots Kw_{s_n}\varphi$  if  $s = s_1 \dots s_n$  is a nonempty sequence of agents.

This definition is inspired by the hierarchy of inter-knowledge of a group given in [10]. According to this definition, ‘commonly knowing whether’ amounts to listing all the possible inter-‘knowing whether’ states among every nonempty subset of the group. .

### 3 Implication Relations among the definitions of $Cw$

This section explores the implication relations among the above five definitions of ‘commonly knowing whether’. The semantics of  $\mathbf{Cw}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  are interpreted over Kripke models. A (*Kripke*) *model* is a tuple  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{R_i \mid i \in \mathbf{G}\}, V \rangle$ , where  $W$  is a nonempty set of (possible) worlds (also called ‘states’),  $R_i$  is an accessibility relation for each agent  $i$ , and  $V$  is a valuation function assigning a set of possible worlds to each propositional variable in  $\mathbf{P}$ . We say that  $(\mathcal{M}, s)$  is a *pointed model*, if  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model and  $s$  is a world in  $\mathcal{M}$ . We use  $\rightarrow$  to denote the union of all  $R_i$  for  $i \in \mathbf{G}$ , and  $\rightarrow^*$  to denote the reflexive-transitive closure of  $\rightarrow$ , that is,  $\rightarrow^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow^n$ . A (*Kripke*) *frame* is a model without valuations. Moreover, we use  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $\mathcal{KD45}$ , and  $\mathcal{S5}$  to denote the class of all Kripke frames, the class of reflexive frames, the class of serial, transitive and Euclidean frames, and the class of reflexive and Euclidean frames, respectively.

Given a model  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{R_i \mid i \in \mathbf{G}\}, V \rangle$  and a world  $w \in W$ , the semantics of  $\mathbf{Cw}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  are defined inductively as follows (we do not list the semantics of  $Ew$  and  $Cw$  due to their alternative definitions).

**Definition 8** *The truth conditions for the formulas in  $\mathbf{Cw}$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  are shown as follows:*

- $\mathcal{M}, w \models p \Leftrightarrow w \in V(p)$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \neg\varphi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}, w \not\models \varphi$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi \wedge \psi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, w \models \psi$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models Kw_i\varphi \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } u, v \in W, \text{ if } wR_iu \text{ and } wR_iv, \text{ then } (\mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi)$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models Ki\varphi \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } u \in W, \text{ if } wR_iu, \text{ then } \mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models E\varphi \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } u \in W, \text{ if } w \rightarrow u, \text{ then } \mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi$
- $\mathcal{M}, w \models C\varphi \Leftrightarrow \text{for all } u \in W, \text{ if } w \rightarrow^* u, \text{ then } \mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi$

Notions of satisfiability and validity are defined as normal. For instance, we say that  $\varphi$  is *valid over the class of frames*  $\mathcal{C}$ , written  $\mathcal{C} \models \varphi$ , if for all frames  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , for all models  $\mathcal{M}$  based on  $\mathcal{F}$ , for all worlds  $w$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$ ; we say that  $\varphi$  is *valid*, if  $\varphi$  is valid over the class of all frames  $\mathcal{K}$ .

The following result will simplify the later proofs. We omit the proof details due to the space limitation.

**Proposition 1**  $1. \models C\varphi \rightarrow CE\varphi$

$2. \models \varphi \rightarrow \psi \text{ implies } \models C\varphi \rightarrow C\psi.$

### 3.1 Single-agent Case

This part investigates the implication relations among definitions of ‘commonly knowing whether’. First, we explore the implication relations between the two definitions of ‘everyone knowing whether’. It turns out that  $Ew_1$  and  $Ew_2$  are equivalent in the single-agent case.

**Proposition 2** *If  $|G| = 1$ , then for any  $\varphi$ ,  $\models Ew_1\varphi \leftrightarrow Ew_2\varphi$ .*

**Proof 1** *Let  $|G| = 1$ , say  $G = \{i\}$ . In this case,  $Ew_2\varphi$  is just  $Kw_i\varphi$ . Also,  $\models E\varphi \leftrightarrow K_i\varphi$ , and  $\models E\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow K_i\neg\varphi$ , and thus  $\models E\varphi \vee E\neg\varphi \leftrightarrow K_i\varphi \vee K_i\neg\varphi$ , that is,  $\models Ew_1\varphi \leftrightarrow Ew_2\varphi$ .*

This tells us that in the single-agent case, we do not need to distinguish between  $Cw_{21}$  and  $Cw_{22}$ , and between  $Cw_{31}$  and  $Cw_{32}$ , and thus we only talk about  $Cw_2$  and  $Cw_3$ , respectively, when only one agent is involved. In the reminder of this subsection, we assume  $G$  to be a single-agent set  $\{i\}$ .

**Proposition 3**  $\models Cw_1\varphi \rightarrow Cw_2\varphi$ ,  $\models Cw_2\varphi \rightarrow Cw_3\varphi$ , and therefore,  $\models Cw_1\varphi \rightarrow Cw_3\varphi$ .

**Proof 2** *Since  $\models C\varphi \rightarrow CE\varphi$ , and  $\models CE\varphi \rightarrow CEw\varphi$  (because  $\models E\varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi$ ), we have  $\models C\varphi \rightarrow CEw\varphi$ . Similarly, we obtain  $\models C\neg\varphi \rightarrow CEw\neg\varphi$ . It is easy to see that  $\models Ew\varphi \leftrightarrow Ew\neg\varphi$ . Therefore,  $\models C\varphi \vee C\neg\varphi \rightarrow CEw\varphi$ , i.e.,  $\models Cw_1\varphi \rightarrow Cw_2\varphi$ .*

*Moreover, since  $CEw\varphi = Ew\varphi \wedge EEw\varphi \wedge \dots$ , and  $\models E\varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi$ , we can show that  $\models CEw\varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi \wedge EwEw\varphi \wedge \dots$ , that is,  $\models Cw_2\varphi \rightarrow Cw_3\varphi$ .*

**Proposition 4**  $\not\models Cw_2\varphi \rightarrow Cw_1\varphi$ .

**Proof 3** *Consider the following model  $\mathcal{M}$ :*

$$s : \neg p \xrightarrow{i} t : p$$

*Clearly,  $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_ip$  and  $\mathcal{M}, t \models K_ip$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Ep$  and  $\mathcal{M}, t \models Ep$ . We can obtain that  $\mathcal{M}, s \models CEwp$ . However,  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Cp \vee C\neg p$ : Since  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models p$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Cp$ ; since  $\mathcal{M}, t \not\models \neg p$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models C\neg p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_2p \rightarrow Cw_1p$ .*

**Proposition 5**  $\not\models Cw_3\varphi \rightarrow Cw_2\varphi$ , and thus  $\not\models Cw_3\varphi \rightarrow Cw_1\varphi$ .

**Proof 4** *Consider the following model  $\mathcal{N}$ :*

$$s : p \xleftarrow{i} t : \neg p \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array}$$

*Since  $s$  has only one successor,  $\mathcal{N}, s \models Kw_i\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , thus  $\mathcal{N}, s \models Ew\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , and hence  $\mathcal{N}, s \models Cw_3\varphi$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{N}, s \models Cw_3p$ .*

*However,  $\mathcal{N}, t \not\models Kw_ip$ , thus  $\mathcal{N}, t \not\models Ewp$ , and then  $\mathcal{N}, s \not\models CEwp$ , that is,  $\mathcal{N}, s \not\models Cw_2p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_3p \rightarrow Cw_2p$ .*

**Proposition 6**  $\models Cw_2\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ . As a corollary,  $\models Cw_1\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proof 5** *Since  $\models CEw\varphi \leftrightarrow CKw_i\varphi$ , whereas  $\models Cw_1Kw_i\varphi \leftrightarrow (CKw_i\varphi \vee C\neg Kw_i\varphi)$ , therefore  $\models CEw\varphi \rightarrow (CKw_i\varphi \vee C\neg Kw_i\varphi)$ , that is,  $\models Cw_2\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .*

**Proposition 7**  $\not\models Cw_3\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proof 6** *Consider the model  $\mathcal{N}$  in the proof of Prop. 5 again. On the one hand, we have shown that  $\mathcal{N}, s \models Cw_3p$ . On the other hand, since  $\mathcal{N}, t \not\models Kw_ip$ , we have that  $\mathcal{N}, s \not\models CKw_ip$ ; moreover, because  $\mathcal{N}, s \not\models \neg Kw_ip$ , we infer that  $\mathcal{N}, s \not\models C\neg Kw_ip$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{N}, s \not\models Cw_4p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_3p \rightarrow Cw_4p$ .*

**Proposition 8**  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_3\varphi$ . As a corollary,  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_2\varphi$  and  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_1\varphi$ .

**Proof 7** *Consider the following model:*

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} \end{array}$$

*It is easy to check that  $s \models \neg Kw_ip$  and  $t \models \neg Kw_ip$ , from which we can obtain  $s \models C\neg Kw_ip$ . Then  $s \models Cw_4p$ .*

*However, since  $s \not\models Kw_ip$ , we have  $s \not\models Ewp$ , i.e.  $s \not\models Cw_3p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_4p \rightarrow Cw_3p$ .*




Figure 1: Logical relationships in the single-agent case

From the proofs of the Props. 6 and 8, it follows that even on  $S5$ -models,  $Cw_4$  is not logically equivalent to  $Cw_1$ ,  $Cw_2$  and  $Cw_3$ .

**Proposition 9**  $\models Cw_3\varphi \leftrightarrow Cw_5\varphi$ .

**Proof 8** Since in the case that  $G = \{i\}$ ,  $\models Ew\varphi \leftrightarrow Kw_i\varphi$ , we have  $\models Cw_3\varphi \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{k \geq 1} (Kw_i)^k\varphi$ . Moreover,  $\models Cw_5\varphi \leftrightarrow (Kw_i\varphi \wedge Kw_iKw_i\varphi \wedge \dots)$ . So,  $\models Cw_3\varphi \leftrightarrow Cw_5\varphi$ .

Summarize the main results of this subsection as follows.

**Theorem 1** In the single-agent case, the logical relationships among  $Cw_1$ ,  $Cw_2$ ,  $Cw_3$ ,  $Cw_4$  and  $Cw_5$  are shown in Fig. 1, where an arrow from one operator  $O$  to another  $O'$  means that for all  $\varphi$ ,  $O\varphi \rightarrow O'\varphi$  is valid over the class of frames in question, and the arrows are transitive.


### 3.2 Multi-agent Cases

Now we move on to the multi-agent cases, that is, the cases when  $|G| > 1$ . As explained before, it is possible that some agents knows that  $\varphi$  is true but others know that  $\varphi$  is false, thus  $Ew_1$  is stronger than  $Ew_2$ .

**Proposition 10** The following statements hold:

- (a)  $\models Ew_1\varphi \rightarrow Ew_2\varphi$ ;
- (b)  $\not\models Ew_2\varphi \rightarrow Ew_1\varphi$ .

**Proof 9** (a) is straightforward by definitions of  $Ew_1$  and  $Ew_2$  and the semantics. For (b), consider the following model  $\mathcal{M}$ :



It is clear that  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Kw_i p \wedge Kw_j p$ , thus  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Ew_2 p$ . However,  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Ep$  and  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models E\neg p$ , thus  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Ew_1 p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Ew_2 p \rightarrow Ew_1 p$ .

Due to Prop. 10, in the multi-agent cases, we need to distinguish between  $Ew_1$  and  $Ew_2$ , and thus need to distinguish between  $Cw_{21}$  and  $Cw_{22}$ , and also between  $Cw_{31}$  and  $Cw_{32}$ .

The following is the main result in this part.

**Theorem 2** In the multi-agent cases, the logical relationships among  $Cw_1$ ,  $Cw_{21}$ ,  $Cw_{22}$ ,  $Cw_{31}$ ,  $Cw_{32}$ ,  $Cw_4$  and  $Cw_5$  are shown in Fig. 2.

**Proposition 11**  $\models Cw_1\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{21}\varphi$ ,  $\models Cw_{21}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{22}\varphi$ . Consequently,  $\models Cw_1\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{22}\varphi$ .

**Proof 10** The first part is immediate from Prop. 3.

Moreover, as  $\models Ew_1\varphi \rightarrow Ew_2\varphi$  (by Prop. 10 (a)), thus  $\models CEw_1\varphi \rightarrow CEw_2\varphi$ , that is,  $\models Cw_{21}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{22}\varphi$ .

**Proposition 12**  $\models Cw_{21}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{31}\varphi$ ,  $\models Cw_{22}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{32}\varphi$ . As a consequence,  $\models Cw_{21}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{32}\varphi$ .

**Proof 11** Similar to the proof in Prop. 3.




Figure 2: Logical relationships in the multi-agent cases


**Proposition 13**  $\not\models Cw_{22}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{31}\varphi$ . As a consequence,  $\not\models Cw_{22}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{21}\varphi$ .

**Proof 12** Consider the model  $\mathcal{M}$  in the proof of Prop. 10 (b).

We have seen that  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Ew_2p$ . Moreover, it is obvious that  $\mathcal{M}, t \models Ew_2p$ , and thus  $\mathcal{M}, s \models CEw_2p$ . However,  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Ep$  and  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models E\neg p$ , thus  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Ew_1p$ , and hence  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Cw_{31}p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_{22}p \rightarrow Cw_{31}p$ .

**Proposition 14**  $\not\models Cw_{31}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{32}\varphi$ . As a result,  $\not\models Cw_{31}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{22}\varphi$ .

**Proof 13** Consider the following model:



Firstly,  $s \models Cw_{31}p$ . To see this, notice that  $s \models Ew_1p$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}, t_1 \not\models Ew_1p$  and  $\mathcal{M}, t_2 \not\models Ew_1p$ , we infer that  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Ew_1Ew_1p$ . Moreover, as  $t_3$  and  $t_4$  both have no successors,  $t_3 \models Ew_1\varphi$  and  $t_4 \models Ew_1\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , then  $t_1 \models Ew_1Ew_1\varphi$  and  $t_2 \models Ew_1Ew_1\varphi$ , and therefore  $s \models Ew_1Ew_1Ew_1\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ . This implies that  $s \models Cw_{31}p$ .

Secondly,  $s \not\models Cw_{32}p$ . To see this, note that  $t_1 \not\models Ew_2p$  and  $t_2 \models Ew_2p$ . This implies that  $s \not\models Ew_2Ew_2p$ , and therefore  $s \not\models Cw_{32}p$ . Now we conclude that  $\not\models Cw_{31}p \rightarrow Cw_{32}p$ .

**Proposition 15**  $\not\models Cw_{32}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{31}\varphi$ .

**Proof 14** Use the model  $\mathcal{M}$  in the proof of Prop. 10 (b). We have seen there that  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Ew_1p$ , and thus  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Cw_{31}p$ .

Moreover, as  $s$  has only one  $i$ -successor and only one  $j$ -successor, we have  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Kw_i\varphi \wedge Kw_j\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , that is,  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Ew_2\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , and thus  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Cw_{32}\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , hence  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Cw_{32}p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_{32}p \rightarrow Cw_{31}p$ .

**Proposition 16**  $\not\models Cw_{21}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_1\varphi$ , and thus  $\not\models Cw_{22}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_1\varphi$ .

**Proof 15** Similar to the proof of Prop. 4.

**Proposition 17**  $\not\models Cw_{31}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{21}\varphi$ , and  $\not\models Cw_{32}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{22}\varphi$ .

**Proof 16** Similar to the proof of Prop. 5.

**Proposition 18**  $\models Cw_{22}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ , and thus  $\models Cw_{21}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proof 17** By definition of  $Ew_2$ , we have  $\models Ew_2\varphi \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbf{G}} Kw_i\varphi$ , then  $\models CEw_2\varphi \leftrightarrow C\bigwedge_{i \in \mathbf{G}} Kw_i\varphi$ , that is,  $\models CEw_2\varphi \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbf{G}} CKw_i\varphi$ , and thus  $\models Cw_{22}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proposition 19**  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{32}\varphi$  and  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{31}\varphi$ . Consequently,  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{22}\varphi$ ,  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{21}\varphi$ ,  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_1\varphi$ .

**Proof 18** Consider the model in the proof of Prop. 8. We have already seen that  $s \models Cw_4p$ .

However, since  $s \not\models Kw_ip$ , thus  $s \not\models Ew_2p$ , which implies that  $s \not\models Ew_1p$  due to Prop. 10 (a). It follows that  $s \not\models Cw_{32}p$  and  $s \not\models Cw_{31}p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_4p \rightarrow Cw_{32}p$  and  $\not\models Cw_4p \rightarrow Cw_{31}p$ .

**Proposition 20**  $\models Cw_{22}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_5\varphi$ .

**Proof 19** Let  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{R_i \mid i \in \mathbf{G}\}, V \rangle$  be a model and  $w \in W$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Cw_{22}\varphi$ , to show that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Cw_5\varphi$ , that is,  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \bigwedge_{s \in G^+} Kw_s\varphi$ . Let  $s \in G^+$  be arbitrary. It suffices to prove that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Kw_s\varphi$ . For this, we show a stronger result: (\*) for any  $u$  such that  $w \rightarrow u$ , we have that  $\mathcal{M}, u \models Kw_s\varphi$ . From this it follows immediately that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Kw_s\varphi$  due to the fact that  $w \rightarrow w$ .

We proceed by induction on the length of  $s$ , denoted by  $|s|$ . By supposition, for all  $u$  such that  $w \rightarrow u$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}, u \models \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbf{G}} Kw_i\varphi$ .


*Base step:*  $|s| = 1$ . We may assume that  $s = i_1$ , where  $i_1 \in \mathbf{G}$ . For any  $u$  with  $w \rightarrow u$ , as  $\mathcal{M}, u \models \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbf{G}} Kw_i\varphi$ , we have obviously that  $\mathcal{M}, u \models Kw_{i_1}\varphi$ . Therefore, (\*) holds.

*Induction step:* hypothesize that (\*) holds for  $|s| = k$  (IH), we prove that (\*) also holds for  $|s| = k + 1$ . For this, we may assume that  $s = i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k+1}$ , where  $i_m \in \mathbf{G}$  for  $m \in [1, k + 1]$ .

For all  $u$  such that  $w \rightarrow u$ , for all  $v$  such that  $uR_{i_1}v$ , we have  $w \rightarrow v$ . Note that  $|i_2 \dots i_{k+1}| = k$ . Then by IH, we derive that  $\mathcal{M}, v \models Kw_{i_2 \dots i_{k+1}}\varphi$ , and therefore,  $\mathcal{M}, u \models Kw_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{k+1}}\varphi$ , that is,  $\mathcal{M}, u \models Kw_s\varphi$ . We have now shown (\*), as desired.

**Proposition 21**  $\not\models Cw_{32}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_5\varphi$ . As a consequence,  $\not\models Cw_{32}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{22}\varphi$ .

**Proof 20** Consider the following model:




In this model, on one hand,  $s \models Cw_{32}p$ : note that  $s \models Ew_2p$  is easily verified; since  $t \not\models Kw_jp$ , thus  $t \not\models Ew_2p$ , similarly, since  $u \not\models Kw_ip$ , thus  $u \not\models Ew_2p$ , from which it follows that  $s \models Ew_2Ew_2p$ . Moreover, since both  $v$  and  $w$  have no successors,  $Ew_2p \wedge Ew_2Ew_2p \wedge \dots$  holds at both  $v$  and  $w$ , then  $Ew_2Ew_2p \wedge Ew_2Ew_2Ew_2p \wedge \dots$  holds at both  $t$  and  $u$ . Therefore,  $s \models Ew_2Ew_2Ew_2p \wedge Ew_2Ew_2Ew_2Ew_2p \wedge \dots$ , as desired.

On the other hand,  $t \models Kw_ip$  but  $u \not\models Kw_ip$ , and hence  $s \not\models Kw_iKw_ip$ . This entails that  $s \not\models Cw_5p$ , as desired.

**Proposition 22**  $\not\models Cw_5\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{32}\varphi$ .


**Proof 21** Consider the following model:



We now show that  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Cw_5p$  but  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Cw_{32}p$ .

One may easily see that  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Kw_j\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , and  $s \models Kw_ip$ , thus  $s \models Kw_ip \wedge Kw_jp$ . Moreover,  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  both satisfy  $Kw_j\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$  and  $Kw_ip$ , and then  $s \models Kw_iKw_ip \wedge Kw_iKw_jp$ . Besides,  $u_1 \models \neg Kw_ip \wedge Kw_jp$  and  $u_2 \models Kw_ip \wedge \neg Kw_jp$ , which implies that  $t_1 \models \neg Kw_iKw_ip \wedge \neg Kw_iKw_jp$ ;  $u_3 \models Kw_i\varphi \wedge Kw_j\varphi$  for any  $\varphi$ ,  $u_4 \models \neg Kw_ip \wedge \neg Kw_jp$ , thus  $t_2 \models \neg Kw_iKw_ip \wedge \neg Kw_iKw_jp$ , and hence  $s \models Kw_iKw_iKw_ip \wedge Kw_iKw_iKw_jp$ . Of course  $s \models Kw_iKw_j\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , thus  $s \models Kw_iKw_jKw_ip \wedge Kw_iKw_jKw_jp$ . Because  $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4$  all satisfy  $Kw_a\varphi$  for all  $\varphi$  and  $a$ , we can obtain that  $s \models Kw_aKw_bKw_cKw_d\varphi$  for all  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbf{G}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Cw_5p$ .

Since  $u_k \not\models Kw_ip \wedge Kw_jp$  for  $k = 1, 2$ , thus  $t_1 \models Kw_iEw_2p$ , and then  $t_1 \models Kw_iEw_2p \wedge Kw_jEw_2p$ , i.e.  $t_1 \models Ew_2Ew_2p$ . However,  $u_3 \models Ew_2p$  and  $u_4 \not\models Ew_2p$ , which entails that  $t_2 \not\models Kw_iEw_2p$ , and thus  $t_2 \not\models Ew_2Ew_2p$ . Therefore,  $s \not\models Kw_iEw_2Ew_2p$ , and thus  $s \not\models Ew_2Ew_2Ew_2p$ . This leads to  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Cw_{32}p$ .

Figure 3: Logical relationships over  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{S5}$  (multi-agent).

**Proposition 23**  $\not\models Cw_{31}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_5\varphi$ .

**Proof 22** Consider the model in the proof of Prop. 21. It has been shown there that  $s \not\models Cw_5p$ . It then suffices to prove that  $s \models Cw_{31}p$ .

As  $s \models K_i p$  and  $s \models K_j \varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , we obtain  $s \models Ep$ , and thus  $s \models Ew_1 p$ . Since  $t \not\models Ep \vee E\neg p$  and  $u \not\models Ep \vee E\neg p$ , we can show that  $s \models E\neg Ew_1 p$ , and then  $s \models Ew_1 Ew_1 p$ . Moreover, because  $v$  and  $w$  both have no successors,  $v \models Ew_1 \varphi$  and  $w \models Ew_1 \varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ , thus  $t \models Ew_1 Ew_1 \varphi$  and  $u \models Ew_1 Ew_1 \varphi$ , and hence  $s \models Ew_1 Ew_1 Ew_1 \varphi$  for all  $\varphi$ . This together gives us  $s \models Cw_{31}p$ .

**Proposition 24**  $\not\models Cw_5\varphi \rightarrow Cw_{31}\varphi$ .

**Proof 23** Consider the model in the proof of Prop. 22. It has been shown there that  $s \models Cw_5p$ . The remainder is to show that  $s \not\models Cw_{31}p$ . The proof is as follows.

One may check that  $Ew_1 p$  is true at  $u_3$  but false at  $u_1, u_2, u_4$ . It then follows that  $t_1 \models Ew_1 Ew_1 p$  but  $t_2 \not\models Ew_1 Ew_1 p$ , and therefore  $s \not\models Ew_1 Ew_1 Ew_1 p$ , which implies that  $s \not\models Cw_{31}p$ , as desired.

**Proposition 25**  $\not\models Cw_{32}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proof 24** Use the model in the proof of Prop. 21. It has been shown there that  $s \models Cw_{32}p$ .

Moreover,  $s \not\models Cw_4p$ . To see this, note that  $t \not\models \neg Kw_i p$  and  $u \not\models Kw_i p$ . This entails that  $s \not\models CKw_i p \vee C\neg Kw_i p$ . Therefore,  $s \not\models Cw_4p$ .

**Proposition 26**  $\not\models Cw_{31}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proof 25** Use the model in the proof of Prop. 21. By Prop. 25, we have  $s \not\models Cw_4p$ . By Prop. 23, we obtain  $s \models Cw_{31}p$ . Therefore,  $\not\models Cw_{31}\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proposition 27**  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_5\varphi$ .

**Proof 26** Consider the model in the proof of Prop. 8. We have seen that  $M, s \models Cw_4p$ . However, as  $M, s \models \neg Kw_i p$ , we can obtain that  $M, s \not\models Cw_5p$ . So,  $\not\models Cw_4\varphi \rightarrow Cw_5\varphi$ .

**Proposition 28**  $\not\models Cw_5\varphi \rightarrow Cw_4\varphi$ .

**Proof 27** Use the model in the proof of Prop. 22. There, we have shown that  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Cw_5p$ . It is now sufficient to prove that  $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models Cw_4p$ .

Note that  $u_1 \not\models Kw_i p$  and  $u_3 \not\models \neg Kw_i p$ . This gives us  $s \not\models CKw_i p \vee C\neg Kw_i p$ , and therefore  $s \not\models Cw_4p$ .

We have thus completed the proof of Thm. 1. Note that all proofs involved are based on  $\mathcal{K}$ . In fact, we can also explore the implication relations of  $Cw_1 - Cw_5$  over  $\mathcal{KD45}$ , over  $\mathcal{T}$ , and also over  $\mathcal{S5}$ . It turns out that the implication relations over  $\mathcal{KD45}$  is the same as those over  $\mathcal{K}$  (see Fig. 2), and the implication relations over  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{S5}$  is figured as follows (see Fig. 3). We omit the proof details due to the space limitation.

Therefore,  $Cw_1$ ,  $Cw_2$ ,  $Cw_3$  and  $Cw_5$  boil down to the same thing once the frame is reflexive, which can be attributed to agents' agreements on the values of  $\varphi$ . For example, if there is  $\mathcal{M}, s \models Kw_i \varphi \wedge Kw_j \varphi$  where  $\mathcal{M}$  is reflexive, the values of  $\varphi$  on all  $i$ -successors must agree with those on all  $j$ -successors since they share a common successor  $s$ . Comparatively, if  $\mathcal{M}$  is not reflexive, the case of  $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_i \varphi \wedge K_j \neg \varphi$  is possible.



## 4 Axiomatization

$S5$  is the class of frames specifically for knowledge or epistemic description. As mentioned above, over  $S5$ , the five definitions of ‘commonly knowing whether’ are logically equivalent except  $Cw_4$ . Also, one may verify that  $Ew_1$  and  $Ew_2$  are logically equivalent over  $S5$ . In this section, we axiomatize **Cw** over  $S5$ . The language **Cw** can now be defined recursively as follows:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid Kw_i\varphi \mid Cw\varphi,$$

where  $Cw$  means  $Cw_1$ , and  $Ew\varphi$  abbreviates  $\bigwedge_{i \in G} Kw_i\varphi$ .

The semantics of **Cw** is defined as before in addition to the semantics of  $Cw$  as follows.

**Definition 9**  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Cw\varphi \Leftrightarrow$  for all  $u, v$ , if  $w \twoheadrightarrow u$  and  $w \twoheadrightarrow v$ , then  $(\mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi)$ .

### 4.1 Proof system and Soundness

The proof system **PLCKW5** is an extension of the axiom system of the logic of ‘knowing whether’ **CLS5** in [6] plus the axioms and rules concerning  $Cw$ .

**Definition 10** The axiomatization of **PLCKW5** consists of the following axiom schemas and inference rules:

All instances of tautologies	(TAUT)
$Kw_i(\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \wedge Kw_i(\neg\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow Kw_i\varphi$	(Kw-CON)
$Kw_i\varphi \rightarrow Kw_i(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \vee Kw_i(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \chi)$	(Kw-DIS)
$Kw_i\varphi \wedge Kw_i(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge \varphi \rightarrow Kw_i\psi$	(Kw-T)
$\neg Kw_i\varphi \rightarrow Kw_i\neg Kw_i\varphi$	(wKw-5)
$Kw_i\varphi \leftrightarrow Kw_i\neg\varphi$	(Kw- $\leftrightarrow$ )
$Cw(\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \wedge Cw(\neg\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \rightarrow Cw\varphi$	(Cw-CON)
$Cw\varphi \rightarrow Cw(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \vee Cw(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \chi)$	(Cw-DIS)
$Cw\varphi \wedge Cw(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge \varphi \rightarrow Cw\psi$	(Cw-T)
$Cw\varphi \rightarrow (Ew\varphi \wedge EwCw\varphi)$	(Cw-Mix)
$Cw(\varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi) \rightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow Cw\varphi)$	(Cw-Ind)
from $\varphi$ infer $Kw_i\varphi$	(Kw-NEC)
from $\varphi$ infer $Cw\varphi$	(Cw-NEC)
from $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ infer $Kw_i\varphi \leftrightarrow Kw_i\psi$	(Kw-RE)
from $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$ infer $Cw\varphi \leftrightarrow Cw\psi$	(Cw-RE)
from $\varphi$ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ infer $\psi$	(MP)

**Proposition 29** **PLCKW5** is sound with respect to  $S5$ .

**Proof 28** The soundness of the axioms (Kw-CON), (Kw-DIS), (Kw-T), (wKw-5) and the soundness of the rules (Kw-NEC), (Kw-RE), (MP) are already proved in [6]. Moreover, the soundness of (Cw-CON), (Cw-DIS), (Cw-T), (Cw-NEC) and (Cw-RE) can be shown as their Kw-counterparts. It suffices to show the soundness of (Cw-Mix) and (Cw-Ind). Let  $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, \{R_i \mid i \in G\}, V \rangle$  be an arbitrary  $S5$ -model and  $w \in W$ .

For (Cw-Mix): Suppose that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Cw\varphi$ , to show that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Ew\varphi \wedge EwCw\varphi$ . We only show that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models EwCw\varphi$ , since  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Ew\varphi$  is straightforward.

If  $\mathcal{M}, w \not\models EwCw\varphi$ , then for some  $i \in G$  and some  $u, v$  such that  $wR_iu$  and  $wR_iv$  we have  $\mathcal{M}, u \models Cw\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{M}, v \not\models Cw\varphi$ . Then there exist  $v_1, v_2$  such that  $v \twoheadrightarrow v_1$  and  $v \twoheadrightarrow v_2$  and  $\mathcal{M}, v_1 \models \varphi$  and  $\mathcal{M}, v_2 \not\models \varphi$ . Then  $w \twoheadrightarrow v_1$  and  $w \twoheadrightarrow v_2$ , and therefore  $\mathcal{M}, w \not\models Cw\varphi$ , which is contrary to the supposition.

For (Cw-Ind): Suppose that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Cw(\varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi) \wedge \varphi$ . We show a stronger result: (\*): for all  $u$  such that  $w \twoheadrightarrow u$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi$ ; equivalently, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all  $u$  such that  $w \twoheadrightarrow^n u$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi$  (Recall that  $\twoheadrightarrow^n = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \twoheadrightarrow^n$ ). From  $\mathcal{M}, w \models Cw(\varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi)$ , it follows that either (1) for all  $u$  such that  $w \twoheadrightarrow u$  we have  $\mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi$  or (2) for all  $u$  such that  $w \twoheadrightarrow u$  we have  $\mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi \wedge \neg Ew\varphi$ . The case (2) immediately gives us (\*). In the remainder, it suffices to consider the case (1).

We proceed with induction on  $n$ .

Base step (i.e.  $n = 0$ ). In this case, we need to show that  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$ . This follows directly from the supposition.

*Inductive step.* Assume by induction hypothesis (IH) that  $(*)$  holds for  $n = k$ . We show that  $(*)$  also holds for  $n = k + 1$ . Hypothesize that  $w \rightarrow^{k+1} u$ , then there exists  $v$  such that  $w \rightarrow^k v \rightarrow u$ . By IH,  $\mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi$ . Obviously,  $w \rightarrow v$ , then using (1) we infer that  $\mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi \rightarrow Ew\varphi$ , thus  $\mathcal{M}, v \models Ew\varphi$ . Together with the fact that  $\mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi$  and the reflexivity of  $\rightarrow$  (since  $R_i$  is reflexive for all  $i \in \mathbf{G}$ ), this would implies that for all  $x$  such that  $v \rightarrow x$  we have  $\mathcal{M}, x \models \varphi$ , and therefore  $\mathcal{M}, u \models \varphi$ , as desired.

## 4.2 Completeness of PLCKWS5

We follow the basic idea on proving completeness of the logic of common knowledge to prove the completeness of PLCKWS5.

**Definition 11** The closure of  $\varphi$ , denoted as  $cl(\varphi)$ , is the smallest set satisfying following conditions:

1.  $\varphi \in cl(\varphi)$ .
2. if  $\psi \in cl(\varphi)$ , then  $sub(\psi) \subseteq cl(\varphi)$ .
3. if  $\psi \in cl(\varphi)$  and  $\psi$  is not itself of the form  $\neg\chi$ , then  $\neg\psi \in cl(\varphi)$ .
4. if  $Kw_i\psi \in cl(\varphi)$  and  $Kw_i\chi \in cl(\varphi)$ , and  $\chi$  and  $\psi$  are not themselves conditionals, then  $Kw_i(\chi \rightarrow \psi) \in cl(\varphi)$ .
5. if  $Cw\psi \in cl(\varphi)$ , then  $\{Kw_iCw\psi \mid i \in \mathbf{G}\} \subseteq cl(\varphi)$ .
6. If  $Cw\psi \in cl(\varphi)$ , then  $\{Kw_i\psi \mid i \in \mathbf{G}\} \subseteq cl(\varphi)$ .
7. If  $\neg Kw_i\psi_1 \in cl(\varphi)$ ,  $\psi_1$  is not a negation and  $Cw\psi_2 \in cl(\varphi)$ , then  $Kw_i\neg(\psi_1 \wedge \neg\psi_2) \in cl(\varphi)$ .

The definition of the canonical model for PLCKWS5 is inspired by the canonical models of CLS5 in [6], where the definition of the canonical relation is inspired by an almost schema.

**Definition 12**  $\Phi$  is a closure of some formula. We define the canonical model based on  $\Phi$  as  $\mathcal{M}^c = \langle W^c, \{R_i^T \mid i \in \mathbf{G}\}, V^c \rangle$  where:

1.  $W^c = \{\Sigma \mid \Sigma \text{ is maximal consistent in } \Phi\}$ .
2. For each  $i \in \mathbf{G}$ , let  $R_i^T$  be the reflexive closure of  $R_i^c$ , where  $\Sigma R_i^c \Delta$  iff there exists an  $\chi$  which is not a conditionals, such that:
  - (a)  $\neg Kw_i\chi \in \Sigma$  and
  - (b) for all  $\varphi \in \Phi$ :  $(Kw_i\varphi \in \Sigma \text{ and } Kw_i\neg(\varphi \wedge \neg\chi) \in \Sigma) \text{ implies } \varphi \in \Delta$ .
3.  $V^c(p) = \{\Sigma \in W^c \mid p \in \Sigma\}$ .

Here, it should be noticed that it has already been proved that  $R_i^T$  is an equivalence relation in [6], which means we no longer need the transitive and symmetric closure. A useful proposition should also be given in advance.

**Proposition 30** For all  $n > 1$ :

1.  $\vdash (Kw_i(\bigwedge_{k=1}^n \varphi_k \rightarrow \neg\psi) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^n Kw_i\varphi_k \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^n Kw_i(\psi \rightarrow \varphi_k)) \rightarrow Kw_i\psi$
2.  $\vdash (Kw_i(\bigwedge_{k=1}^n \varphi_k \rightarrow \psi) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^n Kw_i\varphi_k \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^n Kw_i(\neg\psi \rightarrow \varphi_k)) \rightarrow Kw_i\psi$

The proof of Proposition 30.1 is given in [6] and Proposition 30.2 can thereby be directly derived.

**Lemma 1** (Lindenbaum's Lemma) Let  $\Phi$  be the closure of some formula. Every consistent subset of  $\Phi$  is a subset of a maximal consistent set in  $\Phi$ .

The proof of Lemma 1 is standard. In order to prove the completeness of PLCKWS5, we refer to the basic idea of the completeness of classical common knowledge in [14] and [5] and Lemma 2 should be proved in advance.

**Definition 13** ( $\alpha$ -path) In the canonical model  $M^c$ , if  $\Sigma \twoheadrightarrow \Delta$ , then the sequence of maximal-consistent sets  $l = \langle \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n \rangle$  satisfying following two conditions:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Here we abuse the notation and use  $\twoheadrightarrow$  to denote the reflexive-transitive closure of the union of the canonical relations.

1.  $\Sigma = \Gamma_0, \Delta = \Gamma_n$ ;
2. for any  $k$  ( $0 \leq k < n$ ), there is an agent  $i \in G$  such that  $\Gamma_k R_i^T \Gamma_{k+1}$ ;
3. for any  $m$  ( $0 \leq m \leq n$ ),  $\alpha \in \Gamma_m$ .

is an  $\alpha$ -path from  $\Sigma$  to  $\Delta$ .

**Lemma 2** If  $Cw\varphi \in \Phi$ , then  $Cw\varphi \in \Sigma$  iff every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\varphi$ -path or every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\neg\varphi$ -path.

**Proof 29** ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Proof by induction on the length  $n$  of the path. We have to prove a stronger lemma: if  $Cw\varphi \in \Sigma$ , then every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\varphi$ -path and a  $Cw\varphi$ -path or every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\neg\varphi$ -path and  $Cw\varphi$ -path.

When  $n = 0$ ,  $l = \langle \Sigma \rangle$ . Since  $\Sigma$  is maximal consistent and  $\varphi \in \Phi$ ,  $\varphi \in \Sigma$  or  $\neg\varphi \in \Sigma$ . And  $Cw\varphi \in \Sigma$  is our premise.

Induction hypothesis: If  $Cw\varphi \in \Sigma$ , then every path of length  $n$  is a  $\varphi$ -path and a  $Cw\varphi$ -path or every path of length  $n$  is a  $\neg\varphi$ -path and a  $Cw\varphi$ -path.

Induction Step: Assume  $l_n = \langle \Sigma_0, \Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n \rangle$  is a  $\varphi$ -path and  $Cw\varphi$ -path. Take a path of length  $(n+1)$  from  $\Sigma$ . By induction hypothesis,  $Cw\varphi \in \Sigma_n$ . Let  $i$  be the agent such that  $\Sigma_n R_i^T \Sigma_{n+1}$ . Since  $\text{PLCKWS5} \vdash Cw\varphi \rightarrow Kw_i\varphi$  and  $Kw_i\varphi \in \Phi$ , it must be the case that  $Kw_i\varphi \in \Sigma_n$ . Suppose  $\varphi \notin \Sigma_{n+1}$ . By the definition of  $R_i^T$ , there exists a  $\chi$  which is not conditionals such that  $\neg Kw_i\varphi \in \Sigma_n$ , and  $Kw_i\varphi \notin \Sigma_n$  or  $Kw_i(\chi \in \varphi)$ . By  $Kw_i\varphi \in \Sigma_n$ , we can infer that  $Kw_i(\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \notin \Sigma_n$ . Since  $Cw\varphi \in \Phi$ , we know that  $\varphi$  is itself not a conditionals. So  $Kw_i(\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \in \Phi$ . Thus,  $\neg Kw_i(\chi \rightarrow \varphi) \in \Sigma_n$ . By (Kw-Dis) and (Kw-T), we have  $\{Kw_i\varphi, \neg Kw_i(\chi \rightarrow \varphi), \varphi\} \vdash Kw_i\chi$ , which implies that  $Kw_i\chi \in \Sigma_n$ . It contradicts to  $\neg Kw_i\chi \in \Sigma_n$ . Therefore,  $\varphi \in \Sigma_{n+1}$ .

Since  $\text{PLCKWS5} \vdash Cw\varphi \rightarrow EwCw\varphi$  and  $\text{PLCKWS5} \vdash EwCw\varphi \rightarrow Kw_iCw\varphi$ , it must be the case that  $Kw_iCw\varphi \in \Sigma_n$ . Similarly, we can prove that  $Cw\varphi \in \Sigma_{n+1}$ . Thus, for any path with  $(n+1)$  length, it is a  $\varphi$ -path and  $Cw\varphi$ -path.

Assume  $l_n = \langle \Sigma_0, \Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n \rangle$  is a  $\neg\varphi$ -path and  $Cw\varphi$ -path. We can also prove that for any path with  $(n+1)$  length, it is a  $\neg\varphi$ -path and  $Cw\varphi$ -path.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Suppose that every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\varphi$ -path or every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\neg\varphi$ -path. We want to prove that  $\vdash \bigwedge \Sigma \rightarrow Ew\varphi$ . Assume, to reach a contradiction, that  $\bigwedge \Sigma \wedge \neg Ew\varphi$  is consistent. It implies that there exists  $i \in G$  such that  $\bigwedge \Sigma \wedge \neg Kw_i\varphi$  is consistent. By  $Cw\varphi \in \Phi$ ,  $\neg Kw_i\varphi \in \Phi$ . So  $\neg Kw_i\varphi \in \Sigma$ . And we know that  $\varphi$  is not a conditionals. Now we are to construct two maximal consistent sets in  $\Phi$ ,  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  such that  $\Sigma R_i^T \Gamma_1$  and  $\Sigma R_i^T \Gamma_2$  and  $\varphi \in \Gamma_1$  and  $\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_2$ . Firstly, we will show the following two items:

1.  $\{\theta \mid \theta \text{ is not conditionals and } Kw_i\theta \in \Sigma \text{ and } Kw_i(\varphi \rightarrow \theta) \in \Sigma\} \cup \{\varphi\}$  is consistent.
2.  $\{\theta \mid \theta \text{ is not conditionals and } Kw_i\theta \in \Sigma \text{ and } Kw_i(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \theta) \in \Sigma\} \cup \{\neg\varphi\}$  is consistent.

As for 1, assume that it is not consistent. It implies that there exist  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  in it such that  $\vdash (\theta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_n) \rightarrow \neg\varphi$  and  $Kw_i\theta_k \in \Sigma$  and  $Kw_i(\varphi \rightarrow \theta_k) \in \Sigma$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . By (Kw-NEC),  $\vdash Kw_i((\theta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_n) \rightarrow \neg\varphi)$ . By Proposition 30.1, we infer that  $Kw_i\varphi \in \Sigma$ . Contradiction.

As for 2, assume that it is not consistent. It implies that there exist  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  in it such that  $\vdash (\theta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_n) \rightarrow \varphi$  and  $Kw_i\theta_k \in \Sigma$  and  $Kw_i(\neg\varphi \rightarrow \theta_k) \in \Sigma$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . By (Kw-NEC),  $\vdash Kw_i((\theta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_n) \rightarrow \varphi)$ . By Proposition 30.2, we infer that  $Kw_i\varphi \in \Sigma$ . Contradiction.

Thus, these two consistent sets can be extended to two maximal consistent sets  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$ , according to Lindenbaum lemma. According to the definition of  $R_i^T$ ,  $\Sigma R_i^T \Gamma_1$  and  $\Sigma R_i^T \Gamma_2$  and  $\varphi \in \Gamma_1$  and  $\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_2$ . It contradicts to our supposition that every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\varphi$ -path or every path from  $\Sigma$  is a  $\neg\varphi$ -path. So we have  $\vdash \bigwedge \Sigma \rightarrow Ew\varphi$ . By (Cw-NEC) and (Cw-Ind),  $\vdash \bigwedge \Sigma \rightarrow Cw\varphi$ . Therefore,  $Cw\varphi \in \Sigma$ .

**Lemma 3** (Finite Truth Lemma) For any **Cw**-formula  $\psi$ , for all  $\Sigma \in W^c$ , we have  $\mathcal{M}^c, \Sigma \models \psi$  iff  $\psi \in \Sigma$ .

**Proof 30** By induction on  $\psi$ :

- When  $\psi$  is a Boolean formula or is  $Kw_i\varphi$ , the proof can be shown as in [6].
- When  $\psi = Cw\varphi$ :

‘Only if’: Suppose that  $Cw\varphi \notin \Sigma$ . By Lemma 2, there exist two paths  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  such that  $l_1$  is not a  $\varphi$ -path and  $l_2$  is not a  $\neg\varphi$ -path. Thus, there must be a  $\Delta_1 \in l_1$  such that  $\neg\varphi \in \Delta_1$  and a  $\Delta_2 \in l_2$  such that  $\varphi \in \Delta_2$ . By induction hypothesis, we have  $\mathcal{M}^c, \Delta_1 \models \neg\varphi$  and  $\mathcal{M}^c, \Delta_2 \models \varphi$ . By the definition 13,  $\Sigma \twoheadrightarrow \Delta_1$  and  $\Sigma \twoheadrightarrow \Delta_2$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{M}^c, \Sigma \not\models Cw\varphi$ .

'If': Assume  $\mathcal{M}^c, \Sigma \not\models Cw\varphi$ . By the semantics of  $Cw\varphi$ , there exist  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \in W^c$  with  $\Sigma \rightarrow \Delta_1, \Sigma \rightarrow \Delta_2$ , such that  $\mathcal{M}^c, \Delta_1 \models \varphi$  and  $\mathcal{M}^c, \Delta_2 \models \neg\varphi$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\varphi \in \Delta_1$  and  $\neg\varphi \in \Delta_2$ . Thus, there exists a path  $l_1$  where  $\Delta_1 \in l_1$  such that  $l_1$  is not a  $\neg\varphi$ -path and there also exists a path  $l_2$  where  $\Delta_2 \in l_2$  such that  $l_2$  is not a  $\varphi$ -path. By Lemma 2,  $Cw\varphi \notin \Sigma$ .

By Lemma 3, we obtain the completeness of PLCKWS5.

**Theorem 3** The logic PLCKWS5 is weakly complete with respect to S5.

## 5 Expressivity

In this section, we will compare the expressivity of  $Cw_5$  with that of common knowledge, since both notions are inspired by the hierarchy of inter-knowledge of a group given in [10]. The two languages are:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \mathbf{Cw}_5 & \varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid Kw_i\varphi \mid Cw_5\varphi \\ \mathbf{C} & \varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid K_i\varphi \mid C\varphi \end{array}$$

### 5.1 $Cw_5$ is Bisimulation Invariant

**Definition 14** Let  $M = \langle W, R, V \rangle$  and  $M' = \langle W', R', V' \rangle$  be two Kripke models. A non-empty binary relation  $Z \subseteq W \times W'$  is called bisimulation between  $M$  and  $M'$ , written as  $M \cong M'$ , if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) If  $wZ'w'$ , then  $w$  and  $w'$  satisfy the same proposition letters.
- (ii) if  $wZ'w'$  and  $wRv$ , then there is a  $v' \in W'$  such that  $vZv'$  and  $w'R'v'$ .
- (iii) If  $wZ'w'$  and  $w'R'v'$ , then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $vZv'$  and  $wRv$ .

When  $Z$  is a bisimulation linking two states  $w$  in  $M$  and  $w'$  in  $M'$ , we say that two pointed models are bisimilar and write  $Z : (M, w) \cong (M', w')$ . If a language  $L$  cannot distinguish any pair of bisimilar models,  $L$  is bisimulation invariant.

**Theorem 4**  $Cw_5$  is bisimulation invariant.

**Proof 31** By induction on formulas  $\varphi$  of  $Cw_5$ .

When  $\varphi$  is a Boolean formula, the proof is classical.

When  $\varphi = Kw_i\psi$ , we prove it in three cases. For arbitrary two bisimilar models  $(M, r)$  and  $(N, t)$ , we have:

- if  $M, r \models Kw_i\psi$  and for all  $r_n$  with  $r \rightarrow_M r_n$ ,  $M, r_n \models \psi$ . Since  $M, r \cong N, t$ , for any  $t_n$  with  $t \rightarrow_N t_n$ , there is an  $r_n$  such that  $r \rightarrow_M r_n$  and  $M, r_n \cong N, t_n$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\psi$  is bisimulation invariant. Thus  $N, t_n \models \psi$ . So  $N, t \models K_i\psi$ .
- if  $M, r \models Kw_i\psi$  and for all  $r_n$  with  $r \rightarrow_M r_n$ ,  $M, r_n \models \neg\psi$ , similar to above case.
- if  $M, r \models \neg Kw_i\psi$ , that means there are  $r_1$  with  $r \rightarrow_M r_1$  and  $r_2$  with  $r \rightarrow_M r_2$ , such that  $M, r_1 \models \psi$  and  $M, r_2 \models \neg\psi$ . Since  $M, r \cong N, t$ , there are  $t_1$  with  $t \rightarrow_N t_1$  and  $t_2$  with  $t \rightarrow_N t_2$ , such that  $M, r_1 \cong N, t_1$  and  $M, r_2 \cong N, t_2$ . By induction hypothesis,  $\psi$  is bisimulation invariant. Thus  $N, t_1 \models \psi$  and  $N, t_2 \models \neg\psi$ . Thus  $N, t \models \neg Kw_i\psi$ .

Thus,  $Kw_i\psi$  is bisimulation invariant.

When  $\varphi = Cw_5\psi$ , assume two bisimilar models  $(M, r)$  and  $(N, t)$ , such that  $M, r \models Cw_5\psi$  and  $N, t \models \neg Cw_5\psi$ . That means there exists a sequence of agents  $s$ , such that  $M, r \models Kw_s\psi$  and  $N, t \models \neg Kw_s\psi$ . Let  $s = \langle i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n \rangle$ . So  $M, r \models Kw_{i_1}\gamma$  and  $N, t \models \neg Kw_{i_1}\gamma$ , where  $\gamma = Kw_{\langle i_2, i_3, \dots, i_n \rangle}\psi$ . However, we have proved that for any formula of the form  $Kw_{i_1}\gamma$ , they are bisimulation invariant. Thus, if  $M, r \models Kw_{i_1}\gamma$ , there must be  $N, t \models Kw_{i_1}\gamma$ . Contradiction.

Therefore, we proved that  $Cw_5$  is bisimulation invariant.

## 5.2 C and $Cw_5$

Although  $Cw_5$  is formed merely with  $Kw$ , which can be defined by classical operator  $K$ , surprisingly,  $Cw_5$  is not expressible in **C**. We prove it by constructing two classes of models, which *no* **C**-formula can distinguish whereas some  $Cw_5$ -formula can. The following definitions and lemmas facilitate our proofs.

**Definition 15** (Modal Depth) *The modal depth of a C-formula is defined by:*

$$\begin{aligned} d(p) &= 1; & d(\neg\varphi) &= d(\varphi); \\ d(\varphi \wedge \psi) &= \max\{d(\varphi), d(\psi)\}; & d(K\varphi) &= d(\varphi) + 1; \\ d(C\varphi) &= d(\varphi) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

To construct two classes of models, we first define two kinds of sets of possible worlds.

**Definition 16** *For every  $n \geq 1$ , we inductively define two sets of possible worlds  $T_n$  and  $Z_n$ :*

- $T_0 = \{t_{00}\}$  and  $Z_0 = \{z_0\}$ ;
- If  $t_i \in T_n$ , then  $t_{i0} \in T_{n+1}$  and  $t_{i1} \in T_{n+1}$ ; if  $z_i \in Z_n$ , then  $z_{i0} \in Z_{n+1}$  and  $z_{i1} \in Z_{n+1}$ ;
- $T_n$  and  $Z_n$  have no other possible worlds.

where  $|j|$  denotes the length of the subscript sequence  $j$  in each  $t_j$  and  $z_j$ .

Then we define two classes of models mentioned above.

**Definition 17** *Define the class of models  $\mathcal{M} = \{\mathcal{M}_n = \langle W_n, R_n, V_n \rangle \mid n \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$ , where*

- $W_n = T_n \cup \{r, t_0\}$ ,
- $R_n = \{(t_i, t_{i0}), (t_i, t_{i1}) \mid t_i \in T_n\} \cup \{(r, t_0), (t_0, t_{00})\}$ ,
- $V_n(p) = W_n - \{t_{0i}\}$ , where  $|i| = n + 1$  and  $i$  is a finite sequence of 0s.

*The class of models  $\mathcal{N} = \{\mathcal{N}_n = \langle W'_n, R'_n, V'_n \rangle \mid n \in \mathbb{N}^+\}$ , where*

- $W'_n = W_n \cup Z_n$
- $R'_n = R_n \cup \{(z_i, z_{i0}), (z_i, z_{i1}) \mid z_i \in Z_n\} \cup \{(r, z_0)\}$
- $V'_n(p) = V_n(p) \cup Z_n - \{z_{0i}\}$ , where  $|i| = 1$  and  $i$  is a finite sequence of 0s.

It is easy to see that for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ ,  $M_n$  is a submodel of  $N_n$ . We will prove that *no* **C**-formula can distinguish  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  with the *CL*-game, which is defined below.

**Definition 18** *A CL-game is a game with two players, duplicator and spoiler, playing on a Kripke-model. Given two Kripke models  $M = \langle W, R, V \rangle$  and  $M' = \langle W', R', V' \rangle$ , from an arbitrary node  $w$  in  $W$  and an arbitrary node  $w'$  in  $W'$ , play games in  $n$  rounds between duplicator and spoiler as following rules:*

- When  $n = 0$ , if the sets of satisfied formulas on node  $w$  and  $w'$  are the same, then duplicator wins; otherwise, spoiler wins.
- When  $n \neq 0$ ,
  - *K-move*: If spoiler starting from node  $w$  does *K-move* to node  $x$  which can be reached by  $R$ , then duplicator starting from  $w'$  does *K-move* to a node  $y$  in  $W'$  with the same set of satisfied propositional variables as  $x$ . If spoiler starts from  $w'$ , then duplicator starts from  $w$  with similar way to move.
  - *C-move*: If spoiler starting from node  $w$  does *C-move* to node  $x$  which can be reached by  $\Rightarrow$ , then duplicator starting from  $w'$  does *C-move* to a node  $y$  in  $W'$  with same set of satisfied propositional variables to  $x$ . If spoiler starts from  $w'$ , then duplicator starts from  $w$  with similar way to move.

*In the game, for arbitrary  $x \in W$  and  $y \in W'$ , we say  $(x, y)$  or  $(y, x)$  is a state of *CL*-game.*

If there is a winning strategy for duplicator in  $n$ -round games,  $(M_n, r)$  and  $(N_n, r)$  agree on all *KCL*-formulas whose modal depth is  $n$ .

**Lemma 4** For arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , duplicator has a winning strategy in the CL-game on  $(M_n, r)$  and  $(N_n, r)$  in  $n$  rounds.

**Proof 32** We describe duplicator's winning strategy case by case. Starting with the initial state  $(r, r)$ , we mainly concerns the case where spoiler does a  $K$ -move. Otherwise, duplicator can move to a isomorphic sub-model such that there must be a winning strategy in following rounds. Thus, the cases below exhaust all possibilities.

- The initial state is  $(r, r)$ :
  - If spoiler does a  $K$ -move or a  $C$ -move on  $M_n$  reaching  $t_i$ , then duplicator does a  $K$ -move or a  $C$ -move on  $N_n$  to reach the corresponding  $t_i$ . Since  $(M_n, t_i) \cong (N_n, t_i)$ , there is a winning strategy after this move.
  - If spoiler does a  $K$ -move or a  $C$ -move on  $N_n$  reaching  $t_i$ , then duplicator does a  $K$ -move or a  $C$ -move on  $M_n$  to reach the corresponding  $t_i$ . Since  $(M_n, t_i) \cong (N_n, t_i)$ , there is a winning strategy after this move.
  - If spoiler does a  $K$ -move on  $N_n$  reaching  $z_0$ , duplicator moves to  $t_0$ .
  - If spoiler does a  $C$ -move on  $N_n$  reaching an arbitrary node  $z_{i(i \neq 0)}$  in  $Z_n$ , then duplicator does a  $C$ -move to reach  $t_{0i}$ . Since  $(M_n, t_{0i}) \cong (N_n, z_i)$ , there is a winning strategy after this move.
- The current state is  $(z_0, t_0)$ :
  - If spoiler does a  $K$ -move reaching  $z_{00}$  or  $z_{01}$ , then duplicator moves on  $M_n$  to reach  $t_{00}$ .
  - If spoiler does a  $K$ -move reaching  $t_{00}$  on  $M_n$ , then duplicator moves to  $z_{00}$  on  $N_n$ .
  - If spoiler does a  $C$ -move reaching  $z_{i(i \neq 0)}$ , then duplicator moves to  $t_{0i}$ . Since  $(M_n, t_{0i}) \cong (N_n, z_i)$ , there is a winning strategy after this move.
  - If spoiler does a  $C$ -move reaching  $t_{00}$  on  $M_n$ , then duplicator moves to  $z_{00}$  on  $N_n$ .
  - If spoiler does a  $C$ -move reaching  $t_{0i(i \neq 0)}$ <sup>4</sup>, then duplicator moves to  $z_i$  on  $N_n$ . Since  $(M_n, t_{0i}) \cong (N_n, z_i)$ , there is a winning strategy after this move.
- The current state is  $(z_i, t_i)$  and  $i \neq 0$ : this means before the game gets to this state, both players have only done  $K$ -moves. In the current state, there have been at most  $(n - 1)$  rounds. Thus,  $i \leq (n - 1)$  and players can do next round as follows:
  - If spoiler does a  $K$ -move reaching  $z_{i0}$  or  $z_{i1}$ , then duplicator does a  $K$ -move to reach  $t_{i0}$  where  $M_n, t_{i0} \models p$  since  $|i0| = |i1| = (i + 1) \leq n$  and there are  $N_n, z_{i0} \models p$  and  $N_n, z_{i1} \models p$ .
  - If spoiler does a  $K$ -move or a  $C$ -move reaching  $t_{i0}$  or  $t_{i1}$ , then duplicator does a  $K$ -move or a  $C$ -move to reach  $z_{i0}$  where  $M_n, z_{i0} \models p$  since  $|i0| = |i1| = (i + 1) \leq n$  and there are  $N_n, t_{i0} \models p$  and  $N_n, t_{i1} \models p$ .
  - If spoiler does a  $C$ -move reaching  $z_{j(|j| > |i|)}$ , then duplicator does a  $C$ -move to reach  $t_{0j}$ . Since  $(M_n, t_{0j}) \cong (N_n, z_j)$ , there is a winning strategy after this move.
  - If spoiler does a  $C$ -move reaching  $t_{0i(i \neq 0)}$ , duplicator moves to  $z_i$  on  $N_n$ . Since  $(M_n, t_{0i}) \cong (N_n, z_i)$ , there is a winning strategy after this move.

Therefore, for arbitrary  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there is a winning strategy for duplicator in the  $n$ -round CL-game over  $(M_n, r)$  and  $(N_n, r)$ .

For an arbitrary  $\mathbf{C}$ -formula  $\varphi$ ,  $\varphi$  has finite modal depth  $n$ . By Lemma 4,  $\varphi$  is satisfied both on  $(M_n, r)$  and  $(N_n, r)$ , which means  $\varphi$  cannot distinguish  $(M_n, r)$  and  $(N_n, r)$ . This implies that we can never find a  $\mathbf{C}$ -formula  $\varphi$  to distinguish the class of models  $M$  and  $N$ . But we can find a  $\mathbf{Cw}_5$ -formula  $Kw_iCw^5p$  to distinguish them since for every  $(M_n, r) \in M$ ,  $M_n, r \models Kw_iCw_5p$  and for every  $(N_n, r) \in N$ ,  $N_n, r \models \neg Kw_iCw_5p$ .

Therefore, following Theorem 5 can be proved.

**Theorem 5** Over  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathbf{Cw}_5$  is not expressivity weaker than  $\mathbf{C}$ .

This will follow that over  $\mathcal{K}$ ,  $\mathbf{Cw}_5$  and  $\mathbf{C}$  are incomparable in expressivity. This is because  $\mathbf{C}$  is also not expressively weaker than  $\mathbf{Cw}_5$ . To see this, consider two models  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , where in  $\mathcal{M}_1$ ,  $s_1$  can only see a  $p$ -world, and in  $\mathcal{M}_2$ ,  $s_2$  can only see a  $\neg p$ -world. It is straightforward to check that  $\mathcal{M}_1, s_1 \models Kp$  but  $\mathcal{M}_2, s_2 \not\models Kp$ , thus  $\mathbf{C}$  can distinguish between these pointed models. However, one can show that these two pointed models cannot be distinguished by  $\mathbf{Cw}_5$ -formulas.

<sup>4</sup>The notation  $t_{0i}$  is correct since the index for every node in  $T_n$  begins with 0.

## 6 $Cw_5$ over Binary Trees

Because of the invalidity of the formula  $(Cw_5\varphi \wedge Cw_5\psi) \rightarrow Cw_5(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ , the operator  $Cw_5$  is not normal, in the sense that it cannot be defined with some closures of accessibility relations standardly. However, an interesting observation over binary-tree models can be proved.

**Definition 19**  $(M, r)$  is a binary-tree model with root  $r$  if  $(M, r)$  is a tree model with root  $r$  and for any node  $t$  in  $M$ ,  $t$  has precisely two successors.

**Theorem 6** Consider the single-agent case. If  $M, r \models Cw_5\varphi$  where  $(M, r)$  is a binary tree with root  $r$ , then on every layer of  $(M, r)$ , the number of the nodes where  $\varphi$  is satisfied is even.

In order to prove Theorem 6, we need to prove a stronger theorem:

**Theorem 7** For an arbitrary formula  $\varphi$ , if  $M$  is a binary-tree model, then  $M, v_m \models Kw_i^n\varphi$  ( $1 \leq n$ ) iff the number of the  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + n)$ th layer that  $v_m$  can reach via relation  $\rightarrow$  is even.

**Proof 33** Given a binary tree  $(M, v_0)$ , where  $v_0$  is the root, we firstly define the index of  $M$  as follows: if there are nodes  $v_m, t, r$  in  $M$  and  $v_m \rightarrow_i t, v_m \rightarrow_i r$ , then define the index of  $t$  as  $v_{m0}$  and the index of  $r$  as  $v_{m1}$ .

Let  $v_m$  be an arbitrary node in  $M$ . Do induction on  $n$ :

- When  $n = 1$ ,
  - Assume  $M, v_m \models Kw_i\varphi$ . Since  $M$  is a binary tree, there must be two nodes,  $v_{m0}$  and  $v_{m1}$  such that  $v_m \rightarrow_i v_{m0}$  and  $v_m \rightarrow_i v_{m1}$ . Since  $M, v_m \models Kw_i\varphi$ , we have  $(M, v_{m0} \models \varphi \text{ and } M, v_{m1} \models \varphi)$  or  $(M, v_{m0} \models \neg\varphi \text{ or } M, v_{m1} \models \neg\varphi)$ . Thus, on the  $(|m| + 1)$ th layer, the number of nodes where  $\varphi$  is satisfied is 2 or 0, both of which are even.
  - Assume the number of the nodes on the  $(|m| + 1)$ th layer that  $v_m$  can reach is even. That means there are only two possible cases:  $(M, v_{m0} \models \varphi \text{ and } M, v_{m1} \models \varphi)$  or  $(M, v_{m0} \models \neg\varphi \text{ or } M, v_{m1} \models \neg\varphi)$ . Thus, we have  $M, v_m \models Kw_i\varphi$ .
- Induction hypothesis: when  $n = k$ ,  $M, v_m \models Kw_i^k\varphi$  ( $1 \leq k$ )  $\Leftrightarrow$  the number of the  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + k)$ th layer that  $v_m$  can reach via relation  $\rightarrow$  is even.
- When  $n = k + 1$ ,
  - Assume  $M, v_m \models Kw_i^{k+1}\varphi$ , which is equivalent to  $M, v_m \models Kw_i^k Kw_i\varphi$ .  
Let  $T$  be the set of nodes exactly consisting of all  $Kw_i\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + k)$ th layer that  $v_m$  can reach via relation  $\rightarrow$ . By induction hypothesis,  $|T|$  is even. let  $|T| = 2a$ . Thus, among all the successors of  $T$ , the number of  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes is  $2x + 0y$ , where  $x + y = 2a$ .  $2x + 0y$  is surely an even number. Let  $S$  be a set of nodes only consisting of  $\neg Kw_i\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + k)$ th layer that  $v_m$  can reach via relation  $\rightarrow$ . Since  $M$  is a binary tree, let  $|S| = 2b$ . For every node in  $S$  has only one  $\varphi$ -satisfied successor, among all the successors of  $S$ , the number of  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes is  $2b$ . Thus, the number of  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + k + 1)$ th layer is  $2x + 2b = 2(x + b)$  which must be even.
  - Assume  $M, v_m \not\models Kw_i^{k+1}\varphi$ , which means  $M, v_{m0} \models Kw_i^k\varphi$  and  $M, v_{m1} \models \neg Kw_i^k\varphi$ . By induction hypothesis, the number of the  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + k + 1)$ th layer that  $v_{m0}$  can reach via relation  $\rightarrow$  is even. And the number of the  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + k + 1)$ th layer that  $v_{m1}$  can reach via relation  $\rightarrow$  is odd. That means that the  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes on the  $(|m| + k + 1)$ th layer that  $v_m$  can reach via relation  $\rightarrow$  is an even number plus an odd number, which equals to an odd number.

**Remark 1** Theorem 6 can be extended into a more general conclusion considering the multi-agent case: on any  $G$ -binary-tree model<sup>5</sup>  $(M, r)$  where  $r$  is the root,  $M, r \models Cw_5\varphi$  iff for any sequence of agents  $s$  in  $G$ , on every layer of the subtree (of  $(M, r)$ ) generated with  $s^6$ , the number of the  $\varphi$ -satisfied nodes is even.

<sup>5</sup>A  $G$ -binary-tree model is a tree model where every node exactly has two  $R_i$ -successors for every  $i \in G$ .

<sup>6</sup>A subtree (of some tree model  $(M, r)$ ) generated with a sequence of agents  $s$  is a subtree rooted with  $r$  which only consists of all  $s$ -paths starting with  $r$  in  $(M, r)$ .

## 7 Conclusion and Future work

This is a preliminary report on ‘commonly knowing whether’. We defined five possible notions of ‘commonly knowing whether’ and studied how they are related to one another. On  $S5$ -frames four of the five notions collapse. We prove the soundness and weak completeness of a ‘commonly knowing whether’ logic on that class of frames. Finally, we study the expressivity of one of the proposed languages with respect to the standard common knowledge modal language on  $\mathcal{K}$ -frames.

There are a lot of future work to be done. For instance, the axiomatizations of  $Cw_1$  over  $\mathcal{K}$  and over the class of other various frame classes, the axiomatizations and relative expressivity of other definitions for ‘commonly knowing whether’.

## Acknowledgement

The authors are greatly indebted to Yanjing Wang for many insightful discussions on the topics of this work and helpful comments on earlier versions of the paper. Jie Fan acknowledges the support of the project 17CZX053 of National Social Science Fundation of China. Xingchi Su was financially supported by Chinese Scholarship Council (CSC) and we wish to thank CSC for its fundings.

## References

- [1] Robert Aumann and Adam Brandenburger. Epistemic conditions for nash equilibrium. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1161–1180, 1995.
- [2] Jon Barwise. Three views of common knowledge. In *Readings in Formal Epistemology*, pages 759–772. Springer, 2016.
- [3] A. Brogan. Aristotle’s logic of statements about contingency. *Mind*, 76(301):49–61, 1967.
- [4] Herbert H Clark and C. R. Marshall. Definite reference and mutual knowledge. *Elements of Discourse Understanding*, pages 10–63, 1981.
- [5] Ronald Fagin, Joseph Y Halpern, Yoram Moses, and Moshe Vardi. *Reasoning about Knowledge*. MIT press, 1995.
- [6] Jie Fan, Yanjing Wang, and Hans van Ditmarsch. Contingency and knowing whether. *The Review of Symbolic Logic*, 8(1):75–107, 2015.
- [7] David K Lewis. *Convention : A Philosophical Study*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1969.
- [8] J. McCarthy. First-Order theories of individual concepts and propositions. *Machine Intelligence*, 9.:129–147, 1979.
- [9] J J Ch Meyer and Wiebe van der Hoek. *Epistemic Logic for AI and Computer Science*, volume 41. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [10] Rohit Parikh and Paul Krasucki. Levels of knowledge in distributed systems. *Sadhana*, 17(1):167–191, 1992.
- [11] R. Petrick and F. Bacchus. Extending the knowledge-based approach to planning with incomplete information and sensing. In *KR*, pages 613–622, 2004.
- [12] R. Reiter. *Knowledge in Action: Logical Foundations for Specifying and Implementing Dynamical Systems*. The MIT Press, 2001.
- [13] Hans van Ditmarsch and Jie Fan. Propositional quantification in logics of contingency. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, 26(1):81–102, 2016.
- [14] Hans Van Ditmarsch, Wiebe van Der Hoek, and Barteld Kooi. *Dynamic Epistemic Logic*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [15] Yanjing Wang. Beyond knowing that: A new generation of epistemic logics. In *Jaakko Hintikka on Knowledge and Game-Theoretical Semantics*, pages 499–533. Springer, Cham, 2018.