

Communication Pattern Logic: Epistemic and Topological Views

Armando Castañeda Hans van Ditmarsch David A. Rosenblueth
Diego A. Velázquez*

Abstract

We propose *communication pattern logic*. A communication pattern describes how processes or agents inform each other, independently of the information content. The full information protocol in distributed computing is the special case wherein all agents inform each other. We study this protocol in distributed computing models where communication might fail: an agent is certain about the messages it receives, but it is uncertain about the messages other agents have received. In a dynamic epistemic logic with distributed knowledge and with modalities for communication patterns, the latter are interpreted by updating Kripke models. We propose an axiomatization of communication pattern logic, and we show that collective bisimilarity (comparing models on their distributed knowledge) is preserved when updating models with communication patterns. We can also interpret communication patterns by updating *simplicial complexes*, a well-known topological framework for distributed computing. We show that the different semantics correspond, and propose collective bisimulation between simplicial complexes.

Keywords distributed computing, modal logic, combinatorial topology, multiagent systems, dynamic epistemic logic

1 Introduction

Epistemic logic [18] investigates knowledge and change of knowledge in multi-agent systems, both in temporal epistemic logics [15, 25, 11] and in dynamic epistemic logics [32], including synchronous and asynchronous semantics based on action histories [28, 10, 4]. Recently, logics of knowledge and its dynamics have been proposed for simplicial complexes, topological structures modelling (a)synchronous computation [16, 14, 22, 29]. A state (world) in a multi-agent Kripke model describes the knowledge of all agents in an integrated way. A state (local state, vertex) in a simplicial complex, by contrast, describes

*Armando, David, and Diego are affiliated to: UNAM, Mexico. Hans is affiliated to: Open University, the Netherlands.

the knowledge of a single agent. To obtain a complete state description we must then combine the different agent views. Logics with a topological interpretation to study distributed systems are appealing, given the deep connection between combinatorial topology and distributed computing [8, 17, 27]; see also [16]. Epistemic logic with such a topological interpretation can enrich epistemic analysis with the topological machinery to study distributed computing problems.

In temporal and dynamic epistemic logics we typically model how specific information contained in a message from or to an agent changes the global state of information. In contrast, the *communication patterns* of this contribution describe how agents communicate with each other independently of the information content of the message. Precursor dynamic epistemic logics of such information exchange are [3, 6, 35]. In [3] the authors model a subgroup G of the set of agents A sharing all their knowledge. As intuitively this describes how to make the distributed knowledge between the agents in G common knowledge (modulo Moorean phenomena) this is called *resolving common knowledge*. The agents not in G are aware that the agents in G perform this update. In [6] this idea is generalized to describe agents sharing their knowledge in arbitrary ways, as when agent a gets to know all that b knows but not vice versa. The authors call such information exchanges *reading events*. The communication patterns we investigate originate in [35]: they model that agents may be *uncertain* about what other agents learn in such updates, such as when a is uncertain whether b also learns all she knows.

Communication pattern logic has modalities for distributed knowledge and modalities for communication patterns, that are interpreted by updating models. We give an axiomatization that is a variation of that in [6], and we show that communication patterns preserve collective bisimilarity. We also interpret communication pattern logic in a topological semantics for simplicial complexes, where we provide correspondence between the Kripke and the simplicial semantics, and we additionally propose collective bisimulation between simplicial complexes, with the obvious sanity checks.

Communication patterns describe distributed systems known as *oblivious*, where messages between agents can be lost in a round of communication, and where the same communication failures may occur at any round. The repeated application of a communication pattern describes the dynamics of information exchange through such rounds of communication. Oblivious distributed systems have been extensively studied in distributed computing (e.g. [1, 2, 9, 24]), including topological modellings of the *iterated immediate snapshot* that captures the computational power of multicore architectures with only simple read/write operations for exchanging information [16].

We conclude the introduction with an overview of the content of our contribution. Sections 2 and 3 define the syntax and semantics of communication pattern logic, and provide its axiomatization. Section 4 interprets communication pattern logic on simplicial complexes. Section 5 concludes with further research.

2 Structures

Given are a finite set of *agents* A and a set of *propositional variables* $P \subseteq P' \times A$, where P' is a countable set. For $B \subseteq A$ and $Q \subseteq P$, $Q \cap (P' \times B)$ is denoted Q_B (where Q_a is $Q_{\{a\}}$), and $(p, a) \in P$ is denoted p_a . The set P_a consists of the *local variables* of agent a .

An *epistemic model* M is a triple (W, \sim, L) , where for each $a \in A$, \sim_a is an *equivalence relation* on the *domain* W (also denoted $\mathcal{D}(M)$) and where $L : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(P)$ is the *valuation* (function). Given $w \in W$, (M, w) is a *pointed epistemic model*. For $\bigcap_{a \in B} \sim_a$ we write \sim_B , and for $\{w' \in W \mid w' \sim_a w\}$ we write $[w]_a$. We further require epistemic models to be *local*, that is: for each $a \in A$ and $v, w \in W$: if $v \sim_a w$ then $L(v)_a = L(w)_a$.

An epistemic model encodes uncertainty among the agents about the value of other agents' local variables and about the knowledge of other agents.

A *communication graph* R is a reflexive binary relation on the set of agents A , that is, $R \in \mathcal{P}(A \times A)$ and such that for all $a \in A$, $(a, a) \in R$. A *communication pattern* \mathbf{R} is a set of communication graphs, that is, $\mathbf{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A \times A)$ (respecting reflexivity). For $(a, b) \in R$ we write aRb . We let Ra represent the *in-neighbourhood* of a , that is, $Ra = \{b \in A \mid bRa\}$. Also, $RB := \bigcup_{b \in B} Rb$. Finally (for multiple use in further proofs), we let $RB \equiv R'B$ denote “for all $a \in B$, $Ra = R'a$ ”. Note that $RB \equiv R'B$ implies $RB = R'B$ but not the other way round. The *identity relation* I on the set of agents A is $\{(a, a) \mid a \in A\}$. The *universal relation* U is $A \times A$.

A communication pattern represents how agents are informed by other agents. Different communication graphs R, R' in a communication pattern may inform a given agent a in the same way ($Ra = R'a$) even when agent a is uncertain to what extent other agents inform each other (for $b \neq a$, Rb may differ from $R'b$).

Given an epistemic model $M = (W, \sim, L)$ and a communication pattern \mathbf{R} , the *updated epistemic model* $M \odot \mathbf{R} = (\dot{W}, \dot{\sim}, \dot{L})$ of M with \mathbf{R} is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W} &= W \times \mathbf{R} \\ (w, R) \dot{\sim}_a (w', R') &\text{ iff } w \sim_{Ra} w' \text{ and } Ra = R'a \\ \dot{L}(w, R) &= L(w) \end{aligned}$$

The updated epistemic model encodes how the knowledge has changed after agents have informed each other according to communication pattern \mathbf{R} .

In order to compare the information context of structures we now define bisimulation [7]. For logics with distributed knowledge this notion is also called collective bisimulation [26].

A relation Z between the domains of epistemic models $M = (W, \sim, L)$ and $M' = (W', \sim', L')$ is a (*collective*) *bisimulation* if for all $(w, w') \in Z$:

- **atoms:** for all $p_a \in P$, $p_a \in L(w)$ iff $p_a \in L'(w')$;
- **forth:** for all nonempty $B \subseteq A$ and for all $v \in W$, if $w \sim_B v$ then there is $v' \in W'$ such that $(v, v') \in Z$ and $w' \sim_B v'$.


- **back**: for all nonempty $B \subseteq A$ and for all $v' \in W'$, if $w' \sim_B v'$ then there is $v \in W$ such that $(v, v') \in Z$ and $w \sim_B v$.

If there is a bisimulation Z between M and M' containing (w, w') , we write $(M, w) \Leftrightarrow (M', w')$, and we say that (M, w) and (M', w') are *bisimilar*. The (more standard) notion where **forth** and **back** only hold for singletons B (that is, for individual agents) we here call *standard bisimulation*.

Let us see some examples of communication patterns, and how to update epistemic models with them.

Example 1 (No message arrives) This is the communication pattern $\mathbf{R} = \{I\}$. We now have that for any model M , $M \odot \mathbf{R}$ is bisimilar (and even isomorphic) to M , via the relation Z linking each $w \in W$ to (w, I) . After a failed round of message transmission the knowledge of the agents has not changed. \dashv

Example 2 (Byzantine attack) This example is taken from [35] and models Byzantine attack [21, 12]. We let $A = \{a, b\}$. Generals a and b wish to schedule an attack, where b desires to learn whether a wants to ‘attack at dawn’ (p_a) or ‘attack at noon’ ($\neg p_a$). This fits the communication pattern $\mathbf{R} = \{I, R^{ab}\}$ where $R^{ab} = I \cup \{(a, b)\}$, which models that a is uncertain whether her message has been received by b . In this instantiation of Byzantine generals, general b has no local variable. Modulo notation, \mathbf{R} has the same update effect as the ‘communication pattern model’ A' of [35, Figure 1]:



Above, the worlds are labelled with valuations, where \bar{p}_a means that p_a is false. Worlds indistinguishable for an agent are connected by a link labelled with that agent. In the updated model $M \odot \mathbf{R}$, for example, $(w_1, I) \sim_b (w_2, I)$ because $w_1 \sim_b w_2$ and $Ib = Ib = \{b\}$, whereas $(w_1, R^{ab}) \not\sim_b (w_2, R^{ab})$ because $w_1 \not\sim_{ab} w_2$ and $R^{ab}b = \{a, b\}$ (\sim_{ab} is the identity relation on this model). \dashv

Example 3 (Immediate Snapshot) The communication pattern is the set of ordered partitions of A . An ordered partition is a list (not a set) of the equivalence classes in an equivalence relation. In distributed computing such an ordered partition is called a *schedule*, where each equivalence class is called a *concurrency class*. It is a standard way to model asynchronous communication in rounds by way of a shared memory [16]. For example, if $A = \{a, b\}$ then the set of ordered partitions is $\{R^1, R^2, U\}$, where $R^1 = I \cup \{(a, b)\}$ and $R^2 = I \cup \{(b, a)\}$. The standard notation for these three partitions is respectively $a.b$, $b.a$ and ab . \dashv

Example 4 (Fully asynchronous) $\mathbf{R} = \{R \in \mathcal{P}(A \times A) \mid I \subseteq R\}$.

In this case we do not assume rounds of communication, but complete absence of information on the arrival of messages. \dashv

Example 5 (Public Announcement) In *public announcement* $\mathbf{R} = \{U\}$ the agents announce all they know. It is not an ordinary public announcement as in the muddy children problem [23]. Let there be children a, b, c and atoms m_a, m_b, m_c for ‘ $a/b/c$ is muddy’, and let a be clean and b and c muddy. The children now always announce all they know. This would be the announcement $K_a(m_b \wedge m_c) \wedge K_b(\neg m_a \wedge m_c) \wedge K_c(\neg m_a \wedge m_b)$ (K_a means ‘agent a knows’ and \wedge is conjunction). This removes all uncertainty in the model and restricts it to a singleton wherein it is common knowledge that a is clean and b, c are muddy.

Example 6 (Gossip) $\mathbf{R} = \{ab \mid a, b \in A, a \neq b\}$, where $ab := \{(a, b), (b, a)\} \cup I$.

Communication graph ab represents the call between a and b , as in a *gossip protocol* [19]. For example, if $A = \{a, b, c, d\}$, the relation ab is $\{(a, a), (a, b), (b, a), (b, b), (c, c), (d, d)\}$. To model a call ab in a gossip protocol, the communication graph ab may actually be too strong, as in standard gossip agents merely exchange their secrets (their local propositions), and not necessarily all they know about secrets. It is unclear whether the two are different, when iterated in an initial epistemic model where all agents only know their own secret. \dashv

We can now better compare our work with other research. *Resolving distributed knowledge* [3] is a singleton communication pattern for graph $(G \times G) \cup I$; the public announcement of Example 5 is the case $A = G$. A communication graph is a *reading event* in [6]. The less well investigated *arbitrary reading events* in [6, Section 6] generalize communication patterns. From their perspective our communication patterns are Kripke frames (namely where $R \sim_a R'$ iff $Ra = R'a$) where different states are labelled with different communication graphs. In [35] communication patterns are also frames, and have executability *preconditions*.

3 Language and Logic

Given A and P , the language \mathcal{L} is defined by a BNF (where $p_a \in P$ and $B \subseteq A$).

$$\mathcal{L} \ni \quad \varphi := p_a \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid D_B\varphi \mid [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$$

Expression $D_B\varphi$ is read as ‘the agents in B have distributed knowledge of φ ’. We write $K_a\varphi$ for $D_{\{a\}}\varphi$, for ‘agent a knows φ ’. We let \mathcal{L}^- stand for the language without the construct $[\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$.

For the semantics, given $M = (W, \sim, L)$ and $w \in W$, define *satisfaction relation* \models by induction on $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ (where $p \in P$, $a \in A$, $B \subseteq A$, \mathbf{R} a communication pattern, and

$R \in \mathbf{R}$).

$$\begin{aligned}
M, w \models p_a & \quad \text{iff } p_a \in L(w) \\
M, w \models \neg\varphi & \quad \text{iff } M, w \not\models \varphi \\
M, w \models \varphi \wedge \psi & \quad \text{iff } M, w \models \varphi \text{ and } M, w \models \psi \\
M, w \models D_B\varphi & \quad \text{iff } M, v \models \varphi \text{ for all } v \sim_B w \\
M, w \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi & \quad \text{iff } M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w, R) \models \varphi
\end{aligned}$$

Formula φ is *valid* on M iff for all $w \in W$, $M, w \models \varphi$; and formula φ is *valid* iff for all pointed models (M, w) , $M, w \models \varphi$.

Informally the information content of a pointed epistemic model is the set of all formulas that are true in that model. Given models $M = (W, \sim, L)$ and $M' = (W', \sim', L')$, and $w \in W$, $w' \in W'$, we denote “for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, $M, w \models \varphi$ iff $M', w' \models \varphi$ ” as $(M, w) \equiv (M', w')$ (for “ (M, w) and (M', w') are *modally equivalent*”). Analogously we define $(M, w) \equiv^- (M', w')$ for the language \mathcal{L}^- . It is known that bisimilarity implies modal equivalence with respect to \mathcal{L}^- [26]. This also holds for the language extended with communication patterns:

Theorem 7 $(M, w) \Leftrightarrow (M', w')$ implies $(M, w) \equiv (M', w')$ ⊣

Proof We prove by induction on φ that “for all φ , for all pointed models (M, w) , (M', w') : $M, w \models \varphi$ iff $M', w' \models \varphi$ ”. All cases are standard for logics of distributed knowledge (namely as in [26]) except of course for the update case $[\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$, to which we therefore restrict the proof.

We show that “for all pointed models (M, w) , (M', w') : if $(M, w) \Leftrightarrow (M', w')$ then $M, w \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$ iff $M', w' \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$ ”. In the proof, let $M = (W, \sim, L)$, $M' = (W', \sim', L')$, (and further below) $M \odot \mathbf{R} = (W \times \mathbf{R}, \sim, \dot{L})$, and $M' \odot \mathbf{R} = (W' \times \mathbf{R}, \sim', \dot{L}')$. We show the direction from left to right. The other direction is shown similarly.

Assume $M, w \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$. Then $M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w, R) \models \varphi$. Given $(M, w) \Leftrightarrow (M', w')$, let Z be a bisimulation between M and M' containing (w, w') . We claim that there is a bisimulation between $(M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w, R))$ and $(M' \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R))$, namely \dot{Z} defined as: $((w, R), (w', R')) \in \dot{Z}$ iff $(w, w') \in Z$ and $R = R'$.

Let now $((w, R), (w', R')) \in \dot{Z}$ be arbitrary. We check the requirements of bisimulation.

atoms: This is obvious as $\dot{L}(w, R) = L(w) = L'(w') = \dot{L}'(w', R)$.

forth: Assume $(w, R) \sim_B (v, S)$. Then for all $a \in B$, $(w, R) \sim_a (v, S)$, so, by definition of \sim_a , for all $a \in B$, $w \sim_a v$ and $Ra = Sa$. A different way to write the latter is $w \sim_B v$ and $RB \equiv SB$. From $w \sim_B v$ and $(w, w') \in Z$ and **forth** for B it follows that there is a $v' \in W'$ such that $(v, v') \in Z$ and $w' \sim'_B v'$. From $w' \sim'_B v'$ and $RB \equiv SB$ it then follows that $(w', R) \sim'_B (v', S)$. From $(v, v') \in Z$ and the definition of \dot{Z} it follows that $((v, R), (v', S)) \in \dot{Z}$.

back: Similar to **forth**.

Having established that $(M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w, R))$ is bisimilar to $(M' \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R))$, we now apply the induction hypothesis for φ on pointed models $(M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w, R))$ and $(M' \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R))$ thus obtaining that $M' \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R) \models \varphi$, so that $M', w' \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$ as required. □

$$\begin{array}{ll}
[\mathbf{R}, R]p & \leftrightarrow p \\
[\mathbf{R}, R]\neg\varphi & \leftrightarrow \neg[\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi \\
[\mathbf{R}, R](\varphi \wedge \psi) & \leftrightarrow [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi \wedge [\mathbf{R}, R]\psi \\
[\mathbf{R}, R]D_B\varphi & \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{R'B \equiv RB} D_{RB}[\mathbf{R}, R']\varphi
\end{array}$$

Table 1: Reductions for communication patterns

Example 8 (Bisimilar but not collectively bisimilar) We adapt the standard two-agent example (wherein the agents are uncertain about a propositional variable not known by either, so that such a model is not *local*) to a three-agent example wherein all agents know their local variables (such that the model is local, as we require). The following two models for three agents a, b, c are (standardly) bisimilar but not collectively bisimilar. Note that agent c has the identity relation on both models (and reflexive arrows are not drawn).

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& & \begin{array}{ccc} & a & \\ & \text{---} & \\ p_a p_b p_c & & p_a p_b \bar{p}_c \\ \begin{array}{c} | \\ b \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} | \\ b \end{array} \\ & & \\ & & \begin{array}{ccc} & a & \\ & \text{---} & \\ p_a p_b \bar{p}_c & & p_a p_b p_c \\ \begin{array}{c} | \\ w' \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} | \\ b \end{array} \end{array} \\
M : & p_a p_b \bar{p}_c \xrightarrow{a, b} p_a p_b p_c & M' : p_a p_b \bar{p}_c \xrightarrow{a} p_a p_b p_c
\end{array}$$

We now have that $M, w \not\models D_{ab}p_c$ whereas $M', w' \models D_{ab}p_c$. ⊣

The reduction axioms for communication patterns are as those for action models except for the one of knowledge after update, for (obviously) distributed knowledge after update, and for a sequence of two updates. Assuming an outside-in reduction strategy we can then prove that every formula with communication pattern modalities is equivalent to one without. See Table 1.

Proposition 9 $[\mathbf{R}, R]D_B\varphi \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{R'B \equiv RB} D_{RB}[\mathbf{R}, R']\varphi$ is valid. ⊣

Proof Let $M = (W, \sim, L)$ and $w \in W$. Then:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
M, w \models [\mathbf{R}, R]D_B\varphi & \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{semantics of communication patterns} \\
M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w, R) \models D_B\varphi & \\
\Leftrightarrow & \text{semantics of distributed knowledge} \\
\forall w' \in W, \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : (w, R) \sim_B (w', R') \Rightarrow M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R') \models \varphi & \\
\Leftrightarrow & \\
\forall w' \in W, \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : (\forall a \in B : (w, R) \sim_a (w', R')) \Rightarrow M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R') \models \varphi & \\
\Leftrightarrow & \\
\forall w' \in W, \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : (\forall a \in B : w \sim_{Ra} w' \& Ra = R'a) \Rightarrow M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R') \models \varphi & \\
\Leftrightarrow & \\
\forall w' \in W, \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : (\forall a \in B : w \sim_{Ra} w' \& Ra = R'a) \Rightarrow M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R') \models \varphi & \\
\Leftrightarrow &
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall w' \in W, \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : (\forall a \in B : w \sim_{Ra} w' \ \& \ \forall a \in B : Ra = R'a) \Rightarrow M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R') \models \varphi \\
& \Leftrightarrow \hspace{15em} RB \equiv R'B \text{ is defined as "for all } a \in B, Ra = R'a\text{"} \\
& \forall w' \in W, \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : (w \sim_{RB} w' \ \& \ RB \equiv R'B) \Rightarrow M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w', R') \models \varphi \\
& \Leftrightarrow \\
& \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : RB \equiv R'B \Rightarrow (\forall w' \in W : w \sim_{RB} w' \Rightarrow M \odot \mathbf{R}, (w, R') \models \varphi) \\
& \Leftrightarrow \\
& \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : RB \equiv R'B \Rightarrow (\forall w' \in W : w \sim_{RB} w' \Rightarrow M, w \models [\mathbf{R}, R']\varphi) \\
& \Leftrightarrow \\
& \forall R' \in \mathbf{R} : RB \equiv R'B \Rightarrow M, w \models D_{RB}[\mathbf{R}, R']\varphi \\
& \Leftrightarrow \\
& M, w \models \bigwedge_{R'B \equiv RB} D_{RB}[\mathbf{R}, R']\varphi \hspace{10em} \square
\end{aligned}$$

The interaction between communication patterns and distributed knowledge shown to be valid in Proposition 9 is reminiscent of [36, Prop. 5] and similar to [6, Prop. 4.6]. In [36], (valid) axiom $[\varphi]D_A\psi \leftrightarrow (\varphi \rightarrow D_A[\varphi]\psi)$ (for the set of all agents A) describes the interaction between public announcement and distributed knowledge. In [6], (valid) axiom $[\alpha]D_B\varphi \leftrightarrow D_{\alpha(B)}[\alpha]\varphi$ is the special case for a singleton communication pattern $\mathbf{R} = \{R\}$.

Proposition 10 ([6]) The complete axiomatization of the logic of communication patterns consists of the reduction axioms of Table 1, the axiomatization of epistemic logic with distributed knowledge, and *locality axioms* $K_a p_a \vee K_a \neg p_a$. \dashv

Proof For the completeness of the logic of distributed knowledge, see [26, 36, 31]. As the additional axioms involving communication patterns are a reduction system, completeness for the extension follows. There is no interference with locality. \square

The completeness result is a generalization of the completeness of the similar logic with reading map modalities in [6], and a special case of their conjectured completeness of the logic with arbitrary reading events. This work is therefore credited with this result. Locality axioms expressing that agents know their local state are not in [6] but are common for distributed systems. Locality causes distributed knowledge to have slightly different properties. E.g., $D_A\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi$ is valid, but $D_B\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi$ for $B \subset A$ is not.

4 Simplicial complexes and communication patterns

In this section we update simplicial models with communication patterns. First, we need to introduce standard terminology around simplicial complexes.

Assume agents A and local variables $P \subseteq P' \times A$ as before.

Given a set of *vertices* V , a (*simplicial*) *complex* C is a set of nonempty finite subsets of V , called *simplices*, that is closed under subsets (such that for all $X \in C$, $Y \subseteq X$ implies $Y \in C$), and that contains all singleton subsets of V . If $Y \subseteq X$ we say that Y is a *face* of X . A maximal simplex in C is a *facet*. The facets of a complex C are denoted as $\mathcal{F}(C)$, and the vertices of a complex C are denoted as $\mathcal{V}(C)$. The *dimension* of a simplex X is

$|X| - 1$. The dimension of a complex is the maximal dimension of its facets. A simplicial complex is *pure* if all facets have the same dimension. Otherwise it is *impure*.

We decorate the vertices of simplicial complexes with agent's names, that we often refer to as *colours*. A *chromatic map* $\chi : \mathcal{V}(C) \rightarrow A$ assigns colours to vertices such that different vertices of the same simplex are assigned different colours. Thus, $\chi(v) = a$ denotes that the vertex v belongs to agent a . For any simplex $X \in C$, $\chi(X) := \bigcup_{v \in X} \chi(v)$. A pair (C, χ) consisting of a simplicial complex C and a colouring map χ is a *chromatic simplicial complex*. From now on, all simplicial complexes will be pure chromatic simplicial complexes. We decorate the vertices of simplicial complexes with local variables $p_a \in P_a$ for $a \in A$. *Valuations* (valuation functions) assigning sets of local variables for agents a to vertices coloured a are denoted ℓ, ℓ', \dots . For any $X \in C$, $\ell(X)$ stands for $\bigcup_{v \in X} \ell(v)$. A *simplicial model* \mathcal{C} is a triple (C, χ, ℓ) where (C, χ) is a chromatic simplicial complex and ℓ a valuation function. A *pointed simplicial model* is a pair (\mathcal{C}, X) with $X \in C$.

We now define (collective) bisimulations between simplicial models, as a generalization of the bisimulations (for single-agent epistemic modalities) between simplicial models proposed in [14, 22, 30].

Let simplicial models $\mathcal{C} = (C, \chi, \ell)$ and $\mathcal{C}' = (C', \chi', \ell')$ be given. A nonempty relation \mathfrak{R} between $\mathcal{F}(C)$ and $\mathcal{F}(C')$ is a (collective) *bisimulation* between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' , notation $\mathfrak{R} : \mathcal{C} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}'$, iff for all $Y \in \mathcal{F}(C)$ and $Y' \in \mathcal{F}(C')$ with $\mathfrak{R}YY'$:

- **atoms:** $\ell(Y) = \ell(Y')$.
- **forth:** for all nonempty $B \subseteq A$, if $Z \in \mathcal{F}(C)$ and $B \subseteq \chi(Y \cap Z)$ there is a $Z' \in \mathcal{F}(C')$ with $B \subseteq \chi'(Y' \cap Z')$ such that $\mathfrak{R}ZZ'$.
- **back:** for all nonempty $B \subseteq A$, if $Z' \in \mathcal{F}(C')$ and $B \subseteq \chi'(Y' \cap Z')$ there is a $Z \in \mathcal{F}(C)$ with $B \subseteq \chi(Y \cap Z)$ such that $\mathfrak{R}ZZ'$.

If there is a bisimulation between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' containing (X, X') we write $(\mathcal{C}, X) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}', X')$.

Given a simplicial model $\mathcal{C} = (C, \chi, \ell)$ and a communication pattern \mathbf{R} , the update $\mathcal{C} \circ \mathbf{R} = (\check{C}, \check{\chi}, \check{\ell})$ of \mathcal{C} with \mathbf{R} is defined as follows. Each facet $Y \in \mathcal{F}(C)$ and communication graph $R \in \mathbf{R}$ determines a facet $Y_R := \{(v, X) \mid v \in Y, X \subseteq Y, \chi(X) = R\chi(v)\}$ of \check{C} . The complex \check{C} now consists of the faces of those facets. This also determines the vertices $\mathcal{V}(\check{C})$, and for any $(v, X) \in \mathcal{V}(\check{C})$ we have that $\check{\chi}(v, X) = \chi(v)$ and $\check{\ell}(v, X) = \ell(v)$.


The semantics of the same language \mathcal{L} as in prior sections are now as follows. The interpretation of a formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ in a facet $X \in \mathcal{F}(C)$ of a given simplicial model $\mathcal{C} = (C, \chi, \ell)$ is by induction on the structure of φ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}, X \models p_a & \quad \text{iff } p_a \in \ell(X) \\
\mathcal{C}, X \models \neg\varphi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, X \not\models \varphi \\
\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi \wedge \psi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{C}, X \models \psi \\
\mathcal{C}, X \models D_B\varphi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, Y \models \varphi \text{ for all } Y \in \mathcal{F}(C) \text{ with } B \subseteq \chi(X \cap Y) \\
\mathcal{C}, X \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C} \circ \mathbf{R} \models \varphi
\end{aligned}$$


Validity and modal equivalence are also defined similarly. Formula φ is *valid* iff for all (\mathcal{C}, X) , $\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi$; and given (\mathcal{C}, X) and (\mathcal{C}', X') , by $(\mathcal{C}, X) \equiv (\mathcal{C}', X')$ we mean that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$: $\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{C}', X' \models \varphi$.

We will first present some examples of simplicial models and how to update them with communication patterns. Subsequently we show how updating epistemic models and simplicial models with communication patterns correspond.

Example 11 We consider models for three agents a, b, c , (possibly) uncertain about atoms p_a, p_b, p_c , respectively. The epistemic models and corresponding simplicial models are as follows. Names of some vertices and facets are explicit.




First consider the public announcement of all you know, that has communication graph U . In the first simplicial model we thus obtain the following update.



Crucially, the vertex w coloured with agent a has been duplicated into two vertices in the updated simplicial model, (w, X) and (w, Y) . This is because $\chi(Y) = \chi(X) = \{a, b, c\} = Ua = U\chi(w)$. Agents b and c were not uncertain, so for them there is no such duplication, for example, $\chi(Y) = \chi(X) = \{a, b, c\} = Ub = U\chi(v) = U\chi(x)$. But $v \neq x$, so (v, X) remains different from (x, Y) .


For another example, consider the middle simplicial model above and the (singleton) communication pattern consisting of the communication graph $R = \{(b, c)\} \cup I$ wherein b informs c but not a (cf. Example 2). Although a and c were uncertain about the value of p_b , only c will now learn that value. The resulting simplicial model is depicted below.



Agent c has gained information from this update, as there are two different simplices coloured with $Rc = \{b, c\}$, namely $\{x, y\}$ and $\{v, y\}$. But not a , because $Ra = \{a\}$ and thus only (w, w) is found in the updated simplicial model. \dashv

Also on simplicial models collective bisimilarity is different from standard bisimilarity. Our notion therefore generalizes that of [22, 29].

Example 12 (Bisimilar but not collectively bisimilar, revisited) We recall Example 8 wherein agents a, b are uncertain about the value of agent c . Using the correspondence between epistemic models and simplicial models this gives us straightforwardly an example of standard-bisimilar simplicial models that are not collectively bisimilar. The standard bisimulation maps each facet on the left to the two identical facets on the right. This is not a collective bisimulation, and indeed D_{abp_c} is false in facet X on the left and true in facet X' on the right.



We continue by showing correspondence between updating epistemic models and simplicial models with communication patterns. We first recall the map $\sigma : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ transforming an epistemic model into a simplicial model with the same information content, and the map $\kappa : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ transforming a simplicial model into an epistemic model with the same information content [14, 22], where we follow a presentation more akin to that in [30].

Given an epistemic model $M = (W, \sim, L)$, we define $\sigma(M) = (C, \chi, \ell)$ as follows. Its vertices are $\mathcal{V}(\sigma(M)) = \{([w]_a, a) \mid a \in A, w \in W\}$, where $\chi([w]_a, a) = a$, and for all $p_a \in P$, $p_a \in \ell([w]_a, a)$ iff $p_a \in L(w)$. Its facets are $\mathcal{F}(\sigma(M)) = \{\{([w]_a, a) \mid a \in A\} \mid w \in W\}$.

(This causes worlds that are indistinguishable for all agents to be identified.) For such a facet we write $\sigma(w)$. Then, $([w]_a, a) \in \sigma(w) \cap \sigma(v)$ iff $w \sim_a v$; that is, such that $[w]_a = [v]_a$.

Given a simplicial model $\mathcal{C} = (C, \chi, \ell)$, we define an epistemic model $\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = (W, \sim, L)$ as follows. Its domain W is $\mathcal{F}(C)$. We may occasionally write $\kappa(X)$ instead of X to make explicit that X is a world and not a facet. We define $\kappa(X) \sim_a \kappa(Y)$ iff $a \in \chi(X \cap Y)$, and $L(\kappa(X)) = \ell(X)$.

For standard (single-agent relations) bisimulation between simplicial models it has been shown that bisimilarity implies modal equivalence with respect to the epistemic semantics for modalities K_a (and vice versa on certain finitary complexes), and also that for any (M, w) and (\mathcal{C}, X) , $\kappa(\sigma(M, w)) \stackrel{\cong}{\leftrightarrow} (M, w)$ and $\sigma(\kappa(\mathcal{C}, X)) \stackrel{\cong}{\leftrightarrow} (\mathcal{C}, X)$ [22, 14] (they actually demonstrate isomorphy, based on an additional assumption, but the difference is not crucial). It is not hard to show that this also holds for the collective bisimilarity of this contribution and modal equivalence with respect to the language \mathcal{L}^- (with distributed knowledge modalities D_B). We will show this instead for the full language \mathcal{L} with communication patterns, of which the results for \mathcal{L}^- are a special case.

Theorem 13 Let M, \mathcal{C} and \mathbf{R} be given. Then $\sigma(M \odot \mathbf{R})$ is bisimilar to $\sigma(M) \otimes \mathbf{R}$, and $\kappa(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathbf{R})$ is bisimilar to $\kappa(\mathcal{C}) \odot \mathbf{R}$. \dashv

Proof To prove the first, consider the relation \mathfrak{R} between the domain of $\sigma(M \odot \mathbf{R})$ and the domain of $\sigma(M) \otimes \mathbf{R}$ defined as $\mathfrak{R} : \sigma(w, R) \mapsto \sigma(w)_R$ which induces a relation (with the same name) between vertices of these facets such that $\mathfrak{R} : ([w, R]_a, a) \mapsto (([w]_a, a), \{([w]_b, b) \mid b \in Ra\})$. This relation is a bisimulation:

atoms: $p_a \in \ell([w, R]_a, a)$, iff (def. of σ) $p_a \in \dot{L}(w, R)$, iff (def. of \odot) $p_a \in L(w)$, iff (def. of σ) $p_a \in \ell([w]_a, a)$, iff (def. of \otimes) $p_a \in \dot{\ell}([w]_a, a), \{([w]_b, b) \mid b \in Ra\}$.

forth: Given $(\sigma(w, R), \sigma(w)_R) \in \mathfrak{R}$, let $B \subseteq \sigma(w, R) \cap \sigma(v, S)$ be nonempty. As $\sigma(v)_S$ is by definition the required facet bisimilar to $\sigma(v, S)$, it is sufficient to show that $B \subseteq \chi(\sigma(w, R) \cap \sigma(v, S))$ implies $B \subseteq \chi(\sigma(w)_R \cap \sigma(v)_S)$. Instead of ‘implies’ we show ‘if and only if’, as this then also takes care of **back**:

$B \subseteq \chi(\sigma(w, R) \cap \sigma(v, S))$, iff
for all $a \in B$, $a \in \chi(\sigma(w, R) \cap \sigma(v, S))$, iff
for all $a \in B$, $([w, R]_a, a) = ([v, S]_a, a)$, iff
for all $a \in B$, $(w, R) \sim_a (v, S)$, iff
for all $a \in B$, $w \sim_{Ra} v$ and $Ra = Sa$, iff (*)
for all $a \in B$, $([w]_a, a) = ([v]_a, a) \ \& \ \{([w]_b, b) \mid b \in Ra\} = \{([v]_b, b) \mid b \in Sa\}$, iff
for all $a \in B$, $(([w]_a, a), \{([w]_b, b) \mid b \in Ra\}) = (([v]_a, a), \{([v]_b, b) \mid b \in Sa\})$, iff
for all $a \in B$, $a \in \chi(\sigma(w)_R \cap \sigma(v)_S)$, iff
 $B \subseteq \chi(\sigma(w)_R \cap \sigma(v)_S)$.

(*): $w \sim_{Ra} v$, iff for all $b \in Ra$, $w \sim_b v$, iff for all $b \in Ra$, $[w]_b = [v]_b$, iff for all $b \in Ra$, $([w]_b, b) = ([v]_b, b)$, iff $\{([w]_b, b) \mid b \in Ra\} = \{([v]_b, b) \mid b \in Sa\}$. Also, $a \in Ra$.

back: Similar to **forth**.

To prove the second, consider the relation Z between the domain of $\kappa(\mathcal{C} \circledast \mathbf{R})$ and the domain of $\kappa(\mathcal{C}) \odot \mathbf{R}$ defined as $Z : X_R \mapsto (X, R)$. Also this relation is a bisimulation:

atoms: $p_a \in L(X_R)$, iff $p_a \in \ddot{\ell}(X_R)$, iff $p_a \in \ddot{\ell}(v, Y)$ for $(v, Y) \in X_R$ with $\chi(v) = a$, iff (def. \odot) $p_a \in \ell(v)$ with $v \in X$ and $\chi(v) = a$, iff $p_a \in L(X)$, iff (def. \odot) $p_a \in \dot{L}(X, R)$.

forth: As it is obvious that Y_S is bisimilar to (Y, S) , similarly to above it is sufficient to show that $X_R \sim_B Y_S$ iff $(X, R) \sim_B (Y, S)$, in which case we have sufficient gunpowder to shoot **back** and **forth**.

$X_R \sim_B Y_S$, iff

for all $a \in B$, $X_R \sim_a Y_S$, iff (def. κ)

for all $a \in B$, $a \in \ddot{\chi}(X_R \cap Y_S)$, iff (def. \odot)

for all $a \in B$, $(v, Z) = (w, W)$ for $(v, Z) \in X_R$, $(w, W) \in Y_S$ with $\chi(v) = \chi(w) = a$, iff (**)

for all $a \in B$, $Ra \subseteq \chi(X \cap Y)$ and $Ra = Sa$, iff (def. σ)

for all $a \in B$, $X \sim_{Ra} Y$ and $Ra = Sa$, iff (def. \sim)

for all $a \in B$, $(X, R) \sim_a (Y, S)$, iff (def. \odot)

$(X, R) \sim_B (Y, S)$

(**) Left to right: $(v, Z) = (w, W)$, iff $v = z$ and $Z = W$. Also, $Z = W$, $Z \subseteq X$, and $W \subseteq Y$ imply $Z \subseteq X \cap Y$. Also, as $(v, Z) \in X_R$, $\chi(Z) = Ra$ so that $Ra \subseteq \chi(X \cap Y)$. Right to left: obvious.

back: Similar to **forth**. □

Theorem 14 $(\mathcal{C}, X) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}', X')$ implies $(\mathcal{C}, X) \equiv (\mathcal{C}', X')$. ⊣

Proof We prove by induction on φ that “for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$, for all pointed simplicial models (\mathcal{C}, X) , (\mathcal{C}', X') : if $(\mathcal{C}, X) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}', X')$ then $\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi$ iff $\mathcal{C}', X' \models \varphi$ ”. The non-standard cases are the distributed knowledge case $D_B\varphi$ and the update case $[\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$, to which we therefore restrict the proof.

Case knowledge. Given (\mathcal{C}, X) , (\mathcal{C}', X') , and $(\mathcal{C}, X) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}', X')$, assume $\mathcal{C}', X' \models D_B\varphi$. Let \mathfrak{R} be a bisimulation between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' containing (X, X') . Let $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ be arbitrary such that $B \subseteq \chi(X \cap Y)$. From $B \subseteq \chi(X \cap Y)$ and **forth** it follows that there is a $Y' \in \mathcal{C}'$ with $B \subseteq \chi'(X' \cap Y')$ and $(Y, Y') \in \mathfrak{R}$. From $B \subseteq \chi'(X' \cap Y')$ and $\mathcal{C}', X' \models D_B\varphi$ it follows (by the semantics of D_B) that $\mathcal{C}', Y' \models \varphi$. From $\mathcal{C}', Y' \models \varphi$ and induction it follows that $\mathcal{C}, Y \models \varphi$. Therefore, as Y was arbitrary, $\mathcal{C}, X \models D_B\varphi$. The other direction is similar.

Case update. Given (\mathcal{C}, X) , (\mathcal{C}', X') , and $(\mathcal{C}, X) \Leftrightarrow (\mathcal{C}', X')$, assume $\mathcal{C}, X \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$. Then $\mathcal{C} \circledast \mathbf{R}, X_R \models \varphi$. Let \mathfrak{R} be a bisimulation between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' containing (X, X') . We first show that \mathfrak{R}' defined as: $(X_R, X'_R) \in \mathfrak{R}'$ if $(X, X') \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $R = R'$ is a bisimulation between $(\mathcal{C} \circledast \mathbf{R}, X_R)$ and $(\mathcal{C}' \circledast \mathbf{R}, X'_R)$ containing (X_R, X'_R) .

atoms: $\ddot{\ell}(X_R) = \ell(X) = \ell'(X') = \ell'(X'_R)$.

forth: Let $B \subseteq X_R \cap Y_S$. As $(X_R, X'_R) \in \mathfrak{R}'$, also $(X, X') \in \mathfrak{R}$. As $B \subseteq X_R \cap Y_S$, also $B \subseteq X \cap Y$. From forth for \mathfrak{R} we obtain a Y' such that $(Y, Y') \in \mathfrak{R}$ and $B \subseteq X' \cap Y'$. We now show that Y'_S is the required domain element to close **forth**. For this, it remains to prove that $B \subseteq X_R \cap Y_S$ iff $B \subseteq X'_R \cap Y'_S$. Let $B \subseteq X_R \cap Y_S$ and $a \in B$. Then $(v, W) \in X_R$ with $\chi(v) = a$ satisfies that $W \subseteq X$ and $\chi(W) = Ra$, and as $(v, W) \in Y_S$ as well, also

$W \subseteq Y$ and $\chi(W) = Sa$. We now (crucially) use that $(X, X') \in \mathfrak{R}$ induces a pointwise relation between all $x \in X$ and $x' \in X'$ with $\chi(x) = \chi'(x') = b$ for any $b \in Ra$ (where we note that b may not be in B), and similarly for $(Y, Y') \in \mathfrak{R}$. Therefore, for any such $(v, W) \in X_R$, we obtain $(v', W') \in X'_R$, so that $(v, W) \in X_R \cap Y_S$ implies $(v', W') \in X'_R \cap Y'_S$, as required.

back: Similar to **forth**.

Having established that $(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathbf{R}, X_R)$ is bisimilar to $(\mathcal{C}' \otimes \mathbf{R}, X'_R)$, we now apply the induction hypothesis for φ on pointed models $(\mathcal{C} \otimes \mathbf{R}, X_R)$ and $(\mathcal{C}' \otimes \mathbf{R}, X'_R)$ thus obtaining that $(\mathcal{C}' \otimes \mathbf{R}, X'_R) \models \varphi$, so that $\mathcal{C}', X' \models [\mathbf{R}, R]\varphi$ as required. \square

5 Conclusion and further research

We presented communication pattern logic to reason about distributed systems wherein agents communicate to each other all they know. We provided an original update construction, an axiomatization, gave an alternative semantics on simplicial complexes, and for both semantics showed preservation after update of collective bisimulation.

Let us shortly describe three areas for further research.

Update expressivity We wish to compare the *update expressivity* of communication pattern logic and *action model logic* [5]. Communication patterns, like action models, are examples of *updates* transforming epistemic models into other epistemic models. Communication patterns can always be executed, but other kinds of update cannot always be executed, for example a truthful public announcement of p (that is an example of such an action model) requires p to be true. One can compare updates by their update expressivity [34, 20, 33]. This is a partial order.

It is fairly obvious that communication pattern logic is not at least as update expressive as action model logic. In a public announcement, the environment may reveal something that cannot be revealed by the agents jointly, such as the announcement of $m_a \vee m_b \vee m_c$ in Example 5. Also, agents may choose to reveal only some but not all of their local variables, such as, if a knows p_a and p'_a , a informing b of p_a but not of p'_a .

However, it is currently unclear to us whether action model logic is not at least as update expressive as communication pattern logic, except for the case where there are countably infinitely many local variables. For epistemic models that are interpreted systems [13] (wherein $w \sim_a v$ iff $L(w) = L(v)$), we can show that to every communication pattern corresponds an update equivalent action model. A simple construction suffices. However, for arbitrary epistemic models, the action model that is constructed in that way from a communication pattern is not update equivalent to it.

Structural representation Although we represent a communication pattern as a set of communication graphs, we can also see it as a kind of Kripke model, and also as a kind of simplicial complex.

Let \mathbf{R} be given. Then *communication pattern model* (\mathbf{R}, \sim) is the structure where for each $a \in A$, \sim_a is an equivalence relation defined as: $R \sim_a R'$ iff $Ra = R'a$. This is the representation of communication patterns in [35]. The update of an epistemic model with a communication pattern model is a restricted Cartesian product. It is restricted because the relations are restricted: we recall that $(w, R) \sim_a (w', R')$ iff $w \sim_{Ra} w'$ and $Ra = R'a$, which now has become the requirement that $w \sim_{Ra} w'$ and $R \sim_a R'$.

Alternatively, given \mathbf{R} , the *simplicial communication pattern* $(C^{\mathbf{R}}, \chi^{\mathbf{R}})$ is the chromatic simplicial complex with simplices $\{(a, Ra) \mid a \in B, B \subseteq A, R \in \mathbf{R}\}$, and for all $(a, Ra) \in \mathcal{V}(C^{\mathbf{R}})$, $\chi(a, Ra) = a$. The update of a simplicial model with a simplicial communication pattern is a product. However it is not a Cartesian product or a restriction of it. (Example 11 demonstrates this.) This notion is reminiscent of the simplicial action model in [14] and in [22, Def. 3.34 & 3.35] (but of course, those are action models, and the relation between action models and communication patterns is unclear).

Such alternative, structural, representations may facilitate additional theoretical results for our framework.

Example 15 Once more we recall Example 2 modeling Byzantine attack, and communication pattern $\mathbf{R} = \{I, R^{ab}\}$ where $R^{ab} = I \cup \{(a, b)\}$. The three different representations can be visualized as follows: from left to right a communication pattern (set), a corresponding communication pattern model (where the relation for agent a is the identity relation, and reflexive arrows are not shown), and a corresponding communication pattern complex of dimension 1.

$$\mathbf{R} = \{I, R^{ab}\} \quad I \xrightarrow{b} R^{ab} \quad (b, Ib) \text{ --- } (a, R^{ab}a) \text{ --- } (b, R^{ab}b)$$

We recall that $Ib = \{b\}$, $Ia = R^{ab}a = \{a\}$, and $R^{ab} = \{a, b\}$ so that the complex more appealing can be visualized as:

$$(b, \{b\}) \text{ --- } (a, \{a\}) \text{ --- } (b, \{a, b\}) \quad \dashv$$

History-based epistemic models With a *history-based semantics* [28] we can also keep track of rounds of communicative events. Thus we can make precise how *full information protocols*, where in each round all agents send the tree composed of their own call history and the histories they have received from other agents, correspond to iterated update with communication patterns. This would be similar to how in [35] such histories of communicative events are implicitly modelled.

References

- [1] Y. Afek, Y. Babichenko, U. Feige, E. Gafni, N. Linial, and Be. Sudakov. Oblivious collaboration. In *Proc. of 25th DISC*, pages 489–504, 2011. LNCS 6950.

- [2] Y. Afek and E. Gafni. Asynchrony from synchrony. In *Proc. of 14th ICDCN*, pages 225–239, 2013. LNCS 7730. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-35668-1_16.
- [3] T. Ågotnes and Y.N. Wáng. Resolving distributed knowledge. *Artif. Intell.*, 252:1–21, 2017.
- [4] P. Balbiani, H. van Ditmarsch, and S. Fernández González. Asynchronous announcements. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.*, 23(2):10:1–10:38, 2022.
- [5] A. Baltag, L.S. Moss, and S. Solecki. The logic of public announcements, common knowledge, and private suspicions. In *Proc. of 7th TARK*, pages 43–56, 1998.
- [6] A. Baltag and S. Smets. Learning what others know. In *Proc. of 23rd LPAR*, volume 73 of *EPiC Series in Computing*, pages 90–119, 2020. doi:10.29007/plm4.
- [7] P. Blackburn, M. de Rijke, and Y. Venema. *Modal Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [8] E. Borowsky and E. Gafni. Generalized FLP impossibility result for t-resilient asynchronous computations. In *Proc. of the 25th STOC*, pages 91–100, 1993.
- [9] B. Charron-Bost and A. Schiper. The heard-of model: computing in distributed systems with benign faults. *Distributed Comput.*, 22(1):49–71, 2009.
- [10] C. Degremont, B. Löwe, and A. Witzel. The synchronicity of dynamic epistemic logic. In *Proc. of 13th TARK*, pages 145–152. ACM, 2011.
- [11] C. Dixon, C. Nalon, and R. Ramanujam. Knowledge and time. In H. van Ditmarsch, J.Y. Halpern, W. van der Hoek, and B. Kooi, editors, *Handbook of epistemic logic*, pages 205–259, 2015.
- [12] C. Dwork and Y. Moses. Knowledge and common knowledge in a Byzantine environment: Crash failures. *Inf. Comput.*, 88(2):156–186, 1990.
- [13] R. Fagin, J.Y. Halpern, Y. Moses, and M.Y. Vardi. *Reasoning about Knowledge*. MIT Press, 1995.
- [14] E. Goubault, J. Ledent, and S. Rajsbaum. A simplicial complex model for dynamic epistemic logic to study distributed task computability. *Inf. Comput.*, 278:104597, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.ic.2020.104597.
- [15] J.Y. Halpern and Y. Moses. Knowledge and common knowledge in a distributed environment. *Journal of the ACM*, 37(3):549–587, 1990.
- [16] M. Herlihy, D. Kozlov, and S. Rajsbaum. *Distributed Computing Through Combinatorial Topology*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2013.

- [17] M. Herlihy and N. Shavit. The asynchronous computability theorem for t-resilient tasks. In *Proc. of the 25th STOC*, pages 111–120, 1993.
- [18] J. Hintikka. *Knowledge and Belief*. Cornell University Press, 1962.
- [19] A.-M. Kermarrec and M. van Steen. Gossiping in distributed systems. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.*, 41(5):2–7, 2007.
- [20] B. Kooi and B. Renne. Generalized arrow update logic. In *Proc. of 13th TARK*, pages 205–211, 2011.
- [21] L. Lamport, R. Shostak, and M. Pease. The Byzantine generals problem. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 4(3):382–401, 1982.
- [22] J. Ledent. *Geometric semantics for asynchronous computability*. PhD thesis, École Polytechnique, Palaiseau, France, 2019.
- [23] Y.O. Moses, D. Dolev, and J.Y. Halpern. Cheating husbands and other stories: a case study in knowledge, action, and communication. *Distributed Computing*, 1(3):167–176, 1986.
- [24] T. Nowak, U. Schmid, and K. Winkler. Topological characterization of consensus under general message adversaries. In *Proc. of PODC*, pages 218–227, 2019.
- [25] A. Pnueli. The temporal logic of programs. In *Proc. of 18th FOCS*, pages 46–57. IEEE Computer Society, 1977. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1977.32.
- [26] F. Roelofsen. Distributed knowledge. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, 17(2):255–273, 2007.
- [27] M.E. Saks and F. Zaharoglou. Wait-free k-set agreement is impossible: the topology of public knowledge. In *Proc. of the 25th STOC*, pages 101–110. ACM, 1993.
- [28] J. van Benthem, J.D. Gerbrandy, T. Hoshi, and E. Pacuit. Merging frameworks for interaction. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 38:491–526, 2009.
- [29] H. van Ditmarsch, E. Goubault, M. Lazic, J. Ledent, and S. Rajsbaum. A dynamic epistemic logic analysis of equality negation and other epistemic covering tasks. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 2021.
- [30] H. van Ditmarsch, E. Goubault, J. Ledent, and S. Rajsbaum. Knowledge and simplicial complexes. In B. Lundgren and N. Nuñez Hernández, editors, *Philosophy of Computing, Philosophical Studies Series 143*. Springer, 2022.
- [31] H. van Ditmarsch, J.Y. Halpern, W. van der Hoek, and B. Kooi. An introduction to logics of knowledge and belief. In H. van Ditmarsch, J.Y. Halpern, W. van der Hoek, and B. Kooi, editors, *Handbook of epistemic logic*, pages 1–51, 2015.

- [32] H. van Ditmarsch, W. van der Hoek, and B. Kooi. *Dynamic Epistemic Logic*, volume 337 of *Synthese Library*. Springer, 2008.
- [33] H. van Ditmarsch, W. van der Hoek, B. Kooi, and L.B. Kuijer. Arrow update synthesis. *Information and Computation*, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.ic.2020.104544.
- [34] J. van Eijck, J. Ruan, and T. Sadzik. Action emulation. *Synthese*, 185(1):131–151, 2012.
- [35] D.A. Velázquez, A. Castañeda, and D.A. Rosenblueth. Communication pattern models: an extension of action models for dynamic-network distributed systems. In *Proc. of TARK XVIII*, 2021.
- [36] Y.N. Wáng and T. Ågotnes. Public announcement logic with distributed knowledge: expressivity, completeness and complexity. *Synthese*, 190(Suppl.-1):135–162, 2013.