

---

# On the Computational Complexity of Model Checking for Dynamic Epistemic Logic with S5 Models

Ronald de Haan · Iris van de Pol

**Abstract** Dynamic epistemic logic (DEL) is a logical framework for representing and reasoning about knowledge change for multiple agents. An important computational task in this framework is the model checking problem, which has been shown to be PSPACE-hard even for S5 models and two agents—in the presence of other features, such as multi-pointed models. We answer open questions in the literature about the complexity of this problem in more restricted settings. We provide a detailed complexity analysis of the model checking problem for DEL, where we consider various combinations of restrictions, such as the number of agents, whether the models are single-pointed or multi-pointed, and whether postconditions are allowed in the updates. In particular, we show that the problem is already PSPACE-hard in (1) the case of one agent, multi-pointed S5 models, and no postconditions, and (2) the case of two agents, only single-pointed S5 models, and no postconditions. In addition, we study the setting where only semi-private announcements are allowed as updates. We show that for this case the problem is already PSPACE-hard when restricted to two agents and three propositional variables. The results that we obtain in this paper help outline the exact boundaries of the restricted settings for which the model checking problem for DEL is computationally tractable.

---

Iris van de Pol was supported by Gravitation Grant 024.001.006 of the Language in Interaction Consortium from the Dutch Research Council (NWO).

---

Ronald de Haan  
Institute for Logic, Language and Computation  
University of Amsterdam  
Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
E-mail: me@ronalddehaan.eu

Iris van de Pol  
Institute for Logic, Language and Computation  
University of Amsterdam  
Amsterdam, the Netherlands  
E-mail: i.p.a.vandepol@uva.nl

## 1 Introduction

Dynamic epistemic logic (or DEL, for short) is a logical framework for representing and reasoning about knowledge (and belief) change for multiple agents. This framework has applications in philosophy, cognitive science, computer science and artificial intelligence (see, e.g., [7, 10, 12, 18, 26, 31]). For instance, reasoning about information and knowledge change is an important topic for multi-agent and distributed systems [22].

DEL is a very general and expressive framework, but many settings where the framework is used allow strong restrictions. For instance, in the context of reasoning about knowledge, the semantic models for the logic are often restricted to models that contain only equivalence relations (also called S5 models).

For many of the applications of DEL, computational and algorithmic aspects of the framework are highly relevant. It is important to study the complexity of computational problems associated with the logic to determine to what extent it can be used in practical settings, and what algorithmic approaches are best suited to solve these problems. One important computational task is the problem of model checking, where the question is to decide whether a formula is true in a model.

The complexity of the model checking problem for DEL has been a topic of investigation in the literature. For a restricted fragment of DEL, known as public announcement logic [4, 5, 27], the model checking problem is polynomial-time solvable [9, 23]. The problem of DEL model checking, in its general form, has been shown to be PSPACE-complete [2, 16], even in the case of two agents and S5 models. However, these hardness proofs crucially depend on the use of multi-pointed models, and therefore do not apply for the case where the problem is restricted to single-pointed S5 models. This open question was answered with a PSPACE-hardness proof for the restricted case where all models are single-pointed S5 models, but where the number of agents is unbounded [29, 30]. It remained open whether these PSPACE-hardness results extend to more restrictive settings (e.g., only two agents and single-pointed S5 models).

In this paper, we investigate to what extent these PSPACE-hardness results hold for more demanding combinations of restrictions. In other words, we study the exact boundaries between (A) the combinations of restrictions that lead to the model checking problem being polynomial-time solvable, and (B) the combinations of restrictions for which the model checking problem is computationally intractable. Various examples of restrictions have been found that fit in either (A) or (B), but no structural investigation has been done on the exact boundaries between these two areas. Investigating these exact boundaries is useful and relevant, for example, for the development of (implemented) algorithms for the model checking problem for DEL—we discuss this relevance in more detail in Section 5.

*Other related work* Various topics related to DEL model checking have been studied in the literature. For (several restricted variants of) a knowledge up-

date framework based on epistemic logic, the computational complexity of the model checking problem has been investigated [6]. Other related work includes implementations of algorithms for DEL model checking [8, 15]. Additionally, research has been done on the complexity of the satisfiability problem for (fragments of) DEL [2, 25].

*Results and contributions* In this paper we provide a detailed computational complexity analysis of the model checking problem for DEL, restricted to S5 models. We consider various different restricted settings of this problem.

For the case of arbitrary event models, we have the following results.

- We make the following folklore result explicit: that the problem is polynomial-time solvable in the case of a single agent and single-pointed S5 models without postconditions (Proposition 1).
- We show that a similar restriction (single agent and single-pointed S5 models) where postconditions are allowed already leads to  $\Delta_2^P$ -hardness (Theorem 1).
- When multi-pointed event models are allowed, we show that the problem is PSPACE-hard even for the case of a single agent and S5 models without postconditions (Theorem 2).
- For the case where there are two agents, we show that the problem is already PSPACE-hard when restricted to single-pointed S5 models without postconditions and with only three propositional variables (Theorem 3).

An overview of the complexity results for arbitrary event models can be found in Table 1. These results outline the boundaries of the tractable setting of the folklore results pinpointed in Proposition 1—they indicate that relaxing any of the three elements of the condition (i.e., a single agent, single-pointed models, and no postconditions) results in computational hardness.

Additionally, we consider the setting where instead of arbitrary event models, only semi-private announcements can be used—this is a restricted class of event models. In this setting, the problem is known to be PSPACE-hard, when an arbitrary number of agents is allowed (i.e., when the number of agents is part of the problem input) [29, Theorem 4].

- We show that the problem is already PSPACE-hard in the case where there are only two agents and only three propositional variables (Theorem 4).<sup>1</sup>

*Interpretation of the results* The results that we obtain in the paper contribute to our understanding of the computational complexity of the model checking problem for DEL. In particular, our results form a useful step towards a better comprehension of how the various elements of the framework of DEL

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to point out that Theorem 4 is a stronger result than Theorem 3—Theorem 4 implies the result of Theorem 3. We present it as two separate results because the proof of Theorem 3 acts as a stepping stone for proving Theorem 4—the proof of Theorem 3 is useful for understanding the elaborate proof of Theorem 4.

# agents	single- or multi-pointed	postconditions	complexity
1	single	no	in P (Proposition 1)
1	single	yes	$\Delta_2^P$ -hard (Theorem 1)
1	multi	no / yes	PSPACE-complete (Theorem 2)
$\geq 2$	single / multi	no / yes	PSPACE-complete (Theorem 3)

Table 1: Complexity results for the model checking problem for DEL with S5 models and S5 event models.

contribute to the computational costs of the model checking problem. For example, the hardness result of Theorem 3 indicates that introducing a second agent—even when severely restricting several other aspects of the problem—already leads to a problem that in the worst case is as hard as the general, unrestricted problem. This improved insight can—in future work—be used to develop (implemented) algorithms for DEL model checking that work more efficiently in different settings and for different applications. We discuss the relevance and significance of our results in more detail in Section 5.

*Roadmap* We begin in Section 2 with reviewing basic notions and notation from dynamic epistemic logic and complexity theory. Then, in Section 3, we present the complexity results for the various settings that involve updates with (arbitrary) event models. In Section 4, we present our PSPACE-hardness proof for the setting of semi-private announcements. We discuss the relevance and significance of our results for the computational and algorithmic study of the model checking problem for DEL in Section 5. Finally, we conclude and suggest directions for future research in Section 6.

## 2 Preliminaries

We briefly review some basic notions from dynamic epistemic logic and complexity theory that are required for the complexity results that we present in this paper.

### 2.1 Dynamic Epistemic Logic

We begin by reviewing the syntax and semantics of dynamic epistemic logic. We consider a version of this logic that is often considered in the literature (e.g., by Van Ditmarsch, Van der Hoek and Kooi [12]). After describing the logic that we consider in this paper, we briefly relate it to other variants of dynamic epistemic logic that have been considered in the literature.

We fix a countable set  $\mathcal{P}$  of propositional variables, and a finite set  $\mathcal{A}$  of agents. We begin with introducing the basic language of epistemic logic, and its semantics. The semantics of epistemic logic is based on a type of (Kripke) structures called *epistemic models*. Epistemic models are structures that are

used to represent the agents' knowledge about the world and about the other agents' knowledge.

**Definition 1 (Epistemic models)** An *epistemic model* is a tuple  $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, V)$ , where  $W$  is a non-empty set of worlds,  $R$  maps each agent  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  to a relation  $R_a \subseteq W \times W$ , and  $V : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow 2^W$  is a function called a valuation. By a slight abuse of notation, we write  $w \in \mathcal{M}$  for  $w \in W$ . We also write  $v \in R_a(w)$  for  $vR_a w$ . A *single-pointed model* is a pair  $(\mathcal{M}, w)$  consisting of an epistemic model  $\mathcal{M}$  and a *designated* (or *pointed*) world  $w \in \mathcal{M}$ . A *multi-pointed model* is a pair  $(\mathcal{M}, W_d)$  consisting of an epistemic model  $\mathcal{M}$  and a subset  $W_d$  of designated worlds.

**Definition 2 (Basic epistemic language)** The language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EL}}$  of epistemic logic is defined as the set of formulas  $\varphi$  defined inductively as follows, where  $p$  ranges over  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $a$  ranges over  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid K_a\varphi.$$

The formula  $\perp$  is an abbreviation for  $p \wedge \neg p$ , and the formula  $\top$  is an abbreviation for  $\neg\perp$ . A formula of the form  $(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)$  abbreviates  $\neg(\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2)$ , and a formula of the form  $(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)$  abbreviates  $(\neg\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2)$ . Moreover, a formula of the form  $\check{K}_a\varphi$  is an abbreviation for  $\neg K_a\neg\varphi$ . We call formulas of the form  $p$  or  $\neg p$  literals. We denote the set of all literals by  $\text{Lit}$ .

Intuitively, the formula  $K_a\varphi$  expresses that ‘agent  $a$  knows that  $\varphi$  holds in the current situation.’ Next, we define when a formula in the basic epistemic language is true in a world of an epistemic model.

**Definition 3 (Truth conditions for  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EL}}$ )** Given an epistemic model  $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, V)$ , we inductively define the relation  $\models \subseteq W \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{EL}}$  as follows. For all  $w \in W$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, w \models p & \quad \text{iff} \quad w \in V(p) \\ \mathcal{M}, w \models \neg\varphi & \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{not } \mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi \\ \mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 & \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{both } \mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi_1 \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi_2 \\ \mathcal{M}, w \models K_a\varphi & \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{for all } v \in R_a(w), \text{ it holds that } \mathcal{M}, v \models \varphi \end{aligned}$$

The statement  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$  expresses that the formula  $\varphi$  is true in world  $w$  in the model  $\mathcal{M}$ .

The framework of dynamic epistemic logic extends the basic epistemic logic with a notion of updates, that are based on another type of structures: *event models*. These are used to represent the effects of an event on the world and the knowledge of the agents. The notion of event models that we use in this paper involves postconditions—to bring about changes in the factual state of the world. Event models with postconditions have been studied and used in the literature on dynamic epistemic logic and epistemic planning (see, e.g., [10, 13]).

**Definition 4 (Event models)** An *event model* is a tuple  $\mathcal{E} = (E, S, \text{pre}, \text{post})$ , where  $E$  is a non-empty and finite set of possible events,  $S$  maps each agent  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  to a relation  $S_a \subseteq E \times E$ ,  $\text{pre} : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{EL}}$  is a function that maps each event to a precondition expressed in the epistemic language, and  $\text{post} : E \rightarrow 2^{\text{Lit}}$  is a function that maps each event to a set of literals (not containing complementary literals)<sup>2</sup>. For convenience, we write  $\top$  to denote an empty postcondition. By a slight abuse of notation, we write  $e \in \mathcal{E}$  for  $e \in E$ . A *single-pointed event model* is a pair  $(\mathcal{E}, e)$  consisting of an event model  $\mathcal{E}$  and a *designated* (or *pointed*) *event*  $e \in \mathcal{E}$ . A *multi-pointed event model* is a pair  $(\mathcal{E}, E_d)$  consisting of an event model  $\mathcal{E}$  and a subset  $E_d \subseteq E$  of designated events.

The language of dynamic epistemic logic extends the basic epistemic language with update modalities.

**Definition 5 (Dynamic epistemic language)** The language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$  of dynamic epistemic logic is defined as the set of formulas  $\varphi$  defined inductively as follows:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid K_a\varphi \mid [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi \mid [\mathcal{E}, E_d]\varphi,$$

where  $p$  ranges over  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $a$  ranges over  $\mathcal{A}$ , and where  $(\mathcal{E}, e)$  and  $(\mathcal{E}, E_d)$  are single- and multi-pointed event models, respectively. A formula of the form  $\langle \mathcal{E}, e \rangle \varphi$  is an abbreviation for  $\neg[\mathcal{E}, e]\neg\varphi$ ; we use a similar abbreviation  $\langle \mathcal{E}, E_d \rangle \varphi$  for updates with multi-pointed event models.

The effect of these event models is defined using the following notion of product update.

**Definition 6 (Product update)** Let  $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, V)$  be an epistemic model and let  $\mathcal{E} = (E, S, \text{pre}, \text{post})$  be an event model. The *product update of  $\mathcal{M}$  by  $\mathcal{E}$*  is the epistemic model  $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E} = (W', R', V')$  defined as follows, where  $p$  ranges over  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $a$  ranges over  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} W' &= \{ (w, e) \in W \times E : \mathcal{M}, w \models \text{pre}(e) \} \\ R'_a &= \{ ((w, e), (w', e')) \in W' \times W' : wR_a w' \text{ and } eS_a e' \} \\ V'(p) &= \{ (w, e) \in W' : w \in V(p) \text{ and } \neg p \notin \text{post}(e) \} \cup \\ &\quad \{ (w, e) \in W' : p \in \text{post}(e) \} \end{aligned}$$

Next, we define when a formula in the dynamic epistemic language is true in a world of an epistemic model.

**Definition 7 (Truth conditions for  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$ )** Given an epistemic model  $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, V)$  and a formula  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$ , we inductively define the relation  $\models \subseteq W \times \mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$  as follows. For all  $w \in W$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}, w \models [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi &\quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{M}, w \models \text{pre}(e) \text{ implies } \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}, (w, e) \models \varphi \\ \mathcal{M}, w \models [\mathcal{E}, E_d]\varphi &\quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{M}, w \models [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi \text{ for all } e \in E_d \end{aligned}$$

<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, one can define postconditions using a function  $\text{post} : E \times \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{EL}}$ , (see, e.g., [13]). The complexity results in this paper also hold when this alternative definition is used.

The other cases are identical to Definition 3. Again, the statement  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$  expresses that the formula  $\varphi$  is true in state  $w$  in the model  $\mathcal{M}$ .

(Having defined the language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$ , we could now also change the definition of preconditions in event models to be functions  $\text{pre} : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$  mapping events to formulas in the dynamic epistemic language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$ . The definition of product update would work in an entirely similar way. All results in this paper work for either definition of preconditions  $\text{pre}$ .)

We can then define truth of a formula  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{DEL}}$  in epistemic models as follows. A formula  $\varphi$  is true in a single-pointed epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w)$  if  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$ , and a formula  $\varphi$  is true in a multi-pointed epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, W_d)$  if  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$  for all  $w \in W_d$ .

For the purposes of representing knowledge, the relations in epistemic models and event models are often restricted to be equivalence relations, that is, reflexive, transitive and symmetric (see, e.g., [12]). Models that satisfy these requirements are also called *S5 models*, after the axiomatic system that characterizes this type of relations. In the remainder of this paper, we consider only epistemic models and event models that are S5 models. All our hardness results hold for S5 models, as well as for arbitrary models.

For the sake of convenience, we will often depict epistemic models and event models graphically. We will represent worlds with solid dots, events with solid squares, designated worlds and events with a circle or square around them, valuations, preconditions and postconditions with labels next to the dots, and relations with labelled lines between the dots. Since we restrict ourselves to S5 models, and thus to equivalence relations, all relations are symmetric and it suffices to represent relations with undirected lines. Moreover, the reflexive relations are not represented graphically. For a valuation of a world  $w$ , we use the literals that the valuation makes true in world  $w$  as a label, and for the preconditions and postconditions of an event  $e$ , we use the label  $\langle \text{pre}(e), \text{post}(e) \rangle$ . Moreover, since all epistemic models and event models that we consider in this paper have reflexive relations, in order not to clutter the graphical representation of models, we do not explicitly depict the reflexive relations. For an example of an epistemic model with its graphical representation, see Figure 1, and for an example of an event model with its graphical representation, see Figure 2.




Fig. 1: The epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_1)$  for the set  $\mathcal{A} = \{a, b\}$  of agents and a single proposition  $z$ , where  $\mathcal{M} = (W, R, V)$ ,  $W = \{w_1, w_2\}$ ,  $R_a = \{(w_1, w_1), (w_1, w_2), (w_2, w_1), (w_2, w_2)\}$ ,  $R_b = \{(w_1, w_1), (w_2, w_2)\}$ , and  $V(z) = \{w_1\}$ .




Fig. 2: The event model  $(\mathcal{E}, e_1)$  for the set  $\mathcal{A} = \{a, b\}$  of agents and a single proposition  $h$ , where  $\mathcal{M} = (E, S, \text{pre}, \text{post})$ ,  $E = \{e_1, e_2\}$ ,  $R_a = \{(e_1, e_1), (e_1, e_2), (e_2, e_1), (e_2, e_2)\}$ ,  $R_b = \{(e_1, e_1), (e_2, e_2)\}$ ,  $\text{pre}(e_1) = \text{pre}(e_2) = \top$ ,  $\text{post}(e_1) = h$ , and  $\text{post}(e_2) = \neg h$ .

*Semi-private announcements* A particular type of S5 event models that has been considered in the literature are *semi-private* (or *semi-public*) *announcements* [3]. Intuitively, a semi-private announcement publicly announces one of two formulas  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  to a subset  $A$  of agents, and to the remaining agents it publicly announces that one of the two formulas is the case, and that the agents in  $A$  learned which one is. A semi-private announcement for formulas  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  and a subset  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  of agents is represented by the event model in Figure 3.

To illustrate the notion of semi-private announcements, consider the following example scenario. There are two agents, Ayla ( $a$ ) and Blair ( $b$ ). Ayla flips a coin, which lands either on heads ( $h$ ) or on tails ( $\neg h$ ), and hides the result of the coin flip from Blair. Blair sees that the coin is flipped and that Ayla knows the result of the coin flip, but Blair herself does not see the result of the coin flip. This semi-private announcement is represented by the event model  $\mathcal{E}$  that is depicted in Figure 2 (in the event model depicted in Figure 2, the coin lands on heads).




Fig. 3: A semi-private announcement for formulas  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2$  and the subset  $A \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  of agents.

*Relations to other variants of Dynamic Epistemic Logic* The formalism of dynamic epistemic logic that we consider is based on the one originally introduced by Baltag, Moss, and Solecki [4,5]. Their language only considers single-pointed event models. A few years later, Baltag and Moss [3] extended this original language to include regular operators (union, composition and ‘star’) for the update modalities. The language that we consider corresponds to the variant of their language with only the union operator. The language presented by Van Ditmarsch et al. in their textbook [12] resembles the language that we consider, as their framework also allows the union operator for updates, but not the composition or ‘star’ operators. The union operator for update modalities corresponds to allowing multi-pointed event models.



Because it simplifies notation, we use multi-pointed models, following the notation of other existing work [10]. Additionally, the language that we consider also allows events to have postconditions, unlike the language presented by Van Ditmarsch et al. [12].

## 2.2 Computational Complexity

Next, we review some basic notions from computational complexity that are used in the proofs of the results that we present. We assume the reader to be familiar with the complexity classes P and NP, and with basic notions such as polynomial-time reductions. For more details, we refer to textbooks on computational complexity theory (see, e.g., [1]).

The class PSPACE consists of all decision problems that can be solved by an algorithm that uses a polynomial amount of space (memory). Alternatively, one can characterize the class PSPACE as all decision problems for which there exists a polynomial-time reduction to the problem QSAT, that is defined using quantified Boolean formulas as follows. A (fully) quantified Boolean formula (in prenex form) is a formula of the form  $Q_1x_1Q_2x_2 \dots Q_nx_n.\psi$ , where all  $x_i$  are propositional variables, each  $Q_i$  is either an existential or a universal quantifier, and  $\psi$  is a (quantifier-free) propositional formula over the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Truth for such formulas is defined in the usual way. The problem QSAT consists of deciding whether a given quantified Boolean formula is true. Moreover, QSAT is PSPACE-hard even when restricted to the case where  $Q_i = \exists$  for odd  $i$  and  $Q_i = \forall$  for even  $i$ . (For the proofs of Theorems 2, 3 and 4, we will use reductions from this restricted variant of QSAT.)

Additionally, one can restrict the number of quantifier alternations occurring in quantified Boolean formulas, i.e., the number of times where  $Q_i \neq Q_{i+1}$ . For each constant  $k \geq 1$  number of alternations, this leads to a different complexity class. These classes together constitute the Polynomial Hierarchy. We consider the complexity classes  $\Sigma_k^P$ , for each  $k \geq 1$ . The complexity class  $\Sigma_k^P$  consists of all decision problems for which there exists a polynomial-time reduction to the problem QSAT $_k$ . Instances of QSAT $_k$  are quantified Boolean formulas of the form  $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_{\ell_1} \forall x_{\ell_1+1} \dots \forall x_{\ell_2} \dots Q_k x_{\ell_{k-1}+1} \dots Q_k x_{\ell_k} . \psi$ , where  $Q_k = \exists$  if  $k$  is odd and  $Q_k = \forall$  if  $k$  is even, where  $1 \leq \ell_1 \leq \dots \leq \ell_k$ , and where  $\psi$  is quantifier-free. The question is to decide whether the quantified Boolean formula is true.

The last complexity class that we consider is  $\Delta_2^P$ . We give a definition of this class that is based on algorithms with access to an oracle, i.e., a black box that is able to decide certain decision problems in a single operation. Consider the problem SAT of deciding satisfiability of a given propositional formula. The class  $\Delta_2^P$  consists of all decision problems that can be solved by a polynomial-time algorithm with access to an oracle for SAT. Alternatively, the class  $\Delta_2^P$  consists of all decision problems for which there exists a polynomial-time reduction to the problem where one is given a satisfiable propositional formula  $\varphi$  over the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , and the question is whether the lexicographically

maximal assignment that satisfies  $\varphi$  (given the fixed ordering  $x_1 \prec \dots \prec x_n$ ) sets variable  $x_n$  to true [24]. An assignment  $\alpha_1$  is lexicographically larger than an assignment  $\alpha_2$  (given the ordering  $x_1 \prec \dots \prec x_n$ ) if there exists some  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $\alpha_1(x_i) = 1$ ,  $\alpha_2(x_i) = 0$ , and for all  $1 \leq j \leq i$  it holds that  $\alpha_1(x_j) = \alpha_2(x_j)$ .

### 3 Results for updates with arbitrary S5 models

In this section, we provide complexity results for the model checking problem for DEL when arbitrary event models are allowed for the update modalities in the formulas. For several cases, we prove PSPACE-hardness. Since the problem was recently shown to be in PSPACE for the most general variant of dynamic epistemic logic that we consider in this paper [2, 29, 30], these hardness results suffice to show PSPACE-completeness.

#### 3.1 Polynomial-time solvability

We begin with showing polynomial-time solvability for the strongest restriction that we consider in this paper: a single agent, single-pointed S5 models, and no postconditions. This is a result that is well-known and can be seen as part of the folklore of the DEL literature, but for which—to the best of our knowledge—no detailed proof has been published. The high-level idea of the proof is straightforward: even though updating the model with an event model in this setting might duplicate a lot of words—potentially resulting in an exponential blow-up in the number of worlds—these worlds are copies of only a small number of distinct worlds. We can identify a representative for each of the worlds in polynomial-time, and at each step in the recursive evaluation of the formula, we keep only these representative worlds. To work out an algorithm that implements this proof idea requires some attention to algorithmic details (e.g., using the technique of dynamic programming). We present the proof of Proposition 1 in detail to give insight into the exact algorithmic details involved in the proof—providing a precise recipe that can be used to implement the algorithm.

**Proposition 1** *The model checking problem for DEL with S5 models is polynomial-time solvable when restricted to instances with a single agent and only single-pointed event models without postconditions.*

*Proof* We describe a polynomial-time algorithm that solves the problem. The main idea behind this algorithm is the following. Even though the updates might cause an exponential blow-up in the number of worlds in the model, in this restricted setting, we only need to remember a small number of these worlds.

Concretely, since there is only a single agent  $a$ , and since there is only a single designated world  $w_0$ , we only need to remember the set of worlds that

are connected with an  $a$ -relation to the designated world  $w_0$ . Moreover, among these worlds, we can merge those with an identical valuation. Since the event models contain no postconditions, this (contracted) set of worlds can only decrease after updates, i.e., updates can only remove worlds from this set.

Formally, we can describe this argument as follows. Let  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  be a single-pointed S5 epistemic model with one agent, and let  $(\mathcal{E}, e_0)$  be a single-pointed S5 event model with one agent and no postconditions. Then  $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}$  is bisimilar to a submodel  $\mathcal{M}'$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ , that is, to some  $\mathcal{M}'$  that can be obtained from  $\mathcal{M}$  by removing some worlds. Specifically, let  $W'$  be the set of worlds in  $\mathcal{M}$  that are  $a$ -accessible from  $w_0$ , and let  $E'$  be the set of events in  $\mathcal{E}$  that are  $a$ -accessible from  $e_0$ . Then, let  $W'' \subseteq W'$  be the subset of worlds that satisfy the precondition of at least one  $e \in E'$ . One can straightforwardly verify that  $(\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}, (w_0, e_0))$  is bisimilar to the submodel  $(\mathcal{M}', w_0)$  of  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  induced by  $W''$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{M}'$  can be computed in polynomial time.

Using this property, we can construct a recursive algorithm to decide whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$ . We consider several cases. In the case where  $\varphi = p$  for some  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ , the problem can easily be solved in polynomial time, by simply checking whether  $w \in V(p)$ . In the case where  $\varphi = \neg\varphi_1$ , we can recursively call the algorithm to decide whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi_1$ , and return the opposite answer. Similarly, for  $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ , we can straightforwardly decide whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$  by first recursively determining whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi_1$  and whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi_2$ . In the case where  $\varphi = K_a\varphi_1$ , we firstly recursively determine whether  $\mathcal{M}, w' \models \varphi_1$  for each  $w' \in W$  that is  $a$ -accessible from  $w$ . This information immediately determines whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models K_a\varphi_1$ .

Finally, consider the case where  $\varphi = [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi_1$ . In this case, we firstly recursively decide whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \text{pre}(e)$ . If this is not the case, then trivially,  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$ . Otherwise, we construct the submodel  $\mathcal{M}'$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  that is bisimilar to  $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ . This can be done as described above. In order to do this, we need to decide which states in  $W'$  satisfy the precondition of some  $e' \in E'$ , where  $W' \subseteq W$  and  $E' \subseteq E$  are defined as explained above. This can be done by recursive calls of the algorithm. Having determined  $W'$ , and having constructed  $\mathcal{M}'$ , we can now answer the question whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi_1$  by using only  $\mathcal{M}', w$  and  $\varphi_1$ . We know that  $w$  is a world in  $\mathcal{M}'$ , since  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \text{pre}(e)$ . Since  $\mathcal{M}'$  is bisimilar to  $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ , it holds that  $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}, (w, e) \models \varphi_1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{M}', w \models \varphi_1$ . Therefore, by recursively calling the algorithm to decide whether  $\mathcal{M}', w \models \varphi_1$ , we can decide whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi_1$ .

It is straightforward to verify that this recursive algorithm correctly decides whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$ . However, naively executing this recursive algorithm will, in the worst case result in an exponential running time. This is because for the case for  $\varphi = [\mathcal{E}, e]\varphi_1$ , the algorithm makes multiple (say  $b \geq 2$ ) recursive calls for  $\text{pre}(e)$ , and  $\text{pre}(e)$  could contain subformulas of the form  $[\mathcal{E}', e']\varphi'$ —which in turn triggers multiple recursive calls for  $\text{pre}(e')$  for each of the  $b$  branches in the recursion tree, and so forth. As the number of these iterations can grow linearly with the input size (say  $f(n)$ ), the recursion tree can be of exponential size (namely, of size  $\geq 2^{f(n)}$ ). We describe how to modify the algorithm to run in polynomial time, using the technique of memoization. Whenever a recursive

call is made to decide whether  $\mathcal{N}, u \models \psi$ , for some submodel  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ , some world  $w$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ , and some subformula  $\psi$  of  $\varphi$ , the result of this recursive call is stored in a lookup table. Moreover, before making a recursive call to decide whether  $\mathcal{N}, u \models \psi$ , the lookup table is consulted, and if an answer is stored, the algorithm uses this answer instead of executing the recursive call.

The number of submodels  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  that need to be considered in the execution of the modified algorithm is upper bounded by the number of occurrences of update operators  $[\mathcal{E}, e]$  in the formula  $\varphi$  that is given as input to the problem. Therefore, the size of the lookup table is polynomial in the input size. Moreover, computing the answer for any entry in the lookup table can be done in polynomial time (using the answers for other entries in the lookup table). Therefore, the modified algorithm decides whether  $\mathcal{M}, w \models \varphi$  in polynomial time.  $\square$

### 3.2 Hardness results for one agent

Next, we consider the restriction where we have a single agent and single-pointed models, but where postconditions are allowed in the event models.<sup>3</sup> In this case, the problem is  $\Delta_2^P$ -hard. This hardness result is interesting because it helps identify the boundaries of the tractable fragment of Proposition 1. The result of Theorem 1 shows that adding the single element of postconditions to this tractable fragment leads to computational hardness.

**Theorem 1** *The model checking problem for DEL with S5 models restricted to instances with a single agent and only single-pointed models, but where event models can contain postconditions, is  $\Delta_2^P$ -hard.*

*Proof* To show  $\Delta_2^P$ -hardness, we give a polynomial-time reduction from the problem of deciding whether the lexicographically maximal assignment that satisfies a given propositional formula  $\varphi$  over variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  sets the variable  $x_n$  to true. Let  $\varphi$  be an instance of this problem, with variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . We construct a single-pointed epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  with a single agent  $a$  and a DEL-formula  $\chi$  whose updates consist of single-pointed event models (that contain postconditions), such that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \chi$  if and only if  $x_n$  is true in the lexicographically maximal assignment that satisfies  $\varphi$ .

In addition to the propositional variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , we introduce a variable  $z$ . Then, we construct the model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  as depicted in Figure 4.

Then, for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we introduce the single-pointed event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  as depicted in Figure 5. Intuitively, these updates will serve to generate, for

---

<sup>3</sup> The reader might wonder for what type of situations the DEL setting of Theorem 1 (a single agent, single-pointed S5 models, and postconditions) could be useful. This restricted setting is relevant, for example, when reasoning about the epistemic state of a single agent in the face of uncertainty over changes in the world (made by nature). A simple example of a situation where such reasoning plays a role is in the analysis of single-player memory games where the state of (parts of) the game board can be changed randomly by the rules of the game.




Fig. 4: The epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$ , used in the proof of Theorem 1.

each possible truth assignment  $\alpha$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , a world that agrees with  $\alpha$  (and that sets  $z$  to false), in addition to the designated world (where  $z$  is true). We will denote the model resulting from updating  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  subsequently with the updates  $(\mathcal{E}_1, e_1), \dots, (\mathcal{E}_n, e_n)$  by  $(\mathcal{M}', w')$ .




Fig. 5: The event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$ , used in the proof of Theorem 1.

Next, for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we introduce the single-pointed event model  $(\mathcal{E}'_i, e'_i)$  as depicted in Figure 6. Intuitively, we will use the event models  $(\mathcal{E}'_i, e'_i)$  to obtain (many copies of) the lexicographically maximal assignment that satisfies  $\varphi$ . Applying the update  $(\mathcal{E}'_i, e'_i)$  to  $(\mathcal{M}', w')$  will set the variable  $x_i$  to true in all worlds (that satisfy  $\neg z$ ) if there is an assignment (among the remaining assignments) that satisfies  $\varphi$  and that sets  $x_i$  to true, and it will set the variable  $x_i$  to false in all worlds (that satisfy  $\neg z$ ) otherwise. Then, after applying the updates  $(\mathcal{E}'_1, e'_1), \dots, (\mathcal{E}'_n, e'_n)$  to  $(\mathcal{M}', w')$ , all worlds in the resulting model will have the same valuation—namely, a valuation that agrees with the lexicographically maximal assignment that satisfies  $\varphi$ . In particular, the variable  $x_n$  is true in this valuation if and only if  $x_n$  is true in the lexicographically maximal assignment that satisfies  $\varphi$ .




Fig. 6: The event model  $(\mathcal{E}'_i, e'_i)$ , used in the proof of Theorem 1.

We then let  $\chi = [\mathcal{E}_1, e_1] \dots [\mathcal{E}_n, e_n] [\mathcal{E}'_1, e'_1] \dots [\mathcal{E}'_n, e'_n] \hat{K}_a x_n$ . We now formally show that the lexicographically maximal assignment  $\alpha_0$  that satisfies  $\varphi$  sets  $x_n$  to true if and only if  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \chi$ . In order to do so, we will prove the following claim. The model  $(\mathcal{M}'', w'') = (\mathcal{M}, w_0) \otimes (\mathcal{E}_1, e_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{E}_n, e_n) \otimes (\mathcal{E}'_1, e'_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{E}'_n, e'_n)$  consists of a world  $w''$  that sets  $z$  to true and all other variables to false, and of worlds that set  $z$  to false and that agree with  $\alpha_0$  on the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Firstly, it is straightforward to verify that  $(\mathcal{M}', w') = (\mathcal{M}, w_0) \otimes (\mathcal{E}_1, e_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{E}_n, e_n)$  consists of the world  $w'$  and exactly one world corresponding to each truth assignment  $\alpha$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .

Then, applying the update  $(\mathcal{E}'_1, e'_1)$  to  $(\mathcal{M}', w')$  has two possible outcomes: either (1) if there exists a model of  $\varphi$  that sets  $x_1$  to true, then in all worlds (that set  $z$  to false) the variable  $x_1$  will be set to true; or (2) if there exists no model of  $\varphi$  that sets  $x_1$  to true, then in all worlds (that set  $z$  to false) the variable  $x_1$  will be set to false. For each  $1 < i \leq n$ , subsequently applying the update  $(\mathcal{E}'_i, e'_i)$  has an entirely similar effect. By a straightforward inductive argument, it then follows that all the worlds in  $(\mathcal{M}'', w'')$  that set  $z$  to false agree with the lexicographically maximal model of  $\varphi$ .

Therefore,  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \chi$  if and only if  $x_n$  is true in the lexicographically maximal model of  $\varphi$ , and we can conclude that the problem is  $\Delta_2^P$ -hard.  $\square$

When we allow multi-pointed models, the problem turns out to be PSPACE-hard, even when restricted to a single agent (Theorem 2). This hardness result adds to our understanding of the boundaries of the algorithmically tractable fragment of Proposition 1. Whereas Theorem 1 showed that adding postconditions leads to intractability, the following result shows that adding multi-pointedness to the models instead (and having no further additions) also leads to intractability. In other words, the following result indicates that leaving the fragment of Proposition 1 by a different route also requires giving up polynomial-time algorithms for model checking.

In the literature, PSPACE-hardness results have been shown for a setting that is similar to the one used in Theorem 2—i.e., [16, Proposition 7.2] and [2, Theorem 2]. The difference is that these proofs in the literature depend on particular features of the DEL setting—the result of [16, Proposition 7.2] depends on there being two agents, and the result of [2, Theorem 2] depends on relations not being serial—whereas the result of Theorem 2 holds also for the case with both a single agent and S5 relations. The proofs from the literature depends crucially on there being two agents or non-serial relations—they are used to encode the quantifiers in a quantified Boolean formula. The main technical hurdle that needs to be overcome to establish Theorem 2 is to encode the quantification of a quantified Boolean formula in DEL using a single agent and using S5 relations. We do so by starting with an S5 epistemic model  $\mathcal{M}$  that includes worlds that set different propositional variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  to true, and using multi-pointed event models to quantify over different possibilities of deleting worlds from  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Theorem 2** *The model checking problem for DEL with S5 models restricted to instances with a single agent and no postconditions in the event models, but where models can be multi-pointed, is PSPACE-hard.*

*Proof* In order to show PSPACE-hardness, we give a polynomial-time reduction from the problem of deciding whether a quantified Boolean formula is true. Let  $\varphi = \exists x_1 \forall x_2 \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n \cdot \psi$  be a quantified Boolean formula, where  $\psi$  is quantifier-free (we assume without loss of generality that  $n$  is even). We construct a single-pointed epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  with one agent  $a$  and a DEL-formula  $\chi$  (containing updates with multi-pointed event models) such that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \chi$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is true.

The first main idea behind this reduction is that we represent truth assignments to the propositional variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  with connected groups of worlds. Let  $\alpha$  be a truth assignment to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , and let  $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_\ell}$  be the variables that  $\alpha$  sets to true. We then represent  $\alpha$  by means of a group of worlds  $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_\ell$ , where the world  $w_0$  makes no propositional variable true, and for each  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ , world  $w_j$  makes exactly one propositional variable true (namely,  $x_{i_j}$ ). These worlds  $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_\ell$  are fully connected. This collection of worlds  $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_\ell$  is what we call the *group of worlds corresponding to  $\alpha$* . Moreover, the designated state is  $w_0$ . Consider the truth assignment  $\alpha = \{x_1 \mapsto 1, x_2 \mapsto 1, x_3 \mapsto 0, x_4 \mapsto 1\}$ , for example. In Figure 7 we show the group of worlds that we use to represent this truth assignment  $\alpha$ . We let the model  $\mathcal{M}$  be the group of worlds corresponding to the truth assignment  $\alpha_0$  that assigns all variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  to true.




Fig. 7: The group of worlds that we use to represent the truth assignment  $\alpha = \{x_1 \mapsto 1, x_2 \mapsto 1, x_3 \mapsto 0, x_4 \mapsto 1\}$ , in the proof of Theorem 2.

The next main idea is that we represent existential and universal quantification of the propositional variables using the dynamic operators  $\langle \mathcal{E}, E \rangle$  and  $[\mathcal{E}, E]$ , respectively. For each propositional variable  $x_i$  in the quantified Boolean formula, we introduce the multi-pointed event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, E_i)$  as depicted in Figure 8. We use the event models  $(\mathcal{E}_1, E_1), \dots, (\mathcal{E}_n, E_n)$ , to create (disconnected) groups of worlds (that all have a designated world) that correspond to each possible truth assignment  $\alpha$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .



Fig. 8: The multi-pointed event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, E_i)$  corresponding to variable  $x_i$ , used in the proof of Theorem 2.

Using the alternation of diamond dynamic operators and box dynamic operators, we can simulate existential and universal quantification of variables in the formula  $\varphi$ . We simulate an existentially quantified variable  $\exists x_i$  by the dynamic operator  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i, E_i \rangle$ —a formula of the form  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i, E_i \rangle \phi$  is true if and only if  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i, e_i \rangle \phi$  is true for some  $e_i \in E_i$ . Similarly, we simulate a universally quantified variable  $\forall x_i$  by the dynamic operator  $[\mathcal{E}_i, E_i]$ —a formula of the form  $[\mathcal{E}_i, E_i] \phi$  is true if and only if  $[\mathcal{E}_i, e_i] \phi$  is true for all  $e_i \in E_i$ .

Concretely, we let  $\chi = \langle \mathcal{E}_1, E_1 \rangle [\mathcal{E}_2, E_2] \dots \langle \mathcal{E}_{n-1}, E_{n-1} \rangle [\mathcal{E}_n, E_n] \chi'$ , where  $\chi'$  is the formula obtained from  $\psi$  by replacing each occurrence of a propositional variable  $x_i$  by the formula  $\hat{K}_a x_i$ .

We show that  $\varphi$  is a true quantified Boolean formula if and only if  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \chi$ . In order to do so, we prove the following statement, relating truth assignments  $\alpha$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  to groups of worlds containing a designated world. The statement that we will prove inductively for all  $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$  is the following.

*Statement:* Let  $\alpha$  be any truth assignment to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  that sets all variables  $x_i, \dots, x_n$  to true, and let  $\alpha'$  be the restriction of  $\alpha$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ . Moreover, let  $M$  be a group of worlds that corresponds to the truth assignment  $\alpha$ , containing a designated world  $w$ . Then  $Q_i x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$  if and only if:

- $w$  makes  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i, E_i \rangle \dots [\mathcal{E}_n, E_n] \chi'$  true, if  $i$  is odd; and
- $w$  makes  $[\mathcal{E}_i, E_i] \dots [\mathcal{E}_n, E_n] \chi'$  true, if  $i$  is even.

The statement for  $i = 1$  implies that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \chi$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is a true quantified Boolean formula. We show that the statement holds for  $i = 1$  by showing that the statement holds for all  $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$ . We begin by showing that the statement holds for  $i = n + 1$ . In this case, we know that  $\alpha = \alpha'$  is a truth assignment to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Moreover, by construction of  $\chi'$  we know that  $w$  makes  $\chi'$  true if and only if  $\alpha$  satisfies  $\psi$ . Therefore, the statement holds.

Next, we let  $1 \leq i \leq n$  be arbitrary, and we assume that the statement holds for  $i + 1$ . We now distinguish two cases: either (1)  $Q_i = \exists$ , i.e., the  $i$ -th quantifier of  $\varphi$  is existential, or (2)  $Q_i = \forall$ , i.e., the  $i$ -th quantifier of  $\varphi$  is universal.

First, consider case (1). Suppose that  $\exists x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ . Then there exists a truth assignment  $\alpha''$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  that agrees with  $\alpha'$  on the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$  and for which  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha''$ . Therefore, there exists some event  $e \in E_i$  such that the group  $M' =$



$\{(v, e) : v \in M \text{ and } M, v \models \text{pre}(e)\}$  of worlds and the world  $w' = (w, e)$ , together with the assignment  $\alpha'''$  that agrees with  $\alpha''$  on the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  and that sets the variables  $x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n$  to true, satisfy the requirements for the statement for  $i + 1$ . Then, by the induction hypothesis we know that  $w'$  makes  $\langle \mathcal{E}_{i+1}, E_{i+1} \rangle \dots \langle \mathcal{E}_{n-1}, E_{n-1} \rangle [\mathcal{E}_n, E_n] \chi'$  true. Therefore, we can conclude that  $w$  makes  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i, E_i \rangle \dots \langle \mathcal{E}_{n-1}, E_{n-1} \rangle [\mathcal{E}_n, E_n] \chi'$  true.

Conversely, suppose that  $w$  makes  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i, E_i \rangle \dots \langle \mathcal{E}_{n-1}, E_{n-1} \rangle [\mathcal{E}_n, E_n] \chi'$  true. This can only be the case if there is some event  $e \in E_i$  such that the set  $M'$  and  $w'$  (defined as above) correspond to a truth assignment  $\alpha'''$  (also defined as above). Then, by the induction hypothesis, we know that  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'''$  (obtained from  $\alpha'''$  as above). Therefore, since  $\alpha''$  extends  $\alpha'$ , we can conclude that  $\exists x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ .

The argument for case (2) is entirely analogous (yet dual). We omit a detailed treatment of this case. This concludes the inductive proof of the statement for all  $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$ , and thus concludes our proof that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \chi$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is true.  $\square$

### 3.3 Hardness results for two agents

Next, we show that when we consider the case of two agents, the model checking problem for DEL is PSPACE-hard, even when we only allow single-pointed models without postconditions (Theorem 3). This hardness result adds yet another piece of understanding of the boundaries of the algorithmically tractable fragment of Proposition 1. Namely, it shows that leaving the algorithmically tractable fragment of Proposition 1 by another one of the possible different routes—that is, by adding a second agent only—leads to computational hardness. In fact, this is the third of the three most obvious ways of extending the fragment of Proposition 1. Therefore, Theorem 3—together with Theorems 1 and 2—indicates that all individual restrictions in the fragment of Proposition 1 are necessary to obtain polynomial-time solvability.

Additionally, the result of Theorem 3 shows that the inherent hardness in the model checking problem for DEL with two agents holds even when we restrict the setting to include only three propositional variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3$ —in addition to having only two agents and single-pointed S5 models only.

Similarly to the case of Theorem 2, the result of Theorem 3 differs from similar results from the literature—i.e., [16, Proposition 7.2] and [2, Theorem 2]—in that it considers different restrictions than these results. In particular, the former result [16, Proposition 7.2] requires the use of multi-pointed models, and the latter result [2, Theorem 2] requires non-serial relations in the models (and these proofs crucially depend on these features). In the literature, there are also PSPACE hardness results for the case of single-pointed S5 models [29, 30]. However, these results hold for the case where an unbounded number of agents are used—and the proofs given in the literature crucially depend on the number of agents not being bounded. The result of Theorem 3 holds for

the case with only two agents and where only single-pointed S5 models are allowed.

The main technical hurdle that needs to be overcome to establish Theorem 3 is to encode the differently quantified variables of a quantified Boolean formula using single-pointed S5 models and using only two agents and three propositional variables. We do so—roughly—by (i) representing propositional variables by alternating chains of worlds where the end of the chain is marked by a designated propositional variable  $z_0$ ,<sup>4</sup> (ii) representing quantification over different variables in the quantified Boolean formula using S5 event models where different alternating chains of relations lead to different copies of the original model that represent different truth assignments to the variables of the quantified Boolean formula, and (iii) by introducing DEL formulas that interact appropriately with the gadgets of (i) and (ii), making use of only two auxiliary variables  $z_1$  and  $z_2$ . The main challenge in (i)–(iii) is in the details of the intricate construction of the DEL formulas and in the detailed argument that they interact in exactly the right way with the event models—this is why the proof of Theorem 3 is of considerable length.

**Theorem 3** *The model checking problem for DEL is PSPACE-hard, even when restricted to the case where the question is whether  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models [\mathcal{E}_1, e_1] \dots [\mathcal{E}_n, e_n]\chi$ , where:*

- the model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  is a single-pointed S5 model;
- all the  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  are single-pointed S5 event models without postconditions;
- $\chi$  is an epistemic formula without update modalities that contains (multiple occurrences of) only three propositional variables; and
- there are only two agents.

*Proof* In order to show PSPACE-hardness, we give a polynomial-time reduction from the problem of deciding whether a quantified Boolean formula is true. Let  $\varphi = \exists x_1 \forall x_2 \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  be a quantified Boolean formula, where  $\psi$  is quantifier-free. We construct an epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  with two agents  $a, b$  and a DEL-formula  $\xi$  such that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \xi$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is true.

The first main idea behind the reduction is that we use two propositional variables, say  $z_0$  and  $z_1$ , to represent an arbitrary number of propositions, by creating chains of worlds that represent these propositions. Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be the propositions that we want to represent. Then we represent a proposition  $x_j$  by a chain of worlds of length  $j + 1$  that are connected alternately by  $b$ -relations and  $a$  relations. In this chain, the last world is the only world that makes  $z_0$  true. Moreover, the first world in the chain is the only world that makes  $z_1$  true. An example of such a chain that we use to represent proposition  $x_3$  can be found in Figure 9.

The next idea that plays an important role in the reduction is that we will group together (the first worlds) of several such chains to represent a truth assignment to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Let  $\alpha$  be a truth assignment

<sup>4</sup> This technique was previously used by Van de Pol, Van Rooij, and Szymanik in a hardness proof for DEL model checking [30, Proposition 3].




Fig. 9: The chain of worlds that we use to represent proposition  $x_3$  in the proof of Theorem 3. The first world in the chain is the world  $w_0$ , that is depicted on the left.

to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , and let  $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_\ell}$  be the propositions that  $\alpha$  sets to true (for  $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_\ell \leq n$ ). Then we represent the truth assignment  $\alpha$  in the following way. We take the chains corresponding to the propositions  $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_\ell}$ , and we connect the first world (the world that is labelled with  $w_0$  in Figure 9) of each two of these chains with an  $a$ -relation. In other words, we connect all these first worlds together in a fully connected clique of  $a$ -relations. Moreover, to this  $a$ -clique of worlds, we add a designated world where both  $z_1$  and a third propositional variable  $z_2$  are true. The collection of all worlds in the chains corresponding to the propositions  $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_\ell}$  and this additional designated world is what we call the *group of worlds representing*  $\alpha$ . For the sake of convenience, we call the world where  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are true the *central world* of the group of worlds. In Figure 10 we give an example of such a group of worlds that we use to represent the truth assignment  $\alpha = \{x_1 \mapsto 1, x_2 \mapsto 1, x_3 \mapsto 0, x_4 \mapsto 1\}$ .




Fig. 10: The group of worlds that we use to represent the truth assignment  $\alpha = \{y_1 \mapsto 1, y_2 \mapsto 1, y_3 \mapsto 0, y_4 \mapsto 1\}$  in the proof of Theorem 3.

By using the expressivity of epistemic logic, we can construct formulas that extract information from these representations of truth assignments. Intuitively, we can check whether a truth assignment  $\alpha$  sets a proposition  $x_j$  to true by checking whether the group of worlds representing  $\alpha$  contains a chain of worlds of length exactly  $j + 1$ . Formally, we will define a formula  $\chi_j$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , which is true in the designated world if and only if the group contains a chain representing proposition  $x_j$ . We describe how to construct the formulas  $\chi_j$ . Firstly, we inductively define formulas  $\chi_j^a$  and  $\chi_j^b$ , for

all  $1 \leq j \leq n$  as follows. Intuitively, the formula  $\chi_j^a$  is true in exactly those worlds from which there is an alternating chain that ends in a  $z_0$ -world, that is of length at least  $j$  and that starts with an  $a$ -relation. Similarly, the formula  $\chi_j^b$  is true in exactly those worlds from which there is an alternating chain that ends in a  $z_0$ -world, that is of length at least  $j$ , and that starts with a  $b$ -relation. We let  $\chi_0^a = \chi_0^b = z_0$ , and for each  $j > 0$ , we let  $\chi_j^b = \hat{K}_b(\neg z_1 \wedge \neg z_2 \wedge \chi_{j-1}^a)$  and  $\chi_j^a = \hat{K}_a(\neg z_1 \wedge \neg z_2 \wedge \chi_{j-1}^b)$ . Now, using the formulas  $\chi_j^b$ , we can define the formulas  $\chi_j$ . We let  $\chi_j = z_1 \wedge \neg z_2 \wedge \chi_j^b \wedge \neg \chi_{j-1}^b$ . As a result of this definition, the formula  $\chi_j$  is true in exactly those worlds that are the first world of a chain of length exactly  $j$ .

For example, consider the formula  $\chi_2 = z_1 \wedge \neg z_2 \wedge \hat{K}_b(\neg z_1 \wedge \neg z_2 \wedge \hat{K}_a(\neg z_1 \wedge \neg z_2 \wedge z_0)) \wedge \neg \hat{K}_b(\neg z_1 \wedge \neg z_2 \wedge z_0)$  and consider the group of worlds depicted in Figure 10. This formula is true only in the first world of the chain of length 2.

The epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  that we use in the reduction is based on the model  $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha_0}$  representing the truth assignment  $\alpha_0 : \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  that sets all propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  to true. To obtain  $\mathcal{M}$ , we will add a number of additional worlds to the model  $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha_0}$ , that we will use to simulate the behavior of the existential and universal quantifiers in the DEL-formula  $\chi$  that we will construct below. Specifically, we will add alternating chains of worlds to the model that are similar to the chains that represent the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . However, the additional chains that we add differ in two aspects from the chains that represent the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ : (1) the additional chains start with an  $a$ -relation instead of starting with a  $b$ -relation, and (2) in the first world of the additional chains, the propositional variable  $z_2$  is true instead of the variable  $z_1$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we add such an additional chain of length  $i$ , and we connect the first worlds of these additional chains, together with the designated world, in a clique of  $b$ -relations. To illustrate this, the model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  that results from this construction is shown in Figure 11, for the case where  $n = 3$ . For the sake of convenience, we will denote these additional chains by  $z_2$ -chains, and the chains that represent the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  by  $z_1$ -chains (after the propositional variables that are true in the first worlds of these chains).

To check whether an alternating chain of length exactly  $j$ , that starts from a  $z_2$ -world with an  $a$ -relation, is present in the model, we define formulas  $\chi'_j$  similarly to the way we defined the formulas  $\chi_j$ . Specifically, we let  $\chi'_j = \neg z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \chi_j^a \wedge \neg \chi_{j-1}^a$ .

We will use the  $z_2$ -chains together with the formulas  $\chi'_j$  to keep track of an additional counter. We will use this counter as a technical trick to implement the simulation of existentially and universally quantified variables in the formula  $\varphi$ .

Next, we describe how we can generate all possible truth assignments over the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  from the initial model  $\mathcal{M}$ . We do this in such a way that we can afterwards express the existential and universal quantifications of the formula  $\varphi$  using modal operators in the epistemic language. In order to generate groups of worlds that represent truth assignments  $\alpha$  that differ




Fig. 11: The epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  for the case where  $n = 3$ , as used in the proof of Theorem 3.

from the all-ones assignment  $\alpha_0$ , we will apply updates that copy the existing worlds but that eliminate (the first worlds of) chains of a certain length. This is the third main idea behind this reduction.

Specifically, we will introduce a single-pointed event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  for each propositional variable  $x_i$ , that is depicted in Figure 12. Intuitively, what happens when the update  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  is applied is the following. All existing groups of worlds will be duplicated, resulting in five copies—this corresponds to the five events  $f_i^1, \dots, f_i^5$  in the event model. The resulting groups of worlds will be connected corresponding to the relations between the events in the event model. That is, for any existing group of worlds, three of its copies (corresponding to the events  $f_i^1, f_i^2$ , and  $f_i^3$ ) will be connected by  $b$ -relations. The second and third of these copies (the ones corresponding to the events  $f_i^2$  and  $f_i^3$ ) will be connected by  $a$ -relations to the fourth and fifth copy (corresponding to the events  $f_i^4$  and  $f_i^5$ ), respectively. Moreover, in the fourth and fifth copy, (the first world of) the  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i$  is removed, and in the fifth copy, (the first world of) the  $z_1$ -chain of length  $i$  is removed as well. These effects of removing (the first worlds of) chains is enforced by the preconditions of the events in the event model.

By applying the updates  $(\mathcal{E}_1, e_1), \dots, (\mathcal{E}_n, e_n)$ , we generate many (in fact, an exponential number of) copies of the model  $\mathcal{M}$ , in each of which certain chains of worlds are removed, and which are connected to each other by means of  $a$ -relations and  $b$ -relations in the way described in the previous paragraph. In particular, for each truth assignment  $\alpha$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , there is some group of worlds that corresponds to  $\alpha$ .

Finally, we construct the DEL-formula  $\xi$ . We let  $\xi = [\mathcal{E}_1, e_1] \dots [\mathcal{E}_n, e_n] \xi_1$ , where we define  $\xi_1$  below. The formula  $\xi_1$  exploits the structure of the epistemic model  $\mathcal{M}'$ , that results from updating the model  $\mathcal{M}$  with the updates  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$ , to simulate the semantics of the quantified Boolean formula  $\varphi$ . For each  $1 \leq$




Fig. 12: The event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  corresponding to the propositional variable  $x_i$ , used in the proof of Theorem 3. The events are labelled  $f_i^1, \dots, f_i^5$ .

$i \leq n + 1$ , we define  $\xi_i$  inductively as follows:

$$\xi_i = \begin{cases} \psi' & \text{if } i = n + 1, \\ \hat{K}_b \hat{K}_a (z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi_j' \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi_j' \wedge \xi_{i+1}) & \text{for odd } i \leq n, \\ K_b K_a ((z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi_j' \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi_j') \rightarrow \xi_{i+1}) & \text{for even } i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Here,  $\psi'$  is the formula obtained from  $\psi$  (the quantifier-free part of the quantified Boolean formula  $\varphi$ ) by replacing each occurrence of a propositional variable  $x_i$  by the formula  $\hat{K}_a \chi_i$ .

We use the formulas  $\xi_i$  to express the formula  $\varphi$  with its existentially and universally quantified variables. Intuitively, the formulas  $\xi_i$  navigate through the groups of worlds in the model  $\mathcal{M}'$ —resulting from updating  $\mathcal{M}$  with the event models  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$ —as follows. Consider the central world of some group of worlds in the model  $\mathcal{M}'$ , and consider the formula  $\xi_i$  for some odd  $i \leq n$ . For  $\xi_i$  to be true in this world, the formula  $\xi_{i+1}$  needs to be true in the central world of *some* group of worlds that corresponds to one of the events  $f_i^4$  or  $f_i^5$  from the event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$ . Similarly, for the formula  $\xi_i$  to be true in this world, for even  $i \leq n$ , the formula  $\xi_{i+1}$  needs to be true in the central world of *both* groups of worlds that correspond to the events  $f_i^4$  and  $f_i^5$ . In this way, for odd  $i \leq n$ , the formula  $\xi_i$  together with the event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  serves to simulate an existential choice of a truth value for the variable  $x_i$ . Similarly, for even  $i \leq n$ , the formula  $\xi_i$  together with the event model  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  serves to simulate a universal choice of a truth value for the variable  $x_i$ .

The model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  and the formula  $\xi$  can be constructed in polynomial time in the size of the quantified Boolean formula  $\varphi$ . Furthermore, in the constructed instance, there are only two agents, the epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  is a single-pointed S5 model, all event models  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  are single-pointed S5 models without postconditions, and  $\xi_1$  is a formula without update modalities that contains (many occurrences of) only three propositional variables  $z_0, z_1, z_2$ .

We show that  $\varphi$  is a true quantified Boolean formula if and only if  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \xi$ . In order to do so, we prove the following (technical) statement relating truth assignments  $\alpha$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and (particular) worlds  $w$  in the epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}', w'_0) = (\mathcal{M}, w_0) \otimes (\mathcal{E}_1, e_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{E}_n, e_n)$ . Before we give the statement that we will prove, we observe that every world  $w$  that sets both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  to true is the central world of some group of worlds that represents a truth assignment  $\alpha$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . For the sake of convenience, we will say that  $w$  corresponds to the truth assignment  $\alpha$ . The statement that we will prove for all  $1 \leq i \leq n+1$  is the following.

*Statement:* Let  $\alpha$  be any truth assignment to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ . Moreover, let  $w$  be any world in the model  $(\mathcal{M}', w'_0)$  such that:

1.  $w$  makes  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  true,
2.  $w$  makes  $\hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  false for all  $1 \leq j < i$ ,
3.  $w$  makes  $\hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true for all  $i \leq j \leq n$ , and
4. the truth assignment corresponding to  $w$  agrees with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ .

Then the (partially) quantified Boolean formula  $Q_i x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$  if and only if  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true.

Observe that for  $i = 1$ , the world  $w'_0$  satisfies all four conditions. Therefore, the statement for  $i = 1$  implies that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \xi$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is a true quantified Boolean formula. Thus, proving this statement for all  $1 \leq i \leq n+1$  suffices to show the correctness of our reduction.

We begin by showing that the statement holds for  $i = n+1$ . In this case, we know that  $\alpha$  is a truth assignment to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Moreover,  $\xi_{n+1} = \psi'$ . By construction of  $\psi'$ , we know that  $w$  makes  $\psi'$  true if and only if  $\alpha$  satisfies  $\psi$ . Therefore, the statement holds for  $i = n+1$ .

Next, we let  $1 \leq i \leq n$  be arbitrary, and we assume that the statement holds for  $i+1$ . That is, the statement holds for every combination of a truth assignment  $\alpha$  and a world  $w$  that satisfies the conditions. Since  $w$  is a world in the model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0) \otimes (\mathcal{E}_1, e_1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{E}_n, e_n)$ , and since  $w$  makes  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  true, we know that  $w = (w_0, e'_1, \dots, e'_n)$ , for some  $e'_1, \dots, e'_n$ , where  $e'_j \in \mathcal{E}_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . We know that  $w$  makes  $\hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true for all  $i \leq j \leq n$ . Therefore, we know that for each  $i \leq j \leq n$  it holds that  $e'_j \in \{f_j^1, f_j^2, f_j^3\}$ .

We now distinguish two cases: either (1)  $i$  is odd, or (2)  $i$  is even. In case (1), the  $i$ -th quantifier of  $\varphi$  is existential, and in case (2), the  $i$ -th quantifier of  $\varphi$  is universal. First, consider case (1). Suppose that  $\exists x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ . Then there exists some truth assignment  $\alpha'$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  that agrees with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$  and that ensures that  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ . Suppose that  $\alpha'(x_i) = 0$ ; the case for  $\alpha'(x_i) = 1$  is entirely similar. Now, consider the worlds  $w' = (w_0, e'_1, \dots, e'_{i-1}, f_i^3, e'_{i+1}, \dots, e'_n)$  and  $w'' = (w_0, e'_1, \dots, e'_{i-1}, f_i^5, e'_{i+1}, \dots, e'_n)$ . By the construction of  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$ , by the semantics of product update, and by the fact that  $e'_i \in \{f_i^1, f_i^2, f_i^3\}$ , it holds that  $(w, w') \in R_b$  and  $(w', w'') \in R_a$ . Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that  $w''$  satisfies conditions (1)–(4),

for the truth assignment  $\alpha'$ . Also, we know that  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ . Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, we know that  $w''$  makes the formula  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. It then follows from the definition of  $\xi_i$  that  $w'$  and  $w''$  witness that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true.

Conversely, suppose that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true. Moreover, suppose that  $w'$  and  $w''$  (as defined above) witness this. (The only other possible worlds  $u'$  and  $u''$  that could witness this are obtained from  $w$  by replacing  $e'_i$  by  $f_i^2$  and  $f_i^4$ , respectively. The case where  $u'$  and  $u''$  witness that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true is entirely similar.) This means that  $w''$  makes  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Then, by the induction hypothesis, it follows that the truth assignment  $\alpha'$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  corresponding to the world  $w''$  satisfies  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$ . Moreover, since  $\alpha'$  agrees with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ , it follows that  $\exists x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ .

Next, consider case (2). Suppose that  $\forall x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ . Then for both truth assignments  $\alpha'$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  that agree with  $\alpha$  it holds that  $\exists x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ . The only worlds that satisfy  $(z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi'_j)$  and that are accessible from  $w$  by a  $b$ -relation followed by an  $a$ -relation are the worlds  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , where  $u_1 = (w_0, e'_1, \dots, e'_{i-1}, f_i^4, e'_{i+1}, \dots, e'_n)$  and  $u_2 = (w_0, e'_1, \dots, e'_{i-1}, f_i^5, e'_{i+1}, \dots, e'_n)$ . Moreover, the truth assignments  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  that correspond to  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , respectively, agree with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ . Because  $\forall x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ , we know that  $\exists x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under both  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ . Then, by the induction hypothesis it follows that both  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  make  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Therefore,  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true.

Conversely, suppose that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true. By the definition of  $\xi_i$ , we then know that all worlds that are accessible from  $w$  by a  $b$ -relation followed by an  $a$ -relation and that make  $(z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi'_j)$  true, also make  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Consider the worlds  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , as defined above. These are both accessible from  $w$  by a  $b$ -relation followed by an  $a$ -relation, and they make  $(z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi'_j)$  true. Therefore, both  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  make  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Also, the truth assignments  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  that correspond to  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , respectively, agree with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ . Moreover, the truth assignments  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are both possible truth assignments to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  that agree with  $\alpha$ . By the induction hypothesis, the formula  $\exists x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under both  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ . Therefore, we can conclude that  $\forall x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ .

This concludes the inductive proof of the statement for all  $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ , and thus concludes our correctness proof. Therefore, we can conclude that the problem is PSPACE-hard.  $\square$

#### 4 Results for semi-private announcements

Next, we consider the model checking problem for DEL when restricted to updates that are semi-private announcements. In fact, PSPACE-hardness for the



setting with semi-private announcements (rather than allowing arbitrary event models) already follows from a recent PSPACE-hardness proof for a restricted variant of the model checking problem—see [29, Theorem 4] and [30, Theorem 1]. In that PSPACE-hardness result, the number of agents is unbounded, i.e., the number of agents is part of the problem input. We show that the problem is already PSPACE-hard when the number of agents is bounded by any constant  $k \geq 2$ .

The result of Theorem 4 shows that the inherent hardness of the model checking problem for DEL—which we saw in Theorem 3 is already present in a very restricted setting—is even present when we restrict event models to be of a very specific shape (i.e., semi-private announcements).

Theorem 4 is a stronger result than Theorem 3—Theorem 4 implies the result of Theorem 3. We presented the proof of Theorem 3 in full detail, because it allows us to explain the proof of Theorem 4 in a clear way. In fact, the result of Theorem 4 is stronger than all other PSPACE-hardness results for the model checking problem for DEL in the literature—i.e., [16, Proposition 7.2], [2, Theorem 2] and [29, 30]. These results all depend on allowing certain parts of the DEL setting being unrestricted—e.g., allowing multi-pointed models, allowing more than two agents, or allowing non-serial relations—and their proofs cannot easily be modified to work for the more restricted setting of Theorem 4 with (single-pointed) semi-private announcements, S5 relations, only two agents, and only three propositional variables.

The main technical hurdle that needs to be overcome to establish Theorem 4 is to simulate the event models that we used in the proof of Theorem 3 (each consisting of 5 events) by using a sequence of semi-private announcements (which are event models with 2 events). We do this by constructing—for each event model—three semi-private announcements, in such a way that when these three semi-private announcements are composed, they take the role of the event model in the proof. In order to make sure that the semi-private announcements correctly take over the role of the event models in the proof, we also need to adapt the part of the DEL formula that expresses (the unquantified part of) the quantified Boolean formula.

**Theorem 4** *The model checking problem for DEL is PSPACE-hard, even when restricted to the case where the question is whether  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models [\mathcal{E}_1, e_1] \dots [\mathcal{E}_n, e_n]\chi$ , where:*

- the model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  is a single-pointed S5 model;
- all the  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  are (single-pointed) semi-private announcements;
- $\chi$  is an epistemic formula without update modalities that contains (multiple occurrences of) only three propositional variables; and
- there are only two agents.

*Proof* We modify the proof of Theorem 3 to work also for the case of semi-private announcements. Most prominently, we will replace the event models  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  that are used in the proof of Theorem 3 (shown in Figure 12) by a number of event models for semi-private announcements. Intuitively, these

semi-private announcements will take the role of the event models  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$ . In order to make this work, we will also slightly change the initial model  $\mathcal{M}$ .

As in the proof of Theorem 3, we give a polynomial-time reduction from the problem of deciding whether a quantified Boolean formula is true. Let  $\varphi = \exists x_1 \forall x_2 \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  be a quantified Boolean formula, where  $\psi$  is quantifier-free. We construct an epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0)$  with two agents  $a, b$  and a DEL-formula  $\xi$  such that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \xi$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is true.

In the proof of Theorem 3, the initial model  $\mathcal{M}$  consisted of a central world (where  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  are true), a number of  $z_1$ -chains (for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , there is a  $z_1$ -chain of length  $i$ ), and a number of  $z_2$ -chains (for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , there is a  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i$ )—and these worlds are connected by  $a$ -relations and  $b$ -relations as shown in Figure 11. To obtain the initial model  $\mathcal{M}$  that we use in this proof, we add additional  $z_2$ -chains. Specifically, for each  $1 \leq i \leq 3n$ , we will have a  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i$ . These additional  $z_2$ -chains are connected to the central world in exactly the same way as the original  $z_2$ -chains (that is, all the first worlds of the  $z_2$ -chains are connected in a  $b$ -clique to the central world). We will use these additional  $z_2$ -chains to simulate the behavior of the event models  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  from the proof of Theorem 3 with event models corresponding to semi-private announcements. The number of  $z_1$ -chains remains the same. The designated world  $w_0$  is the central world (that is, the only world that makes both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  true), as in the proof of Theorem 3.




Fig. 13: The semi-private announcements  $(\mathcal{E}_i^1, f_i^1)$ ,  $(\mathcal{E}_i^2, f_i^3)$  and  $(\mathcal{E}_i^3, f_i^5)$  used in the proof of Theorem 4.

The event models  $(\mathcal{E}_i, e_i)$  that are used in the proof of Theorem 3 we replace by the semi-private announcements  $(\mathcal{E}_i^1, f_i^1)$ ,  $(\mathcal{E}_i^2, f_i^3)$ , and  $(\mathcal{E}_i^3, f_i^5)$ , as shown

in Figure 13. The intuition behind these updates is the following. Firstly, the semi-private announcement  $\mathcal{E}_i^1$ , shown in Figure 13a, transforms every group of worlds into two copies, and allows a choice between these two copies when following a  $b$ -relation. Moreover, in one copy, every (first world of the)  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i + n$  is removed, and in the other copy, every (first world of the)  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i + 2n$  is removed. In other words, the choice between these two copies determines whether the formula  $\hat{K}_b\chi'_{i+n}$  or the formula  $\hat{K}_b\chi'_{i+2n}$  is false in the central world. Then for every group of worlds that does not include a  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i + n$ , the semi-private announcement  $\mathcal{E}_i^2$ , shown in Figure 13b, creates an  $a$ -accessible copy where the  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i$  is removed. Similarly, for every group of worlds that does not include a  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i + 2n$ , the semi-private announcement  $\mathcal{E}_i^3$ , shown in Figure 13c, creates an  $a$ -accessible copy where both the  $z_2$ -chain of length  $i$  and the  $z_1$ -chain of length  $i$  are removed.

Next, we construct the DEL-formula  $\xi$ . We let  $\xi = [\mathcal{E}_1^1, f_1^1][\mathcal{E}_1^2, f_1^3][\mathcal{E}_1^3, f_1^5] \dots [\mathcal{E}_n^1, f_n^1][\mathcal{E}_n^2, f_n^3][\mathcal{E}_n^3, f_n^5]\xi_1$ , where  $\xi_1$  is defined as follows, similarly to the definition used in the proof of Theorem 3. For each  $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$ , we define  $\xi_i$  inductively as follows:

$$\xi_i = \begin{cases} \psi' & \text{if } i = n + 1, \\ \hat{K}_b(\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b\chi'_j \wedge \hat{K}_a(z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b\chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b\chi'_j \wedge \xi_{i+1})) & \text{for odd } i \leq n, \\ K_b((\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b\chi'_j) \rightarrow K_a((z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b\chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b\chi'_j) \rightarrow \xi_{i+1})) & \text{for even } i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Here,  $\psi'$  is the formula obtained from  $\psi$  (the quantifier-free part of the quantified Boolean formula  $\varphi$ ) by replacing each occurrence of a propositional variable  $x_i$  by the formula  $\hat{K}_a\chi_i$ .

The formulas  $\xi_i$  that we defined above are very similar to their counterparts in the proof of Theorem 3—and the idea behind their use in the proof is entirely the same as in the proof of Theorem 3. The only difference is the addition of the subformulas  $\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b\chi'_j$  after the first modal operator. These additional subformulas are needed to ensure that some additional worlds—that are a by-product of the combination of the semi-private announcements  $(\mathcal{E}_i^1, f_i^1)$ ,  $(\mathcal{E}_i^2, f_i^3)$ , and  $(\mathcal{E}_i^3, f_i^5)$ —do not interfere in the reduction.

We show that  $\varphi$  is a true quantified Boolean formula if and only if  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \xi$ . In order to do so, as in the proof of Theorem 3, we prove the following (technical) statement relating truth assignments  $\alpha$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and (particular) worlds  $w$  in the epistemic model  $(\mathcal{M}', w'_0) = (\mathcal{M}, w_0) \otimes (\mathcal{E}_1^1, f_1^1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{E}_n^3, f_n^5)$ . Before we give the statement that we will prove, we observe that every world  $w$  that sets both  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  to true is the central world of some group of worlds that represents a truth assignment  $\alpha$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . For the sake of convenience, we will say that  $w$  corresponds to the truth assignment  $\alpha$ . The statement that we will prove for all  $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$  is the following.

*Statement:* Let  $\alpha$  be any truth assignment to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ . Moreover, let  $w$  be any world in the model  $(\mathcal{M}', w'_0)$  such that:

1.  $w$  makes  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  true,
2.  $w$  makes  $\hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  false for all  $1 \leq j < i$ ,
3.  $w$  makes  $\hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true for all  $i \leq j \leq n$ , and
4. the truth assignment corresponding to  $w$  agrees with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ .

Then the (partially) quantified Boolean formula  $Q_i x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$  if and only if  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true.

Observe that for  $i = 1$ , the world  $w'_0$  satisfies all four conditions. Therefore, the statement for  $i = 1$  implies that  $\mathcal{M}, w_0 \models \xi$  if and only if  $\varphi$  is a true quantified Boolean formula. Thus, proving this statement for all  $1 \leq i \leq n+1$  suffices to show the correctness of our reduction.

We begin by showing that the statement holds for  $i = n+1$ . In this case, we know that  $\alpha$  is a truth assignment to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Moreover,  $\xi_{n+1} = \psi'$ . By construction of  $\psi'$ , we know that  $w$  makes  $\psi'$  true if and only if  $\alpha$  satisfies  $\psi$ . Therefore, the statement holds for  $i = n+1$ .

Next, we let  $1 \leq i \leq n$  be arbitrary, and we assume that the statement holds for  $i+1$ . That is, the statement holds for every combination of a truth assignment  $\alpha$  and a world  $w$  that satisfies the conditions. Since  $w$  is a world in the model  $(\mathcal{M}, w_0) \otimes (\mathcal{E}_1^1, f_1^1) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{E}_n^3, f_n^5)$ , and since  $w$  makes  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  true, we know that  $w = (w_0, g_1, g'_1, g''_1, \dots, g_n, g'_n, g''_n)$ , for some  $g_1, g'_1, g''_1, \dots, g_n, g'_n, g''_n$ , where for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , it holds that  $g_j \in \{f_j^1, f_j^2\}$ ,  $g'_j \in \{f_j^3, f_j^4\}$ , and  $g''_j \in \{f_j^5, f_j^6\}$ .

We now distinguish two cases: either (1)  $i$  is odd, or (2)  $i$  is even. In case (1), the  $i$ -th quantifier of  $\varphi$  is existential, and in case (2), the  $i$ -th quantifier of  $\varphi$  is universal. First, consider case (1). Suppose that  $\exists x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ . Then there exists some truth assignment  $\alpha'$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  that agrees with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$  and that ensures that  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ . Suppose that  $\alpha'(x_i) = 0$ ; the case for  $\alpha'(x_i) = 1$  is entirely similar. Now, consider the worlds  $w' = (w_0, g_1, \dots, g'_{i-1}, f_i^2, g'_i, g''_i, g_{i+1}, \dots, g''_n)$  and  $w'' = (w_0, g_1, \dots, g'_{i-1}, f_i^2, g'_i, f_i^6, g_{i+1}, \dots, g''_n)$ . By the construction of  $\mathcal{E}_i^1$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_i^2$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_i^3$ , and by the semantics of product update, it holds that  $(w, w') \in R_b$  and  $(w', w'') \in R_a$ . Also, we know that  $w'$  makes  $\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true. Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that  $w''$  satisfies conditions (1)–(4), for the truth assignment  $\alpha'$ . Also, we know that  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ . Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, we know that  $w''$  makes the formula  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. It then follows from the definition of  $\xi_i$  that  $w'$  and  $w''$  witness that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true.

Conversely, suppose that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true. Moreover, suppose that  $w'$  and  $w''$  (as defined above) witness this. It could also be the case that the worlds  $u'$  and  $u''$  witness this, which are obtained from  $w$  by replacing  $g_i$  by  $f_i^1$ , and by replacing  $g_i$  by  $f_i^1$  and  $g'_i$  by  $f_i^4$ , respectively. The case where  $u'$  and  $u''$  witness that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true is entirely similar. (There are also variants of  $w'$  and  $w''$ , and of  $u'$  and  $u''$ , that could witness the fact that  $w$

makes  $\xi_i$  true. These variants can be obtained by replacing  $g_j$ ,  $g'_j$ , and  $g''_j$ —for  $i < j \leq n$ —ensuring that for all  $i < j \leq n$  it holds that neither (1)  $g_j = f_j^1$  and  $g'_j = f_j^4$  nor (2)  $g_j = f_j^2$  and  $g'_j = f_j^6$ . The following argument is entirely similar for these variants. Therefore, we restrict our attention to the worlds  $w'$  and  $w''$ .) The assumption that  $w'$  and  $w''$  witness that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true implies that  $w'$  makes  $\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true and that  $w''$  makes  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Then, by the induction hypothesis, it follows that the truth assignment  $\alpha'$  to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  corresponding to the world  $w''$  satisfies  $\forall x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$ . Moreover, since  $\alpha'$  agrees with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ , it follows that  $\exists x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ .

Next, consider case (2). Suppose that  $\forall x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ . Then for both truth assignments  $\alpha'$  to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  that agree with  $\alpha$  it holds that  $\exists x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha'$ . We need to look at those worlds that satisfy  $(z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi'_j)$  and that are accessible from  $w$  by a  $b$ -relation followed by an  $a$ -relation (where the intermediate world makes  $\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true). For our argument, it suffices to look at the worlds  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , where  $u_1 = (w_0, g_1, \dots, g''_{i-1}, f_i^1, f_i^4, g''_i, g_{i+1}, \dots, g''_n)$  and  $u_2 = (w_0, g_1, \dots, g''_{i-1}, f_i^2, g'_i, f_i^6, g_{i+1}, \dots, g''_n)$ . (As in the argument for case (1) above, there are variants of these worlds that also satisfy the requirements. The argument for these variants is entirely similar, and therefore we restrict our attention to the worlds  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ .) The truth assignments  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  that correspond to  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , respectively, agree with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ . Because  $\forall x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ , we know that  $\exists x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under both  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ . Then, by the induction hypothesis it follows that both  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  make  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Therefore,  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true.

Conversely, suppose that  $w$  makes  $\xi_i$  true. By the definition of  $\xi_i$ , we then know that all worlds that are accessible from  $w$  by a  $b$ -relation followed by an  $a$ -relation and that make  $(z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi'_j)$  true (where the intermediate world makes  $\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true), also make  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Consider the worlds  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , as defined above. These are both accessible from  $w$  by a  $b$ -relation followed by an  $a$ -relation (where the intermediate world makes  $\bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j$  true), and they make  $(z_1 \wedge z_2 \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq i} \neg \hat{K}_b \chi'_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i < j \leq n} \hat{K}_b \chi'_j)$  true. Therefore, both  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  make  $\xi_{i+1}$  true. Also, the truth assignments  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  that correspond to  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , respectively, agree with  $\alpha$  on the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}$ . Moreover, the truth assignments  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are both possible truth assignments to the propositions  $x_1, \dots, x_i$  that agree with  $\alpha$ . By the induction hypothesis, the formula  $\exists x_{i+1} \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under both  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ . Therefore, we can conclude that  $\forall x_i \dots \exists x_{n-1} \forall x_n. \psi$  is true under  $\alpha$ .

This concludes the inductive proof of the statement for all  $1 \leq i \leq n + 1$ , and thus concludes our correctness proof. Therefore, we can conclude that the problem is PSPACE-hard.  $\square$

## 5 Discussion

In this section, we reflect on the relevance and significance of our results in the overall endeavor of obtaining a well-informed and useful understanding of the computational properties of the model checking problem for DEL. In particular, we discuss (a) how our results contribute to the undertaking of getting a detailed picture of the computational complexity of DEL model checking, (b) why such a detailed theoretical picture is useful and important for the development and improvement of DEL model checking algorithms, and (c) how we can get an even more detailed picture of the complexity of DEL model checking in future research.

*Detailed worst-case complexity analysis* In this paper—as in most works in the literature on the study of the computational properties of DEL—we adopt the framework of worst-case computational complexity analysis (see, e.g., [1]). This is a framework that has been hugely influential and successful, but that also has its inherent downsides. One of its main disadvantages is that it is prone to give an overly negative image of the computational difficulty of a problem. It is not uncommon for a problem to be computationally hard in the worst case sense, while instances of this problem that come up in applications can be solved efficiently. Therefore, for a worst-case computational complexity analysis to provide an accurate picture of the inherent complexity of a problem, it needs to be as fine-grained and detailed as possible. This means that it needs to consider many different restricted settings that are relevant to applications that use the problem under study.

The results that we provided in Sections 3 and 4 contribute to the detail and fine-grainedness of the computational complexity study of the model checking problem for DEL. Previous work on the computational complexity of the problem investigated restricted settings—where certain components of the problem are restricted in number or shape. However, this mostly involved studies where restrictions only involve a single component of the problem [2, 9, 16, 23]. There has been some research that considered combinations of restrictions [29, 30], but this work only focuses on the line between polynomial-time solvable (and an extension thereof: fixed-parameter tractability) and computationally intractable. Our results both (i) take into account combinations of restrictions on different components of the problem, and (ii) are aimed at identifying the exact degree of complexity of the problem—distinguishing between different degrees of computational intractability. As such, our results provide an important and useful step in the direction of establishing a detailed and fine-grained picture of the worst-case complexity of the model checking problem for DEL.

*Guidance for model checking algorithms* Establishing a detailed picture of the exact degree of computational complexity for a wide range of restricted settings provides a good guide for the development of practical model checking algorithms. For example, the results of Theorems 3 and 4 show that the model

checking problem can require polynomial space even in restricted settings with a limited number of agents and propositions. This suggests that better performing algorithms could be obtained by using optimized algorithmic approaches for PSPACE-complete problems. For example, it would be interesting to investigate whether encoding the model checking problem for DEL into the satisfiability problem for quantified Boolean formulas (QBFs) and subsequently invoking QBF solvers on the resulting formula could lead to model checking algorithms that are competitive with existing model checking algorithms—even on instances that involve only a limited number of agents and propositions. Such an approach would have the benefit that years of research and engineering effort on developing QBF solvers (see, e.g., [17]) could be leveraged to get efficient algorithms.

The results that we established in this paper indicate that currently implemented model checking algorithms for DEL—that are based on constructing a representation of the epistemic model resulting from the original model and updates applied to it—are likely to run into barriers of combinatorial explosion already in very limited settings. For example, the results of Theorems 1, 2 and 3 show that deviating from the restricted setting of Proposition 1 in one of various minimal ways leads to a setting where any (deterministic) algorithm cannot run in polynomial time in the worst case. Examples of model checking algorithms for which these results are relevant are those of DEMO [15] and SMCDEL [8, 21].

Our results also suggest directions for experimental evaluation of (implemented) model checking algorithms. For example, it would be useful to investigate on which types of instances algorithms such as DEMO and SMCDEL perform well, and on which types of instances they in fact run into barriers of combinatorial explosion. For instances where DEMO and SMCDEL perform poorly, it would be interesting to study whether model checking algorithms based on QBF solvers—and other optimized algorithmic methods for PSPACE-complete problems—perform better. The computational complexity results in this paper provide indications for which properties of inputs could have an impact on the performance of different model checking algorithms.

*Parameterized complexity analysis* The foundational computational complexity results for DEL model checking that we developed in this paper (and that other papers in the literature developed) enable an interesting direction for future research—namely, to employ the framework of *parameterized complexity theory* (see, e.g., [11, 14, 20]). This would take the undertaking of providing a more fine-grained worst-case complexity analysis even a step further. Parameterized complexity theory provides a complexity-theoretic framework that can be used to identify which parts of the problem input contribute in what way to the running time (or space usage) of algorithms solving the model checking problem for DEL. This framework has already been used to initiate a more detailed investigation of the computational complexity of the model checking problem for DEL [29, 30]. Further pursuing this research direction has

the potential of yielding useful and relevant insights into the computational properties of DEL.

The results in this paper provide a constructive foundation for establishing parameterized complexity results for the model checking problem for DEL. For example, the hardness result of Theorem 3 tells us that the model checking problem for DEL is para-PSPACE-complete when parameterized by the number of agents and the number of propositional variables occurring in the formula—and thus is not fixed-parameter tractable for this parameter. (For more details on the relation between traditional computational complexity results and parameterized complexity, we refer to the literature—e.g., [19,20].)

*Studying other restrictions* Another way forward in the study of the computational properties of the model checking problem for DEL that is pointed at by the results that we provide in this paper, is to consider restrictions on the problem input that go beyond counting simple quantities in the input (such as the number of agents or the number of propositions) and instead are based on structural properties of the input. An example of this would be to consider the computational properties of settings where models are restricted to those whose underlying graph has certain graph-theoretic properties—such as bounded treewidth.<sup>5</sup> Whereas simple restrictions only lead to positive algorithmic results in only a very limited number of cases—as indicated by the results that we provide in this paper—structural restrictions have the potential of leading to positive results in more general settings. Tractability results based on such structural properties could then of course be used to develop efficient model checking algorithms that are tailored to application settings where these structural properties show up in problem inputs. The framework of parameterized complexity theory is particularly well suited to analyze the impact of structural properties of the problem input on the computational complexity of the model checking problem for DEL.

## 6 Conclusion

We extended the investigation of the computational complexity of the model checking problem for DEL by providing a detailed computational complexity analysis of the model checking problem for various (previously uninvestigated) combinations of restrictions on the DEL model. In particular, we studied various restrictions of the problem where all models are S5, including bounds on the number of agents, allowing only single-pointed models, allowing no postconditions, and allowing semi-private announcements rather than updates with arbitrary event models. We showed that the problem is already PSPACE-hard for very restricted settings.

---

<sup>5</sup> Treewidth is a measure that, intuitively, captures how similar a graph is to a tree (trees have minimum possible treewidth). Restricting problems to graphs of bounded treewidth often yields efficient algorithms for problems that are intractable in general (see, e.g., [11, Chapter 7]).



Future research includes extending the computational complexity analysis to additional restricted settings. For instance, it would be interesting to see whether the polynomial-time algorithm for Proposition 1 can be extended to the setting where the models contain only relations that are transitive, Euclidean and serial (KD45 models). Additionally, it would be interesting to further investigate the contribution of various parameters of the problem input to the computational costs required to solve the problem—continuing an endeavor that was recently initiated [29,30]. In the setting of KD45 models, it would also be interesting to investigate the complexity of the problem for the case where all updates are private announcements (i.e., a public announcement to a subset of agents, where the remaining agents have no awareness that any action has taken place). Moreover, future research includes obtaining upper bounds for the case where we only found lower bounds (i.e., for the case of one agent, a single-pointed models, and single-pointed event models with postconditions, where we showed  $\Delta_2^P$ -hardness).

**Acknowledgements** We would like to thank anonymous reviewers for their useful feedback on previous versions of the paper.

## References

1. Arora, S., Barak, B.: Computational Complexity – A Modern Approach. Cambridge University Press (2009)
2. Aucher, G., Schwarzentruber, F.: On the complexity of dynamic epistemic logic. In: Proceedings of the 14th conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge (TARK 2013). Chennai, India (2013)
3. Baltag, A., Moss, L.: Logics for epistemic programs. *Synthese* **139**(2), 165–224 (2004)
4. Baltag, A., Moss, L., Solecki, S.: The logic of public announcements, common knowledge, and private suspicions. In: Proceedings of the 7th conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge (TARK 1998), pp. 43–56. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. (1998)
5. Baltag, A., Moss, L., Solecki, S.: The logic of public announcements, common knowledge, and private suspicions. Tech. rep., Indiana University (1999)
6. Baral, C., Zhang, Y.: Knowledge updates: Semantics and complexity issues. *Artificial Intelligence* **164**(1-2), 209–243 (2005)
7. van Benthem, J.: Epistemic logic and epistemology: The state of their affairs. *Philosophical Studies* **128**(1), 49–76 (2006)
8. van Benthem, J., van Eijck, J., Gattinger, M., Su, K.: Symbolic model checking for dynamic epistemic logic – S5 and beyond. *Journal of Logic and Computation* **28**(2), 367–402 (2018)
9. van Benthem, J., van Eijck, J., Kooi, B.: Logics of communication and change. *Information and computation* **204**(11), 1620–1662 (2006)
10. Bolander, T., Andersen, M.B.: Epistemic planning for single and multi-agent systems. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics* **21**(1), 9–34 (2011)
11. Cygan, M., Fomin, F.V., Kowalik, L., Lokshantov, D., Marx, D., Pilipczuk, M., Pilipczuk, M., Saurabh, S.: Parameterized Algorithms. Springer (2015)
12. van Ditmarsch, H., van der Hoek, W., Kooi, B.P.: Dynamic epistemic logic, *Synthese library*, vol. 337. Springer (2008)
13. van Ditmarsch, H., Kooi, B.: Semantic results for ontic and epistemic change. In: G. Bonanno, W. van der Hoek, M. Wooldridge (eds.) *Logic and the Foundations of Game and Decision Theory (LOFT 7)*, pp. 87–118 (2006)

14. Downey, R.G., Fellows, M.R.: Fundamentals of Parameterized Complexity. Texts in Computer Science. Springer Verlag (2013)
15. van Eijck, J.: DEMO – A demo of epistemic modelling. In: J. van Benthem, D. Gabbay, B. Löwe (eds.) Interactive Logic – Proceedings of the 7th Augustus de Morgan Workshop, vol. 1, pp. 303–362 (2007)
16. van Eijck, J., Schwarzentruher, F.: Epistemic probability logic simplified. In: Advances in Modal Logic, pp. 158–177 (2014)
17. Enrico Giunchiglia Paolo Marin, M.N.: Reasoning with quantified Boolean formulas. In: A. Biere, M. Heule, H. van Maaren, T. Walsh (eds.) Handbook of Satisfiability, pp. 761–780. IOS Press (2009)
18. Fagin, R., Halpern, J.Y., Moses, Y., Vardi, M.Y.: Reasoning about Knowledge. MIT Press, Cambridge (1995)
19. Flum, J., Grohe, M.: Describing parameterized complexity classes. Information and Computation **187**(2), 291–319 (2003)
20. Flum, J., Grohe, M.: Parameterized Complexity Theory, *Texts in Theoretical Computer Science.*, vol. XIV. Springer Verlag, Berlin (2006)
21. Gattinger, M.: SMCDEL — an implementation of symbolic model checking for dynamic epistemic logic with binary decision diagrams (2018). URL <https://github.com/jrclogic/SMCDEL>. Version 1.0.0
22. van der Hoek, W., Wooldridge, M.: Multi-agent systems. In: Handbook of Knowledge Representation, *Foundations of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 3, pp. 887–928. Elsevier (2008)
23. Kooi, B., van Benthem, J.: Reduction axioms for epistemic actions. In: R. Schmidt, I. Pratt-Hartmann, M. Reynolds, H. Wansing (eds.) AiML-2004: Advances in Modal Logic, Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester, Technical report series, UMCS-04-9-1, pp. 197–211 (2004)
24. Krentel, M.W.: Generalizations of OptP to the Polynomial Hierarchy. Theoretical Computer Science **97**(2), 183–198 (1992)
25. Lutz, C.: Complexity and succinctness of public announcement logic. In: H. Nakashima, M.P. Wellman, G. Weiss, P. Stone (eds.) Proceedings of the fifth International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS), pp. 137–143. IFAAMAS (2006)
26. Meyer, J.J., van der Hoek, W.: Epistemic logic for computer science and artificial intelligence (1995)
27. Plaza, J.: Logics of public communications. In: M. Emrich, M. Pfeifer, M. Hadzikadic, Z. Ras (eds.) Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Methodologies for Intelligent Systems: poster session program, pp. 201–216. Oak Ridge National Laboratory (1989). (Reprinted as [28])
28. Plaza, J.: Logics of public communications. *Synthese* **158**(2), 165–179 (2007)
29. van de Pol, I.: How Difficult is it to Think that you Think that I Think that ...? *A DEL-based Computational-level Model of Theory of Mind and its Complexity*. Master’s thesis, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands (2015)
30. van de Pol, I., van Rooij, I., Szymanik, J.: Parameterized complexity of theory of mind reasoning in dynamic epistemic logic. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* (2018)
31. Verbrugge, R.: Logic and social cognition: The facts matters, and so do computational models. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* **38**(6), 649–680 (2009)