

A Simplicial Model for KB_{4_n} : Epistemic Logic with Agents that May Die

Éric Goubault ✉

LIX, CNRS, École Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Paris, France

Jérémy Ledent ✉

MSP Group, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland

Sergio Rajsbaum ✉

UNAM, Mexico D.F., Mexico

Abstract

The standard semantics of multi-agent epistemic logic $\mathbf{S5}_n$ is based on Kripke models whose accessibility relations are reflexive, symmetric and transitive. This one dimensional structure contains implicit higher-dimensional information beyond pairwise interactions, that has been formalized as pure simplicial models in [13]. Here we extend the theory to encompass all simplicial models — including the ones that are not pure. The corresponding Kripke models are those where the accessibility relation is symmetric and transitive, but might not be reflexive. This yields the epistemic logic KB_{4_n} , which can reason about situations where some of the agents may die.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Modal and temporal logics

Keywords and phrases Epistemic logic, Simplicial complexes, Distributed computing

1 Introduction

One of the main reasons computer scientists use logical approaches to knowledge is to analyze distributed systems composed of agents that communicate with each other to perform some joint computation. A very successful research program of using multi-agent epistemic logic began in the early 1980's showing the fundamental role of notions such as common knowledge [10, 26]. The semantics used is based on the classic *possible worlds* relational structure developed by Rudolf Carnap, Stig Kanter, Jikko Hintikka and Saul Kripke in the late 1950's and early 1960's.


The notion of possible worlds goes back at least to Leibniz. However, the intimate relationship between distributed computing and algebraic topology discovered in 1993 [16] showed the importance of moving from using worlds as the primary object, to *perspectives* about possible worlds. After all, what exists in a distributed system is only the local states of the agents and events observable within the system, as is natural from the perspective of special relativity [22]. The global state of the system is an abstraction used to reason about the system. This point of view led to topological models of distributed systems, via a simplicial complex constructed using the local states as vertices and the global states as simplexes. Furthermore, there are topological invariants that are preserved while the agents communicate with each other, that in turn determine which distributed tasks can be solved, or how fast they can be solved. Thus, the computational power of a distributed system is determined by multi-dimensional indistinguishability relations by sets of local states, rather than in the binary indistinguishability relations between pairs of global states defined in a Kripke structure. While the solvability of some tasks such as *consensus* depends only on the one-dimensional (graph) connectivity of the Kripke structure of global states, and hence is intimately related to common knowledge, the solvability of other tasks, most notably *k-set agreement* (where agents agree on at most k different values) depends on the higher dimensional connectivity properties of the simplicial complex of local states [17].

The realization that distributed computability is of a topological nature motivated us to give a formal semantics to epistemic multi-agent formulas in terms of simplicial models [13]. We derived a new class of models, based on simplicial complexes, which is equivalent to the usual Kripke model semantics for S5_n . We were able to provide tools to reason about solvability of distributed tasks such as consensus, approximate agreement and equality negation [13, 32], and explore bisimilarity of simplicial models [8] and connections with covering spaces [32]. The simplicial model semantics led to a logical obstruction to the solvability of set agreement by Yagi and Nishimura [35] using the notion of distributed knowledge [14], in a sense a higher dimensional version of knowledge.

The categorical equivalence of [13] between S5_n Kripke models and simplicial models associates each world of the Kripke model with a facet of the corresponding simplicial model. A core assumption of these models is that the same set of n agents always participate in every possible world. Because of this, every facet of the simplicial model is of the same dimension. Such models are called *pure* simplicial models. They can be used to analyse the basic *wait-free* shared-memory model of computation [18], where all interleavings of the individual operations of the agents are possible.

In this paper, we wish to extend the categorical equivalence to also consider simplicial models that are not pure. Examples of such models can be found in distributed systems where processes may fail by crashing; in epistemic logic terms, we will say that agents may *die*. These situations have been thoroughly studied since early on in distributed computability, e.g. the seminal work of Dwork and Moses [9], where a complete characterization of the number of rounds required to reach simultaneous consensus was given, in terms of common knowledge. For more recent additional references see e.g [6, 12, 15].

The focus however has been on studying solvability of consensus and other problems related to common knowledge, which as mentioned above, depends only on the 1-dimensional connectivity of epistemic models. With the long-term goal of beyond consensus-like problems, to set agreement, renaming and other tasks whose solvability depends on higher dimensional topological connectivity, we propose in this paper a simplicial model where agents may die. We are thus able to give formal semantics to non-pure simplicial models. We show that in this case, the logic is no longer S5_n , but instead KB4_n (or equivalently KB45_n , see [11]) where the Axiom **T** does not hold. This logic corresponds is sound and complete with respect to the class of Kripke models whose accessibility relation is symmetric and transitive, but not necessarily reflexive. It is actually a less studied logic; its close cousin KD45_n being more commonly considered, in order to reason about belief [34].



■ **Figure 1** An input complex for three agents starting with binary inputs. Then the complex of local states after one, and after two rounds. At most one agent may die [19].

Our main insight is that, in a KB4_n Kripke model, an agent is dead in a given state when its accessibility relation at that state is not reflexive. In terms of the corresponding simplicial

model, the number of alive agents is reflected by the dimension of the facets: a facet with k vertices means that k agents are alive. As a running example, we use the synchronous crash failures model of computation [9], described in Example 6. This model has been exploited in [7, 19] to establish a lower bound on the number of rounds needed to solve set agreement. Notice that the protocol complex is no longer a subdivision of the input complex, as in the asynchronous wait-free case, see Figure 1.

Related work. A line of work started by Dwork and Moses [9] studied in great detail the synchronous crash failures model from an epistemic logic perspective. However, in their approach, the crashed processes are treated the same as the active ones, with a distinguished local state “fail”. In that sense, all agents are present in every state, hence they still model the usual epistemic logic $\mathbf{S5}_n$. Instead of changing the underlying model as we do here, they introduce new knowledge and common knowledge operators that take into account the non-rigid set of agents (see e.g. [30], Chapter 6.4).

There are two other works that we are aware of which considered the problem of defining a semantics of knowledge for possibly impure simplicial complexes. Velázquez-Cervantes [33] studies projections from impure complexes to pure sub-complexes, and algorithmic transformations between Kripke models and simplicial complexes. More relevant to our purpose is the paper of van Ditmarsch [31], who describes a two-staged semantics with a *definability relation* prescribing which formulas can be interpreted, on top of which the usual *satisfaction relation* is defined. This ad-hoc approach results in a quite peculiar logic: for instance, it does not obey Axiom **K**, which is the common ground of all Kripke-style modal logics. In fact, the question of finding a complete axiomatization for that logic is left open. In contrast, we take a more systematic approach: we first establish a tight categorical correspondence between simplicial models and Kripke models. Via this correspondence, we simply translate the standard Kripke-style semantics to simplicial models. This leads us to the well-understood modal logic $\mathbf{KB4}_n$. We will discuss further the technical differences between our approach and that of [31] in Section 3.2.

2 Background on simplicial complexes and Kripke structures

Chromatic simplicial complexes. Simplicial complexes with vertices labeled with agent names have been used extensively in the field of fault-tolerant distributed protocols [16]. They are defined as follows:

► **Definition 1.** A simplicial complex is a pair $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S \rangle$ where V is a set, and $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V)$ is a family of non-empty subsets of V such that:

- for all $v \in V$, $\{v\} \in S$, and
- S is downward-closed: for all $X \in S$, $Y \subseteq X$ implies $Y \in S$.

Given a finite set A of colours, a chromatic simplicial complex coloured by A is a triple $\langle V, S, \chi \rangle$ where $\langle V, S \rangle$ is a simplicial complex, and $\chi : V \rightarrow A$ assigns colours to vertices such that for every $X \in S$, all vertices of X have distinct colours.

Elements of V (identified with singletons) are called *vertices*. Elements of S are *simplexes*, and the ones that are maximal w.r.t. inclusion are *facets*. The set of facets of \mathcal{C} is written $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$. The *dimension* of a simplex $X \in S$ is $\dim(X) = |X| - 1$. A simplicial complex \mathcal{C} is *pure* if all facets are of the same dimension.

The condition of having distinct colours for vertices composing simplexes is a fairly strong one: in particular, we will always be allowed to take the (unique) subface of a simplex X of a chromatic simplicial complex with colours in some subset U of $\chi(X)$.

Chromatic simplicial complexes can be arranged into a category, whose morphisms preserve simplex dimension:

► **Definition 2.** A chromatic simplicial map from $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi \rangle$ to $\mathcal{D} = \langle V', S', \chi' \rangle$ is a function $f : V \rightarrow V'$ such that:

- f maps simplexes to simplexes, i.e., for every $X \in S$, $f(X) \in S'$, and
- f respects colours, i.e., for every $v \in V$, $\chi'(f(v)) = \chi(v)$.

We denote by SimCpx_A the category of chromatic simplicial complexes coloured by A , and $\text{SimCpx}_A^{\text{pure}}$ the full sub-category of pure chromatic simplicial complexes on A .

Equivalence with epistemic frames. The traditional possible worlds semantics of (multi-agent) modal logics relies on the notion of Kripke frame. In the following definition, we fix a finite set A of agents.

► **Definition 3.** A Kripke frame $M = \langle W, R \rangle$ is given by a set of worlds W , together with an A -indexed family of relations on W , $R : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W \times W)$. We write R_a rather than $R(a)$, and $u R_a v$ instead of $(u, v) \in R_a$. The relation R_a is called the a -accessibility relation. Given two Kripke frames $M = \langle W, R \rangle$ and $N = \langle W', R' \rangle$, a morphism from M to N is a function $f : W \rightarrow W'$ such that for all $u, v \in W$, for all $a \in A$, $u R_a v$ implies $f(u) R'_a f(v)$.

To model multi-agent epistemic logic $\mathbf{S5}_n$, we additionally require each relation R_a to be an equivalence relation. When this is the case, we usually denote the relation by \sim_a , and call it the *indistinguishability relation*. For the equivalence class of w with respect to \sim_a , we write $[w]_a \subseteq W$. Kripke frames satisfying this condition are called *epistemic frames*. An epistemic frame is *proper* when two distinct worlds can always be distinguished by at least one agent: for all $w, w' \in W$, if $w \neq w'$ then $w \not\sim_a w'$ for some $a \in A$. In [13], we exploited an equivalence of categories between pure chromatic simplicial complexes and proper Kripke frames, to give an interpretation of $\mathbf{S5}_n$ on simplicial models. This allowed us to apply epistemic logics to study distributed tasks.

► **Theorem 4** (see [13]). The category of pure chromatic simplicial complexes $\text{SimCpx}_A^{\text{pure}}$ is equivalent to the category of proper epistemic frames $\text{EFrame}_A^{\text{proper}}$.

► **Example 5.** The picture below shows an epistemic frame (left) and its associated chromatic simplicial complex (right). The three agents a, b, c , are represented as colours blue, magenta and green (respectively) on the vertices of the simplicial complex. The three worlds $\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ of the epistemic frame correspond to the three facets (triangles) of the simplicial complex. The c -labeled edge between the two worlds w_2 and w_3 indicates that $w_2 \sim_c w_3$. Correspondingly, the two facets w_2 and w_3 of the simplicial complex share a common vertex, coloured in green (agent c). Similarly, the two facets w_1 and w_2 share their ab -coloured edge.




3 Partial epistemic frames and simplicial complexes

In this section, we are going to generalise Theorem 4 to deal with chromatic simplicial complexes that are not pure. On the other side of the equivalence, we also need to enlarge the class of Kripke frames to be considered: we introduce *partial epistemic frames*. Impure

simplicial complexes arise naturally in the field of distributed computing, in situations where processes (i.e., agents) may crash.

► **Example 6.** Consider the chromatic simplicial complex \mathcal{C} of Figure 2, that arises when considering a one round synchronous protocol where processes¹ may crash e.g. [16, 19]. Agents are numbered from 1 to 3, and up to 2 failures may happen, they all begin with their number as local input value (1, 2 or 3). Each process sends a message to the two other processes (and to itself, for uniformity), with its input value. A process may crash, in which case it is dead at the end of the round. When a process crashes, it can fail to send some messages. By the end of the round, a process that did not crash, has received all messages sent to it. In the figure, each vertex is coloured with an agent's name, 1, 2 or 3. Also, each vertex is labeled with its local state or *view* at the end of the round (omitted from the figure for clarity). The view is a subset of $\{1, 2, 3\}$, corresponding to the messages it received at the end of the round. The facet w_1 represents the execution where no process crashes, it is a set of 3 vertices, coloured with distinct agent names, all with view $\{1, 2, 3\}$. Facet w_2 instead is of dimension 1, because process 2 has crashed, and it sent a message to 1 but not to 3. Thus, the view of 3 is $\{1, 3\}$. Process 1 does not distinguish the execution of w_1 and of w_2 , while process 3 has the same view in w_2 and w_{10} , where 2 has crashed *cleanly*, before sending any messages. Thus, in w_{10} , both 1 and 3 have view $\{1, 3\}$. In the 0-dimensional facet w_0 the view of 1 is $\{1\}$ because both 2 and 3 crash cleanly.



■ **Figure 2** A chromatic simplicial complex \mathcal{C} (left) and a proper partial epistemic frame M (right). The three agents are $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and the 13 facets/worlds are labelled w_0, \dots, w_{12} .

The one round protocol complex \mathcal{C} is not pure; but is connected, if only one process may crash. As illustrated in Figure 1, executing one more round would produce a disconnected complex. Notice that the messages a process sends in the second round consist of its view at the end of the first round. It is the objective of this paper to extend Theorem 4 to interpret task computability in such distributed architectures, in a logical manner (see Theorem 24).

¹ In the distributed computing literature agents are called *processes*, and a dead agent is said to have *crashed*.

3.1 Partial epistemic frames

We consider now another type of Kripke frame, in the spirit of PER semantic models of programming languages and “Kripke logical partial equivalence relations” of e.g. [24]:

► **Definition 7.** A Partial Equivalence Relation (PER) on a set X is a relation $R \subseteq X \times X$ which is symmetric and transitive (but not necessarily reflexive).

The domain of a PER R is the set $\text{dom}(R) = \{x \in X \mid R(x, x)\} \subseteq X$, and it is easy to see that R is an equivalence relation on its domain, and empty outside of it. Thus, PERs are equivalent to the “local equivalence relations” defined in [31]. We now fix a set of agents A .

► **Definition 8.** A partial epistemic frame $M = \langle W, \sim \rangle$ is a Kripke frame such that each relation $(\sim_a)_{a \in A}$ is a PER.

We say that agent a is *alive* in a world w when $w \in \text{dom}(\sim_a)$, i.e., when $w \sim_a w$. In that case, we write $[w]_a$ for the equivalence class of w with respect to \sim_a , within $\text{dom}(\sim_a)$. We write \bar{w} for the set of agents that are alive in world w and \underline{w} for the set of agents that are dead in world w (the complement of \bar{w}). A partial epistemic frame is *proper* if any two distinct worlds w, w' can be distinguished by at least one agent that is alive in w , i.e.

$$w \neq w' \implies (\exists a \in A. w \sim_a w \text{ and } w \not\sim_a w')$$

Note that, by symmetry of \neq , there is also a (possibly different) agent a' that is alive in w' and can distinguish w and w' .

► **Example 9.** Two partial epistemic frames over the set of agents $A = \{a, b, c\}$ are represented below. The frame on the left is proper, because agent b is alive in w_1 and can distinguish between w_1 and w_2 ; and agent c is alive in w_2 and can distinguish between w_1 and w_2 . The frame on the right is not proper, because there is no agent alive in w'_2 that can distinguish between w'_1 and w'_2 .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a, b & & a, c \\ \cap & & \cap \\ w_1 & \xrightarrow{a} & w_2 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} a, b, c & & a, b \\ \cap & & \cap \\ w'_1 & \xrightarrow{a, b} & w'_2 \end{array}$$

► **Example 10.** The partial epistemic frame pictured in Figure 2 has 13 worlds w_0, \dots, w_{12} in which some of the three agents 1, 2 and 3 are alive:

- w_1 is the only world in which the three agents are alive.
- 1 and 2 are the only alive agents in worlds w_3, w_4 and w_5 . 1 and 3 are the only alive agents in worlds w_2, w_{10} and w_9 . And 2 and 3 are the only alive agents in worlds w_6, w_7 and w_8 .
- In w_0 , only 1 is alive. In w_{11} , only 2 is alive, and in w_{12} , only 3 is alive.

The accessibility relation is represented by edges labelled with the agents that do not distinguish between the worlds at its extremities. For instance, agent 1 cannot distinguish between w_3 and w_1 , and 2 cannot distinguish between w_3 and w_4 . It can easily be checked to be a proper partial epistemic frame.

Morphisms of partial epistemic frames. Our notion of morphism for partial epistemic frames slightly differs from the one for a general Kripke frame (Definition 3). The novelty arises when we want to map a world w , in which some agents \bar{w} are alive, into a world w' where strictly more agents are alive. In this case, there might exist some other w'' , such that

$w' \sim_a w''$ for all $a \in \bar{w}$. We argue that such a world w'' should also be in the image of w by the morphism. Thus, $f(w)$ is not a world but a set of worlds, which we require to be *saturated*. This will be crucial in Section 3.2 when we establish the equivalence of categories between partial epistemic frames and chromatic simplicial complexes.

► **Definition 11.** *Given a partial epistemic frame $M = \langle W, \sim \rangle$, a subset of agents $U \subseteq A$, and a world $w \in W$, we define the set $\text{sat}_U(w) \subseteq W$ as follows.*

$$\text{sat}_U(w) = \{w' \in W \mid w \sim_a w' \text{ for all } a \in U\}$$

► **Definition 12.** *Let $M = \langle W, \sim \rangle$ and $N = \langle W', \sim' \rangle$ be two partial epistemic frames. A morphism of partial epistemic frame from M to N is a function $f : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W')$ such that*

- (Preservation of \sim) *for all $a \in A$, for all $u, v \in W$, for all $u' \in f(u)$, for all $v' \in f(v)$, $u \sim_a v$ implies $u' \sim'_a v'$,*
- (Saturation) *for all $u \in W$, there exists $u' \in f(u)$ such that $f(u) = \text{sat}_{\bar{u}}(u')$, i.e.*

$$f(u) = \{v' \in W' \mid u' \sim'_a v' \text{ for all } a \in \bar{u}\}$$

Composition of morphisms is defined by $(g \circ f)(u) = \text{sat}_{\bar{v}}(w)$, for some $v \in f(u)$ and $w \in g(v)$.

The first condition on f above means that worlds that are indistinguishable by some agent a should have images composed of worlds that are indistinguishable by a . The second condition states that the image of a world u of M is “generated” by a world u' of N , as the set of all worlds of N that cannot be distinguished from u' by the agents alive in u . In particular, notice that the saturation condition implies that $f(u)$ is always non-empty.

The next proposition says that, on proper frames, the only case when $f(u)$ can be multivalued is when $\bar{u} \subsetneq \bar{u}'$ for every u' in $f(u)$.

► **Proposition 13.** *Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a morphism of epistemic frames. For all $u \in W$ and $u' \in f(u)$, $\bar{u} \subseteq \bar{u}'$. Moreover, if N is proper and $\bar{u} = \bar{u}'$, then $f(u) = \{u'\}$.*

Proof. The first fact is a direct consequence of the preservation of \sim . For the second one, let $u' \in f(u)$ such that $\bar{u}' = \bar{u}$. Assume by contradiction that there is $u'' \in f(u)$ with $u'' \neq u'$. By saturation, we have $u'' \sim_a u'$ for all $a \in \bar{u} = \bar{u}'$. This is impossible because N is proper. ◀

The category of partial epistemic frames (with set of agents A) is denoted by KPER_A , and the full subcategory of proper partial epistemic frames (with set of agents A) is denoted by $\text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$. Note that the category of proper epistemic frames $\text{EFrame}_A^{\text{proper}}$ is a full subcategory of $\text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$. Indeed, in an epistemic frame all agents are alive in all worlds, so by Proposition 13 morphisms between proper epistemic frames are single-valued. Then Definition 12 reduces to the standard notion of Kripke frame morphisms (Definition 3).

3.2 Equivalence between chromatic simplicial complexes and partial epistemic frames

In this section, we show how to canonically associate a proper partial epistemic frame with any chromatic simplicial complex, and vice versa. In fact, this correspondence extends to morphisms, and thus we have an equivalence of categories, meaning that the two structures contain the same information. We construct functors $\kappa : \text{SimCpx}_A \rightarrow \text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$ and $\sigma : \text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}} \rightarrow \text{SimCpx}_A$ and show that they form an equivalence of categories in Theorem 24. A similar correspondence appears in [31], with two differences:

- They only show the equivalence between the objects of those categories, while we also deal with morphisms. To achieve this, we had to define morphisms of partial epistemic frames (Definition 12), since the standard notion does not work.
- They only show that $\kappa \circ \sigma(M)$ is bisimilar to M , while we prove a stronger result, that there is an isomorphism. To achieve this, we had to impose the condition of M being proper, which is not considered in [31].

► **Definition 14 (Functor κ).** Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi \rangle$ be a chromatic simplicial complex on the set of agents A . Its associated partial epistemic frame is $\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \langle W, \sim \rangle$, where $W := \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ is the set of facets of \mathcal{C} , and the PER \sim_a is given by $X \sim_a Y$ if $a \in \chi(X \cap Y)$ (for $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$).

The image of a morphism $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ in SimCpx_A , is the morphism $\kappa(f) : \kappa(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \kappa(\mathcal{D})$ in $\text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$ that takes a facet $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ to

$$\kappa(f)(X) = \{Z \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{D}) \mid f(X) \subseteq Z\}$$

► **Example 15.** In Figure 2, the simplicial complex \mathcal{C} on the left is mapped by κ to the partial epistemic frame $M = \kappa(\mathcal{C})$ on the right. The epistemic frame M contains one world for each facet w_0, \dots, w_{12} of the simplicial complex. The reflexive “loops” in the M , indicating which agents are alive in a given world, are labelled with the colours of the corresponding facet. For instance, $w_1 \sim_{\{1,2,3\}} w_1$ but $w_3 \sim_{\{1,2\}} w_3$ only; because w_3 in \mathcal{C} is an edge whose extremities have colours 1 and 2.

We now check that $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ and $\kappa(f)$ above are correctly defined.

► **Proposition 16.** $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is a proper partial epistemic frame.

Proof. The relation \sim_a on facets is easily seen to be a symmetric and transitive, because there can be at most one vertex $v \in X \cap Y$ with $\chi(v) = a$. To show that $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is proper, consider two worlds X and Y in $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$, i.e., two facets of \mathcal{C} . In simplicial complexes, $X \neq Y$ implies that at least one vertex of X , say v , does not belong to Y : otherwise, we would have $X \subseteq Y$ so X would not be a facet. Let $a = \chi(v)$ be the colour of v . Then a is alive in X because $a \in \chi(X \cap X)$; and $X \not\sim_a Y$ because $v \notin X \cap Y$ and there can be only one vertex with colour a in X . ◀

► **Proposition 17.** $\kappa(f)$ is a morphism of partial epistemic frames from $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ to $\kappa(\mathcal{D})$.

Proof. Assume X and Y are facets of $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi \rangle$ such that $X \sim_a Y$ in $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. So there is a vertex $v \in V$ such that $v \in X \cap Y$ and $\chi(v) = a$. Therefore $f(v)$ is in all facets $Z \in \kappa(\mathcal{D})$ such that $f(X) \subseteq Z$ and all facets $T \in \kappa(\mathcal{D})$ such that $f(Y) \subseteq T$. As $\chi(f(v)) = a$, this means that $a \in \chi(Z \cap T)$, hence, for all $Z \in \kappa(f)(X)$ and $T \in \kappa(f)(Y)$, $Z \sim_a T$. Furthermore, $\kappa(f)(X)$ as defined is obviously saturated, so $\kappa(f)$ is a morphism of partial epistemic frames. ◀

► **Proposition 18.** κ is functorial, i.e. $\kappa(g \circ f) = \kappa(g) \circ \kappa(f)$.

Proof. Let $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $g : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be two chromatic simplicial maps. By definition, for a world/facet $X \in \kappa(\mathcal{C})$, we have $\kappa(g \circ f)(X) = \{Z' \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}) \mid (g \circ f)(X) \subseteq Z'\}$, while $(\kappa(g) \circ \kappa(f))(X) = \text{sat}_{\chi(X)}(Z)$ for some facets $Z \in \kappa(g)(Y)$ and $Y \in \kappa(f)(X)$. We show that they are equal.

Consider Z' such that $(g \circ f)(X) \subseteq Z'$; we need to show that $Z' \sim_a Z$ for all $a \in \chi(X)$. Indeed, let v be the a -coloured vertex of X . Then $(g \circ f)(v) \in Z'$ by assumption, and $(g \circ f)(v) \in Z$ because $f(v) \in Y$. So there is an a -coloured vertex $(g \circ f)(v) \in Z' \cap Z$.

Conversely, let $Z' \in \text{sat}_{\chi(X)}(Z)$, i.e. $Z' \sim_a Z$ for all $a \in \chi(X)$. Let v be a vertex of X , and let $a = \chi(v)$. Since $f(v) \in Y$, we have $(g \circ f)(v) \in Z$. Since Z can have only one a -coloured vertex and $a \in \chi(Z' \cap Z)$, we get $(g \circ f)(v) \in Z'$. Thus $(g \circ f)(X) \subseteq Z'$ as required. ◀

Conversely, we now consider a partial epistemic frame $M = \langle W, \sim \rangle$ on the set of agents A , and we define the associated chromatic simplicial complex $\sigma(M)$. Intuitively, each world $w \in W$ where $k + 1$ agents are alive will be represented by a facet X_w of dimension k , whose vertices are coloured by \bar{w} . Such facets must then be “glued” together according to the indistinguishability relations. Formally, this is done by the following quotient construction:

- **Definition 19** (Functor σ on objects). *Let $M = \langle W, \sim \rangle$ be a partial epistemic frame. Its associated chromatic simplicial complex is $\sigma(M) = \langle V, S, \chi \rangle$, where:*
- *The set of vertices is $V = \{(a, [w]_a) \mid w \in W, a \in \bar{w}\}$. We denote such a vertex $(a, [w]_a)$ by v_a^w for succinctness; but note that $v_a^w = v_a^{w'}$ when $w \sim_a w'$.*
 - *The facets are of the form $X_w = \{v_a^w \mid a \in \bar{w}\}$ for each $w \in W$; and the set S consists of all their sub-simplexes.*
 - *The colouring is given by $\chi(v_a^w) = a$.*

It is straightforward to see that this is a chromatic simplicial complex. We now check that there is indeed one distinct facet of $\sigma(M)$ for each world of M .

- **Lemma 20.** *If M is proper, the facets of $\sigma(M)$ are in bijection with the worlds of M .*

Proof. Each world $w \in W$ is associated with the simplex $X_w = \{v_a^w \mid a \in \bar{w}\}$. We need to prove that these simplexes are indeed facets, and that they are distinct for $w \neq w'$. It suffices to show that for all $w \neq w'$, $X_w \not\subseteq X_{w'}$. Since M is proper, there exists an agent a which is alive in w such that $w \not\sim_a w'$. Then, either a is alive in w' , in which case $v_a^w \neq v_a^{w'}$, or a is dead in w' . In both cases, v_a^w is not a vertex of $X_{w'}$ so $X_w \not\subseteq X_{w'}$. ◀

► **Example 21.** In Figure 2, the partial epistemic frame M on the right is mapped by σ onto the simplicial complex $\mathcal{C} = \sigma(M)$ on the left. Each world w_0, \dots, w_{12} of M is turned into a facet of the simplicial complex $\sigma(M)$, whose dimension is the number of alive agents minus one. These facets are glued along the sub-simplexes whose colours are the agents that cannot distinguish between two worlds. For instance, world w_1 is associated with the facet of the same name, with 3 colours, hence of dimension 2 (the central, pink, triangle). On the other hand, the world w_3 turns into an edge (dimension 1), glued to the triangle w_1 along the vertex with colour 1, because $w_1 \sim_1 w_3$.

We also define the action of σ on morphisms of partial epistemic frames:

- **Definition 22** (Functor σ on morphisms). *Now let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a morphism in $\text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$. We define the simplicial map $\sigma(f) : \sigma(M) \rightarrow \sigma(N)$ as follows. For each vertex of $\sigma(M)$ of the form v_a^w with $w \in W$, we pick any $w' \in f(w)$ and define $\sigma(f)(v_a^w) = v_a^{w'}$.*

To check that this is well-defined, we need to show that the simplicial map $\sigma(f)$ does not depend on the choices of w and w' . Assume we pick a different world $u' \in f(w)$, $u' \neq w'$. By the saturation property of f we have $u' \sim'_a w'$, so $v_a^{u'} = v_a^{w'}$. Hence $\sigma(f)(v_a^w)$ is a uniquely defined vertex of $\sigma(N)$. Now, assume that the vertex v_a^w of $\sigma(M)$ could also be described as v_a^u with $u \in W$. Since $v_a^w = v_a^u$, we have $w \sim_a u$ in M . By the preservation property of f , for every $u' \in f(u)$ we have $u' \sim'_a w'$, so $v_a^{u'} = v_a^{w'}$. Once again, the choice of $w \in W$ does not influence the definition of $\sigma(f)$.

It is easy to check that $\sigma(f)$ is indeed a chromatic simplicial map: preservation of colours is obvious by construction; and for the preservation of simplexes, notice that each facet X_w of $\sigma(M)$ is mapped into the facet $X_{w'}$ of $\sigma(N)$, for some $w' \in f(w)$. However, note that $\sigma(f)(X_w)$ might not in general be a facet; we only know that $\sigma(f)(X_w) \subseteq X_{w'}$.

- **Proposition 23.** *σ is functorial, i.e. $\sigma(g \circ f) = \sigma(g) \circ \sigma(f)$.*

Proof. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ and $g : N \rightarrow P$ be morphisms of partial epistemic frames. Let v_a^w be a vertex of $\sigma(M)$, where $w \in W$ is a world of M . By definition, $\sigma(g \circ f)(v_a^w) = v_a^{w''}$ where $w'' \in (g \circ f)(w)$; whereas $(\sigma(g) \circ \sigma(f))(v_a^w) = v_a^{y''}$ where $y'' \in g(y')$ and $y' \in f(w)$. To show that they are the same vertex, we need to prove that $w'' \sim_a y''$. By definition of $(g \circ f)(w)$, there exists $x' \in f(w)$ and $x'' \in g(x')$ such that $w'' \sim_a x''$. Since $w \sim_a w$, we have $x' \sim_a y'$ by the preservation property of f , and then $x'' \sim_a y''$ again by preservation. Finally, $w'' \sim_a y''$ by transitivity. \blacktriangleleft

Now we can state the main theorem:

► **Theorem 24.** κ and σ define an equivalence of categories between $\text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$ and SimCpx_A .

Proof. We have already seen that κ and σ are well-defined functors, it remains to show that:

- (i) The composite $\kappa \circ \sigma$ is naturally isomorphic to the identity functor on $\text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$.
- (ii) The composite $\sigma \circ \kappa$ is naturally isomorphic to the identity functor on SimCpx_A .

(i) Consider a partial epistemic frame $M = \langle W, \sim \rangle$ in $\text{KPER}_A^{\text{proper}}$. By definition, $\kappa\sigma(M) = \langle F, \sim' \rangle$ where F is the set of facets of $\sigma(M)$. By Lemma 20 there is a bijection $W \cong F$, where a world $w \in W$ is associated with the facet $X_w = \{v_a^w \mid a \in \bar{w}\}$ of $\sigma(M)$. Furthermore, for all $w, w' \in W$, $w \sim_a w'$ iff $X_w \sim'_a X_{w'}$. Indeed, $w \sim_a w' \iff v_a^w = v_a^{w'} \iff a \in \chi(X_w \cap X_{w'})$. Hence, $\kappa\sigma(M)$ and M are isomorphic partial epistemic frames.

Consider a morphism of partial epistemic frames $f : M \rightarrow N$, with $M = \langle W, \sim \rangle$ and $N = \langle W', \sim' \rangle$. By definition, $\kappa\sigma(f)$ takes a facet X_w of $\sigma(M)$ to a set of facets of $\sigma(N)$, $\kappa\sigma(f)(X_w) = \{Z \in \sigma(N) \mid \sigma(f)(X_w) \subseteq Z\}$. We want to show that this set is equal to $\{X_{w'} \mid w' \in f(w)\}$. Let $w' \in f(w)$. By definition, $\sigma(f)$ maps each vertex v_a^w of X_w to $v_a^{w'}$, so $\sigma(f)(X_w) \subseteq X_{w'}$. Conversely, assume $\sigma(f)(X_w) \subseteq Z$. Since Z is a facet of $\sigma(N)$, $Z = X_{w'}$ for some $w' \in W'$. For each $a \in \bar{w}$, the vertex v_a^w of X_w is mapped by $\sigma(f)$ to $v_a^{x'}$, for $x' \in f(w)$. But since $\sigma(f)(v_a^w) \in Z$, we must have $v_a^{x'} = v_a^{w'}$, so $x' \sim_a w'$. By the saturation property of f , $x' \in f(w)$ implies $w' \in f(w)$ as required. Therefore $\kappa\sigma$ is an isomorphism also on morphisms of partial epistemic frames.

(ii) Consider now a chromatic simplicial complex $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi \rangle$. Then $\sigma\kappa(\mathcal{C}) = \langle V', S', \chi' \rangle$ has vertices of the form $V' = \{v_a^Z \mid Z \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}) \text{ and } a \in \chi(Z)\}$. We must exhibit a bijection $V \cong V'$ which is a chromatic simplicial map in both directions. Given $u \in V$ of colour a , we map it to v_a^Z where Z is any facet of \mathcal{C} that contains u . This is well-defined since any other facet Z' also containing u gives rise to the same vertex $v_a^{Z'} = v_a^Z$, because $Z' \sim_a Z$ in $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$. This map is obviously chromatic, and preserves simplexes because any simplex $Y \in S$ contained in a facet $Z \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ will be mapped to $\{v_a^Z \mid a \in \chi(Y)\} \subseteq X_Z \in \mathcal{F}(\sigma\kappa(\mathcal{C}))$. Conversely, we map a vertex $v_a^Z \in V'$ to the a -coloured vertex of Z . This is also chromatic, and preserves simplexes because any sub-simplex of X_Z is mapped to a sub-simplex of Z . It is easy to check that our two maps form a bijection, therefore \mathcal{C} and $\sigma\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ are isomorphic.

Lastly, consider a chromatic simplicial map $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ with $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi \rangle$ and $\mathcal{D} = \langle U, R, \zeta \rangle$. As above, we write V' and U' for the vertices of $\sigma\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ and $\sigma\kappa(\mathcal{D})$, respectively. By definition, $\sigma\kappa(f)$ maps a vertex $v_a^Z \in V'$, with $Z \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$, to the vertex $v_a^Y \in U'$, with $Y \in \kappa(f)(Z)$. So by definition of $\kappa(f)$, $f(Z) \subseteq Y$. To prove that $\sigma\kappa(f)$ agrees with f up to the isomorphism of the previous paragraph, we need to show that f sends the a -coloured vertex of Z to the a -coloured vertex of Y . But this is immediate since $f(Z) \subseteq Y$ and f is chromatic. \blacktriangleleft

► **Remark 25.** Note that the equivalence of categories of Theorem 24 strictly extends the one of [13], which was restricted to pure chromatic simplicial complexes on one side and proper epistemic frames on the other. Indeed, if \mathcal{C} is a pure simplicial complex of dimension $|A| - 1$, it is easy to check that $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is an epistemic frame, since all agents are alive in all worlds.

Moreover, by Proposition 13, the morphisms between those frames are single-valued; so we recover the usual notion of Kripke frame morphism that we had in [13]. Similarly, when M is a proper epistemic frame, the associated simplicial complex $\sigma(M)$ is pure of dimension $|A| - 1$. When restricted to these subcategories, σ and κ are the same functors as in [13].

4 Epistemic logics and their simplicial semantics

Let At be a countable set of atomic propositions and A a finite set of agents. The syntax of epistemic logic formulas $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_K$ is generated by the following BNF grammar:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid K_a\varphi \quad p \in \text{At}, a \in A$$

We will also use the derived operators, defined as usual:

$$\varphi \vee \psi := \neg(\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi) \quad \varphi \Rightarrow \psi := \neg\varphi \vee \psi \quad \text{true} := p \vee \neg p \quad \text{false} := \neg\text{true}$$

Moreover, we assume that the set of atomic propositions is split into a disjoint union of sets, indexed by the agents: $\text{At} = \bigcup_{a \in A} \text{At}_a$. This is usually the case in distributed computing where the atomic propositions represent the local state of a particular agent a . In [13], this assumption was crucial to define the notion of *local* Kripke models. Here, this assumption is much less significant: it will only matter in applications to distributed computed, Section Section 4.5, and our models have no notion of locality. For $U \subseteq A$, we write $\text{At}_U := \bigcup_{a \in U} \text{At}_a$ for the set of atomic propositions concerning the agents in U .

4.1 Partial epistemic models and Simplicial models

In Section 3, we exhibited the equivalence between *partial epistemic frames* and *chromatic simplicial complexes*. In order to give a semantics to epistemic logic, we need to add some extra information on those structures, by labelling the worlds (resp., the facets) with the set of atomic propositions that are true in this world. This gives rise to the notions of *partial epistemic models* and *simplicial models*, respectively. As we shall see, the equivalence of Theorem 24 extends to models in a straightforward manner.

► **Definition 26.** A partial epistemic model $M = \langle W, \sim, L \rangle$ over the set of agents A consists of a partial epistemic frame $\langle W, \sim \rangle$ on A , together with function $L : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{At})$.

A morphism of partial epistemic models $f : M \rightarrow M'$ is a morphism of the underlying partial epistemic frames such that for every world $w \in W$ and $w' \in f(w)$, $L'(w') \cap \text{At}_{\bar{w}} = L(w) \cap \text{At}_{\bar{w}}$.

Intuitively, $L(w)$ is the set of atomic propositions that are true in the world w . Note that partial epistemic models are simply Kripke models (in the usual sense of modal logics), such that all the accessibility relations $(\sim_a)_{a \in A}$ are PERs.

A *pointed partial epistemic model* is a pair (M, w) where w is a world of M . A *morphism* of pointed partial epistemic models $f : (M, w) \rightarrow (M', w')$ is a morphism between the underlying partial epistemic frames that preserves the distinguished world, i.e. $w' \in f(w)$. We denote by $\mathcal{PM}_{A, \text{At}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{PM}_{A, \text{At}}^*$) the category of (resp. pointed) proper partial epistemic models over the set of agents A and atomic propositions At .

Recall from Theorem 24 that the worlds of a partial epistemic frame correspond to the facets of the associated chromatic simplicial complex. Thus, to get a corresponding notion of simplicial model, we label the facets by sets of atomic propositions:

► **Definition 27.** A simplicial model $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi, \ell \rangle$ over the set of agents A consists of a chromatic simplicial complex $\langle V, S, \chi \rangle$ together with a labelling $\ell : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{At})$ that associates with each facet $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ a set of atomic propositions.

A morphism of simplicial models $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a chromatic simplicial map such that: for all $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ and all $Y \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{D})$, if $f(X) \subseteq Y$ then $\ell'(Y) \cap \text{At}_{\chi(X)} = \ell(X) \cap \text{At}_{\chi(X)}$.

► **Remark 28.** In [13], our notion of simplicial model was slightly different: the labelling of atomic propositions was on the vertices, not on the facets. This is closer to standard distributed computing practice, but requires to impose an extra assumption on the corresponding Kripke models, called *locality*. Here we label the facets for two reasons: (i) it avoids talking about locality, and (ii) in some worlds, we might want to talk about the value of a dead agent, e.g. in the world w_3 in Figure 2, see Example 30 below.

A *pointed simplicial model* is a pair (\mathcal{C}, X) where \mathcal{C} is a simplicial model and X is a facet of \mathcal{C} . A *morphism* $f : (\mathcal{C}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, Y)$ of pointed simplicial models is a morphism of the underlying models such that $f(X) \subseteq Y$. We denote by $\mathcal{SM}_{A, \text{At}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{SM}_{A, \text{At}}^*$) the category of (resp. pointed) simplicial models over the set of agents A and atomic propositions At . The equivalence of Theorem 24 can be extended to models and pointed models:

► **Theorem 29.** κ and σ induce an equivalence of categories between $\mathcal{SM}_{A, \text{At}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{SM}_{A, \text{At}}^*$) and $\mathcal{PM}_{A, \text{At}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{PM}_{A, \text{At}}^*$).

Proof. For a simplicial model $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi, \ell \rangle$, recall that the worlds of the associated partial epistemic frame are the facets of \mathcal{C} ; so the labelling in $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is $L(X) = \ell(X)$ for $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$. For a partial epistemic model $M = \langle W, \sim, L \rangle$, recall that the facets of the associated chromatic simplicial complex are of the form X_w for $w \in W$; so to define $\sigma(M)$, we set $\ell(X_w) = L(w)$. For the pointed version, we similarly define $\kappa(\mathcal{C}, X) = (\kappa(\mathcal{C}), X)$ and $\sigma(M, w) = (\sigma(M), X_w)$.

Checking that this is indeed an equivalence of category is an immediate consequence of Theorem 24. The only detail to check is that the extra conditions on morphisms are preserved: if f is a morphism of (pointed) simplicial models, then $\kappa(f)$ is a morphism of (pointed) partial epistemic models. Indeed, $f(X) \subseteq Y$ implies that $Y \in \kappa(f)(X)$ by definition of $\kappa(f)$. Similarly, if g is a morphism of (pointed) partial epistemic models, then $\sigma(g)$ is a morphism of (pointed) simplicial models. ◀

► **Example 30.** In distributed computing, we are usually interested in reasoning about the input values of the various processes, so the set of atoms is $\text{At} = \{\text{input}_a^x \mid a \in A, x \in \text{Values}\}$. The meaning of the atomic proposition input_a^x is that “process a has input value x ”.

Consider again the chromatic simplicial complex of Example 6. Here, we have three agents $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and three values $\text{Values} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. We have explained in Example 6 what were the different views of the three agents. Hence, we can construct a simplicial model via the following labelling of facets $\ell : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{At})$.

w_0	$\{\text{input}_1^1\}$	w_7	$\{\text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$
w_1	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$	w_8	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$
w_2	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$	w_9	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$
w_3	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$	w_{10}	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_3^3\}$
w_4	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2\}$	w_{11}	$\{\text{input}_2^2\}$
w_5	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$	w_{12}	$\{\text{input}_3^3\}$
w_6	$\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$		

As we will exemplify in Example 32, this labelling encodes exactly the semantics of views of agents of Example 6. For instance, in w_0 , the labelling encodes the fact that it were as if only agent 1 has ever existed in w_0 , hence the labelling is only composed of the local value of agent 1. In w_4 , w_7 and w_{10} , it is as if only two agents have ever existed and the labelling only encodes the corresponding two local states. In all other worlds, all agents have existed at some point in time, hence the labelling with all three initial values.

► **Example 31** (Morphism of simplicial model). Figure 3 partially shows a simplicial map f (the rest of the mapping is derived by symmetry) from the chromatic simplicial complex \mathcal{C} of Example 30 to a simplicial complex \mathcal{C}' made up of one triangle only, called w'_1 . This map will be the map from the one round protocol complex \mathcal{C} to the input complex \mathcal{C}' , only containing one global state where agent 1 starts with 1, agent 2 starts with 2 and agent 3 starts with 3. This map is also a map of simplicial models, from $\langle \mathcal{C}, \chi, \ell \rangle$ to $\langle \mathcal{C}', \chi', \ell' \rangle$ with the labelling that was used in Example 30 and the labelling $\{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$ of the unique facet w'_1 of \mathcal{C}' . Indeed:


- Since $f(w_4) \subseteq w'_1$, and $\chi(w_4) = \{1, 2\}$, we must check that

$$\ell'(w'_1) \cap \text{At}_{\{1,2\}} = \ell(w_4) \cap \text{At}_{\{1,2\}}$$

which is true because $\ell(w_4) = \{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2\}$, and $\ell'(w'_1) = \{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2, \text{input}_3^3\}$.

- Similarly for w_3 , we have $\ell'(w'_1) \cap \text{At}_{\{1,2\}} = \{\text{input}_1^1, \text{input}_2^2\} = \ell(w_3) \cap \text{At}_{\{1,2\}}$
- $f(w_0) \subseteq w'_1$ and $\chi(w_0) = \{1\}$, so we check that

$$\ell'(w'_1) \cap \text{At}_{\{1\}} = \{\text{input}_1^1\} = \ell(w_0) \cap \text{At}_{\{1\}}.$$



■ **Figure 3** A morphism of simplicial models

4.2 Semantics of epistemic logic

Partial epistemic models are a special case of the usual Kripke models; so we can straightforwardly define the semantics of an epistemic formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_K$ in these models. Formally, given a pointed partial epistemic model (M, w) , we define by induction on φ the *validity relation*

$M, w \models \varphi$ which stands for “in the world w of the epistemic model M , it holds that φ ”.

$$\begin{aligned} M, w \models p & \quad \text{iff } p \in L(w) \\ M, w \models \neg\varphi & \quad \text{iff } M, w \not\models \varphi \\ M, w \models \varphi \wedge \psi & \quad \text{iff } M, w \models \varphi \text{ and } M, w \models \psi \\ M, w \models K_a\varphi & \quad \text{iff } M, w' \models \varphi \text{ for all } w' \text{ such that } w \sim_a w' \end{aligned}$$

We now take advantage of the equivalence with simplicial models (Theorem 29) to define the interpretation of a formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_K(A, P)$ in a simplicial model. Given a pointed simplicial model (\mathcal{C}, X) where $X \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ is a facet of \mathcal{C} , we define the relation $\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi$ by induction:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}, X \models p & \quad \text{iff } p \in \ell(X) \\ \mathcal{C}, X \models \neg\varphi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, X \not\models \varphi \\ \mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi \wedge \psi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{C}, X \models \psi \\ \mathcal{C}, X \models K_a\varphi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, Y \models \varphi \text{ for all } Y \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}) \text{ such that } a \in \chi(X \cap Y) \end{aligned}$$

► **Example 32.** In the simplicial model of Example 30, we have, for instance:

- Agent 1 knows the values of all three agents in world w_1 , i.e. $\mathcal{C}, w_1 \models K_1(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2 \wedge \text{input}_3^3)$ since w_2 and w_3 are indistinguishable from w_1 by agent 1 and $\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2 \wedge \text{input}_3^3$ is true in these three facets. This corresponds to the view of process 1 as described in Example 6.
- In world w_3 , agent 1 knows the values of all three agents but agent 2 only knows the values of 1 and 2: $\mathcal{C}, w_3 \models K_1(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2 \wedge \text{input}_3^3)$ but $\mathcal{C}, w_3 \models K_2(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2)$ and $\mathcal{C}, w_3 \models \neg K_2 \text{input}_3^3$ since in facet w_4 we only have $\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2$, not input_3^3 . Similarly, in world w_4 , agents 1 and 2 know each other, but do not know the local value of agent 3: $\mathcal{C}, w_4 \models K_1(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2)$, $\mathcal{C}, w_4 \models K_2(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2)$, $\mathcal{C}, w_4 \models (\neg K_1 \text{input}_3^3) \wedge (\neg K_2 \text{input}_3^3)$
- In world w_1 , agent 1 knows that agent 2 knows about their respective local values: $\mathcal{C}, w_1 \models K_1 K_2(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2)$ but agent 1 does not know if agent 2 knows about the value of agent 3: $\mathcal{C}, w_1 \models \neg K_1 K_2 \text{input}_3^3$ (because of w_3).
- In world w_1 as well, agent 1 knows that agent 3 knows their respective values: $\mathcal{C}, w_1 \models K_1 K_3(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_3^3)$ because with our semantics $\mathcal{C}, w_3 \models K_3(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_2^2 \wedge \text{input}_3^3)$ (anything really, since 3 is dead in w_3), and $\mathcal{C}, w_2 \models K_3(\text{input}_1^1 \wedge \text{input}_3^3)$

As expected, our two interpretation of \mathcal{L}_K agree up to the equivalence of Theorem 29:

► **Proposition 33.** *Given a pointed simplicial model (\mathcal{C}, X) , $\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi$ iff $\kappa(\mathcal{C}, X) \models \varphi$. Conversely, given a pointed partial epistemic model (M, w) , $M, w \models \varphi$ iff $\sigma(M, w) \models \varphi$.*

Proof. This is straightforward by induction on the structure of the formula φ . ◀

4.3 The axiom system KB4_n

In modal logics, there is a well-known correspondence between properties of Kripke models that we consider, and corresponding axioms that make the logic sound and complete [11]. In our case, partial epistemic models are symmetric and transitive: thus we get the logic KB4_n . It has first order propositional tautologies, and further obeys the following axioms:

- **K:** $K_a(\varphi \Rightarrow \psi) \Rightarrow (K_a\varphi \Rightarrow K_a\psi)$
- **B:** $\varphi \Rightarrow K_a \neg K_a \neg \varphi$
- **4:** $K_a\varphi \Rightarrow K_a K_a\varphi$

All Kripke-style semantics on Kripke models obey Axiom **K**. Axiom **B** is valid exactly on the class of Kripke models whose accessibility relation is symmetric, whereas Axiom **4** is valid when the accessibility relation is transitive. The difference between **KB4_n** and the more standard multi-agent epistemic logics **S5_n** is that we do not necessarily have axiom **T**: $K_a\varphi \implies \varphi$. Axiom **T** is valid in Kripke models whose accessibility relation is reflexive, which we do not enforce. The logic **KB4_n** is in fact equivalent to **KB45_n** (see e.g. [11]), so we also have for free the Axiom **5**, which corresponds to Euclidean Kripke frames. We have the following well-known result.

► **Theorem 34** (see [10]). *The axiom system **KB4_n** is sound and complete with respect to the class of partial epistemic models.*

As a direct consequence of Proposition 33, we also have:

► **Corollary 35.** *The axiom system **KB4_n** is sound and complete with respect to the class of simplicial models.*

Proof. Suppose a formula φ valid in every pointed partial epistemic model. Then given a pointed simplicial model (\mathcal{C}, X) , since by assumption $\kappa(\mathcal{C}, X) \models \varphi$, we deduce that $\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi$ by Proposition 33. So φ is valid in every simplicial model. The converse is similar. ◀

4.4 Reasoning about alive and dead agents

In Example 32, we only considered formulas talking about what the agents know about each other's input values. It is a natural idea to also contemplate formulas expressing which agents are alive or dead, for example “agent a knows that agent b is dead”. Fortunately, such formulas can already be expressed in our logic without any extra work, as derived operators:

$$\text{dead}(a) := K_a \text{false} \qquad \text{alive}(a) := \neg \text{dead}(a)$$

It is easy to check that the semantics of these formulas is, as expected:

- In partial epistemic models, $M, w \models \text{alive}(a)$ iff $w \sim_a w$.
- In simplicial models, $\mathcal{C}, X \models \text{alive}(a)$ iff $a \in \chi(X)$.

► **Example 36.** Consider again the simplicial model of Examples 6 and 30, and its corresponding partial epistemic model of Example 10. It is easy to see that:

- $M, w_3 \models \text{alive}(2) \wedge \text{alive}(1)$ but $M, w_3 \models \text{dead}(3)$,
- $M, w_1 \models \neg K_1 \text{alive}(3)$ since e.g. $M, w_3 \models \text{dead}(3)$ whereas $M, w_1 \models \text{alive}(3)$,
- Agents 1 and 2 know, in world w_4 , that 3 is dead: $M, w_4 \models K_2 \text{dead}(3) \wedge K_1 \text{dead}(3)$ since, first, in world w_3 (which is undistinguishable from w_3 by agent 2), 3 is not alive, and second, in world w_5 (which is undistinguishable from w_3 by agent 1), 3 is not alive either.

In w_4 everything looks as if agents 1 and 2 were executing solo, without 3 ever existing, whereas in worlds w_3 and w_5 , agent 3 dies at some point, but has been active and its local value has been observed by one of the other agents.

Here are a few examples of valid formulas in **KB4_n**. It is easy to check that they are true in every partial epistemic model and in every simplicial model.

- Dead agents know everything: $\mathbf{KB4}_n \vdash \text{dead}(a) \implies K_a\varphi$.
- Alive agents satisfy Axiom **T**: $\mathbf{KB4}_n \vdash \text{alive}(a) \implies (K_a\varphi \implies \varphi)$.
- Only alive agents matter for $K_a\varphi$: $\mathbf{KB4}_n \vdash K_a\varphi \iff (\text{alive}(a) \implies K_a\varphi)$.

As an application of the third tautology, notice that a formula of the form $K_a K_b \varphi$ is equivalent to $K_a(\text{alive}(b) \implies K_b \varphi)$. So, to check whether this formula is true in some pointed model (M, w) , we only need to check that $K_b \varphi$ is true in the worlds $w' \sim_a w$ where b is alive.

4.5 Knowledge gain

In our previous work [13], a key property of our logic that we use in distributed computing applications is the so-called “knowledge gain” property. This principle says that agents cannot acquire new knowledge along morphisms of simplicial models. Namely, what is known in the image of a morphism was already known in the domain. The knowledge gain property is used when we want to prove that a certain simplicial map $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ cannot exist. To achieve this, we choose a formula φ and show:

- that φ is true in every world of \mathcal{D} ,
- and that φ is false in at least one world of \mathcal{C} .

Then by the knowledge gain property, the map f does not exist. Such a formula φ is called a *logical obstruction*. While we are not interested in proving distributed computing results in this paper (the synchronous crash model of Figure 2 is merely an illustrative example), we still check that some version of the knowledge gain property holds, as a sanity check towards future work.

Knowledge gain for well-formed formulas. The knowledge gain property that appeared in [13] applied to *positive* epistemic formulas. Here, we also require an additional condition, which says that the atomic propositions appearing inside the formula must talk only about the agents that are alive. This is because there might be agents that are dead in the domain of a morphism, but are alive in the codomain. We call this condition *well-formedness*, and we write $\mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \varphi$ to denote that the formula φ is well-formed in the world X of the simplicial model \mathcal{C} . It is defined by induction on φ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}, X \bowtie p & \quad \text{iff } p \in \text{At}_{\chi(X)} \\ \mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \neg\varphi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \varphi \\ \mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \varphi \wedge \psi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \psi \\ \mathcal{C}, X \bowtie K_a\varphi & \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{C}, Y \bowtie \varphi \text{ for all } Y \in \mathcal{F}(C) \text{ such that } a \in \chi(X \cap Y) \end{aligned}$$

► **Remark 37.** As the notation suggests, our well-formedness condition is very close to the *definability* relation that appears in [31]. There are two differences however. Firstly, we allow formulas of the form $K_a\varphi$ even if the agent a is dead. Secondly, our definition says that a formula $K_a\varphi$ is well-formed in a world X when φ is well-formed in *every* indistinguishable world Y ; whereas the definability of [31] only requires that φ be definable in *some* world Y .

An epistemic logic formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_K$ is called *positive* when it does not contain negations, except possibly in front of atomic propositions. Formally, positive formulas are built according to the following grammar:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg p \mid \varphi \wedge \psi \mid \varphi \vee \psi \mid K_a\varphi \quad a \in A, p \in \text{At}$$

We write \mathcal{L}_K^+ for the set of positive epistemic formulas. Essentially, positive formulas forbid talking about what an agent does not know.

► **Theorem 38 (knowledge gain).** *Consider simplicial models $\mathcal{C} = \langle V, S, \chi, \ell \rangle$ and $\mathcal{D} = \langle V', S', \chi', \ell' \rangle$, and a morphism of pointed simplicial models $f : (\mathcal{C}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}, Y)$. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_K^+$ be a positive formula that is well-formed in X , i.e., such that $\mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \varphi$. Then $\mathcal{D}, Y \models \varphi$ implies $\mathcal{C}, X \models \varphi$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the structure of the (positive) formula φ . For the base case $\varphi = p \in \text{At}$, since $\mathcal{C}, X \bowtie p$, we must have $p \in \text{At}_{\chi(X)}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}, Y \models p$ means that $p \in \ell'(Y)$, i.e., $p \in \ell'(Y) \cap \text{At}_{\chi(X)}$. Since f is a morphism of pointed simplicial models we

have $f(X) \subseteq Y$, and therefore $\ell'(Y) \cap \text{At}_{\chi(X)} = \ell(X) \cap \text{At}_{\chi(X)}$. Thus $p \in \ell(X)$, so $\mathcal{C}, X \models p$ as required. A similar reasoning works in the case of a negated atomic proposition $\neg p$. The cases of conjunction and disjunction follow trivially from the induction hypothesis.

Suppose now that $\mathcal{D}, Y \models K_a \varphi$. If $a \notin \chi(X)$ then $\mathcal{C}, X \models K_a \varphi$, trivially (dead agents know everything). So let us assume that $a \in \chi(X)$. In order to show $\mathcal{C}, X \models K_a \varphi$, assume that $a \in \chi(X \cap X')$ for some facet X' , and let us prove $\mathcal{C}, X' \models \varphi$. Let v be the a -coloured vertex in $X \cap X'$. Then $f(v) \in f(X) \cap f(X')$. Recall that $f(X) \subseteq Y$ by assumption, and let Y' be a facet of \mathcal{D} containing $f(X')$. So $f(v) \in Y \cap Y'$, and since $\chi(f(v)) = a$, we get $a \in \chi(Y \cap Y')$ and thus $\mathcal{D}, Y' \models \varphi$. By induction hypothesis, we obtain $\mathcal{C}, X' \models \varphi$. ◀

Compared to knowledge gain property that appears in [13], Theorem 38 has an additional restriction: the obstruction formula φ can only contain atomic propositions concerning the agents that are alive. This condition is in fact very restrictive. Indeed, in [13], the logical obstruction formulas for proving the impossibility of solving approximate agreement and consensus rely on nested knowledge and common knowledge, respectively. Such formulas explore a connected component of the epistemic model. However, in such cases the well-formedness condition $\mathcal{C}, X \bowtie \varphi$ only allows atomic propositions belonging to the agents that are alive in *all* the worlds that are reachable. For very connected models such as the one of Figure 2, this would be too restrictive.

5 Conclusion

Epistemic modal logic semantics since Hintikka [21] is formalized using the notion of a set of worlds, together with a binary relation for each agent, describing pairs of worlds that look the same from an agent’s “perspective.” It is thus natural to give a dual semantics based on these perspectives. We have described such a semantics in [13], where the dual of a Kripke frame is a simplicial complex, whose vertices correspond to the perspectives. A simplicial model exposes topological information that is implicit in the usual Kripke model. The importance of the perspective has been well established in distributed computing, where the topology of the simplicial model determines the knowledge about inputs after communication, necessary to solve a task. However, in some situations, especially in distributed computing, different worlds may be “observed” by different set of agents, perhaps because some of them are dead, or have not yet participated in the system. In this work we have described an extended semantics to capture such situations, where in the simplicial complex not all facets need be of the same dimension. The generalization required several new insights, especially related to the adequate definition of the morphisms, and to finally obtain the corresponding logic, which turned out to be **KB4_n**.

The new topological perspective opens many interesting questions. A basic one is of course exploring the relationship with interpreted systems that have been so successful since the 1980s, especially to study consensus solvability in great depth (although there is work on set agreement [5]), where the Kripke model represents the whole set of possible global states at all possible runs, as opposed to our approach that considers a Kripke model representing a set of possible worlds at some time, a consistent cut [22] of the runs. In other words, our approach is “static”, we would like to extend it to include evolution over time, which is precisely when topological invariants are seen to be preserved [16]; we did this using dynamic epistemic logic in [13], and we would like to do it for non-pure simplicial complexes too.


It would be also interesting to consider other semantics. Although Kripke structures are the most natural, neighbourhood semantics are especially intriguing from our topological local perspective point of view, because they are useful to model situations where agents may

have different powers of observation and reasoning, which is reminiscent of what occurs in our case, where some agents may know everything (where no reflexivity happens). In any case, it would be interesting to see if a simplicial model can be derived for neighbourhood semantics, and get the benefits of dealing with the problem of logical omniscience. For more details about generalised structures for knowledge see [2], including topological approaches. It would be interesting to relate our work with the topological approaches to epistemic logic, that have proven so useful to study the nature knowledge and belief, as well as topological semantics beginning with McKinsey and Tarski [23] and the subset space semantics introduced by Moss and Parikh [27], see e.g. [3, 29] for additional references.

Many technical interesting issues arise, such as defining morphisms between complexes, understanding the relation between belief and a dead agent, but the main point is that our work opens the way to give a formal epistemic semantics to distributed systems where processes may fail and failures are detectable (as in the synchronous crash failure model). It would be interesting to use our simplicial model to reason about the solvability of tasks in such systems, for example, the following have not been studied using epistemic logic, to the best of our knowledge: non-complete communication (instead of broadcast situation we considered here) graphs [4], renaming [28], and lattice agreement [36].

Especially interesting would be extending the set agreement logical obstruction of [35] to the case where agents may die and exploit this knowledge. In distributed computing it is known that the number of rounds needed to solve k -set agreement when t processes may crash is $\lfloor t/k \rfloor + 1$, generalizing the result for consensus (where $k = 1$ and $t + 1$ rounds are needed) [7, 20].

We hope our simplicial semantics is useful to reason not only about distributed computing, but also about many other situations where interactions are beyond pairs of agents [1]. Especially in those situations where the simplicial complex is not pure, which is natural in social systems, neuroscience, and other biological systems. Consider for example a set of agents in a political system and compatibilities among them modelled as a simplicial complex. This is one of the examples provided by Mock and Volić [25]. In the left political



structure, agent a_0 can coexist with agent a_1 , but is in conflict with all other agents, who are all compatible among themselves. The right simplicial complex is similar, except agents a_1, a_2 , and a_3 are compatible in pairs, but not all together. Each of those agents is thus open to pairwise coalitions, but not to the third agent joining in.

References

- 1 Federico Battiston, Giulia Cencetti, Iacopo Iacopini, Vito Latora, Maxime Lucas, Alice Patania, Jean-Gabriel Young, and Giovanni Petri. Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics. *Physics Reports*, 874:1–92, 2020. Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0370157320302489>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2020.05.004>.
- 2 Nick Bezhanishvili and Wiebe van der Hoek. *Structures for Epistemic Logic*, pages 339–380. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-06025-5_12.
- 3 Adam Bjorndahl and Aybüke Özgün. Logic and topology for knowledge, knowability, and belief - extended abstract. In Jérôme Lang, editor, *Proceedings Sixteenth Conference on Theoretical*

- Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge, TARK 2017, Liverpool, UK, 24-26 July 2017*, volume 251 of *EPTCS*, pages 88–101, 2017. doi:10.4204/EPTCS.251.7.
- 4 Armando Castañeda, Pierre Fraigniaud, Ami Paz, Sergio Rajsbaum, Matthieu Roy, and Corentin Travers. Synchronous t-resilient consensus in arbitrary graphs. In Mohsen Ghaffari, Mikhail Nesterenko, Sébastien Tixeuil, Sara Tucci, and Yukiko Yamauchi, editors, *Stabilization, Safety, and Security of Distributed Systems - 21st International Symposium, SSS 2019, Pisa, Italy, October 22-25, 2019, Proceedings*, volume 11914 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 53–68. Springer, 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-34992-9_5.
 - 5 Armando Castañeda, Yannai A. Gonczarowski, and Yoram Moses. Unbeatable set consensus via topological and combinatorial reasoning. In George Giakkoupis, editor, *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2016, Chicago, IL, USA, July 25-28, 2016*, pages 107–116. ACM, 2016. doi:10.1145/2933057.2933120.
 - 6 Armando Castañeda, Yoram Moses, Michel Raynal, and Matthieu Roy. Early decision and stopping in synchronous consensus: A predicate-based guided tour. In Amr El Abbadi and Benoît Garbinato, editors, *Networked Systems*, pages 206–221, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing.
 - 7 Soma Chaudhuri, Maurice Herlihy, Nancy A. Lynch, and Mark R. Tuttle. Tight bounds for k -set agreement. *J. ACM*, 47(5):912–943, 2000. doi:10.1145/355483.355489.
 - 8 Hans van Ditmarsch, Éric Goubault, Jérémy Ledent, and Sergio Rajsbaum. Knowledge and simplicial complexes. *CoRR*, abs/2002.08863, 2020. To appear in *Philosophy of Computing—Themes from IACAP 2019*, Editors: Lundgren, Bj URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08863>.
 - 9 Cynthia Dwork and Yoram Moses. Knowledge and common knowledge in a byzantine environment: Crash failures. *Inf. Comput.*, 88(2):156–186, 1990. doi:10.1016/0890-5401(90)90014-9.
 - 10 Ronald Fagin, Joseph Y. Halpern, Yoram Moses, and Moshe Y. Vardi. *Reasoning About Knowledge*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2003.
 - 11 James Garson. Modal Logic. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Summer 2021 edition, 2021.
 - 12 Guy Goren and Yoram Moses. Silence. *J. ACM*, 67(1), January 2020. doi:10.1145/3377883.
 - 13 Éric Goubault, Jérémy Ledent, and Sergio Rajsbaum. A simplicial complex model for dynamic epistemic logic to study distributed task computability. *Inf. Comput.*, 278:104597, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.ic.2020.104597.
 - 14 Joseph Y. Halpern and Yoram Moses. Knowledge and common knowledge in a distributed environment. *J. ACM*, 37(3):549–587, 1990. doi:10.1145/79147.79161.
 - 15 Joseph Y. Halpern and Rafael Pass. A knowledge-based analysis of the blockchain protocol. In Jérôme Lang, editor, *Proceedings Sixteenth Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge, TARK 2017, Liverpool, UK, 24-26 July 2017*, volume 251 of *EPTCS*, pages 324–335, 2017. doi:10.4204/EPTCS.251.22.
 - 16 M. Herlihy, D. Kozlov, and S. Rajsbaum. *Distributed Computing Through Combinatorial Topology*. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2013.
 - 17 M. Herlihy and N. Shavit. The topological structure of asynchronous computability. *J. ACM*, 46(6):858–923, November 1999. doi:10.1145/331524.331529.
 - 18 Maurice Herlihy. Wait-free synchronization. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 13(1):124–149, January 1991. doi:10.1145/114005.102808.
 - 19 Maurice Herlihy, Sergio Rajsbaum, and Mark R. Tuttle. An overview of synchronous message-passing and topology. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 39(2):1–17, 2000. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661\(05\)01148-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1571-0661(05)01148-5).
 - 20 Maurice Herlihy, Sergio Rajsbaum, and Mark R. Tuttle. A new synchronous lower bound for set agreement. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Distributed Computing, DISC '01*, page 136–150, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001. Springer-Verlag.
 - 21 J. Hintikka. *Knowledge and Belief*. Cornell University Press, 1962.

- 22 Leslie Lamport. Time, clocks, and the ordering of events in a distributed system. *Commun. ACM*, 21(7):558–565, July 1978. doi:10.1145/359545.359563.
- 23 J. C. C. McKinsey and Alfred Tarski. The algebra of topology. *Annals of Mathematics*, 45(1):141–191, 1944. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1969080>.
- 24 John C. Mitchell and Eugenio Moggi. Kripke-style models for typed lambda calculus. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 51:99–124, 1996.
- 25 Andrea Mock and Ismar Volic. Political structures and the topology of simplicial complexes, 2021.
- 26 Yoram Moses. *Knowledge in Distributed Systems*, pages 1051–1055. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-2864-4_606.
- 27 Lawrence S. Moss and Rohit Parikh. Topological reasoning and the logic of knowledge. In Yoram Moses, editor, *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Reasoning about Knowledge, Monterey, CA, USA, March 1992*, pages 95–105. Morgan Kaufmann, 1992.
- 28 Michael Okun. Strong order-preserving renaming in the synchronous message passing model. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 411(40–42):3787–3794, September 2010. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2010.06.001.
- 29 R. Parikh, L.S. Moss, and C. Steinsvold. Topology and epistemic logic. In M. Aiello, I. Pratt-Hartmann, and J. van Benthem, editors, *Handbook of Spatial Logics*, pages 299–341. Springer Verlag, 2007.
- 30 Y. Moses R. Fagin, J. Halpern and M. Vardi. *Reasoning About Knowledge*. MIT Press, 1995.
- 31 Hans van Ditmarsch. Wanted dead or alive : Epistemic logic for impure simplicial complexes, 2021.
- 32 Hans van Ditmarsch, Éric Goubault, Marijana Lazic, Jérémy Ledent, and Sergio Rajsbaum. A dynamic epistemic logic analysis of equality negation and other epistemic covering tasks. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, 121:100662, 2021. doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2021.100662.
- 33 Diego Velázquez-Cervantes. Una relación entre las lógicas modales y el enfoque topológico del cómputo distribuido. Master’s thesis, UNAM, Mexico, 2019.
- 34 Frans Voorbraak. Generalized kripke models for epistemic logic. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Reasoning about Knowledge, TARK ’92*, page 214–228, San Francisco, CA, USA, 1992. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- 35 Koki Yagi and Susumu Nishimura. Logical obstruction to set agreement tasks for superset-closed adversaries, 2021.
- 36 Xiong Zheng and Vijay K. Garg. Byzantine lattice agreement in synchronous message passing systems. In Hagit Attiya, editor, *34th International Symposium on Distributed Computing, DISC 2020, October 12-16, 2020, Virtual Conference*, volume 179 of *LIPICs*, pages 32:1–32:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.DISC.2020.32.