

Completeness of two fragments of a logic for conditional strategic reasoning

Yinfeng Li^{1,2} and Fengkui Ju^{3,4*}

¹IRIT-CNRS, University of Toulouse, France

²yinfeng.li@irit.fr

³School of Philosophy, Beijing Normal University, China

⁴fengkui.ju@bnu.edu.cn

Abstract

Classical logics for strategic reasoning, such as Coalition Logic and Alternating-time Temporal Logic, formalize absolute strategic reasoning about the unconditional strategic abilities of agents to achieve their goals. Goranko and Ju in [GJ19, GJ22] introduced a logic **ConStR** for strategic reasoning about conditional strategic abilities. However, its completeness is still an open problem. **ConStR** has three featured operators, and one of them has the following reading: For some action of A that guarantees the achievement of her goal, B has an action to guarantee the achievement of his goal. The logic about this operator is called **CConStR**. In this paper, we prove completeness for two fragments of **CConStR**. The key notions of our proof approach include downward validity lemma, grafted models, and upward derivability lemma. The proof approach has good potential to be applied to the completeness of **ConStR** and other logics.

Keywords: logics for conditional strategic abilities; completeness; reduction of validity; grafted models.

1 Introduction

1.1 Logic for conditional strategic reasoning

1.1.1 Logical research on strategic reasoning

Logical research on strategic reasoning started with Coalition Logic CL ([Pau01, Pau02]) and Alternating-time Temporal Logic ATL ([AHK02]), which is a temporal extension of CL. The featured operator of CL and ATL is $\langle A \rangle \phi$, indicating *some joint action of the coalition A guarantees ϕ* . There has been much following work, including Alternating-time Temporal Epistemic Logic ATEL ([HW04]) and Strategy Logic SL [MMPV14] (cf. [MMPV17]). We refer to [BGV15] and [rGJW15] for overviews of the area.

Most of the present logical systems in the area assume arbitrary behavior of the agents outside of the proponent coalitions. Thus, these logics formalize *absolute* strategic reasoning about the unconditional strategic abilities of agents to achieve their goals.

*Corresponding author

Usually, agents have their own goals and act in pursuit of their fulfillment rather than just to prevent the proponents from achieving their goals. This calls for more refined strategic reasoning, *conditional* on agents' knowledge of opponents' goals and possible actions to achieve them.

1.1.2 ConStR

Goranko and Ju [GJ19, GJ22] presented a logic ConStR (Logic of Local Conditional Strategic Reasoning) for reasoning of the type: *For some/every joint action of the coalition A that guarantees its goal, the coalition B has a joint action to guarantee its goal.* The logic ConStR extends Coalition Logic with the following three featured operators:

- $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$: A has a joint action σ_A such that it guarantees ϕ and B has an available joint action σ_B that guarantees ψ .
- $[A]_\beta(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$: for any joint action σ_A of A that guarantees ϕ , B has an available joint action σ_B that guarantees ψ .
- $[A]_\alpha(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$: B has a joint action σ_B such that for any joint action σ_A of A that guarantees ϕ , σ_B guarantees ψ .

The following example illustrates the three operators.

Example 1. *Alice and Bob are playing a simple one-round game. Alice and Bob have three cards each. On every card, there are two natural numbers, called an F-number and an S-number, respectively¹. Both Alice and Bob will show a card at the same time. There are two kinds of winning: F-winning and S-winning, respectively determined by which F-number is greater and which S-number is greater.*

- *Suppose Alice's three cards are (5, 3), (4, 8), (1, 8), and Bob's three cards are (4, 4), (3, 2), (2, 2). Then the following holds: **Alice has a card such that (1) it guarantees Alice to F-win, and (2) Bob has a card that guarantees Bob to S-win.***
- *Suppose Alice's three cards are (5, 3), (7, 2), (1, 8), and Bob's three cards are (4, 4), (3, 3), (2, 2). Then the following holds: **For every card of Alice, if it guarantees Alice to F-win, then Bob has a card such that it guarantees Bob to S-win.***
- *Suppose Alice's three cards are (6, 3), (5, 8), (1, 8), and Bob's three cards are (4, 6), (3, 4), (2, 9). Then the following holds: **Bob has a card such that, for every card of Alice, if it guarantees Alice to F-win, then Bob's card guarantees Bob to S-win.***

It is shown in [GJ19, GJ22] that none of these operators can be expressed in Coalition Logic and Alternating-time Temporal Logic.

The completeness of ConStR is still open.

1.1.3 Related work with ConStR

In [GE18], Goranko and Enqvist introduced Group Protecting Coalition Logic GPCL, which focuses on the synchronization of different coalitions to achieve their respective goals. The featured formula of GPCL is $\langle A_1 \triangleright \phi_1, \dots, A_n \triangleright \phi_n \rangle$, meaning: *there is an action profile such*

¹Here "F" is for "first" and "S" is for "second".

that its restriction to A_1 guarantees ϕ_1, \dots , and its restriction to A_n guarantees ϕ_n . The operator $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ in **ConStR** is definable by $\langle A_1 \triangleright \phi_1, \dots, A_n \triangleright \phi_n \rangle$. Enqvist and Goranko [EG22] studied Temporal Logic of Coalitional Goal Assignments **TLCGA**, which is a temporal extension of **GPCL**.

In [NY21], Naumov and Yuan presented a logic which can express statements of the type: “the coalition B has a joint action to guarantee its goal, given that they know the joint action of the coalition A ”. This statement relates to the operator $[A]_\beta(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ of **ConStR**.

1.2 Our work

We call the sub-logic of **ConStR** with the operator $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ Logic of Cooperating Conditional Strategic Reasoning **CConStR**. In this work, we show the completeness of two fragments of **CConStR**: the ability fragment and the liability fragment. The former is generated by $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ without negation, and the latter is generated by the dual of $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ without negation.

Generally speaking, our proof approach is as follows. First, we show a downward validity lemma, which reduces the validity of a formula to the validity of its subformulas with lower complexity. In showing this lemma, we use the model construction technique of grafted models. Second, we show an upward derivability lemma, which reduces the derivability of a formula to the derivability of its subformulas with lower complexity.

The remaining part of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides some preliminaries on concurrent game models, the Coalition Logic **CL**, and the logic **CConStR** for conditional strategic reasoning. Section 3 presents our completeness proof approach and the model construction technique of grafted models. Section 4 shows the completeness of two fragments of **CL** by using the completeness proof approach. The proofs in this section share some similarities with the proofs in the next section, which are more complicated. The purpose of this section is to offer readers some preparations for the proofs in the next section. Section 5 shows the completeness of two fragments of **CConStR**. We end with brief concluding remarks in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Concurrent game models

Let $\mathbf{AG} = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\}$ be a nonempty finite set of *agents* and let \mathbf{AC} be a nonempty set of *actions*. What follows are some auxiliary notions and notations.

- Each (possibly empty) subset A of \mathbf{AG} is called a **coalition**. \mathbf{AG} is called the **grand coalition**. The complement \overline{A} of A is called the **opposing coalition** of A .
- For every coalition A , a function $\sigma_A : A \rightarrow \mathbf{AC}$ is called a **joint action** of A . Note that \emptyset is the only joint action of the empty coalition. A joint action of \mathbf{AG} is called an **action profile**.
- Let A be a coalition and $B \subseteq A$. Let σ_A be a joint action of A . We use $\sigma_A|_B$ to denote the subset of σ_A which is a joint action of B , called the **restriction** of σ_A to B . Respectively, σ_A is called an **extension** of $\sigma_A|_B$. Given a set of joint actions Σ_A of A , we denote $\Sigma_A|_B := \{\sigma_A|_B \mid \sigma_A \in \Sigma_A\}$.

- Let A and B be two disjoint coalitions, Σ_A be a set of joint actions of A , and Σ_B be a set of joint actions of B . We define $\Sigma_A \oplus \Sigma_B$ as $\{\sigma_A \cup \sigma_B \mid \sigma_A \in \Sigma_A \text{ and } \sigma_B \in \Sigma_B\}$, which is a set of joint actions of $A \cup B$.

Further, let $\{A_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoint coalitions for some (possibly empty) index set I . For every $i \in I$, let Σ_{A_i} be a set of joint actions of A_i . Define:

$$\bigoplus\{\Sigma_{A_i} \mid i \in I\} = \{\bigcup \Delta \mid \Delta \subseteq \bigcup\{\Sigma_{A_i} \mid i \in I\} \text{ and for every } i \in I, \Delta \cap \Sigma_{A_i} \text{ is a singleton}\}$$

which is a set of joint actions of the coalition $\bigcup\{A_i \mid i \in I\}$.

Definition 1 (Concurrent game models). *A **concurrent game model** is a tuple*

$$M = (\text{ST}, \text{AG}, \text{AC}, \text{ja}, \text{aja}, \text{out}, \text{AP}, \text{label})$$

where:

- ST is a nonempty set of states.
- AG is a nonempty finite set of agents.
- AC is a nonempty set of actions.
- $\text{ja} : \mathcal{P}(\text{AG}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{JA})$, where $\text{JA} = \{\sigma_A \mid A \subseteq \text{AG} \text{ and } \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \text{AC}\}$, is a function, called a **joint action function**, such that for every $A \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{ja}(A) = \{\sigma_A \mid \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \text{AC}\}$.

Here $\text{ja}(A)$ is the set of all possible joint actions of A . Note $\text{ja}(\emptyset) = \{\emptyset\}$.

- $\text{aja} : \text{ST} \times \mathcal{P}(\text{AG}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{JA})$ is a function, called an **available joint action function**, such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$ and $A \subseteq \text{AG}$:
 - $\text{aja}(s, A)$ is a nonempty subset of $\text{ja}(A)$;
 - $\text{aja}(s, A) = \bigoplus\{\text{aja}(s, \{a\}) \mid a \in A\}$, where $A \neq \emptyset$.

Here $\text{aja}(s, A)$ is the set of all available joint actions of A at s . Note $\text{aja}(s, \emptyset) = \{\emptyset\}$.

- $\text{out} : \text{ST} \times \text{JA} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{ST})$ is a function, called an **outcome state function**, such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$, $A \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_A \in \text{ja}(A)$:
 - if $A = \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_A \in \text{aja}(s, A)$, then $\text{out}(s, \sigma_A)$ is a singleton;
 - if $A = \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_A \notin \text{aja}(s, A)$, then $\text{out}(s, \sigma_A) = \emptyset$;
 - if $A \neq \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_A \in \text{aja}(s, A)$, then $\text{out}(s, \sigma_A) = \bigcup\{\text{out}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{aja}(s, \text{AG}) \text{ and } \sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\}$;
 - if $A \neq \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_A \notin \text{aja}(s, A)$, then $\text{out}(s, \sigma_A) = \emptyset$.

Here $\text{out}(s, \sigma_A)$ is the set of outcome states of performing σ_A at s . Note $\text{out}(s, \emptyset) = \bigcup\{\text{out}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{aja}(s, \text{AG})\}$.

- AP is a countable set of atomic propositions.
- $\text{label} : \text{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{AP})$ is a labeling function.

For any model M and state s of M , (M, s) is called a **pointed model**.

2.2 Coalition Logic CL

Definition 2 (The language Φ_{CL}). *The language Φ_{CL} is defined as follows:*

$$\phi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\phi \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid \langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi$$

We will write $\langle a \rangle$ instead of $\langle\!\langle \{a\} \rangle\!\rangle$.

Define the dual $\langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi$ of $\langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi$ as $\neg\langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\neg\phi$, whose intuitive reading is: *every joint action of A is liable to ϕ .*

Models of CL are concurrent game models.

Definition 3 (Semantics of Φ_{CL}).

$$\mathbb{M}, s \Vdash \langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi \iff A \text{ has a joint action } \sigma_A \text{ in } \mathbf{aja}(s, A) \text{ such that } \mathbb{M}, t \Vdash \phi \text{ for every } t \in \mathbf{out}(s, \sigma_A)$$

It can be verified that the truth condition of $\langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi$ is as follows:

$$\mathbb{M}, s \Vdash \langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi \iff \text{for all joint actions } \sigma_A \text{ of } A \text{ in } \mathbf{aja}(s, A), \mathbb{M}, t \Vdash \phi \text{ for some } t \in \mathbf{out}(s, \sigma_A)$$

Let \mathbb{M} be a model. Here are some notations that will be used later:

- We use $\mathbb{M}, S \Vdash \phi$ to state that for all $s \in S$, $\mathbb{M}, s \Vdash \phi$, where S is a set of states.
- We use $\sigma_A \triangleright_s \phi$ to state that $\mathbb{M}, t \Vdash \phi$ for all $t \in (s, \sigma_A)$.
- We use $\sigma_A \times_s \phi$ to state that $\mathbb{M}, t \Vdash \phi$ for some $t \in (s, \sigma_A)$.
- The meaning of $\mathbb{M}, S \Vdash \Gamma$ and $\sigma_A \triangleright_s \Gamma$ is as expected, where Γ is a set of formulas.

We now define two fragments of CL, which we will consider later.

Definition 4 (The liability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\text{LI}}}$ of Φ_{CL}). *The liability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\text{LI}}}$ of Φ_{CL} is defined as follows:*

$$\phi ::= \top \mid \perp \mid p \mid \neg p \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid \langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi$$

Definition 5 (The ability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\text{AB}}}$ of Φ_{CL}). *The ability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\text{AB}}}$ of Φ_{CL} is defined as follows:*

$$\phi ::= \top \mid \perp \mid p \mid \neg p \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid \langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle\phi$$

Here “LI” and “AB” in “ CL_{LI} ” and “ CL_{AB} ” are for “liability” and “ability”, respectively.

2.3 Logic of Cooperating Conditional Strategic Reasoning CConStR

Definition 6 (The language Φ_{CConStR}). *The language Φ_{CConStR} is defined as follows:*

$$\phi ::= p \mid \top \mid \neg\phi \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid \langle\!\langle A \rangle\!\rangle_c(\phi; \langle\!\langle B \rangle\!\rangle\phi)$$

Define the dual $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ of $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ as $\neg \langle A \rangle_c(\neg \phi; \langle B \rangle \neg \psi)$, whose intuitive reading is: *every joint action of A that guarantees $\neg \phi$ also prevents B to guarantee $\neg \psi$* . An alternative reading of $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ is: *for every joint action of A, either it is liable to ϕ , or for every joint action of B, it is liable to ψ* . This operator formalizes the conditional reasoning scenario where the goals of A and B are conflicting, and whichever way A acts towards the guaranteed achievement of its goal, that would block B from acting to guarantee the achievement of its goal.

Fix a concurrent game model $\mathbf{M} = (\text{ST}, \text{AG}, \text{AC}, \text{ja}, \text{aja}, \text{out}, \text{AP}, \text{label})$. For all coalitions A and B, and joint actions σ_A of A and σ_B of B, define $\sigma_A \uplus \sigma_B = \sigma_A \cup \{(b, \beta) \in \sigma_B \mid b \in B - A\}$.

Definition 7 (Semantics of Φ_{CConStR}).

$$\mathbf{M}, s \Vdash \langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi) \Leftrightarrow \begin{array}{l} \text{A has a joint action } \sigma_A \text{ in } \text{aja}(s, A) \text{ such that (1) } \mathbf{M}, t \Vdash \phi \\ \text{for every } t \in \text{out}(s, \sigma_A), \text{ and (2) B has a joint action } \sigma_B \text{ in} \\ \text{aja}(s, B) \text{ such that } \mathbf{M}, t \Vdash \psi \text{ for every } t \in \text{out}(s, \sigma_A \uplus \sigma_B) \end{array}$$

It can be verified that the truth condition of $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ is as follows:

$$\mathbf{M}, s \Vdash \langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi) \Leftrightarrow \begin{array}{l} \text{For every joint action } \sigma_A \text{ of A in } \text{aja}(s, A), \text{ either (1) } \mathbf{M}, t \Vdash \phi \\ \text{for some } t \in \text{out}(s, \sigma_A), \text{ or (2) for every joint action } \sigma_B \text{ of B in} \\ \text{aja}(s, B), \mathbf{M}, t \Vdash \psi \text{ for some } t \in \text{out}(s, \sigma_A \uplus \sigma_B) \end{array}$$

We say that (1) a formula ϕ is **satisfiable** if for some pointed model (\mathbf{M}, s) , $\mathbf{M}, s \Vdash \phi$, (2) ϕ is **valid** if for every pointed model (\mathbf{M}, s) , $\mathbf{M}, s \Vdash \phi$, and (3) ϕ is **equivalent** to a formula ϕ' if $\phi \leftrightarrow \phi'$ is valid.

The following fact can be easily shown, and we skip its proof:

Fact 1.

1. $\mathbf{M}, s \Vdash \langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$ if and only if $A \cup B$ has a joint action $\sigma_{A \cup B}$ in $\text{aja}(s, A \cup B)$ such that (1) $\mathbf{M}, t \Vdash \phi$ for every $t \in \text{out}(s, \sigma_{A \cup B}|_A)$, and (2) $\mathbf{M}, t \Vdash \psi$ for every $t \in \text{out}(s, \sigma_{A \cup B})$.

2. The following formulas are equivalent:

- (a) $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi)$
- (b) $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle (\phi \wedge \psi))$
- (c) $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B - A \rangle \psi)$
- (d) $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle A \cup B \rangle \psi)$

3. The operator $\langle A \rangle \phi$ in CL is definable as $\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)$.

What follows are two fragments of CConStR, which we will consider later:

Definition 8 (The liability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CConStRLi}}$ of Φ_{CConStR}). *The liability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CConStRLi}}$ of Φ_{CConStR} is defined as follows:*

$$\phi ::= \top \mid \perp \mid p \mid \neg p \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid \langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \phi)$$

Definition 9 (The ability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CConStRAB}}$ of Φ_{CConStR}). *The ability fragment $\Phi_{\text{CConStRAB}}$ of Φ_{CConStR} is defined as follows:*

$$\phi ::= \top \mid \perp \mid p \mid \neg p \mid (\phi \wedge \phi) \mid (\phi \vee \phi) \mid \langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \phi)$$

3 Our completeness proof strategy and a model construction technique

Later, we will show the completeness of the liability and ability fragments of CL and CConStR by the same approach, where a model construction technique will be used. This approach is from Goranko and van Drimmelen [GD06], who showed completeness and decidability of Alternating-time Temporal Logic ATL.

In order to state the strategy and technique clearly, we assume an arbitrary modal logic ML meeting the following conditions:

- Its language is an extension of the language of the classical propositional logic with a set of modal operators ∇ ;
- Its models are concurrent game models;
- Its axiomatic system extends the classical propositional logic and is sound.

We assume the usual notion of **modal depth** of formulas of ML.

3.1 Our proof strategy

For every natural number n , $\mathbb{I} = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid -n \leq x \leq -1\}$ is called a **set of negative indices**, and $\mathbb{J} = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 1 \leq x \leq n\}$ is called a **set of positive indices**.

We call a disjunction of literals in the classical propositional logic an **elementary disjunction** and a conjunction of literals in the classical propositional logic an **elementary conjunction**.

Let \mathbb{I} be a set of negative indices and \mathbb{J} be a set of positive indices. We say that a formula ϕ is a **standard formula** if it is in the form of $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \neg \nabla_i \psi_i \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \nabla_j \chi_j$, where γ is an **elementary disjunction**, and every ∇_x is a modal operator.

We claim that to show the completeness of ML, it suffices to show the following two results:

- **Downward validity lemma:** for every standard formula ϕ , if ϕ is valid, then a **validity-reduction condition** is met.
- **Upward derivability lemma:** for every standard formula ϕ , if a **derivability-reduction condition** is met, then ϕ is derivable.

Here, the validity-reduction condition concerns the validity of some formulas with lower modal depth than ϕ , and the derivability-reduction condition is the result of replacing *validity* in the validity-reduction condition by *derivability*.

The arguments go as follows:

- Suppose we have shown the two lemmas. Let ϕ be a formula of ML. Assume ϕ is valid. We want to show that ϕ is derivable. We put an induction on the modal depth n of ϕ .
- Assume $n = 0$. Then, ϕ is a formula of the classical propositional logic. As ML extends the classical propositional logic, ϕ is derivable.

- Assume $n > 0$.

As ML is an extension of the classical propositional logic, there is a ϕ' such that (1) the modal depth of ϕ' equals to n , (2) ϕ is derivable if and only if ϕ' is derivable, (3) ϕ is valid if and only if ϕ' is valid, and (4) ϕ' is a conjunction of some standard formulas ψ . Then ϕ' is valid.

Let χ be a conjunct of ϕ' . Then, χ is valid. It suffices to show that χ is derivable.

Assume the modal depth of χ is less than n . Then, by the inductive hypothesis, χ is derivable.

Assume the modal depth of χ is n . By the downward validity lemma, the validity-reduction condition is met. By the inductive hypothesis, the derivability-reduction condition is met. By the upward derivability lemma, χ is derivable.

3.2 Grafted models from abstract game forms

In showing the downward validity lemma, we will use a model construction technique: grafted models from abstract game forms.

Definition 10 (Abstract game forms). *An **abstract game form** is a tuple $\text{AGF} = (\text{AG}, \text{AC}_0, \text{ja}_0, \text{force})$, where:*

- AG is a non-empty finite set of agents;
- AC_0 is a non-empty set of actions;
- for every $A \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{ja}_0(A) = \{\sigma_A \mid \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \text{AC}_0\}$;
- force is a function from JA to $\mathcal{P}(\Phi_{\text{ML}})$, where $\text{JA} = \bigcup\{\text{ja}_0(A) \mid A \subseteq \text{AG}\}$.

An abstract game form $\text{AGF} = (\text{AG}, \text{AC}_0, \text{ja}_0, \text{force})$ is **regular** if:

- for every $\sigma \in \text{JA}$, $\text{force}(\sigma)$ is satisfiable;
- force is **monotonic**: for all $A, A' \subseteq \text{AG}$ such that $A \subseteq A'$, for all $\sigma_A \in \text{ja}_0(A)$ and $\sigma_{A'} \in \text{ja}_0(A')$ such that $\sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{A'}$, $\text{force}(\sigma_A) \subseteq \text{force}(\sigma_{A'})$.

Definition 11 (Grafted pointed models). *Let $\text{AGF} = (\text{AG}, \text{AC}_0, \text{ja}_0, \text{force})$ be an abstract game form, and γ be a satisfiable elementary conjunction.*

For all $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{ja}_0(\text{AG})$, let $(\mathbf{M}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}, s_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}})$, where $\mathbf{M}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} = (\text{ST}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}, \text{AG}, \text{AC}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}, \text{ja}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}, \text{aja}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}, \text{out}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}, \text{AP}, \text{label}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}})$, be a pointed model such that $\mathbf{M}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}, s_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \models \text{force}(\sigma_{\text{AG}})$. We assume (1) the domains of these models are pairwise disjoint, and (2) AC_0 and $\text{AC}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}$ are disjoint for every $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{ja}_0(\text{AG})$. Let s_0 be a state not in any of these models.

Define a model $\mathbf{M} = (\text{ST}, \text{AG}, \text{AC}, \text{ja}, \text{aja}, \text{out}, \text{AP}, \text{label})$ as follows:

- $\text{ST} = \{s_0\} \cup \bigcup\{\text{ST}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{ja}_0(\text{AG})\}$;
- $\text{AC} = \text{AC}_0 \cup \bigcup\{\text{AC}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{ja}_0(\text{AG})\}$;
- for every $A \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{ja}(A) = \{\sigma_A \mid \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \text{AC}\}$;

- for every $s \in \text{ST}$ and $A \subseteq \text{AG}$:

$$\text{aja}(s, A) = \begin{cases} \text{aja}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}(s, A) & \text{if } s \in \text{ST}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \text{ for some } \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{ja}_0(\text{AG}) \\ \text{ja}_0(A) & \text{if } s = s_0 \end{cases}$$

- $\text{out} : \text{ST} \times \text{JA} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{ST})$, where $\text{JA} = \bigcup \{\text{ja}(A) \mid A \subseteq \text{AG}\}$, is such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$, $A \subseteq \text{AG}$, and $\sigma_A \in \text{ja}(A)$:

$$\text{out}(s, \sigma_A) = \begin{cases} \text{out}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}(s, \sigma_A) & \text{if } s \in \text{ST}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \text{ for some } \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{ja}_0(\text{AG}) \\ \{s_{\sigma_A}\} & \text{if } s = s_0, A = \text{AG} \text{ and } \sigma_A \in \text{aja}_0(s, \text{AG}) \\ \emptyset & \text{if } s = s_0, A = \text{AG} \text{ and } \sigma_A \notin \text{aja}_0(s, \text{AG}) \\ \bigcup \{\text{out}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\} & \text{if } s = s_0, A \neq \text{AG} \end{cases}$$

- $\text{label} : \text{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{AP})$ is such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$:

$$\text{label}(s) = \begin{cases} \text{label}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}(s) & \text{if } s \in \text{ST}_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \text{ for some } \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{ja}_0(\text{AG}) \\ \{p \mid p \text{ is a conjunct of } \gamma\} & \text{if } s = s_0 \end{cases}$$

We call (\mathbb{M}, s_0) a pointed model **grafted** from AGF and γ .

Figure 1 illustrates a grafted pointed model.

Theorem 1. Let $\text{AGF} = (\text{AG}, \text{AC}_0, \text{ja}_0, \text{force})$ be a regular abstract game form and γ be a satisfiable elementary conjunction. Let (\mathbb{M}, s_0) , where $\mathbb{M} = (\text{ST}, \text{AG}, \text{AC}, \text{ja}, \text{aja}, \text{out}, \text{AP}, \text{label})$, be a pointed model grafted from AGF and γ . Then:

- (1) $\mathbb{M}, s_0 \Vdash \gamma$;
- (2) $\sigma_A \triangleright_{s_0} \text{force}(\sigma_A)$ for every coalition A and $\sigma_A \in \text{ja}_0(A)$.

Proof. The first item is easy to see, and we just show the second one. Let $A \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_A \in \text{ja}_0(A)$. Then $\sigma_A \in \text{aja}(s_0, A)$. Let $s \in \text{out}(s_0, \sigma_A)$. We want to show $\mathbb{M}, s \Vdash \text{force}(\sigma_A)$. Note $\text{out}(s_0, \sigma_A) = \bigcup \{\text{out}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\} = \bigcup \{\{s_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}\} \mid \sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\} = \{s_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \mid \sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\}$. Let $s = s_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}}$ for some $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{aja}(s_0, \text{AG})$. Then, $\mathbb{M}, s_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \Vdash \text{force}(\sigma_{\text{AG}})$. Note force is monotonic. Then, $\text{force}(\sigma_A) \subseteq \text{force}(\sigma_{\text{AG}})$. Then $\mathbb{M}, s_{\sigma_{\text{AG}}} \Vdash \text{force}(\sigma_A)$. \square

4 Completeness of two fragments of CL

4.1 Completeness of the liability fragment of CL

Definition 12 (An axiomatic system for CL_{LI}).

Axioms: propositional tautologies in $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\text{LI}}}$

Inference rules:

$$\text{R}_1: \frac{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n}{\psi} \quad \text{where } (\phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n) \rightarrow \psi \text{ is a propositional tautology}$$

$$\text{R}_2: \frac{\phi}{\{A\}\phi}$$

$$\text{R}_3: \frac{\{A \cup B\}(\phi \vee \psi) \vee \chi}{\{A\}\phi \vee \{B\}\psi \vee \chi} \quad \text{where } A \cap B = \emptyset$$




Figure 1: This figure indicates a pointed model (M, s_0) grafted from an abstract game form $AGF = (AG, AC_0, ja_0, force)$ and an elementary conjunction $\neg p \wedge q \wedge r$. In the model M : (1) available joint actions of a coalition A at the state s_0 is specified by ja_0 , and available joint actions of A at other states are as in the corresponding models; (2) outcome states of an available joint action σ_A of a coalition A at the state s_0 is specified by out_0 , and outcome states of σ_A at other states are as in the corresponding models; (3) at the state s_0 , only q and r are true, which are conjuncts of $\neg p \wedge q \wedge r$, and truth values of atomic propositions at other states are as in the corresponding models.

Note that implications are not well-formed formulas in $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}}$.

Theorem 2 (Soundness of $\text{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}$). *The axiomatic system for $\text{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}$ given in Definition 12 is sound with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}}$.*

Proof.

- (1) It suffices to show that all the axioms are valid and all the rules preserve validity.
- (2) It is easy to see that all the axioms are valid, and the first two rules preserve validity.
- (3) We show the third rule preserves validity. It suffices to show $\{A \cup B\}(\phi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\{A\}\phi \vee \{B\}\psi)$ is valid. It suffices to show $(\neg\{A\}\phi \wedge \neg\{B\}\psi) \rightarrow \neg\{A \cup B\}(\phi \vee \psi)$ is valid. It suffices to show $(\{A\}\neg\phi \wedge \{B\}\neg\psi) \rightarrow \{A \cup B\}(\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi)$ is valid, which is easy to see.

□

Definition 13 (Standard formulas for $\text{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}$). *Let γ be an elementary disjunction and \mathbb{I} be a nonempty set of negative indices. A formula ϕ in the form of $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}\phi_i$ in $\Phi_{\text{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}}$ is called a **standard formula** with respect to γ and \mathbb{I} .*

Definition 14 (Neat negative index sets). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}\phi_i$ be a standard formula. A subset \mathbb{I}' of \mathbb{I} is **neat** if for all $i, i' \in \mathbb{I}'$, if $i \neq i'$, then $A_i \cap A_{i'} = \emptyset$.*

Lemma 1 (Downward validity for $\text{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}$). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}\phi_i$ be a standard formula.*

Assume $\models \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}\phi_i$.

Then one of the following two conditions holds:

- (a) $\models \gamma$;
- (b) *there is a neat subset \mathbb{I}' of \mathbb{I} such that $\models \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \phi_i$.*

Proof.

- (1) It is easy to see that the result holds if $\mathbb{I} = \emptyset$. Assume $\mathbb{I} \neq \emptyset$.
- (2) It suffices to show the following: $\neg\gamma \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}\neg\phi_i$ is satisfiable, if (a') $\neg\gamma$ is satisfiable, and (b') for all neat subset \mathbb{I}' of \mathbb{I} , $\bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \neg\phi_i$ is satisfiable. Suppose (a') and (b').
- (3) Define an abstract game form $\text{AGF} = (\text{AG}, \text{AC}_0, \text{ja}_0, \text{force})$ as follows:

- $\text{AC}_0 = \mathbb{I}$;
- for every $A \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{ja}_0(A) = \{\sigma_A \mid \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \text{AC}_0\}$;
- For every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \text{ja}_0(C)$, define:

$$\text{coin}(\sigma_C) = \{i \in \mathbb{I} \mid A_i \subseteq C \text{ and for all } a \in A_i, \sigma_C(a) = i\}$$

$$\text{force}(\sigma_C) = \{\neg\phi_i \mid i \in \text{coin}(\sigma_C)\}$$

(4) We claim that AGF is regular.

First, we show for all coalition C and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$, $\mathbf{force}(\sigma_C)$ is satisfiable. Let C be a coalition and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$. Note for all neat subset \mathbb{I}' of \mathbb{I} , $\bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \neg \phi_i$ is satisfiable. It suffices to show that $\mathbf{coin}(\sigma_C)$ is neat. Let $i, i' \in \mathbf{coin}(\sigma_C)$ such that $i \neq i'$. Then, $A_i \subseteq C$, $\sigma_C(a) = i$ for all $a \in A_i$, $A_{i'} \subseteq C$, and $\sigma_C(a) = i'$ for all $a \in A_{i'}$. Assume $A_i \cap A_{i'} \neq \emptyset$. Then there is an agent a such that $a \in A_i$ and $a \in A_{i'}$. Then $\sigma_C(a) = i$ and $\sigma_C(a) = i'$. Then $i = i'$. We have a contradiction. Then, $A_i \cap A_{i'} = \emptyset$. Then, $\mathbf{coin}(\sigma_C)$ is neat.

Second, we show that \mathbf{force} is monotonic. Let $A, A' \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\sigma_A \in \mathbf{ja}_0(A)$ and $\sigma_{A'} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(A')$ such that $\sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{A'}$. It suffices to show $\mathbf{coin}(\sigma_A) \subseteq \mathbf{coin}(\sigma_{A'})$. Let $i \in \mathbf{coin}(\sigma_A)$. Then $A_i \subseteq A$ and for all $a \in A_i$, $\sigma_A(a) = i$. Then $A_i \subseteq A'$ and for all $a \in A_i$, $\sigma_{A'}(a) = i$. Then $i \in \mathbf{coin}(\sigma_{A'})$. Then, $\mathbf{coin}(\sigma_A) \subseteq \mathbf{coin}(\sigma_{A'})$.

(5) Let γ' be an elementary conjunction equivalent to $\neg\gamma$. Let (M, s_0) be a pointed model grafted from AGF and γ' . We want to show $M, s_0 \Vdash \neg\gamma \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle \neg \phi_i$.

By Theorem 1, $M, s_0 \Vdash \neg\gamma$.

Let $i \in \mathbb{I}$. It suffices to show $M, s_0 \Vdash \langle A_i \rangle \neg \phi_i$. Let $\sigma_{A_i} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(A_i)$ such that $\sigma_{A_i}(a) = i$ for all $a \in A_i$. Then $\neg \phi_i \in \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{A_i})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_i} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg \phi_i$. Then $M, s_0 \Vdash \langle A_i \rangle \neg \phi_i$.

□

Lemma 2 (Upward derivability for $\mathbf{CL}_{\mathbb{I}}$). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle \phi_i$ be a standard formula.*

Assume one of the following two conditions holds:

(a) $\vdash \gamma$;

(b) *there is a neat subset \mathbb{I}' of \mathbb{I} such that $\vdash \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \phi_i$.*

Then $\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle \phi_i$.

Proof.

Suppose (a). By application of the rule R_1 :

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle \phi_i$$

Suppose (b).

(1) By application of the rule R_2 :

$$\vdash \left\{ \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} A_i \right\} \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \phi_i$$

(2) By repeated applications of the rule R_3 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \langle A_i \rangle \phi_i$$

(3) By application of the rule R_1 :

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} [A_i] \phi_i$$

□

Theorem 3 (Completeness of CL_{LI}). *The axiomatic system for CL_{LI} given in Definition 12 is complete with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{CL_{LI}}$.*

Proof.

- (1) Let ϕ be a formula in $\Phi_{CL_{LI}}$. Assume $\models \phi$. We want to show $\vdash \phi$. We put an induction on the modal depth n of ϕ .
- (2) Assume $n = 0$. Then, ϕ is a propositional tautology. Then $\vdash \phi$.
- (3) Assume $n > 0$. It is easy to show that there is ϕ' in $\Phi_{CL_{LI}}$ such that (a) the modal depth of ϕ' is n , (b) $\vdash \phi$ if and only if $\vdash \phi'$, (c) $\models \phi$ if and only if $\models \phi'$, and (d) ϕ' is in the conjunctive normal form of $\chi_0 \wedge \dots \wedge \chi_k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and χ_i is a standard formula whose modal depth of χ_i is less than n for every $i \leq k$. Then $\models \phi'$. Let $i \leq k$. Then $\models \chi_i$. It suffices to show $\vdash \chi_i$.
- (4) Assume the modal depth of χ_i is less than n . By the inductive hypothesis, $\vdash \chi_i$.
- (5) Assume the modal depth of χ_i is n .

Note χ_i is a valid standard formula. χ_i is in the form of $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} [A_i] \phi_i$.

By Lemma 1, one of the following two conditions holds:

- (a) $\models \gamma$;
- (b) there is a neat subset \mathbb{I}' of \mathbb{I} such that $\models \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \phi_i$.

By the inductive hypothesis, one of the following two conditions holds:

- (a) $\vdash \gamma$;
- (b) $\vdash \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}'} \phi_i$.

By Lemma 2, $\vdash \chi_i$.

□

4.2 Completeness of the ability fragment of CL

Definition 15 (An axiomatic system for CL_{AB}).

Axioms: propositional tautologies in $\Phi_{CL_{LI}}$

Inference rules:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1: & \frac{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n}{\psi} && \text{where } (\phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n) \rightarrow \psi \text{ is a propositional tautology} \\
R_2: & \frac{\phi}{\langle A \rangle \phi} \\
R_3: & \frac{\langle A \rangle (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2) \vee \chi}{\langle A \rangle \phi_1 \vee \langle AG \rangle \phi_2 \vee \chi}
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4 (Soundness of CL_{AB}). *The axiomatic system for CL_{AB} given in Definition 15 is sound with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{CL_{AB}}$.*

Proof.

- (1) It suffices to show that all the axioms are valid and all the rules preserve validity.
- (2) It is easy to see that all the axioms are valid, and the first two rules preserve validity.
- (3) We show the third rule preserves validity. It suffices to show $\langle A \rangle (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2) \rightarrow (\langle A \rangle \phi_1 \vee \langle AG \rangle \phi_2)$ is valid. Let (M, w) , where $M = (ST, AG, AC, ja, aja, out, AP, label)$, be a pointed model. Assume $M, w \Vdash \langle A \rangle (\phi_1 \vee \phi_2)$. Then there is σ_A in $\mathbf{aja}(w, A)$ such that $\sigma_A \triangleright_w \phi_1 \vee \phi_2$.

Assume $M, w \not\Vdash \langle A \rangle \phi_1$. It suffices to show $M, w \Vdash \langle AG \rangle \phi_2$.

Then $\sigma_A \not\triangleright_w \phi_1$. Then there is $u \in \mathbf{out}(w, \sigma_A)$ such that $M, u \Vdash \neg \phi_1$. Then $M, u \Vdash \phi_2$. Note there is $\sigma_{AG} \in \mathbf{aja}(w, AG)$ such that $\sigma_A \subseteq \sigma_{AG}$ and $\mathbf{out}(w, \sigma_{AG}) = \{u\}$. Then $\sigma_{AG} \triangleright_w \phi_2$. Then $M, w \Vdash \langle AG \rangle \phi_2$.

□

Definition 16 (Standard formulas for CL_{AB}). *Let γ be an elementary disjunction and \mathbb{J} be a nonempty set of positive indices. A formula ϕ in the form of $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j$ in $\Phi_{CL_{AB}}$ is called a standard formula with respect to γ and \mathbb{J} .*

Define $\mathbb{J}^0 = \{j \in \mathbb{J} \mid B_j = AG\}$.

Lemma 3 (Downward validity for CL_{AB}). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j$ be a standard formula.*

Assume $\models \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j$.

Then one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) $\models \gamma$;
- (b) there is $j' \in \mathbb{J}$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^0} \psi_j \vee \psi_{j'}$.

Proof.

- It is easy to see that the result holds if $\mathbb{J} = \emptyset$. Assume $\mathbb{J} \neq \emptyset$.
- It suffices to show the following: $\neg \gamma \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle B_j \rangle \neg \psi_j$ is satisfiable, if (a') $\neg \gamma$ is satisfiable, and (b') for every $j' \in \mathbb{J}$, $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^0} \neg \psi_j \wedge \neg \psi_{j'}$ is satisfiable. Suppose (a') and (b').
- Assume $\mathbb{J} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Define an abstract game form $AGF = (AG, AC_0, ja_0, force)$ as follows:

- $\mathbf{AC}_0 = \mathbb{J}$;
- for every $A \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\mathbf{ja}(A) = \{\sigma_A \mid \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \mathbf{AC}_0\}$;
- For every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$, define:

$$\mathbf{reject}(\sigma_C) = \left(\sum_{a \in C} \sigma_C(a) \bmod n \right) + 1$$

$$\mathbf{force}(\sigma_C) = \begin{cases} \{\neg\psi_k\} \cup \{\neg\psi_j \mid j \in \mathbb{J}^0\} & \text{if } C = \mathbf{AG} \\ \{\neg\psi_j \mid j \in \mathbb{J}^0\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $k = \mathbf{reject}(\sigma_C)$

- By (b'), for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$, $\mathbf{force}(\sigma_C)$ is satisfiable. It is easy to see that \mathbf{force} is monotonic. Then, \mathbf{AGF} is regular.
- Let γ' be an elementary conjunction equivalent to $\neg\gamma$. Let (M, s_0) be a pointed model grafted from \mathbf{AGF} and γ' . We want to show $M, s_0 \Vdash \neg\gamma \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \{A_j\} \neg\psi_j$.

By Theorem 1, $M, s_0 \Vdash \neg\gamma$.

Let $j \in \mathbb{J}$. It suffices to show $M, s_0 \Vdash \{A_j\} \neg\psi_j$. Let $\sigma_{A_j} \in \mathbf{aja}(s_0, A_j)$. Then, $\sigma_{A_j} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(A_j)$. Consider the following two cases:

- **Case 1:** $A_j = \mathbf{AG}$. Then, $j \in \mathbb{J}^0$ and $\neg\psi_j \in \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{A_j})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_j} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg\psi_j$.
- **Case 2:** $A_j \neq \mathbf{AG}$. Then, $\overline{A_j} \neq \emptyset$. Then, there is $\sigma_{\overline{A_j}} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(\overline{A_j})$ such that $\mathbf{reject}(\sigma_{A_j} \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_j}}) = j$. Then, $\neg\psi_j \in \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{A_j} \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_j}})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_j} \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_j}} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg\psi_j$.

Then, $M, s_0 \Vdash \{A_j\} \neg\psi_j$.

□

Lemma 4 (Upward derivability for $\mathbf{CL}_{\mathbf{AB}}$). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \{B_j\} \psi_j$ be a standard formula.*

Assume one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) $\vdash \gamma$;
- (b) *there is $j' \in \mathbb{J}$ such that $\vdash \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^0} \psi_j \vee \psi_{j'}$.*

Then $\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \{B_j\} \psi_j$.

Proof.

Suppose (a). By application of the rule \mathbf{R}_1 :

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \{B_j\} \psi_j$$

Suppose (b).

(1) By application of the rule \mathbf{R}_2 :

$$\vdash \{B_{j'}\} (\psi_{j'} \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^0} \psi_j)$$

(2) By repeated applications of the rules R_3 :

$$\vdash \langle B_{j'} \rangle \psi_{j'} \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^0} \langle A_G \rangle \psi_j$$

(3) By application of the rule R_1 :

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j$$

□

Theorem 5 (Completeness of CL_{AB}). *The axiomatic system for CL_{AB} given in Definition 15 is complete with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{CL_{AB}}$.*

The proof for this result is similar to the proof for Theorem 3, and we skip it.

5 Completeness of two fragments of CConStR

5.1 Completeness of the liability fragment of CConStR

Definition 17 (An axiomatic system for $CConStR_{LI}$).

Axioms: propositional tautologies in $\Phi_{CConStR_{LI}}$

Inferential rules:

$$R_1: \frac{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n}{\psi} \quad \text{where } (\phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n) \rightarrow \psi \text{ is a propositional tautology}$$

$$R_2: \frac{\phi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \{\emptyset\} \perp)}$$

$$R_3: \frac{\langle A \cup B \rangle_c(\phi \vee \psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \chi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \langle B \rangle_c(\psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \chi} \quad \text{where } A \cap B = \emptyset$$

$$R_4: \frac{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \chi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi) \vee \chi}$$

$$R_5: \frac{\langle A \cup B \rangle_c(\phi \vee \psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \chi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi) \vee \chi}$$

Theorem 6 (Soundness of $CConStR_{LI}$). *The axiomatic system for $CConStR_{LI}$ given in Definition 17 is sound with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{CConStR_{LI}}$.*

Proof.

- (1) It suffices to show that all the axioms are valid and all the rules preserve validity.
- (2) It is easy to see that all the axioms are valid, and the first, the second, and the fourth rules preserve validity.

- (3) We show that the third rule preserves validity. It suffices to show that $\{A \cup B\}_c(\phi \vee \psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \rightarrow (\{A\}_c(\phi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \{B\}_c(\psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp))$ is valid, which is equivalent to $\neg(\{A\}_c(\phi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \{B\}_c(\psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp)) \rightarrow \neg\{A \cup B\}_c(\phi \vee \psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp)$, which is equivalent to $(\{A\}_c(\neg\phi; \{\emptyset\} \top) \wedge \{B\}_c(\neg\psi; \{\emptyset\} \top)) \rightarrow \{A \cup B\}_c(\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi; \{\emptyset\} \top)$, which is equivalent to $(\{A\} \neg\phi \wedge \{B\} \neg\psi) \rightarrow \{A \cup B\}(\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi)$, which can be easily shown to be valid.
- (4) We show the fifth rule preserves validity. It suffices to show $\{A \cup B\}_c(\phi \vee \psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \rightarrow \{A\}_c(\phi; \{B\} \psi)$ is valid. It suffices to show $\neg\{A\}_c(\phi; \{B\} \psi) \rightarrow \neg\{A \cup B\}_c(\phi \vee \psi; \{\emptyset\} \perp)$ is valid. It suffices to show $\{A\}_c(\neg\phi; \{B\} \neg\psi) \rightarrow \{A \cup B\}_c(\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi; \{\emptyset\} \top)$ is valid, which is easy to see.

□

Definition 18 (Standard formulas for CConStRLI). *Let γ be an elementary disjunction and \mathbb{I} be a nonempty set of negative indices. A formula ϕ in the form of $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i)$ in $\Phi_{\text{CConStRLI}}$ is called a standard formula with respect to γ and \mathbb{I} .*

Definition 19 (Neat tuples of negative index sets). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i)$ be a standard formula. Let $\mathbb{I}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ and $\mathbb{I}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$. We say the tuple $(\mathbb{I}_1, \mathbb{I}_2)$ is **neat** if:*

- for all $i, i' \in \mathbb{I}_1$, if $i \neq i'$, then $A_i \cap A_{i'} = \emptyset$;
- for all $i, i' \in \mathbb{I}_2$, if $i \neq i'$, then $(A_i \cup B_i) \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'}) = \emptyset$;
- for all $i \in \mathbb{I}_1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{I}_2$, if $i \neq i'$, then $A_i \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'}) = \emptyset$.

Lemma 5 (Downward validity for CConStRLI). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i)$ be a standard formula.*

Assume $\models \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i)$.

Then one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) $\models \gamma$;
- (b) *there is $\mathbb{I}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ and $\mathbb{I}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ such that $(\mathbb{I}_1, \mathbb{I}_2)$ is neat and $\models \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} \phi_i \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} (\phi_i \vee \psi_i)$.*

Proof.

- (1) It is easy to see that the result holds if $\mathbb{I} = \emptyset$. Assume $\mathbb{I} \neq \emptyset$.
- (2) It suffices to show the following: $\neg\gamma \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}_c(\neg\phi_i; \{B_i\} \neg\psi_i)$ is satisfiable, if (a') $\neg\gamma$ is satisfiable and (b') for all $\mathbb{I}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ and $\mathbb{I}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$, if $(\mathbb{I}_1, \mathbb{I}_2)$ is neat, then $\bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} \neg\phi_i \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} (\neg\phi_i \wedge \neg\psi_i)$ is satisfiable. Suppose (a') and (b').
- (3) Define an abstract game form $\text{AGF} = (\text{AG}, \text{AC}_0, \text{ja}_0, \text{force})$ as follows:
- $\text{AC}_0 = \mathbb{I}$;
 - for every $A \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{ja}_0(A) = \{\sigma_A \mid \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \text{AC}_0\}$;
 - For every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \text{ja}_0(C)$, define:

$$\text{coin}_f(\sigma_C) = \{i \in \mathbb{I} \mid A_i \subseteq C \text{ and for all } a \in A_i, \sigma_C(a) = i\}$$

$$\text{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_C) = \{i \in \mathbb{I} \mid A_i \cup B_i \subseteq C \text{ and for all } a \in A_i \cup B_i, \sigma_C(a) = i\}$$

$$\text{force}(\sigma_C) = \{\neg\phi_i \mid i \in \text{coin}_f(\sigma_C)\} \cup \{\neg\phi_i \wedge \neg\psi_i \mid i \in \text{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_C)\}$$

(4) We claim AGF is regular.

First, we show that for every coalition C and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$, $\mathbf{force}(\sigma_C)$ is satisfiable. By (b'), it suffices to show that for every coalition C and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$, $(\mathbf{coin}_f(\sigma_C), \mathbf{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_C))$ is neat. Let C be a coalition and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$.

- Let i, i' be two different indices in $\mathbf{coin}_f(\sigma_C)$. Assume $A_i \cap A_{i'} \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in A_i \cap A_{i'}$. Then $\sigma_C(a) = i$ and $\sigma_C(a) = i'$. There is a contradiction. Then $A_i \cap A_{i'} = \emptyset$.
- Let i, i' be two different indices in $\mathbf{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_C)$. Assume $(A_i \cup B_i) \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in (A_i \cup B_i) \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'})$. Then $\sigma_C(a) = i$ and $\sigma_C(a) = i'$. There is a contradiction. Then $(A_i \cup B_i) \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'}) = \emptyset$.
- Let $i \in \mathbf{coin}_f(\sigma_C)$ and $i' \in \mathbf{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_C)$ such that $i \neq i'$. Assume $A_i \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in A_i \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'})$. Then $\sigma_C(a) = i$ and $\sigma_C(a) = i'$. There is a contradiction. Then $A_i \cap (A_{i'} \cup B_{i'}) = \emptyset$.

Second, we show that \mathbf{force} is monotonic. Let C and C' be two coalitions, $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$ and $\sigma_{C'} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C')$ such that $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{C'}$. It is easy to see $\mathbf{coin}_f(\sigma_C) \subseteq \mathbf{coin}_f(\sigma_{C'})$ and $\mathbf{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_C) \subseteq \mathbf{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_{C'})$. Then, $\mathbf{force}(\sigma_C) \subseteq \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{C'})$.

(5) Let γ' be an elementary conjunction equivalent to $\neg\gamma$. Let (M, s_0) be a pointed model grafted from AGF and γ' . We want to show $M, s_0 \Vdash \neg\gamma \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle_c (\neg\phi_i; \langle B_i \rangle \neg\psi_i)$.

By Theorem 1, $M, s_0 \Vdash \neg\gamma$.

Let $i \in \mathbb{I}$. We want to show $M, s_0 \Vdash \langle A_i \rangle_c (\neg\phi_i; \langle B_i \rangle \neg\psi_i)$. Let $\sigma_{A_i \cup B_i} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(A_i \cup B_i)$ be such that $\sigma_{A_i \cup B_i}(a) = i$ for all $a \in A_i \cup B_i$. Let $\sigma_{A_i} = \sigma_{A_i \cup B_i} \upharpoonright_{A_i}$. Then $i \in \mathbf{coin}_f(\sigma_{A_i})$ and $\neg\phi_i \in \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{A_i})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_i} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg\phi_i$. Then $i \in \mathbf{coin}_{fs}(\sigma_{A_i \cup B_i})$ and $\neg\phi_i \wedge \neg\psi_i \in \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{A_i \cup B_i})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_i \cup B_i} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg\phi_i \wedge \neg\psi_i$. Then $M, s_0 \Vdash \langle A_i \rangle_c (\neg\phi_i; \langle B_i \rangle \neg\psi_i)$.

□

Lemma 6 (Upward derivability for CConStR_{L1}). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle_c (\phi_i; \langle B_i \rangle \psi_i)$ be a standard formula.*

Assume one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) $\vdash \gamma$;
- (b) *there is $\mathbb{I}_1 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ and $\mathbb{I}_2 \subseteq \mathbb{I}$ such that $(\mathbb{I}_1, \mathbb{I}_2)$ is neat and $\vdash \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} \phi_i \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} (\phi_i \vee \psi_i)$.*

Then $\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle_c (\phi_i; \langle B_i \rangle \psi_i)$.

Proof.

Suppose (a). By application of the rule R₁:

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \langle A_i \rangle_c (\phi_i; \langle B_i \rangle \psi_i)$$

Suppose (b).

(1) By application of the rule R₂:

$$\vdash \left[\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} A_i \cup \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} (A_i \cup B_i) \right]_c \left(\bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} \phi_i \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} (\phi_i \vee \psi_i); \{\emptyset\} \perp \right)$$

(2) By repeated applications of the rule R_3 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{\emptyset\} \perp) \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} \{A_i \cup B_i\}_c(\phi_i \vee \psi_i; \{\emptyset\} \perp)$$

(3) By repeated applications of the rule R_4 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i) \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} \{A_i \cup B_i\}_c(\phi_i \vee \psi_i; \{\emptyset\} \perp)$$

(4) By repeated applications of the rule R_5 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_1} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i) \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}_2} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i)$$

(5) By application of the rule R_1 :

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \{A_i\}_c(\phi_i; \{B_i\} \psi_i)$$

□

Theorem 7 (Completeness of CConStR_{LI}). *The axiomatic system for CConStR_{LI} given in Definition 17 is complete with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{\text{CConStR}_{LI}}$.*

The proof for this result is similar to the proof for Theorem 3, and we skip it.

5.2 Completeness of the ability fragment of CConStR

Definition 20 (An axiomatic system for CConStR_{AB}).

Axioms: propositional tautologies in $\Phi_{\text{CConStR}_{AB}}$

Inferential rules:

$$R_1: \frac{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n}{\psi} \quad \text{where } (\phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \phi_n) \rightarrow \psi \text{ is a propositional tautology}$$

$$R_2: \frac{\phi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)}$$

$$R_3: \frac{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi_1 \vee \phi_2; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \chi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi_1; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle AG \rangle_c(\phi_2; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \chi}$$

$$R_4: \frac{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi \wedge \psi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \chi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi) \vee \chi}$$

$$R_5: \frac{(\langle A \cup B \rangle_c(\phi \wedge \psi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \wedge \langle \emptyset \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)) \vee \chi}{\langle A \rangle_c(\phi; \langle B \rangle \psi) \vee \chi}$$

Theorem 8 (Soundness of $\text{CConStR}_{\text{AB}}$). *The axiomatic system for $\text{CConStR}_{\text{AB}}$ given in Definition 20 is sound with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{\text{CConStR}_{\text{AB}}}$.*

Proof.

- (1) It suffices to show that all the axioms are valid and all the rules preserve validity.
- (2) It is easy to see that all the axioms are valid, and the first two rules preserve validity.
- (3) We show the third rule preserves validity. It suffices to show $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi_1 \vee \phi_2; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \rightarrow (\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi_1; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_2; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top))$ is valid, which is equivalent to $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle(\phi_1 \vee \phi_2) \rightarrow (\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle\phi_1 \vee \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle\phi_2)$, which is shown to be valid in the proof for Theorem 4.
- (4) We show the fourth rule preserves validity. It suffices to show $\langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi \wedge \psi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle \psi)$ is valid. Let (\mathbf{M}, w) , where $\mathbf{M} = (\text{ST}, \text{AG}, \text{AC}, \text{ja}, \text{aja}, \text{out}, \text{AP}, \text{label})$, be a pointed model. Assume $\mathbf{M}, w \Vdash \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi \wedge \psi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)$. Then there is $\sigma_A \in \text{aja}(w, \mathbf{A})$ such that $\sigma_A \triangleright_w \phi \wedge \psi$. Let $\sigma_B \in \text{aja}(w, \mathbf{B})$. Then $\sigma_A \uplus \sigma_B \triangleright_w \phi \wedge \psi$. Then $\sigma_A \uplus \sigma_B \triangleright_w \psi$. Then $\mathbf{M}, w \Vdash \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle \psi)$.
- (5) We show the fifth rule preserves validity. It suffices to show $(\langle \mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B} \rangle_c(\phi \wedge \psi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \wedge \langle \emptyset \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)) \rightarrow \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle \psi)$ is valid. Let (\mathbf{M}, w) , where $\mathbf{M} = (\text{ST}, \text{AG}, \text{AC}, \text{ja}, \text{aja}, \text{out}, \text{AP}, \text{label})$, be a pointed model. Assume $\mathbf{M}, w \Vdash \langle \mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B} \rangle_c(\phi \wedge \psi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \wedge \langle \emptyset \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)$. Then there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}} \in \text{aja}(w, \mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B})$ such that $\sigma_{\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}} \triangleright_w \phi \wedge \psi$, and $\emptyset \triangleright_w \phi$. Let σ_A be the restriction of $\sigma_{\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}}$ to \mathbf{A} and σ_B be the restriction of $\sigma_{\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}}$ to \mathbf{B} . Note $\sigma_{\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}} = \sigma_A \uplus \sigma_B$. Then $\sigma_A \triangleright_w \phi$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{A} \cup \mathbf{B}} \triangleright_w \psi$. Then $\mathbf{M}, w \Vdash \langle \mathbf{A} \rangle_c(\phi; \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle \psi)$.

□

Definition 21 (Standard formulas for $\text{CConStR}_{\text{AB}}$). *Let γ be an elementary disjunction and \mathbb{J} be a set of positive indices. A formula ϕ in the form of $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$ in $\Phi_{\text{CConStR}_{\text{AB}}}$ is called a standard formula with respect to γ and \mathbb{J} .*

Define $\mathbb{J}^f = \{j \in \mathbb{J} \mid \mathbf{A}_j = \mathbf{AG}\}$ and $\mathbb{J}^{\text{fs}} = \{j \in \mathbb{J} \mid \mathbf{A}_j \cup \mathbf{B}_j = \mathbf{AG}\}$. Clearly, $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{\text{fs}}$.

Lemma 7. *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$ be a standard formula.*

Assume $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$.

Then, for all $\mathbb{J}^ \subseteq \mathbb{J}$ such that $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{\text{fs}}$, one of the following conditions holds:*

- (a) $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$;
- (b) there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}^*$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee (\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$;
- (c) there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}^*$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee \phi_{j'}$ and $\mathbf{A}_{j'} \cup \mathbf{B}_{j'} = \mathbf{AG}$.

Proof.

- (1) It is easy to see that the result holds if $\mathbb{J} = \emptyset$. Assume $\mathbb{J} \neq \emptyset$.
- (2) Assume there is $\mathbb{J}^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}$ such that $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{\text{fs}}$ and the following conditions are met:
 - (a') $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$ is satisfiable;
 - (b') for all $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}^*$, $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \neg(\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$ is satisfiable;

(c') for all $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}^*$, $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \neg\phi_{j'}$ is satisfiable, or $\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}} \neq \emptyset$.

It suffices to show $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \neg\langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$ is satisfiable.

(3) Assume $\mathbb{J} = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Define an abstract game form $\mathbf{AGF} = (\mathbf{AG}, \mathbf{AC}_0, \mathbf{ja}_0, \mathbf{force})$ as follows:

- $\mathbf{AC}_0 = \mathbb{J}$;
- for every $A \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\mathbf{ja}_0(A) = \{\sigma_A \mid \sigma_A : A \rightarrow \mathbf{AC}_0\}$;
- For every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$, define:

$$\mathbf{reject}(\sigma_C) = \left(\sum_{a \in C} \sigma_C(a) \bmod n \right) + 1$$

$$\mathbf{force}(\sigma_C) = \begin{cases} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \{ \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \mid j \in \mathbb{J}^* \} \cup \\ \{ \neg\phi_k, \neg(\phi_k \wedge \psi_k) \} \end{array} \right\} & \text{if } C = \mathbf{AG} \text{ and } \bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \neg\phi_k \\ & \text{is satisfiable} \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \{ \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \mid j \in \mathbb{J}^* \} \cup \\ \{ \neg(\phi_k \wedge \psi_k) \} \end{array} \right\} & \text{if } C = \mathbf{AG}, \bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \neg\phi_k \text{ is} \\ & \text{not satisfiable, and } \bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \\ & \neg(\phi_k \wedge \psi_k) \text{ is satisfiable} \\ \{ \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \mid j \in \mathbb{J}^* \} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $k = \mathbf{reject}(\sigma_C)$

It is easy to see that \mathbf{force} is monotonic and for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{ja}_0(C)$, $\mathbf{force}(\sigma_C)$ is satisfiable. Then, \mathbf{AGF} is regular.

(4) Let (\mathbf{M}, s_0) be a grafted pointed model from \mathbf{AGF} . It suffices to show for all $j' \in \mathbb{J}$, $\mathbf{M}, s_0 \Vdash \neg\langle A_{j'} \rangle_c(\phi_{j'}; \langle B_{j'} \rangle \psi_{j'})$. Let $j' \in \mathbb{J}$, $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(A_{j'})$ and $\sigma_{B_{j'}} \in \mathbf{ja}_0(B_{j'})$. It suffices to show $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \not\vdash_{s_0} \phi_{j'}$ or $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}} \not\vdash_{s_0} \phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'}$.

Consider the following two cases:

- **Case 1:** $j' \in \mathbb{J}^*$.

Then $\neg(\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'}) \in \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg(\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$. Then $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}} \not\vdash_{s_0} \phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'}$.

- **Case 2:** $j' \notin \mathbb{J}^*$.

Note $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}^*$. Then, $\overline{A_{j'}} \neq \emptyset$. By the assumption given at the beginning of this proof: (1) $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \neg(\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$ is satisfiable, and (2) $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \neg\phi_{j'}$ is satisfiable, or $\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}} \neq \emptyset$.

Consider the following two cases:

- **Case 2.1:** $\bigwedge_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} \neg(\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \wedge \neg\phi_{j'}$ is satisfiable.

By the definition of \mathbf{reject} , we can get that $\overline{A_{j'}}$ has a joint action $\sigma_{\overline{A_{j'}}}$ in $\mathbf{ja}_0(\overline{A_{j'}})$ such that $\mathbf{reject}(\sigma_{A_{j'}} \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_{j'}}}) = j'$. Then, $\neg\phi_{j'} \in \mathbf{force}(\sigma_{A_{j'}} \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_{j'}}})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_{j'}}} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg\phi_{j'}$. Then, $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \not\vdash_{s_0} \phi_{j'}$.

- **Case 2.2:** $\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}} \neq \emptyset$.

By the definition of \mathbf{reject} , we can get that $\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}}$ has a joint action $\sigma_{\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}}}$ in $\mathbf{ja}_0(\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}})$ such that $\mathbf{reject}((\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}}) \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}}}) = j'$. Then, $\neg(\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'}) \in \mathbf{force}((\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}}) \cup \sigma_{\overline{A_{j'} \cup B_{j'}}})$. By Theorem 1, $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}} \triangleright_{s_0} \neg(\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$. Then, $\sigma_{A_{j'}} \uplus \sigma_{B_{j'}} \not\vdash_{s_0} \phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'}$.

□

Definition 22 (Semantically well-arranged sequences of sets of positive indices). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$ be a standard formula.*

Let \mathbb{J}_1^ and \mathbb{J}_2^* be two subsets of \mathbb{J} . We say \mathbb{J}_2^* is a **semantic expansion** of \mathbb{J}_1^* if there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}_1^*$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_1^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee \phi_{j'}$ and $\mathbb{J}_2^* = \mathbb{J}_1^* \cup \{j'\}$.*

Let $(\mathbb{J}_k^)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ be a sequence of subsets of \mathbb{J} for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$. We say $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ is **semantically well-arranged** if:*

- $\mathbb{J}_0^* = \mathbb{J}^f$;
- for every $k < L$, $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}_k^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$;
- for every $k < L$, \mathbb{J}_{k+1}^* is a semantic expansion of \mathbb{J}_k^* ;
- $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$.

Lemma 8. *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$ be a standard formula.*

Assume for all $\mathbb{J}^ \subseteq \mathbb{J}$ such that $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$, one of the following conditions holds:*

- (a) $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$;
- (b) there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}^*$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee (\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$;
- (c) there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}^*$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee \phi_{j'}$ and $A_{j'} \cup B_{j'} = \mathbf{AG}$.

Then, there is a semantically well-arranged sequence of subsets of \mathbb{J} .

Proof.

- (1) Let $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ be a sequence of subsets of \mathbb{J} for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$. We say $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ is **semantically pseudo-well-arranged** if:

- $\mathbb{J}_0^* = \mathbb{J}^f$;
- for every $k \leq L$, $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}_k^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$;
- for every $k < L$, \mathbb{J}_{k+1}^* is a semantic expansion of \mathbb{J}_k^* .

- (2) Let \mathbf{SP} be the set of all semantically pseudo-well-arranged sequences of subsets of \mathbb{J} . Note that (\mathbb{J}^f) is a semantically pseudo-well-arranged sequence. Then, \mathbf{SP} is not empty. Note that \mathbb{J} is finite. Then, it is easy to see that \mathbf{SP} is finite. Therefore, \mathbf{SP} has a maximal sequence. Let $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ be such a maximal sequence.

- Assume $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$. Then $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ is semantically well-arranged.
- Assume $\not\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$. Since $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}_L^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$, one of the following conditions is met:
 - (a) $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$;
 - (b) there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}_L^*$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee (\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$;
 - (c) there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}_L^*$ such that $\models \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee \phi_{j'}$ and $A_{j'} \cup B_{j'} = \mathbf{AG}$.

Note (a) does not hold.

Assume (c). Look at the sequence $(\mathbb{J}_0^*, \dots, \mathbb{J}_L^*, \mathbb{J}_{L+1}^*)$, where $\mathbb{J}_{L+1}^* = \mathbb{J}_L^* \cup \{j'\}$. It is easy to see the following:

- $\mathbb{J}_0^* = \mathbb{J}^f$;
- for every $k \leq L + 1$, $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}_k^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$;
- for every $k < L + 1$, \mathbb{J}_{k+1}^* is a semantic expansion of \mathbb{J}_k^* .

Then $(\mathbb{J}_0^*, \dots, \mathbb{J}_L^*, \mathbb{J}_{L+1}^*)$ is semantically pseudo-well-arranged. Then $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ is not maximal. We have a contradiction.

Therefore, (b) holds. Note $\bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee (\phi_{j'} \wedge \psi_{j'})$ implies $\bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee \phi_{j'}$. Then $\vDash \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee \phi_{j'}$. Look at the sequence $(\mathbb{J}_0^*, \dots, \mathbb{J}_L^*, \mathbb{J}_{L+1}^*)$, where $\mathbb{J}_{L+1}^* = \mathbb{J}_L^* \cup \{j'\}$. It is easy to see the following:

- $\mathbb{J}_0^* = \mathbb{J}^f$;
- for every $k < L + 1$, $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}_k^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$;
- for every $k < L + 1$, \mathbb{J}_{k+1}^* is a semantic expansion of \mathbb{J}_k^* ;
- $\vDash \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_{L+1}^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$.

Then, $(\mathbb{J}_0^*, \dots, \mathbb{J}_L^*, \mathbb{J}_{L+1}^*)$ is semantically well-arranged. □

By Lemma 7 and Lemma 8, the following result holds:

Lemma 9 (Downward validity for CConStR_{AB}). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$ be a standard formula.*

Assume $\vDash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$.

Then, one of the following conditions holds:

- (a) $\vDash \gamma$;
- (b) *there is a semantically well-arranged sequence of subsets of \mathbb{J} .*

Definition 23 (Syntactically well-arranged sequences of sets of positive indices). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$ be a standard formula.*

Let \mathbb{J}_1^ and \mathbb{J}_2^* be two subsets of \mathbb{J} . We say \mathbb{J}_2^* is a **syntactical expansion** of \mathbb{J}_1^* if there is $j' \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}_1^*$ such that $\vdash \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_2^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j) \vee \phi_{j'}$ and $\mathbb{J}_2^* = \mathbb{J}_1^* \cup \{j'\}$.*

Let $(\mathbb{J}_k^)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ be a sequence of subsets of \mathbb{J} for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$. We say $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ is **syntactically well-arranged** if:*

- $\mathbb{J}_0^* = \mathbb{J}^f$;
- for every $k < L$, $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}_k^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$;
- for every $k < L$, \mathbb{J}_{k+1}^* is a syntactical expansion of \mathbb{J}_k^* ;
- $\vdash \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_j \wedge \psi_j)$.

Lemma 10 (Upward derivability for CConStR_{AB}). *Let $\gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$ be a standard formula.*

Assume one of the following conditions holds:

(a) $\vdash \gamma$;

(b) *there is a syntactically well-arranged sequence of subsets of \mathbb{J} .*

Then $\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$.

Proof.

Suppose (a). By the rule R_1 , $\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_i \rangle_c(\phi_i; \langle B_i \rangle \psi_i)$.

Suppose (b). Let $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ be a syntactically well-arranged sequence for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$. Then:

- $\mathbb{J}_0^* = \mathbb{J}^f$;
- for every $k < L$, $\mathbb{J}^f \subseteq \mathbb{J}_k^* \subseteq \mathbb{J}^{fs}$;
- for every $k < L$, there is $j_{k+1} \in \mathbb{J} - \mathbb{J}_k^*$ such that $\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_k^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}) \vee \phi_{j_{k+1}}$ and $\mathbb{J}_{k+1}^* = \mathbb{J}_k^* \cup \{j_{k+1}\}$;
- $\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*})$.

Assume $L = 0$.

(1) Since $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ is a syntactically well-arranged sequence:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*})$$

(2) By application of the rule R_2 :

$$\vdash \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c \left(\bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}); \langle \emptyset \rangle \top \right)$$

(3) By repeated applications of the rule R_3 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)$$

(4) Note $A_{j^*} = \mathbf{AG}$ for all $j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*$. Then:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle A_{j^*} \rangle_c (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)$$

(5) By repeated applications of the rule R_4 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle A_{j^*} \rangle_c (\phi_{j^*}; \langle B_{j^*} \rangle \psi_{j^*})$$

(6) By application of the rule R_1 :

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c (\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

Assume $L > 0$.

We claim that for every $k < L$:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_k^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_k^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

We put an induction on k *reversely*.

Assume $k = L - 1$.

(1) Since $(\mathbb{J}_k^*)_{0 \leq k \leq L}$ is a syntactically well-arranged sequence:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*})$$

(2) Note $\mathbb{J}_L^* = \mathbb{J}_{L-1}^* \cup \{j_L\}$. By application of the rule \mathbf{R}_2 :

$$\vdash \langle \mathbf{A}_{j_L} \rangle_c \left(\bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_L^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}); \langle \emptyset \rangle \top \right)$$

(3) Then:

$$\vdash \langle \mathbf{A}_{j_L} \rangle_c \left(\bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{L-1}^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}) \vee (\phi_{j_L} \wedge \psi_{j_L}); \langle \emptyset \rangle \top \right)$$

(4) By repeated applications of the rule \mathbf{R}_3 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{L-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle \mathbf{A}_{j_L} \rangle_c(\phi_{j_L} \wedge \psi_{j_L}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)$$

(5) By application of the rule \mathbf{R}_4 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{L-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle \mathbf{A}_{j_L} \rangle_c(\phi_{j_L}; \langle \mathbf{B}_{j_L} \rangle \psi_{j_L})$$

Assume $k = m - 1$ for some m such that $1 \leq m < L$.

(1) By the inductive hypothesis:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_m^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_m^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

(2) Note $\mathbb{J}_m^* = \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^* \cup \{j_m\}$. Then:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}) \vee \phi_{j_m}$$

(3) By application of the rule \mathbf{R}_2 :

$$\vdash \langle \emptyset \rangle_c \left(\bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} (\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}) \vee \phi_{j_m}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top \right)$$

(4) By repeated applications of the rule R_3 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle \emptyset \rangle_c(\phi_{j_m}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)$$

(5) By application of the rule R_1 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle \emptyset \rangle_c(\phi_{j_m}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L - \mathbb{J}_m^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

(6) From (1):

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash & \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j_m} \wedge \psi_{j_m}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \\ & \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_m^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j) \end{aligned}$$

(7) From (5) and (6), by application of the rule R_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash & \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee (\langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j_m} \wedge \psi_{j_m}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \wedge \langle \emptyset \rangle_c(\phi_{j_m}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top)) \vee \\ & \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_m^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j) \end{aligned}$$

(8) Note $A_{j_m} \cup B_{j_m} = \mathbf{AG}$. By application of the rule R_5 :

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash & \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \langle \mathbf{A}_{j_m} \rangle_c(\phi_{j_m}; \langle \mathbf{B}_{j_m} \rangle \psi_{j_m}) \vee \\ & \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_m^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j) \end{aligned}$$

(9) Note $j_m \notin \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*$ and $\mathbb{J}_m^* = \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^* \cup \{j_m\}$. It can be verified $\mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^* = (\mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_m^*) \cup \{j_m\}$. Then:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_{m-1}^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

Therefore, for every $k < L$:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_k^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_k^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

Specially:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}; \langle \emptyset \rangle \top) \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_L^* - \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle \mathbf{A}_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle \mathbf{B}_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

Note $A_{j^*} = \mathbf{AG}$ for all $j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*$. Then:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle A_{j^*} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*} \wedge \psi_{j^*}); \langle \emptyset \rangle \top \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_1^* - \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

By repeated applications of the rule R_4 :

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle A_{j^*} \rangle_c(\phi_{j^*}; \langle B_{j^*} \rangle \psi_{j^*}) \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}_1^* - \mathbb{J}_0^*} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

That is:

$$\vdash \bigvee_{j^* \in \mathbb{J}_1^*} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

By application of the rule R_1 :

$$\vdash \gamma \vee \bigvee_{j \in \mathbb{J}} \langle A_j \rangle_c(\phi_j; \langle B_j \rangle \psi_j)$$

□

Theorem 9 (Completeness of $\mathbf{CConStR}_{AB}$). *The axiomatic system for $\mathbf{CConStR}_{AB}$ given in Definition 20 is complete with respect to the set of valid formulas in $\Phi_{\mathbf{CConStR}_{AB}}$.*

The proof for this result is similar to the proof for Theorem 3, and we skip it.

6 Concluding remarks

Previously, by the same approach, we showed completeness of the liability and ability fragments of Logic of Cooperating Conditional Strategic Reasoning $\mathbf{CConStR}$. The key ingredients of the approach include standard formulas, abstract game form, grafted pointed models from abstract game forms, downward validity lemma, and upward validity lemma. We think that the approach is general and, after some adaptation, it can be applied to show the completeness of Logic of Local Conditional Strategic Reasoning \mathbf{ConStR} and other logics in the family of Coalition Logic.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Valentin Goranko for his kind and great help with this project. Thanks also go to the audience of a seminar and a workshop at Beijing Normal University. This research was supported by the National Social Science Foundation of China (No. 19BZX137).

References

- [AHK02] Rajeev Alur, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Orna Kupferman. Alternating-time temporal logic. *J. ACM*, 49(5):672–713, 2002.

- [BGV15] Johan van Benthem, Sujata Ghosh, and Rineke Verbrugge. *Models of Strategic Reasoning - Logics, Games, and Communities*, volume 8972 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2015.
- [EG22] Sebastian Enqvist and Valentin Goranko. The temporal logic of coalitional goal assignments in concurrent multiplayer games. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 23(4), 2022.
- [GD06] Valentin Goranko and Govert van Drimmelen. Complete axiomatization and decidability of alternating-time temporal logic. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 353:93–117, 2006.
- [GE18] Valentin Goranko and Sebastian Enqvist. Socially friendly and group protecting coalition logics. In *Proceedings of AAMAS 2018*, pages 372–380, 2018.
- [GJ19] Valentin Goranko and Fengkui Ju. Towards a logic for conditional local strategic reasoning. In Patrick Blackburn, Emiliano Lorini, and Meiyun Guo, editors, *Logic, Rationality, and Interaction - 7th International Workshop, LORI 2019, Chongqing, China, October 18-21, 2019, Proceedings*, volume 11813 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 112–125. Springer, 2019.
- [GJ22] Valentin Goranko and Fengkui Ju. A logic for conditional local strategic reasoning. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 31(2):167–188, 2022.
- [HW04] Wiebe van der Hoek and Michael Wooldridge. Cooperation, knowledge, and time: Alternating-time temporal epistemic logic and its applications. *Studia Logica*, 75(1):125–157, 2004.
- [MMPV14] Fabio Mogavero, Aniello Murano, Giuseppe Perelli, and Moshe Y. Vardi. Reasoning about strategies: On the model-checking problem. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 15(4):34:1–34:47, 2014.
- [MMPV17] Fabio Mogavero, Aniello Murano, Giuseppe Perelli, and Moshe Y. Vardi. Reasoning about strategies: On the satisfiability problem. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 13(1), 2017.
- [NY21] Pavel Naumov and Yuan Yuan. Intelligence in strategic games. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 71:521–556, 2021.
- [Pau01] Marc Pauly. Logic for social software, 2001. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- [Pau02] Marc Pauly. A modal logic for coalitional power in games. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 12(1):149–166, 2002.
- [rGJW15] Thomas Ågotnes, Valentin Goranko, Wojciech Jamroga, and Michael Wooldridge. Knowledge and ability. In Hans van Ditmarsch, Joseph Halpern, Wiebe van der Hoek, and Barteld Kooi, editors, *Handbook of Epistemic Logic*, pages 543–589. College Publications, 2015.