

# Depth-Bounded Epistemic Planning (Preprint)

Thomas Bolander<sup>1</sup>, Alessandro Burigana<sup>2</sup>, Marco Montali<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

<sup>2</sup>Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy

tobo@dtu.dk, {burigana, montali}@inf.unibz.it

## Abstract

In this paper, we propose a novel algorithm for epistemic planning based on dynamic epistemic logic (DEL). The novelty is that we limit the depth of reasoning of the planning agent to an upper bound  $b$ , meaning that the planning agent can only reason about higher-order knowledge to at most (modal) depth  $b$ . The algorithm makes use of a novel type of canonical  $b$ -bisimulation contraction guaranteeing unique minimal models with respect to  $b$ -bisimulation. We show our depth-bounded planning algorithm to be sound. Additionally, we show it to be complete with respect to planning tasks having a solution within bound  $b$  of reasoning depth (and hence the iterative bound-deepening variant is complete in the standard sense). For bound  $b$  of reasoning depth, the algorithm is shown to be  $(b + 1)$ -EXPTIME complete, and furthermore fixed-parameter tractable in the number of agents and atoms. We present both a tree search and a graph search variant of the algorithm, and we benchmark an implementation of the tree search version against a baseline epistemic planner.

## 1 Introduction

*Automated planning* is of central concern in symbolic AI research, with applications in *i.e.*, logistics and robotics. In the simple case of an agent operating in a known world using deterministic actions, the output of a planner is just a sequence of actions to be performed to the effect that it achieves a desired goal state. *Epistemic planning* is the enrichment of planning with epistemic notions, in particular knowledge and belief, including higher-order knowledge, *i.e.*, knowledge about what other agents know, knowledge about what someone knows about someone else, etc. In general, epistemic planning considers the following problem: given a current state of knowledge of the agents, and a desirable state of knowledge, how do one get from one to the other?

One possible framework for epistemic planning is dynamic epistemic logic (DEL) (Baltag, Moss, and Solecki 1998). Using DEL for epistemic planning was first pursued by Bolander and Andersen (2011), but independently conceived by several other researchers (Löwe, Pacuit, and Witzel 2011; Pardo and Sadrzadeh 2012; Aucher 2012). Recently, a special issue of the journal Artificial Intelligence (AIJ) was devoted to epistemic planning (Belle et al. 2022).

Unrestricted epistemic planning based on DEL is undecidable, meaning that its plan existence problem is unde-

cidable (Bolander and Andersen 2011). Several more well-behaved fragments of epistemic planning exist, where one of the possible approaches is to restrict the modal depth of the pre- and postconditions of epistemic actions (Bolander et al. 2020). However, a maybe even more natural approach to taming the complexity of epistemic planning is to limit the reasoning depth of the planning agent, *i.e.*, limit the depth of higher-order reasoning that the agent can perform. This is however not completely trivial to define in DEL-based epistemic planning as states are represented semantically as Kripke models. In this paper, we show how to use a novel type of bounded bisimulation contractions to define a notion of depth-bounded epistemic planning. We provide an algorithm for computing depth-bounded epistemic plans, show soundness, completeness and complexity results for it, and provide an empirical evaluation of the algorithm.

## 2 Preliminaries

We now recall the main notions in Dynamic Epistemic Logic. For a more complete overview, consult van Ditmarsch, van der Hoek, and Kooi (2007). Following the DEL methodology, we split our exposition in three parts covering *epistemic models*, *event models* and *product update*. Finally, we recall the definition of the plan existence problem.

**Epistemic Models** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a countable set of atomic propositions and  $\mathcal{AG}$  a countable set of agents. The language  $\mathcal{L}$  of *multi-agent epistemic logic* is defined by the BNF:

$$\varphi ::= p \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \Box_i\varphi$$

where  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $i \in \mathcal{AG}$ . Formulae of the form  $\Box_i\varphi$  are read as “agent  $i$  knows/believes that  $\varphi$ ”. We define the symbols  $\top$ ,  $\perp$ ,  $\vee$ ,  $\rightarrow$  and  $\Diamond_i$  as usual. *Modal depth* is defined inductively on the structure of formulae of  $\mathcal{L}$ :  $md(p) = 0$  (for  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ),  $md(\neg\varphi) = md(\varphi)$ ,  $md(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) = \max\{md(\varphi_1), md(\varphi_2)\}$  and  $md(\Box_i\varphi) = 1 + md(\varphi)$ .

**Definition 1** (Epistemic Model and State). *An (epistemic) model of  $\mathcal{L}$  is a triple  $M = (W, R, L)$  where:*

- $W \neq \emptyset$  is a finite set of (possible) worlds;
- $R : \mathcal{AG}' \rightarrow 2^{W \times W}$  assigns an accessibility relation  $R_i$  to each agent  $i$  in a finite subset  $\mathcal{AG}' \subseteq \mathcal{AG}$ ;
- $L : W \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{P}}$  assigns to each world  $w$  a label  $L(w)$ , being a finite set of atoms.




Figure 1: Epistemic state of Example 1. Bullets represent worlds, labelled by their name and the atoms they satisfy. The circled bullet is the designated world. Edges denote the accessibility relations.

An (epistemic) state of  $\mathcal{L}$  is a pair  $(M, w_d)$ , where  $w_d \in W$  is the designated world.

Intuitively, the designated world  $w_d$  is considered to be the actual world from the perspective of an omniscient observer. We also use the infix notation  $wR_i v$  to denote  $(w, v) \in R_i$ . For any  $X, Y \subseteq W$ ,  $XR_i Y$  denotes the fact that  $\exists x \in X \exists y \in Y (xR_i y)$ . Moreover,  $R_i(x) = \{y \in W \mid xR_i y\}$  and  $R_i(X) = \{y \in W \mid \exists x \in X (xR_i y)\}$ .

**Definition 2.** Let  $M = (W, R, L)$  be a model and  $w \in W$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
(M, w) \models p & \quad \text{iff} \quad p \in L(w) \\
(M, w) \models \neg \varphi & \quad \text{iff} \quad (M, w) \not\models \varphi \\
(M, w) \models \varphi \wedge \psi & \quad \text{iff} \quad (M, w) \models \varphi \text{ and } (M, w) \models \psi \\
(M, w) \models \Box_i \varphi & \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{for all } v, \text{ if } wR_i v \text{ then } (M, v) \models \varphi
\end{aligned}$$

For instance,  $(M, w) \models p$  means that  $p$  is true in  $w$ ;  $(M, w) \models \Diamond_i p$  means that agent  $i$  considers  $\varphi$  to be possible in  $w$ ;  $(M, w) \models \Box_i \varphi$  means that  $i$  knows/believes  $\varphi$  in  $w$ , as  $\varphi$  holds in all worlds that  $i$  considers possible.

**Example 1 (Epistemic State).** In the Consecutive Number Puzzle (van Ditmarsch and Kooi 2015), two agents, Anne ( $a$ ) and Bob ( $b$ ), are given two consecutive numbers  $n_a, n_b$  between 0 and  $N$ . Both agents know that this happens, but they only get to see their own number. We denote with  $has(i, n)$  the fact that agent  $i$  has number  $n$ . Figure 1 shows an epistemic state representing the case for  $N = 5$  where agents  $a$  and  $b$  are given numbers 3 and 4, respectively. Note that both agents know their number, agent  $b$  doesn't know whether agent  $a$  has number 3 or 5 and, similarly,  $a$  doesn't know whether  $b$  has 2 or 4. Moreover, in world  $w_2$ ,  $b$  doesn't know whether  $a$  has 1 or 3, and so on until world  $w_4$ .

We say that two epistemic states  $s$  and  $s'$  agree on (the formulas of) a set  $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  if, for all  $\phi \in \Phi$ ,  $s \models \phi$  iff  $s' \models \phi$ . We recall below the notions of bisimulation and bounded bisimulation ( $b$ -bisimulations) (Blackburn, Rijke, and Venema 2001; Goranko and Otto 2007).

**Definition 3 (Bisimulation).** Let  $s = (M, w_d)$  and  $s' = (M', w'_d)$  be two epistemic states, with  $M = (W, R, L)$  and  $M' = (W', R', L')$ . A bisimulation between  $s$  and  $s'$  is a non-empty binary relation  $Z \subseteq W \times W'$  with  $(w_d, w'_d) \in Z$  and satisfying:

- [atom] If  $(w, w') \in Z$ , then  $L(w) = L(w')$ .
- [forth] If  $(w, w') \in Z$  and  $wR_i v$ , then there exists  $v' \in W'$  such that  $w'R'_i v'$  and  $(v, v') \in Z$ .
- [back] If  $(w, w') \in Z$  and  $w'R'_i v'$ , then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $wR_i v$  and  $(v, v') \in Z$ .

If a bisimulation between  $s$  and  $s'$  exists, we say that  $s$  and  $s'$  are bisimilar, denoted  $s \simeq s'$ . When  $(M, w) \simeq (M, w')$  for

some worlds  $w, w'$  of the same model  $M$ , we simply write  $w \simeq w'$ , and say that  $w$  and  $w'$  are bisimilar. We denote the bisimulation (equivalence) class of a world  $w \in W$  as  $[w]_{\simeq} = \{v \in W \mid w \simeq v\}$ .

**Proposition 1** (Blackburn, Rijke, and Venema 2001). Two pointed models are bisimilar iff they agree on  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**Definition 4.** Let  $b \geq 0$  and let  $s = (M, w_d)$  and  $s' = (M', w'_d)$  be two epistemic states, with  $M = (W, R, L)$  and  $M' = (W', R', L')$ . A  $b$ -bisimulation between  $s$  and  $s'$  is a sequence of non-empty binary relations  $Z_k \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_0 \subseteq W \times W'$  with  $(w_d, w'_d) \in Z_k$  and satisfying, for all  $h < b$ :

- [atom] If  $(w, w') \in Z_0$ , then  $L(w) = L(w')$ .
- [forth $_h$ ] If  $(w, w') \in Z_{h+1}$  and  $wR_i v$ , then there exists  $v' \in W'$  such that  $w'R'_i v'$  and  $(v, v') \in Z_h$ .
- [back $_h$ ] If  $(w, w') \in Z_{h+1}$  and  $w'R'_i v'$ , then there exists  $v \in W$  such that  $wR_i v$  and  $(v, v') \in Z_h$ .

If a  $b$ -bisimulation between  $s$  and  $s'$  exists, we say that  $s$  and  $s'$  are  $b$ -bisimilar, denoted  $s \simeq_b s'$ . When  $(M, w) \simeq_b (M, w')$  for some worlds  $w, w'$  of the same model  $M$ , we simply write  $w \simeq_b w'$ , and say that  $w$  and  $w'$  are  $b$ -bisimilar. We denote the  $b$ -bisimulation (equivalence) class of a world  $w \in W$  as  $[w]_b = \{v \in W \mid w \simeq_b v\}$ .

Note that a  $b$ -bisimulation between epistemic states is also an  $h$ -bisimulation for all  $h \leq b$ , and hence that  $b$ -bisimilar worlds are also  $h$ -bisimilar for all  $h \leq b$ .

**Proposition 2** (Blackburn, Rijke, and Venema 2001). Two epistemic states are  $b$ -bisimilar iff they agree on  $\{\phi \in \mathcal{L} \mid md(\phi) \leq b\}$ , i.e., on all of formulas up to modal depth  $b$ .

**Definition 5.** Let  $(M, w_d)$  be an epistemic state. The depth  $d(w)$  of a world  $w$  is the length of the shortest path from  $w_d$  to  $w$  ( $\infty$  if no such path exists). Given  $d \geq 0$ , the restriction  $M \upharpoonright d$  of  $M$  to  $d$  is the sub-model containing all worlds with depth at most  $d$  (and preserving all edges between them).

**Event Models** Event models represent information and ontic change in DEL. We use them to represent actions that agents can perform, where the individual events represent different perspectives on the action. To each event is associated a *precondition*, which specifies when such event may occur, and *postconditions*, which determine how the event changes the information of an epistemic state.

**Definition 6 (Event Model and Action).** An event model of  $\mathcal{L}$  is a tuple  $A = (E, Q, pre, post)$  where:

- $E \neq \emptyset$  is a finite set of events;
- $Q : \mathcal{AG}' \rightarrow 2^{E \times E}$  assigns an accessibility relation  $Q_i$  to each agent  $i$  in a finite subset  $\mathcal{AG}' \subseteq \mathcal{AG}$ ;
- $pre : E \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  assigns to each event a precondition;
- $post : E \rightarrow (\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{L})$  assigns to each event  $e$  a postcondition map  $post(e) : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  with  $post(e)(p) = p$  on a cofinite subset of  $\mathcal{P}$ .<sup>1</sup>

An action of  $\mathcal{L}$  is a pair  $(A, e_d)$  where  $e_d \in E$  is the designated event.

<sup>1</sup>We can identify postcondition maps  $post(e)$  with their induced finite sets  $\{(p, \phi) \mid post(e)(p) = \phi \text{ and } \phi \neq p\}$ .




Figure 2: Action  $ann(\varphi)$  of Example 2 with  $\mathcal{AG}' = \{a, b\}$ . An event  $e$  is denoted by a square labeled by  $\langle pre(e), post(e) \rangle$ . The designated event is denoted by a boxed square.




Figure 3: State  $s \otimes ann(\neg\psi_b)$ , where  $s$  is the state in Figure 1.

Similarly to epistemic states, the designated event  $e_d$  represents the actual event taking place. We also use infix notation  $eQ_i f$  for  $(e, f) \in Q_i$ . The maximal modal depth among the pre- and postconditions in an action  $\alpha$  is denoted  $md(\alpha)$ .

**Example 2 (Action).** *The public announcement  $ann(\varphi)$  of a formula  $\varphi$  is the action shown in Figure 2. Consider again Example 1. Letting  $\psi_{i,j} = \bigvee_{0 \leq k \leq N} \square_i has(j, k)$ , the action  $ann(\neg\psi_{b,a})$  is the public announcement of the fact that “Bob doesn’t know the number of Anne”.*

**Product Update** The *product update* formalizes the execution of an action  $(A, e_d)$  on a given state  $(M, w_d)$ . Intuitively, the resulting epistemic state  $(M', w'_d)$  is computed by a cross product between the worlds in  $M$  and the events in  $A$ . A pair  $(w, e)$  represents the world of  $M'$  that results from applying the event  $e$  on the world  $w$ . We say that  $(A, e_d)$  is *applicable* in  $(M, w_d)$  iff  $(M, w_d) \models pre(e_d)$ .

**Definition 7 (Product Update).** *Let  $(A, e_d)$  be an action applicable in an epistemic state  $(M, w_d)$ , where  $M = (W, R, L)$  and  $A = (E, Q, pre, post)$ . The product update of  $(M, w_d)$  with  $(A, e_d)$  is the epistemic state  $(M, W_d) \otimes (A, e_d) = ((W', R', L'), (w_d, e_d))$ , where:*

$$W' = \{(w, e) \in W \times E \mid (M, w) \models pre(e)\}$$

$$R'_i = \{((w, e), (v, f)) \in W' \times W' \mid wR_i v \text{ and } eQ_i f\}$$

$$L'((w, e)) = \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid (M, w) \models post(e)(p)\}$$

**Example 3 (Update).** *Let  $s$  be the state shown in Figure 1 and consider the action  $ann(\neg\psi_{b,a})$  of Example 2. The epistemic state  $s \otimes ann(\neg\psi_{b,a})$  is shown in Figure 3. Note that the only world of  $s$  where  $\neg\psi_{b,a}$  does not hold is  $w_4$ , since in this world Bob knows that Anne has number 1. Thus, after the update, all worlds are preserved but  $w_4$ .*

**Proposition 3** (van Ditmarsch, van der Hoek, and Kooi 2007). *Let  $s \simeq s'$  and let  $\alpha$  be an action applicable in both  $s$  and  $s'$ . Then,  $s \otimes \alpha \simeq s' \otimes \alpha$ .*

This result was later generalized by Bolander and Lequen and it will play a central role in the rest of the paper.

**Proposition 4** (Bolander and Lequen 2022). *Let  $s \simeq_b s'$  and let  $\alpha$  be an action applicable in both  $s$  and  $s'$  with  $md(\alpha) \leq b$ . Then,  $s \otimes \alpha \simeq_{b-md(\alpha)} s' \otimes \alpha$ .*




Figure 4: Standard  $(\lfloor s \rfloor_b)$  and rooted  $(\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^<)$   $b$ -contractions of chain  $s$  (symbol  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^<$  is borrowed from Definition 14). As we consider only one agent, we omit arrows labels.

**Epistemic Planning** We recall the notions of epistemic planning task and solution (Aucher and Bolander 2013).

**Definition 8.** *An (epistemic) planning task is a triple  $T = (s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g)$ , where  $s_0$  is an epistemic state (the initial state);  $\mathcal{A}$  is a finite set of actions;  $\varphi_g \in \mathcal{L}$  is the goal formula.*

**Definition 9.** *A solution (or plan) to a planning task  $(s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g)$  is a finite sequence  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$  of actions of  $\mathcal{A}$  where:*

1. For all  $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ ,  $\alpha_k$  is applicable in  $s_0 \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ ;
2.  $s_0 \otimes \alpha_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_\ell \models \varphi_g$ .

### 3 Rooted $b$ -Contractions

A significant challenge for epistemic planners is to handle the rapid growth of the size of states following updates. Typically, planners make use of bisimulation contractions to obtain smaller (modally equivalent) states after each update (Yu, Wen, and Liu 2013; Fabiano et al. 2020; Bolander, Dissing, and Herrmann 2021a). In this paper, we seek to model agents with a bound on their reasoning depth (a bound on the model depth of formulas they can reason about). Instead of considering standard bisimulation contractions, we hence make use of  $b$ -bisimulation contractions (defined formally below). That is, after an update, we take the  $b$ -contraction of the resulting state, thereby obtaining a minimal state satisfying the same formulas up to modal depth  $b$ . A notion of  $b$ -contraction has already been used in epistemic planning (Yu, Wen, and Liu 2013; Bolander and Lequen 2023). There the  $b$ -contraction of an epistemic state  $s = ((W, R, L), w_d)$ , denoted  $\lfloor s \rfloor_b$ , is defined as the quotient structure of  $s$  wrt.  $\simeq_b$ , namely  $\lfloor s \rfloor_b = ((W', R', L'), [w_d]_b)$ , where  $W' = \{[w]_b \mid w \in W\}$ ,  $R'_i = \{([w]_b, [v]_b) \mid wR_i v\}$ , and  $L'([w]_b) = L(w)$ . We call this the *standard  $b$ -contraction* of  $s$ . However, unfortunately  $\lfloor s \rfloor_b$  is not always minimal among the states  $b$ -bisimilar to  $s$ , as the following example shows.

**Example 4** (Bolander and Burigana 2024). *Consider the chain model  $s$  in Figure 4 (left). Since  $p$  is true in all worlds, and the length of the chain is  $b$ , a minimal model  $b$ -bisimilar to  $s$  is a singleton epistemic state with a loop (Figure 4, right). This is because the loop model preserves all formulas up to depth  $b$ , cf. Proposition 2. However, the standard  $b$ -contraction of  $s$  is simply  $s$  itself, as no two worlds of  $s$  satisfy the same formulas up to depth  $b$ .*

Recently, Bolander and Burigana (2024) developed a novel type of  $b$ -contraction, called *rooted  $b$ -contraction* that actually guarantees contracted states to be minimal. We here repeat the definition and minimality result, but refer the reader to the aforementioned paper for further details. In the rest of this section, we will suppose given a constant  $b \geq 0$  and an epistemic state  $s = (M, w_d)$ , with  $M = (W, R, L)$ .

**Definition 10.** The bound of a world  $w \in W$  is  $b(w) = b - d(w)$ , where  $d(w)$  is the depth of  $w$  (Definition 5).

**Lemma 1** (Blackburn, Rijke, and Venema 2001). For every world  $w$  of  $M \upharpoonright b$ , we have  $(M \upharpoonright b, w) \simeq_{b(w)} (M, w)$ .

Intuitively, Lemma 1 states that, given a formula  $\varphi$  of modal depth up to  $b$ , the restriction of  $M$  to  $b$  contains all the worlds that are necessary to determine whether  $\varphi$  is true in  $(M, w_d)$  (since  $b(w_d) = b$ , and therefore  $(M \upharpoonright b, w_d) \simeq_b (M, w_d)$ ), which means that  $(M \upharpoonright b, w_d)$  and  $(M, w_d)$  satisfy the same formulas up to modal depth  $b$ . Note that if there are two worlds  $x, y$  such that  $b(x) \geq b(y)$  and  $x \simeq_{b(y)} y$ , then by Lemma 1 we get  $(M \upharpoonright b, x) \simeq_{b(y)} (M \upharpoonright b, y)$ , namely, the restriction of  $M$  to  $b$  is sufficient to determine the truth of formulas up to modal depth  $b(y)$  in both  $x$  and  $y$ . Moreover, since  $b(x) \geq b(y)$ , in general  $x$  and  $y$  might not be  $b(x)$ -bisimilar, which implies  $(M \upharpoonright b, x) \not\simeq_{b(x)} (M \upharpoonright b, y)$ . Thus, the truth of formulas at  $y$  up to modal depth  $b(y)$  can always be determined in the sub-model of depth  $b(x)$  rooted in  $x$ , however, the truth of formulas at  $x$  up to modal depth  $b(x)$  can not always be checked in the sub-model of depth  $b(y)$  rooted in  $y$ . This leads to the next definition.

**Definition 11** (Bolander and Burigana 2024). Let  $x, y$  be worlds of  $M$  with  $b(x) \geq 0$  and  $b(y) \geq 0$ . We say that  $x$  represents  $y$ , denoted  $x \succeq y$ , if  $b(x) \geq b(y)$  and  $x \simeq_{b(y)} y$ . If furthermore  $b(x) > b(y)$ , we say that  $x$  strictly represents  $y$ , denoted by  $x \succ y$ . The set of maximal representatives of  $W$  is the set of worlds  $W^{\max} = \{x \in W \mid b(x) \geq 0 \text{ and } \neg \exists y \in W (y \succ x)\}$ . We say that a world  $x$  is a maximal representative of  $y$  if  $x \in W^{\max}$  and  $x \succeq y$ .

Note that every world  $w$  with  $b(w) \geq 0$  has at least one maximal representative: Any chain  $w \prec w' \prec w'' \prec \dots$  is finite (since  $W$  is finite) and must hence end in a maximal representative of  $w$ . Rooted  $b$ -contractions are built on the maximal representatives, the intuition being that all other worlds can be represented by one of these and hence deleted.

**Definition 12.** The representative class of  $w \in W$  is the class  $\llbracket w \rrbracket_{b(w)}$ , which we compactly denote as  $\llbracket w \rrbracket$ .

**Definition 13.** Let  $<$  be a total order on  $W$  and let  $0 \leq h \leq b$ . The least  $h$ -representative of  $w \in W$  is the world  $\min_h(w) = \min\{v \in W^{\max} \mid v \simeq_h w\}$ .

**Definition 14** (Bolander and Burigana 2024). Let  $<$  be a total order on  $W$ . The rooted  $b$ -contraction of  $s$  wrt.  $<$  is the state  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^< = ((W', R', L'), \llbracket w_d \rrbracket)$ , where:

- $W' = \{\llbracket x \rrbracket \mid x \in W^{\max}\}$ ;
- $R'_i = \{(\llbracket x \rrbracket, \llbracket \min_{b(x)-1}(y) \rrbracket) \mid x \in W^{\max}, xR_i y \text{ and } b(x) > 0\}$ ;
- $L'(\llbracket x \rrbracket) = L(x)$ , for all  $\llbracket x \rrbracket \in W'$ .

**Theorem 1** (Bolander and Burigana 2024). Let  $s$  be an epistemic state and let  $b \geq 0$ . Then,  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^<$  is a minimal epistemic state  $b$ -bisimilar to  $s$ .

## 4 Canonical $b$ -Contractions

We now present an extension and improvement of the results of Bolander and Burigana (2024) that will be useful for our bounded-depth planning algorithm. To preserve

small epistemic states, planners typically take the bisimulation contraction of each computed state (Fabiano et al. 2020; Bolander, Dissing, and Herrmann 2021a), where the *bisimulation contraction* of  $s = ((W, R, L), w_d)$ , denoted  $\llbracket s \rrbracket$ , is defined as the quotient structure of  $s$  wrt.  $\simeq$ , namely  $\llbracket s \rrbracket = ((W', R', L'), \llbracket w_d \rrbracket)$ , where  $W' = \{\llbracket w \rrbracket \mid w \in W\}$ ,  $R'_i = \{(\llbracket w \rrbracket, \llbracket v \rrbracket) \mid wR_i v\}$ , and  $L'(\llbracket w \rrbracket) = L(w)$ . A very common and important operation during planning is checking whether a state has already previously been reached. When working with bisimulation contracted states, this amounts to checking whether the new state is bisimilar to a previously computed state. However, checking for bisimilarity after first having computed the bisimulation contraction of course incurs an extra cost, and Bolander, Dissing, and Herrmann (2021a) show how this can be avoided by devising a so-called *ordered partition refinement* technique for computing bisimulation contractions guaranteeing two bisimilar states to have *identical* bisimulation contractions. Using this technique, checking whether a computed (contracted) state already exists in the search tree amounts to check for identity of (contracted) states.<sup>2</sup> In the present work, we are only interested in preserving the truth of formulas up to modal depth  $b$ , and hence we want to compute the rooted  $b$ -contraction of each state instead of its standard bisimulation contraction. We then run into the same issue regarding the need to check whether two  $b$ -contracted states are  $b$ -bisimilar. In this section we will show how to define a notion of *canonical  $b$ -contractions* that guarantees two  $b$ -bisimilar states to have identical contractions.

**Example 5.** Let  $s$  be the pointed model in Figure 5 (left) with  $W = \{w_d, w_1, \dots, w_4\}$ , and let  $<$  be the following total order on  $W$ :  $w_d < w_1 < w_2 < w_3 < w_4$ . Let  $b = 3$ . Then  $b(w_d) = 3$ ,  $b(w_1) = b(w_2) = 2$ , and  $b(w_3) = b(w_4) = 1$ . Since no two worlds of  $W$  are 1-bisimilar, it follows that all worlds of  $W$  are maximal representatives, i.e.,  $W^{\max} = W$ . The rooted  $b$ -contraction of  $s$  is shown in Figure 5 (center). Since  $W^{\max} = W$ , for each world  $w \in W$ ,  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_3^<$  contains the world  $\llbracket w \rrbracket = \llbracket w \rrbracket_{b(w)}$ . The contraction only differs from the original model by the deletion of a single “unnecessary” edge. Now let  $t$  be an epistemic state equal to  $s$ , except that we rename  $w_1$  as  $w_2$  and, vice versa,  $w_2$  as  $w_1$ . Clearly  $s$  and  $t$  are isomorphic, but  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_3^<$  and  $\llbracket t \rrbracket_3^<$  are not! The rooted  $b$ -contraction of  $t$  is shown in Figure 5 (right). We still delete an unnecessary edge, but this time a different one (since it depends on the order  $<$ ). This shows that rooted  $b$ -contractions don’t ensure unique representatives of classes of  $b$ -bisimilar states.

We now provide a novel and revised definition of  $b$ -contractions, called *canonical  $b$ -contractions*, guaranteeing a unique representative of each class of  $b$ -bisimilar states. We first need unique identifiers for  $h$ -bisimilar worlds. We do this by introducing a notion of  *$h$ -signature*, inspired by Bolander, Dissing, and Herrmann (2021b).

**Definition 15.** Let  $h \geq 0$ . By mutual recursion we define the  $h$ -signature  $\sigma_h(w)$  of  $w$  and the relation  $\Sigma_h(w)$

<sup>2</sup>In Bolander, Dissing, and Herrmann (2021a), doing bisimulation contractions is not only for practical efficiency of the planner but also to guarantee uniformity of the generated policies.




Figure 5: Epistemic states  $s$  (left),  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_3^<$  (center) and  $\llbracket t \rrbracket_3^<$  (right).

between agents  $i$  and sets of  $(h-1)$ -signatures  $i$ -accessible from  $[w]_h$ :

$$\sigma_h(w) = (L(w), \Sigma_h(w))$$

$$\Sigma_h(w) = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } h = 0 \\ \{(i, \sigma_h(w, i)) \mid R_i([w]_h) \neq \emptyset\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\sigma_h(w, i) = \{\sigma_{h-1}(v) \mid [w]_h R_i [v]_{h-1}\}$$

The representative signature of  $w$  is the signature  $\sigma_{b(w)}(w)$ , which we compactly denote with  $\sigma(w)$ .

The  $h$ -signature of  $w$  describes both what atoms hold in  $w$  and which  $(h-1)$ -bisimulation classes are accessible from  $[w]_h$  by each agent  $i$ . More precisely,  $\sigma_{h-1}(v) \in \sigma_h(w, i)$  denotes that there exist  $w' \in [w]_h, v' \in [v]_{h-1}$  such that  $w' R_i v'$ . This allows to identify  $h$ -bisimilar worlds by the same  $h$ -signature, as we will formally show (Theorem 2).

**Lemma 2.** Let  $M = (W, R, L)$  and  $M' = (W', R', L')$  be two epistemic models, let  $h \geq 0$  and let  $x \in W, x' \in W'$  be s.t.  $\sigma_{h+1}(x) = \sigma_{h+1}(x')$ . Then  $\sigma_h(x) = \sigma_h(x')$ .

*Proof.* We show this by induction on  $h$ . If  $h = 0$  (base case), then  $\sigma_1(x) = \sigma_1(x')$  implies  $L(x) = L(x')$  and, thus,  $\sigma_0(x) = (L(x), \emptyset) = (L(x'), \emptyset) = \sigma_0(x')$ . If  $h > 0$ , assume by induction hypothesis (I.H.) that  $\sigma_h(y) = \sigma_h(y')$  implies  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) = \sigma_{h-1}(y')$ , for all  $y \in W, y' \in W'$ . If  $\sigma_{h+1}(x) = \sigma_{h+1}(x')$ , then  $L(x) = L(x')$  and for all  $y \in W$  s.t.  $[x]_{h+1} R_i [y]_h$  there exists  $y' \in W'$  s.t.  $[x']_{h+1} R'_i [y']_h$  and  $\sigma_h(y) = \sigma_h(y')$  (and vice versa). By I.H., we have  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) = \sigma_{h-1}(y')$ . Moreover, from  $[x]_{h+1} R_i [y]_h$  and  $[x']_{h+1} R'_i [y']_h$ , we get  $[x]_h R_i [y]_{h-1}$  and  $[x']_h R'_i [y']_{h-1}$ . We then have  $L(x) = L(x')$  and for all  $y \in W$  s.t.  $[x]_h R_i [y]_{h-1}$  there exists  $y' \in W'$  s.t.  $[x']_h R'_i [y']_{h-1}$  and  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) = \sigma_{h-1}(y')$  (and vice versa). Thus,  $\sigma_h(x) = \sigma_h(x')$ , as required.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** Let  $M = (W, R, L)$  and  $M' = (W', R', L')$  be two epistemic models, let  $x \in W, x' \in W'$  and let  $0 \leq h \leq b$ . Then,  $(M, x) \rightleftharpoons_h (M', x')$  iff  $\sigma_h(x) = \sigma_h(x')$ .

*Proof.*  $(\rightarrow)$  The proof is by induction on  $h$ . If  $h = 0$  (base case), then  $(M, x) \rightleftharpoons_0 (M', x')$  iff  $L(x) = L'(x')$  iff  $L(x) = L(x')$  iff  $\sigma_0(x) = (L(x), \emptyset) = (L(x'), \emptyset) = \sigma_0(x')$ . If  $h > 0$ , assume by induction hypothesis (I.H.) that  $(M, y) \rightleftharpoons_{h-1} (M', y')$  implies  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) = \sigma_{h-1}(y')$ , for all  $y \in W, y' \in W'$ . Let  $(M, x) \rightleftharpoons_h (M', x')$ . We need to prove that  $\sigma_h(x) = \sigma_h(x')$ . Since  $x$  and  $x'$  are  $h$ -bisimilar, they are also 0-bisimilar. By [atom] of Definition 4 we then have  $L(x) = L'(x')$ , and thus  $L(x) = L(x')$ . Only left to show is that  $\Sigma_h(x) = \Sigma_h(x')$ , i.e.,  $\sigma_h(x, i) = \sigma_h(x', i)$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{AG}$ . We only show  $\sigma_h(x, i) \subseteq \sigma_h(x', i)$ , the other

direction being symmetrical. So let  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) \in \sigma_h(x, i)$ . We then need to show  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) \in \sigma_h(x', i)$ . From  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) \in \sigma_h(x, i)$  we get  $[x]_h R_i [y]_{h-1}$ , i.e.,  $\bar{x} R_i \bar{y}$  for some  $\bar{x} \in [x]_h$  and  $\bar{y} \in [y]_{h-1}$ . From  $(M, x) \rightleftharpoons_h (M', x')$  and  $x \rightleftharpoons_h \bar{x}$ , we get  $(M, \bar{x}) \rightleftharpoons_h (M', x')$ . Since also  $\bar{x} R_i \bar{y}$ , there exists  $y' \in W'$  such that  $x' R'_i y'$  and  $(M, \bar{y}) \rightleftharpoons_{h-1} (M', y')$ . By I.H. and from  $y \rightleftharpoons_{h-1} \bar{y}$ , we get  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) = \sigma_{h-1}(\bar{y}) = \sigma_{h-1}(y')$ . Since  $x' R'_i y'$ , we have  $[x']_h R'_i [y']_{h-1}$ , and hence  $\sigma_{h-1}(y') \in \sigma_h(x', i)$ . As  $\sigma_{h-1}(y') = \sigma_{h-1}(y)$ , we then get  $\sigma_{h-1}(y) \in \sigma_h(x', i)$ , as required.

$(\leftarrow)$  Let  $\sigma_h(x) = \sigma_h(x')$ . For all  $g \leq h$ , let  $Z_g \subseteq W \times W'$  be defined by  $Z_g = \{(w, w') \in W \times W' \mid \sigma_g(w) = \sigma_g(w')\}$ . We need to show that  $Z_h, \dots, Z_0$  is an  $h$ -bisimulation between  $(M, x)$  and  $(M, x')$ . Clearly,  $(x, x') \in Z_h$ .  $Z_h \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_0$  follows from Lemma 2 and [atom] follows from the definition of 0-signatures. We only show [forth $_h$ ] ([back $_h$ ] being symmetric). Let  $g < h$ ,  $(w, w') \in Z_{g+1}$  and  $w R_i v$ . We need to find  $v' \in W'$  s.t.  $w' R'_i v'$  and  $(v, v') \in Z_g$ . From  $w R_i v$  we have  $[w]_{g+1} R_i [v]_g$  and hence  $\sigma_g(v) \in \sigma_{g+1}(w, i)$ . Since  $\sigma_{g+1}(w) = \sigma_{g+1}(w')$ , we also have  $\sigma_g(v) \in \sigma_{g+1}(w', i)$ . Thus, there is  $u' \in W'$  s.t.  $\sigma_g(u') = \sigma_g(v)$ , implying  $[w']_{g+1} R'_i [u']_g$  and hence there is  $w'' \in [w']_{g+1}$  and  $u'' \in [u']_g$  s.t.  $w'' R'_i u''$ . From  $w' \rightleftharpoons_{g+1} w''$  and  $w'' R'_i u''$  we get a  $v' \in W'$  s.t.  $w' R'_i v'$  and  $v' \rightleftharpoons_g u''$ . Since  $v' \rightleftharpoons_g u'' \rightleftharpoons_g u'$ , by  $(\rightarrow)$  we get  $\sigma_g(v') = \sigma_g(v)$  and hence  $(v, v') \in Z_g$ .  $\square$

Note that since the sets  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{AG}$  are countable, we can assume a fixed total order on them. This induces a fixed total order on signatures that we will denote  $\prec$ . From this, we define the notion *canonical  $h$ -signatures*.

**Definition 16.** Let  $s$  be an epistemic state and let  $0 \leq h \leq b$ . The canonical  $h$ -signature of a world  $w$  of  $s$  is the signature  $\sigma_h^*(w) = \min_{\prec} \{\sigma(v) \mid v \in W^{\max} \text{ and } \sigma_h(v) = \sigma_h(w)\}$ .

**Definition 17.** Let  $s = ((W, R, L), w_d)$  be an epistemic state and let  $b \geq 0$ . The canonical  $b$ -contraction of  $s$  is the epistemic state  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^* = ((W', R', L'), \sigma(w_d))$ , where:

- $W' = \{\sigma(x) \mid x \in W^{\max}\}$ ;
- $R'_i = \{(\sigma(x), \sigma_{b(x)-1}^*(y)) \mid x \in W^{\max}, x R_i y \text{ and } b(x) > 0\}$ ;
- $L'(\sigma(x)) = L(x)$ , for all  $\sigma(x) \in W'$ .

Note that the canonical  $b$ -contraction only differs from the rooted  $b$ -contraction by the naming of worlds ( $\sigma(x)$  instead of  $\llbracket x \rrbracket$ ) and by the choice of representative of the class of worlds  $(b(x) - 1)$ -bisimilar to  $y$  in the definition of  $R'_i$  ( $\sigma_{b(x)-1}^*(y)$  instead of  $\llbracket \min_{b(x)-1}(y) \rrbracket$ ). This means that the proof of Theorem 1 carries directly over to this setting:

**Theorem 3.** Let  $s$  be a state and  $b \geq 0$ . Then,  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^*$  is a minimal state  $b$ -bisimilar to  $s$ .

**Example 6.** Consider again the states  $s$  and  $t$  from Example 5. Before the issue was that whether the contraction of  $s$  would delete the edge  $(w_3, w_1)$  or the edge  $(w_3, w_2)$  depended on the naming of the worlds. Let us confirm that with signatures this is no longer the case. For the canonical 3-contraction, the edges  $(w_3, w_1)$  and  $(w_3, w_2)$  become the edge  $(\sigma(w_3), \sigma_0^*(w_1)) = (\sigma(w_3), \min_{<} \{\sigma(v) \mid v \in W \text{ and } \sigma_0(v) = \sigma_0(w_1)\}) = (\sigma(w_3), \min_{<} \{\sigma(v) \mid v \in W \text{ and } L(v) = L(w_1)\})$ . This shows that the end node of the edge only depends on the world labelling and the total order on worlds, not on the naming. So  $s$  and  $t$  will have the same canonical 3-contraction, and as shown by the next theorem, this uniqueness of representatives hold in general.

The next theorem captures the core property of canonical  $b$ -contractions (full proof in Supplementary Material).

**Theorem 4.** If  $s \Leftrightarrow_b t$ , then  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^* = \llbracket t \rrbracket_b^*$ .

*Proof.* (Sketch) We use Theorem 2 to show that the worlds of  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^*$  and  $\llbracket t \rrbracket_b^*$  are equal; Theorem 2 and Definition 16 to show that such worlds are linked by the same edges; and Lemma 2 to show that they have the same labels.  $\square$

## 5 Algorithms

**Bounded Partition Refinement** A well-known technique for computing the standard bisimulation contraction of an epistemic state  $s$  is the *partition refinement* algorithm (Paige and Tarjan 1987). As the original algorithm is described for unlabeled accessibility relations, we adapt its presentation to accommodate for labeled relations. Let  $s = (M, w_d)$  with  $M = (W, R, L)$  and agent set  $\mathcal{AG}'$ . A *partition*  $P$  of  $W$  is a set of non-empty and pairwise disjoint subsets of  $W$ . Elements of  $P$  are also called *blocks*. A block  $B$  is  *$i$ -stable* wrt. a second block  $S$  if either  $B \subseteq R_i(S)$  or  $B \cap R_i(S) = \emptyset$ . That is,  $B$  is  *$i$ -stable* wrt.  $S$  if either  $B$  contains all worlds accessible from  $S$  by agent  $i$ , or if no such world is in  $B$ .  $B$  is *stable* wrt.  $S$  if it is  $i$ -stable for all  $i \in \mathcal{AG}'$ . A partition  $P$  is *stable* wrt.  $S$  if all blocks of  $P$  are stable wrt.  $S$ .  $P$  is *stable* if it is stable wrt. to all of its blocks. Given  $i \in \mathcal{AG}'$ , a partition  $P$  and a set  $S \subseteq W$ , we let  $\text{SPLIT}(i, S, P)$  be the partition obtained by replacing each block  $B \in P$  such that  $B \cap R_i(S) \neq \emptyset$  by the two blocks  $B \cap R_i(S)$  and  $B \setminus R_i(S)$ .  $\text{SPLIT}(i, S, P)$  is also called the  *$i$ -refinement* of  $P$  (wrt.  $S$ ). Furthermore, we let  $\text{REFINE}(S, P)$  be the partition resulting from iteratively taking the  $i$ -refinement of  $P$  wrt.  $S$  for all agents  $i \in \mathcal{AG}'$ . If  $P \neq \text{REFINE}(S, P)$ , we call  $S$  a *splitter* of  $P$ . Note that  $P$  is not stable wrt.  $S$  iff  $S$  is a splitter of  $P$  and that, furthermore,  $\text{REFINE}(S, P)$  is stable wrt.  $S$ . The partition refinement algorithm,  $\text{PARTITIONREF}$ , takes as input parameter an epistemic state  $s = (W, R, L)$ . First, the algorithm builds an initial partition  $P$  of  $W$  that groups worlds with the same label. Then, until there exists a splitter  $S$  of  $P$ , it replaces  $P$  with  $\text{REFINE}(S, P)$ . In other words, at each step the algorithm refines  $P$  wrt. one of its splitters, until a stable partition is obtained. At the end of the partition refinement algorithm, the following holds.

---

### Algorithm 1 Bounded Partition Refinement

---

```

1: function BOUNDEDPARTITIONREF( $s = (W, R, L)$ ,  $b$ )
2:   Let  $h = 0$  and  $P_0$  be a partition of  $W$  wrt. labels
3:   while  $h < b$  and  $P_h$  is not stable do
4:     for all  $S$  in  $P_h$  do  $P_{h+1} \leftarrow \text{REFINE}(S, P_h)$ 
5:      $h \leftarrow h + 1$ 
6:   return  $[P_0, \dots, P_b]$ 

```

---

**Proposition 5** (Aceto, Ingólfssdóttir, and Srba 2012). Let  $P$  be the partition returned by  $\text{PARTITIONREF}(s)$ ,  $B \in P$  and  $x \in B$ . Then  $[x]_{\Leftrightarrow} = B$ .

As a result, from the output of the partition refinement algorithm, we can build the bisimulation contraction of  $s$ .

To compute rooted and canonical  $b$ -contractions, we instead do *bounded partition refinement*, shown in Algorithm 1. The inputs of the algorithm are an epistemic state  $s = (W, R, L)$  and an integer  $b \geq 0$  and the output is a vector  $[P_0, \dots, P_b]$  of partitions of  $W$ . As in the standard partition refinement, the algorithm starts from the partition  $P_0$  of  $W$  calculated wrt. labels (line 2). At each step  $0 \leq h < b$ , if  $P_h$  is not stable, for all blocks  $S \in P_h$ , the algorithm refines  $P_h$  wrt.  $S$  (line 4) using the  $\text{REFINE}$  operator described above. At each step  $h$  of the algorithm, the following invariant hold.

**Proposition 6.** Let  $P_h$  ( $0 \leq h \leq b$ ) be a partition computed by  $\text{BOUNDEDPARTITIONREF}(s, b)$ ,  $B \in P_h$  and  $x \in B$ . Then  $[x]_h = B$ .

This result is Proposition 7 in Bolander and Lequen (2022), except here adopted to the exact formulation of Algorithm 1. As a result, the output of  $\text{BOUNDEDPARTITIONREF}(s, b)$  is a vector  $[P_0, \dots, P_b]$  of partitions of  $W$  such that each  $P_h$  contains all the  $h$ -bisimulation classes of  $s$ . From this, we can compute the rooted and canonical  $b$ -contraction of  $s$  by following Definitions 14 and 17, respectively.

**Iterative Bound-Deepening Search** We now describe two variants of our iterative bound-deepening planning algorithm. We begin with the tree search variant,  $\text{ITERBOUND-TREESearch}$ , shown in Algorithm 2. A *node*  $n$  of the search tree is a triple  $(s, b, is\_bisim)$ , where  $s$  is the state of  $n$ ,  $b$  is the *depth bound* (or simply *bound*) of  $n$ , intended to denote the maximum modal depth of formulas we can safely evaluate in  $s$ , and  $is\_bisim$  is a boolean representing whether  $\llbracket s \rrbracket_b^* \Leftrightarrow s$  holds. We denote the elements  $s$ ,  $b$  and  $is\_bisim$  of a node  $n$  as  $n.state$ ,  $n.bound$  and  $n.is\_bisim$ , respectively. In general, a node  $n$  contains an  $(n.bound)$ -contracted state  $n.state$ . We can think of  $n.state$  as an approximation of a “real” state, where we are guaranteed that  $n.state$  is at least  $(n.bound)$ -bisimilar to the real state.

In the  $\text{ITERBOUND-TREESearch}$  algorithm, the integer  $b \geq 0$  denotes the global maximum modal depth of the formulas that we evaluate in each state of the search tree. In other words, we can see  $b$  as a bound on the reasoning-depth of the planning agent. In the first iteration of the algorithm, we let  $b = md(\varphi_g)$  (line 2), ensuring that agents

---

**Algorithm 2** Iterative Bound-Deepening Tree Search

---

```
1: function ITERBOUNDTREESEARCH( $(s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g)$ )
2:   for  $b \leftarrow md(\varphi_g)$  to  $\infty$  do
3:      $\pi \leftarrow$  BOUNDEDTREESEARCH( $(s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g), b$ )
4:     if  $\pi \neq fail$  then return  $\pi$ 

5: function BOUNDEDTREESEARCH( $(s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g), b$ )
6:    $frontier \leftarrow$  INITNODE( $s_0, b, true$ )
7:   while  $frontier \neq \langle \rangle$  do
8:      $n \leftarrow$  frontier.POP()
9:     if  $n.state \models \varphi_g$  then return plan to  $n.state$ 
10:    for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$  applicable in  $n.state$  do
11:      if  $md(\alpha) \leq n.bound$  then
12:         $n' \leftarrow$  CHILDNODE( $n, \alpha, md(\varphi_g)$ )
13:        if  $n' \neq fail$  then  $frontier.PUSH(n')$ 
14:  return fail

15: function INITNODE( $s, b, was\_bisim$ )
16:   $n.state \leftarrow \llbracket s \rrbracket_b^*$ 
17:   $n.bound \leftarrow b$ 
18:   $n.is\_bisim \leftarrow (n.state \Leftrightarrow s) \wedge was\_bisim$ 
19:  return  $n$ 

20: function CHILDNODE( $n, \alpha, d_g$ )
21:   $(s, b, is\_bisim) \leftarrow (n.state, n.bound, n.is\_bisim)$ 
22:  if  $is\_bisim$  then
23:    return INITNODE( $s \otimes \alpha, b, true$ )
24:  if  $b - md(\alpha) \geq d_g$  then
25:    return INITNODE( $s \otimes \alpha, b - md(\alpha), false$ )
26:  return fail
```

---

can effectively verify whether the goal formula is satisfied in any state. We then iteratively call the BOUNDEDTREESEARCH algorithm over increasing values of  $b$ , until a plan  $\pi$  is found (lines 2-4). This algorithm implements a Breadth-First Search (BFS) that starts from the initial node  $n_0 = (s_0, b, true)$  (line 6). We keep track of the nodes to be expanded in the *frontier* queue, initially only containing  $n_0$ . While *frontier* contains a node  $n$ , we extract it from the queue and check whether its state satisfies the goal formula. If it does, then we return the plan that lead to  $n.state$  (line 9). Otherwise, we process  $n$  by (attempting to) generate child nodes for all actions  $\alpha$  applicable in  $n.state$  satisfying  $md(\alpha) \leq n.bound$  (lines 10-12). The latter condition is necessary to ensure that we do not evaluate in  $n.state$  formulas with modal depth exceeding the bound of node  $n$ . The update operation is carried out by the CHILDNODE function described later. We push onto *frontier* all the updated nodes  $n' \neq fail$  and continue the search. If the frontier is empty and no plan has been found, we return *fail* and we proceed to the next iteration of ITERBOUNDTREESEARCH.

We now describe the CHILDNODE function (line 20). Let  $n = (s, b, is\_bisim)$  be a node, let  $\alpha$  be an action and let  $d_g$  be the modal depth of the goal formula. The CHILDNODE function returns either an updated node  $n'$ , generated by the INITNODE function, or *fail*. We will analyze CHILDNODE

in detail in our later soundness proof, so here we only provide the intuition. The intuition is that if  $n.is\_bisim$  is true, then  $s = n.state$  is a state that is bisimilar to the “real” state  $s'$  that it is approximating. In this case, Proposition 3 gives us that also  $s \otimes \alpha$  and  $s' \otimes \alpha$  are bisimilar, so the state  $n'.state$  of the generated child  $n'$  is also approximating the real child state,  $s' \otimes \alpha$ , up to bisimilarity (see lines (22-23)). If  $n.is\_bisim$  is false, we only know that  $s$  is  $b$ -bisimilar to the real state  $s'$ , where  $b = n.bound$ . Hence, from Proposition 4 we are only guaranteed that the state  $n'.state$  of the generated child is  $(b - md(\alpha))$ -bisimilar to the real child state  $s' \otimes \alpha$  (see lines (24-25)). If neither of these conditions hold, it means that  $s \otimes \alpha$  is not a sufficiently good approximation of the real child state  $s' \otimes \alpha$  to guarantee that we can correctly evaluate  $\varphi_g$  in it, and we return *fail*. This essentially amounts to a “pruning” or “blocking” technique, where we stop expanding the tree from nodes when the approximation becomes too bad to safely evaluate the goal formula.

All nodes  $n$  calculated at iteration  $b$  such that  $n.is\_bisim$  is true will be computed again in iteration  $b + 1$ . For this reason, in the implementation, we make sure to avoid this redundancy and only recompute nodes in iteration  $b + 1$  if their *is\\_bisim* value was false during iteration  $b$ .

Finally, we describe the graph search variant of our iterative bound-deepening search algorithm. As this variant is very similar to the tree search one, we do not report its pseudocode. The main difference is that in line 13 we also check that  $n'.state$  has not already been visited. We do so by keeping a set of *visited* states containing the canonical contractions of the states computed so far. By Theorem 4, to check whether  $n'.state$  has already been visited, it suffices to check whether  $\llbracket n'.state \rrbracket_{n'.bound}^* \in visited$ . The graph search variant of BOUNDEDTREESEARCH is called BOUNDEDGRAPHSEARCH.

## 6 Soundness, Completeness and Complexity

**Theorem 5** (Soundness). *Let  $T = (s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g)$  be a planning task and  $b \geq md(\varphi_g)$ . If the algorithm BOUNDEDTREESEARCH( $T, b$ ) returns a plan  $\pi$ , then  $\pi$  is a solution to  $T$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T = (s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g)$  and  $b_0 \geq 0$  be the inputs of the algorithm. We first prove that for any path

$$n_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} n_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\alpha_{k-1}} n_k \quad (1)$$

of the search tree, we have

1. If  $n_k.is\_bisim = true$ , then

$$n_k.state \Leftrightarrow s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \quad (2)$$

else

$$n_k.state \Leftrightarrow_{n_k.bound} s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \quad (3)$$

2.  $n_k.bound \geq b_0 - \sum_{i < k} md(\alpha_i)$  and  $n_k.bound \geq md(\varphi_g)$ .

This is by induction on  $k$ . In the base case  $k = 0$  we have  $n_0 = INITNODE(s_0, b_0, true) = (\llbracket s_0 \rrbracket_{b_0}^*, b_0, \sigma)$  where  $\sigma = true$  iff  $\llbracket s_0 \rrbracket_{b_0}^* \Leftrightarrow s_0$ . Thus,  $n_0.bound = b_0$  and  $n_0.state = \llbracket s_0 \rrbracket_{b_0}^* \Leftrightarrow_{b_0} s_0$ . This immediately proves (3), and if  $n.is\_bisim = \sigma = true$ , we furthermore get  $n_0.state = \llbracket s_0 \rrbracket_{b_0}^* \Leftrightarrow s_0$ , proving (2).

Since  $b_0 \geq md(\varphi_g)$  by assumption, we get  $n_0.\text{bound} = b_0 \geq md(\varphi_g)$ , proving 2. For the induction step, suppose the claim holds for  $k - 1$ . Extending the path to  $n_k$  we get  $n_k = \text{CHILDNODE}(n_{k-1}, \alpha_{k-1}, d_g)$ . Let  $(s, b, \text{is\_bisim}) = n_{k-1}$ . There are two cases to consider, depending on whether it was the condition in line 22 or line 24 that was satisfied in the (successful) call of  $\text{CHILDNODE}(n_{k-1}, \alpha_{k-1}, d_g)$ .

*Case 1:* Line 22 was satisfied. Then  $\text{is\_bisim}$  is true and  $n_k = \text{INITNODE}(s \otimes \alpha_{k-1}, b, \text{true}) = (\llbracket s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \rrbracket_b^*, b, \sigma)$  where  $\sigma$  is true iff  $\llbracket s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \rrbracket_b^* \Leftrightarrow s \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ . Since  $n_{k-1}.\text{is\_bisim} = \text{true}$ , I.H. gives us  $s \Leftrightarrow s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-2}$ . Proposition 3 then gives  $s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \Leftrightarrow s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ . If  $n_k.\text{is\_bisim} = \sigma = \text{true}$ , then  $\llbracket s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \rrbracket_b^* \Leftrightarrow s \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$  and hence we get  $n_k.\text{state} = \llbracket s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \rrbracket_b^* \Leftrightarrow s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \Leftrightarrow s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ , proving (2). If  $n_k.\text{is\_bisim} = \text{false}$ , we get  $n_k.\text{state} = \llbracket s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \rrbracket_b^* \Leftrightarrow b \cdot s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \Leftrightarrow s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ , proving (3), since  $n_k.\text{bound} = b$ . Thus, we have proved 1. Since  $n_k.\text{bound} = b = n_{k-1}.\text{bound}$ , I.H. immediately gives us 2.

*Case 2:* Line 24 was satisfied. Then  $\text{is\_bisim} = \text{false}$  is false,  $b - md(\alpha_{k-1}) \geq md(\varphi_g)$ , and  $n_k = \text{INITNODE}(s \otimes \alpha_{k-1}, b - md(\alpha_{k-1}), \text{false}) = (\llbracket s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \rrbracket_{b-md(\alpha_{k-1})}^*, b - md(\alpha_{k-1}), \text{false})$ . Now by I.H. we get  $s \Leftrightarrow_b s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-2}$ . Proposition 4 then gives  $s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \Leftrightarrow_{b-md(\alpha_{k-1})} s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ , and hence  $n_k.\text{state} = \llbracket s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \rrbracket_{b-md(\alpha_{k-1})}^* \Leftrightarrow_{b-md(\alpha_{k-1})} s \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \Leftrightarrow_{b-md(\alpha_{k-1})} s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ , proving (3), since  $n_k.\text{bound} = b - md(\alpha_{k-1})$ . As  $n_k.\text{is\_bisim} = \text{false}$ , we don't need to prove (2). Since the condition of line 24 was satisfied, we get  $n_k.\text{bound} = b - md(\alpha_{k-1}) \geq md(\varphi_g)$ , proving the second inequality of 2. I.H. then gives us  $n_{k-1}.\text{bound} \geq b_0 - \sum_{i < k-1} md(\alpha_i)$ , and hence  $n_k.\text{bound} = b - md(\alpha_{k-1}) = n_{k-1}.\text{bound} - md(\alpha_{k-1}) \geq b_0 - \sum_{i < k} md(\alpha_i)$ , proving the first inequality of 2.

This completes the proof of 1 and 2. If the algorithm returns a plan in line 9, we must have  $n_k.\text{state} \models \phi_g$  where  $n_k$  is the last node of a path of the form (1). By 1, we then have  $n_k.\text{state} \Leftrightarrow_{n_k.\text{bound}} s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$ . By 2, we have  $n_k.\text{bound} \geq md(\varphi_g)$ , so Proposition 2 gives us that  $n_k.\text{state}$  and  $s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$  agree on formulas up to modal depth  $md(\varphi_g)$ , and hence also  $s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1} \models \varphi_g$ . Thus,  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}$  is a solution to the planning task.  $\square$

We now introduce the parameters that will be used for our completeness and complexity results. The same parameters have previously been introduced to do parameterized complexity analysis of epistemic plan verification (van de Pol, van Rooij, and Szymanik 2018; Bolander and Lequen 2022). For any planning task  $T = (s_0, \mathcal{A}, \varphi_g)$ , we use  $a$  to denote the number of agents used in  $T$ , i.e.,  $a = |\mathcal{AG}'|$ , where  $\mathcal{AG}'$  is the agent set of  $s_0$  (and of the actions in  $\mathcal{A}$ ). Similarly, we use  $p$  to denote the number of propositional atoms used in  $s_0$  and the actions of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We furthermore use  $c$  to denote the maximal modal depth of the pre- and post-conditions in  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e.,  $c = \max\{md(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . We use  $o$  to denote the modal depth of the goal formula, i.e.,  $o = md(\varphi_g)$ . Finally, we use  $u$  to denote the maximal allowed solution length.

**Theorem 6 (Completeness).** *If a planning task  $T$  has a solution of length at most  $u$ , then the algorithm  $\text{BOUNDEDTREESEARCH}(T, cu + o)$  will find it.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $T$  has a solution  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{l-1}$  with  $l \leq u$ . First we want to prove that the search tree computed by the algorithm includes a path of the form (1) for all  $k \leq l$ . The proof is by induction on  $k$ . The base case is trivial. For the induction step, suppose the algorithm has found the path (1) for some  $k < l$ . We want to show that the algorithm will at some point extend the path (1) with the node resulting from applying  $\alpha_k$ . From the soundness proof we have properties 1 and 2 (using I.H.). In particular, we have  $n_k.\text{state} \Leftrightarrow_{n_k.\text{bound}} s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$  where  $n_k.\text{bound} \geq b_0 - \sum_{i < k} md(\alpha_i)$  and  $n_k.\text{bound} \geq md(\varphi_g)$  with  $b_0$  being the input bound, in our case  $b_0 = cu + o$ . Since  $md(\alpha) \leq c$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ , and since  $k \leq l - 1 \leq u - 1$ , we get  $n_k.\text{bound} \geq b_0 - \sum_{i < k} md(\alpha_i) \geq cu + o - kc \geq cu + o - (u - 1)c \geq c + o$ .

Since  $\alpha_k$  is applicable in  $s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$  (otherwise  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_k$  would not be a solution), and since  $n_k.\text{state} \Leftrightarrow_{n_k.\text{bound}} s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{k-1}$  with  $n_k.\text{bound} \geq c + o \geq md(\alpha_k)$ , we get that  $\alpha_k$  is also applicable in  $n_k.\text{state}$ . Hence when  $n_k$  is popped from the frontier,  $\alpha_k$  will eventually be chosen in line 10, and since  $n_k.\text{bound} \geq md(\alpha_k)$ , the test in line 11 will be satisfied, and hence  $\text{CHILDNODE}(n_k, \alpha_k, md(\varphi_g))$  will be called. If  $\text{is\_bisim}$  tests true in line 22, then we immediately get that a child node  $n'$  with state  $n_k.\text{state} \otimes \alpha_k$  is added, as required. Otherwise, we get in line 24 that  $b - md(\alpha_k) = n_k.\text{bound} - md(\alpha_k) \geq c + o - md(\alpha_k) \geq c + o - c = o \geq md(\varphi_g)$ , so the test returns true and then the child node  $n'$  with the relevant state will be added by line 25.

Thus the algorithm will eventually compute the path (1) for  $k = l$ . It only remains to show that when the last node of the path,  $n_{l-1}$ , is popped, a solution will be returned. So we need to show that  $n_{l-1}.\text{state} \models \varphi_g$ . From property 1 of the soundness proof, we have  $n_{l-1}.\text{state} \Leftrightarrow_{n_{l-1}.\text{bound}} s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{l-1}$ , and property 2 gives  $n_{l-1}.\text{bound} \geq md(\varphi_g)$ . Proposition 2 then gives us that  $n_{l-1}.\text{state}$  and  $s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{l-1}$  agree on all formulas up to modal depth  $md(\varphi_g)$ , and since  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{l-1}$  is a solution to  $T$ , we get  $s_0 \otimes \alpha_0 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{l-1} \models \varphi_g$  and hence  $n_{l-1}.\text{state} \models \varphi_g$ , as required.  $\square$

Theorem 6 shows that  $\text{BOUNDEDTREESEARCH}$  will always solve a planning task  $T$  if the bound is high enough. Since  $\text{ITERBOUNDEDTREESEARCH}$  calls  $\text{BOUNDEDTREESEARCH}$  iteratively with increasing bounds, it will eventually find a solution if one exists.

**Theorem 7.**  $\text{BOUNDEDTREESEARCH}(T, b)$  runs in time  $|T|^{O(1)} \exp_2^{b+1} O(a + p)^3$ .

*Proof.* First let us determine the size of the search tree computed by the algorithm, more precisely, an upper bound on the number of nodes it contains. As we are doing graph search, it will contain at most one node per canonically  $b$ -contracted state, i.e., at most one node per  $b$ -bisimulation class (Theorem 4). Since each  $b$ -bisimulation class is

<sup>3</sup>Where  $\exp_a^n x$  is the iterated exponential  $a^{a^{\dots^{a^x}}}$  with  $n$  as.

uniquely determined by the signature of the designated worlds of its elements (Theorem 4), it suffices to compute how many such signatures exist. We can do that using Definition 15. Let  $|\sigma_h|$  denote the number of unique  $h$ -signatures (given a fixed set of agents and atomic propositions). Recall that  $a$  is the number of agents, and  $p$  the number of atoms. As  $\sigma_0(w)$  is just  $(L(w), \emptyset)$ , we have  $|\sigma_0| = 2^p$ . For  $h > 0$ ,  $\sigma_h(w) = (L(w), \Sigma_h(w))$ , where  $\Sigma_h(w)$  is a mapping from agents into sets of  $(h-1)$ -signatures. There are  $a$  agents and  $|\sigma_{h-1}|$  possible  $(h-1)$ -signatures, so there are  $(2^{|\sigma_{h-1}|})^a = 2^{|\sigma_{h-1}|a}$  such mappings. Thus in total we get  $|\sigma_h| = 2^p 2^{|\sigma_{h-1}|a} = 2^{p+|\sigma_{h-1}|a}$ . We now prove that  $|\sigma_h| = \exp_2^{h+1} O(a+p)$  by induction on  $h$ . For  $h=0$  we have  $|\sigma_h| = 2^p = 2^{O(a+p)} = \exp_2^1 O(a+p)$ . For  $h > 0$  we get, using I.H.,  $|\sigma_h| = 2^{p+|\sigma_{h-1}|a} = 2^{p+(\exp_2^h O(a+p))a} = 2^{\exp_2^h O(a+p)} = \exp_2^{h+1} O(a+p)$ . We have now proved that the number of nodes of the search tree is bounded by  $|\sigma_b| = \exp_2^{b+1} O(a+p)$ . This also gives an upper bound on their size, and hence we also get upper bounds on computing each contracted update and model checking the goal formula given by  $|T|^{O(1)} \exp_2^{b+1} O(a+p)$  (see the proof of Theorem 4 by Bolander and Lequen (2022) for details).  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** BOUNDEDGRAPHSEARCH runs in  $(b+1) - \text{EXPTIME}$ .

Theorem 7 generalises a number of existing results. First of all, if  $c = 0$ , then by Theorem 6, BOUNDEDTREESEARCH, and hence also BOUNDEDGRAPHSEARCH, will solve the problem with bound  $b = cu + o = o$ , and hence in time  $|T|^{O(1)} \exp_2^{o+1} O(a+p)$ . This shows that we can solve propositional planning tasks (planning tasks where all pre- and postconditions are propositional) in  $(md(\varphi_g) + 1) - \text{EXPTIME}$ , hence providing a new proof of an existing result (Yu, Wen, and Liu 2013; Maubert 2014). Also note that if  $b \geq cu + o$ , then Theorem 6 gives that BOUNDEDGRAPHSEARCH is complete, and Theorem 7 that it runs in time  $|T|^{O(1)} \exp_2^{cu+o} O(a+p)$ . This proves that epistemic planning is fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) with parameters  $acopu$ , generalizing the corresponding FPT result for plan verification by Bolander and Lequen (2022). As the aforementioned paper shows that plan verification is *not* FPT for any subset of these parameters, this is the best result we can get. It means that epistemic planning is tractable as long as we can put a bound on the number of agents ( $a$ ), number of atoms ( $p$ ), modal depth of the formula ( $o$ ), maximal modal depth of pre- and postconditions ( $c$ ) and maximal length of a plan ( $u$ ), but that if we only put a bound on some of them, the problem becomes intractable. Also note that epistemic planning is tractable for a fixed bound on the depth of reasoning, and fixed agent and atom sets, which might be a quite realistic assumption for many practical applications. Of course putting a bound on the reasoning depth means that certain problems become unsolvable, but in other cases we just get longer solutions (the agent finds a solution that doesn't require complex higher-order reasoning). Next, we do a brief experimental evaluation, and leave a deeper evaluation of the trade-off between reasoning depth and solution quality for future work.




Figure 6: Time results for ITERBOUNDTREESEARCH (blue line) and BFS (red line).

## 7 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we report the results of our experiments. We tested our ITERBOUNDTREESEARCH algorithm on a sample of well-known benchmarks from the literature, such as *Coin in the Box* (Baral et al. 2015; Fabiano et al. 2020), *Selective Communication and Collaboration through Communication* (Kominis and Geffner 2015). We refer to the original papers for a presentation of the benchmarks. We compared our algorithm to a baseline BFS search using standard bisimulation contractions. The results are shown in Figure 6 (timetables in Supplementary Material). As seen, our algorithm consistently outperforms the baseline. The tests show that in most cases, the two algorithms compute a similar number of nodes (see Supplementary Material). This suggests that  $b$ -contractions play a key role in improving the overall performance. They result in smaller states than standard bisimulation contractions. As these preliminary experiments show promising results, we plan to implement also the graph search variant and compare it to tree search.

To highlight the strength of our algorithm, we also devised a simple, yet illustrative domain, called *Switches*. In a control room, agent  $a_0$  needs to turn on  $n$  switches (all initially off). To turn on switch  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , agent  $a_0$  must be supervised by a specific agent  $a_k$ . The result of turning on a switch is only witnessed by agents  $a_0$  and  $a_k$  (the other agents believe that no switch was toggled). Agents may also communicate their knowledge on which switches are on. The goal is to turn all switches on. Since the goal has modal depth 0 and turning on a switch can be done with a propositional action, ITERBOUNDTREESEARCH does not consider the communication actions (that have modal preconditions). Hence, our algorithm takes the 0-contraction of each visited state, which consists of a singleton state. On the other hand, the baseline algorithm keeps the states in their full size. Since each switch action is witnessed only by a particular agent (plus  $a_0$ ), the depth of the state grows after each action. With 8 switches, our algorithm solves the problem in 16 seconds, while the baseline takes 5 minutes. With 9 switches, our algorithm uses 3 minutes, and the baseline times out after 30 minutes. If the problem could only be solved at a higher bound than 0, of course our algorithm would eventually reach that bound and still find a solution.

## References

- Aceto, L.; Ingólfssdóttir, A.; and Srba, J. 2012. The algorithmics of bisimilarity. In Sangiorgi, D., and Rutten, J. J. M. M., eds., *Advanced Topics in Bisimulation and Coinduction*, volume 52 of *Cambridge tracts in theoretical computer science*. Cambridge University Press. 100–172.
- Aucher, G., and Bolander, T. 2013. Undecidability in epistemic planning. In Rossi, F., ed., *IJCAI 2013, Proceedings of the 23rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Beijing, China, August 3-9, 2013*, 27–33. IJCAI/AAAI.
- Aucher, G. 2012. DEL-sequents for regression and epistemic planning. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics* 22(4):337–367.
- Baltag, A.; Moss, L. S.; and Solecki, S. 1998. The logic of public announcements and common knowledge and private suspicions. In Gilboa, I., ed., *Proceedings of the 7th Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge (TARK-98), Evanston, IL, USA, July 22-24, 1998*, 43–56. Morgan Kaufmann.
- Baral, C.; Gelfond, G.; Pontelli, E.; and Son, T. C. 2015. An action language for multi-agent domains: Foundations. *CoRR* abs/1511.01960.
- Belle, V.; Bolander, T.; Herzig, A.; and Nebel, B. 2022. Epistemic planning: Perspectives on the special issue. *Artificial Intelligence* 103842.
- Blackburn, P.; Rijke, M. d.; and Venema, Y. 2001. *Modal Logic*. Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science. Cambridge University Press.
- Bolander, T., and Andersen, M. B. 2011. Epistemic planning for single and multi-agent systems. *J. Appl. Non Class. Logics* 21(1):9–34.
- Bolander, T., and Burigana, A. 2024. Better bounded bisimulation contractions. Under review.
- Bolander, T., and Lequen, A. 2022. Parameterized Complexity of Dynamic Belief Updates: A Complete Map. *Journal of Logic and Computation*.
- Bolander, T., and Lequen, A. 2023. Parameterized complexity of dynamic belief updates: A complete map. *J. Log. Comput.* 33(6):1270–1300.
- Bolander, T.; Charrier, T.; Pinchinat, S.; and Schwarzentruher, F. 2020. DEL-based epistemic planning: Decidability and complexity. *Artificial Intelligence* 287:1–34.
- Bolander, T.; Dissing, L.; and Herrmann, N. 2021a. DEL-based Epistemic Planning for Human-Robot Collaboration: Theory and Implementation. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, 120–129.
- Bolander, T.; Dissing, L.; and Herrmann, N. 2021b. DEL-based epistemic planning for human-robot collaboration: Theory and implementation. In Bienvenu, M.; Lakemeyer, G.; and Erdem, E., eds., *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning, KR 2021, Online event, November 3-12, 2021*, 120–129.
- Fabiano, F.; Burigana, A.; Dovier, A.; and Pontelli, E. 2020. EFP 2.0: A multi-agent epistemic solver with multiple e-state representations. In Beck, J. C.; Buffet, O.; Hoffmann, J.; Karpas, E.; and Sohrabi, S., eds., *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling, Nancy, France, October 26-30, 2020*, 101–109. AAAI Press.
- Goranko, V., and Otto, M. 2007. Model theory of modal logic. In Blackburn, P.; Van Benthem, J.; and Wolter, F., eds., *Handbook of Modal Logic*, volume 3 of *Studies in Logic and Practical Reasoning*. Elsevier. chapter 5, 249–329.
- Kominis, F., and Geffner, H. 2015. Beliefs In Multiagent Planning: From One Agent to Many. In Brafman, R. I.; Domshlak, C.; Haslum, P.; and Zilberstein, S., eds., *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling, ICAPS 2015, Jerusalem, Israel, June 7-11, 2015*, 147–155. AAAI Press.
- Löwe, B.; Pacuit, E.; and Witzel, A. 2011. DEL planning and some tractable cases. In van Ditmarsch, H.; Lang, J.; and Ju, S., eds., *Logic, Rationality, and Interaction - Third International Workshop, LORI 2011, Guangzhou, China, October 10-13, 2011. Proceedings*, volume 6953 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 179–192. Springer.
- Maubert, B. 2014. *Logical foundations of games with imperfect information : uniform strategies. (Fondations logiques des jeux à information imparfaite : stratégies uniformes)*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Rennes 1, France.
- Paige, R., and Tarjan, R. E. 1987. Three partition refinement algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.* 16(6):973–989.
- Pardo, P., and Sadrzadeh, M. 2012. Planning in the logics of communication and change. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems - Volume 3, AAMAS '12*, 1231–1232. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- van de Pol, I.; van Rooij, I.; and Szymanik, J. 2018. Parameterized complexity of Theory of Mind reasoning in dynamic epistemic logic. *Journal of Logic, Language, and Information* 27:255–294.
- van Ditmarsch, H., and Kooi, B. 2015. *One Hundred Prisoners and a Light Bulb*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. 83–94.
- van Ditmarsch, H. P.; van der Hoek, W.; and Kooi, B. P. 2007. *Dynamic Epistemic Logic*, volume 337. Springer Netherlands.
- Yu, Q.; Wen, X.; and Liu, Y. 2013. Multi-agent epistemic explanatory diagnosis via reasoning about actions. In Rossi, F., ed., *IJCAI 2013, Proceedings of the 23rd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Beijing, China, August 3-9, 2013*, 1183–1190. IJCAI/AAAI.