

A Logic-Based Analysis of Responsibility

Aldo Iván Ramírez Abarca

Utrecht University
Utrecht, The Netherlands
nadabundo@gmail.com

This paper presents a logic-based framework to analyze responsibility, which I refer to as intentional epistemic act-utilitarian stit theory (IEAUST). To be precise, IEAUST is used to model and syntactically characterize various modes of responsibility, where by ‘modes of responsibility’ I mean instances of Broersen’s three categories of responsibility (causal, informational, and motivational responsibility), cast against the background of particular deontic contexts. IEAUST is obtained by integrating a modal language to express the following components of responsibility on stit models: agency, epistemic notions, intentionality, and different senses of obligation. With such a language, I characterize the components of responsibility using particular formulas. Then, adopting a compositional approach—where complex modalities are built out of more basic ones—these characterizations of the components are used to formalize the aforementioned modes of responsibility.

1 Introduction

The study of responsibility is a complicated matter. The term is used in different ways in different fields, and it is easy to engage in everyday discussions as to why someone should be considered responsible for something. Typically, the backdrop of these discussions involves social, legal, moral, or philosophical problems, each with slightly different meanings for expressions like *being responsible for...*, *being held responsible for...*, or *having the responsibility of...*, among others. Therefore—to approach such problems efficiently—there is a demand for clear, taxonomical definitions of responsibility.

For instance, suppose that you are a judge in Texas. You are presiding over a trial where the defendant is being charged with first-degree murder. The alleged crime is horrible, and the prosecution seeks capital punishment. The case is as follows: driving her car, the defendant ran over a traffic officer that was holding a stop-sign at a crossing walk, while school children were crossing the street. The traffic officer was killed, and some of the children were severely injured. A highly complicated case, the possibility of a death-penalty sentence means that the life of the defendant is at stake. More than ever, due process is imperative. As the presiding judge, you must abide by the prevailing definitions of criminal liability with precision. In other words, there is little to no room for ambiguity in the ruling, and your handling of the notions associated with responsibility in criminal law should be impeccable.

As this example suggests, a framework with intelligible, realistically applicable definitions of responsibility is paramount in the field of law. However, responsibility-related problems arise across many other disciplines—social psychology, philosophy of emotion, legal theory, and ethics, to name a few [17, 24]. A clear pattern in all these is the intent of issuing standards for when—and to what extent—an agent should be held responsible for a state of affairs.

This is where Logic lends a hand. The development of expressive logics—to reason about agents’ decisions in situations with moral consequences—involves devising unequivocal representations of components of behavior that are highly relevant to systematic responsibility attribution and to systematic

blame-or-praise assignment. To put it plainly, expressive syntactic-and-semantic frameworks help us analyze responsibility-related problems in a methodical way.¹

The main goal of this paper is to present a proposal for a formal theory of responsibility. Such a proposal relies on (a) a *decomposition* of responsibility into specific components and (b) a functional *classification* of responsibility, where the different categories directly correlate with the components of the decomposition. As for the decomposition, it is given by the following list:

- **Agency:** the process by which agents bring about states of affairs in the environment. In other words, the phenomenon by which agents choose and perform actions, with accompanying mental states, that change the environment.
- **Knowledge and belief:** mental states that concern the information available in the environment and that explain agents' particular choices of action.
- **Intentions:** mental states that determine whether an action was done with the purpose of bringing about its effects.
- **Ought-to-do's:** the actions that agents should perform, complying to the codes of a normative system. Oughts-to-do's make up contexts that provide a criterion for deciding whether an agent should be blamed or praised. I refer to these contexts as the *deontic contexts* of responsibility.

As for the classification, it is a refinement of Broersen's three categories of responsibility: *causal*, *informational*, and *motivational* responsibility [4, 9, 14]. I will discuss these categories at length in Section 2. On the basis of both the decomposition and the classification, here I introduce a very rich stit logic to analyze responsibility, which I refer to as *intentional epistemic act-utilitarian stit theory (IEAUST)*. More precisely, I use *IEAUST* to model and syntactically characterize various modes of responsibility. By 'modes of responsibility' I mean combinations of sub-categories of the three ones mentioned above, cast against the background of particular deontic contexts. On the one hand, the sub-categories correspond to the different versions of responsibility that one can consider according to the *active* and *passive* forms of the notion: while the active form involves contributions—in terms of explicitly bringing about outcomes—the passive form involves omissions—which are interpreted as the processes by which agents allow that an outcome happens while being able, to some extent, to prevent it. On the other hand, the deontic context of a mode establishes whether and to what degree the combination of sub-categories involves either blameworthiness or praiseworthiness.

The logic *IEAUST* includes a language that expresses agency, epistemic notions, intentionality, and different senses of obligation. With this language, I characterize the components of responsibility using particular formulas. Then, adopting a compositional approach—where complex modalities are built out of more basic ones—I use these characterizations of the components to formalize the aforementioned modes of responsibility. An outline of the paper is included below.

- Section 2 presents an operational definition for responsibility and addresses the philosophical perspective adopted in my study of the notion.
- Section 3 introduces *IEAUST* and uses this logic to provide stit-theoretic characterizations of different modes of responsibility.
- Section 4 presents Hilbert-style proof systems both for *IEAUST* and for a technical extension, addressing the status of their soundness & completeness results.

¹Most likely, this is why the logic-based formalization of responsibility has become such an important topic in, for instance, normative multi-agent systems, responsible autonomous agents, and machine ethics for AI [21, 6]

2 Categories of Responsibility

To make a start on formally analyzing responsibility, I identify (a) two *viewpoints* for the philosophical study of responsibility, (b) three main *categories* for the viewpoint that I focus on, and (c) two *forms* in which the elements of the categories can be interpreted.

As for point (a), the philosophical literature on responsibility usually distinguishes two *viewpoints* on the notion [22]: *backward-looking responsibility* and *forward-looking responsibility*. By backward-looking responsibility one refers to the viewpoint according to which an agent is considered to have produced a state of affairs that has already ensued and lies in the past. This is the viewpoint taken by a judge when, while trying a murder case, she wants to get to the bottom of things and find out who is responsible for doing the killing. In contrast, by forward-looking responsibility one refers to the viewpoint according to which which an agent is expected to comply with the duty of bringing about a state of affairs in the future. When one thinks of a student that has to write an essay before its due date, for instance, this is the view that is being used. In other words, the writing and the handing in of the essay before the deadline are seen as responsibilities of the student.

From here on, I will focus on backward-looking responsibility. I work with the following operational definition: *responsibility* is a relation between the agents and the states of affairs of an environment, such that an agent is responsible for a state of affairs iff the agent's degree of involvement in the realization of that state of affairs warrants blame or praise (in light of a given normative system). As for point (b), I follow [10] and [14] and distinguish three main *categories* of responsibility, where each category can be correlated with the components of responsibility that it involves:²

1. ***Causal responsibility***: an agent is causally responsible for a state of affairs iff the agent is the material author of such a state of affairs. The component that this category involves is agency.
2. ***Informational responsibility***: an agent is informationally responsible for a state of affairs iff the agent is the material author and it behaved knowingly, or consciously, while bringing about the state of affairs. The components that this category involves are agency, knowledge, and belief.
3. ***Motivational responsibility***: an agent is motivationally responsible for a state of affairs iff the agent is the material author and it behaved knowingly and intentionally while bringing about the state of affairs. The components that this category involves are agency, knowledge, and intentions.

Finally, as for point (c), the two *forms* of responsibility are the *active* form and the *passive* form. The active form of responsibility concerns contributions, and the passive form of responsibility concerns omissions.

Now, key elements in my operational definition of responsibility are the notions of blame and praise. Intuitively, responsibility can be measured by how much blame or how much praise an agent gets for its participation in bringing about a state of affairs. As mentioned before, *ought-to-do's* can provide a criterion for deciding when agents should be blamed and when agents should be praised. The main idea is as follows: if agent α ought to have done ϕ , then having seen to it that ϕ makes α praiseworthy, while having refrained from seeing to it that ϕ makes α blameworthy. For a given ϕ , then, the degrees of α 's praiseworthiness/blameworthiness correspond to the possible combinations between (a) an agent's ought-to-do's and (b) the active/passive forms of the three categories of responsibility.

²These categories extend the literature's common distinction between *causal* and *agentive* responsibility [17, 23, 13], and they were derived by [10] on the basis of his analysis of the modes of *mens rea*.

3 A Logic of Responsibility

We are ready to introduce *intentional epistemic act-utilitarian stit theory (IEAUST)*, a stit-theoretic logic of responsibility. Without further ado, let me address the syntax and semantics of this expressive framework.

3.1 Syntax & Semantics

Definition 3.1 (Syntax of intentional epistemic act-utilitarian stit theory). Given a finite set Ags of agent names and a countable set of propositions P , the grammar for the formal language \mathcal{L}_R is given by

$$\phi ::= p \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \Box\phi \mid [\alpha]\phi \mid K_\alpha\phi \mid I_\alpha\phi \mid \odot_\alpha\phi \mid \odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{I}}\phi,$$

where p ranges over P and α ranges over Ags .

In this language, $\Box\phi$ is meant to express the historical necessity of ϕ ($\Diamond\phi$ abbreviates $\neg\Box\neg\phi$); $[\alpha]\phi$ expresses that ‘agent α has seen to it that ϕ ’; $K_\alpha\phi$ expresses that ‘ α knew ϕ ’; $I_\alpha\phi$ expresses that ‘ α had a present-directed intention toward the realization of ϕ ’; $\odot_\alpha\phi$ expresses that ‘ α objectively ought to have seen to it that ϕ ’; and $\odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{I}}\phi$ expresses that ‘ α subjectively ought to have seen to it that ϕ ’. As for the semantics, the structures on which the formulas of \mathcal{L}_R are evaluated are based on what I call *knowledge-intentions-oughts branching-time frames*. Let me first present the formal definition of these frames and then review the intuitions behind the extensions.

Definition 3.2 (*Kiobt*-frames & models). A tuple $\langle M, \sqsubset, Ags, \mathbf{Choice}, \{\sim_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Ags}, \tau, \mathbf{Value} \rangle$ is called a *knowledge-intention-oughts branching-time frame* (*kiobt*-frame for short) iff

- M is a non-empty set of moments and \sqsubset is a strict partial ordering on M satisfying ‘no backward branching.’ Each maximal \sqsubset -chain of moments is called a history, where each history represents a complete temporal evolution of the world. H denotes the set of all histories, and for each $m \in M$, $H_m := \{h \in H; m \in h\}$. Tuples $\langle m, h \rangle$ such that $m \in M$, $h \in H$, and $m \in h$, are called *indices*, and the set of indices is denoted by $I(M \times H)$. **Choice** is a function that maps each agent α and moment m to a partition **Choice** $_\alpha^m$ of H_m , where the cells of such a partition represent α ’s available actions at m . For $m \in M$ and $h \in H_m$, we denote the equivalence class of h in **Choice** $_\alpha^m$ by **Choice** $_\alpha^m(h)$. **Choice** satisfies two constraints:
 - (NC) *No choice between undivided histories*: For all $h, h' \in H_m$, if $m' \in h \cap h'$ for some $m' \sqsubset m$, then $h \in L$ iff $h' \in L$ for every $L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$.
 - (IA) *Independence of agency*: A function s on Ags is called a *selection function* at m if it assigns to each α a member of **Choice** $_\alpha^m$. If we denote by **Select** m the set of all selection functions at m , then we have that for every $m \in M$ and $s \in \mathbf{Select}^m$, $\bigcap_{\alpha \in Ags} s(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ (see [8] for a discussion of the property).
- For $\alpha \in Ags$, \sim_α is the epistemic indistinguishability equivalence relation for agent α , which satisfies the following constraints:
 - (OAC) *Own action condition*: if $\langle m_*, h_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, h \rangle$, then $\langle m_*, h'_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, h \rangle$ for every $h'_* \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}(h_*)$. We refer to this constraint as the ‘own action condition’ because it implies that agents do not know more than what they perform.
 - (Unif – H) *Uniformity of historical possibility*: if $\langle m_*, h_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, h \rangle$, then for every $h'_* \in H_{m_*}$ there exists $h' \in H_m$ such that $\langle m_*, h'_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, h' \rangle$. Combined with (OAC), this constraint is meant to capture a notion of uniformity of strategies, where epistemically indistinguishable indices should have the same available actions for the agent to choose upon.

For $\langle m, h \rangle$ and $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, the set $\pi_\alpha^\square[\langle m, h \rangle] := \{\langle m', h' \rangle; \exists h'' \in H_{m'} \text{ s.t. } \langle m, h \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h'' \rangle\}$ is known as α 's *ex ante information set*.

- τ is a function that assigns to each $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and index $\langle m, h \rangle$ a topology $\tau_\alpha^{\langle m, h \rangle}$ on $\pi_\alpha^\square[\langle m, h \rangle]$. This is the *topology of α 's intentionality at $\langle m, h \rangle$* , where any non-empty open set is interpreted as a *present-directed intention*, written ‘p-d intention’ from here on, of α at $\langle m, h \rangle$. Additionally, τ must satisfy the following conditions:
 - (CI) *Finitary consistency of intention*: for every $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and index $\langle m, h \rangle$, every non-empty $U, V \in \tau_\alpha^{\langle m, h \rangle}$ are such that $U \cap V \neq \emptyset$. In other words, every non-empty $U \in \tau_\alpha^{\langle m, h \rangle}$ is $\tau_\alpha^{\langle m, h \rangle}$ -dense.
 - (KI) *Knowledge of intention*: for every $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and index $\langle m, h \rangle$, $\tau_\alpha^{\langle m, h \rangle} = \tau_\alpha^{\langle m', h' \rangle}$ for every $\langle m', h' \rangle$ such that $\pi_\alpha^\square[\langle m, h \rangle] = \pi_\alpha^\square[\langle m', h' \rangle]$. In other words, α has the same topology of p-d intentions at all indices lying within α 's current *ex ante* information set.
- **Value** is a deontic function that assigns to each history $h \in H$ a real number, representing the utility of h .

A *kiobt*-model \mathcal{M} , then, results from adding a valuation function \mathcal{V} to a *kiobt*-frame, where $\mathcal{V} : P \rightarrow 2^{I(M \times H)}$ assigns to each atomic proposition a set of indices.

For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, the equivalence relation \sim_α is the usual indistinguishability relation, borrowed from epistemic logic, that represents α 's uncertainty: whatever holds at all epistemically accessible indices is what an agent knows. As for the function τ , it assigns to each agent the topology of intentions, according to the ideas presented by [3]. The open sets of any such topology are taken to be p-d intentions for bringing about circumstances. At each moment, the fact that the non-empty open sets of the topologies are dense implies that an agent's intentions are consistent.

Regarding the deontic dimension, the idea is that objective, subjective, and doxastic ought-to-do's stem from the optimal actions for an agent: to have seen to it that ϕ is taken to be an obligation of an agent at an index iff ϕ is an effect of all the optimal actions for that agent and index, where the notion of optimality is based on the deontic value of the histories in those actions—provided by **Value**. The semantics for formulas involving the deontic operators require some previous definitions. For $m \in M$ and $\beta \in \text{Ags}$, we define $\mathbf{State}_\beta^m = \{S \subseteq H_m; S = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \text{Ags} - \{\beta\}} s(\alpha), \text{ where } s \in \mathbf{Select}^m\}$. For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and $m_* \in M$, we first define a general ordering \leq on $\mathcal{P}(H_{m_*})$ such that for $X, Y \subseteq H_{m_*}$, $X \leq Y$ iff $\mathbf{Value}(h) \leq \mathbf{Value}(h')$ for every $h \in X, h' \in Y$. The *objective dominance ordering* \preceq is defined such that for $L, L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}$, $L \preceq L'$ iff for each $S \in \mathbf{State}_\alpha^{m_*}$, $L \cap S \leq L' \cap S$. The optimal set of actions is taken as $\mathbf{Optimal}_\alpha^{m_*} := \{L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}; \text{there is no } L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*} \text{ such that } L \prec L'\}$.

Subjective ought-to-do's involve a different dominance ordering. To define it, [11] and [1] introduce the so-called *epistemic clusters*, which are nothing more than a given action's epistemic equivalents in indices that are indistinguishable to the one of evaluation. Formally, we have that for $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, $m_*, m \in M$, and $L \subseteq H_{m_*}$, L 's *epistemic cluster* at m is the set $[L]_\alpha^m := \{h \in H_m; \exists h_* \in L \text{ s.t. } \langle m_*, h_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, h \rangle\}$. A subjective dominance ordering \preceq_s on $\mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}$ is then defined by the following rule: for $L, L' \subseteq H_{m_*}$, $L \preceq_s L'$ iff for each m such that $m_* \sim_\alpha m$, for each $S \in \mathbf{State}_\alpha^m$, $[L]_\alpha^m \cap S \leq [L']_\alpha^m \cap S$.³ Just as in the case of objective ought-to-do's, this ordering allows us to define a subjectively optimal set of actions $\mathbf{SOptimal}_\alpha^{m_*} := \{L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}; \text{there is no } L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*} \text{ s. t. } L \prec_s L'\}$, where I write $L \prec_s L'$ iff $L \preceq_s L'$ and $L' \not\preceq_s L$.

³As a convention, I write $m \sim_\alpha m'$ if there exist $h \in H_m, h' \in H_{m'}$ such that $\langle m, h \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h' \rangle$.

Therefore, *kiobt*-frames allow us to represent the components of responsibility discussed in the introduction: agency, knowledge, intentions, and ought-to-do's. More precisely, they allow us to provide semantics for the modalities of \mathcal{L}_R :

Definition 3.3 (Evaluation rules for *IEAUST*). Let \mathcal{M} be a finite-choice *kiobt*-model.⁴ The semantics on \mathcal{M} for the formulas of \mathcal{L}_R are recursively defined by the following truth conditions:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models p & \text{iff } \langle m, h \rangle \in \mathcal{V}(p) \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \neg\phi & \text{iff } \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \not\models \phi \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \phi \wedge \psi & \text{iff } \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \phi \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \psi \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \Box\phi & \text{iff for all } h' \in H_m, \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h' \rangle \models \phi \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models [\alpha]\phi & \text{iff for all } h' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m(h), \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h' \rangle \models \phi \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models K_\alpha\phi & \text{iff for all } \langle m', h' \rangle \text{ s. t. } \langle m, h \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h' \rangle, \\
& \mathcal{M}, \langle m', h' \rangle \models \phi \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models I_\alpha\phi & \text{iff there exists } U \in \tau_\alpha^{\langle m, h \rangle} \text{ s. t. } U \subseteq \|\phi\| \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha\phi & \text{iff for all } L \in \mathbf{Optimal}_\alpha^m, \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h' \rangle \models \phi \\
& \text{for every } h' \in L \\
\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{S}\phi & \text{iff for all } L \in \mathbf{SOptimal}_\alpha^m, \mathcal{M}, \langle m', h' \rangle \models \phi \\
& \text{for every } m' \text{ s. t. } m \sim_\alpha m' \text{ and every } h' \in [L]_\alpha^{m''}.
\end{array}$$

where $\|\phi\|$ refers to the set $\{\langle m, h \rangle \in I(M \times H); \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \phi\}$.

3.2 Formalization of Sub-Categories of Responsibility

The logic introduced in the previous subsection allows us to formalize different modes of responsibility by means of formulas of \mathcal{L}_R . Before diving into the formulas, let me present an operational definition for the expression ‘mode of responsibility.’ For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, index $\langle m, h \rangle$, and ϕ of \mathcal{L}_R , a *mode of α 's responsibility with respect to ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$* is a tuple consisting of three constituents: (1) a set of categories, taken from Broersen's three categories of responsibility, that applies to the relation between α and ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$, (2) the forms of responsibility—active or passive—that apply to the categories in said set, and (3) a deontic context, determining whether the forms of the categories are either blameworthy, praiseworthy, or neutral. As for constituents (1) and (2), observe that the active and passive forms of the three categories of responsibility lead to sub-categories of the notion. For clarity, first I will introduce the stit-theoretic characterizations of these sub-categories; afterwards, in Subsection 3.3, these sub-categories will be discussed against the backdrop of the deontic contexts that will decide their degree of blameworthiness or praiseworthiness (constituent (3) in a given mode).

A maxim usually endorsed in the philosophical literature on moral responsibility is the *principle of alternate possibilities*. According to this principle, “a person is morally responsible for what he has done only if he could have done otherwise” [15]. Following the example of [17], then, I adopt the intuitions behind deliberative agency and restrict my view on responsibility to situations where agents can be said to actually have had a hand in bringing about states of affairs. Therefore, each sub-category of α 's responsibility with respect to ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ will include a positive condition—concerning the realization of ϕ —and a negative condition—concerning the realization of $\neg\phi$. For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and ϕ of \mathcal{L}_R , the main sub-categories of α 's responsibility with respect to ϕ are displayed in Table 1.

⁴Finite-choice *bt*-models are those for which function **Choice** is such that \mathbf{Choice}_α^m is finite for every $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and $m \in M$. I focus on finite-choice models to simplify the evaluation rules for objective and subjective ought-to-do's. The reader is referred to [1] for the evaluation rules in the case of infinite-choice models.

<i>Category</i> \ <i>Form</i>	Active (contributions)	Passive (omissions)
Causal	$[\alpha]\phi \wedge \diamond[\alpha]\neg\phi$	$\phi \wedge \diamond[\alpha]\neg\phi$
Informational	$K_\alpha[\alpha]\phi \wedge \diamond K_\alpha[\alpha]\neg\phi$	$\phi \wedge K_\alpha\neg[\alpha]\neg\phi \wedge \diamond K_\alpha[\alpha]\neg\phi$
Motivational	$K_\alpha[\alpha]\phi \wedge I_\alpha[\alpha]\phi \wedge \diamond K_\alpha[\alpha]\neg\phi$	$\phi \wedge K_\alpha\neg[\alpha]\neg\phi \wedge I_\alpha\neg[\alpha]\neg\phi \wedge \diamond K_\alpha[\alpha]\neg\phi$

Table 1: Main sub-categories.

Let me explain and discuss Table 1. Let \mathcal{M} be a *kiobt*-model. For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and index $\langle m, h \rangle$, the sub-categories of α 's responsibility with respect to ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ are defined as follows:

- α was *causal-active responsible* for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ α has seen to it that ϕ (the positive condition) and it was possible for α to prevent ϕ (the negative condition). As such, I refer to state of affairs ϕ as a causal contribution of α at $\langle m, h \rangle$. α was *causal-passive responsible* for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ ϕ was the case (the positive condition), and α refrained from preventing ϕ while it was possible for α to prevent ϕ (the negative conditions). To clarify, formula $\phi \rightarrow \neg[\alpha]\neg\phi$ is valid, so that if ϕ was the case then α refrained from preventing ϕ . I refer to $\neg\phi$ as a causal omission of α at $\langle m, h \rangle$.
- α was *informational-active responsible* for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ α has knowingly seen to it that ϕ (the positive condition) and it was possible for α to knowingly prevent ϕ (the negative condition). I refer to ϕ as a conscious contribution of α at $\langle m, h \rangle$. α was *informational-passive responsible* for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ ϕ was the case (the positive condition), and α knowingly refrained from preventing ϕ while it was possible for α to knowingly prevent ϕ (the negative conditions). I refer to $\neg\phi$ as a conscious omission of α at $\langle m, h \rangle$.
- α was *motivational-active responsible* for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ α has both knowingly and intentionally seen to it that ϕ (the positive conditions) and it was possible for α to knowingly prevent ϕ (the negative condition). I refer to ϕ as a motivational contribution of α at $\langle m, h \rangle$. α was *motivational-passive responsible* for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ ϕ was the case (the positive condition), and α both knowingly and intentionally refrained from preventing ϕ while it was possible for α to knowingly prevent ϕ (the negative conditions). I refer to $\neg\phi$ as a motivational omission of α at $\langle m, h \rangle$.

The main reason for setting the negative conditions as stated in Table 1 is that it greatly simplifies the relation between the active and the passive forms of responsibility. That said, it is important to mention that these negative conditions lead to a policy that I call *leniency on blameworthy agents*.

Two important observations concerning the relations between these sub-categories are the following:

1. (a) If α was informational-active, resp. informational-passive, responsible for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$, then α was causal-active, resp. causal-passive, responsible for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$; the converse is not true.
 (b) If α was motivational-active, resp. motivational-passive, responsible for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$, then α was informational-active, resp. informational-passive, responsible for ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$; the converse is not true.
2. For all three categories, the active form of responsibility with respect to ϕ implies the passive form.

3.3 Formalization of Modes of Responsibility

In Section 2 I explained that obligations provide the deontic contexts of responsibility, which in turn determine degrees of praiseworthiness/blameworthiness for instances of the notion. Let \mathcal{M} be a *kiobt*-model. Take $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, and let ϕ be a formula of \mathcal{L}_R . For each index $\langle m, h \rangle$, there are 4 main possibilities for conjunctions of deontic modalities holding at $\langle m, h \rangle$, according to whether $\Delta\phi$ or $\neg\Delta\phi$ is satisfied at the index, where $\Delta \in \{\odot_\alpha, \odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{S}}\}$. I refer to any such conjunction as a *deontic context for α 's responsibility with respect to ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$* . Thus, these contexts render 4 main levels of praiseworthiness, resp. blameworthiness, under the premise that bringing about ϕ is praiseworthy and refraining from bringing about ϕ is blameworthy. I use numbers 1–4 to refer to these levels, so that *Level 1* corresponds the highest level of praiseworthiness, resp. blameworthiness, and *Level 4* corresponds to the lowest level.

Level 1: when deontic context $\odot_\alpha\phi \wedge \odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{S}}\phi$ holds at $\langle m, h \rangle$, which occurs iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ α objectively and subjectively ought to have seen to it that ϕ . **Level 2:** when deontic context $\neg\odot_\alpha\phi \wedge \odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{S}}\phi$ holds at $\langle m, h \rangle$, which occurs iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ α subjectively ought to have seen to it that ϕ , but α did not objectively ought to have seen to it that ϕ . **Level 3:** when deontic context $\odot_\alpha\phi \wedge \neg\odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{S}}\phi$ holds at $\langle m, h \rangle$, which occurs iff at $\langle m, h \rangle$ α objectively ought to have seen to it that ϕ , but α did not subjectively ought to have seen to it that ϕ . **Level 4:** when deontic context $\neg\odot_\alpha\phi \wedge \neg\odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{S}}\phi$ holds at $\langle m, h \rangle$, where, unless α either objectively or subjectively ought have seen to it that $\neg\phi$ at $\langle m, h \rangle$ (which would imply that a deontic context of the previous levels holds with respect to $\neg\phi$), neither bringing about ϕ nor refraining from doing so elicits any interest in terms of blame-or-praise assignment.

For each of these deontic contexts, the *basic modes of α 's active responsibility with respect to ϕ at $\langle m, h \rangle$* are displayed in Table 2, and the *basic modes of α 's passive responsibility* are obtained by substituting the term 'passive' for 'active' in such a table.

<i>Deg.</i> \ <i>Att.</i>	Praiseworthiness	Blameworthiness
<i>Low_A</i>	Causal-active for ϕ ✓ Infor.-active for ϕ ✗ Motiv.-active for ϕ ✗	Causal-active for $\neg\phi$ ✓ Infor.-active for $\neg\phi$ ✗ Motiv.-active for $\neg\phi$ ✗
<i>Middle_A</i>	Causal-active for ϕ ✓ Infor.-active for ϕ ✓ Motiv.-active for ϕ ✗	Causal-active for $\neg\phi$ ✓ Infor.-active for $\neg\phi$ ✓ Motiv.-active for $\neg\phi$ ✗
<i>High_A</i>	Causal-active for ϕ ✓ Infor.-active for ϕ ✓ Motiv.-active for ϕ ✓	Causal-active for $\neg\phi$ ✓ Infor.-active for $\neg\phi$ ✓ Motiv.-active for $\neg\phi$ ✓

Table 2: Modes of α 's active responsibility with respect to ϕ .

4 Axiomatization

This section is devoted to introducing proof systems for *IEAUST*. More precisely, I present two systems:

- A sound system for *IEAUST*, for which achieving a completeness result is still an open problem.

- A sound and complete system for a technical extension of *IEAUST* that I refer to as *bi-valued IEAUST*. Bi-valued *IEAUST* was devised with the aim of having a completeness result for a logic that would be reasonably similar to the one presented in Section 3.

As for the first bullet point, a proof system for *IEAUST* is defined as follows:

Definition 4.1 (Proof system for *IEAUST*). Let Λ_R be the proof system defined by the following axioms and rules of inference:

- (*Axioms*) All classical tautologies from propositional logic; the **S5** schemata for \Box , $[\alpha]$, and K_α ; the **KD** schemata for I_α ; and the schemata given in Table 3.

<p><i>Basic-stit-theory schemata:</i></p> $\Box\phi \rightarrow [\alpha]\phi \quad (SET)$ <p>For distinct $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$,</p> $\bigwedge_{1 \leq k \leq m} \Diamond[\alpha_k]\phi_k \rightarrow \Diamond\left(\bigwedge_{1 \leq k \leq m} [\alpha_k]\phi_k\right) \quad (IA)$	<p><i>Schemata for knowledge:</i></p> $K_\alpha\phi \rightarrow [\alpha]\phi \quad (OAC)$ $\Diamond K_\alpha\phi \rightarrow K_\alpha\Diamond\phi \quad (Unif - H)$
<p><i>Schemata for objective ought-to-do's:</i></p> $\odot_\alpha(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\odot_\alpha\phi \rightarrow \odot_\alpha\psi) \quad (A1)$ $\Box\phi \rightarrow \odot_\alpha\phi \quad (A2)$ $\odot_\alpha\phi \rightarrow \Box\odot_\alpha\phi \quad (A3)$ $\odot_\alpha\phi \rightarrow \odot_\alpha([\alpha]\phi) \quad (A4)$ $\odot_\alpha\phi \rightarrow \Diamond[\alpha]\phi \quad (Oic)$	<p><i>Schemata for subjective ought-to-do's:</i></p> $\odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi \rightarrow \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\psi) \quad (A5)$ $\odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi \rightarrow \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}(K_\alpha\phi) \quad (A6)$ $K_\alpha\Box\phi \rightarrow \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi \quad (SuN)$ $\odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi \rightarrow \Diamond K_\alpha\phi \quad (s.Oic)$ $\odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi \rightarrow K_\alpha\Box\odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi \quad (s.CI)$ $\odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi \rightarrow \neg\odot_\alpha\neg\phi \quad (ConSO)$
<p><i>Schemata for intentionality:</i></p> $\Box K_\alpha\phi \rightarrow I_\alpha\phi \quad (InN)$ $I_\alpha\phi \rightarrow \Box K_\alpha I_\alpha\phi \quad (KI)$	

Table 3: Axioms for the modalities' interactions.

- (*Rules of inference*) *Modus Ponens*, Substitution, and Necessitation for all modal operators.

For a discussion of all these axioms and schemas, the reader is referred to [1, 18, 3]. An important result for Λ_R , then, is the following proposition, whose proof is relegated to Appendix A.

Proposition 4.2 (Soundness of Λ_R). *The proof system Λ_R is sound with respect to the class of kiobt-models.*

Unfortunately, the question of whether Λ_R is complete with respect to the class of *kiobt*-models is still an open problem. Now, in the search for a complete proof system for *IEAUST*, and following a strategy found in my joint works with Jan Broersen [1, 2], I tried to first prove completeness of Λ_R with respect to a class of more general models, that I refer to as *bi-valued kiobt*-models (Definition 4.3 below). This strategy led to the need of dropping one of the schemata in Λ_R : (*ConSO*). More precisely, if Λ'_R is obtained from Λ_R by eliminating (*ConSO*) in Definition 4.1, then Λ'_R turns out to be sound and complete with respect to the class of *bi-valued kiobt*-models. The formal statements are included below.

Definition 4.3 (Bi-valued *kiobt*-frames & models). $\langle M, \Box, Ags, \mathbf{Choice}, \{\sim_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Ags}, \tau, \mathbf{Value}_\emptyset, \mathbf{Value}_\mathcal{J} \rangle$ is called a *bi-valued kiobt*-frame iff

- $M, \Box, Ags, \mathbf{Choice}, \{\sim_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Ags}$, and τ are defined just as in Definition 3.2.
- \mathbf{Value}_\emptyset and $\mathbf{Value}_\mathcal{J}$ are functions that independently assign to each history $h \in H$ a real number.

A *bi-valued kiobt-model* \mathcal{M} , then, results from adding a valuation function \mathcal{V} to a bi-valued *kiobt-frame*, where $\mathcal{V} : P \rightarrow 2^{I(M \times H)}$ assigns to each atomic proposition of \mathcal{L}_R a set of indices (recall that P is the set of propositions in \mathcal{L}_R).

The two value functions in bi-valued *kiobt-frames* allow us to redefine the dominance orderings so that they are independent from one another, something that proves useful in achieving a completeness result in the style of [1]. For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and $m \in M$, two general orderings \leq and \leq_s are first defined on 2^{H_m} : for $X, Y \subseteq H_m$, $X \leq Y$, resp. $X \leq_s Y$, iff $\text{Value}_\theta(h) \leq \text{Value}_\theta(h')$, resp. $\text{Value}_\theta(h) \leq \text{Value}_\theta(h')$, for every $h \in X$ and $h' \in Y$. Then, for $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and $m \in M$, an objective dominance ordering \preceq is now defined on **Choice** $^m_\alpha$ by the rule: $L \preceq L'$ iff for every $S \in \mathbf{State}^m_\alpha$, $L \cap S \leq L' \cap S$. In turn, for $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and $m \in M$, a subjective dominance ordering \preceq_s is now defined on **Choice** $^m_\alpha$ by the rule: $L \preceq_s L'$ iff for all m' such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$ and each $S \in \mathbf{State}^m_\alpha$, $[L]^{m'}_\alpha \cap S \leq_s [L']^{m'}_\alpha \cap S$. With these new notions, the sets **Optimal** $^m_\alpha$ and **SOptimal** $^m_\alpha$ are redefined accordingly, and the evaluation rules for the formulas of \mathcal{L}_R (with respect to bi-valued *kiobt-models*) are given just as in Definition 3.3. As mentioned before, I refer to the resulting logic as *bi-valued IEAUST*. Bi-valued *IEAUST*, then, admits the following metalogic result, whose proof is sketched in Appendix A.

Theorem 4.4 (Soundness & Completeness of Λ'_R). *Let Λ'_R be the proof system obtained from Λ_R by eliminating (ConSO) in Definition 4.1. Then Λ'_R is sound and complete with respect to the class of bi-valued kiobt-models.*

5 Conclusion

This paper built a formal theory of responsibility by means of stit-theoretic models and languages that were designed to explore the interplay between the following components of responsibility: agency, knowledge, beliefs, intentions, and obligations. Said models were integrated into a framework that is rich enough to provide logic-based characterizations for different instances of three categories of responsibility: causal, informational, and motivational responsibility.

The developed theory belongs to a relatively recent tradition in the philosophical literature, that seeks to formalize responsibility allocation by means of models of agency and logic-based languages (see, for instance, [16], [17], [5], [19], [20], and [7]). Most of these frameworks characterize different forms of responsibility as combinations of causal agency, knowledge, and the principle of alternate possibilities. The novelty of the present approach, then, lies in the introduction of intentionality and ought-to-do's. Such an introduction gives rise to a taxonomy that distinguishes various kinds of responsibility and blameworthiness/praiseworthiness in a methodical, meticulous way. Interesting directions for future work, then, involve extending these models with beliefs and rational decision-making, group notions (coalitions, group knowledge & belief, collective intentionality, collective responsibility), temporal modalities, and long-term strategies, for instance. As for the technical aspects of the formal theory, an important directions for future work involve checking whether the logic is decidable, checking for the complexity of its satisfiability problem, and figuring out its applicability for implementation.⁵

⁵Implementing logics of responsibility might prove relevant in the design, formal verification, and explainability of ethical AI (see, for instance, [12]).

References

- [1] Aldo Iván Ramírez Abarca & Jan Broersen (2019): *A Logic of Objective and Subjective Oughts*. In: *European Conference on Logics in Artificial Intelligence*, Springer, pp. 629–641, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-19570-0_41.
- [2] Aldo Iván Ramírez Abarca & Jan Broersen (2021): *A Deontic Stit Logic Based on Beliefs and Expected Utility*. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 335, pp. 281–294, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.335.27.
- [3] Aldo Iván Ramírez Abarca & Jan Broersen (2023): *A stit logic of intentionality*. In Carlos Areces & Diana Costa, editors: *Dynamic Logic. New Trends and Applications*, Springer, pp. 125–153, doi:10.1007/978-3-031-26622-5_8.
- [4] Thomas Ágotnes (2006): *Action and knowledge in alternating-time temporal logic*. *Synthese* 149(2), pp. 375–407, doi:10.1007/s11229-005-3875-8.
- [5] Natasha Alechina, Joseph Y Halpern & Brian Logan (2017): *Causality, Responsibility and Blame in Team Plans*. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems*, pp. 1091–1099. Available at <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.5555/3091125.3091279>.
- [6] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Bennetot, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbado, Salvador García, Sergio Gil-López, Daniel Molina & Richard Benjamins (2020): *Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI*. *Information Fusion* 58, pp. 82–115, doi:10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.012.
- [7] Christel Baier, Florian Funke & Rupak Majumdar (2021): *A Game-Theoretic Account of Responsibility Allocation*. In: *Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI*, pp. 1773–1779, doi:10.24963/ijcai.2021/244.
- [8] N. Belnap, M. Perloff & M. Xu (2001): *Facing the future: agents and choices in our indeterminist world*. Oxford University Press.
- [9] Jan Broersen (2008): *A complete stit logic for knowledge and action, and some of its applications*. In: *International Workshop on Declarative Agent Languages and Technologies*, Springer, pp. 47–59, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-93920-7_4.
- [10] Jan Broersen (2011): *Deontic epistemic stit logic distinguishing modes of mens rea*. *Journal of Applied Logic* 9(2), pp. 137–152, doi:10.1016/j.jal.2010.06.002.
- [11] Jan Broersen & Aldo Iván Ramírez Abarca (2018): *Formalising Oughts and Practical Knowledge without Resorting to Action Types*. In: *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, pp. 1877–1879. Available at <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.5555/3237383.3238009>.
- [12] Roberta Calegari, Giovanni Ciatto, Enrico Denti & Andrea Omicini (2020): *Logic-based technologies for intelligent systems: State of the art and perspectives*. *Information* 11(3), p. 167, doi:10.3390/info11030167.
- [13] Roger Crisp (2014): *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Hein Duijf (2018): *Let's do it!: Collective responsibility, joint action, and participation*. Ph.D. thesis, Utrecht University.
- [15] Harry Frankfurt (2018): *Alternate possibilities and moral responsibility*. In: *Moral Responsibility and Alternative Possibilities*, Routledge, pp. 17–25, doi:10.2307/2023833.
- [16] Tiago de Lima, Lambér Royakkers & Frank Dignum (2010): *A logic for reasoning about responsibility*. *Logic Journal of the IGPL* 18(1), pp. 99–117, doi:10.1093/jigpal/jzp073.
- [17] Emiliano Lorini, Dominique Longin & Eunata Mayor (2014): *A logical analysis of responsibility attribution: emotions, individuals and collectives*. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 24(6), pp. 1313–1339, doi:10.1093/logcom/ext072.
- [18] Yuko Murakami (2004): *Utilitarian deontic logic*. *Advances in Modal Logic* 287.

- [19] Pavel Naumov & Jia Tao (2019): *Blameworthiness in strategic games*. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33, pp. 3011–3018, doi:10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33013011.
- [20] Pavel Naumov & Jia Tao (2020): *An epistemic logic of blameworthiness*. *Artificial Intelligence* 283, p. 103269, doi:10.1016/j.artint.2020.103269.
- [21] Luís Moniz Pereira & Ari Saptawijaya (2016): *Programming machine ethics*. 26, Springer, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-29354-7_8.
- [22] Ibo van de Poel (2011): *The relation between forward-looking and backward-looking responsibility*. In: *Moral Responsibility*, Springer, pp. 37–52, doi:10.1007/978-94-007-1878-4_3.
- [23] Gary Watson (1996): *Two faces of responsibility*. *Philosophical Topics* 24(2), pp. 227–248, doi:10.5840/philtopics199624222.
- [24] Bernard Weiner (1995): *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. Guilford Press.
- [25] Ming Xu (1994): *Decidability of deliberative stit theories with multiple agents*. In: *International Conference on Temporal Logic*, Springer, pp. 332–348, doi:10.1007/BFb0013997.

A Metalogic Results for IEAUST

Appendix A.A Soundness

Proposition A.1 (Soundness of Λ_R). *The system Λ_R (Definition 4) is sound with respect to the class of kiobt-models.*

Proof. The proof of soundness is routine: the validity of the **S5** schemata for \Box and $[\alpha]$, as well as that of (*SET*) and (*IA*), is standard from [25]; the validity of the **S5** schemata for K_α is standard from epistemic logic; the validity of schemata (*A1*)–(*A4*), as well as that of (*Oic*), is standard from [18]; the validity of the **KD** schemata for I_α , as well as that of (*InN*), follows from Definitions 3.2 and 3.3; and the validity of (*KI*) follows from frame condition (*KI*); and the validity of schemata (*OAC*), (*Unif – H*), (*A5*) and (*A6*), as well as that of (*SuN*), (*s.Oic*), (*s.Cl*), and (*ConSO*) can be shown as follows:

To see that $\mathcal{M} \models (\text{OAC})$, take $\langle m, h \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models K_\alpha \varphi$. Take $h' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m(h)$. Frame condition (*OAC*) implies that $\langle m, h \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, h' \rangle$. The assumption that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models K_\alpha \varphi$ then implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h' \rangle \models \varphi$. Therefore, for any $h' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m(h)$, $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h' \rangle \models \varphi$, which implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models [\alpha]\varphi$.

To see that $\mathcal{M} \models (\text{Unif} - H)$, take $\langle m, h \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \Diamond K_\alpha \varphi$. Let $\langle m', h' \rangle$ be an index such that $\langle m, h \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h' \rangle$. We want to show that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m', h' \rangle \models \Diamond \varphi$. The fact that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \Diamond K_\alpha \varphi$ implies that there exists $h_* \in H_m$ such that $(\star) \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h_* \rangle \models K_\alpha \varphi$. Frame condition (*Unif – H*) implies that there exists $h'_* \in H_{m'}$ such that $\langle m, h_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h'_* \rangle$. With (\star) , this last fact implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m', h'_* \rangle \models \varphi$, which in turn implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m', h' \rangle \models \Diamond \varphi$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models K_\alpha \Diamond \varphi$.

To see that $\mathcal{M} \models (\text{A6})$, take $\langle m, h \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{S} \varphi$. We want to show that, for every $L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $[L]^{m'} \not\subseteq |K_\alpha \varphi|^{m'}$ (for some m' such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$), there is $L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $L \prec_s L'$ and, if $L'' = L'$ or $L' \preceq_s L''$, then $[L'']^{m''} \subseteq |K_\alpha \varphi|^{m''}$ for every m'' such that $m \sim_\alpha m''$. Take $L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that there exists $m' \in M$ such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$ and $[L]^{m'} \not\subseteq |K_\alpha \varphi|^{m'}$. This implies that $[L]^{m''} \not\subseteq |\varphi|^{m''}$ for some m'' such that $m' \sim_\alpha m''$. Now, transitivity of \sim_α implies that $m \sim_\alpha m''$. Therefore, the assumption that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{S} \varphi$ implies that there is $L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $L \prec_s L'$ and, if $L'' = L'$ or $L' \preceq_s L''$, then $[L'']^{m''} \subseteq |\varphi|^{m''}$ for every m'' such that $m \sim_\alpha m''$. By definition of epistemic clusters and transitivity

of \sim_α , this last clause implies that if $L'' = L'$ or $L' \preceq_s L''$ then $[L'']_\alpha^{m''} \subseteq |K_\alpha \phi|^{m''}$ for every m'' such that $m \sim_\alpha m''$. Thus, L' attests to the fact that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} (K_\alpha \phi)$.

To see that $\mathcal{M} \models (SuN)$, take $\langle m, h \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models K_\alpha \Box \phi$. Take $L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$, and let $m' \in M$ be such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$ (which means that there exist $j \in H_m$, $j' \in H_{m'}$ such that $\langle m, j \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', j' \rangle$). Condition (Unif – H) ensures that there exists $h' \in H_{m'}$ such that $\langle m, h \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h' \rangle$. The assumption that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models K_\alpha \Box \phi$ then implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m', h' \rangle \models \Box \phi$. Thus, for any $h'' \in [L]_\alpha^{m'}$, the fact that $h'' \in H_{m'}$ yields that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m', h'' \rangle \models \phi$. Therefore, for all $L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ and m' such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$, $[L]_\alpha^{m'} \subseteq |\phi|^{m'}$, which vacuously implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$.

To see that $\mathcal{M} \models (s.Oic)$, take $\langle m, h \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$. This implies that there exists $L \subseteq H_m$ such that $[L]_\alpha^{m''} \subseteq |\phi|^{m''}$ for every $m'' \in M$ such that $m \sim_\alpha m''$. Since \sim_α is reflexive, $[L]_\alpha^m \subseteq |\phi|^m$. Now, take $h_0 \in L$. Let $\langle m', h' \rangle$ be an index such that $\langle m, h_0 \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h' \rangle$. From the definition of epistemic clusters, $h' \in [L]_\alpha^{m'}$, so the fact that $[L]_\alpha^{m'} \subseteq |\phi|^{m'}$ implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m', h' \rangle \models \phi$. Therefore, history $h_0 \in H_m$ is such that, for every $\langle m', h' \rangle$ with $\langle m, h_0 \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m', h' \rangle$, $\mathcal{M}, \langle m', h' \rangle \models \phi$. This means that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h_0 \rangle \models K_\alpha \phi$, which implies that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \Diamond K_\alpha \phi$.

To see that $\mathcal{M} \models (s.Cl)$, take $\langle m_*, h_* \rangle$ such that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m_*, h_* \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$. Let $\langle m, j \rangle$ be such that $\langle m_*, h_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, j \rangle$. Take $h \in H_m$. We want to show that, for every $L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $[L]_\alpha^{m'} \not\subseteq |\phi|^{m'}$ (for some m' such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$), there is $L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $L \prec_s L'$ and, if $L'' = L'$ or $L' \preceq_s L''$, then $[L'']_\alpha^{m''} \subseteq |\phi|^{m''}$ for every m'' such that $m \sim_\alpha m''$. Take $L \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that there exists $m' \in M$ such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$ and $[L]_\alpha^{m'} \not\subseteq |\phi|^{m'}$. Let N_L be an action in $\mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}$ such that $N_L \subseteq [L]_\alpha^{m_*}$, where we know that such an action exists in virtue of (Unif – H) and (OAC). Notice that transitivity of \sim_α entails that $[N_L]_\alpha^o = [L]_\alpha^o$ for any moment o , so that $[N_L]_\alpha^{m'} \not\subseteq |\phi|^{m'}$. Since $\mathcal{M}, \langle m_*, h_* \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$, there must exist $N \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}$ such that $N_L \prec_s N$ and, if $N' = N$ or $N \preceq_s N'$, then $[N']_\alpha^{m''} \subseteq |\phi|^{m''}$ for every m'' such that $m_* \sim_\alpha m''$. Now, let L_N be an action in \mathbf{Choice}_α^m such that $L_N \subseteq [N]_\alpha^m$ (which implies that $[L_N]_\alpha^o = [N]_\alpha^o$ for any moment o). We claim that $L \prec_s L_N$, and show our claim with the following argument: let $m'' \in M$ be such that $m \sim_\alpha m''$, and take $S \in \mathbf{State}_\alpha^{m''}$; on the one hand, $(\star) [L]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S = [N_L]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S \leq [N]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S = [L_N]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S$; on the other hand, we know that there exist a moment m''' and a state $S_0 \in \mathbf{State}_\alpha^{m'''}$ such that $m_* \sim_\alpha m'''$ and such that $[N]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S_0 \not\subseteq [N_L]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S_0$; therefore, $(\star\star) [L_N]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S_0 = [N]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S_0 \not\subseteq [N_L]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S_0 = [L]_\alpha^{m''} \cap S_0$. Together, (\star) and $(\star\star)$ entail that $L \prec_s L_N$, proving our claim. Now, let $L'' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ be such that $L'' = L_N$ or $L_N \preceq_s L''$. If $L'' = L_N$, then $[L'']_\alpha^{m''} = [L_N]_\alpha^{m''} \subseteq |\phi|^{m''}$ for every m'' such that $m \sim_\alpha m''$. If $L_N \prec_s L''$, then an argument similar to the one used to show that our claim was true renders that there is an action $N_{L''} \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^{m_*}$ such that $N_{L''} \subseteq [L'']_\alpha^{m_*}$ and $N \preceq_s N_{L''}$. Thus, $[L'']_\alpha^{m''} = [N_{L''}]_\alpha^{m''} \subseteq |\phi|^{m''}$. With this, we have shown that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$ for every $h \in H_m$, so that $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, j \rangle \models \Box \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$. But $\langle m, j \rangle$ was an arbitrary index such that $\langle m_*, h_* \rangle \sim_\alpha \langle m, j \rangle$. Thus, $\mathcal{M}, \langle m_*, h_* \rangle \models K_\alpha \Box \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$.

Let us show that $\mathcal{M} \models (ConSO)$. First of all, let us show that, for all $L, L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$, if $L \preceq_s L'$, then $L \preceq L'$. Take $L, L' \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$. If $L \preceq_s L'$, then, for each m' such that $m \sim_\alpha m'$, $\mathbf{Value}(h) \leq \mathbf{Value}(h')$ for every $h \in [L]_\alpha^{m'}$, $h' \in [L']_\alpha^{m'}$. Reflexivity of \sim_α implies both that $m \sim_\alpha m'$ and that $L \subseteq [L]_\alpha^m$ and $L' \subseteq [L']_\alpha^m$. Therefore, for all $h'' \in L$ and $h''' \in L'$, $\mathbf{Value}(h'') \leq \mathbf{Value}(h''')$, which implies that $L \preceq L'$.

Now, let $\langle m, h \rangle$ be an index. Assume for a contradiction that $(\star) \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J} \phi$ and that $(\star\star) \mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha \neg \phi$. On the one hand, assumption (\star) implies that there is $L_* \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $L_* \subseteq |\phi|^m$. Thus, assumption $(\star\star)$ yields that there is $L'_* \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $L_* \prec L'_*$ and, if $N = L'_*$ or $L'_* \preceq N$, then $N \subseteq |\neg \phi|^m$. In particular, $L'_* \subseteq |\neg \phi|^m$. Assumption (\star) then implies that there is $L''_* \in \mathbf{Choice}_\alpha^m$ such that $L'_* \prec_s L''_*$ and, if $N = L''_*$ or $L''_* \preceq_s N$, then $N \subseteq [N]_\alpha^m \subseteq |\phi|^m$. In particular, $L''_* \subseteq |\phi|^m$. On the other hand, by the first observation in the proof, the fact that $L'_* \prec_s L''_*$ implies that $L'_* \preceq L''_*$, so

that assumption $(\star\star)$ yields that $L_*'' \subseteq |\neg\phi|^m$, which contradicts the previously shown fact that $L_*'' \subseteq |\phi|^m$. Thus, $\mathcal{M}, \langle m, h \rangle \models \odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{L}} \phi \rightarrow \neg \odot_\alpha \neg \phi$ for every index $\langle m, h \rangle$, so that $\odot_\alpha^{\mathcal{L}} \phi \rightarrow \neg \odot_\alpha \neg \phi$ is indeed valid. It is clear that the rules of inference *Modus Ponens*, Substitution, and Necessitation for the modal operators all preserve validity. \square

Appendix A.B Completeness

As mentioned in the main body of the paper, whether Λ_R is complete with respect to the class of *kiobt*-models is still an open problem. However, the proof system Λ'_R —obtained from Λ_R by eliminating (*ConSO*) in Definition 4.1—is sound and complete with respect to the class of bi-valued *kiobt*-models (Definition 4.3). Soundness follows from Proposition A.1, and the proof of completeness is obtained by integrating the proofs of completeness in [1] and [3]. More precisely, the proof of completeness will be sketched below as a two-step process. First, I introduce a Kripke semantics for *bi-valued IEAUST*, where the formulas of \mathcal{L}_R are evaluated on bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-models (Definition A.2). Completeness of Λ'_R with respect to the class of these structures is shown via the well-known technique of canonical models. Secondly, a truth-preserving correspondence between bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-models and a subclass of bi-valued *kiobt*-models is used to prove completeness with respect to bi-valued *kiobt*-models via completeness with respect to bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-models.

A Kripke semantics for *IEAUST* is defined as follows:

Definition A.2 (Bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-frames & models). A tuple

$$\langle W, Ags, R_\square, \mathbf{Choice}, \{\approx_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Ags}, \{R'_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Ags}, \text{Value}_\emptyset, \text{Value}_\mathcal{L} \rangle$$

is called a *bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-frame* iff

- W is a set of possible worlds. R_\square is an equivalence relation over W . For $w \in W$, the class of w under R_\square is denoted by \bar{w} . **Choice** is a function that assigns to each $\alpha \in Ags$ and \square -class \bar{w} a partition $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ of \bar{w} given by an equivalence relation denoted by R'_α . **Choice** must satisfy the following constraint:
 - $(\text{IA})_K$ For all $w \in W$, each function $s : Ags \rightarrow 2^{\bar{w}}$ that maps α to a member of $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ is such that $\bigcap_{\alpha \in Ags} s(\alpha) \neq \emptyset$ (where the set of all functions s that map α to a member of $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ is denoted by $\text{Select}^{\bar{w}}$).

For $\alpha \in Ags$, $w \in W$, and $v \in \bar{w}$, the class of v in the partition $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ is denoted by $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}(v)$. Now, for $\beta \in Ags$ and $w \in W$, $\text{State}_\beta^{\bar{w}} := \left\{ S \subseteq \bar{w}; S = \bigcap_{\alpha \in Ags - \{\beta\}} s(\alpha), \text{ for } s \in \text{Select}^{\bar{w}} \right\}$, where $\text{Select}^{\bar{w}}$ denotes the set of all selection functions at \bar{w} (i.e., functions that assign to each α a member of $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$).

- For all $\alpha \in Ags$, \approx_α is an (epistemic) equivalence relation on W . The following conditions must be satisfied:
 - $(\text{OAC})_K$ For all $\alpha \in Ags$, $w \in W$, and $v \in \bar{w}$, $v \approx_\alpha u$ for every $u \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}(v)$.
 - $(\text{Unif} - \text{H})_K$ For all $\alpha \in Ags$, if $v, u \in W$ are such that $v \approx_\alpha u$, then for all $v' \in \bar{v}$ there exists $u' \in \bar{u}$ such that $v' \approx_\alpha u'$.

For $\alpha \in Ags$ and $w \in W$, α 's *ex ante information set at w* is defined as $\pi_\alpha^\square[w] := \{v; w \approx_\alpha \circ R_\square v\}$, which by frame condition $(\text{Unif} - \text{H})_K$ coincides with the set $\{v; w R_\square \circ \approx_\alpha v\}$. To clarify, $(\text{Unif} - \text{H})_K$ implies that $R_\square \circ \approx_\alpha = \approx_\alpha \circ R_\square$. Thus, $\approx_\alpha \circ R_\square$ is an equivalence relation such that $\pi_\alpha^\square[w] = \pi_\alpha^\square[v]$ for every $w, v \in W$ such that $w \approx_\alpha \circ R_\square v$.

- For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, R_α^I is a serial, transitive, and euclidean relation on W such that $R_\alpha^I \subseteq \approx_\alpha \circ R_\square$ and such that the following condition is satisfied:

– (Den)_K For all $v, u \in W$ such that $v \approx_\alpha \circ R_\square u$, there exists $z \in W$ such that $v R_\alpha^I z$ and $u R_\alpha^I z$.

For $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, R_α^{I+} denotes the reflexive closure of R_α^I . For $w \in W$, $w \uparrow_{R_\alpha^{I+}}$ denotes the set $\{v \in W; w R_\alpha^{I+} v\}$.

For $w, v \in W$, I write $\bar{w} \approx_\alpha \bar{v}$ iff there exist $w' \in \bar{w}$ and $v' \in \bar{v}$ such that $w' \approx_\alpha v'$. For $w, v \in W$ such that $\bar{w} \approx_\alpha \bar{v}$ and $L \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$, L 's epistemic cluster at \bar{v} is the set $[[L]]_\alpha^{\bar{v}} := \{u \in \bar{v}; \text{there is } o \in L \text{ such that } o \approx_\alpha u\}$.

- Value_θ and $\text{Value}_\mathcal{J}$ are functions that independently assign to each world $w \in W$ a real number. These functions are used to define an objective ordering \preceq and a subjective ordering \preceq_s of choices. Formally, for $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and $w \in W$, one first defines two general orderings \leq and \leq_s on 2^W by the rules: $X \leq Y$ iff $\text{Value}_\theta(w) \leq \text{Value}_\theta(w')$ for all $w \in X$ and $w' \in Y$; and $X \leq_s Y$ iff $\text{Value}_\mathcal{J}(w) \leq \text{Value}_\mathcal{J}(w')$ for all $w \in X$ and $w' \in Y$. An objective dominance ordering \preceq is then defined on $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ by the rule: $L \preceq L'$ iff $L \cap S \leq L' \cap S$ for every $S \in \text{State}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$. In turn, a subjective dominance ordering \preceq_s is then defined on $\text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ by the rule: $L \preceq_s L'$ iff $[[L]]_\alpha^{\bar{v}} \cap S \leq_s [[L']]_\alpha^{\bar{v}} \cap S$ for every v such that $w \approx_\alpha v$ and every $S \in \text{State}_\alpha^{\bar{v}}$. I write $L \prec L'$ iff $L \preceq L'$ and $L' \not\preceq L$, and I write $L \prec_s L'$ iff $L \preceq_s L'$ and $L' \not\preceq_s L$, so that $\text{Optimal}_\alpha^{\bar{w}} := \{L \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}; \text{there is no } L' \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}} \text{ s. t. } L \prec L'\}$ and $\text{SOptimal}_\alpha^{\bar{w}} := \{L \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}; \text{there is no } L' \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}} \text{ s. t. } L \prec_s L'\}$.

A Kripke-kios-model \mathcal{M} consists of the tuple that results from adding a valuation function \mathcal{V} to a Kripke-kios-frame, where $\mathcal{V} : P \rightarrow 2^W$ assigns to each atomic proposition a set of worlds (recall that P is the set of propositions in \mathcal{L}_R).

Kripke-kios-models allow us to evaluate the formulas of \mathcal{L}_R with semantics that are analogous to the ones provided for *kiobt*-models:

Definition A.3 (Evaluation rules on Kripke models). Let \mathcal{M} be a Kripke-kios-model, the semantics on \mathcal{M} for the formulas of \mathcal{L}_{KO} are defined recursively by the following truth conditions, evaluated at world w :

$\mathcal{M}, w \models p$	iff	$w \in \mathcal{V}(p)$
$\mathcal{M}, w \models \neg\phi$	iff	$\mathcal{M}, w \not\models \phi$
$\mathcal{M}, w \models \phi \wedge \psi$	iff	$\mathcal{M}, w \models \phi$ and $\mathcal{M}, w \models \psi$
$\mathcal{M}, w \models \Box\phi$	iff	for each $v \in \bar{w}$, $\mathcal{M}, v \models \phi$
$\mathcal{M}, w \models [\alpha]\phi$	iff	for each $v \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}(w)$, $\mathcal{M}, v \models \phi$
$\mathcal{M}, w \models K_\alpha\phi$	iff	for each v s. t. $w \approx_\alpha v$, $\mathcal{M}, v \models \phi$
$\mathcal{M}, w \models I_\alpha\phi$	iff	there exists $x \in \pi_\alpha^\square[w]$ s. t. $x \uparrow_{R_\alpha^{I+}} \subseteq \phi $
$\mathcal{M}, w \models \odot_\alpha\phi$	iff	for all $L \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ s. t. $\mathcal{M}, v \not\models \phi$ for some $v \in L$, there is $L' \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ s. t. $L \prec L'$ and, if $L'' = L'$ or $L' \preceq_s L''$, then $\mathcal{M}, w' \models \phi$ for every $w' \in L''_\alpha$
$\mathcal{M}, w \models \odot_\alpha^\mathcal{J}\phi$	iff	for all $L \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ s. t. $\mathcal{M}, v \not\models \phi$ for some $w' \in L$ s. t. $w \approx_\alpha w'$ and some $v \in [[L]]_\alpha^{w'}$, there is $L' \in \text{Choice}_\alpha^{\bar{w}}$ s. t. $L \prec_s L'$ and, if $L'' = L'$ or $L' \preceq_s L''$, then $\mathcal{M}, w''' \models \phi$ for every $w''' \in [[L'']]_\alpha^{w'}$, s. t. $\bar{w} \approx_\alpha \bar{w}''$ and every $w''' \in [[L'']]_\alpha^{w'}$,

where I write $|\phi|$ to refer to the set $\{w \in W; \mathcal{M}, w \models \phi\}$. Satisfiability, validity on a frame, and general validity are defined as usual.

A truth-preserving correspondence between Kripke-*kios*-models and *kiobt*-models is shown as follows:

Definition A.4 (Associated *kiobt*-frame). Let

$$\mathcal{F} = \langle W, \text{Ags}, R_{\square}, \text{Choice}, \{\approx_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}, \{R_{\alpha}^I\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}, \text{Value}_{\theta}, \text{Value}_{\mathcal{J}} \rangle$$

be a bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-frame.

Then $\mathcal{F}^T := \langle M_W, \square, \text{Ags}, \text{Choice}, \{\sim_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}, \tau, \text{Value}_{\theta}, \text{Value}_{\mathcal{J}} \rangle$ is called the bi-valued *kiobt*-frame associated with \mathcal{F} iff

- $M_W, \square, \text{Choice}, \{\sim_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}$, and τ are defined just as in Definition 11 in [3].
- Value_{θ} and $\text{Value}_{\mathcal{J}}$ are defined by the following rules: for $h_v \in H$, $\text{Value}_{\theta}(h_v) = \text{Value}_{\theta}(v)$, and $\text{Value}_{\mathcal{J}}(h_v) = \text{Value}_{\mathcal{J}}(v)$.

Proposition A.5. Let \mathcal{F} be a bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-frame. Then \mathcal{F}^T is a bi-valued *kiobt*-frame, indeed.

Proof. Follows from Proposition 2 in [3] and Definition A.4. □

Lemma A.6. Let \mathcal{M} be a bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-model, and let \mathcal{M}^T be its associated bi-valued *kiobt*-model. For all $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$, $w \in W$, and $L, N \in \text{Choice}_{\alpha}^{\bar{w}}$, the following conditions hold:

- (a) $L \preceq N$ iff $L^T \preceq N^T$ and $L \prec N$ iff $L^T \prec N^T$.
- (b) $L \preceq_s N$ iff $L^T \preceq_s N^T$ and $L \prec_s N$ iff $L^T \prec_s N^T$.
- (c) $L \in \text{Optimal}_{\alpha}^{\bar{w}}$ iff $L^T \in \text{Optimal}_{\alpha}^{\bar{w}}$.
- (d) $L \in \mathbf{S} - \text{Optimal}_{\alpha}^{\bar{w}}$ iff $L^T \in \mathbf{S} - \text{Optimal}_{\alpha}^{\bar{w}}$.

Proof. The reader is referred to the proof of Proposition 4 in <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1903.10577> for a proof. □

Proposition A.7 (Truth-preserving correspondence). Let \mathcal{M} be a bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-model, and let \mathcal{M}^T be its associated bi-valued *kiobt*-model. For all ϕ of \mathcal{L}_R and $w \in W$, $\mathcal{M}, w \models \phi$ iff $\mathcal{M}^T, \langle \bar{w}, h_w \rangle \models \phi$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the complexity of ϕ . For the base case, the cases of Boolean connectives, and the cases of all modal operators except I_{α} , the proofs are exactly the same as their analogs' in Proposition 4 in <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1903.10577>. For the case of I_{α} , the proof is the same as its analog in Proposition 3 in [3]. □

Thus, completeness with respect to bi-valued *kiobt*-models is proved with Propositions A.8 and A.9 below.

Proposition A.8 (Completeness w.r.t. bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-models). The proof system Λ_R' is complete with respect to the class of bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-models.

Proof. Completeness with respect to bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-models is shown via canonical models. To be precise, one defines a structure $\mathcal{M} := \langle W^{\Lambda_R'}, R_{\square}, \text{Choice}, \{\approx_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}, \{R_{\alpha}^I\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}, \text{Value}_{\theta}, \text{Value}_{\mathcal{J}}, \mathcal{V} \rangle$, where $W^{\Lambda_R'} = \{w; w \text{ is a } \Lambda_R'\text{-MCS}\}$, where $R_{\square}, \text{Choice}, \{\approx_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}, \{R_{\alpha}^I\}_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}}$, and \mathcal{V} are defined just as in Definition 12 in [3], and

where Value_θ and $\text{Value}_\mathcal{J}$ are defined as follows: for $\alpha \in \text{Ags}$ and $w \in W^\Lambda$, one first defines $\Sigma_\alpha^w := \{[\alpha]\phi; \odot[\alpha]\phi \in w\}$ and $\Gamma_\alpha^w := \{K_\alpha\phi; \odot_\mathcal{J}[\alpha]\phi \in w\}$. Then, taking $\Sigma^w = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}} \Sigma_\alpha^w$ and $\Gamma^w = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ags}} \Gamma_\alpha^w$, the deontic functions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Value}_\theta(w) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{iff } \Sigma^w \subseteq w, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ \text{Value}_\mathcal{J}(w) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{iff } \Gamma^w \subseteq w, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The canonical structure \mathcal{M} is shown to be a bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-model just as in Proposition 4 in [3]. Then, the so-called *truth lemma* is shown by merging Lemma 2 in [3] and Lemma 4 in <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1903.10577>. This renders completeness with respect to bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-models. \square

Proposition A.9 (Completeness w.r.t. bi-valued *kiobt*-models). *The proof system Λ_R' is complete with respect to the class of bi-valued *kiobt*-models.*

Proof. Let ϕ be a Λ_R' -consistent formula of \mathcal{L}_R . Proposition A.8 implies that there exists a bi-valued Kripke-*kios*-model \mathcal{M} and a world w in its domain such that $\mathcal{M}, w \models \phi$. Proposition A.7 then ensures that the bi-valued *kiobt*-model \mathcal{M}^T associated with \mathcal{M} is such that $\mathcal{M}^T, \langle \bar{w}, h_w \rangle \models \phi$. \square

Therefore, Proposition A.1 and Proposition A.9 imply that the following result, appearing in the main body of the paper, is true:

Theorem 4.4 (Soundness & Completeness of Λ_R'). *Let Λ_R' be the proof system obtained from Λ_R by eliminating (ConSO) in Definition 4.1. Then Λ_R' is sound and complete with respect to the class of bi-valued *kiobt*-models.*