

Each of those eight coalition logics is also determined by six other kinds of models

Zixuan Chen^{1,2} and Fengkui Ju^{1,3*}

¹School of Philosophy, Beijing Normal University, China

²zixuan.chen21@outlook.com

³fengkui.ju@bnu.edu.cn

Abstract

Coalition Logic is a central logic in logical research on strategic reasoning. In two recent papers, Li and Ju argued that generally, concurrent game models, models of Coalition Logic, have three too strong assumptions: seriality, independence of agents, and determinism. They presented eight coalition logics based on eight classes of general concurrent game models, determined by which of the three assumptions are met. In this paper, we show that each of the eight logics is also determined by six other kinds of models, with respective properties, that is, single-coalition-first action models, single-coalition-first neighborhood models, clear grand-coalition-first action models, clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models, tree-like grand-coalition-first action models, and tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models.

Keywords: coalition logics, action models, neighborhood models, seriality, independence of agents, determinism

1 Introduction

1.1 Eight coalition logics determined by eight classes of general concurrent game models

Coalition Logic CL, proposed by Pauly ([Pau01, Pau02]), is a central logic in logical research on strategic reasoning.

The language of CL is a modal language with the featured operator $\langle C \rangle \phi$, indicating *some available joint action of the coalition C ensures ϕ* .

*Corresponding author

CL has two kinds of models.

The first kind is *concurrent game models*. Roughly, in a concurrent game model: there are some states; there are some agents, who can form coalitions; for every coalition, there is an availability function, specifying available joint actions of the coalition at states; for every coalition, there is an outcome function, specifying possible outcome states of joint actions of the coalition. The formula $\langle C \rangle \phi$ is true at a state in a concurrent game model if C has an available joint action such that ϕ is true at every possible outcome state of the action.

The second kind is alpha neighborhood models. Alpha neighborhood models do not have actions. Consequently, they do not have availability functions and outcome functions. Instead, for every coalition, there is a neighborhood function that specifies the alpha powers of the coalition. An alpha power is a set of states into which the coalition can force the next moment to fall. The formula $\langle C \rangle \phi$ is true at a state in an alpha neighborhood model if C has an alpha power such that ϕ is true at every state of the power.

[LJ24b] argued that concurrent game models have three too strong assumptions: *seriality*, *the independence of agents*, and *determinism*. Based on *general concurrent game models*, which do not have the three assumptions, they proposed a Minimal Coalition Logic MCL. Although the three assumptions are generally too strong, we might want to keep some of them when constructing logics for strategic reasoning in some kinds of situations. Considering which of the three properties we want to keep, there are eight coalition logics in total. [LJ24a] showed the completeness of the eight logics in a uniform way.

1.2 Our work

In this paper, we call general concurrent game models *grand-coalition-first action models*. In this work, we show that each of the eight coalition logics is also determined by six other kinds of models, with respective properties.

The first kind is *single-coalition-first action models*. In this kind of models, the outcome functions for single coalitions determine the outcome functions for other coalitions. This kind of models makes good sense for situations where every agent can change a component of the state, and different components of the state that can be changed by different agents are independent of each other. The second kind is *single-coalition-first neighborhood models*. In this kind of models, the neighborhood function for a coalition specifies the *actual powers* of the coalition. An actual power is a *minimal scope* into which the coalition can force the next moment to fall. In this kind of models, the neighborhood functions for single coalitions determine the neighborhood functions for other coalitions.

The third kind is *clear grand-coalition-first action models*. In this kind of models, different joint actions of the grand coalition have different outcomes. Clear grand-coalition-first action

models are quite common in game theory. The fourth kind is *clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models*. In this kind of models, the actual powers of an agent are pairwise disjoint.

The fifth kind is *tree-like grand-coalition-first action models*. In this kind of models, every state has a determined history. The sixth kind is *tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models*. In this kind of models, every state has a determined history, too.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we present some general settings of coalition logics, including their language, their action semantics and neighborhood semantics, and the transformation from action semantics to neighborhood semantics. In Section 3, we introduce the eight coalition logics determined by eight classes of grand-coalition-first action models. In Section 4, we define single-coalition-first action models and show that they are grand-coalition-first action models; we define single-coalition-first neighborhood models and show that they can *represent* single-coalition-first action models. In Section 5, we define clear grand-coalition-first action models and show they are single-coalition-first action models; we define clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models and show that they can represent clear grand-coalition-first action models. In Section 6, we define tree-like grand-coalition-first action models and show that they are clear grand-coalition-first action models; we define tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models and show that they can represent tree-like grand-coalition-first action models. In Section 7, we show that each of the eight coalition logics is determined by the six kinds of models with respective properties. We conclude in Section 8.

2 General settings of coalition logics

2.1 Language

Let \mathbf{AP} be a countable set of atomic propositions, and \mathbf{AG} be a finite *nonempty* set of agents. The subsets of \mathbf{AG} are called **coalitions**, and \mathbf{AG} is called the **grand coalition**. In the sequel, when no confusion arises, we often write a instead of $\{a\}$, where $a \in \mathbf{AG}$.

Definition 1 (The language Φ). *The language Φ is defined as follows, where p ranges over \mathbf{AP} and $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$:*

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

The formula $\langle C \rangle \phi$ indicates *some available joint action of C ensures ϕ* . The propositional connectives \perp, \vee, \rightarrow and \leftrightarrow are defined as usual.

2.2 Action semantics

Let \mathbf{AC} be a *nonempty* set of actions. For every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, we define $\mathbf{JA}_C = \{\sigma_C \mid \sigma_C : C \rightarrow \mathbf{AC}\}$, which is a set of **joint actions** of C . Joint actions of the grand coalition are called **action**

profiles. In the sequel, we sometimes use sequences of actions to represent joint actions of coalitions, where an order among agents is implicitly presupposed. We define $\mathbf{JA} = \bigcup\{\mathbf{JA}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}$.

For every $C, D \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ such that $D \subseteq C$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, we use $\sigma_C|_D$ to indicate the *restriction* of σ_C to D , which is in \mathbf{JA}_D .

Definition 2 (Action models). *An **action model** is a tuple $\mathbf{AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \{\mathbf{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}, \{\mathbf{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}, \mathbf{label})$, where:*

- \mathbf{ST} is a nonempty set of states.
- \mathbf{AC} is a nonempty set of actions.
- for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\mathbf{av}_C : \mathbf{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{JA}_C)$ is an **availability function** for C .
- for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\mathbf{out}_C : \mathbf{ST} \times \mathbf{JA}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{ST})$ is an **outcome function** for C .
- $\mathbf{label} : \mathbf{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{AP})$ is a **labeling function**.

Different coalition logics might put different constraints on action models.

Definition 3 (Action semantics).

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \top & \\
\mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash p & \Leftrightarrow p \in \mathbf{label}(s) \\
\mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \neg\phi & \Leftrightarrow \text{not } \mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \phi \\
\mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \phi \wedge \psi & \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \phi \text{ and } \mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \psi \\
\mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \langle C \rangle \phi & \Leftrightarrow \text{there is } \sigma_C \in \mathbf{av}_C(s) \text{ such that for all } t \in \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C), \mathbf{AM}, t \Vdash \phi
\end{aligned}$$

2.3 Neighborhood semantics

Definition 4 (Neighborhood models and alpha neighborhood models). *A **neighborhood model** is a tuple $\mathbf{NM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \{\mathbf{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}, \mathbf{label})$, where:*

- \mathbf{ST} is a nonempty set of states.
- for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\mathbf{nei}_C : \mathbf{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{ST}))$ is a **neighborhood function** for C .
- $\mathbf{label} : \mathbf{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{AP})$ is a **labeling function**.

*A neighborhood model $\mathbf{NM}^\alpha = (\mathbf{ST}, \{\mathbf{nei}_C^\alpha \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}, \mathbf{label})$ is an **alpha neighborhood model** if for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, $\mathbf{nei}_C^\alpha(s)$ is closed under supersets.*

Different coalition logics might put different constraints on neighborhood models.

Definition 5 (Neighborhood semantics).

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{NM}, s \Vdash \top & \\
\text{NM}, s \Vdash p & \Leftrightarrow p \in \text{label}(s) \\
\text{NM}, s \Vdash \neg\phi & \Leftrightarrow \text{not } \text{NM}, s \Vdash \phi \\
\text{NM}, s \Vdash \phi \wedge \psi & \Leftrightarrow \text{NM}, s \Vdash \phi \text{ and } \text{NM}, s \Vdash \psi \\
\text{NM}, s \Vdash \langle C \rangle \phi & \Leftrightarrow \text{there is } Y \in \text{nei}_C(s) \text{ such that for all } t \in Y, \text{NM}, t \Vdash \phi
\end{aligned}$$

The following fact, which is easy to verify, indicates that we can transform a pointed neighborhood model to a pointed alpha neighborhood model without changing the set of formulas it satisfies.

Fact 1. Let $\text{NM} = (\text{ST}, \{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a neighborhood model and $\text{NM}^\alpha = (\text{ST}, \{\text{nei}_C^\alpha \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be an alpha neighborhood model such that for all $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, $\text{nei}_C^\alpha(s)$ is the closure of $\text{nei}_C(s)$ under supersets.

Then, for every $s \in \text{ST}$ and $\phi \in \Phi$, $\text{NM}, s \Vdash \phi$ if and only if $\text{NM}^\alpha, s \Vdash \phi$.

2.4 Transformation of action semantics to neighborhood semantics

Definition 6 (Actual effectivity functions and alpha effectivity functions of action models). Let $\text{AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \{\text{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}, \{\text{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be an action model.

For every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, the function AE_C defined as follows is called the **actual effectivity function** for C in AM : for every $s \in \text{ST}$,

$$\text{AE}_C(s) = \{\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \mid \sigma_C \in \text{av}_C(s)\}.$$

For every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, the function LE_C defined as follows is called the **alpha effectivity function** for C in AM : for every $s \in \text{ST}$,

$$\text{LE}_C(s) = \{Y \subseteq \text{ST} \mid \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \subseteq Y \text{ for some } \sigma_C \in \text{av}_C(s)\}.$$

Actual effectivity functions are more transparent in the following sense: each element of $\text{AE}_C(s)$ can be understood as a class of equivalent actions.

Definition 7 (Action models z -representable by neighborhood models and α -representable by alpha neighborhood models).

An action model $\text{AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \{\text{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}, \{\text{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ is **z -representable** by a neighborhood model $\text{NM} = (\text{ST}, \{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ if for every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{AE}_C = \text{nei}_C$.

A class of action models \mathbf{AM} is **z -representable** by a class of neighborhood models \mathbf{NM} if (1) every action model in \mathbf{AM} is z -representable by a neighborhood model in \mathbf{NM} , and (2) every neighborhood model in \mathbf{NM} z -represents an action model in \mathbf{AM} .

An action model \mathbf{AM} is α -**representable** by an alpha neighborhood model $\mathbf{NM}^\alpha = (\mathbf{ST}, \{\mathbf{nei}_C^\alpha \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}, \mathbf{label})$ if for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\mathbf{LE}_C = \mathbf{nei}_C^\alpha$.

A class of action models \mathbf{AM} is α -**representable** by a class of alpha neighborhood models \mathbf{NM}^α if (1) every action model in \mathbf{AM} is α -representable by an alpha neighborhood model in \mathbf{NM}^α , and (2) every alpha neighborhood model in \mathbf{NM}^α α -represents an action mode in \mathbf{AM} .

Intuitively, that a neighborhood model \mathbf{NM} represents an action model \mathbf{AM} means that \mathbf{NM} contains all the information of \mathbf{AM} to evaluate formulas of Φ .

The following result can be easily shown:

Theorem 1 (Representability implies equivalence).

(1) For every action model \mathbf{AM} and neighborhood model \mathbf{NM} , if \mathbf{AM} is z -representable by \mathbf{NM} , then for every state s of \mathbf{AM} and formula ϕ in Φ , $\mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \phi$ if and only if $\mathbf{NM}, s \Vdash \phi$.

Consequently, for every class of action models \mathbf{AM} and class of neighborhood models \mathbf{NM} , if \mathbf{AM} is z -representable by \mathbf{NM} , then for every formula ϕ in Φ , ϕ is valid with respect to \mathbf{AM} if and only if ϕ is valid with respect to \mathbf{NM} .

(2) For every action model \mathbf{AM} and alpha neighborhood model \mathbf{NM}^α , if \mathbf{AM} is α -representable by \mathbf{NM}^α , then for every state s of \mathbf{AM} and formula ϕ in Φ , $\mathbf{AM}, s \Vdash \phi$ if and only if $\mathbf{NM}^\alpha, s \Vdash \phi$.

Consequently, for every class of action models \mathbf{AM} and class of alpha neighborhood model \mathbf{NM}^α , if \mathbf{AM} is α -representable by \mathbf{NM}^α , then for every formula ϕ in Φ , ϕ is valid with respect to \mathbf{AM} if and only if ϕ is valid with respect to \mathbf{NM}^α .

3 Eight coalition logics determined by eight classes of grand-coalition-first action models

3.1 Eight classes of grand-coalition-first action models

Definition 8 (Grand-coalition-first action models). A *grand-coalition-first action model* is a tuple $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$, where:

- \mathbf{ST} is a nonempty set of states.
- \mathbf{AC} is a nonempty set of actions.
- $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}} : \mathbf{ST} \times \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{ST})$ is an outcome function for \mathbf{AG} .
- $\mathbf{label} : \mathbf{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{AP})$ is a labeling function.

Definition 9 (Outcome functions and availability functions of grand-coalition-first action models). Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model.

For every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, define the outcome function \mathbf{out}_C for C as follows: for all $s \in \mathbf{ST}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$,

$$\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \bigcup \{ \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}} \text{ and } \sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \}.$$

For every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, define the availability function \mathbf{av}_C for C as follows: for all $s \in \mathbf{ST}$,

$$\mathbf{av}_C(s) = \{ \sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C \mid \mathbf{out}(s, \sigma_C) \neq \emptyset \}.$$

Definition 10 (Successor functions of grand-coalition-first action models). Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model.

Define the **successor function** \mathbf{suc} of $\mathbf{G-AM}$ as follows: for all $s \in \mathbf{ST}$,

$$\mathbf{suc}(s) = \bigcup \{ \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}} \}.$$

For every set X of states, we say $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ is a **general cover** of X if $\bigcup \Delta = X$. A general cover Δ is a **cover** if $\emptyset \notin \Delta$. It is easy to verify the following fact:

Fact 2. Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model.

Then, for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, $\{ \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \mid \sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C \}$ is a general cover of $\mathbf{suc}(s)$.

Fact 3. Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model, $\{ \mathbf{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG} \}$ be the set of availability functions of $\mathbf{G-AM}$, and $\{ \mathbf{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG} \}$ be the set of outcome functions of $\mathbf{G-AM}$.

Then:

- (1) for all $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, $C, D \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C(s)$, and $\sigma_D \in \mathbf{JA}_D(s)$, $\mathbf{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) \subseteq \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$;
- (2) for all $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, where $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C(s)$, where $\sigma_C = \sigma_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{a_n}$, $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \subseteq \mathbf{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathbf{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n})$.

Note that neither of the converses of the two statements holds. Figure 1 indicates a counterexample for them.

Definition 11 (Seriality, independence, and determinism of grand-coalition-first action models). Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model.

We say:

- $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is **serial** if for all $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, $\mathbf{av}_C(s) \neq \emptyset$;




Figure 1: This figure is used to show that in grand-coalition-first action models, the set of outcome states of a joint action might not contain the intersection of the sets of outcome states of the joint action's parts. A grand-coalition-first action model is indicated in the figure, where we suppose $\text{AG} = \{a, b\}$. It can be seen: (1) $\text{out}_a(s_0, \alpha_1)$, the set of outcome states of a performing α_1 at s_0 , equals to $\{s_1, s_2\}$, (2) $\text{out}_b(s_0, \beta_1)$, the set of outcome states of b performing β_1 at s_0 , equals to $\{s_1, s_2\}$, but (3) $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_0, (\alpha_1, \beta_1))$, the set of outcome states of a and b respectively performing α_1 and β_1 at s_0 , does not contain the intersection of $\text{out}_a(s_0, \alpha_1)$ and $\text{out}_b(s_0, \beta_1)$.

- **G-AM is independent** if for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $C, D \subseteq \text{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, $\sigma_C \in \text{av}_C(s)$, and $\sigma_D \in \text{av}_D(s)$, $\sigma_C \cup \sigma_D \in \text{av}_{C \cup D}(s)$;
- **G-AM is deterministic** if for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{av}_{\text{AG}}(s)$, $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$ is a singleton.

We let the three symbols **S**, **I** and **D** correspond to the three properties, respectively, and let the eight strings ϵ , **S**, **I**, **D**, **SI**, **SD**, **ID**, and **SID** correspond to the eight combinations of the three properties, respectively. We use **ES** to indicate the set of the eight strings.

For every $X \in \text{ES}$ and grand-coalition-first action model **G-AM**, we say **G-AM** is a **X-model** if **G-AM** has the properties corresponding to **X**.

For every $X \in \text{ES}$, we use **MCL + X** to refer to the coalition logic determined by the class of grand-coalition-first action **X**-models.

3.2 Eight axiomatic systems

Definition 12 (An axiomatic system for MCL).

Axioms:

Tautologies (A-Tau): all propositional tautologies

No absurd available actions (A-NAAA): $\neg\langle C \rangle \perp$

Monotonicity of goals (A-MG): $\langle \emptyset \rangle (\phi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\langle C \rangle \phi \rightarrow \langle C \rangle \psi)$

Monotonicity of coalitions (A-MC): $\langle C \rangle \phi \rightarrow \langle D \rangle \phi$, where $C \subseteq D$

Inference rules:

$$\text{Modus ponens (MP): } \frac{\phi, \phi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$$

$$\text{Conditional necessitation (CN): } \frac{\phi}{\langle\langle C \rangle\rangle \psi \rightarrow \langle\langle \emptyset \rangle\rangle \phi}$$

We let the following formulas respectively correspond to S, I and D.

$$\text{Seriality (A-Ser): } \langle\langle C \rangle\rangle \top$$

$$\text{Independence of agents (A-IA): } (\langle\langle C \rangle\rangle \phi \wedge \langle\langle D \rangle\rangle \psi) \rightarrow \langle\langle C \cup D \rangle\rangle (\phi \wedge \psi), \text{ where } C \cap D = \emptyset$$

$$\text{Determinism (A-Det): } \langle\langle C \rangle\rangle (\phi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\langle\langle C \rangle\rangle \phi \vee \langle\langle \mathbf{AG} \rangle\rangle \psi)$$

Definition 13 (Axiomatic systems for MCL + X). *For every X in ES, the axiomatic system for MCL + X consists of the axioms and inference rules of MCL, and the axioms corresponding to the elements of X.*

Theorem 2 (Soundness and completeness of MCL + X [LJ24a]). *For every X in ES, the axiomatic system for MCL + X given in Definition 13 is sound and complete with respect to the set of valid formulas of MCL + X.*

Remarks The class of grand-coalition-first SID-models is α -representable ([Pau02, GJT13]), and the class of grand-coalition-first SD-models is α -representable ([SW24]). Are the other six classes of grand-coalition-first action models α -representable? Are the eight classes of grand-coalition-first action models z -representable? All this is yet unknown.

4 Single-coalition-first action models and single-coalition-first neighborhood models

4.1 Outcome functions are compositional in many situations

We say outcome functions of a class of action models are **compositional** if there is a way such that for every action model in the class, the outcome function of a coalition is determined by the outcome functions of its members in this way.

Outcome functions in grand-coalition-first action models are not compositional. Figure 2 gives a counterexample for this.

There are many situations where every agent can change a component of the state, and different components of the state that can be changed by different agents are independent of each other. In these situations, the set of outcomes of a joint action is the intersection of the sets of outcomes of individual actions of the joint action.




Figure 2: This figure offers a counterexample that outcome functions in grand-coalition-first action models are not generally compositional. We suppose $\text{AG} = \{a, b\}$. Two grand-coalition-first action models G-AM_1 and G-AM_2 are depicted above, where $\{\text{out}_C^1 \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ is the set of outcome functions of G-AM_1 and $\{\text{out}_C^2 \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ is the set of outcome functions of G-AM_2 . In G-AM_1 : $\text{out}_a^1(s_0, \alpha_1) = \{s_1, s_2\}$, $\text{out}_b^1(s_0, \beta_1) = \{s_1, s_2\}$, and $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}^1(s_0, (\alpha_1, \beta_1)) = \{s_1\}$. In G-AM_2 : $\text{out}_a^2(s_0, \alpha_1) = \{s_1, s_2\}$, $\text{out}_b^2(s_0, \beta_1) = \{s_1, s_2\}$, and $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}^2(s_0, (\alpha_1, \beta_1)) = \{s_2\}$. Note: $\text{out}_a^1(s_0, \alpha_1) = \text{out}_a^2(s_0, \alpha_1)$, $\text{out}_b^1(s_0, \beta_1) = \text{out}_b^2(s_0, \beta_1)$, but $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}^1(s_0, (\alpha_1, \beta_1)) \neq \text{out}_{\text{AG}}^2(s_0, (\alpha_1, \beta_1))$. This implies that outcome functions in grand-coalition-first action models are not generally compositional: there is no way such that for every grand-coalition-first action model, the outcome function of a coalition is determined by the outcome functions of its members in this way.




Figure 3: This figure indicates a grand-coalition-first action model for the situation of Example 1. Here, c_f and c_b , respectively, express *the front door is closed* and *the back door is closed*. It can be checked that in this model, the set of outcomes of a joint action is the intersection of the sets of outcomes of individual actions of the joint action. For example: (1) $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_1, (\text{skip}, \text{skip})) = \text{out}_a(s_1, \text{skip}) \cap \text{out}_b(s_1, \text{skip}) = \{s_1, s_2\} \cap \{s_1, s_3\} = \{s_1\}$; (2) $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_2, (\text{skip}, \text{close-b})) = \text{out}_a(s_2, \text{skip}) \cap \text{out}_b(s_2, \text{close-b}) = \{s_1, s_2\} \cap \{s_1\} = \{s_1\}$; (3) $\text{out}_{\{a,b\}}(s_3, (\text{close-f}, \text{skip})) = \text{out}_a(s_3, \text{close-f}) \cap \text{out}_b(s_3, \text{skip}) = \{s_1\} \cap \{s_1, s_3\} = \{s_1\}$.

What follows are two examples, and the second is from [AHK02].

Example 1. *Adam and Bob control a ship lock with two doors: a front door and a back door. Adam can make the front door closed or open, Bob can make the back door closed or open, but they cannot make the two doors open at the same time. This situation can be represented by the grand-coalition-first action model depicted in Figure 3, where the set of outcomes of a joint action is the intersection of the sets of outcomes of individual actions of the joint action.*

Example 2. *A system has two processes, a and b. The process a can assign 1 or 0 to the variable x, and the process b can assign 1 or 0 to the variable y. When $x = 0$, a can leave the value of x unchanged or change it to 1. When $x = 1$, a leaves the value of x unchanged. Similarly, when $y = 0$, b can leave the value of y unchanged or change it to 1. When $y = 1$, b leaves the value of y unchanged. Figure 4 indicates a grand-coalition-first model for this scenario, where the set of outcomes of a joint action is the intersection of the sets of outcomes of individual actions of the joint action.*

We want to mention that some literature, such as [HvdHMW01] and [HW05], deals with agency by *propositional control*: there are some agents; every atomic proposition is controlled by at most one agent. In these settings, outcome functions are compositional.




Figure 4: This figure indicates a grand-coalition-first action model for the situation of Example 2. It can be checked that in this model, the set of outcomes of a joint action is the intersection of the sets of outcomes of individual actions of the joint action. For example: (1) $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_1, (\text{skip}, \text{skip})) = \text{out}_a(s_1, \text{skip}) \cap \text{out}_b(s_1, \text{skip}) = \{s_1\} \cap \{s_1\} = \{s_1\}$; (2) $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_2, (\text{skip}, y := 1)) = \text{out}_a(s_2, \text{skip}) \cap \text{out}_b(s_2, y := 1) = \{s_1, s_2\} \cap \{s_1\} = \{s_1\}$; (3) $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_4, (x := 1, y := 1)) = \text{out}_a(s_4, x := 1) \cap \text{out}_b(s_4, y := 1) = \{s_1, s_2\} \cap \{s_1, s_3\} = \{s_1\}$.

4.2 Single-coalition-first action models

Definition 14 (Single-coalition-first action models). *A single-coalition-first action model is a tuple $\text{S-AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{suc}, \{\text{out}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$, where:*

- *ST is a nonempty set of states.*
- *AC is a nonempty set of actions.*
- *$\text{suc} : \text{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{ST})$ is a successor function.*
- *for all $a \in \text{AG}$, $\text{out}_a : \text{ST} \times \text{JA}_a \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{ST})$ is an outcome function for a such that for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $\{\text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \text{JA}_a\}$ is a general cover of $\text{suc}(s)$.*
- *$\text{label} : \text{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{AP})$ is a labeling function.*

Definition 15 (Outcome functions and availability functions of single-coalition-first action models). *Let $\text{S-AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{suc}, \{\text{out}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first action model.*

For every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, define the outcome function out_C for C as follows: for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $\sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C$,

$$\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \begin{cases} \text{suc}(s) & \text{if } C = \emptyset \\ \bigcap \{\text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid a \in C, \sigma_a \in \text{JA}_a, \text{ and } \sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_C\} & \text{if } C \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

For every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, define the availability function \mathbf{av}_C for C as follows: for all $s \in \mathbf{ST}$,

$$\mathbf{av}_C(s) = \{\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C \mid \mathbf{out}(s, \sigma_C) \neq \emptyset\}$$

Clearly, the outcome functions in single-coalition-first action models are compositional.

For all $\sigma_C, \sigma'_C, \sigma''_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, we say that σ''_C is a **fusion** of σ_C and σ'_C , if for all $a \in C$, $\sigma''_C|_a$ equals to $\sigma_C|_a$ or $\sigma'_C|_a$.

The following result offers two alternative definitions of sing-coalition-first action models.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathbf{AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \{\mathbf{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}, \{\mathbf{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}, \mathbf{label})$ be an action model and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$.*

The following three sets of conditions are equivalent:

- (1) (a) for all $a \in \mathbf{AG}$, $\{\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a\}$ is a general cover of $\mathbf{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$;
(b) for all nonempty $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \bigcap \{\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid a \in C, \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a, \text{ and } \sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_C\}$.

It is easy to check this set of conditions is equivalent to the set of constraints on single-coalition-first action models given in Definition 14.

- (2) (a) for all $a \in \mathbf{AG}$, $\{\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a\}$ is a general cover of $\mathbf{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$;
(b) for all $C, D \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, and $\sigma_D \in \mathbf{JA}_D$, $\mathbf{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) = \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$.
- (3) (a) for all $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \bigcup \{\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}} \text{ and } \sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}\}$;
(b) for all $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C, \sigma'_C, \sigma''_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, if σ''_C is a fusion of σ_C and σ'_C , then $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma'_C) \subseteq \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma''_C)$.

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2)

Assume (1). We only need to show (2b). Let $C, D \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, and $\sigma_D \in \mathbf{JA}_D$. We want to show $\mathbf{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) = \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$.

Assume $C = \emptyset$ and $D = \emptyset$. Then, $\mathbf{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) = \mathbf{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset) = \mathbf{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset) \cap \mathbf{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset) = \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$.

Assume $C = \emptyset$ and $D \neq \emptyset$. Then $\mathbf{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) = \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$ and $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D) = \mathbf{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset) \cap \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$. It suffices to show $\mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D) \subseteq \mathbf{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$. Let $t \in \mathbf{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$. Let $a \in D$. By (1b), $t \in \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_D|_a)$. Then, $t \in \bigcup \{\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a\} =$

$\text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$. Then, $t \in \text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$. Then, $\text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D) \subseteq \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C)$. Then, $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D) = \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$. Then, $\text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) = \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$.

The case that $C \neq \emptyset$ and $D = \emptyset$ can be handled similarly.

Assume $C \neq \emptyset$ and $D \neq \emptyset$. Let $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$, $D = \{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, $\sigma_C = \sigma_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{a_n}$, and $\sigma_D = \sigma_{b_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{b_m}$. By (1b), $\text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) = \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n}) \cap \text{out}_{b_1}(s, \sigma_{b_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{out}_{b_m}(s, \sigma_{b_m}) = \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1)

Assume (2). It suffices to show (1b). Let C be a nonempty subset of \mathbf{AG} and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$. Let $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\sigma_C = \sigma_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{a_n}$.

Note $C = \{a_1\} \cup C - \{a_1\}$. By (2b), $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \cap \text{out}_{C - \{a_1\}}(s, \sigma_C|_{C - \{a_1\}})$.

Note $C - \{a_1\} = \{a_2\} \cup C - \{a_1, a_2\}$. By (2b), $\text{out}_{C - \{a_1\}}(s, \sigma_C|_{C - \{a_1\}}) = \text{out}_{a_2}(s, \sigma_{a_2}) \cap \text{out}_{C - \{a_1, a_2\}}(s, \sigma_C|_{C - \{a_1, a_2\}})$.

...

Finally, we have $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n}) = \bigcap \{\text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid a \in C, \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a \text{ and } \sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_C\}$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3)

Assume (2).

First, we show (3a). Let $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$. We want to show $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \bigcup \{\text{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}} \text{ and } \sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}\}$.

Let $w \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C)$. We want to show $w \in \bigcup \{\text{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}} \text{ and } \sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}\}$. It suffices to show there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$ and $w \in \text{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$. By (2b), it suffices to show that there is $\sigma_{\overline{C}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\overline{C}}$ such that $w \in \text{out}_{\overline{C}}(s, \sigma_{\overline{C}})$.

By (1a) and (1b), it is easy to verify $w \in \text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$. Assume $\overline{C} = \emptyset$. Clearly, what we want holds. Assume $\overline{C} \neq \emptyset$. Let $\overline{C} = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Note for every $a \in \mathbf{AG}$, $\bigcup \{\text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a\} = \text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$. Then, there is $\sigma_{a_1} \in \mathbf{JA}_{a_1}$ such that $w \in \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1})$, ..., there is $\sigma_{a_n} \in \mathbf{JA}_{a_n}$ such that $w \in \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n})$. Let $\sigma_{\overline{C}} = \sigma_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{a_n}$. By (1b), $w \in \text{out}_{\overline{C}}(s, \sigma_{\overline{C}})$.

Let $w \in \bigcup \{\text{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}} \text{ and } \sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}\}$. Then, there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$ and $w \in \text{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$. Let $\sigma_{\overline{C}} = \sigma_C \cup \sigma_{\overline{C}}$. By (2b), $w \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C)$.

Second, we show (3b). Let $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C, \sigma'_C, \sigma''_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$ such that σ''_C is a fusion of σ_C and σ'_C . We want to show $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_C(s, \sigma'_C) \subseteq \text{out}_C(s, \sigma''_C)$. Let $t \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_C(s, \sigma'_C)$.

Assume $C = \emptyset$. It is easy to see $t \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma''_C)$.

Assume $C \neq \emptyset$. Let $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$. Let $\sigma_C = \sigma_{c_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{c_n}$, $\sigma'_C = \sigma'_{c_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma'_{c_n}$, and $\sigma''_C = \sigma''_{c_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma''_{c_n}$, where $\sigma''_{c_i} = \sigma_{c_i}$ or $\sigma''_{c_i} = \sigma'_{c_i}$ for every i such that $1 \leq i \leq n$. By (1b), $t \in \text{out}_{c_1}(s, \sigma_{c_1})$, $t \in \text{out}_{c_1}(s, \sigma'_{c_1})$, ..., $t \in \text{out}_{c_n}(s, \sigma_{c_n})$, $t \in \text{out}_{c_n}(s, \sigma'_{c_n})$. Then, $t \in \text{out}_{c_1}(s, \sigma''_{c_1})$,

..., $t \in \text{out}_{c_n}(s, \sigma''_{c_n})$. By (1b), $t \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma''_C)$.

(3) \Rightarrow (2)

Assume (3).

First, we show (2a). Let $a \in \text{AG}$. We want to show $\bigcup\{\text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \text{JA}_a\} = \text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$.

Let $t \in \bigcup\{\text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \text{JA}_a\}$. Then, there is $\sigma_a \in \text{JA}_a$ such that $t \in \text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a)$. By (3a), there is σ_{AG} such that $\sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$ and $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$. Then, $t \in \bigcup\{\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}} \text{ and } \emptyset \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\}$, which equals to $\text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$ by (3a).

Let $t \in \text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset)$. By (3a), $t \in \bigcup\{\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}} \text{ and } \emptyset \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\}$. Then, there is σ_{AG} such that $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$. By (3a), $t \in \bigcup\{\text{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \text{JA}_a\}$.

Second, we show (2b). Let $C, D \subseteq \text{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, $\sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C$, and $\sigma_D \in \text{JA}_D$. We want to show $\text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D) = \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$.

Assume $t \in \text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D)$. By (3a), $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$ for some $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_C \cup \sigma_D \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$. Note $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$ and $\sigma_D \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$. By (3a), $t \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C)$ and $t \in \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$. Then, $t \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$.

Assume $t \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \text{out}_D(s, \sigma_D)$. Then, there is σ_{AG} and σ'_{AG} such that $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$, $\sigma_D \subseteq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$, $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$ and $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\text{AG}})$. Assume $t \notin \text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D)$. We want to get a contradiction.

We claim $\sigma_C \not\subseteq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$ and $\sigma_D \not\subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$. Assume $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$. Note $C \cap D = \emptyset$. Then $\sigma_C \cup \sigma_D \subseteq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$. By (3a), $t \in \text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D)$, which is impossible. Similarly, we can show $\sigma_D \not\subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$.

Let $\sigma'_C \in \text{JA}_C$ and $\sigma'_D \in \text{JA}_D$ such that $\sigma'_C \subseteq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$ and $\sigma'_D \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$. Then, $\sigma'_C \cup \sigma_D \subseteq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$ and $\sigma_C \cup \sigma'_D \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$. By (3a), $t \in \text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma'_C \cup \sigma_D)$ and $t \in \text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma'_D)$. Note $\sigma_C \cup \sigma_D$ is a fusion of $\sigma'_C \cup \sigma_D$ and $\sigma_C \cup \sigma'_D$. By (3b), $t \in \text{out}_{C \cup D}(s, \sigma_C \cup \sigma_D)$. We have a contradiction. \square

Theorem 4. *Every single-coalition-first action model is a grand-coalition-first action model, but not vice versa.*

The first part of the result follows from the previous theorem. For the second part, the grand-coalition-first action model indicated in Figure 1 is a counterexample.

Remarks Goranko and Jamroga [GJ04] discussed *convex concurrent game models*, which are closely related to *rectangular game forms* in game theory [Abd98]. It can be verified convex concurrent game models are single-coalition-first action SID-models.

4.3 Single-coalition-first neighborhood models

Let ST be a nonempty set of states and $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\text{ST}) - \{\emptyset\}$. Define $\Delta_1 \odot \Delta_2 = \{Y_1 \cap Y_2 \mid Y_1 \in \Delta_1, Y_2 \in \Delta_2, \text{ and } Y_1 \cap Y_2 \neq \emptyset\}$. Let I be a nonempty set of indices. Define $\odot\{\Delta_i \mid i \in I \text{ and } \Delta_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\text{ST}) - \{\emptyset\}\}$ as expected. Note $\odot\{\Delta\} = \Delta$.

Definition 16 (Single-coalition-first neighborhood models). *A **single-coalition-first neighborhood model** is a tuple $\text{S-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$, where:*

- ST is a nonempty set of states.
- $\text{suc} : \text{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{ST})$ is a successor function.
- for all $a \in \text{AG}$, $\text{nei}_a : \text{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\text{ST}))$ is a neighborhood function for a such that for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $\text{nei}_a(s)$ is a cover of $\text{suc}(s)$.
- $\text{label} : \text{ST} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{AP})$ is a labeling function.

Definition 17 (Neighborhood functions of single-coalition-first neighborhood models). *Let $\text{S-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model.*

For every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, define the neighborhood function nei_C for C as follows: for all $s \in \text{ST}$,

$$\text{nei}_C(s) = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \text{suc}(s) = \emptyset \\ \{\text{suc}(s)\} & \text{if } \text{suc}(s) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } C = \emptyset \\ \odot\{\text{nei}_a(s) \mid a \in C\} & \text{if } \text{suc}(s) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } C \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

Fact 4. *Let $\text{S-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model, and $\{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of neighborhood functions of S-NM .*

Then, for all $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, $\text{nei}_C(s)$ is a cover of $\text{suc}(s)$.

Proof. Let $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$. Assume $\text{suc}(s) = \emptyset$. Then $\text{nei}_C(s) = \emptyset$, which is a cover of $\text{suc}(s)$. Assume $\text{suc}(s) \neq \emptyset$ and $C = \emptyset$. Then $\text{nei}_C(s) = \{\text{suc}(s)\}$, which is a cover of $\text{suc}(s)$. Assume $\text{suc}(s) \neq \emptyset$ and $C \neq \emptyset$. Let $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Let $t \in \text{suc}(s)$. We want to show $t \in \bigcup \text{nei}_C(s)$. Note $\text{nei}_a(s)$ is a cover of $\text{suc}(s)$ for every $a \in \text{AG}$. Then, there is $X_{a_1} \in \text{nei}_{a_1}(s)$ such that $t \in X_{a_1}$, ..., there is $X_{a_n} \in \text{nei}_{a_n}(s)$ such that $t \in X_{a_n}$. Then $t \in X_{a_1} \cap \dots \cap X_{a_n}$. Note $X_{a_1} \cap \dots \cap X_{a_n} \in \text{nei}_C(s)$. Then $t \in \bigcup \text{nei}_C(s)$. □

Definition 18 (Seriality, independence, and determinism of single-coalition-first neighborhood models). *Let $\text{S-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model.*

We say:

- **S-NM is *serial*** if for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{nei}_C(s) \neq \emptyset$.
- **S-NM is *independent*** if for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $C, D \subseteq \text{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, $Y_1 \in \text{nei}_C(s)$ and $Y_2 \in \text{nei}_D(s)$, $Y_1 \cap Y_2 = \emptyset$.
- **S-NM is *deterministic*** if for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $Y \in \text{nei}_{\text{AG}}(s)$, Y is a singleton.

As above, we let the eight strings ϵ , **S**, **I**, **D**, **SI**, **SD**, **ID**, and **SID** in the set **ES** correspond to the eight combinations of the three properties, respectively.

For any $X \in \text{ES}$ and single-coalition-first neighborhood model **S-NM**, we say **S-NM** is an **X-model** if it has the properties corresponding to X .

Remarks Alur, Henzinger, and Kupferman [AHK98] proposed a semantics for ATL, where models are based on *alternating transition systems*. Goranko and Jamroga [GJ04] discussed *tight* alternating transition systems, which we can verify are single-coalition-first neighborhood **SID**-models.

4.4 Representation of single-coalition-first action models by single-coalition-first neighborhood models

Theorem 5. *Every single-coalition-first action model is z -representable by a single-coalition-first neighborhood model.*

This result is easy to show, and we skip its proof.

Theorem 6. *Every single-coalition-first neighborhood model z -represents a single-coalition-first action model.*

Proof.

Let **S-NM** = $(\text{ST}, \text{succ}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model, and $\{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the set of neighborhood functions of **S-NM**.

Define a single-coalition-first action model **S-AM** = $(\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{succ}, \{\text{out}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ as follows:

- $\text{AC} = \{\alpha_{a-s-X} \mid a \in \text{AG}, s \in \text{ST}, \text{ and } X \in \text{nei}_a(s)\}$.
- for every $a \in \text{AG}$, $s \in \text{ST}$ and $\alpha_{x-u-X} \in \text{AC}$,

$$\text{out}_a(s, \alpha_{x-u-X}) = \begin{cases} X & \text{if } x = a \text{ and } u = s \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Let $\{\text{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of outcome functions of **S-AM**.

We claim that **S-AM** is z -representable by **S-NM**.

Let $\{\text{AE}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of actual effectivity functions of **S-AM**. Let $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$. It suffices to show $\text{AE}_C(s) = \text{nei}_C(s)$. Note $\text{AE}_C(s) = \{\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \mid \sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C \text{ and } \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C)\}$.

Assume $\text{suc}(s) = \emptyset$. Note $\text{AE}_C(s) = \emptyset$ and $\text{nei}_C(s) = \emptyset$. Then, $\text{AE}_C(s) = \text{nei}_C(s)$.

Assume $\text{suc}(s) \neq \emptyset$ and $C = \emptyset$. Note $\text{AE}_C(s) = \{\text{suc}(s)\}$ and $\text{nei}_C(s) = \{\text{suc}(s)\}$. Then, $\text{AE}_C(s) = \text{nei}_C(s)$.

Assume $\text{suc}(s) \neq \emptyset$ and $C \neq \emptyset$. Let $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Note $\text{nei}_C(s) = \odot\{\text{nei}_{a_i}(s) \mid a_i \in C\}$.

Let $X \in \text{AE}_C(s)$. Then, there is $\sigma_C \in \text{av}_C(s)$ such that $X = \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C)$. Let $\sigma_C = \sigma_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{a_n}$. Note that $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n})$ and $X \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \neq \emptyset, \dots, \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n}) \neq \emptyset$. Let i be such that $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\sigma_{a_i} = \alpha_{x-u-X_i}$. By the definition of $\text{out}_{a_i}(s, \sigma_{a_i})$, $\text{out}_{a_i}(s, \sigma_{a_i}) = X_i$, $x = a_i$, and $u = s$. Then $\sigma_{a_i} = \alpha_{a_i-s-X_i}$ and $X_i \in \text{nei}_{a_i}(s)$. Then, $X = X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_n$. Then, $X \in \text{nei}_C(s, C)$.

Let $X \in \text{nei}_C(s, C)$. Then, $X = X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_n$ for some $X_1 \in \text{nei}_{a_1}(s), \dots, X_n \in \text{nei}_{a_n}(s)$. Then, $\alpha_{a_1-s-X_1}, \dots, \alpha_{a_n-s-X_n} \in \text{AC}$. Note $\text{out}_{a_1}(s, \alpha_{a_1-s-X_1}) = X_1, \dots, \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \alpha_{a_n-s-X_n}) = X_n$. Let $\sigma_C = \alpha_{a_1-s-X_1} \cup \dots \cup \alpha_{a_n-s-X_n}$. Then, $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \alpha_{a_1-s-X_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \alpha_{a_n-s-X_n}) = X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_n = X$. Note X is not empty. Then, $X \in \text{AE}_C(s)$.

□

Theorem 7. *For every single-coalition-first action model **S-AM** and single-coalition-first neighborhood model **S-NM**, if **S-AM** is z -representable by **S-NM**, then for every $X \in \text{ES}$, **S-AM** is an X -model if and only if **S-NM** is an X -model.*

Proof.

Let **S-AM** = $(\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{suc}, \{\text{out}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first action model, $\{\text{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of availability functions of **S-AM**, $\{\text{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of outcome functions of **S-AM**, and $\{\text{AE}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of actual effectivity functions of **S-AM**. Let **S-NM** = $(\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model, and $\{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the set of neighborhood functions of **S-NM**. Assume **S-AM** is z -representable by **S-NM**. Then, for all $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{AE}_C = \text{nei}_C$.

Let $X \in \text{ES}$. It is easy to see that the following three groups of statements are equivalent, respectively.

- (1)
 - **S-AM** is serial;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{av}_C(s) \neq \emptyset$;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{AE}_C(s) \neq \emptyset$;

- for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\text{nei}_C(s) \neq \emptyset$;
 - S-NM is serial.
- (2)
- S-AM is independent;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $C, D \subseteq \text{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, $\sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C$, and $\sigma_D \in \text{JA}_D$, if $\sigma_C \in \text{av}_C(s)$ and $\sigma_D \in \text{av}_D(s)$, then $\sigma_C \cup \sigma_D \in \text{av}_{C \cup D}(s)$;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $C, D \subseteq \text{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, and $Y_1, Y_2 \subseteq \text{ST}$, if $Y_1 \in \text{AE}_C(s)$ and $Y_2 \in \text{AE}_D(s)$, then $Y_1 \cap Y_2 \neq \emptyset$;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $C, D \subseteq \text{AG}$ such that $C \cap D = \emptyset$, and $Y_1, Y_2 \subseteq \text{ST}$, if $Y_1 \in \text{nei}_C(s)$ and $Y_2 \in \text{nei}_D(s)$, then $Y_1 \cap Y_2 \neq \emptyset$;
 - S-NM is independent.
- (3)
- S-AM is deterministic;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{av}_{\text{AG}}(s)$, $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$ is a singleton;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $Y \in \text{AE}_{\text{AG}}(s)$, Y is a singleton;
 - for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $Y \in \text{nei}_{\text{AG}}(s)$, Y is a singleton;
 - S-NM is deterministic.

It follows that S-AM is an X-model if and only if S-NM is an X-model. □

The following result follows from Theorems 5, 6, and 7.

Theorem 8 (Representation of the class of single-coalition-first action X-models by the class of single-coalition-first neighborhood X-models). *For every $X \in \text{ES}$, the class of single-coalition-first action X-models is z -representable by the class of single-coalition-first neighborhood X-models.*

5 Clear grand-coalition-first action models and clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models

5.1 Clear grand-coalition-first action models

Definition 19 (Clear grand-coalition-first action models). *Let $\text{G-AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{out}_{\text{AG}}, \text{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model.*

*We say G-AM is **clear** if for all $s \in \text{ST}$ and $\sigma_{\text{AG}}, \sigma'_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}$, if $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \neq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$, then $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \cap \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\text{AG}}) = \emptyset$.*

The following result offers two alternative definitions of clear grand-coalition-first action models.

Theorem 9. *Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model, $\{\mathbf{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}$ be the set of outcome functions of $\mathbf{G-AM}$, \mathbf{suc} be the successor function of $\mathbf{G-AM}$, and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$.*

The following three conditions are equivalent:

- (1) *for all $a \in \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_a, \sigma'_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a$, if $\sigma_a \neq \sigma'_a$, then $\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \cap \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma'_a) = \emptyset$;*
- (2) *for all $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C, \sigma'_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$, if $\sigma_C \neq \sigma'_C$, then $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma'_C) = \emptyset$;*
- (3) *for all $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}, \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}}$, if $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \neq \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}$, then $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \cap \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}) = \emptyset$.*

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2)

Assume (1). Suppose (2) does not hold. Then, there is $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_C, \sigma'_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$ such that $\sigma_C \neq \sigma'_C$ and $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma'_C) \neq \emptyset$. Then, there is $a \in C$ and $\sigma_a, \sigma'_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a$ such that $\sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_C$, $\sigma'_a \subseteq \sigma'_C$, and $\sigma_a \neq \sigma'_a$. Let $t \in \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \cap \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma'_C)$. Then, there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$ and $\sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$, $\sigma'_C \subseteq \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}$, $t \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$, and $t \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}})$. Then, $\sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$ and $\sigma'_a \subseteq \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}$. Then, $t \in \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a)$ and $t \in \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma'_a)$. Then, $\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \cap \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma'_a) \neq \emptyset$, which is impossible.

(2) \Rightarrow (3)

(3) is a special case of (2).

(3) \Rightarrow (1)

Assume (3). Suppose (1) does not hold. Then, there is $a \in \mathbf{AG}$ and $\sigma_a, \sigma'_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a$ such that $\sigma_a \neq \sigma'_a$ and $\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \cap \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma'_a) \neq \emptyset$. Let $t \in \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \cap \mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma'_a)$. Then, there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$ and $\sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$, $\sigma'_a \subseteq \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}$, $t \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$, and $t \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}})$. Then, $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \cap \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\mathbf{AG}}) \neq \emptyset$, which is impossible. □

For any set X of states, we say $\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ is a **general partition** of X if (1) $\bigcup \Delta = X$ and (2) for every $Y, Y' \in \Delta$, if $Y \neq Y'$, then $Y \cap Y' = \emptyset$. Note a general partition Δ is a partition if $\emptyset \notin \Delta$.

Fact 5. *Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model, $\{\mathbf{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}$ be the set of outcome functions of $\mathbf{G-AM}$, and \mathbf{suc} be the successor function of $\mathbf{G-AM}$.*

Then, if $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is clear, then for all $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, $\{\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \mid \sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C\}$ is a general partition of $\mathbf{suc}(s)$.

Proof. Assume **G-AM** is clear. Let $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $t \in \mathbf{ST}$. Note $\mathbf{suc}(s) = \bigcup \{\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{JA}_{\mathbf{AG}}\}$. It is easy to show $\bigcup \{\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \mid \sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C\} = \mathbf{suc}(s)$. Let $X_1, X_2 \in \{\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \mid \sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C\}$ such that $X_1 \neq X_2$. Then, $X_1 = \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C^1)$ for some $\sigma_C^1 \in \mathbf{JA}_C$ and $X_2 = \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C^2)$ for some $\sigma_C^2 \in \mathbf{JA}_C$. Note $\sigma_C^1 \neq \sigma_C^2$. Then, $\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C^1) \cap \mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C^2) = \emptyset$, that is, $X_1 \cap X_2 = \emptyset$.

□

Note the other direction of the statement of this fact might not hold. Suppose $\mathbf{AG} = \{a\}$. Consider a grand-coalition-first action model $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ such that:

- $\mathbf{ST} = \{s\}$;
- $\mathbf{AC} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$;
- $\mathbf{out}_a(s, \alpha_1) = \mathbf{out}_a(s, \alpha_2) = \mathbf{ST}$.

It is easy to check for all $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $\{\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \mid \sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C\}$ is a general partition of $\mathbf{suc}(s)$. However, **G-AM** is not clear.

Theorem 10. *Every clear grand-coalition-first action model is a single-coalition-first action model, but not vice versa.*

Proof.

Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a clear grand-coalition-first action model, $\{\mathbf{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}$ be the set of availability functions of **G-AM**, $\{\mathbf{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}$ be the set of outcome functions of **G-AM**, and \mathbf{suc} be the successor function of **G-AM**.

To show **G-AM** is a single-coalition-first action model, we need to show:

- (1) for all $a \in \mathbf{AG}$ and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, $\{\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a\}$ is a general cover of $\mathbf{suc}(s)$.
- (2) for all $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$,

$$\mathbf{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{suc}(s) & \text{if } C = \emptyset \\ \bigcap \{\mathbf{out}_a(s, \sigma_a) \mid a \in C, \sigma_a \in \mathbf{JA}_a, \text{ and } \sigma_a \subseteq \sigma_C\} & \text{if } C \neq \emptyset \end{cases}$$

- (3) for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, for all $s \in \mathbf{ST}$,

$$\mathbf{av}_C(s) = \{\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C \mid \mathbf{out}(s, \sigma_C) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

By Fact 2, (1) holds. Clearly, (3) holds. It remains to show (2). Let $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, and $\sigma_C \in \mathbf{JA}_C$.

Assume $C = \emptyset$. Then, $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) = \text{out}_\emptyset(s, \emptyset) = \bigcup \{\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}} \text{ and } \emptyset \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}\} = \bigcup \{\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \mid \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}\} = \text{suc}(s)$;

Assume $C \neq \emptyset$. Let $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\sigma_C = \sigma_{a_1} \cup \dots \cup \sigma_{a_n}$. By Fact 3, $\text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C) \subseteq \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n})$. Let $t \in \text{out}_{a_1}(s, \sigma_{a_1}) \cap \dots \cap \text{out}_{a_n}(s, \sigma_{a_n})$. Then, there is σ_{AG}^1 such that $\sigma_{a_1} \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1$ and $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1)$, \dots , there is σ_{AG}^n such that $\sigma_{a_n} \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n$ and $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n)$. As **G-AM** is clear, $\sigma_{\text{AG}}^1 = \dots = \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n$. Then $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1$. Then $t \in \text{out}_C(s, \sigma_C)$.

It is easy to find a single-coalition-first action model that is not clear. □

Remarks Goranko and Jamroga [GJ04] and Ågotnes and Alechina [rA15] discussed *injective concurrent game models*, which are clear grand-coalition-first action **SID**-models.

As observed by Ågotnes and Alechina [rA15], the assumption behind injective concurrent game models, *different available action profiles have different outcomes*, is very common in game theory.

5.2 Clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models

Definition 20 (Clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models). *Let $\mathbf{S-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model.*

*We say $\mathbf{S-NM}$ is **clear** if for all $a \in \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, $\text{nei}_a(s)$ is a partition of $\text{suc}(s)$.*

The following result gives an alternative definition of clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models.

Theorem 11. *Let $\mathbf{S-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model, and $\{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of neighborhood functions of $\mathbf{S-NM}$.*

The following two conditions are equivalent:

(1) *for all $a \in \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, $\text{nei}_a(s)$ is a partition of $\text{suc}(s)$;*

(2) *for all $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, $\text{nei}_C(s)$ is a partition of $\text{suc}(s)$.*

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2)

Assume (1). Let $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$. By Fact 4, $\text{nei}_C(s)$ is a cover of $\text{suc}(s)$. Assume $\text{nei}_C(s)$ is not a partition of $\text{suc}(s)$. Then, there is $Y_1, Y_2 \in \text{nei}_C(s)$ such that $Y_1 \neq Y_2$ and $Y_1 \cap Y_2 \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of any generality, we can assume there is w such that $w \in Y_1$ but $w \notin Y_2$. Let $u \in Y_1 \cap Y_2$. It is easy to see $\text{suc}(s) \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\text{nei}_\emptyset(s) = \{\text{suc}(s)\}$,

which is a singleton. Note $\text{nei}_C(s)$ is not a singleton. Then, $C \neq \emptyset$. Let $C = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Then, there is $X_{a_1} \in \text{nei}_{a_1}(s), \dots, X_{a_n} \in \text{nei}_{a_n}(s)$ such that $Y_1 = X_{a_1} \cap \dots \cap X_{a_n}$, and there is $X'_{a_1} \in \text{nei}_{a_1}(s), \dots, X'_{a_n} \in \text{nei}_{a_n}(s)$ such that $Y_2 = X'_{a_1} \cap \dots \cap X'_{a_n}$. Note $w \notin Y_2$. Then $w \notin X'_{a_i}$ for some a_i . Note $w \in X_{a_i}$. Then $X_{a_i} \neq X'_{a_i}$. Note $u \in X_{a_i}$ and $u \in X'_{a_i}$. Then $X_{a_i} \cap X'_{a_i} \neq \emptyset$. We have a contradiction.

(2) \Rightarrow (1)

(1) is a special case of (2).

□

By Theorem 9, clear grand-coalition-first action models can be equivalently defined in three different ways, which respectively concern all agents, all coalitions, and the grand coalition. It might be expected that the following condition, which concerns the grand coalition, is equivalent to the two conditions given in Theorem 11: *for all $s \in \text{ST}$, $\text{nei}_{\text{AG}}(s)$ is a partition of $\text{suc}(s)$* . Actually, this is not the case. What follows is a counterexample.

Assume $\text{AG} = \{a, b\}$. Let $\text{S-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model such that:

- $\text{ST} = \{s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3\}$;
- $\text{suc}(s_0) = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$;
- $\text{nei}_a(s_0) = \{\{s_1, s_2\}, \{s_2, s_3\}\}$ and $\text{nei}_b(s_0) = \{\{s_2\}, \{s_1, s_3\}\}$.

Note $\text{nei}_a(s_0)$ is not a partition of $\text{suc}(s_0)$. However, it can be checked that $\text{nei}_{\text{AG}}(s_0) = \{\{s_1\}, \{s_2\}, \{s_3\}\}$, which is a partition of $\text{suc}(s_0)$.

Remarks Alur, Henzinger, and Kupferman [AHK98] proposed models for ATL based on so-called *lock-step synchronous alternating transition systems*. It can be shown that they are clear single-coalition-first neighborhood SID-models.

5.3 Representation of clear grand-coalition-first action models by clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models

Theorem 12. *Every clear grand-coalition-first action model is z -representable by a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood model.*

Proof. Let G-AM be a clear grand-coalition-first action model. By Theorem 10, G-AM is a single-coalition-first action model. It is easy to show that G-AM is z -representable by a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood model. □

Theorem 13. *Every clear single-coalition-first neighborhood model z -represents a clear grand-coalition-first action model.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{S-NM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{suc}, \{\mathbf{nei}_a \mid a \in \mathbf{AG}\}, \mathbf{label})$ be a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood model. Define a single-coalition-first action model $\mathbf{S-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{suc}, \{\mathbf{out}_a \mid a \in \mathbf{AG}\}, \mathbf{label})$ as in the proof for Theorem 6. As shown in that proof, $\mathbf{S-NM}$ z -represents $\mathbf{S-AM}$. It is easy to check that $\mathbf{S-AM}$ is clear. By Theorem 4, it is a grand-coalition-first action model. □

Theorem 14 (Representation of the class of clear grand-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -models by the class of clear single-coalition-first neighborhood \mathbf{X} -models). *For every $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{ES}$, the class of clear grand-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -models is z -representable by the class of clear single-coalition-first neighborhood \mathbf{X} -models.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{ES}$. Let $\mathbf{G-AM}$ be a clear grand-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -model. By Theorem 12, $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is z -representable by a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood model $\mathbf{S-NM}$. By Theorem 10, $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is a single-coalition-first action model. By Theorem 7, $\mathbf{S-NM}$ is a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood \mathbf{X} -model. Let $\mathbf{S-NM}$ be a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood \mathbf{X} -model. By Theorem 13, $\mathbf{S-NM}$ z -represents a clear grand-coalition-first action model $\mathbf{G-AM}$. By Theorem 10, $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is a single-coalition-first action model. By Theorem 7, $\mathbf{S-AM}$ is a clear grand-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -model. □

6 Tree-like grand-coalition-first action models and tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models

6.1 Tree-like grand-coalition-first action models

Definition 21 (Histories in grand-coalition-first action models). *Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model, $\{\mathbf{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}$ be the set of availability functions of $\mathbf{G-AM}$, and $\{\mathbf{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}\}$ be the set of outcome functions of $\mathbf{G-AM}$.*

*For every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$, a finite sequence $\theta_C = (s_0, \sigma_C^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_C^n, s_n)$, where every s_i is a state and every σ_C^i is a joint action of C , is called a **C-history** from s_0 to s_n if for every i such that $0 \leq i < n$, $\sigma_C^{i+1} \in \mathbf{av}_C(s_i)$ and $s_{i+1} \in \mathbf{out}_C(s_i, \sigma_C^{i+1})$.*

*Specially, for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, s is called a **C-history** from s to s .*

Definition 22 (Tree-like grand-coalition-first action models). *Let $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\mathbf{ST}, \mathbf{AC}, \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}, \mathbf{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model.*

We say **G-AM** is a **tree-like model** if there is $r \in \text{ST}$, called a **root**, such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique **AG-history** from r to s .

Note every tree-like model has a unique root.

The following result gives two alternative definitions of tree-like grand-coalition-first action models.

Theorem 15. Let $\text{G-AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{out}_{\text{AG}}, \text{label})$ be a grand-coalition-first action model, $\{\text{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the set of availability functions of **G-AM**, and $\{\text{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the set of outcome functions of **G-AM**.

The following three conditions are equivalent:

- (1) there is $r \in \text{ST}$ such that for every $a \in \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique a -history from r to s ;
- (2) there is $r \in \text{ST}$ such that for every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique C -history from r to s ;
- (3) there is $r \in \text{ST}$ such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique **AG-history** from r to s .

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (3)

Assume (1). Let $r \in \text{ST}$ such that for every $a \in \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique a -history from r to s . Let $s \in \text{ST}$. We want to show that there is a unique **AG-history** from r to s . Let $a \in \text{AG}$.

Assume $s = r$. Note r is an **AG-history** from r to r .

Assume there is an **AG-history** θ_{AG} from r to r which is different from r . It is impossible that $\theta_{\text{AG}} = x$ for some $x \in \text{ST}$. Assume $\theta_{\text{AG}} = (s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n, s_n)$. It is easy to check that $\theta_a = (s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1|_a, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n|_a, s_n)$ is an a -history from r to r . Clearly, θ_a is different from r . Note r is an a -history from r to r . We have a contradiction.

Assume $s \neq r$.

Let θ_a be the unique a -history from r to s . Note it is impossible $\theta_a = x$ for some $x \in \text{ST}$. Assume $\theta_a = (s_0, \sigma_a^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_a^n, s_n)$.

For every i such that $1 \leq i \leq n$, let σ_{AG}^i be an action profile such that $\sigma_a^i \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}^i$ and $s_i \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_{i-1}, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^i)$. Then, $(s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n, s_n)$ is an **AG-history** from r to s .

Assume there is a different **AG-history** θ'_{AG} from r to s . Note it is impossible $\theta'_{\text{AG}} = x$ for some $x \in \text{ST}$. Let $\theta'_{\text{AG}} = (t_0, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^1, t_1, \dots, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^m, t_m)$.

We want to show $(s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n, s_n) = (t_0, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^1, t_1, \dots, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^m, t_m)$.

Note both $(s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1|_a, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n|_a, s_n)$ and $(t_0, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^1|_a, t_1, \dots, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^m|_a, t_m)$ are a -histories from r to s . Then $n = m$ and $s_i = t_i$ for all i .

Assume $\sigma_{\text{AG}}^i \neq \lambda_{\text{AG}}^i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then, there is $b \in \text{AG}$ such that $\sigma_{\text{AG}}^i|_b \neq \lambda_{\text{AG}}^i|_b$. Note both $(s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1|_b, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n|_b, s_n)$ and $(t_0, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^1|_b, t_1, \dots, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^m|_b, t_m)$ are b -histories from r to s , which are different. We have a contradiction.

(3) \Rightarrow (2)

Assume (3). Let $r \in \text{ST}$ such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique AG-history from r to s . Let $s \in \text{ST}$ and $C \subseteq \text{AG}$. We want to show that there is a unique C-history from r to s .

Assume $s = r$. Note r is a C-history from r to r .

Assume there is a C-history θ_C from r to r which is different from r . Note it is impossible $\theta_C = x$ for some $x \in \text{ST}$. Assume $\theta_C = (s_0, \sigma_C^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_C^n, s_n)$.

For every $1 \leq i \leq n$, let λ_{AG}^i be an action profile such that $\sigma_C^i \subseteq \lambda_{\text{AG}}^i$ and $s_i \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s_{i-1}, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^i)$. Then, $(s_0, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^1, s_1, \dots, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^n, s_n)$ is an AG-history from r to r , which is different from r . Note r is an AG-history from r to r . We have a contradiction.

Assume $s \neq r$.

Let θ_{AG} be an AG-history from r to s . Note it is impossible $\theta_{\text{AG}} = x$ for some $x \in \text{ST}$. Let $\theta_{\text{AG}} = (s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n, s_n)$. It is easy to see $(s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1|_C, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n|_C, s_n)$ is a C-history from r to s .

Assume there is a different C-history θ'_C from r to s . Again, it is impossible $\theta'_C = x$ for some $x \in \text{ST}$. Let $\theta'_C = (t_0, \lambda_C^1, t_1, \dots, \lambda_C^m, t_m)$.

For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, let λ_{AG}^i be an action profile such that $\lambda_C^i \subseteq \lambda_{\text{AG}}^i$ and $t_i \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(t_{i-1}, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^i)$. Then, $(t_0, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^1, t_1, \dots, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^m, t_m)$ is an AG-history from r to s .

It is easy to check that $(t_0, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^1, t_1, \dots, \lambda_{\text{AG}}^m, t_m)$ is different from $(s_0, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^1, s_1, \dots, \sigma_{\text{AG}}^n, s_n)$. We have a contradiction.

(2) \Rightarrow (1)

(1) is a special case of (2).

□

Theorem 16. *Every tree-like grand-coalition-first action model is a clear grand-coalition-first action model, but not vice versa.*

Proof.

Let $\text{G-AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{out}_{\text{AG}}, \text{label})$ be a tree-like grand-coalition-first action model and r be its root. Let $s \in \text{ST}$ and $\sigma_{\text{AG}}, \sigma'_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \neq \sigma'_{\text{AG}}$. It suffices to show $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \cap \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\text{AG}}) = \emptyset$. Assume $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \cap \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\text{AG}}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \cap \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(s, \sigma'_{\text{AG}})$.

Let θ_{AG} be an AG-history from r to s . It is easy to check that both $(\theta_{\text{AG}}, \sigma_{\text{AG}}, t)$ and $(\theta_{\text{AG}}, \sigma'_{\text{AG}}, t)$ are AG-histories from r to t , which are different. We have a contradiction.

It is easy to find a clear grand-coalition-first action model with a loop, which is not tree-like. □

Remarks Ågotnes, Goranko, and Jamroga [rGJ07] defined *tree-like concurrent game models*, which are different from tree-like grand-coalition-first action SID-models defined in this section. For the former, it is only required that for every state, there is a unique *computation*, which is a sequence of states, from the root to the state.

6.2 Tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models

Definition 23 (Histories in single-coalition-first neighborhood models). *Let $\mathbf{S}\text{-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{succ}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model and $\{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the set of neighborhood functions of $\mathbf{S}\text{-NM}$.*

*For every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, a finite sequence $\theta_C = (s_0, Y_1, s_1, \dots, Y_n, s_n)$, where every s_i is a state and every Y_i is a set of states, is called a **C-history** from s_0 to s_n if for every i such that $0 \leq i < n$, $Y_{i+1} \in \text{nei}_C(s_i)$ and $s_{i+1} \in Y_{i+1}$.*

*Specially, for every $C \subseteq \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, s is called a **C-history** from s to s .*

Definition 24 (Tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models). *Let $\mathbf{S}\text{-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{succ}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model.*

*We say $\mathbf{S}\text{-NM}$ is a **tree-like model** if there is $r \in \text{ST}$, called a **root**, such that for every $a \in \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique a -history from r to s .*

The following result is easy to verify and we skip its proof.

Fact 6. *Every tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood model is a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood model, but not vice versa.*

The following result offers an alternative definition of tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models.

Theorem 17. *Let $\mathbf{S}\text{-NM} = (\text{ST}, \text{succ}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a single-coalition-first neighborhood model and $\{\text{nei}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the class of neighborhood functions of $\mathbf{S}\text{-NM}$.*

The following two conditions are equivalent:

- (1) *there is $r \in \text{ST}$ such that for every $a \in \text{AG}$ and $s \in \text{ST}$, there is an unique a -history from r to s ;*

(2) there is $r \in \mathbf{ST}$ such that for every $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ and $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, there is a unique C -history from r to s .

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2)

Assume (1). Let $r \in \mathbf{ST}$ such that for every $s \in \mathbf{ST}$, there is a unique a -history from r to s . Let $s \in \mathbf{ST}$ and $C \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$. We want to show that there is a unique C -history from r to s .

Assume $s = r$. Note r is a C -history from r to r . Assume there is a different C -history θ_C from r to r . Note it is impossible $\theta_C = x$ for some $x \in \mathbf{ST}$. Let $\theta_C = (s_0, Y_1, s_1, \dots, Y_n, s_n)$.

Assume $C = \emptyset$. Then for every i such that $1 \leq i \leq n$, $Y_i = \mathbf{suc}(s_{i-1})$. Let $a \in \mathbf{AG}$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $Z_i \in \mathbf{nei}_a(s_{i-1})$ such that $Z_i \subseteq Y_i$ and $s_i \in Z_i$. Then, $(s_0, Z_1, s_1, \dots, Z_m, s_m)$ is an a -history from r to r , which is different from r . Note r is an a -history from r to r . We have a contradiction.

Assume $C \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in C$. Note $\mathbf{nei}_C(s) = \bigodot \{\mathbf{nei}_a(s) \mid a \in C\}$ for every $s \in \mathbf{ST}$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $Z_i \in \mathbf{nei}_a(s_{i-1})$ such that $Y_i \subseteq Z_i$. Then, $(s_0, Z_1, s_1, \dots, Z_m, s_m)$ is an a -history from r to r , which is different from r . Note r is an a -history from r to r . We have a contradiction.

Assume $s \neq r$.

Assume $C = \emptyset$. Let $a \in \mathbf{AG}$ and θ_a be the unique a -history from r to s . It is impossible $\theta_a = x$ for some $x \in \mathbf{ST}$. Let $\theta_a = (s_0, Y_1, s_1, \dots, Y_n, s_n)$. It is easy to see $(s_0, \mathbf{suc}(s_0), s_1, \dots, \mathbf{suc}(s_{n-1}), s_n)$ is a C -history from r to s . Let θ_C be a C -history from r to s . We want to show $\theta_C = (s_0, \mathbf{suc}(s_0), s_1, \dots, \mathbf{suc}(s_{n-1}), s_n)$.

It is impossible $\theta_C = x$ for some $x \in \mathbf{ST}$. Let $\theta_C = (t_0, \mathbf{suc}(t_0), t_1, \dots, \mathbf{suc}(t_{m-1}), t_m)$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $Z_i \in \mathbf{nei}_a(t_{i-1})$ such that $Z_i \subseteq \mathbf{suc}(t_{i-1})$ and $t_i \in Z_i$. Then, $(t_0, Z_1, t_1, \dots, Z_m, t_m)$ is an a -history from r to s . Then $n = m$ and $s_i = t_i$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. Then, $\theta_C = (s_0, \mathbf{suc}(s_0), s_1, \dots, \mathbf{suc}(s_{n-1}), s_n)$.

Assume $C \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in C$ and θ_a be the unique a -history from r to s . Note it is impossible $\theta_a = x$ for some $x \in \mathbf{ST}$. Let $\theta_a = (s_0, Y_1, s_1, \dots, Y_n, s_n)$. For every $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $Z_i \in \mathbf{nei}_C(s_{i-1})$ such that $Z_i \subseteq Y_i$ and $s_i \in Z_i$. Then, $(s_0, Z_1, s_1, \dots, Z_n, s_n)$ is a C -history from r to s .

Let θ_C be a C -history from r to s . We want to show $\theta_C = (s_0, Z_1, s_1, \dots, Z_n, s_n)$.

It is impossible $\theta_C = x$ for some $x \in \mathbf{ST}$. Let $\theta_C = (t_0, U_1, t_1, \dots, U_m, t_m)$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $V_i \in \mathbf{nei}_a(t_{i-1})$ such that $U_i \subseteq V_i$. Then, $(t_0, V_1, t_1, \dots, V_m, t_m)$ is an a -history from r to s . Then $n = m$ and $s_i = t_i$ for every $0 \leq i \leq n$. Assume $Z_i \neq U_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Note $\mathbf{S-NM}$ is a clear single-coalition-first neighborhood model. Then, $Z_i \cap U_i = \emptyset$. Then, $s_i \neq t_i$, which is impossible. Then, $\theta_C = (s_0, Z_1, s_1, \dots, Z_n, s_n)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1)

(1) is a special case of (2).

□

By Theorem 15, tree-like grand-coalition-first action models can be equivalently defined in three different ways, which respectively concern all agents, all coalitions, and the grand coalition. It might be expected that the following condition is equivalent to the two conditions in Theorem 17: *there is $r \in \text{ST}$ such that for every $s \in \text{ST}$, there is a unique AG-history from r to s* . In fact, this is not the case. The example given after Theorem 11 also works here.

6.3 Representation of tree-like grand-coalition-first action models by tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models

Theorem 18. *Every tree-like grand-coalition-first action model is z -representable by a tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood model.*

Proof. Let **G-AM** be a tree-like grand-coalition-first action model. By Theorems 16 and 10, **G-AM** is a tree-like single-coalition-first action model. It is easy to show that **G-AM** is z -representable by a tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood model. □

Theorem 19. *Every tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood model z -represents a tree-like grand-coalition-first action model.*

Proof. Let **S-NM** = $(\text{ST}, \text{suc}, \{\text{nei}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ be a tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood model. Define a single-coalition-first action model **S-AM** = $(\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{suc}, \{\text{out}_a \mid a \in \text{AG}\}, \text{label})$ as in the proof for Theorem 6. As shown there, **S-NM** z -represents **S-AM**. It is easy to check that **S-AM** is tree-like. By Theorem 4, **S-AM** is a grand-coalition-first action model. □

The following result follows from Theorems 18, 19, and 7.

Theorem 20 (Representation of the class of tree-like grand-coalition-first action **X**-models by the class of tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood **X**-models). *For every $\mathbf{X} \in \text{ES}$, the class of tree-like grand-coalition-first action **X**-models is z -representable by the class of tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood **X**-models.*

7 Each of those eight coalition logics is determined by these six kinds of models, too

Theorem 21. *For every $X \in \text{ES}$ and $(\mathbf{G-AM}, s)$, there is a pointed tree-like grand-coalition-first action X -model $(\mathbf{G-AM}', s')$ such that for all $\phi \in \Phi$, $\mathbf{G-AM}, s \Vdash \phi$ if and only if $\mathbf{G-AM}', s' \Vdash \phi$.*

Proof.

Let $X \in \text{ES}$ and $(\mathbf{G-AM}, s)$ be a pointed grand-coalition-first action X -model, where $\mathbf{G-AM} = (\text{ST}, \text{AC}, \text{out}_{\text{AG}}, \text{label})$, $\{\text{av}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ is the set of availability functions of $\mathbf{S-AM}$, and $\{\text{out}_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ is the set of outcome functions of $\mathbf{S-AM}$.

In the following, for every finite nonempty sequence π , we use π^l to denote the last element of π .

Define a grand-coalition-first action model $\mathbf{G-AM}' = (\text{ST}', \text{AC}, \text{out}'_{\text{AG}}, \text{label}')$ as follows:

- $\text{ST}' = \text{ST}'_0 \cup \text{ST}'_1 \cup \text{ST}'_2 \cup \dots$, where:
 - $\text{ST}'_0 = \{s\}$;
 - $\text{ST}'_{k+1} = \{\pi - \sigma_{\text{AG}} - u \mid \pi \in \text{ST}'_k, \sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}, \text{ and } u \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\text{AG}})\}$.
- for every $\pi \in \text{ST}'$ and $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}$, $\text{out}'_{\text{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) = \{\pi - \sigma_{\text{AG}} - u \mid u \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\text{AG}})\}$.
- for every $\pi \in \text{ST}'$, $\text{label}'(\pi) = \{p \in \text{AP} \mid p \in \text{label}(\pi^l)\}$.

Let $\{\text{av}'_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the set of availability functions of $\mathbf{S-AM}$ and $\{\text{out}'_C \mid C \subseteq \text{AG}\}$ be the set of outcome functions of $\mathbf{S-AM}$. We claim $(\mathbf{G-AM}', s)$ is what we want.

We first make two claims:

- (1) for every $\pi \in \text{ST}'$, $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C$, and $\pi' \in \text{ST}'$, if $\pi' \in \text{out}'_C(\pi, \sigma_C)$, then $\pi^l \in \text{out}_C(\pi^l, \sigma_C)$;
- (2) for every $\pi \in \text{ST}'$, $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C$, $t \in \text{ST}$, if $t \in \text{out}_C(\pi^l, \sigma_C)$, then there is $\pi' \in \text{ST}'$ such that $\pi^l = t$ and $\pi' \in \text{out}'_C(\pi, \sigma_C)$.

First, we show the claim (1). Let $\pi \in \text{ST}'$, $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C$, and $\pi' \in \text{ST}'$. Assume $\pi' \in \text{out}'_C(\pi, \sigma_C)$. Then, $\pi' \in \text{out}'_{\text{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$ for some $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$. Then, $\pi' = \pi - \sigma_{\text{AG}} - u$ for some $u \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$. Note $\text{out}_{\text{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\text{AG}}) \subseteq \text{out}_C(\pi^l, \sigma_C)$. Then, $u \in \text{out}_C(\pi^l, \sigma_C)$, that is, $\pi^l \in \text{out}_C(\pi^l, \sigma_C)$.

Second, we show the claim (2). Let $\pi \in \text{ST}'$, $C \subseteq \text{AG}$, $\sigma_C \in \text{JA}_C$, and $t \in \text{ST}$. Assume $t \in \text{out}_C(\pi^l, \sigma_C)$. Then, $t \in \text{out}_{\text{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\text{AG}})$ for some $\sigma_{\text{AG}} \in \text{JA}_{\text{AG}}$ such that $\sigma_C \subseteq \sigma_{\text{AG}}$. Then, there

is $\pi' \in \mathbf{ST}'$ such that $\pi' = \pi - \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} - t$ and $\pi' \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$. Note $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \subseteq \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$. Then, $\pi' \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$.

We show $\mathbf{G-AM}'$ is an \mathbf{X} -model.

Assume $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is serial. Let $\pi \in \mathbf{ST}'$. Note there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}$ such that $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $u \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$. Then, $\pi - \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} - u \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$. Then, $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}}) \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\mathbf{G-AM}'$ is serial.

Assume $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is independent. Let $\pi \in \mathbf{ST}'$, $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} \subseteq \mathbf{AG}$ such that $\mathbf{C} \cap \mathbf{D} = \emptyset$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi)$, and $\sigma_{\mathbf{D}} \in \mathbf{av}'_{\mathbf{D}}(\pi)$. To show $\mathbf{G-AM}'$ is independent, it suffices to show $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \cup \sigma_{\mathbf{D}} \in \mathbf{av}'_{\mathbf{C} \cup \mathbf{D}}(\pi)$. Note $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{D}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{D}}) \neq \emptyset$. By the claim (1), $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{D}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{D}}) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l)$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{D}} \in \mathbf{av}_{\mathbf{D}}(\pi^l)$. Then, $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \cup \sigma_{\mathbf{D}} \in \mathbf{av}_{\mathbf{C} \cup \mathbf{D}}(\pi^l)$. Then, $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C} \cup \mathbf{D}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \cup \sigma_{\mathbf{D}}) \neq \emptyset$. By the claim (2), $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C} \cup \mathbf{D}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \cup \sigma_{\mathbf{D}}) \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \cup \sigma_{\mathbf{D}} \in \mathbf{av}'_{\mathbf{C} \cup \mathbf{D}}(\pi)$.

Assume $\mathbf{G-AM}$ is deterministic. Assume $\mathbf{G-AM}'$ is not deterministic. Then, there is $\pi \in \mathbf{ST}'$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} \in \mathbf{av}_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi)$ such that $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$ is not a singleton. Let $\pi', \pi'' \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$ such that $\pi' \neq \pi''$. Let $\pi' = \pi - \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} - t'$ and $\pi'' = \pi - \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}} - t''$. Note $t' \neq t''$. Then, $t', t'' \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{AG}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{AG}})$. We have a contradiction.

It is easy to check that $(\mathbf{G-AM}', w)$ is tree-like.

We show for all $\pi \in \mathbf{ST}'$ and $\phi \in \Phi$, $\mathbf{G-AM}', \pi \Vdash \phi$ if and only if $\mathbf{G-AM}, \pi^l \Vdash \phi$, which implies for all $\phi \in \Phi$, $\mathbf{G-AM}', s \Vdash \phi$ if and only if $\mathbf{G-AM}, s \Vdash \phi$. We put an induction on ϕ . We consider only the case $\phi = \langle \mathbf{C} \rangle \psi$ and skip others.

Assume $\mathbf{G-AM}', \pi \Vdash \langle \mathbf{C} \rangle \psi$. Then, there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi)$ such that for all $\pi' \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$, $\mathbf{G-AM}', \pi' \Vdash \psi$. We want to show $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi)$ and for all $t \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$, $\mathbf{G-AM}, t \Vdash \psi$. Note $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}}) \neq \emptyset$. By the claim (1), $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}}) \neq \emptyset$. Then, $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l)$. Let $t \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$. By the claim (2), there is a $\pi' \in \mathbf{ST}'$ such that $\pi^l = t$ and $\pi' \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$. Note $\mathbf{G-AM}', \pi' \Vdash \psi$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\mathbf{G-AM}, t \Vdash \psi$.

Assume $\mathbf{G-AM}, \pi^l \Vdash \langle \mathbf{C} \rangle \psi$. Then, there is $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l)$ such that for all $t \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$, $\mathbf{G-AM}, t \Vdash \psi$. We want to show $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi)$ and for all $\pi' \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$, $\mathbf{G-AM}', \pi' \Vdash \psi$. Note $\mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}}) \neq \emptyset$. By the claim (2), $\mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}}) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\sigma_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{av}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi)$. Let $\pi' \in \mathbf{out}'_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$. By the claim (1), $\pi^l \in \mathbf{out}_{\mathbf{C}}(\pi^l, \sigma_{\mathbf{C}})$. Note $\mathbf{G-AM}, \pi^l \Vdash \psi$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\mathbf{G-AM}', \pi' \Vdash \psi$.

□

Theorem 22. *For all $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbf{ES}$ and $\phi \in \Phi$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (0) ϕ is valid with respect to the class of grand-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -models;
- (1) ϕ is valid with respect to the class of single-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -models;
- (2) ϕ is valid with respect to the class of single-coalition-first neighborhood \mathbf{X} -models;

- (3) ϕ is valid with respect to the class of clear grand-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -models;
- (4) ϕ is valid with respect to the class of clear single-coalition-first neighborhood \mathbf{X} -models;
- (5) ϕ is valid with respect to the class of tree-like grand-coalition-first action \mathbf{X} -models;
- (6) ϕ is valid with respect to the class of tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood \mathbf{X} -models.

Proof. By Theorem 8 and Theorem 1, (1) and (2) are equivalent. By Theorem 14 and Theorem 1, (3) and (4) are equivalent. By Theorem 20 and Theorem 1, (5) and (6) are equivalent. It suffices to show that (0), (1), (3) and (5) are equivalent. By Theorem 4, (0) implies (1). By Theorem 10, (1) implies (3). By Theorem 16, (3) implies (5). By Theorem 21, (5) implies (1). □

8 Conclusion

Li and Ju [LJ24b, LJ24a] proposed eight coalition logics based on grand-coalition-first action models. In this work, we show that each of them is determined by six kinds of models, that is, single-coalition-first action models, single-coalition-first neighborhood models, clear grand-coalition-first action models, clear single-coalition-first neighborhood models, tree-like grand-coalition-first action models, and tree-like single-coalition-first neighborhood models.

Acknowledgments

Thanks go to Thomas Ågotnes, Valentin Goranko, and the audience of a logic seminar at Beijing Normal University.

References

- [Abd98] Joseph Abdou. Rectangularity and tightness: A normal form characterization of perfect information extensive game forms. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 23(3):553–567, 1998.
- [AHK98] Rajeev Alur, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Orna Kupferman. Alternating-time temporal logic. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, volume 1536, pages 23–60. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [AHK02] Rajeev Alur, Thomas A. Henzinger, and Orna Kupferman. Alternating-time temporal logic. *Journal of the ACM*, 49(5):672–713, 2002.

- [GJ04] Valentin Goranko and Wojciech Jamroga. Comparing semantics of logics for multi-agent systems. *Synthese*, 139(2):241–280, 2004.
- [GJT13] Valentin Goranko, Wojciech Jamroga, and Paolo Turrini. Strategic games and truly playable effectivity functions. *Journal of Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 26(2):288–314, 2013.
- [HvdHMW01] Paul Harrenstein, Wiebe van der Hoek, John-Jules Meyer, and Cees Witteveen. Boolean games. In Johan van Benthem, editor, *Proceedings of the 8th Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge*, pages 287–298. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 2001.
- [HW05] Wiebe van der Hoek and Michael Wooldridge. On the logic of cooperation and propositional control. *Artificial Intelligence*, 164(1):81–119, 2005.
- [LJ24a] Yinfeng Li and Fengkui Ju. Completeness of coalition logics with seriality, independence of agents, or determinism, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.14635>.
- [LJ24b] Yinfeng Li and Fengkui Ju. A minimal coalition logic, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.14704>.
- [Pau01] Marc Pauly. Logic for social software, 2001. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- [Pau02] Marc Pauly. A modal logic for coalitional power in games. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 12(1):149–166, 2002.
- [rA15] Thomas Ågotnes and Natasha Alechina. Embedding coalition logic in the minimal normal multimodal logic with intersection. In Shier Ju, Hu Liu, and Hiroakira Ono, editors, *Modality, Semantics and Interpretations: The Second Asian Workshop on Philosophical Logic*, pages 1–22. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2015.
- [rGJ07] Thomas Ågotnes, Valentin Goranko, and Wojciech Jamroga. Alternating-time temporal logics with irrevocable strategies. In Dov Samet, editor, *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Rationality and Knowledge (TARK XI)*, pages 15–24. Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 2007.
- [SW24] Chenwei Shi and Wei Wang. Representation theorem for coalition logic without superadditivity, 2024. Manuscript.