

# Pearce’s Characterisation in an Epistemic Domain

Ezgi Iraz Su

Sinop University, Department of Computer Engineering, Sinop, Turkey

eirazsu@sinop.edu.tr

Answer-set programming (ASP) is a successful problem-solving approach in logic-based AI. In ASP, problems are represented as declarative logic programs, and solutions are identified through their answer sets. Equilibrium logic (EL) is a general-purpose nonmonotonic reasoning formalism, based on a monotonic logic called here-and-there logic. EL was basically proposed by Pearce as a foundational framework of ASP. Epistemic specifications (ES) are extensions of ASP-programs with subjective literals. These new modal constructs in the ASP-language make it possible to check whether a regular literal of ASP is true in every (or some) answer-set of a program. ES-programs are interpreted by world-views, which are essentially collections of answer-sets. (Reflexive) autoepistemic logic is a nonmonotonic formalism, modeling self-belief (knowledge) of ideally rational agents. A relatively new semantics for ES is based on a combination of EL and (reflexive) autoepistemic logic. In this paper, we first propose an overarching framework in the epistemic ASP domain. We then establish a correspondence between existing (reflexive) (auto)epistemic equilibrium logics and our easily-adaptable comprehensive framework, building on Pearce’s characterisation of answer-sets as equilibrium models. We achieve this by extending Ferraris’ work on answer sets for propositional theories to the epistemic case and reveal the relationship between some ES-semantic proposals.

## 1 Introduction

*Answer-set programming* (ASP), introduced by Gelfond&Lifschitz [7, 8], is an approach to declarative logic programming. Its reduct-based semantics is defined by *stable models* (alias, *answer-sets*), essentially the supported classical models of a logic program. ASP has demonstrated success in solving problems within logic-based AI: a problem is first encoded as a logic program, and then efficient ASP-solvers are employed to compute its stable models corresponding to the solutions. However, as Gelfond pointed out in his seminal work [4], ASP encounters challenges in accurately representing and reasoning about incomplete information. The difficulty arises when a program involves multiple stable models, and a proposition holds in one stable model but contradicts another. The main reason for this drawback lies in the local performance of ASP’s negation as failure (NAF) operator, which handles incomplete information within individual stable models. To address this issue and enable collective reasoning about incomplete information, we need additional tools in the language of ASP. Epistemic modal operators provide one potential solution to ASP’s limitation with incomplete information. By integrating such operators into the ASP-language, the new modal constructs in the extended language allow us to quantify over a collection of stable models and check whether a proposition holds in every (some) stable model.

The initial approach to this problem is by Gelfond’s *epistemic specifications* [4, 5], referred to as  $ES_{94}$  here: Gelfond extended ASP with epistemic constructs known as *subjective literals*. Indeed, with the incorporation of epistemic modalities K and M, he could represent incomplete information within stable-model collections. While a subjective literal  $Kl$  ( $Ml$ ) makes it possible to check whether a literal  $l$  is true in every (some) stable model of a collection, in particular, the epistemic negation  $\text{not } K$  accurately captures collective reasoning of incomplete information. The extended language is interpreted in terms of *world-views*, which are, in essence, stable-model collections. However, researchers have soon

realised that  $ES_{94}$  allows unsupported world-views. Thus, Gelfond himself [6], along with many other researchers, have proposed various semantic revisions for ES; each aiming to eliminate newly-appearing unintended results. The first counter-example that undermines the soundness of  $ES_{94}$ -semantics is the model  $\{\{p\}\}$  resulting from the epistemic rule  $p \leftarrow Kp$ . This problem with recursion through K arises due to epistemic circular justification; yet efforts to resolve this problem do not focus on the core reasons for the emergence of unsupported models in  $ES_{94}$ . This situation leads to incrementally more complex reduct definitions. Although we refrain from calling these solutions ad hoc, as they can be based on reasonable grounds, we find it crucial to reveal the underlying reasons behind the existence of such models under  $ES_{94}$ -semantics. Moreover, we introduce a conventional and straightforward generalisation of ASP's reduct definition to epistemic logic programs, which constitutes our first contribution here.

One line of world-view computing methods in the literature depends on the reduct-based fixed-point techniques within the logic programming domain, with  $ES_{94}$  serving as the prototype and most subsequent formalisms being its follow-ups. In a parallel, purely logical context, world-views are computed as (reflexive) (auto)epistemic extensions of equilibrium models. The initial attempt in this direction was made by Wang&Zhang [19], whose semantics has captured the world-views of  $ES_{94}$ . Sequentially, stronger formalisms followed [18, 1, 17]. These epistemic equilibrium logics (EELs) share a common approach: a twofold world-view computation process. First, they determine stable models of an ES-program  $\Pi$  in terms of truth ( $\mathbf{t}$ ) by applying the  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality criterion of the formalism. This involves generalising the usual  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality method which is used to compute stable models (equilibrium models) to ES-programs, resulting in the epistemic equilibrium models (EEMs) of  $\Pi$ . The inclusion of epistemic constructs into the ASP-language requires the minimisation of these concepts as well, which is fundamental in nonmonotonic epistemic logics. Thus, once  $\mathbf{t}$ -stable models are determined, a knowledge-minimality technique should also be applied to guarantee stability in terms of knowledge ( $\mathbf{k}$ ). As a result, world-views are stable-models w.r.t. both truth and knowledge. One formally strong  $\mathbf{k}$ -minimality approach applied to ES is Schwarz's [12] minimal model reasoning for nonmonotonic modal logics. Cabalar et al. [1] pioneered the introduction of this technique to ES, proposing a new semantics based on a combination of Pearce's equilibrium logic (EL) [11] and Schwarz's nonmonotonic KD45 [12, 16] (equivalently, Moore's autoepistemic logic). Their formalism so represents a nonmonotonic epistemic logic of belief where K is interpreted as *the self-belief of a rational agent*. It also captures  $ES_{94}$ -semantics under a foundedness restriction. Su [17] then suggested employing the reflexive closure of KD45-models, namely SW5-models, in the search for  $\mathbf{k}$ -minimal models and proposed reflexive autoepistemic EL. This formalism alternatively applies Schwarz's minimal model technique for nonmonotonic SW5 as a  $\mathbf{k}$ -minimality criterion, aligning it more closely with other ES-formalisms where the K operator formalises *knowledge*.

The existence of many ES-formalisms without a common agreement makes it difficult to understand the current state of the art. Thus, as a natural continuation, we explore the relationship between them. Our reference point will be classifying ES-formalisms under a twofold world-view computation method. We then generalise Ferraris' lemma, enabling *the capture of equilibrium models of a theory as its stable models*, to the epistemic case. Using our new result, we transform EEMs to truth-stable ( $\mathbf{t}$ -stable) models of epistemic ASP and vice versa. This work will then help ASP programmers better understand existing EELs, being reflected in the logic programming context and also give rise to a versatile and solid framework in epistemic ASP, an approach not studied before, which will be our main contribution here.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows: Sect. 2 provides preliminary information about ASP and Gelfond's primary  $ES_{94}$ -semantics. Sect. 3 presents epistemic ASP (EASP) as a unifying framework for several ES-semantics. Sect. 4 makes a short overview of the existing EELs in the literature, focusing on their  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality methods. Sect. 5 establishes a correspondence between these EELs and EASP by generalising Ferraris' lemma to EASP. Sect. 6 concludes the paper with future work plan.

## 2 Background: ASP and epistemic specifications (ES) in a nutshell

In this context, ASP-formulas are built from an infinite set  $\mathbb{P}$  of atoms using the connectives, viz. reversed implication ( $\leftarrow$ ), disjunction ( $\vee$ ), conjunction ( $\wedge$ ), NAF (**not**), strong negation ( $\sim$ ), true ( $\top$ ) and false ( $\perp$ ). In ASP, a *literal*  $l$  is an atom  $p$  or a strongly-negated atom  $\sim p$  for  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ . An ASP-program consists of a finite set of rules  $\mathbf{r} : \text{head}(\mathbf{r}) \leftarrow \text{body}(\mathbf{r})$  s.t.  $\text{body}(\mathbf{r})$  is formed by a conjunction of literals possibly preceded by NAF, and  $\text{head}(\mathbf{r})$  is formed by a disjunction of literals: for  $0 \leq m \leq n \leq k$ ,

$$l_1 \vee \dots \vee l_m \leftarrow l_{m+1} \wedge \dots \wedge l_n \wedge \text{not } l_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \text{not } l_k. \quad (1)$$

Alternatively, we call  $\text{body}$  *goal* and its conjuncts *subgoals*. When  $m = 0$ , we suppose  $\text{head}(\mathbf{r})$  to be  $\perp$  and call the rule  $\mathbf{r}$  *constraint*. When  $k = m$ , we call  $\mathbf{r}$  *fact* and omit both  $\text{body}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\leftarrow$ . When  $k = n$ , we call  $\mathbf{r}$  a positive rule. A program composed of only positive rules is positive. Finally, as strong negation can be removed from a logic program via auxiliary atoms, this paper mostly ignores  $\sim$  for simplicity.

A *valuation* is a consistent (possibly empty) set  $T$  of literals, i.e.,  $p \notin T$  or  $\sim p \notin T$  for any  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ . A valuation  $T$  satisfying an ASP-program  $\Pi$  (which means  $T \models \Pi$ ) is a *classical* model of  $\Pi$ . Then, stable-models of  $\Pi$  are its reduct-based minimal classical models. Stable-model semantics is based on a program transformation that aims to eliminate ‘not’ from  $\Pi$  w.r.t.  $\Pi$ ’s classical model  $T$  (a candidate model), resulting in a positive program  $\Pi^T$  referred to as *reduct* of  $\Pi$  w.r.t.  $T$ : (*reduct-taking*) replace  $\text{not } p$  with  $\top$  if  $T \models \text{not } p$  (equivalently, if  $T \not\models p$ , i.e.,  $p \notin T$ ); otherwise, with  $\perp$ . This approach also requires that the valuation  $T$  be a smallest (minimal) model of this reduct  $\Pi^T$  w.r.t. subset relation. Eventually, the successful models of this process are called *stable models* (alias, *answer-sets*) of  $\Pi$ .

### 2.1 Gelfond’s epistemic specifications: ES<sub>94</sub>

Epistemic specifications (ES) extends ASP-programs with the epistemic modal operators K (‘known’) and M (‘may be true’). The language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{ES}}$  contains four kinds of literals: *objective literals* ( $l$ ), *extended objective literals* ( $L$ ), *subjective literals* ( $g$ ), and *extended subjective literals* ( $G$ ), viz. for  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ ,

$l$	$L$	$g$	$G$
$p \mid \sim p$	$l \mid \text{not } l$	$Kl \mid Ml$	$g \mid \text{not } g$

Note that ASP’s regular literals are called objective literals in ES. By convention, the belief operator M can be defined in terms of the knowledge operator K, i.e.,  $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{not } K \text{not}$ , meaning that they are dual.

An *ES-rule* ‘ $\mathbf{r} : l_1 \vee \dots \vee l_m \leftarrow e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n$ ’ is an extension of an ASP-rule (1) with extended subjective literals that can appear exclusively in  $\text{body}(\mathbf{r})$  as subgoals. Thus,  $\text{body}(\mathbf{r}) = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n$  is a conjunction of arbitrary ES-literals. Then, an *ES-program* is a finite collection of ES-rules.

**Truth conditions:** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a non-empty collection of valuations. Let  $I$  be a valuation, which is not necessarily included in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then, for an objective literal  $l$  and a subjective literal  $g$ , we have:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{T}, I \models l & \text{if } l \in I; & \mathcal{T}, I \models \text{not } l & \text{if } l \notin I. \\ \mathcal{T}, I \models Kl & \text{if } l \in T \text{ for every } T \in \mathcal{T}; & \mathcal{T}, I \models \text{not } g & \text{if } \mathcal{T}, I \not\models g. \\ \mathcal{T}, I \models Ml & \text{if } l \in T \text{ for some } T \in \mathcal{T}; & & \end{array}$$

Note that the satisfaction of an objective literal  $l$  is independent of  $\mathcal{T}$ , while the satisfaction of a subjective literal  $g$  is independent of  $I$ . Thus, we simply write  $\mathcal{T} \models g$  or  $I \models l$ . Then, we define the

Table 1: Kahl's reduct definition proposed in his PhD thesis [9] with changes over [6] in bold.

literal $G$	if $\mathcal{T} \models G$	if $\mathcal{T} \not\models G$	literal $G$	if $\mathcal{T} \models G$	if $\mathcal{T} \not\models G$
$Kl$	replace by $l$	replace by $\perp$	not $Kl$	replace by $\top$	<b>replace by not <math>l</math></b>
$Ml$	replace by $\top$	<b>replace by not not <math>l</math></b>	not $Ml$	<b>replace by not <math>l</math></b>	replace by $\perp$

satisfaction of an ES-program  $\Pi$  as follows:  $\mathcal{T}, I \models \Pi$  if for every rule  $r \in \Pi$ ,  $\mathcal{T}, I \models r$ , i.e., explicitly

$$\mathcal{T}, I \models \text{body}(r) \text{ implies } \mathcal{T}, I \models \text{head}(r).$$

An S5-model is a nonempty collection of possible worlds, each with assigned truth values, where the connection between these worlds is defined by an equivalence relation (reflexive, symmetric, and transitive). In this context, we assume an S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$  to be in the form of a nonempty set of valuations s.t. any two valuations are related. When  $\mathcal{T}, T \models \Pi$  for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , we say that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a *classical S5-model* of  $\Pi$ . In particular, when we designate a valuation  $T$  s.t.  $\mathcal{T}, T \models \Pi$ , we call  $(\mathcal{T}, T)$  a *pointed S5-model* of  $\Pi$ . Extending this to a set  $\mathcal{T}_0$  of designated valuations,  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_0 \rangle$  is said to be a *multi-pointed S5-model* of  $\Pi$ . To facilitate reading, we symbolise a multi-pointed S5-model  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}_0 \rangle$  by underlying its designated valuations  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0$  in an explicit representation of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Given  $\mathcal{T} = \{\{a\}, \{b\}, \emptyset\}$ , the (multi)pointed S5-models  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \{a\} \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \{\{a\}, \{b\}\} \rangle$  correspond to  $\{\{a\}, \{b\}, \emptyset\}$  and  $\{\{a\}, \{b\}, \emptyset\}$  respectively. When no valuation is underlined or specified, by default this means that any valuation of  $\mathcal{T}$  behaves as designated. The rest of the paper uses the terms ‘‘point’’, ‘‘valuation’’ and ‘‘world’’ interchangeably. Finally, given a syntactic ES-construct (head, rule, program, etc.)  $\varphi$ , when  $\mathcal{T}, T \models \varphi$  for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , we simply write  $\mathcal{T} \models \varphi$ .

**Semantics:** An ES-program  $\Pi$  is interpreted by means of its world-views, which are selected from among its S5-models. Thus, given a candidate S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\Pi$ , we first compute the (epistemic) reduct  $\Pi^{\mathcal{T}} = \{r^{\mathcal{T}} : r \in \Pi\}$  of  $\Pi$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{T}$  by replacing every subjective literal  $Kl$  ( $Ml$ ), possibly preceded by NAF, with  $\top$  if  $\mathcal{T} \models Kl$  ( $Ml$ ); otherwise, with  $\perp$ . Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a *world view* of  $\Pi$  if  $\mathcal{T} = \text{AS}(\Pi^{\mathcal{T}})$  where  $\text{AS}(\Pi)$  denotes the set of all stable models of  $\Pi$ . The reduct definition of  $\text{ES}_{94}$  is so oriented to remove extended subjective literals. The resulting program  $\Pi^{\mathcal{T}}$  is then a nonepistemic, but not necessarily positive ASP-program potentially containing NAF. In fact,  $\text{ES}_{94}$  offers a twofold reduct definition; first removing epistemic operators w.r.t.  $\mathcal{T}$  and then eliminating NAF w.r.t.  $T \in \mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{X}$  akin to ASP's methodology.

### 2.1.1 Motivation

**Example 1** The one-rule program  $\Gamma = \{a \leftarrow Ka\}$  has 2 world-views,  $\{\emptyset\}$  and  $\{\{a\}\}$  in  $\text{ES}_{94}$ . Among these, only the former is intended. The self-supported model  $\{\{a\}\}$  appears due to the fact that  $\text{ES}_{94}$ -reduct attacks positive (not preceded by NAF) literals. This approach causes unsupported models to provide fake derivations for head-literals, which in return produce these models by fixed-point justifications. Thus, Gelfond's methodology includes flaws for programs containing cyclic dependencies like  $\Gamma$ ,  $\{a \leftarrow Ka \wedge \text{not } Kb\}$ ,  $\{a \leftarrow Ka \wedge \text{not } b\}$ , etc. Such circular scenarios may arise when the goal contains a positive subjective literal and is satisfied by the candidate unsupported S5-model. Notice that transformation of a literal into true/false w.r.t. its truth-value is secure when it is preceded by NAF with literal reading *there is no evidence*, or when there exists logical derivations of literals as used by splitting property of (epistemic) ASP. To overcome this problem, Gelfond [6] slightly modifies his reduct definition by replacing  $Kp$  with  $p$  when  $\mathcal{T} \models Kp$  and partly avoids circular justifications, but the problem of recursion via  $M$  prevails.

This modification has probably necessitated further changes in his reduct definition as shown in Table 1. The underlying reasons of Kahl's new reduct [9] may be grounded as follows: (1) If  $\mathcal{T} \not\models \text{not } Kl$ ,

then  $\mathcal{T} \models Kl$ . When the reduct definition transforms  $Kl$  into  $l$ , it replaces  $\text{not } Kl$  with  $\text{not } l$ . (2) Remember that  $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{not } K\text{not}$ . If  $\mathcal{T} \not\models Ml$ , then  $\mathcal{T} \not\models \text{not } K\text{not}l$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{T} \models K\text{not}l$ . A similar reasoning may force the transformation of  $K\text{not}l$  into  $\text{not}l$ ;  $Ml$  into  $\text{not not}l$ . (3) If  $\mathcal{T} \models \text{not } Ml$ , then  $\mathcal{T} \models K\text{not}l$ . If  $K\text{not}l$  is transformed into  $\text{not}l$ , then  $\text{not } Ml$  is turned into  $\text{not not not}l$ , equivalently [10] into  $\text{not}l$ . While this explanation is a guess, in fact when NAF is involved, such further intricate changes may not be required.

**Example 2** Another recursive program  $\Sigma = \{a \leftarrow Ma\}$  yields the same world-views in  $\text{ES}_{94}$ . Researchers have widely varying perspectives on the intended models of  $\Sigma$ . While some find both models reasonable, the others argue that  $\Sigma$  should have one model; yet they also differ on which model should be preferred. We will not engage in this debate, as different approaches may prove useful depending on the specific problem at hand. Our stance on the topic is distinct. In alignment with Su et al.’s approach [18], and following the tradition of intuitionistic modal logics, we will adopt a positive belief operator here, namely  $\hat{K}$ , which is not definable in terms of  $K$  and  $\text{not}$ . As  $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{not } K\text{not}$ , in our opinion,  $M$  cannot be regarded as purely positive like  $\text{not not } a$  in ASP. Remember that Su et al. handle  $M$  as a syntactic sugar, giving a concise representation for the equivalent formulas  $\text{not not } \hat{K}$ ,  $\hat{K}\text{not not}$ , and  $\text{not } K\text{not}$ . Also recall that in epistemic ASP, aligning with ASP, double NAF should not vanish regardless of where it occurs. On the other hand, similarly to  $\Gamma$  in Ex. 1, we claim that the intended model of  $\Sigma' = \{a \leftarrow \hat{K}a\}$  should be  $\{\emptyset\}$ .

### 3 Epistemic Answer Set Programming (EASP)

This section introduces a direct generalisation of logic programs under stable-model semantics (aka, ASP-programs) to epistemic logic programs under stable S5-model semantics. This new concept has been partially explored by [15]. The shift from the general term *world-view* to *stable S5-model* in EASP, and *equilibrium S5-model* in the following section is intended to emphasise the purpose of this work. Our main motivation for this study arises from the unsupported models that emerge due to circular justifications under  $\text{ES}_{94}$ -semantics (see Ex. 1-2).  $\text{ES}_{94}$ ’s reduct definition deviates somewhat from the traditional approach. We here propose a new reduct definition for ES-programs, oriented to eliminate exclusively NAF. Thus, our reduct is a positive program, similar to the method in search for stable models.

The new approach exploits a two-step computation process, focusing on stability in terms of truth ( $\mathfrak{t}$ ) and knowledge ( $\mathfrak{k}$ ). The method involves finding the minimal models in terms of truth first, and then refining them further w.r.t. a  $\mathfrak{k}$ -minimality criterion to select stable S5-models. Such models then capture truth and knowledge minimality concepts that is central in (nonmonotonic) epistemic ASP. In broader terms, what we refer to as  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimality in ES is essentially an extension of the familiar minimisation criterion of ASP from classical models to classical S5-models. However,  $\mathfrak{k}$ -minimality is a relatively new concern within the ASP field compared to the well-established method of  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimality. The necessity for such a technique has become evident with the incorporation of epistemic concepts into ASP and the need to maximise epistemic possibilities (i.e., ignorance).

A stable S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$  of an epistemic logic program  $\Pi$  is its S5-model s.t. each valuation  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  forms  $\Pi$ ’s pointed S5-model  $(\mathcal{T}, T)$  where  $T$  is minimal w.r.t. truth and  $\mathcal{T}$  is minimal w.r.t. knowledge. For a nonepistemic ASP-program  $\Pi$ , such valuations are  $\Pi$ ’s stable-models in ASP, and the (unique) stable S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$  is the set of all such models. Similar to stable-models of ASP, the intuition underlying stable S5-models is to capture the *rationality* of an agent associated with an epistemic logic program  $\Pi$ : “*an agent is not supposed to believe anything that it is not forced to believe.*” The aim, in principle, is to determine which propositions can be nonmonotonically inferred from  $\Pi$  by considering all its stable-models. These inferences are then used to deduce new information about the knowledge of  $\Pi$ .

### 3.1 The Language of EASP ( $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EASP}}$ )

The language  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EASP}}$  extends that of ASP by epistemic modalities  $K$  and  $\hat{K}$ . Literals ( $\lambda$ ) of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EASP}}$  are of two types; *objective* ( $l$ ) and *subjective* ( $g$ ) literals, viz.  $l := p \mid \sim p$  and  $g := Kl \mid \hat{K}l$  for  $p \in \mathbb{P}$ . Then,  $\text{not } \lambda$  means *failing to derive  $\lambda$ , the query  $\lambda?$  is undetermined and assumed to be false*; yet we do not offer literal interpretations of the modalities for the sake of flexibility.

Replacing literals of ASP with those of EASP in (1), we obtain an EASP-rule  $r$ , viz.

$$\lambda_1 \vee \dots \vee \lambda_m \leftarrow \lambda_{m+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \lambda_n \wedge \text{not } \lambda_{n+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \text{not } \lambda_k. \quad (\text{for } 0 \leq m \leq n \leq k) \quad (2)$$

in which  $\lambda_i$ 's are objective or subjective literals for every  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . When we restrict  $\lambda_i$ 's to objective literals, the resulting program is a disjunctive logic program [8]. Hence, EASP-rules are conservative extensions of ASP's disjunctive rules (1). Different from ES, we allow  $Kl$  and  $\hat{K}l$  to appear in  $\text{head}(r)$ . While the use of subjective literals in the head has not yet been fully explored, we still find it useful to provide the same syntax structure with ASP for easier understanding of the approach. This way, extensions to richer languages are straightforward via the main ASP track. An *epistemic logic program* (ELP), also known as EASP-program, is a finite collection of EASP-rules (2).

### 3.2 Semantics of EASP in terms of stable S5-models

We first introduce  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality concept in EASP. Based on the existing ES-formalisms in the literature, we provide two slightly different approach. For example, the program  $\Phi = \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$

$$r_1 = a \vee b. \quad r_2 = a \leftarrow Kb. \quad r_3 = b \leftarrow Ka. \quad (3)$$

may produce  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimal models  $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{\{a\}, \{b\}\}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\{a, b\}\}$ ; yet it may also yield  $\mathcal{T}_1$  only, depending on how restrictive we want to be. In EASP, this subtle distinction originates from differing approaches of  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality techniques, emphasising functional vs. relational perspective.

**Definition 1 (weakening of a point in an S5-model in terms of truth: functional approach)** Given a nonempty collection  $\mathcal{T}$  of valuations, let  $s : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{P}}$  be a *subset* function s.t.  $s(T) \subseteq T$  for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Let  $id$  refer to the identity function, and let  $s[\mathcal{T}] = \{s(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$  denote the image of  $\mathcal{T}$  under  $s$ . A *functional* ( $\mathbf{f}$ ) *weakening* of  $\mathcal{T}$  at a point  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  by means of  $s$  is identified with  $\langle s[\mathcal{T}], s(T) \rangle$  s.t.  $s \neq id$  on  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $s|_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T\}} = id$ , by which we take a strict subset of  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and keep the elements of  $\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T\}$  unchanged. We say that  $\langle s[\mathcal{T}], s(T) \rangle$  is  $\mathbf{f}$ -weaker than  $\langle \mathcal{T}, T \rangle$  on  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and denote it by  $\langle s[\mathcal{T}], s(T) \rangle \triangleleft_{\mathbf{f}} \langle \mathcal{T}, T \rangle$ .

Def. 1 has already been introduced by [15]; yet the following more cautious approach is novel.

**Definition 2 (weakening of a point in an S5-model in terms of truth: relational approach)** Let  $s_r : \mathcal{T} \Rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{P}}$  be a multi-valued *subset* function s.t.  $s_r(T) \subseteq 2^T$  and  $s_r(T) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . For ease of understanding, we also design  $s_r$  as a serial subset relation, relating each  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  to at least one element from  $2^T$  and form the collection  $s_r = \{(T, H) : H \in s_r(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ . Then, a *relational* ( $\mathbf{r}$ ) *weakening* of  $\mathcal{T}$  at a point  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  by means of  $s_r$  is identified with  $\langle s_r[\mathcal{T}], s_r(T) \rangle$  s.t.  $s_r \neq id$  on  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $s_r|_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T\}} = id$ , by which we replace only  $T$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  by a set of its subsets including at least one strict subset  $H \subset T$ . We say that  $\langle s_r[\mathcal{T}], s_r(T) \rangle$  is  $\mathbf{r}$ -weaker than  $\langle \mathcal{T}, T \rangle$  on  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  and denote it by  $\langle s_r[\mathcal{T}], s_r(T) \rangle \triangleleft_{\mathbf{r}} \langle \mathcal{T}, T \rangle$ .

We now define a nonmonotonic satisfaction relation  $\models^*$  for S5-models, involving a  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality criterion based on set inclusion over each set  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Intuitively, this condition says that none of the weakenings of  $\langle \mathcal{T}, T \rangle$  is an S5-model of an epistemic logic program (ELP)  $\Pi$  for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ .

**Definition 3 (generalisation of the truth-minimality (t-minimality) criterion of ASP to EASP)** For a positive EASP-program  $\Pi$ , let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a nonempty collection of valuations, and  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then, we have:

$$\mathcal{T}, T \models_{\mathbf{f}}^* \Pi \text{ iff } \mathcal{T}, T \models \Pi \text{ and } s[\mathcal{T}], s(T) \not\models \Pi \text{ for every } s \text{ s.t. } \langle s[\mathcal{T}], s(T) \rangle \triangleleft_{\mathbf{f}} \langle \mathcal{T}, T \rangle. \quad (4)$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}$ -minimal model of  $\Pi$  if  $\mathcal{T}, T \models_{\mathbf{f}}^* \Pi$  for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  [15]. In this paper, we also define  $\models_{\mathbf{r}}^*$  by replacing  $s$  with  $s_{\mathbf{r}}$ , and  $\triangleleft_{\mathbf{f}}$  with  $\triangleleft_{\mathbf{r}}$  in (4) and produce  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{r}}$ -minimal models of  $\Pi$  accordingly.

Although the above definitions seem to be technically complex and daunting, they are easily applied:

**Example 3** Reconsider first the program  $\Phi$ , identified by (3), and its S5-model  $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{\{a, b\}\}$ . Then construct  $2^{(a,b)} = \{\{a, b\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \emptyset\}$ . Since the  $\mathbf{f}$ -weaker models  $\{\{a\}\}$ ,  $\{\{b\}\}$ , and  $\{\emptyset\}$  of  $\mathcal{T}_2$  do not satisfy  $r_3$ ,  $r_2$ , and  $r_1$  respectively,  $\Phi$  does not hold in them either. Thus,  $\mathcal{T}_2$  is a  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}$ -minimal model of  $\Phi$ .

What eliminates  $\mathcal{T}_2$  in the second approach is the relational nature of the weakening methodology because now we have to consider all possible subsets of  $2^{(a,b)}$  different from  $\emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$ , i.e., all the elements of the set  $2^{2^{(a,b)}} \setminus \{\mathcal{T}_2, \emptyset\}$ . The element  $\{\{a\}, \{b\}\}$  from this set, namely an  $\mathbf{r}$ -weakening of  $\mathcal{T}_2$  at the point  $\{a, b\} \in \mathcal{T}_2$ , satisfies  $\Phi$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{T}_2$  fails to be a  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{r}}$ -minimal model of  $\Phi$ .

Note that when we consider  $\mathcal{T}_1$ , different from the singleton model  $\mathcal{T}_2$ , we follow the above steps for every pointed S5-model of  $\mathcal{T}_1$ , viz.  $\{\{a\}, \{b\}\}$  and  $\{\{a\}, \{b\}\}$ . Also note that  $\Phi$  is a positive program, and its reduct trivially equals itself. Thus, our reduct is not interested in the positive literals  $Ka$  and  $Kb$  in  $\Phi$ .

**Fact 1** Functional minimality implies relational minimality because any function can be defined as a relation. Thus, a  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{r}}$ -minimal model of an ELP  $\Pi$  is a  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}$ -minimal model of  $\Pi$ , but not vice versa.

**Example 4** Consider the EASP-program  $\Sigma = \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$  with its rules explicitly represented below:

$$r_1 = a \vee b. \quad r_2 = c \leftarrow b. \quad r_3 = d \leftarrow Ka. \quad r_4 = \perp \leftarrow \hat{K}d.$$

Note that  $\Sigma$  is a positive program. We compute that  $\{\{a\}, \{b, c\}\}$  is a  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimal model of  $\Sigma$ :  $\{\{a\}, \{b, c\}\} \models \Sigma$  while its only  $\mathbf{f}$ -weakening  $\{\emptyset, \{b, c\}\}$  refutes it. Likewise,  $\{\{a\}, \{b, c\}\} \models \Sigma$  while all its  $\mathbf{f}$ -weakenings, i.e.,  $\{\{a\}, \{b\}\}$ ,  $\{\{a\}, \{c\}\}$ , and  $\{\{a\}, \emptyset\}$  do not satisfy it. We leave it to the reader to show that  $\mathcal{T}$  is also  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{r}}$ -minimal; yet we give a hint that while computing the  $\mathbf{r}$ -weakenings of, for example,  $\{\{a\}, \{b, c\}\}$ , we consider all possible models including  $\{\{a\}, \{b\}, \{c\}\}$ ,  $\{\{a\}, \{b, c\}, \emptyset, \{b\}\}$ , etc. There are 14 of such models. Clearly,  $\{\{b, c\}\}$  is  $\Sigma$ 's other  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimal model, that is unintended and to be eliminated under  $\mathbf{k}$ -minimality conditions. Note that like  $Ka$ , the other positive literal  $\hat{K}d$  is not involved in the reduct-taking process.

**Remark 1** The need for relational minimality arises from the fact that under singleton S5-models like  $\{\{p\}\}$ , the literals  $Kp$ ,  $\hat{K}p$ , and  $p$  are of no difference since quantification is trivially performed over just one valuation  $\{p\}$ . For instance, notice that when we replace  $Kl$  by  $l$  in  $\Phi$  (3), the resulting ASP-program has the stable model  $\{a, b\}$ . Using relational weakening, we increase epistemic possibilities (points) while reducing truth. Quantifying over these points then reveals the nontrivial functionality of subjective literals. In a sense, the relational  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality approach simultaneously embeds in itself a kind of  $\mathbf{k}$ -minimality strategy by increasing ignorance with epistemic possibilities. The difference between two minimality methods strikingly appears for  $\Phi$  under the S5-model  $\{\{a, b\}\}$  (see Ex. 3). Adding the constraint  $r_c = \perp \leftarrow \text{not } Ka$  into  $\Phi$ , the new program  $\Phi' = \Phi \cup \{r_c\}$  has a world-view  $\{\{a, b\}\}$  under several ES-formalisms. Some researchers find this result unsupported; yet the existing  $\mathbf{k}$ -minimality techniques is unable to eliminate this model. Thus, a more restrictive  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality tool has been designed to remove models like  $\{\{a, b\}\}$  while computing  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimal models. We do not discuss this issue here, as our aim is just to establish a correspondence between existing ES-formalisms; to put it better, to demonstrate the reader how current epistemic equilibrium logics are manifested in the logic programming domain.

We will now see how to compute stable w.r.t. truth ( $\mathfrak{t}$ -stable) models of an arbitrary EASP program potentially including NAF. Satisfaction of the subjective literal  $\hat{K}l$  is the same as  $MI$  in ES. What makes the difference is primarily how the reduct definition handles them.

**Definition 4 (generalisation of the conventional reduct definition of ASP to EASP)** For an arbitrary EASP-program  $\Pi$ , let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a nonempty collection of valuations, and let  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then, the reduct  $\Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T)}$  of  $\Pi$  w.r.t. the pointed S5-model  $\langle \mathcal{T}, T \rangle$  is defined by replacing every occurrence of NAF-negated (i.e., preceded by NAF) literals  $\text{not } \lambda$  in  $\Pi$  with the truth-constants

$$\begin{aligned} \perp & \text{ if } \mathcal{T}, T \models \lambda & (\text{ for } \lambda = l \text{ if } T \models l; & \text{ for } \lambda = KI(\hat{K}l) \text{ if } \mathcal{T} \models KI(\hat{K}l)); \\ \top & \text{ if } \mathcal{T}, T \not\models \lambda & (\text{ for } \lambda = l \text{ if } T \not\models l; & \text{ for } \lambda = KI(\hat{K}l) \text{ if } \mathcal{T} \not\models KI(\hat{K}l)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimal model of  $\Pi$  if  $\mathcal{T}, T \models^* \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T)}$  for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  [15].

While Def. 4 provides a general definition, its specialisation to  $\mathfrak{t}_f$  and  $\mathfrak{t}_r$  is straightforward. When these methods do not result in a distinction, we refer to them by the general name “truth” ( $\mathfrak{t}$ ).

**Example 5** Consider the EASP-program  $\Gamma = \{r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4\}$  where its rules are explicitly shown below:

$$r_1 = a \vee b. \quad r_2 = c \leftarrow \hat{K}a \wedge \text{not } b. \quad r_3 = d \leftarrow \text{not } Ka \wedge b. \quad r_4 = \perp \leftarrow \text{not } \hat{K}c.$$

We claim that  $\{\{a, c\}, \{b, d\}\}$  is a  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimal model of  $\Gamma$ . We first compute the following reducts:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} a \vee b. \\ c \leftarrow \hat{K}a \wedge \text{not } \perp. \\ d \leftarrow \text{not } \perp \wedge b. \\ \perp \leftarrow \text{not } \top. \end{array} \right\} \Gamma^{\{\{a, c\}, \{b, d\}\}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \begin{array}{l} a \vee b. \\ c \leftarrow \hat{K}a \wedge \text{not } \top. \\ d \leftarrow \text{not } \perp \wedge b. \\ \perp \leftarrow \text{not } \top. \end{array} \right\} \Gamma^{\{\{a, c\}, \underline{b, d}\}}$$

The above reducts are respectively equivalent to  $\{r_1, c \leftarrow \hat{K}a, d \leftarrow b\}$  and  $\{r_1, d \leftarrow b\}$ : when  $\perp$  ( $\text{not } \top$ ) appears as a subgoal, the goal fails to hold. This means that the effect of the entire rule  $r$  is negligible, and  $r$  can be safely omitted. When  $\top$  ( $\text{not } \perp$ ) appears as a subgoal,  $\top$  can be dropped from the subgoals of  $\text{body}(r)$  as it trivially holds. While  $\{\{a, c\}, \{b, d\}\} \models \Gamma^{\{\{a, c\}, \{b, d\}\}}$ , all its  $f$ -weakenings, viz.  $\{\{a\}, \{b, d\}\}$ ,  $\{\{c\}, \{b, d\}\}$  and  $\{\emptyset, \{b, d\}\}$ , refute it. While  $\{\{a, c\}, \underline{b, d}\} \models \Gamma^{\{\{a, c\}, \underline{b, d}\}}$ , all its  $f$ -weakenings, viz.  $\{\{a, c\}, \underline{b}\}$ ,  $\{\{a, c\}, \underline{d}\}$  and  $\{\{a, c\}, \emptyset\}$ , refute it. Finally, notice that the S5-model  $\{\{a, c\}\}$  is the other (unintended)  $\mathfrak{t}_f$ -minimal model of  $\Gamma$ , and both  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimality tools produce the identical results for  $\Gamma$ .

In a parallel, purely logical context, world-views are alternatively computed as epistemic extensions of equilibrium models. A first step towards epistemic equilibrium logic belongs to Wang&Zhang [19]. As their approach has generalised  $ES_{94}$  and also due to page restrictions, we do not include it below.

## 4 Epistemic Extensions of Equilibrium Logic

*Equilibrium logic* (EL) is a nonmonotonic formalism, basically proposed by Pearce [11] as a logical and mathematical framework of ASP. EL is based on *here-and-there logic* (HT), a three-valued monotonic logic which is intermediate between classical logic and intuitionistic logic. An HT-model is an ordered pair  $(H, T)$  of valuations  $H, T \subseteq \mathbb{P}$  satisfying  $H \subseteq T$ . The semantics of EL, via *equilibrium models*, is obtained through a  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimality criterion over HT-models:  $T$  is an equilibrium model of  $\varphi$  iff  $T, T \models_{\text{HT}} \varphi$  (i.e.,  $T \models \varphi$ ) and ( $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimality condition)  $H, T \not\models_{\text{HT}} \varphi$  for any  $H$  strictly included in  $T$  ( $H \subset T$ ). In summary, Pearce has generalised ASP by characterising its stable-models as equilibrium models in EL.



#### 4.1 Su et al.'s approach (ES<sub>20a</sub>): autoepistemic equilibrium logic (AEEL)

Inspired by EL's success as a foundational framework for ASP, Su et al. introduced [13, 2, 18] an epistemic extension of EL as an alternative semantics for ES. We here name their approach ES<sub>20a</sub> and recall how ES<sub>20a</sub> produces its  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimal models, namely epistemic equilibrium models (EEMs). For our purposes, we do not include their  $\mathfrak{k}$ -minimality method, selecting ES<sub>20a</sub>-world-views among its EEMs.

##### 4.1.1 Epistemic here-and-there logic (EHT) and its equilibrium S5-models w.r.t. truth

EHT extends HT with nondual epistemic modalities  $K$  and  $\hat{K}$ , both of which are primitive and structurally identical to the modalities in EASP. Depending on knowledge-minimality conditions, these modalities may characterise different epistemic concepts, so we do not assign them a literal reading for generality. The language of EHT ( $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EHT}}$ ) is given by the grammar below, where the formulas outside HT are in bold.

$$\varphi := p \mid \perp \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi \mid \varphi \vee \varphi \mid \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \mid \mathbf{K}\varphi \mid \hat{\mathbf{K}}\varphi. \quad (\text{for } p \in \mathbb{P})$$

As usual, the derived formulas  $\neg\varphi$ ,  $\top$ , and  $\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$  respectively abbreviate  $\varphi \rightarrow \perp$ ,  $\perp \rightarrow \perp$ , and  $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \varphi)$ . A theory is a finite set of formulas. An EASP-program  $\Pi$  is translated to the corresponding EHT-theory  $\Pi^*$  via a map  $(.)^*$ : given  $\Sigma = \{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2\}$  s.t.  $\mathbf{r}_1 = p \vee \sim q \leftarrow \hat{K}r \wedge \text{not } s$  and  $\mathbf{r}_2 = q \leftarrow \text{not } Kp$ ,

$$\Sigma^* = ((\hat{K}r \wedge \neg s) \rightarrow (p \vee \tilde{q})) \wedge (\neg Kp \rightarrow q) \wedge \neg(q \wedge \tilde{q}).$$

The literal  $\sim q$  is treated as a new atom  $\tilde{q} \in \mathbb{P}$ , and this entails the formula  $\neg(q \wedge \tilde{q})$  to be inserted into  $\Sigma^*$  for consistency purposes. Since it can be easily removed from a logic program with the addition of a constraint  $\perp \leftarrow q \wedge \tilde{q}$  as above, the rest of the paper disregards strong negation  $\sim$  for simplicity.

As already mentioned in Ex. 2, the  $\hat{K}$  operator is syntactically different from  $M \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{ES}}$ . This is justified by the fact that  $M$  is derived as  $\text{not } K \text{not}$  in ES and so translated into EHT as  $\neg K \neg$  where  $\neg$  refers to EHT-negation. Because  $\neg K \neg \varphi$ ,  $\neg \neg \hat{K}\varphi$ , and  $\hat{K} \neg \neg \varphi$  are all equivalent in EHT, the  $M$  operator is expected to coincide with  $\text{notnot}\hat{K}$  and  $\hat{K}\text{notnot}$  in a possible extension of EASP-programs to propositional theories, which will be shortly discussed in the next section. Notice that the difference between  $Mp$  and  $\hat{K}p$  in EASP resembles that of  $\text{notnot}p$  and  $p$  in ASP. As a result, in an extended language, we expect  $Mp$  not to have a world-view, whereas  $\{\emptyset, \{p\}\}$  is one easily-understandable world-view for  $\hat{K}p$ .

An EHT-model  $\langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle$  is a refinement of a classical S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$  in which valuations  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  are replaced by HT-models  $(s(T), T)$  w.r.t. a subset function  $s : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{P}}$ , assigning to each  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  one of its subsets, i.e.,  $s(T) \subseteq T$ . Thus, the explicit representation of  $\langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle$  is given by  $\{(s(T), T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ . Satisfaction of a formula  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EHT}}$  is defined recursively w.r.t. to the following truth conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \models_{\text{EHT}} p & \quad \text{if } p \in s(T); \\ \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \models_{\text{EHT}} \varphi \rightarrow \psi & \quad \text{if } (\langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \not\models_{\text{EHT}} \varphi \text{ or } \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \models_{\text{EHT}} \psi) \text{ and} \\ & \quad (\langle \mathcal{T}, id \rangle, T \not\models_{\text{EHT}} \varphi \text{ or } \langle \mathcal{T}, id \rangle, T \models_{\text{EHT}} \psi); \\ \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \models_{\text{EHT}} K\varphi & \quad \text{if } \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T' \models_{\text{EHT}} \varphi \text{ for every } T' \in \mathcal{T}; \\ \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \models_{\text{EHT}} \hat{K}\varphi & \quad \text{if } \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T' \models_{\text{EHT}} \varphi \text{ for some } T' \in \mathcal{T}; \end{aligned}$$

where  $id$  denotes the identity function. The truth conditions of  $\perp$ ,  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$  are standard. The EHT-model  $\langle \mathcal{T}, id \rangle = \{(T, T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$  is called *total* and identical to the classical S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  is an *equilibrium S5-model w.r.t. truth*, or originally an *epistemic equilibrium model* (EEM) of  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{\text{EHT}}$  if  $\mathcal{T}$  is a classical S5-model of  $\varphi$ , and the following  $\mathfrak{t}$ -minimality condition (referred to as  $\mathfrak{t}_f$ -minimality), viz.

$$\text{for every possible subset function } s \text{ on } \mathcal{T} \text{ with } s \neq id, \text{ there is } T \in \mathcal{T} \text{ s.t. } \langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \not\models_{\text{EHT}} \varphi \quad (5)$$

holds.  $ES_{20a}$  further applies a knowledge-minimality (k-minimality) criterion ([18], p. 12), simultaneously functioning two different conditions, upon EEMs to determine its world-views, originally referred to as autoepistemic equilibrium models (AEEMs). The inspiration comes from autoepistemic logic and the logic of all-that-I-know, and the selection process is carried out by mutual comparison of EEMs according to set inclusion and a formula-indexed preorder. Note that applying the same criterion upon EASP's  $\tau_f$ -minimal models to select world-views, we can search for a relationship between two formalisms.

## 4.2 Cabalar et al.'s approach ( $ES_{20b}$ ): founded autoepistemic equilibrium logic (FAEEL)

Cabalar et al. [1] define EHT on a  $\hat{K}$ -free fragment of  $\mathcal{L}_{EHT}$ . The authors acknowledge that the relation of a second operator (M vs.  $\hat{K}$ ) to K is under debate, and so they leave its study for future work. Even though not in terms of meaning, the inclusion of  $\hat{K}$  into  $ES_{20b}$  is methodologically straightforward. Therefore, we here follow the same language  $\mathcal{L}_{EHT}$  for  $ES_{20b}$  as well in terms of harmony. Moreover,  $ES_{20b}$  partially contains  $\hat{K}$  when considered in its original language since  $\neg\hat{K}$  and  $\hat{K}\neg$  are EHT-equivalent respectively to  $K\neg$  and  $\neg K$ . As a derived formula, M is also included by default in all existing EELs in the form of  $\neg K\neg$ . Unlike in  $ES_{20a}$  where K represents *knowledge*, in this context,  $K\varphi$  reads  *$\varphi$  is one of the agent's beliefs*.

In  $ES_{20b}$ , an EHT-model  $\langle \mathcal{T}, s_r \rangle$  is defined w.r.t. a serial subset relation (multi-valued subset function)  $s_r$ , relating each  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  to at least one element from  $2^T$ , i.e., to some subsets of  $T$ . Thus, a serial subset relation  $s_r$  and an S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$  give rise to the EHT-model  $s_r = \{(H, T) : T s_r H\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ . To illustrate the functional vs. relational nature of the formalisms  $ES_{20a}$  and  $ES_{20b}$ , take the S5-model  $\mathcal{T} = \{T\}$  where  $T = \{p, q\}$ . Depending on the subset function  $s$  on  $\mathcal{T}$ , we can only form the EHT-models  $\{(\emptyset, T)\}$ ,  $\{(\{p\}, T)\}$ ,  $\{(\{q\}, T)\}$ , and  $\{(T, T)\}$  in  $ES_{20a}$  as we are restricted to choose a unique subset  $H = s(T)$  and so build a unique HT-model  $(H, T)$  for each  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . However, in  $EHT_{20}$ , we can obtain the additional EHT-models

$$\{(\{p\}, T), (\{q\}, T)\}, \{(\emptyset, T), (\{p\}, T), (\{q\}, T)\}, \{(\emptyset, T), (T, T)\}, \{(\emptyset, T), (\{p\}, T), (T, T)\}, \text{ etc.}$$

since as many subset as desired can be chosen for each  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , keeping in mind that  $s_r$  is serial.

While the truth conditions are the same, to avoid possible confusion, we recall that  $\langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T \models_{EHT} \varphi$  means  $\{(H, T) : H = s(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, (H, T) \models_{EHT} \varphi$  in  $ES_{20a}$ , but here  $s_r(T)$  may refer to more than one subset as  $s_r$  is multi-valued. Thus, we prefer an explicit notation  $\{(H, T) : T s_r H\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, (H, T) \models_{EHT} \varphi$  to be precise.

An *epistemic equilibrium model* (EEM) of  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}_{EHT}$  is then defined as its classical S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfying a  $\tau_r$ -minimality condition: for every multi-valued subset function  $s_r$  on  $\mathcal{T}$  s.t.  $s_r \neq id$ ,

$$\text{there is an HT-model } (H, T) \text{ s.t. } T s_r H \text{ and } \{(H, T) : T s_r H\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, (H, T) \not\models_{EHT} \varphi. \quad (6)$$

Once EEMs are produced, the next step is to apply Schwarz's [12] minimal model reasoning<sup>1</sup> for non-monotonic KD45 to select world-views of  $ES_{20b}$  from among EEMs. The operator K obtains its meaning from this approach because in autoepistemic logic, the epistemic operator K characterises the *self-belief* of a rational agent. To weaken a  $\tau_r$ -minimal S5-model (EEM) w.r.t belief,  $ES_{20b}$  needs to generalise EEMs to KD45-model structures because minimality w.r.t. belief (b) is tested in nonmonotonic KD45 by examining whether an S5-model has a *preferred* model extension in KD45. To check stability w.r.t. belief in  $ES_{20b}$ , we add a new valuation  $I$  into a (candidate) EEM  $\mathcal{T}$  s.t.  $I \notin \mathcal{T}$  and design the resulting KD45 model  $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T} \uplus \{I\}$  in a way that  $I$  is not accessible by any point in  $\mathcal{T}'$  while any point in  $\mathcal{T}$  can be accessed by every point in  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Thus every point in  $\mathcal{T}'$ , including  $I$ , uses the same belief that is determined by  $\mathcal{T}$ . Formally,  $\mathcal{T}'$  is preferred over  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a  $\tau_r$ -minimal KD45-model of  $\varphi$  if the following conditions

$$(i) \mathcal{T} \uplus \{I\}, I \models_{KD45} \varphi \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \mathcal{T} \uplus \{(s(I), I)\}, (s(I), I) \not\models_{EHT} \varphi \quad (7)$$

<sup>1</sup>Schwarz has proved that autoepistemic logic under stable expansions and KD45 under minimal models coincide.

respectively hold. When (7) holds for a candidate EEM  $\mathcal{T}$ , this means that  $\mathcal{T}$  is not stable (or at equilibrium) w.r.t. belief and fails to be an AEEM of  $\varphi$  in  $\text{ES}_{20b}$ . Notice that the condition (7).(ii) does not require that the points of  $\mathcal{T}$  be weakened w.r.t. truth: as  $\mathcal{T}$  is an EEM of  $\varphi$ , by definition, any weakening of  $\mathcal{T}$  results in the formula  $\varphi$  being refuted at some point of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Also note that due to the KD45-model structure, we weaken  $I$  w.r.t. truth in  $\text{ES}_{20b}$  simply by using the subset function  $s$  in (7) as  $s_{\mathbf{r}}$  and  $s$  provide identical models. We do not reformulate above the details of the method in its original notation as our aim here is to give a brief overview to the reader. However, for our purposes, it is worth mentioning that this b-minimality approach can be easily adapted to  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{r}}$ -minimal models of EASP as formalised below.

**Definition 5 (stable S5-models of EASP w.r.t. truth and belief)** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a nonempty collection of valuations, and let  $\Pi$  be an EASP-program. Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a *stable S5-model* of  $\Pi$  w.r.t. truth and belief if for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , we have  $\mathcal{T}, T \models_{\mathbf{r}}^* \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T)}$  and for every  $I \in 2^{\mathcal{P}} \setminus \mathcal{T}$ ,

$$\mathcal{T} \uplus \{I\}, I \not\models_{\text{KD45}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, I)} \text{ or } \mathcal{T} \uplus \{(s(I), I)\}, (s(I), I) \models_{\text{KD45}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, I)} \text{ for some subset map } s \text{ s.t. } s(I) \subset I. \quad (8)$$

The condition (8) states that  $\mathcal{T}$  has no  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{r}}$ -minimal preferred model in KD45. This definition will then allow us to search for a correspondence between the resulting formalism and  $\text{ES}_{20b}$ .

### 4.3 Su's approach ( $\text{ES}_{21}$ ): reflexive autoepistemic equilibrium logic (RAEEL)

Su [17] then suggests applying the k-minimality criterion of nonmonotonic SW5 [14] over EEMs of  $\text{ES}_{20a}$  or  $\text{ES}_{20b}$  to select AEEMs and proposes  $\text{ES}_{21}$ . Remember that the modal logic SW5 is just a reflexive<sup>2</sup> closure of KD45 where K represents *knowledge*. Our underlying intuition is simply because the formulas  $Kp$  and  $\hat{K}p$  have respectively the unique AEEMs  $\{\{p\}\}$  and  $\{\emptyset, \{p\}\}$  in  $\text{ES}_{21}$ , regardless of the  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimality technique chosen,  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{r}}$  vs.  $\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{f}}$ . While  $\hat{K}p$  has the same AEEM,  $Kp$  has no AEEM in  $\text{ES}_{20b}$ . In an extended language,  $\text{ES}_{94}$  cannot provide any world views for these formulas, and a slightly modified version  $\text{ES}_{11}$  [6] cannot produce a reasonable model  $\{\{p\}\}$  for  $Kp \vee q$ . These results reinforce the counter-arguments provided in Ex. 1-2 towards their reduct definitions, attacking positive subjective literals. If an atom  $p$  can be derived in all stable models of an ASP-program, then the query  $p?$  is answered as *true*. Does it provide an enough justification for the derivation of  $Kp$ ? While  $p$  has a unique world view  $\{\{p\}\}$ , why does a stronger expression  $Kp$  lack a world-view? Such questions go on... Although it is unclear what researchers intend to capture with K, the above-mentioned EELs, especially  $\text{ES}_{20a}$  and  $\text{ES}_{21}$  with their well-studied minimality tools, are strong formalisms, and in our opinion, they both can serve with their different functionalities (especially towards constraints) for the encoding of different problems.

All existing EELs in the literature employ a twofold world-view computation process. The method is first to compute  $\mathbf{t}$ -minimal models of a program, upon which a k-minimality criterion is applied. In  $\text{ES}_{94}$ , there is no such clear-cut distinction between truth and knowledge minimality conditions; instead, they are given intertwined with each other. The follow-up ES-formalisms are mostly focused on reduct without modifications in the minimality. This makes it difficult to understand the relationships between ES-formalisms proposed in the logic programming domain and the purely logical domain of EL. However, there are some work in the literature, revealing similarities between existing ES-formalisms. For instance, Wang&Zhang [19]) have embedded  $\text{ES}_{94}$  into an EEL they designed; Cabalar et al. [1] have proved that AEEMs of  $\text{ES}_{20b}$  and founded world-views of  $\text{ES}_{94}$  coincide under a foundedness property they proposed. We tackle this research topic in reverse direction by following Ferraris' work, which captures equilibrium models as stable models. To achieve this, we propose a versatile and comprehensive framework called EASP that can evolve into various EELs, incorporating their k-minimality conditions.

<sup>2</sup>Schwarz [12] has proved that reflexive autoepistemic logic and nonmonotonic SW5 coincide under their specific semantics.

Moreover, compared to related work, it is evident how EASP accommodates existing EELs through the traditional nature of EASP. The next section clarifies how we accomplish this in a unifying framework.

## 5 Correspondence between EASP and EEL

This section first generalises Ferraris' lemma, presented in ([3], p. 3), to S5, KD45 and SW5-models.

**Lemma 1** *Given  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_i\}_{i \in I} = \{T_i : i \in I\}$  be an S5-model, and let  $s : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{T}}$  be a subset function s.t.  $s(T_i) = H_i \subseteq T_i$  for every  $i \in I$ . For an EASP-program  $\Pi$ ,*

$$\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}, H_j \models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T_j)} \text{ iff } \{(H_i, T_i) : i \in I\}, (H_j, T_j) \models_{\text{EHT}} \Pi^*, \text{ for every } j \in I.$$

The lemma is proven by structural induction. As  $H_i = H_j$  is possible for some  $i, j \in I$ , we consider  $\{H_i\}_{i \in I}$  as a multiset and employ the traditional reduct introduced in Def. 4. Under this general result, we can clearly see how EELs appear in the logic programming domain and vice versa.

We begin with EEMs of  $\text{ES}_{20a}$ : for an EASP-program  $\Pi$ , let  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_i\}_{i \in I} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$  be an EEM of  $\Pi^*$ . By definition of EEM in  $\text{ES}_{20a}$  (5), we have (1)  $\mathcal{T}, T_i \models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^*$  for every  $i \in I$  and (2) for every non-identity subset function  $s$  on  $\mathcal{T}$  s.t.  $s(T_i) = H_i$  for each  $i$ , there is  $k \in I$  s.t.  $\langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle, T_k \not\models_{\text{EHT}} \Pi^*$ . The model  $\langle \mathcal{T}, s \rangle$  gives rise to the EHT-model  $\{(H_i, T_i)\}_{i=1}^n = \{(H_1, T_1), \dots, (H_n, T_n)\}$ , and so,  $\{(H_i, T_i)\}_{i=1}^n, (H_k, T_k) \not\models_{\text{EHT}} \Pi^*$ . First let  $s = id$  in Lemma 1, then  $H_i = T_i$  for each  $i$ . Recall that  $\langle \mathcal{T}, id \rangle$  refers to the classical S5-model  $\mathcal{T}$ . The condition (1) so implies  $\{T_1 \dots T_n\}, T_j \models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T_j)}$ , for every  $j \in I$ . Again by Lemma 1, the condition (2) refers to a more relaxed  $\mathfrak{t}_f$ -minimality criterion not discussed in Sect. 3, saying that “for every subset function  $s$  with  $s \neq id$ , there is  $k \in I$  s.t.  $\{s(T_1), \dots, s(T_n)\}, s(T_k) \not\models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T_k)}$ ”. To sum up, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}, T \models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T)} \text{ for every } T \in \mathcal{T} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{for every subset function } s \neq id, \text{ there is } T' \in \mathcal{T} \text{ s.t. } \{s(T)\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, s(T') \not\models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T')}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Since EHT-models of  $\text{ES}_{20b}$  are formed in a relational structure, first we should refine Lemma 1.

**Lemma 2** *Let  $\Pi$  be an EASP-program. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be an S5-model, and let  $\mathfrak{s}_r$  be a multi-valued subset function on  $\mathcal{T}$  s.t.  $\mathfrak{s}_r = \{(H, T) : T \mathfrak{s}_r H\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}$ . For every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , let  $H$  be s.t.  $T \mathfrak{s}_r H$ . Then, we have:*

$$\{H : T \mathfrak{s}_r H\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, H \models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T)} \text{ iff } \{(H, T) : T \mathfrak{s}_r H\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, (H, T) \models_{\text{EHT}} \Pi^*.$$

Pursuing a similar proof, we can also capture EEMs of  $\text{ES}_{20b}$  in EASP. While the line (9) remains the same, we again obtain a more-relaxed  $\mathfrak{t}_r$ -minimality condition compared to one proposed in Sect. 3:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for every multi-valued subset function } \mathfrak{s}_r \text{ s.t. } \neq id, \\ \{H : T \mathfrak{s}_r H\}_{T \in \mathcal{T}}, H' \not\models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T')} \text{ for some } T' \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and for some } H' \text{ s.t. } T' \mathfrak{s}_r H'. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The extensions of Lemma 1-2 to KD45 and SW5-model structures and reflecting generalised EEMs in such weaker model structures to EASP are straightforward. We now perform the same task in the opposite direction and embed Def. 4 into EEL domain. Using Lemma 1,  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_i\}_{i \in I}$  is a  $\mathfrak{t}_f$ -minimal S5-model of  $\Pi$  iff  $\mathcal{T}, T_i \models_{\text{S5}} \Pi^*$  for every  $i \in I$  and for every  $j \in I$ , we have

$$\text{for every subset map } s \text{ s.t. } s|_{\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T_j\}} = id \text{ and } s(T_j) \subset T_j, \{(s(T_i), T_i)\}_i, (s(T_j), T_j) \not\models_{\text{EHT}} \Pi^*. \quad (11)$$

We leave it to the reader to generalise this result to  $\mathfrak{t}_r$ -minimal S5-models of EASP by Lemma 2.

Through the same approach, we try to analyse  $ES_{94}$ -semantics: let  $\mathcal{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$  be a world-view of an ES-program  $\Pi$ . By definition,  $\mathcal{T}$  is the maximal set w.r.t. subset relation  $\subseteq$  satisfying (1)  $\mathcal{T} \models \Pi^{\mathcal{T}}$  and (2)  $(\mathcal{T} \setminus \{T\}) \cup \{H\}, H \not\models \Pi^{\mathcal{T}}$  for every  $H \subset T$ , for every  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Notice that  $\Pi^{\mathcal{T}} = \Pi^{(\mathcal{T}, T_i)}$  for every  $i \in I$  as  $ES_{94}$ -reduct eliminates only extended subjective literals. This definition, except maximality condition, coincides with  $\tau_f$ -minimal S5-model definition of EASP, and so with (11) by Lemma 1. However,  $\{\{p\}\}$  is a world-view of  $p \leftarrow Kp$ , but not a  $\tau_f$ -minimal S5-model of  $\Pi$ . For some reasons, we cannot apply Ferraris' generalised lemma (i.e., Lemma 1) to  $ES_{94}$ -semantics.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we first discuss the problems that arise under Gelfond's original  $ES_{94}$ -semantics, aiming to shed light on the underlying reasons for these issues. We also briefly overview the follow-up semantics, that were primarily proposed to address the limitations of  $ES_{94}$ . Next, we introduce a flexible and robust framework for epistemic logic programs called EASP, which already accommodates Su's traditional  $\tau_f$ -minimal S5-models, as studied in [15], and their novel variations known as  $\tau_r$ -minimal S5-models.

We recognise that all existing epistemic equilibrium logics (EELs) in the literature share a two-step world-view computation process. This motivates us to explore their similarities and beyond within the EASP context. To this end, we generalise Ferraris' lemma (see [3], p. 3), which establishes a correlation between stable models and equilibrium models, to the epistemic case. We then examine how these EELs are reflected within the EASP framework. This approach also allows us to investigate whether different  $\tau_f$  ( $\tau_r$ ) minimality methods, such as those presented in [15] and [18], produce the same results when considered at least within the current EASP language fragment. It is worth noting that the technique in [15] is slightly easier than that in [18], which raises an immediate research question for future studies. Furthermore, Ferraris' generalised lemmas lead to the strong equivalence characterisations of EASP-programs through the logical equivalences of their translations in EHT, akin to Lifschitz et al.'s finding [10] in regular ASP. Finally, future work will also involve a more detailed investigation of how Gelfond's  $ES_{94}$ -semantics can be reflected into the EEL domain, following a similar approach as discussed in this paper. This study will help us better identify the problems of  $ES_{94}$ , as well as its possible similarities with other ES-semantic approaches originally proposed in the EEL domain.

## References

- [1] Pedro Cabalar, Jorge Fandinno & Luis Fariñas del Cerro (2020): *Autoepistemic answer set programming*. *Artif. Intell.* 289, p. 103382. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2020.103382>.
- [2] Luis Fariñas del Cerro, Andreas Herzig & Ezgi Iraz Su (2015): *Epistemic Equilibrium Logic*. In Qiang Yang & Michael J. Wooldridge, editors: *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2015, Buenos Aires, Argentina, July 25-31, 2015*, AAAI Press, pp. 2964–2970. Available at <http://ijcai.org/Abstract/15/419>.
- [3] Paolo Ferraris (2005): *Answer Sets for Propositional Theories*. In Chitta Baral, Gianluigi Greco, Nicola Leone & Giorgio Terracina, editors: *Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning, 8th International Conference, LPNMR 2005, Diamante, Italy, September 5-8, 2005, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3662*, Springer, pp. 119–131. Available at [https://doi.org/10.1007/11546207\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/11546207_10).
- [4] Michael Gelfond (1991): *Strong Introspection*. In Thomas L. Dean & Kathleen R. McKeown, editors: *Proceedings of the 9th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Anaheim, CA, USA, July 14-19, 1991, Volume 1*, AAAI Press / The MIT Press, pp. 386–391. Available at <http://www.aaai.org/Library/AAAI/1991/aaai91-060.php>.

- [5] Michael Gelfond (1994): *Logic Programming and Reasoning with Incomplete Information*. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.* 12(1-2), pp. 89–116. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01530762>.
- [6] Michael Gelfond (2011): *New Semantics for Epistemic Specifications*. In James P. Delgrande & Wolfgang Faber, editors: *Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning - 11th International Conference, LPNMR 2011, Vancouver, Canada, May 16-19, 2011. Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 6645, Springer, pp. 260–265. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-20895-9>.
- [7] Michael Gelfond & Vladimir Lifschitz (1988): *The Stable Model Semantics for Logic Programming*. In Robert A. Kowalski & Kenneth A. Bowen, editors: *Logic Programming, Proceedings of the 5th International Conference and Symposium, Seattle, Washington, USA, August 15-19, 1988 (2 Volumes)*, MIT Press, pp. 1070–1080.
- [8] Michael Gelfond & Vladimir Lifschitz (1991): *Classical Negation in Logic Programs and Disjunctive Databases*. *New Gener. Comput.* 9(3/4), pp. 365–386. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03037169>.
- [9] Patrick Thor Kahl (2014): *Refining the semantics for epistemic logic programs*. Ph.D. thesis, Texas Tech University, Department of Computer Science, Lubbock, TX, USA.
- [10] Vladimir Lifschitz, David Pearce & Agustín Valverde (2001): *Strongly equivalent logic programs*. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 2(4), pp. 526–541. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1145/383779.383783>.
- [11] David Pearce (2006): *Equilibrium logic*. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell.* 47(1-2), pp. 3–41, doi:10.1007/s10472-006-9028-z.
- [12] Grigori Schwarz (1992): *Minimal Model Semantics for Nonmonotonic Modal Logics*. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS) '92, Santa Cruz, California, USA, June 22-25, 1992*, pp. 34–43, doi:10.1109/LICS.1992.185517.
- [13] Ezgi Iraz Su (2015): *Extensions of equilibrium logic by modal concepts. (Extensions de la logique d'équilibre par des concepts modaux)*. Ph.D. thesis, Institut de Recherche en Informatique de Toulouse, France. Available at <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01636791>.
- [14] Ezgi Iraz Su (2017): *A Monotonic View on Reflexive Autoepistemic Reasoning*. In Marcello Balduccini & Tomi Janhunen, editors: *Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning - 14th International Conference, LPNMR 2017, Espoo, Finland, July 3-6, 2017, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 10377, Springer, pp. 85–100. Available at [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61660-5\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61660-5_10).
- [15] Ezgi Iraz Su (2019): *Epistemic Answer Set Programming*. In Francesco Calimeri, Nicola Leone & Marco Manna, editors: *Logics in Artificial Intelligence - 16th European Conference, JELIA 2019, Rende, Italy, May 7-11, 2019, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 11468, Springer, pp. 608–626. Available at [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19570-0\\_40](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19570-0_40).
- [16] Ezgi Iraz Su (2020): *A Unifying Approach for Nonmonotonic S4F, (Reflexive) Autoepistemic Logic, and Answer Set Programming*. *Fundam. Informaticae* 176(3-4), pp. 205–234. Available at <https://doi.org/10.3233/FI-2020-1972>.
- [17] Ezgi Iraz Su (2021): *Refining the Semantics of Epistemic Specifications*. In Andrea Formisano, Yanhong Annie Liu, Bart Bogaerts, Alex Brik, Verónica Dahl, Carmine Dodaro, Paul Fodor, Gian Luca Pozzato, Joost Vennekens & Neng-Fa Zhou, editors: *Proceedings 37th International Conference on Logic Programming, ICLP Technical Communications 2021, Porto (virtual event), 20-27th September 2021, EPTCS* 345, pp. 113–126. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.345.25>.
- [18] Ezgi Iraz Su, Luis Fariñas del Cerro & Andreas Herzig (2020): *Autoepistemic equilibrium logic and epistemic specifications*. *Artif. Intell.* 282, p. 103249. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2020.103249>.
- [19] Kewen Wang & Yan Zhang (2005): *Nested Epistemic Logic Programs*. In Chitta Baral, Gianluigi Greco, Nicola Leone & Giorgio Terracina, editors: *Logic Programming and Nonmonotonic Reasoning, 8th International Conference, LPNMR 2005, Diamante, Italy, September 5-8, 2005, Proceedings, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 3662, Springer, pp. 279–290. Available at [https://doi.org/10.1007/11546207\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/11546207_22).