

A Complete Epistemic Temporal Logic for Intelligent Agent

Zining Cao

College of Computer Science and Engineering
Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing 211106, China
caozn@nuaa.edu.cn

Abstract. In this paper, we present a complete epistemic temporal logic, called *BPICTL*, which generalizes *CTL* by introducing epistemic modalities. A sound and complete inference system of *BPICTL* is given. We prove the finite model property of *BPICTL*. Furthermore, we present a model checking algorithm for *BPICTL*.

The field of multi-agent systems (*MAS*) theories is traditionally concerned with the formal representation of the mental attitudes of autonomous entities, or agents, in a distributed system. For this task several modal logics have been developed. The most studied being logics include logics for knowledge, beliefs, desires, goals, and intentions. These logics are seen as specifications of particular classes of *MAS* systems. Their aim is to offer a description of the macroscopic mental attitudes (such as knowledge, belief and etc.) that a *MAS* should exhibit in a specific class of scenarios. A considerable number of these formal studies are available in the literature and temporal extensions of these (i.e., modal combinations of *CTL* or *LTL* with the modalities for the mental attitudes) have been proposed [3,5,8]. The typical technical contribution of this line of work is to explore the metalogical properties of these logics, e.g., completeness, decidability, and computational complexity.

Verification of reaction systems by means of model checking techniques is a well-established area of research [2]. In this paradigm one typically models a system S in terms of automata (or by a similar transition-based formalism), builds an implementation P_S of the system by means of a model-checker friendly language such as the input for *SMV* or *PROMELA*, and finally uses a model-checker such as *SMV* or *SPIN* to verify some property φ in the model M_P : $M_P \models \varphi$, where M_P is a model representing the executions of P_S . The field of multi-agent systems has also become interested in the problem of verifying complex systems [1,11]. In *MAS*, modal logics representing concepts such as knowledge, belief, and intention. Since these modalities are given interpretations that are different from the ones of the standard temporal operators, it is not straightforward to apply existing model checking tools developed for $LTL \setminus CTL$ temporal logic to the specification of *MAS*.

In this paper, we present an epistemic temporal logic *BPICTL*, which is an extension of *CTL* by adding belief modality, preference modality and intension

modality. Some new interaction properties between epistemic modalities and temporal modalities are given. We prove the soundness, completeness and finite model property of *BPICTL*. Furthermore we present a model checking algorithm for *BPICTL*. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we present an epistemic temporal logic *BPICTL*, give its syntax, semantics and inference system. In Section 3, we study the the soundness and completeness of *BPICTL*. In Section 4, the approach to model checking *BPICTL* is studied. The paper is concluded in Section 5.

1 An Epistemic Temporal Logic *BPICTL*

1.1 Syntax of *BPICTL*

Throughout this paper, we let L^{BPICTL} be a language which is just the set of formulas of interest to us.

Definition 1. The set of formulas in *BPICTL*, called L^{BPICTL} , is given by the following rules:

- (1) If $\varphi \in$ atomic formulas set Π , then $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$.
- (2) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $\neg\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$.
- (3) If $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$.
- (4) If $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$.
- (5) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $B_a\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $B_a\varphi$ means that agent a believes φ .
- (6) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $P_a\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $P_a\varphi$ means that agent a prefers φ .
- (7) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $I_a\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $I_a\varphi$ means that agent a intends φ .
- (8) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $AX\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $AX\varphi$ means that every next state satisfies φ .
- (9) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $EX\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $EX\varphi$ means that there is a next state which satisfies φ .
- (10) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $AG\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $AG\varphi$ means that property φ holds at every state on every path from the current state.
- (11) If $\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $EG\varphi \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $EG\varphi$ means that property φ holds at every state on some path from the current state.
- (12) If $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $A\varphi_1U\varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $A\varphi_1U\varphi_2$ means that for every path from the current state, such that there is a state on the path where φ_2 holds, and at every preceding state on the path, φ_1 holds.
- (13) If $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$, then $E\varphi_1U\varphi_2 \in L^{BPICTL}$. Intuitively, $E\varphi_1U\varphi_2$ means that there exists a path from the current state, such that there is a state on the path where φ_2 holds, and at every preceding state on the path, φ_1 holds.

We use the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 &\stackrel{def}{=} \neg\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2. \\ \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2 &\stackrel{def}{=} (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge (\varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi_1). \\ D_a\varphi &\stackrel{def}{=} P_a\varphi \wedge B_a\neg\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

$$EF\varphi \stackrel{def}{=} \neg AG\neg\varphi.$$

$$AF\varphi \stackrel{def}{=} AtrueU\varphi.$$

1.2 Semantics of *BPICTL*

We will describe the semantics of *BPICTL*, that is, a formal model that we can use to determine whether a given formula is true or false. Semantics of epistemic logic and temporal logic are usually based on Kripke model. In *BPICTL*, preference modality and intension modality are not normal modal operator, so we give semantics of preference modality and intension modality based on neighbourhood model [10].

Definition 2. A model M of *BPICTL* is a structure $M = (S, \Pi, \pi, R_a^B, R_a^P, R_a^I, R_a^X, D_a)$, where

- (1) S is a nonempty set, whose elements are called possible worlds or states.
- (2) Π is a set of atomic formulas
- (3) π is a map: $S \rightarrow 2^\Pi$.
- (4) $R_a^B : R_a^B \subseteq S \times S$ is an accessible relation on S , which is a belief relation.
- (5) $R_a^P : R_a^P : S \rightarrow \wp(\wp(S))$, where $\wp(S)$ is the power set of S .
- (6) $R_a^I : R_a^I : S \rightarrow \wp(\wp(S))$.
- (7) $R_a^X : R_a^X \subseteq S \times S$ is an accessible relation on S , which is a temporal relation.
- (8) D_a is a nonempty subset of $\wp(S)$, which satisfies the following conditions:
 - (a) If p is an atomic formula, then $ev(p) = \{s \mid \pi(s, p) = true\} \in D_a$.
 - (b) If $A \in D_a$, then $S - A \in D_a$.
 - (c) If $A_1, A_2 \in D_a$, then $A_1 \cap A_2 \in D_a$.
 - (d) If $A \in D_a$, then $Pre_a^B(A) \in D_a$. where $Pre_a^B(A) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } (q, s) \in R_a^B \Rightarrow s \in A\}$.
 - (e) If $A \in D_a$, then $Pre_a^P(A) \in D_a$. where $Pre_a^P(A) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } \sigma = R_a^P(q) \Rightarrow \sigma \subseteq A\}$.
 - (f) If $A \in D_a$, then $Pre_a^I(A) \in D_a$. where $Pre_a^I(A) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } \sigma = R_a^I(q) \Rightarrow \sigma \subseteq A\}$.
 - (g) If $A \in D_a$, then $Pre_a^{EX}(A) \in D_a$. where $Pre_a^{EX}(A) = \{q \mid \text{there exists } (r, q) \in R_a^X \text{ such that } q \in A\}$.
 - (h) If $A \in D_a$, then $Eva_a^{EG}(A) \in D_a$. where $Eva_a^{EG}(A) = \{r \mid \text{there exists trace } \pi = q_0, q_1, \dots \text{ from state } r, \text{ where } (q_i, q_{i+1}) \in R_a^X, \text{ such that } q_i \in A\}$.
 - (i) If $A_1, A_2 \in D_a$, then $Eva_a^{EU}(A_1, A_2) \in D_a$. where $Eva_a^{EU}(A_1, A_2) = \{r \mid \text{there exists trace } \pi = q_0, q_1, \dots \text{ from state } r, \text{ where } (q_i, q_{i+1}) \in R_a^X, \text{ and there exists a position } m \geq 0, \text{ such that } q_m \in A_2 \text{ and for all positions } 0 \leq k < m, \text{ we have } q_k \in A_1.\}$

In order to give the semantics of *BPICTL*, we define conditions of $R_a^B, R_a^P, R_a^I, R_a^X$.

- (B3) $(\forall x \forall y \forall z. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \wedge (y, z) \in R_a^B \rightarrow (x, z) \in R_a^B))$
- (B4) $(\forall x \forall y \forall z. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \wedge (x, z) \in R_a^B \rightarrow (y, z) \in R_a^B))$
- (B5) $(\forall x \exists y. (x, y) \in R_a^B)$
- (P1) $\forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge Q_2 \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow Q_1 \cap Q_2 \in R_a^P(x))$

(P2) $\forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge (\overline{Q_1} \cup Q_2) \in R_a^P(x)) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^P(x)$,
where \overline{Q} is the complement of Q .

(P3) $\forall x. \forall y. \forall Q_1 \in D_a. \exists Q_2 \in D_a. (y \in Q_2 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge Q_1 \in R_a^P(y)) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(x)$

(P4) $\forall x. \forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a. \exists y. Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow ((Q_2 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge y \in Q_2) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(y))$

(BP1) $\forall x, y. \forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^P(x)$

(BP2) $\forall x, y. \forall Q \in D_a. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \wedge Q \in R_a^P(x)) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(y)$

(BP3) $\forall x, y. \forall Q \in D_a. Q \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow \forall y. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(y))$

(BP4) $\forall x. \forall y. \forall Q \in D_a. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(y)) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(x)$

(BP5) $\forall x. \exists y. \forall Q \in D_a. Q \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(y))$

(BI1) $\forall x, y. \forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a. (Q_1 \in R_a^I(x) \wedge \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^I(x)$

(BI2) $\forall x, y. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \wedge Q \in R_a^I(x)) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y)$

(BI3) $\forall x. \forall Q \in D_a. Q \in R_a^I(x) \rightarrow \forall y. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y))$

(BI4) $\forall x. \forall y. \forall Q \in D_a. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y)) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(x)$

(BI5) $\forall x. \exists y. Q \in R_a^I(x) \rightarrow ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y))$

(BPIEF1a) $\forall x. \forall Q \in D_a. (Q \in R_a^I(x) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(x))$

(BPIEF1b) $\forall x. (\cup\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(x)\} \cap \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\} = \emptyset)$

(BPIEF1c) $\forall x. \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^{EF}\} \subseteq (\cap\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(x)\})$, where R_a^{EF} is the reflexion and transition closure of R_a^X .

(BX1) $\forall x. \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X \circ R_a^B\} \subseteq \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X\}$

(BX2) $\forall x. \forall Q \in D_a. (\forall y. \exists z. (x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((y, z) \in R_a^X \wedge z \in Q)) \rightarrow (\forall u. \exists v. \forall w. (x, u) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((u, v) \in R_a^X \wedge ((v, w) \in R_a^B \rightarrow w \in Q)))$

Formally, a formula φ is interpreted as a set of states in which φ is true. We write such set of states as $[[\varphi]]_S$, where S is a model. The set $[[\varphi]]_S$ is defined recursively as follows:

Definition 3. Semantics of *BPICTL*

$$[[p]]_M = \{q \mid p \in \pi(q)\}$$

$$[[\neg\varphi]]_M = S - [[\varphi]]_M$$

$$[[\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2]]_M = [[\varphi_1]]_M \cap [[\varphi_2]]_M$$

$$[[\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2]]_M = [[\varphi_1]]_M \cup [[\varphi_2]]_M$$

$$[[B_a\varphi]]_M = \{r \mid \text{for all } (r, q) \in R_a^B \text{ implies } q \in [[\varphi]]_M.\}$$

$$[[P_a\varphi]]_M = \{r \mid \{q \mid q \in [[\varphi]]_M\} \in R_a^P(r).\}$$

$$[[I_a\varphi]]_M = \{r \mid \{q \mid q \in [[\varphi]]_M\} \in R_a^I(r).\}$$

$$[[AX\varphi]]_M = \{r \mid \text{for all } (r, q) \in R_a^X \text{ implies } q \in [[\varphi]]_M.\}$$

$$[[EX\varphi]]_M = \{r \mid \text{there exists } (r, q) \in R_a^X \text{ such that } q \in [[\varphi]]_M.\}$$

$$[[AG\varphi]]_M = \{r \mid \text{for all traces } \pi = q_0, q_1, \dots \text{ from state } r, \text{ where } (q_i, q_{i+1}) \in R_a^X, q_i \in [[\varphi]]_M.\}$$

$$[[EG\varphi]]_M = \{r \mid \text{there exists } \pi = q_0, q_1, \dots \text{ from state } r, \text{ where } (q_i, q_{i+1}) \in R_a^X, \text{ such that } q_i \in [[\varphi]]_M.\}$$

$$[[A\varphi_1 U \varphi_2]]_M = \{r \mid \text{for all traces } \pi = q_0, q_1, \dots \text{ from state } r, \text{ where } (q_i, q_{i+1}) \in R_a^X, \text{ there exists a position } m \geq 0, \text{ such that } q_m \in [[\varphi_2]]_M \text{ and for all positions } 0 \leq k < m, \text{ we have } q_k \in [[\varphi_1]]_M.\}$$

$[[E\varphi_1U\varphi_2]]_M = \{r \mid \text{there exists trace } \pi = q_0, q_1, \dots \text{ from state } r, \text{ where } (q_i, q_{i+1}) \in R_a^X, \text{ and there exists a position } m \geq 0, \text{ such that } q_m \in [[\varphi_2]]_M \text{ and for all positions } 0 \leq k < m, \text{ we have } q_k \in [[\varphi_1]]_M.\}$

In order to characterize the properties of belief, preference, intention and temporal, we will characterize the formulas that are always true. More formally, given a model M , we say that φ is valid in M , and write $M \models \varphi$, if $q \in [[\varphi]]_M$ for every state q in S , and we say that φ is satisfiable in M , and write $M, q \models \varphi$, if $q \in [[\varphi]]_M$ for some q in S . We say that φ is valid, and write $\models_{BPICTL} \varphi$, if φ is valid in all models, and that φ is satisfiable if it is satisfiable in some model. We write $\Gamma \models_{BPICTL} \varphi$, if φ is valid in all models in which Γ is satisfiable.

1.3 Inference System of *BPICTL*

Now we list a number of valid properties of belief, preference, intention and temporal, which form the inference system of *BPICTL*.

All instances of propositional tautologies and rules.

- (B1) $\vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \vdash B_a\varphi$
- (B2) $(B_a\varphi_1 \wedge B_a(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)) \rightarrow B_a\varphi_2$
- (B3) $B_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aB_a\varphi$
- (B4) $\neg B_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg B_a\varphi$
- (B5) $B_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a\neg\varphi$
- (P1) $(P_a\varphi_1 \wedge P_a\varphi_2) \rightarrow P_a(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$
- (P2) $(P_a\varphi_1 \wedge P_a(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)) \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2$
- (P3) $P_aP_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$
- (P4) $P_a\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\varphi$
- (AX1) $\vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \vdash AX\varphi$
- (AX2) $(AX\varphi_1 \wedge AX(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)) \rightarrow AX\varphi_2$
- (EX1) $EX\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg AX\neg\varphi$
- (AG1) $AG\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge AXAG\varphi$
- (EG1) $EG\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge EXEG\varphi$
- (AU1) $A\varphi_1U\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge AXA\varphi_1U\varphi_2)$
- (EU1) $E\varphi_1U\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge EXE\varphi_1U\varphi_2)$
- (BP1) $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge P_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2.$
- (BP2) $P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aP_a\varphi$
- (BP3) $\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg P_a\varphi$
- (BP4) $B_aP_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$
- (BP5) $B_a\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\varphi$
- (BI1) $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge I_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow I_a\varphi_2$
- (BI2) $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aI_a\varphi$
- (BI3) $\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg I_a\varphi$
- (BI4) $B_aI_a\varphi \rightarrow I_a\varphi$
- (BI5) $B_a\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg I_a\varphi$
- (BPIEF1) $I_a\varphi \rightarrow (P_a\varphi \wedge B_a\neg\varphi \wedge B_a\neg AG\neg\varphi)$
- (BX1) $B_aAX\varphi \rightarrow B_aAXB_a\varphi$
- (BX2) $B_aEX\varphi \rightarrow B_aEXB_a\varphi$

In this inference system, B1-B5 characterize belief modality. P1-P4 characterize preference modality. I1 characterize intention modality. AX1-AX2, EX1, AG1, EG1, AU1, EU1 characterize temporal operators, BP1-BP3 characterize the interaction of belief and preference, BI1-BI3 characterize the interaction of belief and intention, BPIEF1 characterizes the interaction of belief, preference, intention and temporal operators, BX1, BX2 characterize the interaction of belief and temporal operators. Although some interaction properties between epistemic modal operators were studied in previous works, interactive properties between epistemic and temporal modal operators are rarely studied. In the inference system of *BPICTL*, we present some new interactive properties between belief modality, preference modality, intention modality and temporal operators.

A proof in *BPICTL* consists of a sequence of formulas, each of which is either an instance of an axiom in *BPICTL* or follows from an application of an inference rule. (If “ $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ infer ψ ” is an instance of an inference rule, and if the formulas $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ have appeared earlier in the proof, then we say that ψ follows from an application of an inference rule.) A proof is said to be from Γ to φ if the premise is Γ and the last formula is φ in the proof. We say φ is provable from Γ in *BPICTL*, and write $\Gamma \vdash_{BPICTL} \varphi$, if there is a proof from Γ to φ in *BPICTL*.

2 Soundness and Completeness of *BPICTL*

Inference system of *BPICTL* is said to be sound with respect to concurrent game structures if every formula provable in *BPICTL* is valid with respect to models. The system *BPICTL* is complete with respect to models if every formula valid with respect to models is provable in *BPICTL*. The soundness and completeness provide a tight connection between the syntactic notion of provability and the semantic notion of validity.

It is not difficult to prove that all axioms and rules in the inference system hold in any model M . Therefore we have the soundness of the inference system:

Proposition 1 (Soundness of *BPICTL*). The inference system of *BPICTL* is sound, i.e., $\Gamma \vdash_{BPICTL} \varphi \Rightarrow \Gamma \models_{BPICTL} \varphi$.

Proof : We show each axiom and each rule of *BPICTL* is sound, respectively.

- (B1) $\vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \vdash B_a \varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of belief logic.
- (B2) $(B_a \varphi \wedge B_a(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)) \rightarrow B_a \psi$: It is trivial by the soundness of belief logic.
- (B3) $B_a \varphi \rightarrow B_a B_a \varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of belief logic.
- (B4) $\neg B_a \varphi \rightarrow B_a \neg B_a \varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of belief logic.
- (B5) $B_a \varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a \neg \varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of belief logic.
- (P1) $(P_a \varphi_1 \wedge P_a \varphi_2) \rightarrow P_a(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$: By $\forall Q_1, Q_2. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge Q_2 \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow Q_1 \cap Q_2 \in R_a^P(x))$.
- (P2) $(P_a \varphi_1 \wedge P_a(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)) \rightarrow P_a \varphi_2$: By $\forall Q_1, Q_2. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge (\overline{Q_1} \cup Q_2) \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^P(x))$.
- (P3) $P_a P_a \varphi \rightarrow P_a \varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[P_a P_a \varphi]]_M$, we have $[[P_a \varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$. Then $\forall x, y. (y \in [[P_a \varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x) \wedge [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(y))$. Since $\forall x. \forall y. \forall Q_1. \exists Q_2. (y \in$

$Q_2 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge Q_1 \in R_a^P(y) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(x)$, we have $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$, $x \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $P_aP_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$.

(P4) $P_a\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$, we have $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$. Since $\forall x.\forall Q_1.\forall Q_2.\exists y.Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow ((Q_2 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge y \in Q_2) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(y))$, suppose for any $\psi, \exists y. [[\psi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$, $y \in [[\psi]]_M$, then $y \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$, $x \in [[\neg P_a\neg P_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\neg P_a\varphi$.

(AX1) $\vdash \varphi \Rightarrow \vdash AX\varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of temporal logic *CTL*.

(AX2) $(AX\varphi_1 \wedge AX(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)) \rightarrow AX\varphi_2$: It is trivial by the soundness of temporal logic *CTL*.

(EX1) $EX\varphi \leftrightarrow \neg AX\neg\varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of temporal logic *CTL*.

(AG1) $AG\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge AXAG\varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of temporal logic *CTL*.

(EG1) $EG\varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi \wedge EXEG\varphi$: It is trivial by the soundness of temporal logic *CTL*.

(AU1) $A\varphi_1U\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge AXA\varphi_1U\varphi_2)$: It is trivial by the soundness of temporal logic *CTL*.

(EU1) $E\varphi_1U\varphi_2 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2 \vee (\varphi_1 \wedge EXE\varphi_1U\varphi_2)$: It is trivial by the soundness of temporal logic *CTL*.

(BP1) $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge P_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2$: Suppose $x \in [[B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)]]_M$, $x \in [[P_a\varphi_1]]_M$, since $\forall x, y.\forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a.(Q_1 \in R_a^P(x) \wedge \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^P(x)$. $x \in [[P_a\varphi_2]]_M$. We have $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge P_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2$.

(BP2) $P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aP_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$, we have $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$. By $((x, y) \in R_a^B \wedge Q \in R_a^P(x)) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(y)$. $((x, y) \in R_a^B \wedge [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(y)) \rightarrow [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$. Therefore for any y , if $(x, y) \in R_a^B$, then $y \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$ and $x \in [[B_aP_a\varphi]]_M$. We have $P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aP_a\varphi$.

(BP3) $\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg P_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[\neg P_a\varphi]]_M$, we have $R_a^P(x) \neq \emptyset$, and $\forall Q.Q \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow \exists y.y \in Q$ and $y \in [[\neg\varphi]]_M$. Since $Q \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow \forall y.((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(y))$, then $\forall Q.\forall z.((x, z) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(z)) \rightarrow \exists y.y \in Q$ and $[[\neg\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $\forall z.((x, z) \in R_a^B \rightarrow z \in [[\neg P_a\varphi]]_M)$. Hence $x \in [[B_a\neg P_a\varphi]]_M$. $\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg P_a\varphi$.

(BP4) $B_aP_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[B_aP_a\varphi]]_M$, we have $(x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow y \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$. Then $\forall x, y.((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(y))$. Since $\forall x.\forall y.\forall Q_1.((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(y)) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(x)$, we have $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$, $x \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $B_aP_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$.

(BP5) $B_a\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\varphi$: Suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$, we have $x \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$. Since $\forall x.\exists y.Q \in R_a^P(x) \rightarrow ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(y))$, $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(y)$, $y \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$. Since $(x, y) \in R_a^B$, $x \in [[\neg B_a\neg P_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a\neg P_a\varphi$.

(BI1) $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge I_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow I_a\varphi_2$: Suppose $x \in [[B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)]]_M$, $x \in [[I_a\varphi_1]]_M$, since $\forall x, y.\forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a^I.(Q_1 \in R_a^I(x) \wedge \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^I(x)$. $x \in [[I_a\varphi_2]]_M$. We have $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge I_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow I_a\varphi_2$.

(BI2) $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aI_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$, we have $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(x)$. By $((x, y) \in R_a^B \wedge Q \in R_a^I(x)) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y)$. Therefore for any y , if $(x, y) \in R_a^B$, then $y \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$ and $x \in [[B_aI_a\varphi]]_M$. We have $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aI_a\varphi$.

(BI3) $\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg I_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[\neg I_a\varphi]]_M$, we have $R_a^I(x) \neq \emptyset$, and $\forall Q. Q \in R_a^I(x) \rightarrow \exists y. y \in Q$ and $y \in [[\neg\varphi]]_M$. Since $Q \in R_a^I(x) \rightarrow \forall y. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y))$, then $\forall Q. \forall y. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y)) \rightarrow \exists z. z \in Q$ and $[[\neg\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $\forall y. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow y \in [[\neg I_a\varphi]]_M)$. Hence $x \in [[B_a\neg I_a\varphi]]_M$. $\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg I_a\varphi$.

(BI4) $B_aI_a\varphi \rightarrow I_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[B_aI_a\varphi]]_M$, we have $(x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow y \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$. Then $\forall x, y. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(y))$. Since $\forall x. \forall y. \forall Q_1. ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^I(y)) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^I(x)$, we have $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(x)$, $x \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $B_aI_a\varphi \rightarrow I_a\varphi$.

(BI5) $B_a\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg I_a\varphi$: Suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(x)$, we have $x \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$. Since $\forall x \exists y. Q \in R_a^I(x) \rightarrow ((x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(y))$, $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(x)$, $y \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$. Since $(x, y) \in R_a^B$, $x \in [[\neg B_a\neg I_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a\neg P_a\varphi$.

(BPIEF1) $I_a\varphi \rightarrow (P_a\varphi \wedge B_a\neg\varphi \wedge B_a\neg AG\neg\varphi)$: It is enough to prove that $(I_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi) \wedge (I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg\varphi) \wedge (I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aEF\varphi)$.

(BPIEF1a) $I_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$, then $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(x)$. By $\forall x. \forall Q. (Q \in R_a^I(x) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(x))$, we have $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(x)$. Hence $x \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$.

(BPIEF1b) $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg\varphi$: Since $\forall x. (\cup\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(x)\} \cap \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\}) = \emptyset$. Suppose $x \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$, then $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(x)$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \cap \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\} = \emptyset$. $\{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B\} \subseteq [[\neg\varphi]]_M$. So we have $x \in [[B_a\neg\varphi]]_M$.

(BPIEF1c) $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg AG\neg\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$, then $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(x)$. By $\forall x. \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^{EF}\} \subseteq (\cap\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(x)\})$, we have $\{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^{EF}\} \subseteq [[\varphi]]_M$. Hence $x \in [[B_a\neg AG\neg\varphi]]_M$.

(BX1) $B_aAX\varphi \rightarrow B_aAXB_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[B_aAX\varphi]]_M$, then $\forall y. (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X \rightarrow y \in [[\varphi]]_M$. By $\forall x. \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X \circ R_a^B\} \subseteq \{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X\}$, we have $\{y \mid (x, y) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X \circ R_a^B\} \subseteq [[\varphi]]_M$. Hence $x \in [[B_aAXB_a\varphi]]_M$.

(BX2) $B_aEX\varphi \rightarrow B_aEXB_a\varphi$: Suppose $x \in [[B_aEX\varphi]]_M$, then $\forall y. \exists z. (x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((y, z) \in R_a^X \wedge z \in [[\varphi]]_M)$. By $\forall x. \forall Q \in D_a. (\forall y. \exists z. (x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((y, z) \in R_a^X \wedge z \in Q)) \rightarrow (\forall u. \exists v. \forall w. (x, u) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((u, v) \in R_a^X \wedge ((v, w) \in R_a^B \rightarrow w \in Q)))$, we have $\forall y. \exists z. \forall w. (x, y) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((y, z) \in R_a^X \wedge ((z, w) \in R_a^B \rightarrow w \in [[\varphi]]_M))$. Hence $x \in [[B_aEXB_a\varphi]]_M$.

We shall show that the inference system of *BPICTL* provides a complete axiomatization for belief, preference, intention and temporal property with respect to a *BPICTL* model. To achieve this aim, it suffices to prove that every *BPICTL*-consistent set is satisfiable with respect to a *BPICTL* model. We construct a special structure M called a canonical structure for *BPICTL*. M has a state s_V corresponding to every maximal *BPICTL*-consistent set V and the following property holds: $(M, s_V) \models \varphi$ iff $\varphi \in V$.

We need some definitions before giving the proof of the completeness. Given an inference system of *BPICTL*, we say a set of formulae Γ is a consistent set with respect to L^{BPICTL} exactly if false is not provable from Γ . A set of formulae Γ is a maximal consistent set with respect to L^{BPICTL} if (1) it is

$BPICTL$ -consistent, and (2) for all φ in L^{BPICTL} but not in Γ , the set $\Gamma \cup \{\varphi\}$ is not $BPICTL$ -consistent.

Definition 4. The canonical model M with respect to $BPICTL$ is $(S, \Pi, \pi, R_a^B, R_a^P, R_a^I, R_a^X, D_a)$.

- (1) $S = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \text{ is a maximal consistent set with respect to } BPICTL\}$.
- (2) Π is the set of atomic formulae.
- (3) π is a truth assignment as follows: for any atomic formula p , $\pi(p, \Gamma) = \text{true} \Leftrightarrow p \in \Gamma$.
- (4) $R_a^B = \{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \mid \Gamma_1/B_a \subseteq \Gamma_2\}$, where $\Gamma_1/B_a = \{\varphi \mid B_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1\}$.
- (5) R_a^P maps every element of S to a subset of $\wp(S)$: $R_a^P(\Gamma) = \{U_a^P(\varphi) \mid \varphi \text{ is a formula of } BPICTL, \text{ where } U_a^P(\varphi) = \{\Gamma' \mid \varphi \in \Gamma', \text{ and } P_a\varphi \in \Gamma\}\}$.
- (6) R_a^I maps every element of S to a subset of $\wp(S)$: $R_a^I(\Gamma) = \{U_a^I(\varphi) \mid \varphi \text{ is a formula of } BPICTL, \text{ where } U_a^I(\varphi) = \{\Gamma' \mid \varphi \in \Gamma', \text{ and } I_a\varphi \in \Gamma\}\}$.
- (7) $R_a^X = \{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \mid \Gamma_1/AX_a \subseteq \Gamma_2\}$, where $\Gamma_1/AX_a = \{\varphi \mid AX\varphi \in \Gamma_1\}$.
- (8) $D_a = \{\{\Gamma_\varphi \mid \varphi \in \Gamma_\varphi\}, \varphi \text{ is an arbitrary formula of } BPICTL\}$.

Lemma 1. S is a nonempty set.

Proof. Since the rules and axioms of $BPICTL$ are consistent, S is nonempty.

In classical logic, it is easy to see that every consistent set of formulae can be extended to a maximal consistent set. Therefore we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2. For any $BPICTL$ -consistent set of formulae Δ , there is a maximal $BPICTL$ -consistent set Γ such that $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$.

Proof. To show that Δ can be extended to a maximal $BPICTL$ -consistent set, we construct a sequence $\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, \dots$ of $BPICTL$ -consistent sets as follows.

Let ψ_1, ψ_2, \dots be a sequence of the formulae in L^{BPICTL} .

At first, we construct Γ_i which satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $\Delta = \Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma_i$.
- (2) Γ_i is consistent.
- (3) For every $\psi_{i+1} \in L^{BPICTL}$, either $\{\psi_{i+1}\} \cup \Gamma_i$ or $\{\neg\psi_{i+1}\} \cup \Gamma_i$ is consistent. We let $\Gamma_{i+1} = \{\psi_{i+1}\} \cup \Gamma_i$ if $\{\psi_{i+1}\} \cup \Gamma_i$ is consistent. $\Gamma_{i+1} = \{\neg\psi_{i+1}\} \cup \Gamma_i$ if $\{\neg\psi_{i+1}\} \cup \Gamma_i$ is consistent.

We let $\Gamma = \cup_{i \geq 0} \Gamma_i$. By the above discussion, we have a maximal $BPICTL$ -consistent set Γ such that $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$.

Lemma 3. D_a satisfy the conditions of Definition of $BPICTL$ model M .

Proof. By the construction of $BPICTL$ canonical model M , for any $Q \in D_a$, there is a φ , $Q = [[\varphi]]_M$. Therefore D_a satisfy the conditions of Definition of $BPICTL$ model M .

In the following, we prove that $R_a^B, R_a^P, R_a^I, R_a^X$ satisfy the conditions of Definition of $BPICTL$ model M .

Lemma 4 (B3). $(\forall \Gamma_1 \forall \Gamma_2 \forall \Gamma_3 ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \wedge (\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^B \rightarrow (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^B))$

Proof. By $B_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a B_a\varphi$.

Lemma 5 (B4). $(\forall \Gamma_1 \forall \Gamma_2 \forall \Gamma_3 ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \wedge (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^B \rightarrow (\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^B))$

Proof. By $\neg B_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a \neg B_a\varphi$.

Lemma 6 (B5). $(\forall \Gamma_1 \exists \Gamma_2 (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B)$

Proof. By $B_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a\neg\varphi$.

Lemma 7 (P1). $\forall Q_1, Q_2. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma) \wedge Q_2 \in R_a^P(\Gamma) \rightarrow Q_1 \cap Q_2 \in R_a^P(\Gamma))$

Proof. For any φ_1, φ_2 , Suppose $([[\varphi_1]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma) \wedge [[\varphi_2]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma))$. Since $(P_a\varphi_1 \wedge P_a\varphi_2) \rightarrow P_a(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2)$, we have $[[\varphi_1]]_M \cap [[\varphi_2]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma)$.

Lemma 8 (P2). $\forall Q_1, Q_2. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma) \wedge \overline{Q_1} \cup Q_2 \in R_a^P(\Gamma) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^P(\Gamma))$

Proof. It is trival.

Lemma 9 (P3). $\forall \Gamma_1. \forall \Gamma_2. \forall Q_1. \exists Q_2. (\Gamma_2 \in Q_2 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \wedge Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$

Proof. For any Γ_1, Γ_2 , if $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)$, $\Gamma_2 \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$. Therefore $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2$, $P_aP_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$, since $(P_aP_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi)$, $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$, so $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$.

Lemma 10 (P4). $\forall \Gamma_1. \forall Q_1. \forall Q_2. \exists \Gamma_2. Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow ((Q_2 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \wedge \Gamma_2 \in Q_2) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2))$

Proof. Suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$, $\Gamma_1 \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$. Since $P_a\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\varphi$, $P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\neg P_a\varphi$. We have $[[\neg P_a\neg P_a\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$. We have for any ψ , $\exists \Gamma_2. ([[\psi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \wedge \Gamma_2 \in [[\psi]]_M \wedge \Gamma_2 \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M)$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)$.

Lemma 11 (BP1). $\forall \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2. \forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a^P. (Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \wedge \{ \Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$

Proof. Suppose $Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \wedge \{ \Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})$, Therefore for any φ_1, φ_2 , if $[[\varphi_1]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \wedge \{ \Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \} \subseteq ([[\varphi_1]]_M \cap [[\varphi_2]]_M) \cup ([[\varphi_1]]_M \cap [[\varphi_2]]_M)$, by $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge P_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2$, we have $B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge P_a\varphi_1 \in \Gamma_1$, hence $P_a\varphi_2 \in \Gamma_1$. Therefore $Q_2 = [[\varphi_2]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$.

Lemma 12 (BP2). $\forall \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \wedge Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)$

Proof. For any Γ_1 , for any φ , if $Q = [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$, then $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. By $P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_aP_a\varphi$, if $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$, then $B_aP_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Suppose $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B$, then $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2$, and $Q = [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)$.

Lemma 13 (BP3). $\forall \Gamma_1. Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow \forall \Gamma_2. ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2))$

Proof. Suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$, Suppose $\forall \Gamma_2. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B, \Gamma_1/B_a \subseteq \Gamma_2$, Therefore for any ψ , $B_a\psi \in \Gamma_1$ implies $\psi \in \Gamma_2$. For any $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2, \neg P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2$ implies $\neg B_a\neg P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Since $\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg P_a\varphi$, we have $\neg B_a\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$. Therefore $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2$ implies $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)$.

Lemma 14 (BP4). $\forall \Gamma_1. \forall \Gamma_2. \forall Q_1. ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$

Proof. Suppose for any $\varphi, \forall \Gamma_1. \forall \Gamma_2. ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2))$, so $\Gamma_2 \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M, \Gamma_1 \in [[B_aP_a\varphi]]_M$. Since $B_aP_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi, \Gamma_1 \in [[P_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$.

Lemma 15 (BP5). $\forall \Gamma_1. \exists \Gamma_2. Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2))$

Proof. Suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$, then $[[P_a\varphi]]_M \in \Gamma_1$. Since $B_a\neg P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg P_a\varphi, P_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a\neg P_a\varphi$. We have $[[\neg B_a\neg P_a\varphi]]_M \in \Gamma_1$. There is $\Gamma_2, (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B, [[P_a\varphi]]_M \in \Gamma_2$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_2)$.

Lemma 16 (BI1). $\forall \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2. \forall Q_1, Q_2 \in D_a^I. (Q_1 \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \wedge \{ \Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})) \rightarrow Q_2 \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$

Proof. Suppose $Q_1 \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \wedge \{ \Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \} \subseteq (Q_1 \cap Q_2) \cup (\overline{Q_1} \cap \overline{Q_2})$, Therefore for any φ_1, φ_2 , if $[[\varphi_1]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \wedge \{ \Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \} \subseteq$

$([[\varphi_1]]_M \cap [[\varphi_2]]_M) \cup (\overline{[[\varphi_1]]_M} \cap \overline{[[\varphi_2]]_M})$, by $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge I_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow I_a\varphi_2$, we have $B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge I_a\varphi_1 \in \Gamma_1$, hence $I_a\varphi_2 \in \Gamma_1$. Therefore $Q_2 = [[\varphi_2]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$.

Lemma 17 (BI2). $\forall \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \wedge Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2)$

Proof. For any Γ_1 , for any φ , if $Q = [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$, then $I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. By $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a I_a\varphi$, if $I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$, then $B_a I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Suppose $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B$, then $I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2$, and $Q = [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2)$.

Lemma 18 (BI3). $\forall \Gamma_1. Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow \forall \Gamma_2. ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2))$

Proof. Suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$, Suppose $\forall \Gamma_2. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B, \Gamma_1/B_a \subseteq \Gamma_2$, Therefore for any ψ , $B_a\psi \in \Gamma_1$ implies $\psi \in \Gamma_2$. For any $I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2, \neg\neg I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2$ implies $\neg B_a\neg I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Since $\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg I_a\varphi$, we have $\neg B_a\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow I_a\varphi$. Therefore $I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_2$ implies $I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2)$.

Lemma 19 (BI4). $\forall \Gamma_1. \forall \Gamma_2. \forall Q_1. ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2)) \rightarrow Q_1 \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$

Proof. Suppose for any $\varphi, \forall \Gamma_1. \forall \Gamma_2. ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow [[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2))$, so $\Gamma_2 \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M, \Gamma_1 \in [[B_a I_a\varphi]]_M$. Since $B_a I_a\varphi \rightarrow I_a\varphi, \Gamma_1 \in [[I_a\varphi]]_M$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$.

Lemma 20 (BI5). $\forall \Gamma_1. \exists \Gamma_2. Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow ((\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2))$

Proof. Suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$, then $[[I_a\varphi]]_M \in \Gamma_1$. Since $B_a\neg I_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg I_a\varphi, I_a\varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a\neg I_a\varphi$. We have $[[\neg B_a\neg I_a\varphi]]_M \in \Gamma_1$. There is $\Gamma_2, (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B, [[I_a\varphi]]_M \in \Gamma_2$. Therefore $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_2)$.

Lemma 21 (BPIEF1a). $\forall \Gamma_1. \forall Q. (Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1))$

Proof. For any Γ_1 , suppose $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)$. For any φ , since $I_a\varphi \rightarrow P_a\varphi$, if $I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$, then $P_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Hence $[[\varphi]]_M \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1)$. Therefore $\forall \Gamma_1. \forall Q. (Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow Q \in R_a^P(\Gamma_1))$.

Lemma 22 (BPIEF1b). $\forall \Gamma_1. (\cup\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)\}) \cap \{\Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B\} = \emptyset$

Proof. For any Γ_1 , suppose $\Gamma_2 \in \cup\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)\}$, then $\exists \varphi. I_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1$, and $\varphi \in \Gamma_2$. Since $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg\varphi$, we have $B_a\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_1$, and $\varphi \in \Gamma_2$. Therefore $\Gamma_2 \notin \{y \mid (\Gamma_1, y) \in R_a^B\}$. It holds that $\forall \Gamma_1. (\cup\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)\}) \cap \{\Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B\} = \emptyset$.

Lemma 23 (BPIEF1c). $\forall \Gamma_1. \{\Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^{EF}\} \subseteq (\cap\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)\})$, where R_a^{EF} is the reflexion and transition closure of R_a^X .

Proof. For any Γ_1 , suppose $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^{EF}$. Therefore there is Γ_3 such that $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^B, (\Gamma_3, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^{EF}$. Then for any $\varphi, \varphi \in \Gamma_2$ implies $AG\varphi \in \Gamma_3$, and $AG\varphi \in \Gamma_3$ implies $\neg B_a\neg AG\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. By $I_a\varphi \rightarrow B_a\neg AG\neg\varphi$, we have $\neg B_a\neg AG\neg\varphi \rightarrow \neg I_a\varphi$. Therefore for any $\varphi, \varphi \in \Gamma_2$ implies $\neg I_a\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. So $I_a\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_1$ implies $\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_2$, we have $\Gamma_2 \in \cap\{Q \mid Q \in R_a^I(\Gamma_1)\}$.

Lemma 24 (BX1). $\forall \Gamma_1. \{\Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X \circ R_a^B\} \subseteq \{\Gamma_2 \mid (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X\}$

Proof. For any Γ_1 , suppose $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X \circ R_a^B$. Therefore there is Γ_3 such that $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X, (\Gamma_3, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B$. Then for any $\varphi, \varphi \in \Gamma_2$ implies $\neg B_a\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_3$, and $\neg B_a\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_3$ implies $\neg B_a AX B_a\neg\varphi \in \Gamma_1$. By $B_a AX \varphi \rightarrow B_a AX B_a\varphi$, we have $\neg B_a AX B_a\neg\varphi \rightarrow \neg B_a AX \neg\varphi$. Therefore for any $\varphi, \varphi \in \Gamma_2$

implies $\neg B_a A X \neg \varphi \in \Gamma_1$. So $B_a A X \neg \varphi \in \Gamma_1$ implies $\neg \varphi \in \Gamma_2$, we have $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \circ R_a^X$.

Lemma 25 (BX2). $\forall \Gamma_1. \forall Q \in D_a. (\forall \Gamma_2. \exists \Gamma_3. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^X \wedge \Gamma_3 \in Q)) \rightarrow (\forall \Gamma_4. \exists \Gamma_5. \forall \Gamma_6. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_4) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((\Gamma_4, \Gamma_5) \in R_a^X) \wedge ((\Gamma_5, \Gamma_6) \in R_a^B \rightarrow \Gamma_6 \in Q))$

Proof. For any Γ_1 , any φ , suppose $\forall \Gamma_2. \exists \Gamma_3. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((\Gamma_2, \Gamma_3) \in R_a^X \wedge \Gamma_3 \in [[\varphi]]_M)$, we have $B_a E X \varphi \in \Gamma_1$. By $B_a E X \varphi \rightarrow B_a E X B_a \varphi$, we have $B_a E X B_a \varphi \in \Gamma_1$. Therefore $\forall \Gamma_4. \exists \Gamma_5. \forall \Gamma_6. (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_4) \in R_a^B \rightarrow ((\Gamma_4, \Gamma_5) \in R_a^X) \wedge ((\Gamma_5, \Gamma_6) \in R_a^B \rightarrow \Gamma_6 \in [[\varphi]]_M)$.

Lemma 26. The canonical model M is a *BPICTL* model.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 1 to Lemma 25.

The above lemmas state that the model satisfies all conditions in Definition , then as a consequence, the model M is a *BPICTL* model. In order to get the completeness, we further prove the following lemma, which states that M is "canonical".

Lemma 27. In the model M , for any Γ and any φ , $(M, \Gamma) \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \varphi \in \Gamma$.

Proof. We argue by the cases on the structure of φ , here we only give the proof in the cases of (1) $\varphi \equiv B_a \psi$ and (2) $\varphi \equiv I_a \psi$.

(1) It suffices to prove that: $(M, \Gamma) \models B_a \psi \Leftrightarrow B_a \psi \in \Gamma$.

If $B_a \psi \in \Gamma$, by the definition of M , for every $(\Gamma, \Gamma') \in R_a^B$, $\psi \in \Gamma'$, therefore $(M, \Gamma) \models B_a \psi$.

If $B_a \psi \notin \Gamma$, by the definition of M , there is Γ' such that $\psi \in \Gamma'$ and $(\Gamma, \Gamma') \notin R_a^B$, therefore $(M, \Gamma) \not\models B_a \psi$.

(2) It suffices to prove that: $(M, \Gamma) \models I_a \psi \Leftrightarrow I_a \psi \in \Gamma$.

If $I_a \psi \in \Gamma$, by the definition of M , $\{\Gamma' \mid \psi \in \Gamma'\} \in R_a^I(\Gamma)$, therefore $(M, \Gamma) \models I_a \psi$.

If $I_a \psi \notin \Gamma$, by the definition of M , $\{\Gamma' \mid \psi \in \Gamma'\} \notin R_a^I(\Gamma)$, therefore $(M, \Gamma) \not\models I_a \psi$.

Now it is ready to get the completeness of *BPICTL*:

Proposition 2 (Completeness of *BPICTL*). The inference system of *BPICTL* is complete, i.e., If $\Gamma \models_{BPICTL} \varphi$, then $\Gamma \vdash_{BPICTL} \varphi$.

Proof. Suppose not, then there is a *BPICTL* - consistent formulae set $\Phi = \Gamma \cup \{\neg \varphi\}$, and there is no model M such that Φ is satisfied in M . For there is a *BPICTL* - maximal consistent formula set Σ such that $\Phi \subseteq \Sigma$, by Lemma 27, Φ is satisfied in possible world Σ of M . It is a contradiction.

Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 show that the axioms and inference rules of *BPICTL* give us a sound and complete axiomatization for belief, preference, intention and temporal property.

In the following, we give some corollaries of the inference system of *BPICTL*.

Corollary 1.

(1) $\vdash (\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \Rightarrow \vdash P_a \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow P_a \varphi_2$

(2) $\vdash (\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \Rightarrow \vdash I_a \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow I_a \varphi_2$

Proof. (1) Suppose $\vdash (\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)$, we have $\vdash B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)$. Since $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge P_a \varphi_1) \rightarrow P_a \varphi_2$, we have $\vdash P_a \varphi_1 \rightarrow P_a \varphi_2$. Similarly, we have $\vdash P_a \varphi_2 \rightarrow P_a \varphi_1$. Therefore $\vdash P_a \varphi_1 \leftrightarrow P_a \varphi_2$.

(2) Suppose $\vdash (\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)$, we have $\vdash B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2)$. Since $(B_a(\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2) \wedge I_a\varphi_1) \rightarrow I_a\varphi_2$, we have $\vdash I_a\varphi_1 \rightarrow I_a\varphi_2$. Similarly, we have $\vdash I_a\varphi_2 \rightarrow I_a\varphi_1$. Therefore $\vdash I_a\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow I_a\varphi_2$.

Corollary 2. $(P_a\varphi_1 \wedge P_a(\varphi_1 \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2)) \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2$

Proof. Since $(P_a\varphi_1 \wedge P_a(\varphi_1 \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2))$, by $(P_a\varphi_1 \wedge P_a(\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2)) \rightarrow P_a(\varphi_2)$, we have $P_aP_a\varphi_2$. Since $P_aP_a\varphi_2 \rightarrow P_a\varphi_2$, we have $P_a\varphi_2$.

3 Finite Model Property of *BPICTL*

We now turn our attention to the finite model property of *BPICTL*. It needs to show that if a formula is *BPICTL*-consistent, then it is satisfiable in a finite structure. The idea is that rather than considering maximal consistent formulae set when trying to construct a structure satisfying a formula φ , we restrict our attention to sets of subformulae of φ .

Definition 5. A finite model M of *BPICTL* is a structure $M = (S, \Pi, \pi, R_a^B, R_a^P, R_a^I, R_a^X)$, where

- (1) S is a nonempty finite set, whose elements are called possible worlds or states.
- (2) Π is a set of atomic formulas.
- (3) π is a map: $S \rightarrow 2^\Pi$.
- (4) $R_a^B : R_a^B \subseteq S \times S$ is an accessible relation on S , which is a belief relation.
- (5) $R_a^P : R_a^P : S \rightarrow \wp(\wp(S))$, where $\wp(S)$ is the power set of S .
- (6) $R_a^I : R_a^I : S \rightarrow \wp(\wp(S))$.
- (7) $R_a^X : R_a^X \subseteq S \times S$ is an accessible relation on S , which is a temporal relation.

The conditions of $R_a^B, R_a^P, R_a^I, R_a^X$ is same as in Definition 2.

Definition 6. Suppose ζ is a consistent formula with respect to *BPICTL*, $Sub^*(\zeta)$ is a set of formulae defined as follows: let $\zeta \in L^{BPICTL}$, $Sub(\zeta)$ is the set of subformulae of ζ , then $Sub^*(\zeta) = Sub(\zeta) \cup \{\neg\psi \mid \psi \in Sub(\zeta)\}$. It is clear that $Sub^*(\zeta)$ is finite.

Definition 7. The finite canonical model M_ζ with respect to *BPICTL* formula ζ is $(S_\zeta, \Pi_\zeta, \pi_\zeta, R_{a,\zeta}^B, R_{a,\zeta}^P, R_{a,\zeta}^I, R_{a,\zeta}^X)$.

- (1) $S_\zeta = \{\Gamma \mid \Gamma \text{ is a maximal consistent set with respect to } BPICTL \text{ and } \Gamma \subseteq Sub^*(\zeta)\}$.

(2) Π_ζ is the set of atomic formulae.

(3) π_ζ is a truth assignment as follows: for any atomic formula p , $\pi_\zeta(p, \Gamma) = true \Leftrightarrow p \in \Gamma$.

(4) $R_{a,\zeta}^B = \{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \mid \Gamma_1/B_a \subseteq \Gamma_2, \Gamma_1 \in S_\zeta, \Gamma_2 \in S_\zeta\}$, where $\Gamma_1/B_a = \{\varphi \mid B_a\varphi \in \Gamma_1\}$.

(5) $R_{a,\zeta}^P$ maps every element of S to a subset of $\wp(S)$: $R_{a,\zeta}^P(\Gamma) = \{U_a^P(\varphi) \mid \varphi \text{ is a formula of } BPICTL, \text{ where } U_a^P(\varphi) = \{\Gamma' \mid \varphi \in \Gamma', \text{ and } P_a\varphi \in \Gamma, \Gamma \in S_\zeta, \Gamma' \in S_\zeta\}\}$.

(6) $R_{a,\zeta}^I$ maps every element of S to a subset of $\wp(S)$: $R_{a,\zeta}^I(\Gamma) = \{U_a^I(\varphi) \mid \varphi \text{ is a formula of } BPICTL, \text{ where } U_a^I(\varphi) = \{\Gamma' \mid \varphi \in \Gamma', \text{ and } I_a\varphi \in \Gamma, \Gamma \in S_\zeta, \Gamma' \in S_\zeta\}\}$.

(7) $R_{a,\zeta}^X = \{(I_1, I_2) \mid I_1/AX_a \subseteq I_2, I_1 \in S_\zeta, I_2 \in S_\zeta\}$, where $I_1/AX_a = \{\varphi \mid AX\varphi \in I_1\}$.

Similar to the proof of completeness of *BPICTL*, we mainly need to show that the above canonical model M_ζ is a *BPICTL* model. The following lemmas contribute to this purpose.

Lemma 28. S_ζ is a nonempty finite set.

Proof. Since the rules and axioms of *BPICTL* are consistent, S_ζ is nonempty. For $Sub^*(\zeta)$ is a finite set, by the definition of S_ζ , the cardinality of S_ζ is no more than the cardinality of $\wp(Sub^*(\zeta))$.

Lemma 29. $D_{a,\zeta} = \{[[\varphi]]_{M_\zeta} \mid \varphi \text{ is a } BPICTL \text{ formula}\}$ is the power set of S_ζ .

Proof. Firstly, since $Sub^*(\zeta)$ is finite, so if $\Gamma \in S_\zeta$ then Γ is finite. We can let φ_Γ be the conjunction of the formulae in Γ . Secondly, if $A \subseteq S_\zeta$, then $A = X(\bigvee_{\Gamma \in A} \varphi_\Gamma)$. By the above argument, we have that $D_{a,\zeta}$ is the power set of S_ζ .

Lemma 30. If φ is consistent (here φ is a Boolean combination of formulae in $Sub^*(\zeta)$), then there exists Γ such that φ can be proved from Γ , here Γ is a maximal consistent set with respect to *BPICTL* and $\Gamma \subseteq Sub^*(\zeta)$.

Proof. For φ is a Boolean combination of formulae in $Sub^*(\zeta)$, therefore by regarding the formulae in $Sub^*(\zeta)$ as atomic formulae, φ can be represented as disjunctive normal form. Since φ is consistent, so there is a consistent disjunctive term in disjunctive normal form expression of φ , let such term be $\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_n$, then φ can be derived from the maximal consistent set Γ which contains $\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n\}$.

Lemma 31. The model M_ζ is a finite model.

Proof. By the definition of S_ζ , the cardinality of S_ζ is no more than the cardinality of $\wp(Sub^*(\zeta))$, which means $|S_\zeta| \leq 2^{|Sub^*(\zeta)|}$.

Similar to the proof of completeness of *BPICTL*, the above lemmas show that M_ζ is a finite *BPICTL*-model and the following lemma states that M_ζ is canonical.

Lemma 32. For the finite canonical model M_ζ , for any $\Gamma \in S_\zeta$ and any $\varphi \in Sub^*(\zeta)$, $(M_\zeta, \Gamma) \models \varphi \Leftrightarrow \varphi \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Similar to Lemma 27.

From the above lemmas, we know that M_ζ is a finite *BPICTL*-model that is canonical. Now it is no difficult to get the following proposition.

Proposition 3 (Finite model property of *BPICTL*). If Γ is a finite set of consistent formulae, then there is a finite *BPICTL*-model M such that $M \models \Gamma$.

Proof. By Lemma 32, there exists a finite *BPICTL*-model $M_{\wedge \Gamma}$ such that Γ is satisfied in $M_{\wedge \Gamma}$.

Usually, in the case of modal logics, one can get decidability of the provability problem from finite model property. At first, one can simply construct every model with finite (for example, say $2^{|Sub^*(\varphi)|}$) states. One then check if φ is true at some state of one of these models (note that the number of models that have $2^{|Sub^*(\varphi)|}$ states is finite). By finite model property, if a formula φ is consistent, then φ is satisfiable with respect to some models. Conversely, if φ is satisfiable with respect to some models, then φ is consistent.

4 Model Checking Algorithm for *BPICTL*

In this section we give a model checking algorithm for *BPICTL*. The model checking problem for *BPICTL* asks, given a model M and a *BPICTL* formula φ , for the set of states in S that satisfy φ . In the following, we denote the desired set of states by $Eval(M, \varphi)$, where $M = (S, \Pi, \pi, R_a^B, R_a^P, R_a^I, R_a^X, D_a)$.

```

Procedure ModelCheck( $M, \varphi$ )
  for all  $s \in S$  do  $label(s) := \emptyset$ ;
  case  $\varphi = p$  : if  $p \in \pi(s)$  then  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{p\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = \neg\theta$  :  $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ; for all  $s \notin T$  do  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{\neg\theta\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$  :  $T_1 := ModelCheck(M, \theta_1)$ ;  $T_2 := ModelCheck(M, \theta_2)$ ;
  for all  $s \in T_1 \cap T_2$  do  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = \theta_1 \vee \theta_2$  :  $T_1 := ModelCheck(M, \theta_1)$ ;  $T_2 := ModelCheck(M, \theta_2)$ ;
  for all  $s \in T_1 \cup T_2$  do  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{\theta_1 \vee \theta_2\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = B_a\theta$  :  $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ; for all  $s \in Pre_a^B(M, T)$  do
 $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{B_a\theta\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = P_a\theta$  :  $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ; for all  $s \in Pre_a^P(M, T)$  do
 $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{P_a\theta\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = I_a\theta$  :  $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ; for all  $s \in Pre_a^I(M, T)$  do
 $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{I_a\theta\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = AX\theta$  :  $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ; for all  $s \in Pre_a^{AX}(M, T)$  do
 $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{AX\theta\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = EX\theta$  :  $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ; for all  $s \in Pre_a^{EX}(M, T)$  do
 $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{EX\theta\}$ ;
  case  $\varphi = AG\theta$  :
     $S' := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ;
     $SCC := \{C \mid C \text{ is a nontrivial strongly connected component of } S' \text{ with}$ 
    respect to  $R_a^X\}$ ;
     $V := \cup_{C \in SCC} \{s \mid s \in C\}$ ;
     $T := \{s \mid s \in V \text{ and } \forall t. (s, t) \in R_a^X \rightarrow t \in V\}$ ;
    for all  $s \in T$  do  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{AG\theta\}$ ;
    for all  $t$  such that
      for all  $s \in T$  such that  $t \in S'$  and  $(t, s) \in R_a^X$  do
        if  $AG\theta \notin label(t)$  then
           $label(t) := label(t) \cup \{AG\theta\}$ ;
           $T := T \cup \{t\}$ ;
        end if;
      end for all;
    end for all;
  end case;
  end case;
  case  $\varphi = EG\theta$  :
     $S' := ModelCheck(M, \theta)$ ;
     $SCC := \{C \mid C \text{ is a nontrivial strongly connected component of } S' \text{ with}$ 
    respect to  $R_a^X\}$ ;
     $T := \cup_{C \in SCC} \{s \mid s \in C\}$ ;

```

```

for all  $s \in T$  do  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{EG\theta\}$ ;
while  $T \neq \emptyset$  do
  choose  $s \in T$ ;
   $T := T \setminus \{s\}$ ;
  for all  $t$  such that  $t \in S'$  and  $(t, s) \in R_a^X$  do
    if  $EG\theta \notin label(t)$  then
       $label(t) := label(t) \cup \{EG\theta\}$ ;
       $T := T \cup \{t\}$ ;
    end if;
  end for all;
end while;
end case;
case  $\varphi = A\theta_1 U \theta_2$  :
   $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta_2)$ ;
  for all  $s \in T$  do  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{A\theta_1 U \theta_2\}$ ;
  for all  $t$  such that
    for all  $s \in T$  such that  $(t, s) \in R_a^X$  do
      if  $A\theta_1 U \theta_2 \notin label(t)$  and  $t \in ModelCheck(M, \theta_1)$  then
         $label(t) := label(t) \cup \{A\theta_1 U \theta_2\}$ ;
         $T := T \cup \{t\}$ ;
      end if;
    end for all;
  end for all;
end case;
case  $\varphi = E\theta_1 U \theta_2$  :
   $T := ModelCheck(M, \theta_2)$ ;
  for all  $s \in T$  do  $label(s) := label(s) \cup \{E\theta_1 U \theta_2\}$ ;
  while  $T \neq \emptyset$  do
    choose  $s \in T$ ;
     $T := T \setminus \{s\}$ ;
    for all  $t$  such that  $(t, s) \in R_a^X$  do
      if  $E\theta_1 U \theta_2 \notin label(t)$  and  $t \in ModelCheck(M, \theta_1)$  then
         $label(t) := label(t) \cup \{E\theta_1 U \theta_2\}$ ;
         $T := T \cup \{t\}$ ;
      end if;
    end for all;
  end while;
end case;
 $Eval(M, \varphi) := \{s \mid \varphi \in label(s)\}$ ;
return  $Eval(M, \varphi)$ 

```

The algorithm uses the following primitive operations:

- (1) The function Pre_a^B , when given a set $\rho \subseteq S$ of states, returns the set of states q such that from q the next state to lie in ρ . Formally, $Pre_a^B(\rho) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } (q, s) \in R_a^B \Rightarrow s \in \rho\}$.

(2) The function Pre_a^P , when given a set $\rho \subseteq S$ of states, returns the set of states q such that R_a^P maps q to a set included in ρ . Formally, $Pre_a^P(\rho) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } \sigma = R_a^P(q) \Rightarrow \sigma \subseteq \rho\}$.

(3) The function Pre_a^I , when given a set $\rho \subseteq S$ of states, returns the set of states q such that R_a^I maps q to a set included in ρ . Formally, $Pre_a^I(\rho) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } \sigma = R_a^I(q) \Rightarrow \sigma \subseteq \rho\}$.

(4) The function Pre_a^{AX} , when given a set $\rho \subseteq S$ of states, returns the set of states q such that from q the next state to lie in ρ . Formally, $Pre_a^{AX}(\rho) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } (q, s) \in R_a^X \Rightarrow s \in \rho\}$.

(5) The function Pre_a^{EX} , $Pre_a^{EX}(\rho) = \{q \mid q \in S \text{ such that } \exists s.(q, s) \in R_a^X \wedge s \in \rho\}$.

(6) Union, intersection, difference, and inclusion test for state sets.

Partial correctness of the algorithm can be proved induction on the structure of the input formula φ . Termination is guaranteed since the state space S is finite.

Proposition 4. The algorithm given in the above terminates and is correct, i.e., it returns the set of states in which the input formula is satisfied.

5 Conclusions

There were several works in representing, reasoning and verifying temporal and epistemic properties in multi-agent systems [1,5,6,8,9,11]. In this paper, we present an epistemic temporal logic *BPICTL*, which is a powerful language for expressing complex properties of multi-agent system. We present an inference system of *BPICTL*. The soundness, completeness and finite model property of *BPICTL* are proved. To verify multi-agent systems, we present a model checking algorithm for *BPICTL*.

References

1. M. Bourahla and M. Benmohamed. Model Checking Multi-Agent Systems. In *Informatica* 29: 189-197, 2005.
2. E. M. Clarke, J. O. Grumberg, and D. A. Peled. Model checking. The MIT Press, 1999.
3. H. van Ditmarsch, W van der Hoek, and B. P. Kooi. Dynamic Epistemic Logic with Assignment, in *AAMAS05*, ACM Inc, New York, vol. 1, 141-148, 2005.
4. V. Goranko, G. van Drimmelen. Complete axiomatization and decidability of Alternating-time temporal logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* 353 (2006) 93-117.
5. W. van der Hoek and M. Wooldridge. Model Checking Knowledge, and Time. In *Proceedings of SPIN 2002 (LNCS 2318)*, 95-111, 2002.
6. W. van der Hoek and M. Wooldridge. Cooperation, Knowledge, and Time: Alternating-time Temporal Epistemic Logic and its Applications. *Studia Logica*, 75: 125-157, 2003.
7. W. van der Hoek and M. Wooldridge. On the Logic of Cooperation and Propositional Control. *Artificial Intelligence*, 64:1-2, 81-119, 2005.
8. M. Kacprzak, A. Lomuscio and W. Penczek. Verification of multiagent systems via unbounded model checking. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS-04)*, 2004.

9. B. Konikowska and W. Penczek. Model Checking for Multivalued Logic of Knowledge and Time. AAMAS06, 169-176, 2006.
10. E. Pacuit. Neighbourhood Semantics for Modal Logic. Heidelberg: Springer, 2017.
11. M. Wooldridge, M. Fisher, M. Huget, and S. Parsons. Model checking multiagent systems with mable. In Proceedings of the First International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS-02), 2002.