

Tableaux for Relation-Changing Modal Logics

Carlos Areces^{1,2}, Raul Fervari¹ & Guillaume Hoffmann¹

¹ Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina,
² CONICET, Argentina

Frontiers of Combining Systems 2013, Nancy, France

Dynamic modal logics

- ▶ Modal logics are known to **describe** models.
- ▶ Different modal operators:
 - ▶ $\Diamond\varphi, \Diamond^{-}\varphi$
 - ▶ $E\varphi$
 - ▶ $\Diamond_{\geq n}\varphi$
 - ▶ $\Diamond^*\varphi$
 - ▶ ...
- ▶ Now, what about operators that can **modify** models?
 - ▶ Change the domain of the model.
 - ▶ Change the properties of the elements of the domain while we are evaluating a formula.
 - ▶ Evaluate φ after deleting/adding/swapping around an edge.

Why modify models?

- ▶ epistemic operators modify models
- ▶ $[!\psi]\varphi$: announce that ψ is true, eliminate states of the model where $\neg\psi$ holds (**Public Announcement Logic**) [Plaza 89].
- ▶ In some way these operators are deleting states.
- ▶ We will focus on operators that modify the **accessibility relation**.
- ▶ We study various relation-changing operators to help completing the “world map of dynamic modal logics”

Sabotage Modal Logic [van Benthem 2002]

$\mathcal{M}, w \models \langle gsb \rangle \varphi$ iff \exists pair (u, v) of \mathcal{M} such that $\mathcal{M}_{\{(u,v)\}}^-, w \models \varphi$,

where $\mathcal{M}_{\{(u,v)\}}^-$ is \mathcal{M} without the edge (u, v) .

What we know [Löding & Rohde 03]:

- ▶ Model checking is PSPACE-complete.
- ▶ Satisfiability is undecidable.

Our operators

We have the Basic Modal Logic (\mathcal{ML}):

- ▶ propositional language + a modal operator \diamond .
- ▶ $\diamond\varphi$: traverse some edge, then evaluate φ .

Our operators

We have the Basic Modal Logic (\mathcal{ML}):

- ▶ propositional language + a modal operator \diamond .
- ▶ $\diamond\varphi$: traverse some edge, then evaluate φ .

Now add new dynamic operators:

	sabotage	bridge	swap
local	$\langle sb \rangle$	$\langle br \rangle$	$\langle sw \rangle$
global	$\langle gsb \rangle$	$\langle gbr \rangle$	$\langle gsw \rangle$

- ▶ Local:
 - ▶ sabotage and swap: for wv an edge with w the evaluation state, delete or swap it, and move to v
 - ▶ bridge: for wv not an edge with w the evaluation state, create it and move to v
- ▶ Global: delete, create or swap edges anywhere without moving

Example: local sabotage



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \langle sb \rangle \top$$

Example: local sabotage



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \langle sb \rangle \top$$



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \top$$

Example: local sabotage



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \langle sb \rangle \top$$

$$\models \langle sb \rangle \top$$

$$\models \top$$

Example: local sabotage



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \langle sb \rangle \top$$



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \top$$



$$\models \top$$



$$\not\models \langle sb \rangle \langle sb \rangle \top$$

Example: local sabotage



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \langle sb \rangle \top$$



$$\models \langle sb \rangle \top$$



$$\models \top$$



$$\not\models \langle sb \rangle \langle sb \rangle \top$$



$$\not\models \langle sb \rangle \top$$

Example: local swap

▶ ● → ○

$\models \langle sw \rangle \langle sw \rangle \top$

Example: local swap

▶ ● → ○

$\models \langle sw \rangle \langle sw \rangle \top$

▶ ○ ← ●

$\models \langle sw \rangle \top$

Example: local swap

▶ ● → ○

▶ ○ ← ●

▶ ● → ○

$\models \langle sw \rangle \langle sw \rangle \top$

$\models \langle sw \rangle \top$

$\models \top$

Tableaux

- ▶ Quite common procedure for modal logics in general
- ▶ Questions raised by tableaux methods for relation-changing modal logics:
 - ▶ what would they look like?
 - ▶ will we learn something interesting?

Common features of tableaux for RCML

- ▶ We prefix formulas with one constant and a set of edge names (pair of constants)
- ▶ $(s, S) : \varphi$
- ▶ “ φ holds at the state referred to by s in the model variant described by the set of sabotaged/new/swapped edges S ”.

Common tableau rules

- ▶ Boolean rules
- ▶ Equational rules
- ▶ Clashing rules
- ▶ “Unrestricted Blocking” rule: saturate branch with equalities and desingularities between all pairs of constants:

$$\frac{}{n \dot{=} m \mid n \dot{\neq} m} (ub)$$

- ▶ Common notation:

$$\begin{aligned} nm \dot{\neq} xy &:= n \dot{\neq} x \vee m \dot{\neq} y \\ nm \dot{\in} X &:= \bigwedge_{xy \in X} nm \dot{\neq} xy \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

Local sabotage tableau

$$\frac{(n, S) : \diamond\varphi}{\begin{array}{c} \dot{R}nm \\ nm \notin S \\ (m, S) : \varphi \end{array}} (\diamond)$$

$$\frac{(n, S) : \Box\varphi}{\begin{array}{c} \dot{R}nm \\ nm \notin S \end{array}} (\Box)$$

$$\frac{(n, S) : \langle sb \rangle \varphi}{\begin{array}{c} \dot{R}nm \\ nm \notin S \\ (m, S \cup nm) : \varphi \end{array}} (\langle sb \rangle)$$

$$\frac{(n, S) : [sb]\varphi}{\begin{array}{c} Rnm \\ nm \notin S \end{array}} ([sb])$$

What we obtained

- ▶ Sound and complete calculi for all 6 logics.
- ▶ Swap calculus quite complicated (have to maintain swapped and re-swapped edges, quite ugly)

Ending remarks

- ▶ Combining incomplete tableaux with model checking provides termination:
 - ▶ run tableaux for N steps
 - ▶ if closed: UNSAT
 - ▶ if open and input formula true in induced model: SAT
 - ▶ otherwise: DON'T KNOW
- ▶ From the calculi, it is easy to propose equivalence-preserving translations to hybrid logics (modal logics with constants)