

## Tutorial 2:

Modal logic -- what is modal logic?

- informally, a logic which contains a modality, or several modalities
- a modal logic can be described with the notion of possible worlds
  - $M = (W, R, V)$ 
    - $W$  - a set of possible worlds (states of the system (e.g.,
    - $R$  - accessibility relation ( $w, w' \in R$ , if world  $w'$  is reachable (or it is considered possible) from state  $w$ ), we can denote this as  $(w R w')$
    - $V$  - evaluation of propositions in each world of  $W$
  - basic modality:  $w \models \Box p \rightarrow p$  is necessary true if and only if for every  $w'$ , such that  $w R w'$ , it holds that  $w' \models p$ 
    - this for example means that in every other world state that I consider possible,  $p$  must hold
  - we can pose some restrictions on the properties of relation  $R$ 
    - reflexive
    - symmetric
    - transitive
    - serial
    - euclidean
  - different modal logics apply different restrictions on the relation  $R$ 
    - e.g., in modal logic representing knowledge (relation  $R$  represents that agent  $i$  knows something -  $K_i$ ) uses reflexive, symmetric, transitive and euclidean assumptions
    - temporal logics have serial restriction (there is always a next state)
  - different restrictions cause different axioms to hold
    - e.g., if there is no symmetric restriction, an agent can believe that  $p$  is true, although it could be the case that  $p$  does not hold in the particular state -- i.e., the agents beliefs can be incorrect
- an example with cards
  - we have 3 players (A,B,C), 8 cards = 4xA, 4x8
  - each player receives two cards and places them on her forehead without looking at them
  - each player is able to observe the cards of the other players
  - players take turns and they try to determine what cards they have on their foreheads
  - we assume all players are rational, they do not take guesses, and they do not lie
  - an example:
    - you are player C, you observe AA, 88; it is your turn (both players A and B have said that they did not know) -- can you determine what your cards are?
  - modeling the dynamic of this game using modal logic and possible worlds
    - the player C considers possible states (AA, 88, AA) - (AA, 88, 88) - (AA, 88, 8A)
    - without any other information the player C cannot determine what cards are on her forehead
    - when player A says that she does not know, player C can remove the state (AA, 88, 88) from the state of possible worlds -- if this would have been the case, the player A could have surely determined the cards on her forehead (she would have observed 88, 88 -- there is no other possibility than having AA), but A has said "I do not know", therefore this state is no longer possible.
- example with a robot -- Where is waldo?
  - we can use temporal logic to describe behavior/dynamics of an agent or a system, but also e.g., the goals

- we need to specify the states, sensors ( $r_1 \dots r_4$  -> in which region the robot is,  $s_w$  -> whether the robot senses waldo)
- we can specify the goal as follows:  $\Box \Diamond (r_2 \text{ OR } s_w) \text{ AND } \Box \Diamond (r_4 \text{ OR } s_w)$ 
  - the robot has to look for Waldo repeatedly in regions 2 and 4 until it sees Waldo
  - $\Box \Diamond p$  - this means that p will hold infinitely often in temporal logics
- we can use model checking tools to verify whether our robot based on some simple rules can actually accomplish the goal
- alternatively, there are approaches that could generate behavior of agent/robot based on the specification of the environment and goals in (restricted variant of) temporal logic