

Distributed Knowing How

Bin Liu

Department of Philosophy, Peking University
liub85@stu.pku.edu.cn

Yanjing Wang

Department of Philosophy, Peking University
y.wang@pku.edu.cn

Distributed knowledge is a key concept in the standard epistemic logic of knowledge-that. In this paper, we propose a corresponding notion of distributed knowledge-how and study its logic. Our framework generalizes two existing traditions in the logic of know-how: the individual-based multi-step framework and the coalition-based single-step framework. In particular, we assume a group can accomplish more than what its individuals can jointly do. The distributed knowledge-how is based on the distributed knowledge-that of a group whose multi-step strategies derive from distributed actions that subgroups can collectively perform. As the main result, we obtain a sound and strongly complete proof system for our logic of distributed knowledge-how, which closely resembles the logic of distributed knowledge-that in both the axioms and the proof method of completeness.

1 Introduction

One charming feature of epistemic logic is the formalization of group knowledge, such as common knowledge and distributed knowledge [7]. In particular, distributed knowledge plays an important role in various applications of epistemic logic, which also brings technical challenges that go beyond the bisimulation-invariant modal logic (cf. e.g., [1]).

While epistemic logic mainly focuses on propositional *de dicto* knowledge (knowledge-that), there is an increasing interest in studying *de re* knowledge, such as knowledge-how/why/what, and so on [20]. It is natural to ask what the suitable notions of group knowledge-wh are [23]. In [21, 8], various common/distributed notions of *knowing whether* have been proposed and studied. In this work, we try to propose a notion of distributed *knowing how* and study its logic.

We build our work by first combining two logical frameworks of knowing how. Initiated in [22, 24], the planning-based multi-step framework was inspired by the philosophical discussion of knowledge-how and the theory of automated planning in AI. In such a logic, one knows how to achieve φ means there is a *plan* consisting of her own actions such that the agent knows that the plan can be executed and will always terminate and guarantee φ . The plans can be linear, branching, or even a program written in a programming language [15]. The second framework is a coalition-based one-step setting initiated in [18, 19], where a coalition knows how to achieve φ means there is a *joint action* of the coalition such that the coalition knows that this joint action can make sure φ no matter what others do. To some extent, the second framework captures a simple form of distributed knowledge-how as [14] remarked, but in this work we aim for a much more general notion which requires the power of both frameworks. The differences between these two existing approaches and our new “mixed” approach can be summarized below:

| approach | know-that | know-how | actions |
|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| planning-based | individual | multi-step | individual |
| coalition-based | distributed | one-step | joint |
| mixed | distributed | multi-step | group |

The last column specifies what actions are used. The first approach assumes that the actions by individuals can already move the states. The second approach presupposes that the transitions only happen due to the joint actions of *all* the agents, which is suitable for game-theoretical settings. In contrast, actions in our approach are somehow the generalization of the two, featuring what we call *group actions* that may or may not be decomposable into individual actions. To see the need for our mixed approach, let us see a few examples of knowledge-how intuitively distributed in a group based on various types of group actions, such that only the group knows how to achieve a certain goal without each member knowing how to do it.

The first example is about actions that agents can only do together as a group.

Example 1 (Couch moving) *No one can single-handedly move a heavy couch through a narrow doorway around a corner. However, if two people work together, they know how to do it through a synchronized group action of one person lifting and maneuvering one end of the couch and the other handling the opposite end of the couch.*

The group action here in the example belongs to the group as a whole and is not decomposable into *independent* individual actions. We will take such actions as *atomic* in the framework. In contrast with the joint actions in the coalition-based game-like framework (and ATL-like epistemic frameworks [11, 12]), other agents outside the group do not affect the result of such a group action, which is similar to the individual actions in the planning-based approach.


Moreover, distributed knowledge-how arise when a group can use actions from its members or subgroups.

Example 2 (Theorem proving) *In collaborations on mathematical work, it often happens that two researchers do not know how to prove a theorem independently, but together they do. For example, i knows how to prove a lemma, and j knows how to prove a theorem given the lemma is true, then together they should know how to prove the theorem by first proving the lemma using i 's knowledge-how and then proving the theorem using j 's knowledge-how. Intuitively, the knowledge-how to prove the theorem is (sequentially) distributed in the group of these two researchers.*

This example shows that the distributed knowledge-how of a group may be based on a plan making use of actions inherited from its members or subgroups.

Yet another source of distributed knowledge-how is based on actions of a group that are *decomposable* into *independent* actions of its members and subgroups. It resembles the joint actions in the coalition-based approach, but not necessarily for the full set of agents.

Example 3 (Joint treatment) *Suppose a patient has two health problems represented by p and q . Doctor 1 knows how to cure p by treatment a but is not sure whether it can cure q , and Doctor 2 knows how to treat q by treatment b but is not sure whether it can cure p . Then, assuming the treatments are independent (not affecting each other), by doing both a and b respectively, the doctors distributedly know how to cure both problems (making sure $\neg p \wedge \neg q$).*



Compared to the group action in Example 1, the effect of the joint action in Example 3 is determined and decomposable by the effects of the independent composing actions. As we will see later, the set of outcomes induced by such a joint action is the *intersection* of the outcomes caused by each composing action.

From these three examples, we can summarize the following observations respectively:

- O1 A group may have some *extra* irreducible actions that none of its proper subgroups can do.
- O2 The available actions of a group at least include all the actions of the subgroups.
- O3 The group can perform decomposable *joint actions*, whose outcomes are the intersection of the outcomes of the composing actions (by subgroups).

Thus, there are three types of group actions relevant for distributed knowledge-how: (I) irreducible group actions belonging to the whole group but not less; (II) actions inherited from the subgroups; (III) the joint actions computed as the “intersections” of the composing actions.


We will formalize the above idea by first giving “atomic” group actions A_G of type (I) for each group G (including singleton groups as individuals). By O1, if $H \subsetneq G$ then $A_H \cap A_G = \emptyset$. Next, we compute the closure A_G^* (call it the set of distributed actions) recursively with respect to all the inherited actions of type (II) and the joint actions of type (III). In particular, the joint actions of group G are composed of actions belonging to any non-singleton partial partition of the group, not just a tuple of actions from each member. This reflects the fact that a task force may be divided into subteams with their own know-how. We assume that for joint actions, each person can remain idle but cannot be used twice *at the same time*¹, thus requiring the partial partition (partition of a subset).

Below is an example to illustrate the definition of group actions, where we write $A_{\{i\}}$ as A_i for brevity and present the joint actions according to a fixed ordering of agents and groups.

Example 4 Suppose there are two agents 1, 2, the atomic group actions of type (I) are defined as $A_1 = \{a, b\}$, $A_2 = \{c\}$, $A_{\{1,2\}} = \{d\}$. Then the closures A_G^* are computed as: $A_i^* = A_i$ for singleton sets $\{i\}$; $A_{\{1,2\}}^* = A_{\{1,2\}} \cup (A_1 \cup A_2) \cup (A_1^* \times A_2^*) = \{d, a, b, c, \langle a, c \rangle, \langle b, c \rangle\}$ where $A_{\{1,2\}}$ is the set of type (I) group actions, and $A_1 \cup A_2$ is the set of inherited actions of type (II), and $(A_1^* \times A_2^*)$ is the set of intersecting joint actions of type (III). Note that if there are more than two agents, then the actions of type (III) become complicated, e.g., $A_{\{1,2,3\}}^*$ should include $A_{\{1,2\}}^* \times A_3^*$, $A_1^* \times A_{\{2,3\}}^*$, $A_{\{1,3\}}^* \times A_2^*$, $A_1^* \times A_2^*$, $A_2^* \times A_3^*$, $A_1^* \times A_3^*$, and $A_1^* \times A_2^* \times A_3^*$, i.e., it includes the joint actions of any non-singleton partial partition of the group representing how the work can be distributed among subgroups.

Distributed knowledge-how is then based on multi-step strategies that make use of actions in A_G^* and distributed knowledge-that. We say a (possibly singleton) group G (distributedly) knows how to achieve ϕ if there is a strategy σ making use of A_G^* such that it is distributed knowledge of G that σ will terminate and guarantee ϕ . Consider the following example extending Example 3:

Example 5 (Distributed knowledge-that and -how) On top of Example 3, we further assume that the two doctors have some uncertainty regarding the patient's problems: Doctor 1 is sure the patient has p but not sure about q , and Doctor 2 is sure the patient has q but not sure about p . Furthermore, if $p \wedge \neg q$ then Doctor 1 should do treatment c (not a) to cure p , and if $\neg p \wedge q$ Doctor 2 should do treatment d (not b) to cure q . The situation can be formalized in the following model where $A_1 = \{a, c\}$, $A_2 = \{b, d\}$ and $A_{\{1,2\}} = \emptyset$. The dotted lines represent the epistemic indistinguishability relations of the agents, and we omit the reflexive arrows.



¹Otherwise, an agent may have the unrealistic ability to execute two actions at the same time. For example, if we assume a and b in Example 3 are both actions for Doctor 1, then Doctor 1 can team up with herself, to execute $\langle a, b \rangle$ to guarantee the outcome $\neg p \wedge \neg q$, which may not be possible.

Intuitively, at world (p, q) , Doctor 1 does not know how to achieve $\neg p$ as she does not have a uniform move to do so over the indistinguishable worlds $(p, \neg q)$ and (p, q) . Similarly, Doctor 2 does not know how to achieve $\neg q$. However, the group of the two doctors 1 and 2 distributedly knows how to make sure $\neg p \wedge \neg q$ by doing the joint action $\langle a, b \rangle \in A_{\{1,2\}}^*$ based on their distributed knowledge, which leaves them with a sole possible world (p, q) .

In this paper, we propose such a mixed framework of distributed knowing how, based on the group actions explained above and the notion of strategies proposed in [9]. The main technical contribution is a sound and complete proof system of the logic with intuitive axioms, whose completeness proof is based on the unraveling of both the epistemic relations and the action transitions. One crucial difference from the systems of coalition-based know-how logics is that the *cooperation axiom* that plays a key role there is no longer valid here due to the multi-step setting. In the following, Section 2 lays out the language and semantics for our logic of distributed knowledge-how. Section 3 gives a proof system. In Section 4, we prove the completeness. Finally, we conclude and discuss future work in Section 5.

2 Language and semantics

We present the following syntax and semantics given the set P of proposition letters and the finite set $I = \{i_0, \dots, i_n\}$ of agents.²

Definition 6 (Language) The language **DKH** is defined by the following BNF where $p \in P$ and G is a subset of I called group:

$$\varphi ::= \top \mid p \mid \neg\varphi \mid (\varphi \wedge \varphi) \mid K_G\varphi \mid Kh_G\varphi$$

Definition 7 (Model) A model \mathcal{M} is a tuple $\langle S, \{\sim_i\}_{i \in I}, \{A_G\}_{G \subseteq I}, \{\xrightarrow{a} \mid a \in \bigcup_{G \subseteq I} A_G\}, V \rangle$, where

- S is a set of states;
- \sim_i is an equivalence relation on S for each $i \in I$;
- A_G is a set of atomic group actions for each $G \subseteq I$ such that: $G \subsetneq H$ implies $A_G \cap A_H = \emptyset$; $A_\emptyset = \emptyset$;
- \xrightarrow{a} is a binary relation on S for each $a \in \bigcup_{G \subseteq I} A_G$, called the transition relation of a ;
- $V : P \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$ is a valuation function.

We use A_G^+ to denote $\bigcup_{G' \subseteq G} A_{G'}$ for any $G \subseteq I$, thus A_I^+ is the set of all atomic group actions and $G \subseteq H$ implies $A_G^+ \subseteq A_H^+$. Note that the actions only appear in the models, but not in the language, and the transitions can be non-deterministic. The models in this paper closely align with those in [16] with some notable distinctions. First, instead of the set of actions of each agent, we have the set of actions for each group. Moreover, as mentioned in the introduction, we will compute the closures of these atomic action sets, which serve as the basis for distributed knowledge-how. Second, the requirement that $G \subsetneq H$ implies $A_G \cap A_H = \emptyset$, reflects the intuition behind the type (I) group actions that are only available to the whole group and not less.³

Definition 8 (Distributed indistinguishability) For each group G , \sim_G is a binary relation on S such that $s \sim_G t$ iff $s \sim_i t$ for each $i \in G$.

²The requirement for the finiteness of the set I of agents is solely for the convenience of denoting distributed actions and has no effect on the logic (valid formulas).

³Although this requirement is conceptually important, technically, we think it can be dropped without changing the logic, because the closures of action sets are the same with or without the requirement. To tell the difference in logic, we may need to talk about concrete actions in the language.

It is routine to show that distributed indistinguishability relations are equivalence relations.

Proposition 9 *For any group G , \sim_G is an equivalence relation on S .*

Therefore, we can define equivalence classes w.r.t. \sim_G .

Definition 10 *For any group G and $s \in S$, we use $[s]_G$ to denote the equivalence class $\{t \in S \mid s \sim_G t\}$, and use $[S]_G$ to denote the collection of all the equivalence classes on S w.r.t. \sim_G .*

Note that by definition $s \sim_\emptyset t$ for any $s, t \in S$, which implies that $[s]_\emptyset = S$ for any $s \in S$.

We will now define the set of *distributed actions* A_G^* as a closure of A_G recursively, which includes the three types of group actions as discussed in the introduction and illustrated in Example 4. To make the technical definition concise, we divide the actions in A_G^* into two parts: (1) atomic group actions of G and its subgroups, and (2) joint actions in the form of $\langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle$. Since the order of d_0, \dots, d_n is insignificant in our setting, we fix an ordering \prec below on *mutually disjoint groups* to avoid generating redundant joint actions, which will not affect the logic technically. Recall that the set of all agents is $I = \{i_0, \dots, i_n\}$. For any nonempty group $G = \{i_{n_0}, \dots, i_{n_k}\}$, let $\min G = \min\{n_0, \dots, n_k\}$ and let $G \prec H$ iff $\min G < \min H$. This will always give us a strict ordering over a set of mutually disjoint groups of agents.

Definition 11 (Distributed actions) *For each group G , its distributed action set $A_G^* := A_G^+ \cup \{\langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle \in A_{G_0}^* \times \dots \times A_{G_n}^* \mid \{G_0, \dots, G_n\} \text{ is a non-trivial partial partition of } G \text{ and } G_0 \prec \dots \prec G_n\}$, where a non-trivial partial partition of a set X is a partition of a (not necessarily proper) subset of X such that it is not a singleton set. It follows that $A_\emptyset^* = \emptyset$ and $A_i^* = A_i$ for each $i \in I$.*

Note that joint actions of subgroups of a group G are also inherited because a non-trivial partial partition of a subgroup is also a non-trivial partial partition of G . Thus we have the following monotonicity for both distributed indistinguishability and distributed action sets.

Proposition 12 *$G \subseteq H$ implies $\sim_H \subseteq \sim_G$ and $A_G^* \subseteq A_H^*$.*

PROOF Suppose that $G \subseteq H$. $\sim_H \subseteq \sim_G$ is straightforward by definition. We show $A_G^* \subseteq A_H^*$ as follows. If $G = \emptyset$, then $A_G^* = \emptyset$, then we have $A_G^* \subseteq A_H^*$. If $G = \{i\}$ where $i \in I$, then $A_G^* = A_i \subseteq A_H^+ \subseteq A_H^*$. If G is a multi-agent group, then suppose that $d \in A_G^*$. If $d \in A_G^+$, then since $A_G^+ \subseteq A_H^+$, we have $d \in A_H^+ \subseteq A_H^*$. If $d = \langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle \in A_{G_0}^* \times \dots \times A_{G_n}^*$ where $\{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ is a non-trivial partial partition of G and $G_0 \prec \dots \prec G_n$, since $G \subseteq H$, $\{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ is also a non-trivial partial partition of H . Then $\langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle \in A_H^*$. Therefore $A_G^* \subseteq A_H^*$. \square

By Proposition 12, A_I^* is the set of all distributed actions and $A_I^+ \subseteq A_I^*$. We now define distributed transitions according to the observation O3 in the introduction.

Definition 13 (Distributed transition) *For each $d = \langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle \in A_I^*$, we define the distributed transition relation $\xrightarrow{d} := \bigcap_{0 \leq k \leq n} \xrightarrow{d_k}$.*

For any nonempty $X, Y \subseteq S$ and $d \in A_I^*$, we use $X \xrightarrow{d} Y$ to indicate that there is some $s \in X$ and some $t \in Y$ such that $s \xrightarrow{d} t$. A distributed transition relation could be empty, which indicates that there are conflicting actions among subgroups. For example, the actions of opening and closing the same door cannot constitute an executable distributed action.

Although a joint action $d = \langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle \in A_I^*$ may well use other joint actions as d_i , they can be in effect reduced to the intersections of atomic transitions, e.g., the transitions for $\langle \langle a, b \rangle, c \rangle$ are the same as the transitions for $\langle a, b, c \rangle$, as they are computed by taking the intersection of \xrightarrow{a} , \xrightarrow{b} , and \xrightarrow{c} . The following observation plays an important role in the completeness proof.

Proposition 14 *For any nonempty group G and $d \in A_G^*$, there exist $d'_0 \in A_{G'_0}, \dots, d'_m \in A_{G'_m}$ such that $\{G'_0, \dots, G'_m\}$ is a partial partition of G and $\xrightarrow{d} = \bigcap_{0 \leq k \leq m} \xrightarrow{d'_k}$.*

PROOF We show by induction on the number of agents in G . If $G = \{i\}$ where $i \in I$, then $d \in A_i$ and $\{\{i\}\}$ is a partial partition of $\{i\}$. Assume that G is a multi-agent group. If $d \in A_G^+$, then there exists $G' \subseteq G$ such that $d \in A_{G'}$, then $\{G'\}$ is a partial partition of G . If $d = \langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle \in A_{G_0}^* \times \dots \times A_{G_n}^*$ where $\{G_0, \dots, G_n\}$ is a non-trivial partial partition of G and $G_0 \prec \dots \prec G_n$, then $n > 0$ and $\emptyset \neq G_k \subsetneq G$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$. By induction hypothesis, for $0 \leq k \leq n$ there exist $d_0^k \in A_{G_0^k}, \dots, d_{m_k}^k \in A_{G_{m_k}^k}$ such that $\{G_0^k, \dots, G_{m_k}^k\}$ is a partial partition of G_k and $\xrightarrow{d_k} = \bigcap_{0 \leq j \leq m_k} \xrightarrow{d_j^k}$. Then $\{G_0^0, \dots, G_{m_0}^0, \dots, G_0^n, \dots, G_{m_n}^n\}$ is a partial partition of G . Since $\xrightarrow{\langle d_0, \dots, d_n \rangle} = \bigcap_{0 \leq k \leq n} \xrightarrow{d_k}$, the proposition holds. \square

Observe that in the last case of the proof, $|\{G_0^0, \dots, G_{m_0}^0, \dots, G_0^n, \dots, G_{m_n}^n\}| > 1$ because $n > 0$. Therefore, we have the following corollary, which will be helpful for the completeness proof:

Corollary 15 *For any multi-agent group G and $d \in A_G^* \setminus A_G^+$, there exist $a_0 \in A_{G_0}, \dots, a_m \in A_{G_m}$ such that $m > 0$, $\{G_0, \dots, G_m\}$ is a partial partition of G and $\xrightarrow{d} = \bigcap_{0 \leq k \leq m} \xrightarrow{a_k}$.*

The following definitions are generalizations of the counterparts in [9].

Definition 16 (Executability) *For any nonempty $X \subseteq S$, we say that $d \in A_I^*$ is executable on X , if for each $s \in X$ there exists t such that $s \xrightarrow{d} t$.*

Definition 17 (Strategy) *A strategy of group G is a partial function $\sigma_G : [S]_G \rightarrow A_G^*$ such that $\sigma_G([s]_G)$ is executable on $[s]_G$. Particularly, for each group, the empty function is also a strategy, called the empty strategy.*

By definition, the only strategy for the empty group is the empty strategy.

Definition 18 (Execution) *Given a strategy σ_G of group G w.r.t. a model \mathcal{M} , a possible execution of σ_G is a possibly infinite nonempty sequence of equivalence classes $\delta = [s_0]_G [s_1]_G \dots$ such that $[s_j]_G \xrightarrow{\sigma_G([s_j]_G)} [s_{j+1}]_G$ for all $0 \leq j < |\delta| - 1$. If the execution is a finite sequence $[s_0]_G \dots [s_n]_G$, we call $[s_n]_G$ the leaf-node, and $[s_j]_G (0 \leq j < n)$ an inner-node w.r.t. this execution. If it is infinite, then all $[s_j]_G (j \in \mathbb{N})$ are inner-nodes. A possible execution of σ_G is complete if it is infinite or its leaf-node is not in $\text{dom}(\sigma_G)$. We use $\text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s)$ to denote the set of all leaf-nodes of all complete executions of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$, and $\text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$ to denote the set of all inner-nodes of all complete executions of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$.*

Now we formally define the semantics of know-how $\text{Kh}_G \phi$ which intuitively says that there is a strategy σ_G such that G distributedly knows that σ will terminate and guarantee ϕ .

Definition 19 (Semantics) *Given a model \mathcal{M} , for any state $s \in S$ and any formula $\phi \in \text{DKH}$*

| | |
|---|---|
| $\mathcal{M}, s \models \top$ | always holds |
| $\mathcal{M}, s \models p$ | iff $s \in V(p)$, where $p \in P$ |
| $\mathcal{M}, s \models \neg \phi$ | iff $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models \phi$ |
| $\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi \wedge \psi$ | iff $\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi$ and $\mathcal{M}, s \models \psi$ |
| $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_G \phi$ | iff $\mathcal{M}, s' \models \phi$ for all $s' \in [s]_G$ |
| $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G \phi$ | iff there is a strategy σ_G of G such that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. $[t]_G \subseteq \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ for all $[t]_G \in \text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s)$, and 2. all its complete executions starting from $[s]_G$ are finite. |

where $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket = \{s \in S \mid \mathcal{M}, s \models \varphi\}$.

Note that when G is a singleton, the semantics of Kh_G is exactly as in [9]. It is also worth noting that the key axiom Cooperation:⁴ $\text{Kh}_G\varphi \wedge \text{Kh}_H\varphi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_{G \cup H}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ (G and H are disjoint) in the coalition-based approach such as [19] is *not* valid in our setting, which demonstrates that our mixed framework is by no means a trivial combination. There are two reasons for the invalidity. First of all, as our know-how is based on *multi-step* strategies, the strategies behind the know-how of G and H may not be synchronizable in the number of steps of reaching the goals, which is fundamentally different from the one-step coalition-based setting where joint actions always end at the same time. Moreover, even if we restrict to one-step actions, the distributed transition relations (as intersections) can be empty, that is, joint actions may be non-executable, which is different from the setting in [19] and makes it uncertain whether the two actions can be combined into an executable joint action.

Moreover, the invalidity also shows that distributed knowledge-how cannot be conceptualized as simply putting together individual/subgroup knowledge-how (and their consequences), which separates it from distributed knowledge-that, where Cooperation is valid.

As a technical remark, the empty group provides us with additional expressive power of a *universal modality*, which will play a vital role in the axiomatization proposed in the next section.

Proposition 20 $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_\emptyset\varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_\emptyset\varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, t \models \varphi$ for any $t \in S$.

PROOF It is obvious that $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_\emptyset\varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, t \models \varphi$ for any $t \in S$. We show $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_\emptyset\varphi$ iff $\mathcal{M}, t \models \varphi$ for any $t \in S$.

(\Rightarrow) Since $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_\emptyset\varphi$, then there is a strategy σ_\emptyset for the empty group such that

1. $[t]_\emptyset \subseteq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ for all $[t]_\emptyset \in \text{CELeaf}(\sigma_\emptyset, s)$, and
2. all its complete executions starting from $[s]_\emptyset$ are finite.

By definition, the only strategy for the empty group is the empty strategy \emptyset . Since $[s]_\emptyset \notin \text{dom}(\emptyset)$, the only execution of the empty strategy \emptyset starting from $[s]_\emptyset$ is $\delta_\emptyset = [s]_\emptyset$, then $\text{CELeaf}(\sigma_\emptyset, s) = \{[s]_\emptyset\}$. Therefore, $S = [s]_\emptyset \subseteq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$.

(\Leftarrow) Since $\mathcal{M}, t \models \varphi$ for any $t \in S$, we have $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_\emptyset\varphi$. We show a stronger result that $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_G\varphi$ implies $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G\varphi$ for any group G . Consider the empty strategy \emptyset for G . Since $[s]_G \notin \text{dom}(\emptyset)$, the only execution of the empty strategy \emptyset starting from $[s]_G$ is $\delta_G = [s]_G$, then $\text{CELeaf}(\emptyset, s) = \{[s]_G\}$. Since $\mathcal{M}, s \models K_G\varphi$, we have $[s]_G \subseteq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G\varphi$. \square

3 Axiomatization

Proof system SDKH⁵

Axioms

| | | | |
|-------|---|------------|---|
| TAUT | axioms of propositional logic ⁶ | AxKtoKh | $K_G\varphi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G\varphi$ |
| DISTK | $K_G\varphi \wedge K_G(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow K_G\psi$ | AxEmpKhtoK | $\text{Kh}_\emptyset\varphi \rightarrow K_\emptyset\varphi$ |
| T | $K_G\varphi \rightarrow \varphi$ | AxKhtoKKh | $\text{Kh}_G\varphi \rightarrow K_G\text{Kh}_G\varphi$ |
| 4 | $K_G\varphi \rightarrow K_GK_G\varphi$ | AxEmpMono | $K_\emptyset(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow K_\emptyset(\text{Kh}_G\varphi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G\psi)$ |

⁴An alternative form is $\text{Kh}_G(\varphi \rightarrow \psi) \rightarrow (\text{Kh}_H\varphi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_{G \cup H}\psi)$.

⁵Formulas φ, ψ are from the language defined in Definition 6.

⁶All instantiations in language **DKH** of axioms of propositional logic, to be more precise.

| | | | |
|--------------|---|-----------|---|
| 5 | $\neg K_G \phi \rightarrow K_G \neg K_G \phi$ | AxKhbot | $\text{Kh}_G \perp \rightarrow \perp$ |
| AxKMono | $K_G \phi \rightarrow K_H \phi$, where $G \subseteq H$ | AxKhtoKhK | $\text{Kh}_G \phi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G K_G \phi$ |
| AxKhMono | $\text{Kh}_G \phi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_H \phi$, where $G \subseteq H$ | AxKhKh | $\text{Kh}_G \text{Kh}_G \phi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G \phi$ |
| Rules | | | |
| MP | $\frac{\phi, \phi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi}$ | NECK | $\frac{\vdash \phi}{\vdash K_G \phi}$ |

SDKH contains all S5 axioms for K. AxKMono and AxKhMono are monotonicity axioms for distributed knowledge-that and distributed knowledge-how. They express that a group knows/knows how ϕ whenever its subgroup knows/knows how ϕ . Their validity is due to the monotonicity of distributed indistinguishability and distributed action sets shown by Proposition 12. We will provide the validity of AxKhMono later. AxKhKh is a key axiom w.r.t. multi-step planning, revealing the compositional nature of knowing how. Its validity is highly non-trivial as in [9], and we will provide a sketch of the proof later.

Note that the logic is *not* normal, for example, $\text{Kh}_G \phi \wedge \text{Kh}_G \psi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G(\phi \wedge \psi)$ is invalid. In [9] the monotonicity rule MONOKh is proposed to fill the gap left by the absence of the K axiom for Kh, which states that if $\phi \rightarrow \psi$ is provable then $\text{Kh} \phi \rightarrow \text{Kh} \psi$ is provable. In SDKH we use a stronger *axiom* AxEmpMono which reflects the monotonicity of Kh_G at the *model level*. The rule MONOKh can be derived from AxEmpMono, NECK and T.

As for other important axioms, AxKtoKh says if a group already knows ϕ then it knows how to achieve ϕ by doing nothing (the empty strategy). AxEmpKhtoK helps us reduce Kh_\emptyset to K_\emptyset . AxKhtoKKh is the positive introspection axiom for Kh_G , whose validity comes from uniformity of strategies, and the negative introspection of know-how is derivable. AxKhbot encodes part of the termination condition within the semantics, for it excludes strategies that have no terminating executions. AxKhtoKhK says that ϕ is known after executing the know-how strategy, as required in the semantics, which is usually also assumed in discussions of contingent planning (cf. [17]).

Proposition 21 (Axiom AxKhMono) $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G \phi$ implies $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_H \phi$, where $G \subseteq H$.

PROOF Suppose $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G \phi$. Then there exists a strategy σ_G such that:

1. $[t]_G \subseteq \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ for all $[t]_G \in \text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s)$, and
2. all its complete executions starting from $[s]_G$ are finite.

If $[s]_G \notin \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$, the only execution of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$ is $\delta_G = [s]_G$, which is also complete and finite. Then $\text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s) = \{[s]_G\}$, implying $[s]_G \subseteq \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$. Since $G \subseteq H$, it follows that $[s]_H \subseteq [s]_G \subseteq \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$, then by empty strategy we have $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_H \phi$.

If $[s]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$, then A_G^* is non-empty. Since $G \subseteq H$, by Proposition 12 we have $A_G^* \subseteq A_H^*$, so A_H^* is also non-empty. Define partial function $\sigma_H : [S]_H \rightarrow A_H^*$ as follows: for each $v \in S$ such that $[v]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$, let $\sigma_H([v]_H) = \sigma_G([v]_G)$. We first show that σ_H is well-defined. Suppose $s_1 \sim_H s_2$. Since $G \subseteq H$, we have $s_1 \sim_G s_2$, so $[s_1]_G = [s_2]_G$. Thus $[s_1]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$ if and only if $[s_2]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$. If $[s_1]_G = [s_2]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$, then $\sigma_H([s_1]_H) = \sigma_G([s_1]_G) = \sigma_G([s_2]_G) = \sigma_H([s_2]_H)$. Additionally, for any $[v]_H \in \text{dom}(\sigma_H)$, by definition $[v]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$ and $\sigma_G([v]_G)$ is executable on $[v]_G$. Since $\sigma_H([v]_H) = \sigma_G([v]_G)$ and $[v]_H \subseteq [v]_G$, $\sigma_H([v]_H)$ is executable on $[v]_H$. Therefore, σ_H is well-defined.

Let $\delta_H = [s_0]_H [s_1]_H \dots$ be an arbitrary complete execution of σ_H starting from $[s]_H = [s_0]_H$, with $|\delta_H| > 1$. We show that δ_H is finite and its leaf nodes are contained in $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket$. For $[s_j]_H$ in δ_H such that $[s_j]_H \in \text{dom}(\sigma_H)$, we have $[s_j]_H \xrightarrow{\sigma_H([s_j]_H)} [s_{j+1}]_H$. Thus there exist $s'_j \in [s_j]_H$ and $s'_{j+1} \in [s_{j+1}]_H$ such that $s'_j \xrightarrow{\sigma_H([s_j]_H)} s'_{j+1}$. By the definition of σ_H , $\sigma_H([s_j]_H) = \sigma_G([s_j]_G)$, so $s'_j \xrightarrow{\sigma_G([s_j]_G)} s'_{j+1}$. This implies

$[s'_j]_G \xrightarrow{\sigma_G([s_j]_G)} [s'_{j+1}]_G$. Since $s_j \sim_H s'_j$, $s_{j+1} \sim_H s'_{j+1}$, and $G \subseteq H$, we have $s_j \sim_G s'_j$, $s_{j+1} \sim_G s'_{j+1}$, hence $[s_j]_G = [s'_j]_G$, $[s_{j+1}]_G = [s'_{j+1}]_G$. Therefore, $[s_j]_G \xrightarrow{\sigma_G([s_j]_G)} [s_{j+1}]_G$. Let $\delta_G = [s_0]_G[s_1]_G \dots$. Then δ_H must be finite; otherwise, δ_G would be an infinite execution of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$. Let $|\delta_G| = |\delta_H| = n + 1$. Since δ_H is finite and complete, $[s_n]_H \notin \text{dom}(\sigma_H)$, implying $[s_n]_G \notin \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$. Thus δ_G is a finite complete execution starting from $[s]_G$. As $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G \phi$, we have $[s_n]_G \subseteq \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$, hence $[s_n]_H \subseteq \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_H \phi$. \square

Proposition 22 (Axiom AxKhKh) $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G \text{Kh}_G \phi$ implies $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G \phi$.

PROOF [Sketch] Axiom AxKhKh states that for any pointed model \mathcal{M}, s , if there exists a strategy σ_G of G such that all complete executions starting from $[s]_G$ are finite, and for each leaf node $[s']_G$ of these executions, there exists another strategy σ'_G of G such that all complete executions starting from $[s']_G$ are finite and ϕ is satisfied on their leaf nodes, then there exists a strategy τ_G of G such that all complete executions starting from $[s]_G$ are finite and ϕ is satisfied on their leaf nodes. To prove the validity, we need to combine σ_G and each σ'_G into τ_G , while resolving three critical issues:

First, the domains of strategies σ'_G may contain irrelevant equivalence classes that are not visited during executions starting from its corresponding leaf node; however, when combined with other strategies, new executions might pass through these equivalence classes. This may result in the new execution failing to achieve ϕ . Second, overlapping domains of different strategies could result in the combined strategy not being a function. Third, the domain of some strategies might include leaf nodes of other strategies' complete executions. This can cause executions that are originally planned to terminate to continue, even leading to infinite executions.

To address these, we will proceed as follows:

1. Restrict the domain of each strategy to the inner nodes of its complete executions starting from the corresponding leaf node, eliminating irrelevant equivalence classes.
2. Use the Well-ordering Theorem to order the leaf nodes of complete executions of σ_G (this also orders their corresponding strategies σ'_G), then combine these strategies according to the ordering while skipping defined equivalence classes and leaf nodes, constructing τ_G^γ .
3. Finally, combine σ_G and τ_G^γ into τ_G , also skipping defined equivalence classes and leaf nodes.

We present a sketch of the proof (cf. [9] for a similar proof). Suppose that $\mathcal{M}, s \models \text{Kh}_G \text{Kh}_G \phi$, then there exists a strategy σ_G of G such that all complete executions starting from $[s]_G$ are finite and $\text{Kh}_G \phi$ is satisfied on their leaf nodes. By the Well-ordering Theorem, let $\text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s) = \{S_i \mid i < \gamma\}$, where γ is an ordinal number. Pick $s_i \in S_i$, then $[s_i]_G = S_i$. Since $\mathcal{M}, s_i \models \text{Kh}_G \phi$ for each $i < \gamma$, there exists a strategy σ_G^i of G for each $i < \gamma$ such that all complete executions starting from $[s_i]_G$ are finite and ϕ is satisfied on their leaf nodes. We define τ_G^γ as follows:

Define τ_G^i inductively where $0 \leq i < \gamma$:

- If $i = 0$, $\tau_G^0 = \sigma_G^0|_{\text{CEInner}(\sigma_G^0, s_0)}$;
- If $i > 0$, $\tau_G^i = f_i \cup (\sigma_G^i|_{D_i})$,

where $f_i = \bigcup_{j < i} \tau_G^j$, $D_i = \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G^i, s_i) \setminus (\text{dom}(f_i) \cup \{[v]_G \in \text{CELeaf}(f_i, t) \mid [t]_G \in \text{dom}(f_i)\})$. Let $\tau_G^\gamma = \bigcup_{i < \gamma} \tau_G^i$.

We can see that the domain of each τ_G^i is restricted to the inner nodes of its complete executions starting from the corresponding leaf node, and defined equivalence classes and leaf nodes are skipped

(this requires further proof). Moreover, we can verify that τ_G^γ is indeed a partial function. With these results, we can show that on any equivalence class of $\text{dom}(\tau_G^\gamma)$, τ_G^γ is a witness of $\text{Kh}_G\varphi$.

Finally, we define strategy τ_G :

$$\tau_G = \tau_G^\gamma \cup (\sigma_G|_E),$$

where $E = \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s) \setminus (\text{dom}(\tau_G^\gamma) \cup \{[v]_G \in \text{CELeaf}(\tau_G^\gamma, t) \mid [t]_G \in \text{dom}(\tau_G^\gamma)\})$. The combination of τ_G^γ and σ_G follows a similar method as before, also skipping defined equivalence classes and leaf nodes. With the above results, we can show that τ_G is the desired strategy. \square

The above propositions give us the soundness of the logic.

Theorem 23 (Soundness) $\vdash \varphi$ implies $\models \varphi$.

4 Completeness

In this section, we prove the completeness theorem for **SDKH**. Inspired by [19], we adopt the unraveling technique to handle distributed knowledge-that. On the other hand, when dealing with distributed knowledge-how, we face a similar problem to that with distributed knowledge-that. To find witness strategies for $\text{Kh}_G\varphi$ -formulas, we make use of atomic group actions and define them as pairs (φ, G) , and then transition relations can be defined as $s \xrightarrow{(\varphi, G)} t$ iff $\text{Kh}_G\varphi \in s$ and $K_G\varphi \in t$, meaning that the witness for $\text{Kh}_G\varphi$ can be found in one step by (φ, G) . However, $\text{Kh}_{\{i,j\}}(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ could be satisfied at a state s accidentally by $\langle(\varphi, i), (\psi, j)\rangle$ in the absence of $\text{Kh}_{\{i,j\}}(\varphi \wedge \psi) \in s$, since $K_{\{i,j\}}(\varphi \wedge \psi) \in t$ always holds whenever $s \xrightarrow{\langle(\varphi, i), (\psi, j)\rangle} t$. To avoid this, we use the unraveling technique again, splitting distributed transitions into transitions of atomic group actions, thereby ensuring that all joint actions are not executable in the canonical model. Moreover, our multi-step setting introduces complications when refuting Kh_G -formulas in the canonical model, where AxKhKh and AxEmpMono will play crucial roles instead of the Cooperation axiom in [19].

Based on the ideas discussed above, we fix a maximal consistent set X_0 and define the canonical model $\mathcal{M}^c(X_0)$ as follows:

Definition 24 (Canonical model) *Given a maximal consistent subset X_0 of **DKH**, the canonical model $\mathcal{M}^c(X_0) = \langle S^c, \{\sim_i^c\}_{i \in I}, \{A_G^c\}_{G \subseteq I}, \{\xrightarrow{a} \mid a \in A_I^{c+}\}, V^c \rangle$ is defined as follows:*

- S^c is the set of all mixed sequences $X_0 \langle(\varphi_1, G_1), H_1\rangle X_1 \cdots \langle(\varphi_n, G_n), H_n\rangle X_n$ such that
 - X_j is a maximal consistent subsets of **DKH** for each $j \geq 0$,
 - $\varphi_j \in \mathbf{DKH}$ for each $j \geq 1$,
 - $G_j \neq \emptyset$ and $G_j, H_j \subseteq I$ for each $j \geq 1$,
 - $\text{Kh}_{G_j}\varphi_j \in X_{j-1}$ and $K_{G_j}\varphi_j \in X_j$ for each $j \geq 1$,
 - $\{\varphi \mid K_{H_j}\varphi \in X_{j-1}\} \subseteq X_j$ for each $j \geq 1$;

for any state $s = X_0 \langle(\varphi_1, G_1), H_1\rangle X_1 \cdots \langle(\varphi_n, G_n), H_n\rangle X_n$, we use $\text{ed}(s)$ to denote X_n ;

- For each $i \in I$, \sim_i^c is defined as follows: for any states $s = X_0 \langle(\varphi_1, G_1), H_1\rangle X_1 \cdots \langle(\varphi_n, G_n), H_n\rangle X_n$ and $s' = X_0 \langle(\varphi'_1, G'_1), H'_1\rangle X'_1 \cdots \langle(\varphi'_m, G'_m), H'_m\rangle X'_m$, $s \sim_i^c s'$ iff there exists an integer k such that:
 - $0 \leq k \leq \min\{n, m\}$;
 - $X_j = X'_j$ and $H_j = H'_j$ for each $1 \leq j \leq k$;

- $i \in H_j$ for each $k < j \leq n$;
- $i \in H'_j$ for each $k < j \leq m$;
- For each nonempty $G \subseteq I$, $A_G^c = \{(\varphi, G) \mid \varphi \in \mathbf{DKH}\}$ and $A_\emptyset^c = \emptyset$;
- For any $(\varphi, G) \in A_I^{c+}$ and states s, t , $s \xrightarrow{(\varphi, G)} t$ iff $t = s \langle (\varphi, G), G' \rangle X$ where $G' \subseteq I$ and X is an MCS;
- For any $p \in P$, $V^c(p) = \{s \in S^c \mid p \in \text{ed}(s)\}$.

Before explaining the construction of the canonical model, we first verify that $\mathcal{M}^c(X_0)$ is well-defined, i.e., \sim_i^c is an equivalence relation and A_G^c satisfies the requirement in Definition 7.

Proposition 25 \sim_i^c is an equivalence relation on S^c for any $i \in I$.

PROOF

Let $i \in I$. \sim_i^c clearly satisfies reflexivity and symmetry.

For any states $s = X_0 \langle (\varphi_1, G_1), H_1 \rangle X_1 \cdots \langle (\varphi_n, G_n), H_n \rangle X_n$, $s' = X_0 \langle (\varphi'_1, G'_1), H'_1 \rangle X'_1 \cdots \langle (\varphi'_m, G'_m), H'_m \rangle X'_m$, and $s'' = X_0 \langle (\varphi''_1, G''_1), H''_1 \rangle X''_1 \cdots \langle (\varphi''_r, G''_r), H''_r \rangle X''_r$, suppose $s \sim_i^c s'$ and $s' \sim_i^c s''$. Then there exist integers k and k' such that:

- $0 \leq k \leq \min\{n, m\}$, satisfying:
 - $X_j = X'_j$ and $H_j = H'_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$;
 - $i \in H_j$ for $k < j \leq n$;
 - $i \in H'_j$ for $k < j \leq m$;
- $0 \leq k' \leq \min\{m, r\}$, satisfying:
 - $X'_j = X''_j$ and $H'_j = H''_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k'$;
 - $i \in H'_j$ for $k' < j \leq m$;
 - $i \in H''_j$ for $k' < j \leq r$.

Let $k'' = \min\{k, k'\}$. Then for all j :

- If $1 \leq j \leq k''$, then $X_j = X''_j$ and $H_j = H''_j$;
- If $k'' < j \leq n$:
 - Case $k \leq k'$: $k'' = k$, and then $i \in H_j$ for $k'' < j \leq n$;
 - Case $k' < k$: $k'' = k'$, and then:
 - * For $k < j \leq n$, $i \in H_j$;
 - * For $k' < j \leq k$, since $k \leq m$, we have $H_j = H'_j$ and $i \in H'_j$, and then $i \in H_j$.
- If $k'' < j \leq r$, similarly $i \in H''_j$.

Therefore, $s \sim_i^c s''$. This proves that \sim_i^c is an equivalence relation on S^c . □

By the definition of A_G^c it is obvious:

Proposition 26 $G \subsetneq H$ implies $A_G^c \cap A_H^c = \emptyset$.

Now we are ready to explain how we construct the canonical model. Recall that we would like to unravel both the (group) epistemic relations and the (group) action relations in the model. Instead of building a model and then unraveling it, we do it in one go by considering paths of MCSs. Note that between two given MCSs, there can be both the epistemic relations and the action relations, and this is the reason for considering the so-called mixed sequences $X_0 \langle (\varphi_1, G_1), H_1 \rangle X_1 \cdots \langle (\varphi_n, G_n), H_n \rangle X_n$, where

H_i represents the epistemic relation and (φ_i, G_i) represents the action transition. Moreover, although we need to unravel the epistemic relations and the action transitions respectively, we do not need to unravel the “cross-type” relations, i.e., it is fine to have transitions of both types between two MCSs. The detailed definition of the mixed sequences resembles the usual conditions of canonical epistemic relation and the canonical relations for the actions in the literature of knowing how logics [9].

Interested readers may wonder why in mixed sequences, we can always require the double (epistemic+action) transitions between the MCSs. Intuitively, there can be two MCSs with only epistemic relations between them, without any action transition (or the other way around). Thanks to the epistemic relation of the empty group and the trivial action (\top, G) , such cases are not ruled out, as there are always such trivial epistemic and action relations between any two relevant MCSs: the empty group cannot distinguish any two states and any group always knows how to achieve \top . The trivial epistemic relation \sim_\emptyset and the trivial action transition $\xrightarrow{(\top, G)}$ will also play an important role in the existence lemmas for both K_G and Kh_G .

Finally, the definition of \sim_G^c is essentially the same as the canonical epistemic relation in [19], if we ignore the action transitions in the mixed sequences. Intuitively, two sequences are indistinguishable by i if they are two extensions of the same initial history (ignoring the action information) such that i is always in the groups that cannot distinguish the adjacent MCSs from the departing point onward of the two extensions. The action transitions between the mixed sequences are defined similarly as the canonical action relation used in [9].

We now show that all joint actions are not executable in the canonical model, as discussed in the beginning of this section.

Proposition 27 *For any $d \in A_I^{c*} \setminus A_I^{c+}$, d is not executable anywhere in \mathcal{M}^c .*

PROOF By Corollary 15, there exist $(\varphi_0, G_0) \in A_{G_0}^c, \dots, (\varphi_m, G_m) \in A_{G_m}^c$ such that $m > 0$, $\{G_0, \dots, G_m\}$ is a partial partition of I and $\xrightarrow{d} = \bigcap_{0 \leq k \leq m} \xrightarrow{(\varphi_k, G_k)}$, then G_0, \dots, G_m are distinct. Suppose towards a contradiction that there is $s, t \in S^c$ such that $s \xrightarrow{d} t$. Then $s \xrightarrow{(\varphi_k, G_k)} t$ for $0 \leq k \leq m$. Then $t = s \langle (\varphi_0, G_0), G'_0 \rangle Y_0 = \dots = s \langle (\varphi_m, G_m), G'_m \rangle Y_m$ where $G'_0, \dots, G'_m \subseteq I$ and Y_0, \dots, Y_m are MCSs. But G_0, \dots, G_m are distinct, contradiction. \square

For the knowledge-that part in the Truth Lemma, we firstly need the following propositions:

Proposition 28 *For any $s = X_0 \langle (\varphi_1, G_1), H_1 \rangle X_1 \dots \langle (\varphi_n, G_n), H_n \rangle X_n \in S^c$ and $k \leq n$, if $K_H \varphi \in X_n$ and $H \subseteq H_j$ holds for all $k < j \leq n$, then $K_H \varphi \in X_k$.*

PROOF Suppose there exists $k \leq n$ such that $\neg K_H \varphi \in X_k$. Let m be the maximal such k . Since $K_H \varphi \in X_n$, we have $m < n$. By Axiom 5, we get $K_H \neg K_H \varphi \in X_m$. By Axiom AxKMono, we have $K_{H_{m+1}} \neg K_H \varphi \in X_m$. By the definition of states in the canonical model, it follows that $\neg K_H \varphi \in X_{m+1}$, contradicting the maximality of m . \square

Proposition 29 *For any $s = X_0 \langle (\varphi_1, G_1), H_1 \rangle X_1 \dots \langle (\varphi_n, G_n), H_n \rangle X_n \in S^c$ and $k \leq n$, if $K_H \varphi \in X_k$ and $H \subseteq H_j$ holds for all $k < j \leq n$, then $\varphi \in X_n$.*

PROOF We show by induction on $n - k$. If $n - k = 0$, then $K_H \varphi \in X_n$. By Axiom T, we have $\varphi \in X_n$. If $n - k > 0$, by Axiom 4 and Axiom AxKMono, we get $K_{H_{k+1}} K_H \varphi \in X_k$. By the definition of states in the canonical model, it follows that $K_H \varphi \in X_{k+1}$. Since $n - (k + 1) < n - k$, $k + 1 \leq n$, $K_H \varphi \in X_{k+1}$, and

$H \subseteq H_j$ holds for all $k+1 < j \leq n$, by induction hypothesis we have $\varphi \in X_n$. \square

With Proposition 28 and 29, we can show the following key lemmas that are essential for the knowledge-that part in the Truth Lemma. Note that we will need to make use of the trivial action transition $\xrightarrow{(\top, G)}$ in the proof of the existence lemma, as mentioned earlier in this section.

Lemma 30 *If $K_H \varphi \in ed(s)$ and $s \sim_H^c s'$, then $\varphi \in ed(s')$.*

PROOF Note that \sim_H^c is defined by Definition 8 via indistinguishability relations of agents. Let $s = X_0 \langle (\varphi_1, G_1), H_1 \rangle X_1 \cdots \langle (\varphi_n, G_n), H_n \rangle X_n$ and $s' = X_0 \langle (\varphi'_1, G'_1), H'_1 \rangle X'_1 \cdots \langle (\varphi'_m, G'_m), H'_m \rangle X'_m$. If $H = \emptyset$, then since $\emptyset \subseteq H_j$ holds for all $0 < j \leq n$, by Proposition 28 we have $K_\emptyset \varphi \in X_0$. Since $\emptyset \subseteq H'_j$ holds for all $0 < j \leq m$, by Proposition 29 we have $\varphi \in X'_m = ed(s')$.

If $H \neq \emptyset$, since $s \sim_H^c s'$, for each $i \in H$ there exists an integer k_i satisfying:

- $0 \leq k_i \leq \min\{n, m\}$;
- $X_j = X'_j$ and $H_j = H'_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k_i$;
- $i \in H_j$ for $k_i < j \leq n$;
- $i \in H'_j$ for $k_i < j \leq m$.

Let $k = \max\{k_i\}_{i \in H}$. Then $X_k = X'_k$ and for each $i \in H$, $i \in H_j$ for $k < j \leq n$ and $i \in H'_j$ for $k < j \leq m$. Then $H \subseteq H_j$ holds for all $k < j \leq n$ and $H \subseteq H'_j$ holds for all $k < j \leq m$. Since $K_H \varphi \in ed(s)$, by Proposition 28, $K_H \varphi \in X_k = X'_k$. By Proposition 29, $\varphi \in X'_m = ed(s')$. \square

Lemma 31 *If $K_H \varphi \notin ed(s)$, then there exists a state $s' \in S^c$ such that $s \sim_H^c s'$ and $\varphi \notin ed(s')$.*

PROOF Let $Y_0 = \{\psi \mid K_H \psi \in ed(s)\}$. First, we prove that $Y = Y_0 \cup \{\neg \varphi\}$ is consistent. Suppose not. Then there exist $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n \in Y_0$ with $K_H \psi_1, \dots, K_H \psi_n \in ed(s)$ such that

$$\vdash (\psi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi_n) \rightarrow \varphi.$$

By NEC and Axiom DISTK, we get:

$$\vdash (K_H \psi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge K_H \psi_n) \rightarrow K_H \varphi.$$

Since $K_H \psi_1, \dots, K_H \psi_n \in ed(s)$, it follows that $K_H \varphi \in ed(s)$, contradicting the assumption $K_H \varphi \notin ed(s)$. Thus Y is consistent. By Lindenbaum's Lemma, there exists a maximal consistent set Y^* such that $Y \subseteq Y^*$. Let $s' = s \langle (\top, H), H \rangle Y^*$. To verify $s' \in S^c$, we only need to check that $K_H \psi \in ed(s)$ implies $\psi \in Y^*$ and that $K_H \top \in ed(s)$ and $K_H \top \in Y^*$, which is guaranteed by the construction of Y and the maximality of $ed(s)$ and Y^* . By definition, $s \sim_H^c s'$, making s' the desired state. \square

The following lemma is a crucial observation, which is in effect the existence lemma for Kh_G . Note that we will make use of the trivial epistemic relation \sim_\emptyset as mentioned earlier.

Lemma 32 *Let s be a state in S^c , G, H be groups such that $\emptyset \neq H \subseteq G$, (ψ, H) be an action executable on $[s]_G$. If $Kh_G \varphi \in ed(s')$ for any s' such that $[s]_G \xrightarrow{(\psi, H)} [s']_G$, then $Kh_G \varphi \in ed(s)$.*

PROOF Let $Y_0 = \{\chi \mid K_\emptyset \chi \in ed(s)\}$. We first show that $Y = Y_0 \cup \{K_H \psi, \neg Kh_G \phi\}$ is inconsistent. Suppose towards a contradiction that Y is consistent, then by Lindenbaum's Lemma, there is an MCS Y^* such that $Y \subseteq Y^*$. Let $s' = s \langle (\psi, H), \emptyset \rangle Y^*$. By the definition of Y_0 , for any $K_\emptyset \chi \in ed(s)$, we have $\chi \in ed(s')$. To verify $s' \in S^c$, we still need to show that $Kh_H \psi \in ed(s)$ and $K_H \psi \in Y^*$. Since $K_H \psi \in Y \subseteq Y^*$, we only need to show that $Kh_H \psi \in ed(s)$. Since (ψ, H) is executable on $[s]_G$, there exists $t \in S^c$ such that $s \xrightarrow{(\psi, H)} t$, then $t = s \langle (\psi, H), H' \rangle X$ where $H' \subseteq I$ and X is an MCS. Then $Kh_H \psi \in ed(s)$ and $K_H \psi \in X$. Therefore $s' \in S^c$. It follows that $s \xrightarrow{(\psi, H)} s'$, then $[s]_G \xrightarrow{(\psi, H)} [s']_G$, which is contradictory with the assumption that $Kh_G \phi \in ed(s')$ for any s' such that $[s]_G \xrightarrow{(\psi, H)} [s']_G$. Therefore $Y = Y_0 \cup \{K_H \psi, \neg Kh_G \phi\}$ is inconsistent. Then there are $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_n \in Y_0$ such that $Kh_\emptyset \chi_j \in ed(s)$ for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $\{\chi_1, \dots, \chi_n, K_H \psi, \neg Kh_G \phi\}$ is inconsistent. Then

$$\vdash (\chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \chi_n) \rightarrow (K_H \psi \rightarrow Kh_G \phi).$$

By NECK and Axiom DISTK,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow K_\emptyset (K_H \psi \rightarrow Kh_G \phi).$$

By Axiom AxEmpMono,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow K_\emptyset (Kh_H K_H \psi \rightarrow Kh_H Kh_G \phi).$$

By Axiom T,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow (Kh_H K_H \psi \rightarrow Kh_H Kh_G \phi).$$

By Axiom AxKhtoKhK,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow (Kh_H \psi \rightarrow Kh_H Kh_G \phi).$$

By Axiom AxKhMono and Axiom AxKhKh,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow (Kh_H \psi \rightarrow Kh_G \phi).$$

Since $K_\emptyset \chi_1, \dots, K_\emptyset \chi_n, Kh_H \psi \in ed(s)$, we have $Kh_G \phi \in ed(s)$. □

We are now ready to prove the Truth Lemma.

Lemma 33 (Truth Lemma) For any $\phi \in \mathbf{DKH}$ and $s \in S^c$, $\mathcal{M}^c(X_0), s \models \phi$ iff $\phi \in ed(s)$.

PROOF We show by induction on ϕ . We only show the case of $Kh_G \phi$, the other cases are straightforward.

Right to Left: Suppose that $Kh_G \phi \in ed(s)$, we show that $\mathcal{M}^c, s \models Kh_G \phi$. There are two cases: $K_G \phi \in ed(s)$ or $K_G \phi \notin ed(s)$. If $K_G \phi \in ed(s)$, then by Lemma 30, $\phi \in ed(s')$ for each $s' \in [s]_G$. By IH, $\mathcal{M}^c, s' \models \phi$ for each $s' \in [s]_G$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}^c, s \models K_G \phi$. By Axiom AxKtoKh and soundness, we have $\mathcal{M}^c, s \models Kh_G \phi$.

If $K_G \phi \notin ed(s)$, then $G \neq \emptyset$, otherwise $K_\emptyset \phi \in ed(s)$ by Axiom AxEmpKhtoK. Consider partial function $\sigma_G = \{[s]_G \mapsto (\phi, G)\}$. We need to show that (ϕ, G) is executable on $[s]_G$. Let v be a state in $[s]_G$. Since $Kh_G \phi \in ed(s)$, then $K_G Kh_G \phi \in ed(s)$ by Axiom AxKhtoKKh. By Lemma 30 and Lemma 31, $K_G Kh_G \phi \in ed(v)$. By Axiom T, $Kh_G \phi \in ed(v)$. Let $Y_0 = \{\chi \mid K_\emptyset \chi \in ed(v)\}$. We need to show that

$Y = Y_0 \cup \{K_G \varphi\}$ is consistent. Suppose not, then there are $\chi_1, \dots, \chi_n \in Y_0$ such that $\text{Kh}_\emptyset \chi_j \in \text{ed}(v)$ for each $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $\{\chi_1, \dots, \chi_n, K_G \varphi\}$ is inconsistent. Then

$$\vdash (\chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \chi_n) \rightarrow (K_G \varphi \rightarrow \perp).$$

By NECK and Axiom DISTK,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow K_\emptyset (K_G \varphi \rightarrow \perp).$$

By Axiom AxEmpMono,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow K_\emptyset (\text{Kh}_G K_G \varphi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G \perp).$$

By Axiom T,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow (\text{Kh}_G K_G \varphi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G \perp).$$

By Axiom AxKhtoKhK,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow (\text{Kh}_G \varphi \rightarrow \text{Kh}_G \perp).$$

By Axiom AxKhbot,

$$\vdash (K_\emptyset \chi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge K_\emptyset \chi_n) \rightarrow (\text{Kh}_G \varphi \rightarrow \perp).$$

Since $K_\emptyset \chi_1, \dots, K_\emptyset \chi_n, \text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(v)$, we have $\perp \in \text{ed}(v)$, which is in contradiction with the consistency of $\text{ed}(v)$. Therefore, Y is consistent.

By Lindenbaum's Lemma, there is an MCS Y^* such that $Y \subseteq Y^*$. Let $s' = v \langle (\varphi, G), \emptyset \rangle Y^*$. By the definition of Y , $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(v)$, $K_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s')$ and $\chi \in \text{ed}(s')$ for any $K_\emptyset \chi \in \text{ed}(v)$, therefore $s' \in S^c$. Then $v \xrightarrow{(\varphi, G)} s'$. Therefore (φ, G) is executable on $[s]_G$. Let $[s'']_G$ be an equivalence class such that $[s]_G \xrightarrow{(\varphi, G)} [s'']_G$, then there are $t' \in [s]_G$ and $t'' \in [s'']_G$ such that $t' \xrightarrow{(\varphi, G)} t''$. It follows that $t'' = t' \langle (\varphi, G), H \rangle X$ where $H \subseteq I$ and X is an MCS. Then $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(t')$ and $K_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(t'')$. By Lemma 30 and Lemma 31, $K_G \varphi, \varphi \in \text{ed}(t)$ for each $t \in [s'']_G$. By IH, $\mathcal{M}^c(X_0), t \models \varphi$. Moreover, since $\neg K_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s)$, it is not the case that $[s]_G \xrightarrow{(\varphi, G)} [s]_G$, then all complete executions of $\sigma_G = \{[s]_G \mapsto (\varphi, G)\}$ starting from $[s]_G$ are finite. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}^c(X_0), s \models \text{Kh}_G \varphi$.

Left to Right: Suppose that $\mathcal{M}^c(X_0), s \models \text{Kh}_G \varphi$, we show that $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s)$. By semantics, there is a strategy σ_G such that

1. $[t]_G \subseteq \llbracket \varphi \rrbracket$ for all $[t]_G \in \text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s)$, and
2. all its complete executions starting from $[s]_G$ are finite.

For each $t' \in [t]_G$, by IH, $\varphi \in \text{ed}(t')$. By Lemma 31, $K_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(t)$. By Axiom AxKtoKh, $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(t)$.

If $[s]_G \notin \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$, then $[s]_G \in \text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s)$, then $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s)$. If $[s]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$, then $G \neq \emptyset$ and $[s]_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$. In order to show that $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s)$, we will show a stronger result, that is, $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s')$ for all $[s']_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$. We firstly show the following claim:

Claim 33.1 *If there exists $[s']_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$ such that $\neg \text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s')$, then there exists an infinite execution of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$.*

Proof of Claim 33.1: Suppose that there exists $[s']_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$ such that $\neg \text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s')$. Let $X = \{[v]_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s) \mid \neg \text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(v)\}$, then $[s']_G \in X$, and for any $[v]_G \in X$, since $[v]_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$, we have $[v]_G \in \text{dom}(\sigma_G)$, then $\sigma_G([v]_G)$ is executable on $[v]_G$. By Proposition 27, $\sigma_G([v]_G) \in A_G^+$, so it has the form of (ψ, H) where $\emptyset \neq H \subseteq G$.

Define binary relation on $[S^c]_G$ as $R = \{([v]_G, [v']_G) \mid [v]_G \xrightarrow{\sigma_G([v]_G)} [v']_G\}$. For any $[v]_G \in X$, since $\neg \text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(v)$, by Lemma 32, there exists $v' \in S^c$ such that $[v]_G \xrightarrow{\sigma_G([v]_G)} [v']_G$ and $\neg \text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(v')$. Since $[v]_G \in X$, then $[v]_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$. Since $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(t)$ for all $[t]_G \in \text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s)$, then $[v']_G \notin \text{CELeaf}(\sigma_G, s)$. Since $[v]_G \xrightarrow{\sigma_G([v]_G)} [v']_G$, then $[v']_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$, then $[v']_G \in X$, then $([v]_G, [v']_G) \in R$. Therefore, R is an entire binary relation on X , that is, for each $[v]_G \in X$, there is $[v']_G \in X$ such that $([v]_G, [v']_G) \in R$. By Axiom of Dependent Choice, there exists an infinite sequence $[v_0]_G [v_1]_G \cdots$ such that $([v_n]_G, [v_{n+1}]_G) \in R$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

By definition of R , $[v_0]_G [v_1]_G \cdots$ is a complete execution of σ_G starting from $[v_0]$. Since all complete execution of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$ are finite and $[v_0]_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$, there exists an execution of σ_G $[s_0]_G \cdots [s_j]_G$ ($j \in \mathbb{N}$) such that $[s_0]_G = [s]_G$ and $[s_j]_G = [v_0]_G$. Then $[s_0]_G \cdots [s_j]_G [v_1]_G \cdots$ is an infinite execution of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$. ■

For any $[s']_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$, suppose that $\neg \text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s')$. By Claim 33.1, there exists an infinite execution of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$, which is in contradiction with all complete execution of σ_G starting from $[s]_G$ are finite. Therefore, $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s')$ for all $[s']_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$. Since $[s]_G \in \text{CEInner}(\sigma_G, s)$, we have $\text{Kh}_G \varphi \in \text{ed}(s)$. □

Theorem 34 *SDKH is strongly complete.*

5 Conclusions and future work

In this paper, we propose a framework of group knowledge-how, featuring the distributed actions of groups that can come from three sources. The framework can be viewed as a generalization of both the planning-based approach and the coalition-based approach to the logic of knowing how. We give a sound and complete proof system of the logic with intuitive axioms. We leave the discussions on the decidability and model-theoretical properties to a future occasion.

There are many further directions to explore based on this very general framework. One interesting direction is to consider subclasses of the models and study their corresponding logics. For example, one may want to consider the case when the atomic group actions are all empty except the singleton ones, which will bring our framework closer to the setting of coalition logic and (epistemic) ATL such as [18, 19, 11, 12]. Conceptually, this also makes sense if one really wants the distributed knowledge-how to be always decomposable into individual know-how. It will also help us to better understand the differences and connections with other related existing frameworks.

One may notice that in our current setting, a joint action consisting of multiple subgroups doing the same action is equivalent to a single subgroup doing it,⁷ e.g., the transition relation of $\langle a, a \rangle$ is the intersection of \xrightarrow{a} and itself, which is exactly \xrightarrow{a} . This is different from the ATL-like frameworks, where the effect of the joint action $\langle a, a \rangle$ can be different from a [13, 5]. This invites us to extend our work in a non-trivial way to handle resource-sensitive settings where the number of individuals performing the same action matters. We may also add more structure to groups or consider intensional groups as

⁷It is similar in the setting of STIT logic, where “actions” are formalized as possible outcomes [4].

discussed in [3]. Also, the members of the groups may not be equal in their roles as in [6]. In particular, an interesting direction to explore is the possibility that each group has a leader who can plan the actions of the members. The commitments and communication among the leaders may help the groups synchronize better.

Given our discussions on extra group actions which cannot be reduced to the individual actions, it may be interesting to find out whether this can be applied to distributed knowledge-that as well: the epistemic relation \sim_G is not defined by the intersection of the individual ones but just a subset of it. More precisely, in addition to distributed knowledge where $\sim_G = \bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i$, through brainstorming, a group can be smarter than the mere union of individuals, so $\bigcap_{i \in G} \sim_i \subseteq \sim_G$ does not necessarily hold. However, we think the logic stays the same.

Finally, inspired by various versions of distributed knowledge-how, e.g., [10, 2], we may also consider other definitions of distributed knowledge-how that incorporate dynamics as well.

Acknowledgment The authors thank Yanjun Li and Pavel Naumov for their comments and discussions about earlier versions of the paper and related topics. The authors are also grateful to the anonymous reviewers, whose comments improved the presentation of the paper.

References

- [1] Thomas Ågotnes & Yi N. Wáng (2017): *Resolving distributed knowledge*. *Artif. Intell.* 252, pp. 1–21, doi:10.1016/j.artint.2017.07.002.
- [2] Philippe Balbiani & Hans van Ditmarsch (2024): *Towards Dynamic Distributed Knowledge*. In Agata Ciabattoni, David Gabelaia & Igor Sedlár, editors: *Proceedings of AiML 2024*, College Publications, pp. 125–146. Available at <https://hal.science/hal-04712434>.
- [3] Marta Bílková & Igor Sedlár (2023): *Epistemic Logics of Structured Intensional Groups*. In Rineke Verbrugge, editor: *Proceedings of TARK2023, EPTCS* 379, pp. 113–130, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.379.11.
- [4] Jan Broersen & Andreas Herzig (2015): *Using STIT Theory to Talk About Strategies*, pp. 137–173. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48540-8_5.
- [5] Nils Bulling, Valentin Goranko & Wojciech Jamroga (2015): *Logics for Reasoning About Strategic Abilities in Multi-player Games*, pp. 93–136. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48540-8_4.
- [6] Barbara Dunin-Keplicz & Rineke Verbrugge (2004): *A Tuning Machine for Cooperative Problem Solving*. *Fundam. Inf.* 63(2–3), p. 283–307. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220444551_A_Tuning_Machine_for_Cooperative_Problem_Solving.
- [7] R Fagin, J Halpern, Y Moses & M Vardi (1995): *Reasoning about knowledge*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, doi:10.7551/mitpress/5803.001.0001.
- [8] Jie Fan, Davide Grossi, Barteld Kooi, Xingchi Su & Rineke Verbrugge (2021): *Commonly Knowing Whether*. arXiv:2001.03945.
- [9] Raul Fervari, Andreas Herzig, Yanjun Li & Yanjing Wang (2017): *Strategically Knowing How*. In Carles Sierra, editor: *Proceedings of IJCAI 2017*, pp. 1031–1038, doi:10.24963/ijcai.2017/143.
- [10] Rustam Galimullin & Louwe B. Kuijter (2024): *Varieties of Distributed Knowledge*. In: *Proceedings of AiML 2024*, College Publications, pp. 379–400. Available at <https://rgalimullin.gitlab.io/AiML24/DK.pdf>.
- [11] Wiebe van der Hoek & Michael Wooldridge (2003): *Cooperation, Knowledge, and Time: Alternating-Time Temporal Epistemic Logic and its Applications*. *Studia Logica* 75(1), pp. 125–157, doi:10.1023/a:1026185103185.

- [12] Wojciech Jamroga & Thomas Ågotnes (2007): *Constructive knowledge: what agents can achieve under imperfect information*. *J. Appl. Non Class. Logics* 17(4), pp. 423–475, doi:10.3166/JANCL.17.423-475.
- [13] Wojciech Jamroga & Wiebe van der Hoek (2004): *Agents that Know How to Play*. *Fundamenta informaticae* 63(2-3), pp. 185–219. Available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220444694>.
- [14] Yanjun Li & Yanjing Wang (2019): *Multi-agent Knowing How via Multi-step Plans: A Dynamic Epistemic Planning Based Approach*. In: *Proceedings of LORI2019, Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 11813, Springer, pp. 126–139, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-60292-8_10.
- [15] Yanjun Li & Yanjing Wang (2021): *Planning-based knowing how: A unified approach*. *Artif. Intell.* 296, p. 103487, doi:10.1016/j.artint.2021.103487.
- [16] Yanjun Li & Yanjing Wang (2024): *Knowing how to plan about planning: Higher-order and meta-level epistemic planning*. *Artif. Intell.* 337, p. 104233, doi:10.1016/j.artint.2024.104233.
- [17] Yanjun Li, Quan Yu & Yanjing Wang (2017): *More for free: a dynamic epistemic framework for conformant planning over transition systems*. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 27(8), pp. 2383–2410, doi:10.1093/logcom/exx020.
- [18] Pavel Naumov & Jia Tao (2017): *Together We Know How to Achieve: An Epistemic Logic of Know-How (Extended Abstract)*. In Jérôme Lang, editor: *Proceedings of TARK 2017*, 251, pp. 441–453, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.251.32.
- [19] Pavel Naumov & Jia Tao (2018): *Together we know how to achieve: An epistemic logic of know-how*. *Artificial Intelligence* 262, pp. 279–300, doi:10.1016/j.artint.2018.06.007.
- [20] Rasmus Rendsvig, John Symons & Yanjing Wang (2024): *Epistemic Logic*. In Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman, editors: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer 2024 edition, Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. Available at <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/logic-epistemic/>.
- [21] Xingchi Su (2017): *Distributed Knowing Whether*. In Alexandru Baltag, Jeremy Seligman & Tomoyuki Yamada, editors: *Proceedings of LORI 2017*, pp. 653–657, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-55665-8_47.
- [22] Yanjing Wang (2015): *A Logic of Knowing How*. In: *Proceedings of LORI-V*, pp. 392–405, doi:10.1007/978-3-662-48561-3_32.
- [23] Yanjing Wang (2018): *Beyond knowing that: a new generation of epistemic logics*. In: Jaakko Hintikka on knowledge and game theoretical semantics, Springer, Cham, pp. 499–533, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-62864-6_21.
- [24] Yanjing Wang (2018): *A logic of goal-directed knowing how*. *Synthese* 195(10), pp. 4419–4439, doi:10.1007/s11229-016-1272-0.