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ABSTRACT

In game theory, as well as in the semantics of game logics, a strategy can be represented by any function from states of the game to the agent’s actions. That makes sense from the mathematical point of view, but not necessarily in the context of human behavior. This is because humans are quite bad at executing complex plans, and also rather unlikely to come up with such plans in the first place. In this paper, we adopt the view of bounded rationality, and look only at “simple” strategies in specifications of agents’ abilities. We formally define what “simple” means, and propose a variant of alternating-time temporal logic that takes only such strategies into account. We also study the model checking problem for the resulting semantics of ability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Logics for strategic reasoning provide powerful tools to reason about multi-agent systems [7, 42, 40, 30, 21, 34]. The logics allow to express properties of agents’ behavior and its dynamics, driven by their individual and collective goals. An important factor here is interaction between the agents, which can be cooperative as well as adversarial. Specifications in agent logics can be then used as input to model checking [22, 38], which makes it possible to verify the correct behavior of a multi-agent system using recently developed practical automatic tools [33, 19, 20].

A fundamental contribution in this field is Alternating-Time Temporal Logic (ATL*) and its fragment ATL [7]. ATL* formulas are usually interpreted over concurrent game structures (CGS) which are labeled state-transition systems that model synchronous interaction among agents. For example, given a CGS modeling a system with $k$ agents and a shared resource, the ATL formula $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle F$ grants expresses the fact that the set of agents $A$ can ensure that, regardless of the actions of the other agents, an access to the resource will be eventually granted. The specification holds if agents in $A$ have a collective strategy whose every execution path satisfies $F$ grant. As in game theory, strategies are understood as conditional plans, and play a central role in reasoning about purposeful agents.

Formally, strategies in ATL* (as well as in other logics of strategic reasoning, such as Strategy Logic [21, 34]) are defined as functions from sequences of system states (i.e., possible histories of the game) to actions. A simpler notion of positional a.k.a. memoryless strategies is formally defined by functions from states to actions.

That makes sense from a mathematical point of view, and also in case we think of strategic ability of a machine (robot, computer program). We claim, however, that the approach is not very realistic for reasoning about human behavior. This is because humans are very bad at handling combinatorially complex objects. A human strategy should be relatively simple and “intuitive” or “natural” in order for the person to understand it, memorize it, and execute it. This applies even more if the human agent has to come up with the strategy on its own.

In this paper, we adopt the view of bounded rationality, and look only at strategies whose complexity does not exceed a given bound. In this way we put a limit on the resources needed to represent and use the strategy. More precisely, we introduce NatATL*, a logic that extends ATL* by replacing the strategic operator $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \varphi$ with a bounded version $\langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \varphi^k$ where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the complexity bound. To measure the complexity of strategies, we assume that they are represented by lists of guarded actions. For memoryless strategies, guards are boolean propositional formulas. For strategies with recall, guards are given as regular expressions over boolean propositional formulas. As technical results, we study the problem of model checking NatATL for both memoryless and memoryfull strategies. The complexity ranges from $\Delta^2_P$ to $\Delta^3_P$ in the general case, and from $P$ to $\Delta^2_P$ for small complexity bounds.

Related Works. ATL* has been the subject of intensive research within multi-agent systems and AI. Works that are closest in spirit to our proposal concern modeling, specification, and reasoning about strategies of bounded agents. The papers that studied explicit representation of strategies are also relevant.

In the former group, [2] investigates strategic properties of agents with bounded memory, while [5, 6, 15, 16] extend temporal and strategic logics to handle agents with bounded resources. Issues related to bounded rationality are also investigated in [10, 28, 25].

The latter category is much richer and includes extensions of ATL* with explicit reasoning about actions and strategies [41, 1, 44, 27], and logics that combine features of temporal and dynamic logic [26, 35]. A variant of STIT logic that enables reasoning about strategies and their performance in the object language [24]. Also, plans in agent-oriented programming are in fact rule-based descriptions of strategies. In particular, reasoning about agent programs using strategic logics was investigated in [12, 3, 4, 23, 45].

None of those works considers directly the subject of this paper, i.e., logic-based reasoning about agents’ abilities in scenarios where natural representation and reasonable complexity of strategies is essential.

2. A LOGIC FOR NATURAL ABILITY

In this section we introduce all ingredients to define NatATL, a logic for reasoning about natural strategic ability.
EXAMPLE 1 (Motivating examples). The main application domain that we have in mind is reasoning about usability. Consider, e.g., a ticket vending machine at a railway station. Intuitively, it is not enough that a customer has a strategy to successfully buy the right ticket. If the strategy is too complex, most people will be unable to follow it, and the machine will be practically useless.

Another application area is gaming, where one could define the game level by the complexity of the smallest winning strategy. In both cases, we need to understand what it means for a strategy to be “simple” or “complex”, and to relate our definition of strategic ability to this complexity measure.

We begin by presenting the syntax of NatATL. Then, we recall how to model multi-agent systems by means of concurrent game structures. Further, we show how to define natural memoryless strategies based on guarded actions. Finally, we propose the formal semantics of NatATL formulas.

2.1 Syntax

Alternating-time temporal logic (ATL, for short) [7] generalizes branching-time temporal logic CTL* by replacing path quantifiers E, A with strategic modality ⟨⟨A⟩⟩. Informally, ⟨⟨A⟩⟩γ reads “there exists a strategy for the coalition A such that, no matter how the other players will act, the formula γ is satisfied.” Natural ATL (NatATL, for short) is obtained by replacing in ATL the modality ⟨⟨A⟩⟩ with the bounded strategic modality ⟨⟨A⟩⟩≤ k. Intuitively, ⟨⟨A⟩⟩≤ kγ reads as coalition A has a collective strategy of size less or equal than k to enforce the property γ. As for ATL, the formulas of NatATL make use of classical temporal operators: “X” (in the next state), “G” (“always (from now on)”), “F” (“now or sometime in the future”), U (strong “until”), and W (weak “until”).

Formally, let A be a finite set of agents and Prop a countable set of atomic propositions. The language of NatATL is defined as follows:

\[ \varphi ::= p | \neg \varphi | \varphi \land \varphi | \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \leq k \varphi \ | \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \leq k \varphi \land \varphi \ | \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \leq k \varphi \land \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \leq k \varphi \land \varphi \ | \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \leq k \varphi \land \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle \leq k \varphi \land \varphi \]

where A ⊆ A, k ∈ N, and p ∈ Prop. Derived boolean connectives and constants (V, T, ⊥) are defined as usual. “Sometime” and “always” can be defined as Fγ ≡ T U γ and Gγ ≡ γ W T.

Additionally, 1NatATL will denote the fragment of NatATL that admits only formulas consisting of a single strategic modality, followed by a temporal formula over boolean connectives and atomic propositions.

2.2 Concurrent Game Structures

The semantics of NatATL is defined over concurrent game structures [7].

DEFINITION 1 (CGS). A concurrent game structure (CGS) is a tuple M = ⟨A, St, Act, d, t, Prop, V⟩ which includes nonempty finite sets of: agents A = {a1, ..., a|A|}, states St, actions Act, atomic propositions Prop, and a propositional valuation V : St → 2Prop. The function d : A × St → 2Act defines availability of actions. The (deterministic) transition function t assigns a successor state s′ = t(q, a1, ..., a|A|) to each state q ∈ St and any tuple of actions a1 ∈ d(a1, q) that can be executed by A in q.

In the rest of the paper, we will write dα(q) instead of d(a, q), and we will denote the set of collective choice of group A at state q by dA(q) = \{\prod_{a_i \in \alpha} dα_i(q)\}.

A pointed CGS is a pair (M, q0) consisting of a concurrent game structure M and an initial state q0 in M.

A path λ = q0q1q2 ... in a CGS is an infinite sequence of states such that there is a transition between each qi, qi+1. λ[i] denotes the ith position on λ, λ[i, j] the part of λ between positions i and j, and λ[i, ∞] the suffix of λ starting with i. We denote with Δ the set of all paths. Similarly, a history h = q0q1q2 ... qn is a finite sequence of states that can be effected by subsequent transitions. By last(h) = qn we denote the last element of the sequence. We denote by H = St+ the set of all the histories in the model.

2.3 Strategies and Their Complexity

To properly interpret NatATL formulas, we introduce the concept of natural strategies and their outcomes over a CGS. Following Schobbens [40], we distinguish between strategies with and without the recall of the hitherto history of the game. We will use R to refer to the semantics of strategic ability arising for strategies with recall, and r for strategies without recall. In this section, we show how natural strategies without recall can be defined. The other kind of strategies is proposed and studied in Section 4.

We start by defining a natural memoryless strategy (or r-strategy) sα for agent a. The idea is to use a rule-based representation, with a list of condition-action rules. The first rule whose condition holds in the current state is selected, and the corresponding action is executed. We formally represent it with lists of guarded actions, i.e., sequences of pairs (β(2Prop), α) such that β(2Prop) is a boolean combination over possible subsets of Prop and α is an action in dα(q) for every q ∈ St such that q |− β(2Prop), i.e. q satisfies β(2Prop) w.r.t. the propositional evaluation V. We assume that the last pair on the list is (T, idle), i.e., the last rule is guarded by a condition that will always be satisfied. The set of all natural memoryless strategies is denoted by Σα. By size(sα), we denote the number of guarded actions in sα. Moreover, condα(sα) will denote the kth guard (condition) on the list, and actα(sα) the corresponding action. Finally, match(q, sα) is the smallest n ≤ size(sα) such that q |− condα(sα) and actα(sα) is dα(q). That is, match(q, sα) matches state q with the first condition in sα that holds in q, and action available in q.

By compl(sα), we denote the complexity of the strategy sα. Intuitively, the complexity of a strategy is understood as the level of sophistication of its representation. Several natural metrics can be used to measure the complexity of a strategy, given its representation from (β(2Prop) × Act)+, e.g.:

- Number of used propositions: \( \text{compl}_p(s\alpha) = |\{p ∈ Prop | p ∈ \text{dom}(s\alpha)\}| \)
- Largest condition: \( \text{compl}_{\max}(s\alpha) = \max |\{φ | (φ, α) ∈ s\alpha\} | \)
- Total size of the representation: \( \text{compl}_L(s\alpha) = \sum_{(φ, α) ∈ s\alpha} |φ| \)

with |φ| being the number of symbols in φ. From now on, we will focus on the last metric for complexity of strategies, which takes into account the total size of all the conditions used in the representation.

EXAMPLE 2. Consider the following r-strategy s:

1. (!ticket ∧ !selected, select);
2. (!ticket ∧ selected, pay);
3. (T, idle).

If we look at the number of used propositions, we have that compl_p(s) = |{ticket, selected}| = 2. If we consider the largest condition instead, we have compl_{max}(s) = 5. Finally, if we use the total size of the representation, we get compl_L(s) = 10.1

1 We leave it as an exercise to the interested reader to construct an equivalent strategy with compl_L(s) = 8.
A collective natural strategy for agents $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_{|A|}\}$ is a tuple of individual natural strategies $s_A = (s_{a_1}, \ldots, s_{a_{|A|}})$. The set of such strategies is denoted by $\Sigma^A$. The “outcome” function $\text{out}(q, s_A)$ returns the set of all paths that occur when agents $A$ execute strategy $s_A$ from state $q$ onward. Formally, given a state $q \in S$, a subset of agents $A$ and a collective memoryless strategy $s_A$, we define:

$$\text{out}(q, s_A) = \{ \lambda \in A \mid (\lambda[0] = q) \wedge \forall i \geq 0 \exists a_i, \ldots, a_{|A|} : (a \in A \Rightarrow \alpha_a = \text{act}_m(\lambda[i], s_a(a_{a_i}))) \wedge (a \notin A \Rightarrow \alpha_a = d_a(\lambda[i])) \wedge (\lambda[i + 1] = t(\lambda[i], a_1, \ldots, a_{|A|}))\}.$$

2.4 Semantics of NatATL

Given a CGS $M$, a state $q \in S$, a path $\lambda \in A$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the semantics of NatATL is defined as follows:

$$M, q \models \varphi \text{ iff } p \in V(q), \text{ for } p \in \text{Prop};$$

$$M, q \models \neg \varphi \text{ iff } M, q \not\models \varphi;$$

$$M, q \models \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \text{ iff } M, q \models \varphi_1 \text{ and } M, q \models \varphi_2;$$

$$M, q \models \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\leq k} \varphi \text{ iff } there is a strategy } s_A \in \Sigma^A \text{ such that } \text{compl}(s_A) \leq k \text{ and, for each path } \lambda \in \text{out}(q, s_A), \text{ we have } M, \lambda[1] \models \varphi;$$

$$M, q \models \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\leq k} \varphi \text{ iff there is a strategy } s_A \in \Sigma^A \text{ such that } \text{compl}(s_A) \leq k \text{ and, for each path } \lambda \in \text{out}(q, s_A), \text{ we have } M, \lambda[i] \models \varphi \text{ for all } i \geq 0;$$

$$M, q \models \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\leq k} \varphi \text{ iff there is a strategy } s_A \in \Sigma^A \text{ such that } \text{compl}(s_A) \leq k \text{ and, for each path } \lambda \in \text{out}(q, s_A), \text{ we have } M, \lambda[j] \models \varphi \text{ for some } i \geq 0 \text{ and } M, \lambda[j] \models \varphi \text{ for all } 0 \leq j < i.$$

Example 3. When designing a game, the designer can define the game level by the complexity of the smallest winning strategy for the player. Using NatATL, we can say that the level of game $G$ is $k$ iff $G \models \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\leq k} \varphi$.

We will refer to the logical system (NatATL, $\models$) as NatATL$^r$, and analogously for 1NatATL$^r$.

3. MODEL CHECKING FOR NATURAL MEMORYLESS STRATEGIES

In this section we show how to solve the model checking problem for NatATL with r-strategies, i.e. 1NatATL$^r$. We start with the simpler case in which the bound of the strategies is given as a constant and prove that the model checking problem is polynomial in the size of the game structure. Then, we consider the case in which the bound $k$ is a variable and prove that the model checking problem becomes $\Delta^P_2$-complete. Regarding this latter case, we also investigate the setting in which NatATL$^r$ formulas have only one strategic operator, i.e. 1NatATL$^r$, and show that the model checking problem turns out to be NP-complete. The results and the proofs presented in this section have been inspired by [40, 29].

3.1 Model Checking for Small Strategies

We begin by looking at the model checking of NatATL$^r$ formulas with constant bounds on the strategy modalities. Under this restriction, one can show a polynomial reduction to the model checking problem for CTL formulas. Thus, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1. The model checking problem for NatATL$^r$, with fixed $k$ is in P.

Proof. First, consider the formula $\varphi = \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\leq k} \gamma$, in which $A \subseteq A$ and $\gamma$ is a formula over boolean connectives and atomic propositions. By assumption, the collective strategy that we can assign to coalition $A$, namely $s_A$, is bounded and precisely it holds that $\text{compl}_A(s_A) \leq k$. Thus, we have $O(|\text{Prop}|^k)$ possible kinds of guarded actions and so $O(|\text{Prop}|^k) = O(|\text{Prop}|^k)$ possible lists. Given the collective strategy $s_A$, we can prune the CGS by removing all edges that disagree with $s_A$. This operation costs, in the worst case, $O(|t|)$, where $t$ is the transition relation of the input CGS. So far we have solved the strategic operator of the input formula $\varphi$ and we are left with a structure $S$ that can be seen as a Kripke structure. Now, we can reduce our problem to model checking the CTL formula $\varphi_\gamma$ (“for all paths $\gamma$”) over $S$ by using the standard model checking algorithm for CTL [22], well-known to have complexity $O(|t| \cdot |\gamma|)$. The total complexity is thus $O(|\text{Prop}|^k \cdot (|t| + |t| \cdot |\gamma|)) = O(|\text{Prop}|^k \cdot |t| \cdot |\gamma|)$, and hence polynomial in the size of the model.

To conclude the proof, note that if we have a formula with more strategic operators then we can use a classic bottom-up procedure, i.e. we start solving the innermost formula having a strategic operator (as we have done above) and, once this is solved, we update the formula and the structure and continue with the new innermost formula. The procedure ends on dealing with the outermost strategic operator of the input formula.

3.2 Model Checking: General Case

We now study the complexity for NatATL with the bound of the strategic modalities given as variables. We consider two different cases: formulas with a single strategic operator followed by a simple temporal subformula, and formulas with possibly nested strategic operators. For the former case we show an NP procedure, and by a reduction from SAT that the problem is NP-complete. For the latter case we show a $\Delta^P_2$ procedure and by a reduction from SNSAT the $\Delta^P_2$-completeness.

Theorem 2. Model checking 1NatATL$^r$ is in NP.

Proof. Consider $\varphi = \langle\langle A \rangle\rangle^{\leq k} \gamma$, in which $A \subseteq A$ and $\gamma$ is a formula over boolean connectives and atomic propositions. By assumption, we can use strategies with no a priori bounded size. To overcome this, to construct a collective strategy $s_A$ we use an oracle that returns a collective strategy for $A$. We can now conclude by using the same reasoning done in the proof of Theorem 1. In particular, since we use an oracle over a polynomial algorithm the overall complexity is NP.

We continue by showing a matching lower bound by means of a reduction from the well-known SAT problem. We first provide the reduction and then show that it is correct in Theorem 3. In SAT, the main ingredients are a CNF formula $\varphi = C_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge C_n$ and $m$ propositional variables from a set $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$. Each clause $C_i$ can be written as $C_i = x_i^{(i,1)} \wedge \ldots \wedge x_i^{(i,m)}$, where $s(i, j) \in \{+1, -1\}$; $x_i^{(i,m)}$ denotes a positive occurrence of $x_i$ in $C_i$, $x_i^{(i,j)}$ denotes an occurrence of $x_i$ in $C_i$, and $x_i^{(i,0)}$ indicates that $x_i$ does not occur in $C_i$. The SAT problem asks if there exists $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$ such that $\varphi$ holds. We construct the corresponding CGS $M_{\varphi}$ as follows. There are two players: verifier $v$ and refuter $r$. The state space contains an initial state $q_0$, a state for each clause $C_i$ in $\varphi$, a state for each literal in $C_i$ and the state $q_{\top}$. The set of $Prop$ is $\{C_1, \ldots, C_n, x_1, \ldots, x_m, win\}$. Furthermore, we label each state clause/variable with its proposition and $q_{\top}$ with win. The flow of the game is defined as follows. The refuter decides at the beginning of the game which clause $C_i$ will have to be satisfied; it is done by proceeding from the initial
state $q_0$ to a clause state $q_1$. At $q_1$, verifier decides (by proceeding to a proposition state $q_{i,j}$) which of the literals $x_j^{i,j}$ from $C_i$ will be attempted. Finally, at $q_{i,j}$, verifier attempts to prove $C_i$ by declaring the underlying propositional variable $x_j$ true (action $\top$) or false (action $\bot$). If $v$ succeeds (i.e., if it executes $\top$ for $x_j$, or executes $\bot$ for $x_j$), then the system proceeds to the winning state $q_T$. Otherwise, the system stays in $q_{i,j}$. It is important to note that by definitions of $Prop$ and $V$, we know that $v$ can use just one action (i.e., truth value) for each variable. This is due to the fact that we use as strategies the actions that are determined directly from the atomic proposition instead from states.

Formally, $M_\varphi = (A, St, Act, d, t, Prop, V)$, where:

- $A = \{v, r\}$,
- $St = \{q_0\} \cup St_{cl} \cup St_{prop} \cup \{q_T\}$, where $St_{cl} = \{q_1, \ldots, q_n\}$, and $St_{prop} = \{q_{1,1}, \ldots, q_{i,j}, m, \ldots, q_{n,n, m}\}$;
- $Act = \{I, C_1, \ldots, C_n, x_1, \ldots, x_m, \top, \bot\}$;
- $d(v, q_0) = d(v, q_T) = \{I\}$, $d(v, q_i) = \{x_j | x_j \in C_i\}$, and $d(v, q_{i,j}) = \{\top, \bot\}$;
- $t(s, q_I, C_1) = q_1$, $t(q_1, x_1, I) = q_{1,1}$, $t(q_i, j, \top, I) = q_T$ if $s(i, j) = +$, and $q_i$ otherwise; $t(q_i, j, \bot, I) = q_\bot$ if $s(i, j) = -$;
- $Prop = \{C_1, \ldots, C_n, x_1, \ldots, x_m, \text{win}\}$;
- $V(q_0) = \emptyset$, $V(q_i) = C_i$, $V(q_{i,j}) = x_j$, and $V(q_T) = \text{win}$;

where $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$.

As an example, model $M_\varphi$ for $\varphi = (x_1 \lor x_3) \land (x_2 \lor \neg x_3)$ is presented in Figure 1.

**Theorem 3.** $SAT(n, m, \varphi)$ iff $M_{\varphi, q_0} \models \langle v \rangle \leq n + m F \text{win}$

**Proof.** ($\Rightarrow$) Firstly, if there is a valuation $v$ that makes $\varphi$ true, then for every clause $C_i$, one can choose a literal out of $C_i$ that is made true by the valuation $v$. Now, we can construct a strategy for $v$ such that: (i) for each clause $C_i$, we define a guarded action $(C_i, \alpha)$, where $\alpha$ is the action to go at the state literal that satisfy $C_i$ in accordance with $v$; and (ii) for each literal $x_j$, we define a guarded action $(x_j, \alpha)$, where $\alpha$ is the action to go in $q_T$ in accordance with $v$. Conversely, if $M_{\varphi, q_0} \models \langle v \rangle \leq n + m F \text{win}$, then there is a strategy $s_v$ such that $q_T$ is achieved for all paths from out($q_0, s_v$). But then the valuation, which assigns propositions $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ with the same values as $s_v$, satisfies $\varphi$. □

By Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, the following result holds.

**Corollary 1.** Model checking 1NatATL$_t$ is $NP$-complete.

Now, we show how to solve the model checking problem for any formula in NatATL$_t$.

**Theorem 4.** Model checking 1NatATL$_t$ is in $\Delta^P_2$.

**Proof.** We make use of a bottom-up procedure based on the one introduced in the proof of Theorem 1. Precisely, take an arbitrary formula $\varphi$ of NatATL, and consider its inner part that is of the kind $\psi = \llbracket A \rrbracket^{\leq k}_\gamma$, with $\gamma$ being a formula over boolean connectives and atomic propositions. Now, apply over $\psi$ the procedure used in the proof of Theorem 2 that we know to be $NP$. Once $\psi$ is solved, use the same $NP$ procedure to solve $\psi'$, a formula that contains $\psi$ and a strategic operator, and so on for each strategic operator in $\varphi$. This means that we use an oracle over a polynomial procedure for each strategic operator in $\varphi$. Summing up, the total complexity to solve a formula in NatATL$_t$ is $P^{NP} = \Delta^P_2$. □

We now turn on the lower bound and show a reduction from the SNSAT problem, a well-known $\Delta^P_2$-hard problem. We first provide the reduction and then prove that it is correct.

**Definition 2.** Given a fixed number $r$ and $1 \leq i \leq r$, a SNSAT instance is defined as follows:

- $r$ sets of propositional variables $X_i = \{x_{1,i}, \ldots, x_{m,i}\}$;
- $r$ propositional variables $z_i$;
- $r$ Boolean formulas $\varphi_i$ involving only on variables in $X_i \cup \{z_1, \ldots, z_{i-1}\}$;
- $z_i \equiv$ there exists an assignment of variables in $X_i$ such that $\varphi_i$ is true.

The output of an SNSAT instance is the truth-value of $z_r$. Note that we can write, by abuse of notation, $z_i \equiv \exists X_i \varphi_i(z_1, \ldots, z_{i-1}, X_i)$. Let $n$ be the maximal number of clauses in any $\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_r$ from the given input. Now, each $\varphi_i$ can be written as:

$\varphi_i = C_{i1} \land \ldots \land C_{ir}$, and

$C_{ij} = x_{1,i}^{j,1} \lor \ldots \lor x_{m,i}^{j,m} \lor x_1^{j,1+i} \lor \ldots \lor x_{n,i}^{j,1+i}$

where $1 \leq j \leq n$, $s_i(j, k) \in \{+,-,0\}$ with $1 \leq k \leq m$; as before, $x_{k,i}$ denotes a positive occurrence of $x_k$ in $C_{ij}$; $x_{k,i}$ denotes an occurrence of $\neg x_k$ in $C_{ij}$, and $x_{k,i}^0$ indicates that $x_k,i$ does not occur in $C_{ij}$, and $s_i(j, k) \in \{+,-,0\}$ with $m < k < m + i$; defines the sign of $z_{k-m}$ in $C_{ij}$.

Given such an instance of SNSAT, we construct a sequence of concurrent game structures $M_i$ in a similar way to the construction used for the reduction from SAT. That is, clauses and variables $x_{k,i}$ are handled in exactly the same way as before. Moreover, if $z_i$, with $1 \leq h < i$, occurs as a positive literal in $\varphi_i$, we embed $M_h$ in $M_i$, and add a transition to the initial state $q_{0i}^h$ of $M_i$. If $\neg z_i$ occurs in $\varphi_i$, we do almost the same: the only difference is that we split the transition into two steps, with a state $neg_{q_{0i}^h}$ (labeled with a proposition neg) added in between. More formally, $M_i = (A, St^i, Act^i, d^i, t^i, Prop^i, V^i)$, where:

- $A = \{v, r\}$,
- $St^i = \{q_0^i\} \cup St_{cl} \cup St_{prop} \cup St_{neg} \cup \{q_T\} \cup St^{i-1}$, where $St_{cl} = \{q_1^i, \ldots, q_n^i\}$, $St_{prop} = \{q_{1,1}^i, \ldots, q_{i,j}^i, m, \ldots, q_{n,n, m}^i\}$, and $St_{neg} = \{neg_1^i, \ldots, neg_{i-1}^i\}$.
Before we prove the hardness, we state an important lemma. It says that overlong formulas \( \phi \) do not introduce new properties of model \( M_i \), with \( 1 \leq i \leq r \). More precisely, a formula \( \phi \) that includes more nestings than model \( M_i \) can be as well reduced to \( \phi_{i-1} \) when model checked in \( M_i, q_0^i \).

**Lemma 1.** \( \forall 1 \leq i \leq r : M_i, q_0^i \models \phi_i \iff M_i, q_0^i \models \phi_{i-1}. \)

The proof of the lemma is a straightforward adaptation of [29, Lemma 5].

**Theorem 5.** \( \forall 1 \leq i \leq r : z_i \) is true iff \( M_i, q_0^i \models \phi_i \)

**Proof.** Induction on \( i \):

(i) For \( i = 1 \), we use the proof of Theorem 3.

(ii) For \( i > 1 \), we prove both directions.

(\( \Rightarrow \)) Firstly, if \( z_i \) is true then there is a valuation \( v \) of \( X_i \) that makes \( \phi_i \) true. We construct \( s_v \) as in the proof of Theorem 3. In case that some \( x_{j,k}^i \) has been chosen in clause \( C_j^i \), then we define the guarded action \( (C_j^i, x_{j,k}^i) \) and we are done. In case that some \( z_h^i \) has been chosen in clause \( C_j^i \), where \( h < i \), we have (by induction) that \( M_h, q_0^h \models \neg \phi_h \). By Lemma 1, also \( M_i, q_0^i \models \neg \phi_h \), and hence \( M_i, q_0^i \models \neg \phi_i \). So we can make the same choice (i.e., we define the guarded action \( (C_j^i, x_{j,k}^i) \) in \( s_v \), and this will lead to state \( neg_h^j \), in which it holds that \( \neg \phi \wedge AX \neg \phi_i \). In case that some \( x_{j,k}^i \) has been chosen in clause \( C_j^i \), we have that \( M_h, q_0^h \models \phi_h \). By Lemma 1, also \( M_i, q_0^i \models \phi_i \). That is, there is a strategy \( s_v \) in \( M_h \), such that \((\neg \phi) U (\phi \wedge AX \neg \phi_i)\) holds for all paths from \( out(q_0^i, s_v^i) \). Then, we can merge \( s_v \) into \( s_v \).

(\( \Leftarrow \)) Conversely, if \( M_i, q_0^i \models \phi_i \), then there is a strategy \( s_v \) that enforces \((\neg \phi) U (\phi \wedge AX \neg \phi_i)\). First, we consider the clause \( C_j^i \) with guarded action \((C_j^i, x_{j,k}^i)\), i.e., for which a propositional state is chosen by \( s_v \). The strategy defines a valuation for \( X_j \) that satisfies these clauses. For the other clauses, i.e., there is a guarded action \((C_j^i, z_h^i)\), we have two possibilities:

- \( s_v \) chooses \( q_0^j \) in the state corresponding to \( C_j^i \). Neither \( \neg \phi_i \) nor \( \phi_i \) have been encountered on this path yet, so we can take \( s_v \) to demonstrate that \( M_i, q_0^i \models \phi_i \) and hence \( M_h, q_0^h \models \phi_i \). By Lemma 1, also \( M_i, q_0^i \models \phi_i \). By induction, \( \phi_h \) must be true, and hence clause \( C_j^i \) is satisfied.

- \( s_v \) chooses \( neg_h^j \) in the state corresponding to \( C_j^i \). Then, it must be that \( M_i, neg_h^j \models AX \neg \phi_{i-1} \), and hence \( M_h, q_0^h \models \neg \phi_{i-1} \). By Lemma 1, also \( M_i, q_0^i \models \neg \phi_{i-1} \). By induction, \( \phi_h \) must be false, and hence clause \( C_j^i \) (containing \( \neg z_h^i \)) is also satisfied.

By Theorem 4 and Theorem 5, the following result holds.

**Corollary 2.** Model checking NatATL is \( D^2_\Delta \)-complete.

## 4. A LOGIC FOR NATURAL STRATEGIC ABILITY OF AGENTS WITH MEMORY

Agents with memory can base their decisions on the history of the game, that has occurred so far. We represent conditions on histories by regular expression over boolean propositional formulas.

### 4.1 Natural Recall

Let \( Reg(L) \) be the set of regular expressions over the language \( L \) (with the standard constructors \( \cdot, \cup, \ast \) representing concatenation, nondeterministic choice, and finite iteration). A natural strategy with recall (or R-strategy) \( s_a \) for agent \( a \) is a sequence of appropriate pairs from \( Reg(\beta(2^{Prop})) \times Act \). That is, it consists of
pairs \((r, \alpha)\) where \(r\) is a regular expression over \(\beta^{Prop}\) and \(\alpha\) is an action available in \(last(h)\), i.e. \(\alpha \in d_a(last(h))\), for all histories \(h \in H\) consistent with \(r\). Formally, given a regular expression \(r\) and the language \(L(r)\) on words generated by \(r\), a history \(h = q_0 \ldots q_n\) is consistent with \(r\) iff \(\exists b \in L(r)\) such that \(|h| = |b|\) and \(\forall 0 \leq i \leq n \; h[i] \vdash b[i]\). Similarly to \(r\)-strategies, the last pair on the list is assumed to be simply \((\top^+, \text{idle})\). The set of such strategies is denoted by \(\Sigma^R\).

Finally, \(\text{match}(\lambda[0,i],s_0)\) is the smallest \(n \leq \text{size}(s_0)\) such that \(\forall 0 \leq j \leq n \lambda[j] \vdash \text{cond}(s_0)[j]\) and \(\text{act}(s_0) \in d_a(\lambda[i])\). A collective natural strategy for agents \(A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}\) is a tuple of individual natural strategies \(s_A = (s_{a_1}, \ldots, s_{a_n})\).

We extend the metrics to strategies with recall and collective strategies with recall in the straightforward way.

**Example 4.** Consider the following \(R\)-strategy \(s\):

1. \((\text{safe}^+, \text{digGold})\);
2. \((\text{safe}^+ \cdot (\neg\text{safe} \land \text{haveGun}), \text{shoot})\);
3. \((\text{safe}^+ \cdot (\neg\text{safe} \land \text{haveGun}), \text{run})\);
4. \((\top^+ \cdot (\neg\text{safe}) \cdot (\neg\text{safe}), \text{hide})\);
5. \((\top^+, \text{idle})\).

(1) represents the guarded action in which \text{safe} has held in all the states of the history. In that case, the agent should quietly dig for gold. Otherwise, (2) or (3) is used for each history in which \text{safe} held for all states but the last. Then, the agent should run away or shoot back depending on whether she has a gun. If it doesn’t work (item (3)), the agent should hide. Otherwise (item (4)), she waits and does nothing. For the complexity, we have that \(\text{compl}_p(s) = 2\), \(\text{compl}_{\max}(s) = 8\), and \(\text{compl}_s(s) = 27\).

**Remark 1.** Note that natural strategies with recall are by definition finite. Thus, they do not exactly correspond to the notion of perfect recall where an agent may specify different choices for each of the infinitely many finite histories of the game. In this sense, our representations are similar to finite memory strategies from [43]. We will look closer at the connection in Section ??.

### 4.2 NatATL for Strategies with Recall

Now it is easy to define the semantics of natural strategic ability for agents with recall. Formally, we construct the semantic relation \(\models_{\text{R}}\) by replacing "\(\models\)" with "\(\models_{\text{R}}\)" and \(\Sigma^R\) with \(\Sigma^{R\text{A}}\) in the clauses from Section 2.4.

We will refer to the logical system \((\text{NatATL}_R, \models_{\text{R}})\) as \(\text{NatATL}_R\).

### 4.3 Relation to Natural Memoryless Strategies

It is well known that the semantics of ATL based on memoryless and perfect recall strategies coincide (under perfect information). This follows from the correctness of the model checking algorithm in [7], cf. also [40]. Precisely, there is a strategy with recall to enforce a given temporal property \(\gamma\) iff there is a memoryless strategy to enforce \(\gamma\).

We now prove that the same does not hold in \(\text{NatATL}\).

**Theorem 6.** The following results hold in \(\text{NatATL}\):

1. For all \(M, q,\) and all formulas \(\varphi = \langle A \rangle^{\leq k},\) it holds that \(M, q \models_{\text{R}} \varphi\) if and only if \(M, q \models_{\text{R}} \varphi\).
2. There exist \(M, q,\) and a formula \(\varphi = \langle A \rangle^{\leq k},\) such that \(M, q \models_{\text{R}} \varphi\) and not \(M, q \models \varphi\).

**Proof.** (1) Assume now that \(M, q \models_{\text{R}} \varphi\). By definition, there is a strategy \(s_A \in \Sigma^{R\text{A}}\) such that \(\text{compl}(s_A) \leq k\), and for each path.

![Figure 3: A counterexample for Theorem 6.](image-url)
\[ \lambda \in \text{out}(q, s_A), \text{we have } M, \lambda \models \gamma. \text{ From } s_A, \text{ let us construct } \text{a memoryless strategy } s'_A \in \Sigma_A \text{ such that the following facts hold: (i) } \forall \lambda \in \text{out}(q, s_A), \text{ we have } M, \lambda \models \gamma \text{ and (ii) } \text{compl}(s'_A) \leq \text{compl}(s_A). \text{ We start at the state } q. \text{ We know that } M \text{ is a fully distinguishing model, so the state } q \text{ is distinguishable with respect to the other states of } M. \text{ Consider for simplicity that the only atomic proposition that is true in } q \text{ is } s. \text{ We fix } s'_A(q) = s_A(q), \text{ where } s_A(q) \text{ represents the action in the strategy with recall } s_A \text{ for the regular expression } q \text{ that is just an atomic proposition. Consider now the successors of } q \text{ consistent with } s_A(q). \forall q' \in \text{out}(q, s_A(q)) \text{ we take the atomic proposition } q' \text{ that is true just in } q' \text{ and fix } s'_A(q') = s_A(q \cdot q'), \text{ where } q \cdot q' \text{ is the regular expression that is composed by the atomic propositions } q \text{ and } q' \text{ that are only true in } q \text{ and } q', \text{ respectively. We repeat this procedure until we get to a fixpoint, i.e. all states are covered, except possibly for some states that are unreachable when we execute } s_A. \text{ By the definition, we also know that these states satisfy the guarded action (} \top, \text{ idle). To conclude the proof, we just need to show that (i) and (ii) hold. Item (i) can be proved by induction. For the lack of space, we omit the details. Item (ii) follows by the construction of } s'_A. \text{ In fact, we construct } s'_A \text{ from } s_A \text{ that is for each guarded action } (q, \alpha) \text{ of } s_A \text{ there is a guarded action } (r, \alpha) \text{ of } s_A, \text{ where } r = r_0 \cdot \ldots \cdot r_n \text{ and } r_n = q, \text{ then } \text{compl}(s'_A) \leq \text{compl}(s_A). \]

5. MODEL CHECKING FOR NATURAL STRATEGIES WITH RECALL

In this section we show how to solve the model checking problem for NatATL with R-strategies, i.e. NatATLR. We consider both the cases in which the bound of the strategies is a constant or a variable.

5.1 Model Checking for Small Strategies

When the bound of the strategies is fixed, we can reduce our problem to the model checking for CTL. This leads to the following result.

**Theorem 8.** The model checking problem for NatATLR with fixed k is in \( \Delta_2^P \).

**Proof.** Assume for the moment that we have a NatATLR formula \( \phi = \langle A \rangle \Sigma^k \gamma, \) where \( A \subseteq \Sigma \) and \( \gamma \) is a formula over boolean connectives and atomic propositions. As for the solution in NatATL, we know that the collective strategy we can assign to A, namely \( s_A \), is bounded and, precisely, we have that \( \text{compl}(s_A) \leq k \). The main difference between r-strategies and R-strategies regards the underlying domains, i.e., we move from boolean propositional formulas to regular expressions over boolean propositional formulas with fixed bound. Theorem 7 states that removing the bound of the strategy from the automaton is polynomial. Recall that, regular expressions are a combination of atomic propositions (Prop), boolean connectives (Bool), and standard constructors (Con). Thus, in this case, we have \( (\text{Prop} \cup \text{Boo} \cup \text{Con})^k \) possible different guarded actions and \( (\text{Prop} \cup \text{Boo} \cup \text{Con}^k)^k = |\text{Prop} \cup \text{Boo} \cup \text{Con}|^{k^2} \) possible lists. Given \( s_A \), we cannot prune M since we have an R-strategy. Let us consider now the unwinding of M and remove all edges that are not in accordance with \( s_A \). It is important to observe that the unwinding of a model can be infinite and thus we need to consider a bounded unwinding. A possibility would be to consider the tree unwinding with depth \( |\text{St}| + 1 \) as we are sure that after this bound there is a loop. Unfortunately, this is a too big upper bound. Indeed, checking all paths of the unwinding, in the worst case (i.e. each state is connected with all states of the model), requires \( |\text{St}|^{|\text{St}|} \) steps, that is exponential on the number of states. To avoid this exponential blow-up we use a guessing oracle.

![Figure 4: Model checking algorithm for NatATLR with fixed k](image)

![Algorithm](algorithm)

![Figure 5: Oracle](image)

**Algorithm **mCheck\(_{\text{NatATLR}}\)(M, q, ϕ):
for every \( s_A \) with \( \text{compl}(s_A) \leq k \)
do
\( t = \text{Oracle}(M, q, \varphi, s_A) \)
return \( \neg t \)

**Algorithm **Oracle(M, q, ϕ, s_A):
Guess \( h \in H^{\text{st}+1}(q) \)
if \( h \) is inconsistent with \( s_A \)
return \text{false}
else
return mCheck\(_{\text{CTL}}\)(h, h[0], \neg Aγ)

5.2 Model Checking: General Case

We now study the complexity for NatATLR in case the bound over the strategies is not fixed. In particular, we study separately the cases in which the formula under exam has one or more nested strategic operators. For the former we show a \( \Sigma_2^P \) procedure and, for the latter, a \( \Delta_2^P \) one. As for the memoryless case, the proofs in this section have been inspired by [40, 29].

**Theorem 9.** Model checking \( 1\text{NatATLR} \) with variable k is in \( \Sigma_2^P \).

**Proof.** Consider the formula \( \langle A \rangle \Sigma^k \gamma, \) where \( A \subseteq \{a\} \) and \( \gamma \) is a formula over boolean connectives and atomic propositions. By assumption, the bound of the strategy is not fixed. For this reason, to construct a strategy \( s_a \) we use an NP oracle that constructs a strategy for \( a \). We report in Figure 6 the related mCheck\(_{\text{NatATLR}}\) algorithm. Regarding the complexity, since we use an oracle over a non-deterministic algorithm we have that checking the model checking problem is \( \text{NP} \leq \Delta_2^P \).

**Theorem 10.** Model checking \( 2\text{NatATLR} \) with variable k is in \( \Delta_2^P \).

**Proof.** We can use a bottom-up procedure similarly to the one we have used in the proof of Theorem 1 for NatATL, by looping the construction in Theorem 9. In this case, we use an oracle over a non-deterministic procedure over a polynomial procedure, so we
Algorithm $mCheck_{NatATL_k}(M, q, \phi, k)$:
Guess $s_A$ with $\text{compl}(s_A) \leq k$
$t = \text{Oracle}(M, q, \phi, s_A)$
return ($-t$)

Figure 6: Model checking NatATL$_k$ with variable $k$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic</th>
<th>memoryless</th>
<th>finite recall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATL</td>
<td>$P$-complete</td>
<td>$P$-complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NatATL, fixed $k$</td>
<td>in $P$</td>
<td>in $\Sigma^P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatATL, fixed $k$</td>
<td>in $P$</td>
<td>in $\Delta^P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NatATL, variable $k$</td>
<td>$NP$-complete</td>
<td>in $\Sigma^P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NatATL, variable $k$</td>
<td>$\Delta^P_3$-complete</td>
<td>in $\Delta^P_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Summary of model checking complexity results

obtain that the overall complexity to solve the addressed problem is $P^{NPNP} = \Delta^P_3$. □

6. SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we propose an alternative take on strategic reasoning, where agents can handle only relatively simple strategies. We use a natural representation of strategies by lists of guarded actions, and assume that only strategies up to size $k$ can be employed as witnesses to formula $\langle A \rangle^{E \cdot \chi}$. In terms of technical results, we show that model-checking for NatATL with memoryless strategies is in $P$ when $k$ is fixed, and $\Delta^P_3$-complete when $k$ is a parameter of the problem. For strategies with recall, the problem is in $\Delta^P_2$ when $k$ is fixed, and in $\Delta^P_3$ in the general case, cf. the summary presented in Figure 7. Clearly, reasoning about simple natural memoryless strategies is no more difficult than about arbitrary ATL strategies (and in practice we expect it to be actually easier). On the other hand, verification of natural strategies with recall seems distinctly harder. It would be interesting to look for conditions under which the latter kind of strategies can be synthesized in polynomial time.

We also prove an important property that sets NatATL apart from standard ATL: in NatATL, the memoryless and memory full semantics do not coincide.

In the future, we plan to extend the framework to natural strategies with imperfect information. We would also like to extend our results to the broader language of NatATL$^*$, and refine them in terms of parameterized complexity. Another interesting path concerns a graded version of the logic with counting how many successful natural strategies are available. We also intend to look at other natural expressions of strategies, including a survey of psychological studies suggesting how people plan and execute their long-term behaviors. Finally, a more complete account of bounded rationality may be obtained by combining bounds on conceptual complexity of strategies (in the spirit of our work here) with their temporal complexity via timing constraints in the vein of [14, 9].
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