

Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning

Semantic Networks and Description Logics I:
Simple, Strict Inheritance Networks

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg



Bernhard Nebel, Stefan Wölfl, and Julien Hué

January 11, 2013

1 Introduction

■ Motivation

Introduction

Motivation

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

- Often, we need to use semantic (conceptual, terminological) knowledge ...
- For example, consider a knowledge base that classifies things into different categories, which in turn may be organized in some hierarchical way
Task: Query objects that belong to a specific category or one of its super categories ...
- Even more involved: Answer queries of users of the knowledge base who are not aware of the internal categories of the knowledge base
- Topic of this section: a naïve (maybe too naïve) approach to reasoning with **terminological knowledge**, namely **inheritance networks**

Introduction

Motivation

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances


Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Definition

A **strict inheritance network** is defined by a set of **nodes** (representing **concepts**, **properties**) and a set of **directed edges** (representing generalization, the **is-a**-relation).



- **Reasoning problem:** Is some concept C a **specialization** (a subconcept) of another concept C' ?
- ... and how can we solve this problem **efficiently**?

Introduction

Motivation

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

2 A simple network formalism

- Semantics
- A polynomial inheritance algorithm
- Soundness & Completeness

Introduction

**A simple
network
formalism**

Semantics

A polynomial
inheritance
algorithm

Soundness &
Completeness

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

A strict inheritance network can be seen as a set Θ of formulae of the form

$$C_1 \text{ isa } C_2.$$

Example

Student **isa** Person

Student **isa** studious

Professor **isa** Person

Professor **isa** knowledgeable

Grad-Student **isa** Student

Undergrad-Student **isa** Student

Reasoning problem (inheritance problem): $\Theta \models C_1 \text{ isa } C_2?$

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantics

A polynomial
inheritance
algorithm

Soundness &
Completeness

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

- We assign the following logical semantics to **isa**-formulae:

$$C_1 \text{ isa } C_2 \mapsto \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x)$$

- ...i.e., we interpret each directed edge or **isa**-formula as a **universally quantified implication**.
- This is intuitively plausible: each instance of a sub-concept is an instance of the super-concept.
- Now we can **reduce** the **inheritance problem** as follows:
Let $\pi(\Theta)$ be the translation. Then we want to know:

$$\pi(\Theta) \models \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x)?$$

- How hard is this problem?

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantics

A polynomial
inheritance
algorithm

Soundness &
Completeness

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

A polynomial reasoning algorithm

Let G_Θ be the **graph corresponding to Θ** . Then we have:

$$\pi(\Theta) \models \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x)$$

iff

there exists a path in G_Θ from C_1 to C_2 .

- ... which has to be proven (next slides).
- Thus, we have reduced reasoning in strict inheritance networks to graph reachability problem, which is solvable in polynomial time.
- **Note:** Reasoning is not simple because we used a graph to represent the knowledge (there are actually very difficult graph problems),
- ... reasoning is simple because the expressiveness compared with first-order logic is very restricted.

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantics
A polynomial
inheritance
algorithm

Soundness &
Completeness

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Theorem (Soundness of inheritance reasoning)

If there exists a path from C_1 to C_2 in G_Θ , then

$$\pi(\Theta) \models \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x).$$

Proof.

If there is a path, then there exists a chain of implications of the form $\forall x. D_j(x) \rightarrow D_{j+1}(x)$ with $D_0 = C_1$ and $D_n = C_2$. Since logical implication is transitive, the claim follows trivially. □

Theorem (Completeness of inheritance reasoning)

If $\pi(\Theta) \models \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x)$, then there exists a path from C_1 to C_2 in G_Θ .

Proof.

We prove the contraposition. Assume that there exists no such path from C_1 to C_2 in G_Θ . We show that $\pi(\Theta) \not\models \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x)$. For this define an interpretation on a universe with exactly one element d such that d is in the interpretation of C_1 and in the interpretation of all concepts reachable from C_1 by following directed edges (and not in the interpretation of any other concept).

This interpretation satisfies all formulae in $\pi(\Theta)$.

However, it does not satisfy $\forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x)$.

For this reason, we have $\pi(\Theta) \not\models \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow C_2(x)$. □

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantics
A polynomial
inheritance
algorithm

Soundness &
Completeness

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

3 Semantic Networks with Instances



Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

**Semantic
Networks
with
Instances**

Semantic
Networks
with Negation


Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

An extension: instances

We also want to talk about **instances** of concepts.

Example:



... as formulae:

⋮

John **inst-of** Undergrad-Student

Bernhard **inst-of** Professor

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Logical semantics:

$$i \text{ inst-of } C \mapsto C(i).$$

- **Problem 1:** Is this extension of the language **conservative**?
That is, can we still decide $\Theta \models C_1 \text{ isa } C_2$ without taking formulae of the form $i \text{ inst-of } C$ into account?
- yes (but has to be shown)
- **Problem 2:** Is it true: $\Theta \models i \text{ inst-of } C$ if and only if there is a path from the node i to the node C in G_Θ ?
- yes (has to be shown)
- This means, we can also use efficient graph algorithms for this extension.

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

4 Semantic Networks with Negation

- Satisfiability of a Semantic Network
- Reasoning

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

**Semantic
Networks
with Negation**

Satisfiability of a
Semantic Network

Reasoning

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

A further extension: negated concepts

We now allow for negated concepts, i.e, concept terms of the form

not C ,

where C is concept name (an atomic concept).

Example

Undergrad-Student **isa not** Grad-Student

Logical semantics:

$$\mathbf{not\ } C \mapsto \neg C(x)$$

Example

$$C_1 \mathbf{isa\ not\ } C_2 \mapsto \forall x. C_1(x) \rightarrow \neg C_2(x).$$

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Satisfiability of a
Semantic Network
Reasoning

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Define $\overline{\alpha}$:

$$\overline{C} = \text{not } C$$
$$\overline{\text{not } C} = C$$

Construct G_{Θ} from Θ as follows:

- For each concept name C , we will have two **nodes**: C and **not** C .
- For each formula α_1 **isa** α_2 , we introduce the following two **edges**:

$$\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2$$
$$\overline{\alpha_2} \rightarrow \overline{\alpha_1}$$

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Satisfiability of a
Semantic Network

Reasoning


Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Example



$$\Theta = \{A \text{ isa not } B, P \text{ isa } A, P \text{ isa } B, Q \text{ isa } R, R \text{ isa not } A\}$$



- Strict inheritance networks **without negation** are always satisfiable, i.e. they have a non-empty model (which one?)
- This is no longer true when we allow for negated concepts. Consider:

$$P \text{ isa not } P, \text{ not } P \text{ isa } P$$

means

$$\forall x. P(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x), \forall x. \neg P(x) \rightarrow P(x),$$

which is equivalent to

$$\forall x. \neg P(x), \forall x. P(x).$$

- ... i.e., this set of formulae is not satisfiable, symb. $\Theta \models \perp$.
- This is important to find out since in this case everything follows.

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Satisfiability of a
Semantic Network
Reasoning

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Theorem (Satisfiability of strict networks with negation)

$\Theta \models \perp$ if and only if the graph G_Θ contains a cycle from α to $\bar{\alpha}$ and back to α .

Proof.

\Leftarrow : Adding $\bar{\alpha}_2 \rightarrow \bar{\alpha}_1$ corresponds to adding

$$\forall x. \neg \alpha_2(x) \rightarrow \neg \alpha_1(x)$$

when $\forall x. \alpha_1(x) \rightarrow \alpha_2(x)$ is given. This is logically correct (contraposition). Since all directed paths in G_Θ correspond to universally quantified implications that can be deduced from $\pi(\Theta)$, a cycle as in the theorem implies:

$$\forall x. \alpha(x) \rightarrow \bar{\alpha}(x), \forall x. \bar{\alpha}(x) \rightarrow \alpha(x).$$

This, however, is unsatisfiable. □

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Satisfiability of a
Semantic Network
Reasoning

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Proof (cont'd).

⇒: We have to show that unsatisfiability of Θ implies the existence of a cycle from some node α to $\bar{\alpha}$ and back to α in G_Θ .

We prove the contraposition, i.e. that the absence of any such cycle implies satisfiability.

We start with the universe $\mathbf{D} = \{d\}$ and then construct step-wise an interpretation for all concepts. Convention: When we assign $\alpha^{\mathcal{I}} = \{d\}$, then we assign $\bar{\alpha}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$ simultaneously.

- 1 **Choose** an α without an interpretation that has no path to $\bar{\alpha}$.
- 2 **Assign** $\alpha^{\mathcal{I}} = \{d\}$ and continue to do that for all concepts β reachable from α that do not have an interpretation.
- 3 **Continue** until all concepts have an interpretation.

If there is still a concept without an interpretation, we always can find one satisfying the condition in step 1 since there is no cycle. In step 2, no concept reachable from α can have an empty interpretation, so the assignment does not violate any subconcept relations.

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Satisfiability of a
Semantic Network
Reasoning

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Theorem (Inheritance in strict networks with negation)

$\Theta \models \alpha_1$ **isa** α_2 if and only if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- 1 $\Theta \models \perp$.
- 2 There is a path from α_1 to $\overline{\alpha_1}$ in G_Θ .
- 3 There is a path from $\overline{\alpha_2}$ to α_2 in G_Θ .
- 4 There is a path from α_1 to α_2 in G_Θ .

Proof (sketch).

Soundness is obvious.

Completeness can be shown using the same argument that we used for completeness of the Satisfiability Theorem and the fact that we can start the construction process with $\alpha_1^I = \{d\}$ and $\overline{\alpha_2}^I = \{d\}$. \square

\rightsquigarrow What about instance-relationship reasoning?

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Satisfiability of a
Semantic Network

Reasoning

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

5 Semantic Networks with Negation and Conjunction



Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

**Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction**

Literature

A final extension: conjunctions and negation



A **concept description** is a concept name (C), a negation of a concept name (**not** C) or the **conjunction** of concept descriptions (α_1 **and** α_2).

Example

(Student **and not** Grad-Student) **isa** Undergrad-Student
(Woman **and** Parent) **isa** Mother

- **Logical semantics** is obvious!
- Is it still possible to decide inheritance in polynomial time?

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

Theorem (Complexity of strict inheritance with negation and conjunction)

The reasoning problem for strict inheritance networks with conjunction and negation is coNP-complete.

Proof (sketch).

We show hardness by a reduction from 3SAT.

Let $D = C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$ be formula in CNF with exactly three literals per clause (over atoms a_i).

Let $\sigma(C_j)$ be the following translation:

$$a_1 \vee a_2 \vee a_3 \mapsto (\text{not } a_1 \text{ and not } a_2) \text{ isa } a_3$$

$$\neg a_1 \vee a_2 \vee a_3 \mapsto (a_1 \text{ and not } a_2) \text{ isa } a_3$$

$$\neg a_1 \vee \neg a_2 \vee a_3 \mapsto (a_1 \text{ and } a_2) \text{ isa } a_3$$

$$\neg a_1 \vee \neg a_2 \vee \neg a_3 \mapsto (a_1 \text{ and } a_2) \text{ isa } (\text{not } a_3)$$

Extend σ to CNF formulae, and show that D is unsatisfiable iff $\sigma(D) \models \perp$. □

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature

- Strict inheritance networks are easy
- Inheritance corresponds to a universally quantified implication
- If concepts are atomic, everything can be decided in poly. time
- We can deal with negation without increasing the complexity
- Conjunction and negation, however, make the reasoning problem hard
- ... as hard as propositional unsatisfiability.

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature



P. Atzeni, D. S. Parker.

Set Containment Inference and Syllogisms.

Theoretical Computer Science, 62: 39–65, 1988.

Introduction

A simple
network
formalism

Semantic
Networks
with
Instances

Semantic
Networks
with Negation

Semantic
Networks
with Negation
and
Conjunction

Literature