

Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning

Semantic Networks and Description Logics II: Description Logics – Terminology and Notation

Bernhard Nebel, Stefan Wöfl, and Marco Ragni

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

July 5, 2010

Description Logics – Terminology and Notation

Introduction

Concept and Roles

TBox and ABox

Reasoning Services

Outlook

Motivation

- ▶ Main problem with **semantic networks** and **frames**
 - ▶ The lack of **formal semantics!**
 - ▶ Disadvantage of simple **inheritance networks**
 - ▶ Concepts are atomic and do not have any **structure**
- ↪ Brachman's **structural inheritance networks** (1977)

Structural Inheritance Networks

- ▶ Concepts are *defined/described* using a small set of well-defined operators
- ▶ Distinction between *conceptual* and *object-related* knowledge
- ▶ Computation of *subconcept relation* and of *instance relation*
- ▶ *Strict inheritance* (of the entire structure of a concept)

Systems and Applications

► Systems:

- **KL-ONE**: First implementation of the ideas (1978)
- ... then **NIKL**, **KL-TWO**, **KRYPTON**, **KANDOR**, **CLASSIC**, **BACK**, **KRIS**, **YAK**, **CRACK** ...
- ... currently **FaCT**, **DLP**, **RACER** 1998

► Applications:

- First, natural language understanding systems
- ... then configuration systems,
- ... information systems,
- ... currently, it is one tool for the *semantic web*
- **DAML+OIL**, now **OWL**

Description Logics

- ▶ Previously also *KL-ONE-like languages*, *frame-based languages*, *terminological logics*, *concept languages*
- ▶ **Description Logics (DL)** allow us
 - to describe concepts using *complex descriptions*,
 - to introduce the terminology of an application and to structure it (**TBox**),
 - to introduce objects (**ABox**) and relate them to the introduced terminology,
 - and to *reason* about the terminology and the objects.

Informal Example

Male is:	the opposite of female
A human is a kind of:	living entity
A woman is:	a human and a female
A man is:	a human and a male
A mother is:	a woman with at least one child that is a human
A father is:	a man with at least one child that is a human
A parent is:	a mother or a father
A grandmother is:	a woman, with at least one child that is a parent
A mother-wod is:	a mother with only male children

Elizabeth is a woman
 Elizabeth has the child Charles
 Charles is a man
 Diana is a mother-wod
 Diana has the child William

Possible Questions:
 Is a grandmother a parent?
 Is Diana a parent?
 Is William a man?
 Is Elizabeth a mother-wod?

Atomic Concepts and Roles

► Concept names:

- E.g., Grandmother, Male, ... (in the following usually *capitalized*)
- We will use *symbols* such as A, A_1, \dots
- **Semantics:** Monadic predicates $A(\cdot)$ or set-theoretically a subset of the universe $A^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$.

► Role names:

- In our example, e.g., child. Often we will use names such as has-child or something similar (in the following usually *lowercase*).
- Role names are *disjoint* from concept names
- **Symbolically:** t, t_1, \dots
- **Semantics:** Dyadic predicates $t(\cdot, \cdot)$ or set-theoretically $t^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D}$.

Concept and Role Description

- ▶ Out of *concept* and *role names*, complex **descriptions** can be created
- ▶ In our example, e.g. “a Human and Female.”
- ▶ **Symbolically**: C for concept descriptions and r for role descriptions

Which particular constructs are available depends on the chosen description logic!

- ▶ **Predicate logic semantics**: A concept descriptions C corresponds to a formula $C(x)$ with the free variable x . Similarly with r : It corresponds to formula $r(x, y)$ with free variables x, y .
- ▶ **Set semantics**:

$$C^{\mathcal{I}} = \{d \mid C(d) \text{ “is true in” } \mathcal{I}\}$$

$$r^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(d, e) \mid r(d, e) \text{ “is true in” } \mathcal{I}\}$$

Boolean Operators

- ▶ **Syntax:** let C and D be concept descriptions, then the following are also concept descriptions:
 - $C \sqcap D$ (concept conjunction)
 - $C \sqcup D$ (concept disjunction)
 - $\neg C$ (concept negation)
- ▶ **Examples:**
 - $\text{Human} \sqcap \text{Female}$
 - $\text{Father} \sqcup \text{Mother}$
 - $\neg \text{Female}$
- ▶ **Predicate logic semantics:** $C(x) \wedge D(x)$, $C(x) \vee D(x)$, $\neg C(x)$
- ▶ **Set semantics:** $C^{\mathcal{I}} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}}$, $C^{\mathcal{I}} \cup D^{\mathcal{I}}$, $\mathcal{D} - C^{\mathcal{I}}$

Role Restrictions

► Motivation:

- Often we want to describe something by *restricting* the possible “fillers” of a role, e.g. Mother-wod.
- Sometimes we want to say that there is at least a filler of a particular type, e.g. Grandmother

► Idea: Use **quantifiers** that range over the role-fillers

- $\text{Mother} \sqcap \forall \text{has-child.Man}$
- $\text{Woman} \sqcap \exists \text{has-child.Parent}$

► Predicate logic semantics:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\exists r.C)(x) &= \exists y : (r(x,y) \wedge C(y)) \\
 (\forall r.C)(x) &= \forall y : (r(x,y) \rightarrow C(y))
 \end{aligned}$$

► Set semantics:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{d \mid \exists e : (d, e) \in r^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge e \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \\
 (\forall r.C)^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{d \mid \forall e : (d, e) \in r^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow e \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Cardinality Restriction

► Motivation:

- Often we want to describe something by *restricting the number* of possible “fillers” of a role, e.g., a Mother with at least 3 children or at most 2 children.

► Idea: We restrict the cardinality of the role filler sets:

- $\text{Mother} \sqcap (\geq 3 \text{ has-child})$
- $\text{Mother} \sqcap (\leq 2 \text{ has-child})$

► Predicate logic semantics:

$$(\geq n r)(x) = \exists y_1 \dots y_n : (r(x, y_1) \wedge \dots \wedge r(x, y_n) \wedge y_1 \neq y_2 \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-1} \neq y_n)$$

$$(\leq n r)(x) = \neg(\geq n + 1 r)(x)$$

► Set semantics:

$$(\geq n r)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{d \mid |\{e \mid r^{\mathcal{I}}(d, e)\}| \geq n\}$$

$$(\leq n r)^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{D} - (\geq n + 1 r)^{\mathcal{I}}$$

Inverse Roles

- ▶ **Motivation:**
 - How can we describe the concept “*children of rich parents*”?
- ▶ **Idea:** Define the “inverse” role for a given role (the **converse relation**)
 - `has-child-1`
- ▶ **Application:** $\exists \text{has-child}^{-1}.\text{Rich}$
- ▶ **Predicate logic semantics:**

$$r^{-1}(x, y) = r(y, x)$$

- ▶ **Set semantics:**

$$(r^{-1})^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(d, e) \mid (e, d) \in r^{\mathcal{I}}\}$$

Role Composition

► **Motivation:**

- How can we define the role `has-grandchild` given the role `has-child`?

► **Idea:** Compose roles (as one can compose binary relations)

- `has-child` ◦ `has-child`

► **Predicate logic semantics:**

$$(r \circ s)(x, y) = \exists z : (r(x, z) \wedge s(z, y))$$

► **Set semantics:**

$$(r \circ s)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(d, e) \mid \exists f : (d, f) \in r^{\mathcal{I}} \wedge (f, e) \in s^{\mathcal{I}}\}$$

Role Value Maps

▶ **Motivation:**

- How do we express the concept “*women who know all the friends of their children*”

▶ **Idea:** Relate role filler sets to each other

- $\text{Woman} \sqcap (\text{has-child} \circ \text{has-friend} \sqsubseteq \text{knows})$

▶ **Predicate logic semantics:**

$$(r \sqsubseteq s)(x) = \forall y : (r(x, y) \rightarrow s(x, y))$$

▶ **Set semantics:** Let $r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = \{e \mid r^{\mathcal{I}}(d, e)\}$.

$$(r \sqsubseteq s)^{\mathcal{I}} = \{d \mid r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \subseteq s^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$$

▶ **Note:** Role value maps lead to undecidability of satisfiability of concept descriptions!

Terminology Box

- ▶ In order to *introduce* new terms, we use two kinds of **terminological axioms**:

- $A \doteq C$
- $A \sqsubseteq C$

where A is a *concept name* and C is a *concept description*.

- ▶ A **terminology** or **TBox** is a finite set of such axioms with the following additional restrictions:
 - no multiple definitions of the same symbol such as $A \doteq C$, $A \sqsubseteq D$
 - no cyclic definitions (even not indirectly), such as $A \doteq \forall r.B$, $B \doteq \exists s.A$

TBoxes: Semantics

- ▶ TBoxes restrict the set of possible interpretations.
- ▶ **Predicate logic semantics:**
 - $A \doteq C$ corresponds to $\forall x : (A(x) \leftrightarrow C(x))$
 - $A \sqsubseteq C$ corresponds to $\forall x : (A(x) \rightarrow C(x))$
- ▶ **Set semantics:**
 - $A \doteq C$ corresponds to $A^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{I}}$
 - $A \sqsubseteq C$ corresponds to $A^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq C^{\mathcal{I}}$
- ▶ Non-empty interpretations which satisfy all terminological axioms are called **models** of the TBox.

Assertional Box

- ▶ In order to state something about objects in the world, we use two forms of **assertions**:

- $a : C$
- $(a, b) : r$

where a and b are **individual names** (e.g., ELIZABETH, PHILIP), C is a **concept description**, and r is a **role description**.

- ▶ An **ABox** is a finite set of assertions.

ABoxes: Semantics

- ▶ **Individual names** are interpreted as elements of the universe under the **unique-name-assumption**, i.e., different names refer to different objects.
- ▶ **Assertions** express that an object is an instance of a concept or that two objects are related by a role.
- ▶ **Predicate logic semantics:**
 - $a : C$ corresponds to $C(a)$
 - $(a, b) : r$ corresponds to $r(a, b)$
- ▶ **Set semantics:**
 - $a^{\mathcal{I}} \in D$
 - $a : C$ corresponds to $a^{\mathcal{I}} \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$
 - $(a, b) : r$ corresponds to $(a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}}) \in r^{\mathcal{I}}$
- ▶ **Models** of an ABox and of ABox+TBox can be defined analogously to models of a TBox.

Example TBox

$\text{Male} \doteq \neg \text{Female}$
 $\text{Human} \sqsubseteq \text{Living_entity}$
 $\text{Woman} \doteq \text{Human} \sqcap \text{Female}$
 $\text{Man} \doteq \text{Human} \sqcap \text{Male}$
 $\text{Mother} \doteq \text{Woman} \sqcap \exists \text{has-child.Human}$
 $\text{Father} \doteq \text{Man} \sqcap \exists \text{has-child.Human}$
 $\text{Parent} \doteq \text{Father} \sqcup \text{Mother}$
 $\text{Grandmother} \doteq \text{Woman} \sqcap \exists \text{has-child.Parent}$
 $\text{Mother-without-daughter} \doteq \text{Mother} \sqcap \forall \text{has-child.Male}$
 $\text{Mother-with-many-children} \doteq \text{Mother} \sqcap (\geq 3 \text{has-child})$

Example ABox

CHARLES: Man

EDWARD: Man

ANDREW: Man

DIANA: Mother-without-daughter

(ELIZABETH, CHARLES): has-child

(ELIZABETH, EDWARD): has-child

(ELIZABETH, ANDREW): has-child

(DIANA, WILLIAM): has-child

(CHARLES, WILLIAM): has-child

DIANA: Woman

ELIZABETH: Woman

Some Reasoning Services

- ▶ Does a description C make sense at all, i.e., is it **satisfiable**?
- ▶ A concept description C is satisfiable iff there exists an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $C^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$.
- ▶ Is one concept a specialization of another one, is it **subsumed**?
- ▶ C is **subsumed by** D , in symbols $C \sqsubseteq D$ iff we have for all interpretations $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$.
- ▶ Is a an **instance** of a concept C ?
- ▶ a is an instance of C iff for all interpretations, we have $a^{\mathcal{I}} \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$.
- ▶ **Note:** These questions can be posed with or without a TBox that restricts the possible interpretations.

Outlook

- ▶ Can we **reduce** the reasoning services to perhaps just one problem?
- ▶ What could be **reasoning algorithms**?
- ▶ What about **complexity** and **decidability**?
- ▶ What has all that to do with **modal logics**?
- ▶ How can one build **efficient systems**?

Literature



Baader, F., D. Calvanese, D. L. McGuinness, D. Nardi, and P. F. Patel-Schneider, *The Description Logic Handbook: Theory, Implementation, Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2003.



Ronald J. Brachman and James G. Schmolze. An overview of the KL-ONE knowledge representation system. *Cognitive Science*, 9(2):171–216, April 1985.



Franz Baader, Hans-Jürgen Bürckert, Jochen Heinsohn, Bernhard Hollunder, Jürgen Müller, Bernhard Nebel, Werner Nutt, and Hans-Jürgen Profitlich. Terminological Knowledge Representation: A proposal for a terminological logic. Published in Proc. *International Workshop on Terminological Logics*, 1991, DFKI Document D-91-13.



Bernhard Nebel. *Reasoning and Revision in Hybrid Representation Systems*, volume 422 of *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1990.

Summary: Concept Descriptions

Abstract	Concrete	Interpretation
A	A	$A^{\mathcal{I}}$
$C \sqcap D$	(and $C D$)	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}}$
$C \sqcup D$	(or $C D$)	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \cup D^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\neg C$	(not C)	$\mathcal{D} - C^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\forall r.C$	(all $r C$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \subseteq C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
$\exists r$	(some r)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq \emptyset\}$
$\geq n r$	(atleast $n r$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \geq n\}$
$\leq n r$	(atmost $n r$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \leq n\}$
$\exists r.C$	(some $r C$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \cap C^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset\}$
$\geq n r.C$	(atleast $n r C$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \cap C^{\mathcal{I}} \geq n\}$
$\leq n r.C$	(atmost $n r C$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \cap C^{\mathcal{I}} \leq n\}$
$r \doteq s$	(eq $r s$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = s^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
$r \neq s$	(neq $r s$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq s^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
$r \sqsubseteq s$	(subset $r s$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : r^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \subseteq s^{\mathcal{I}}(d)\}$
$g \doteq h$	(eq $g h$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : g^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = h^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq \emptyset\}$
$g \neq h$	(neq $g h$)	$\{d \in \mathcal{D} : \emptyset \neq g^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq h^{\mathcal{I}}(d) \neq \emptyset\}$
$\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n\}$	(oneof $i_1 \dots i_n$)	$\{i_1^{\mathcal{I}}, i_2^{\mathcal{I}}, \dots, i_n^{\mathcal{I}}\}$

Summary: Role Descriptions

Abstract	Concrete	Interpretation
t	t	$t^{\mathcal{I}}$
f	f	$f^{\mathcal{I}}$, (functional role)
$r \sqcap s$	(and r s)	$r^{\mathcal{I}} \cap s^{\mathcal{I}}$
$r \sqcup s$	(or r s)	$r^{\mathcal{I}} \cup s^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\neg r$	(not r)	$\mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} - r^{\mathcal{I}}$
r^{-1}	(inverse r)	$\{(d, d') : (d', d) \in r^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
$r _C$	(restr r C)	$\{(d, d') \in r^{\mathcal{I}} : d' \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\}$
r^+	(trans r)	$(r^{\mathcal{I}})^+$
$r \circ s$	(compose r s)	$r^{\mathcal{I}} \circ s^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\mathbf{1}$	self	$\{(d, d) : d \in \mathcal{D}\}$