

Fuzzy Description Logics from a Mathematical Fuzzy Logic point of view

Marco Cerami

Institut de Investigació en Intel·ligència Artificial (IIIA-CSIC)
Bellaterra, Catalonia

PhD Thesis defense, Barcelona, October 16th 2012

Advisors: Francesc Esteva
Félix Bou
Lluís Godo

Introduction and motivations

Previous framework

- **Description Logics** (DLs) are logic-based knowledge representation languages.
- They are an attempt to find a **fair trade-off** between expressivity and computational complexity in Knowledge Representation.
- In the early 90's it began an effort to generalize the classical version to the fuzzy case.
- The first works on **Fuzzy Description Logic** (FDL) considered a semantics based on Fuzzy Set Theory.

A framework for FDL based on MFL

- [Hájek, 1998] considers formal calculi of many-valued logic to be the kernel of fuzzy logic.
- This framework is nowadays called **Mathematical Fuzzy Logic** (MFL).
- [Hájek, 2005] proposes to take MFL as the **underlying logics of FDLs** (mimicking the relation between DL and classical logic).
- In this framework FDL has been strictly related to **first order Fuzzy Logic**.
- The **work presented in our dissertation** follows Hájek's approach and further develops it.

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Semantics of early FDL

The first works on FDL considered a semantics based on fuzzy set-theoretical operations. The **truth functions** of this semantics are:

$\min\{x, y\}$ for the conjunction \sqcap

$\max\{x, y\}$ for the disjunction \sqcup

$1 - x$ for the negation \neg

The **semantics of** $C \sqsubseteq D$ was defined as the following (crisp) condition:

$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \leq D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$, for every x in the domain of the interpretation \mathcal{I} .

MFL based semantics

MTL-chains are used as algebras of truth values.

An **MTL-chain** is a structure:

$$\mathbf{T} = \langle T, *, \Rightarrow, \wedge, \vee, 0, 1 \rangle$$

where:

- T is a **linearly ordered** set,
- $\langle T, *, 1 \rangle$ is a **commutative monoid**,
- \Rightarrow is the **residuum** of $*$,
- \wedge and \vee are the **minimum** and **maximum operations** w.r.t. the order of T ,
- 0 and 1 are the **minimum** and **maximum elements** of T .

We are considering MTL-chains with **domain** either

$$[0,1] \quad \text{or} \quad \left\{0, \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{n-1}{n}, 1\right\}$$

and **operations**:

	Gödel	Product	Łukasiewicz
$x * y$	$\min(x, y)$	$x \cdot y$	$\max(0, x + y - 1)$
$x \Rightarrow y$	$\begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \leq y \\ y, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x \leq y \\ y/x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$\min(1, 1 - x + y)$
$\neg x$	$\begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$\begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$1 - x$

PART I

A proposal of FDL based on MFL

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
 - ★ Syntax and Semantics
 - ★ Hierarchies
 - ★ Fuzzy knowledge bases
 - ★ Relation to first order logic
 - ★ Relation to multi-modal logic
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Syntax of complex concepts

$C, D \rightarrow \perp$	empty concept	\mathcal{AL}
\top	universal concept	\mathcal{AL}
A	atomic concept	\mathcal{AL}
$C \boxtimes D$	strong conjunction	\mathcal{AL}
$\forall R.C$	value restriction	\mathcal{AL}
$\exists R.\top$	restricted existential quantif.	\mathcal{AL}
$\sim A$	atomic complementation	\mathcal{AL}
\bar{r}	a constant concept for every $r \in S$	\mathcal{X}^S
ΔC	delta operator	\mathcal{D}
$C \sqsupset D$	implication	\mathcal{I}
$\neg C$	residuated negation	\mathcal{I}
$C \sqcap D$	weak conjunction	\mathcal{I}
$C \sqcup D$	weak disjunction	\mathcal{I}
$\sim C$	complementation	\mathcal{C}
$C \boxplus D$	strong disjunction	\mathcal{U}
$\exists R.C$	existential quantification	\mathcal{E}

Interpretations

A **T-interpretation** is a pair

$$\mathcal{I} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$$

where

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a nonempty (crisp) set called **domain**,
- $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a **fuzzy interpretation function** such that:

- 1 $A^{\mathcal{I}}: \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \longrightarrow T,$
- 2 $R^{\mathcal{I}}: \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \longrightarrow T,$
- 3 $a^{\mathcal{I}} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$

Semantics of complex concepts

$$\perp^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := 0$$

$$\top^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := 1$$

$$\bar{r}^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := r$$

$$(\sim C)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := 1 - C^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$$

$$(\neg C)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \rightarrow \perp^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$$

$$(\Delta C)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := \Delta C^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$$

$$(C \boxtimes D)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) * D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$$

$$(C \sqcap D)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := \min\{C^{\mathcal{I}}(x), D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)\}$$

$$(C \boxplus D)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := 1 - ((1 - C^{\mathcal{I}}(x)) * (1 - D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)))$$

$$(C \sqcup D)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := \max\{C^{\mathcal{I}}(x), D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)\}$$

$$(C \sqsupset D)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \Rightarrow D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$$

$$(\forall R.C)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := \inf_{y \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}} \{R^{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) \Rightarrow C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)\}$$

$$(\exists R.C)^{\mathcal{I}}(x) := \sup_{y \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}} \{R^{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) * C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)\}$$

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
 - ★ Syntax and Semantics
 - ★ Hierarchies
 - ★ Fuzzy knowledge bases
 - ★ Relation to first order logic
 - ★ Relation to multi-modal logic
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Definability of concept constructors

In general,

- The **implication** \supset is not definable from conjunction and negation.
- The **existential quantifier** $\exists R$. is not definable from the universal quantifier $\forall R$. and the negations \neg or \sim .
- The **Delta** constructor Δ is not definable.

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
 - ★ Syntax and Semantics
 - ★ Hierarchies
 - ★ Fuzzy knowledge bases
 - ★ Relation to first order logic
 - ★ Relation to multi-modal logic
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Fuzzy knowledge bases

- A TBox consists of **fuzzy concept inclusion** axioms:

$$\langle C \sqsubseteq D \geq r \rangle \quad \longrightarrow \quad \inf_{x \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}} \{C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \Rightarrow D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)\} \geq r$$

- An ABox consists of

- ▶ **fuzzy concept assertion** axioms:

$$\langle C(a) \geq r \rangle \quad \longrightarrow \quad C^{\mathcal{I}}(a^{\mathcal{I}}) \geq r$$

- ▶ **fuzzy role assertion** axioms:

$$\langle R(a, b) \geq r \rangle \quad \longrightarrow \quad R^{\mathcal{I}}(a^{\mathcal{I}}, b^{\mathcal{I}}) \geq r$$

Reasoning tasks

- Fuzzy knowledge base consistency
- Graded concept satisfiability
- Positive satisfiability
- Graded concept subsumption
- Entailment
- Best satisfiability degree of a concept with respect to a KB
- Best entailment degree of an axiom with respect to a KB

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
 - ★ Syntax and Semantics
 - ★ Hierarchies
 - ★ Fuzzy knowledge bases
 - ★ Relation to first order logic
 - ★ Relation to multi-modal logic
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Translation of concepts to first order formulas

The translation is defined on **concept, role and individual names**

$$A \rightsquigarrow A(x)$$

$$R \rightsquigarrow R(x, y)$$

$$a \rightsquigarrow a$$

It is inductively extended to **complex concepts** as, for example:

$$\forall R.(A \boxtimes A) \rightsquigarrow (\forall y) \left(R(x, y) \rightarrow (A(y) \otimes A(y)) \right)$$

The translation of complex concepts can be extended to **fuzzy inclusions**

$$\langle A \boxtimes B \sqsubseteq C \geq \bar{r} \rangle \rightsquigarrow \bar{r} \rightarrow (\forall x)(A(x) \otimes B(x) \rightarrow C(x)),$$

and **fuzzy assertions**.

$$\langle (A \boxtimes A)(a) \geq \bar{r} \rangle \rightsquigarrow (\bar{r} \rightarrow A(x) \otimes A(x))[a/x],$$

Result

*The respective semantics are **invariant under the translation**.*

This shows that our proposal of FDL indeed corresponds to a **fragment of first order Fuzzy Logic**.

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
 - ★ Syntax and Semantics
 - ★ Hierarchies
 - ★ Knowledge bases
 - ★ Relation to first order logic
 - ★ Relation to multi-modal logic
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Translation of concepts to multi-modal formulas

The translation is defined on **concept names**

$$A \rightsquigarrow p_A$$

For every role name R a pair of **modal operators** is added to the propositional language

$$R \rightsquigarrow \square_R, \diamond_R$$

The translation is inductively extended to **complex concepts**, as for example:

$$\forall R.(A \boxtimes A) \rightsquigarrow \square_R(p_A \otimes p_A)$$

Translation of multi-modal formulas to concepts

The translation is defined on **propositional variables**

$$p \rightsquigarrow A_p$$

For every pair of modal operators \square_i and \diamond_i a **role name** is added to the FDL signature

$$\{\square_i, \diamond_i\} \rightsquigarrow R_i$$

The translation is inductively extended to **complex formulas** as, for example:

$$\square_i(p \otimes p) \rightsquigarrow \forall R_i.(A_p \boxtimes A_p)$$

- The translation of complex concepts can be extended to **fuzzy inclusions**.

$$\langle A \boxtimes B \sqsubseteq C \geq r \rangle \rightsquigarrow \Box_U(\bar{r} \rightarrow ((A \otimes B) \rightarrow C))$$

- Due to the lack of a translation of individual names, a translation of **fuzzy assertions** can not be obtained.

Result

*The respective semantics are **invariant under the translation**.*

PART II

Computability and complexity issues

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ★ Decidability of concept satisfiability in $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$ - \mathcal{IALC}
 - ★ Undecidability of KB satisfiability in $[0, 1]_{\perp}$ - \mathcal{ALC}
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Related previous results

- Standard tautologies are not recursively axiomatizable and **not arithmetical** for first order logic over $[0, 1]_{\sqcap}$ [Montagna, 2001].
- Concept satisfiability, validity and subsumption problems in the \mathcal{ALC} description language over $[0, 1]_{\perp}$ are **decidable** [Hájek, 2005].
- Language \mathcal{JALC} over $[0, 1]_{\sqcap}$ has **not** the **finite model property** [Hájek, 2005].

Concept satisfiability and subsumption in Π - $\mathcal{IAL}\mathcal{E}$

Result

Concept validity and positive satisfiability problems for the language $\mathcal{IAL}\mathcal{E}$ over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$ are decidable.

- We prove it by providing a recursive **reduction** of such problems to the logical consequence problem in **propositional Product Logic**.
- The reduction exploits the **quasi-witnessed model property** of first order Product Logic [Laskowski, Malekpour, 2007].
- The result then follows from the fact that **logical consequence** in propositional Product Logic is a **decidable** problem.
- Notice that we are **not** considering satisfiability **with respect to a knowledge base**.

Quasi-witnessed models and standard semantics

The **quasi-witnessed model property** can be proved in first order Product Logic with respect to the **standard semantics**.

Tautologies and **positively satisfiable formulas** in first order logic over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$ are the same of those in quasi-witnessed standard models.

φ is true in every model over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$ \iff φ is true in every quasi-witnessed model over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$

φ is positively satisfiable in a model over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$ \iff φ is positively satisfiable in a quasi-witnessed model over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$

φ is 1-satisfiable in a model over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$? φ is 1-satisfiable in a quasi-witnessed model over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$

Important remarks

- This shows the fact that **restricting the first order language** over $[0, 1]_{\mathbb{N}}$ to the $\mathcal{IAC}\mathcal{E}$ fragment we obtain decidability of the set of tautologies of the restricted language, in contrast to the fact that, without such restriction, the set of tautologies is not arithmetical.
- The given algorithm is able to **cope with infinite interpretations** by means of finite resources.

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ★ Decidability of concept satisfiability in $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$ - \mathcal{IALC}
 - ★ Undecidability of KB satisfiability in $[0, 1]_{\perp}$ - \mathcal{ALC}
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Related previous results: concept satisfiability

- Concept satisfiability w.r.t. **witnessed** models coincides with concept satisfiability w.r.t. **finite** models in the language \mathcal{ALC} [Hájek, 2005].
- Concept satisfiability w.r.t. **witnessed** models coincides with **unrestricted** concept satisfiability in the language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\perp}$ [Hájek, 2005].
- Concept satisfiability is **decidable** in the language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\perp}$ [Hájek, 2005].

Related previous results: knowledge base satisfiability

- KB satisfiability is **decidable** in very expressive languages over $[0, 1]_G$ [Bobillo, Delgado, Gómez-Romero, Straccia, 2009].
- KB satisfiability is **decidable** in the language \mathcal{ALCH} over finite t -norms [Bobillo, Straccia, 2010].
- KB satisfiability **does not coincide** with KB satisfiability w.r.t. finite models in the language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\perp}$ and $[0, 1]_{\cap}$ [Bobillo, Bou, Straccia, 2011].
- KB satisfiability w.r.t. **(strongly) witnessed models** is **undecidable** in the language \mathcal{JALCE} over $[0, 1]_{\cap}$ [Baader, Peñaloza, 2011].
- KB satisfiability is **undecidable** in the language \mathcal{ALCE} over lattices with t -norms [Borgwardt, Peñaloza, 2011].

KB satisfiability in $[0, 1]_{\mathcal{L}}\text{-}\mathcal{ALC}$

Result (C., Straccia)

- *KB satisfiability models is **undecidable** in the language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\mathcal{L}}$.*
- *KB satisfiability w.r.t. **finite** models is **undecidable** in the language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\mathcal{L}}$.*
- The results are obtained by means of a reduction of the **Post Correspondence Problem** to the corresponding KB satisfiability problem.
- The reduction is inspired in the one used in [Borgwardt, Peñaloza, 2011].

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ★ PSPACE completeness concept satisfiability in $\mathcal{I}ALCCED^T$ over finite MTL-chains
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Concept satisfiability: a uniform approach

The computational problem **Satisf** is the following one:

INPUT: (\mathbf{T}, C, t) where \mathbf{T} is a finite MTL-chain, C is a concept of $\mathbf{T}\text{-}\mathcal{I}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}^S$ and $t \in T$.

OUTPUT: Yes/No depending whether there is/isn't an interpretation \mathcal{I} and an individual $a \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $C^{\mathcal{I}}(a) = t$.

Moreover, for every finite MTL-chain \mathbf{T} , the computational problem **Satisf_T** is the one obtained by fixing the finite MTL-chain in the previous problem.

Related previous results

- Concept satisfiability is **decidable** in the language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\perp}$, [Hájek, 2005].
- Concept satisfiability is **decidable** in the language \mathcal{ALCH} over finite t -norms [Bobillo, Straccia, 2010].
- Concept satisfiability is **PSPACE-complete** in the language \mathcal{ALCE} over a finite residuated lattice based semantics, [Borgwardt, Peñaloza, 2011].

PSPACE completeness of language $\mathfrak{I}ALCED^T$ over any finite MTL-chain

Result

Concept satisfiability and subsumption are PSPACE-complete in the language $\mathfrak{I}ALCED^T$ over any finite MTL-chain.

- The **upper bound** argument is based on a PSPACE implementation of the reduction to the corresponding propositional logic presented in [Hájek, 2005].
- The **lower bound** argument is inspired in the reduction from the problem of deciding the truth of Quantified Boolean Formulas (QBF) problem provided in [Ladner, 1977].

Important remarks

- We obtain a **PSPACE implementation** of the reduction provided in [Hájek, 2005].

Note that this PSPACE implementation is not possible if the algebra of truth values \mathbf{T} is infinite.

- With respect to [Bobillo, Straccia 2010] we obtain **complexity bounds**.
- The result from [Borgwardt, Peñaloza, 2011] is **more general than ours**, but here we use an alternative procedure.

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ **Algorithmic research**
- Summary and future research

A reduction to propositional logic

The reduction to propositional logic proposed in [Hájek, 2005] has been studied under different points of view:

- A **generalization** to the case of quasi-witnessed models.
- The **size** of the propositional theory produced by the reduction.
- An **implementation** that runs in PSPACE.

Other algorithms

Other algorithms that have been studied during the writing of the dissertation are:

- A generalization to the case of the minimal finite-valued Łukasiewicz Modal Logic of the classical algorithm based on **Hintikka sets** proposed in [Blackburn, De Rijke, Venema, 2001].
- A reduction of the ABox consistency problem in the language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\perp}$ to the **Mixed Integer Linear Programming** problem [C., Straccia].

Outline

- Introduction
- Preliminaries
- PART I
 - ▶ A proposal for FDL
- PART II
 - ▶ (Un)decidability results for FDL
 - ▶ Complexity results for FDL
 - ▶ Algorithmic research
- Summary and future research

Summary

- Expansion of the early **description languages**, by means of concept constructors that are used in Mathematical Fuzzy Logic.
- Study of the **hierarchies** of FDL languages.
- Analysis of the **relations to two other related formalisms**, i.e. first order Fuzzy Logic and Fuzzy Modal Logic.
- **Decidability** of the concept satisfiability and subsumption problems for language $\mathfrak{I}\mathcal{AL}\mathcal{E}$ over $[0, 1]_{\Pi}$.
- **Undecidability** of the knowledge base consistency problem for language \mathcal{ALC} over $[0, 1]_{\perp}$.
- **PSPACE completeness** of the concept satisfiability and subsumption problems for language $\mathfrak{I}\mathcal{ALCCED}^T$ over any finite MTL-chain.
- A study of **decision procedures** based on a reduction to the corresponding propositional logic.

Directions for future research

- The study of the computational complexity of **more expressive FDLs** based on finite t -norms.
- A systematic study of the **intractability sources** for $\mathcal{I}ALCED^S$ FDL languages.
- A **computational comparison between the algorithms** for FDLs based on finite t -norms; in particular the ones based on Hintikka sets, on Hájek sets, on Automata Theory, on completion forests and on a reduction to classical DLs.
- The **implementation** of the algorithms provided in this dissertation.

Publications

Publications

- M. Cerami, F. Esteva; *First Order SMTL Logic and Quasi-Witnessed Models*. ESTYLF 2010, pp. 145–150.
- M. Cerami, F. Esteva; *Strict core fuzzy logics and quasi-witnessed models*. Archive for Math. Logic, 50(5), pp. 625–641, 2011.
- M. Cerami, À. García-Cerdaña, F. Esteva; *From Classical Description Logic to n -graded Fuzzy Description Logic*. Fuzz-IEEE 2010, pp. 1506–1513.
- M. Cerami, F. Esteva, À. García-Cerdaña; *On finitely valued Fuzzy Description Logics: The Łukasiewicz case*. IPMU 2012, pp. 235–244.
- M. Cerami, F. Esteva, F. Bou; *Decidability of a Description Logic over Infinite-Valued Product Logic*. KR-2010, pp. 203–213.
- M. Cerami, U. Straccia; *On the (Un)decidability of Fuzzy Description Logic under Łukasiewicz t -norm*. Submitted to Information Sciences.
- F. Bou, M. Cerami, F. Esteva; *Finite-valued Łukasiewicz Modal Logic is PSPACE-complete*. IJCAI 2011, pp.774–780.