Mathematical Logics Description Logic: Tableaux

Fausto Giunchiglia and Mattia Fumagallli

University of Trento



*Originally by Luciano Serafini and Chiara Ghidini Modified by Fausto Giunchiglia and Mattia Fumagalli

- I. Idea: DL is a MultiModal Modal Logic
- 2. DL reasoning as MultiModal SAT reasoning
- 3. Examples: TBOX reasoning
- Examples: ABOX reasoning DL as a query language

The Tableau Algorithm (same as Modal Logics)

- The formula C in input is translated into Negation Normal Form (negation pushed down to negate atomic formulas, useful to avoid negation rules).
- An ABox A is incrementally constructed by adding assertions according to the constraints in C (identified by decomposition) following precise transformation rules
- □ Each time we have more than one option we split the space of the solutions as in a decision tree (i.e. in presence of \sqcup)
- When a contradiction is found (i.e. A is inconsistent) we need to try another path in the space of the solutions (backtracking)
- The algorithm stops when either we find a consistent A satisfying all the constraints in C (the formula is satisfiable) or there is no consistent A (the formula is unsatisfiable)

□ □-rule

Condition: A contains (C1 \square C2)(x), but not both C1(x) and C2(x)

Action: $A' = A \cup \{C1(x), C2(x)\}$

```
T=\{Mother \equiv Female \sqcap \exists hasChild.Person\} A=\{Mother(Anna)\}
Is (¬\existshasChild.Person \sqcap ¬\existshasParent. Person) satisfiable?
```

```
Expand A w.r.t. T
Mother(Anna) ⇒ (Female □ ∃hasChild.Person)(Anna) ⇒
A' = A ∪ {Female(Anna), (∃hasChild.Person)(Anna)}
```

```
(¬∃hasChild.Person □ ¬∃hasParent.Person)(Anna) ⇒
A' = A ∪ {(¬∃hasChild.Person)(Anna), (¬∃hasParent.Person)(Anna)}
Both of them must be true, but the first constraint is clearly
in contradiction with A'
```

NOTE: See use of constants/ variables as arguments

Transformation rules

□⊔-rule

Condition: A contains (C1 \sqcup C2)(x), but neither C1(x) or C2(x)

Action: $A' = A \cup \{C1(x)\} \text{ and } A'' = A \cup \{C2(x)\}\$

T={Parent≡∃hasChild.Female⊔∃hasChild.Male, Person≡Male⊔Female, Mother≡Parent ⊓Female} A={Mother(Anna)} Is ¬∃hasChild.Person satisfiable?

Expand A w.r.t. T A = {Mother(Anna)} ⇒ A' = A ∪ {Parent(Anna), Female(Anna)} Parent(Anna) ⇒ (∃hasChild.Female⊔∃hasChild.Male)(Anna) ⇒ (∃hasChild.Female)(Anna) or (∃hasChild.Male)(Anna)

Both are in contradiction with ¬∃hasChild.Person, not satisfiable.

□∃-rule

Condition: A contains $(\exists R.C)(x)$, but there is no z such that both C(z) and R(x,z) are in A **Action**: A' = A U {C(z), R(x,z)}

T={Parent≡∃hasChild.Female⊔∃hasChild.Male, Person≡Male⊔Female, Mother≡Parent⊓Female} A={Mother(Anna), hasChild(Anna,Bob), ¬Female(Bob)} Is ¬(∃hasChild.Person) satisfiable?

```
Expand A w.r.t. T
Mother(Anna) ⇒ Parent(Anna) ⇒
(∃hasChild.Female⊔∃hasChild.Male)(Anna)
```

take (∃hasChild.Male)(Anna) ⇒ hasChild(Anna,Bob), Male(Bob) ...

□∀-rule

Condition: A contains (\forall R.C)(x) and R(x,z), but it does not contain C(z)

Action: $A' = A \cup \{C(z)\}$

```
T={DaughterParent≡∀hasChild.Female, Male⊓Female⊑⊥}
A={hasChild(Anna,Bob), ¬Female(Bob)}
Is DaughterParent satisfiable?
```

```
Expand A w.r.t. T
```

```
DaughterParent(x) ⇒ ∀hasChild.Female(x) ⇒
```

```
Given that hasChild(Anna,Bob) ⇒ A' = A ∪ {Female(Bob)}
```

but this in contradiction with ¬Female(Bob)

Mathematical Logics Description Logic: Tableaux

Fausto Giunchiglia and Mattia Fumagallli

University of Trento



*Originally by Luciano Serafini and Chiara Ghidini Modified by Fausto Giunchiglia and Mattia Fumagalli