

Semantic difference in \mathcal{ALN}

A. Léger¹ C. Rey² F. Toumani²

¹Orange Labs, Rennes, France

alain.leger@francetelecom.com

²Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France

christophe.rey@univ-bpclermont.fr

ftoumani@isima.fr

International Workshop on Description Logics, 2007

Presentation outline

- 1 Motivation
- 2 \mathcal{ALN} -materials
- 3 Computation of the semantic difference in \mathcal{ALN}
- 4 Computation of the syntactic difference in \mathcal{ALN}
- 5 Semantic VS syntactic ?
- 6 Conclusion

Generalities

- Non standard reasonings (generate description(s))
- Informal definitions, with A and B two descriptions:
 - ▶ "subtraction operator"
 $B - A$: what remains of B once A has been removed
 - ▶ "difference operation"
 $B - A$: what has to be added to A to get B

Two difference operators

- Semantic difference [Teege, 94]
 - ▶ Principle: $B - A$ is what has to be added by conjunction with A in order to get an description (semantically) equivalent to B
 - ▶ Application: concept decomposition in tutorial systems, best covers using a terminology [Hacid et al, 02]
- Syntactic difference [Brandt et al, 02]
 - ▶ Principle: (syntactically) remove from B all subdescriptions that are redundant wrt A
 - ▶ Applications: evaluating the accuracy of an approximated concept

Contributions of this work

- (Sound and complete) algorithm to compute the semantic difference in \mathcal{ALN}
- (Sound and complete) algorithm to compute the syntactic difference in \mathcal{ALN}
- Comparison of both to justify which one to use in best covers

\mathcal{ALN} -clausal form

- $\mathcal{ALN} = \{\sqcap, \forall R.D, \neg A, \leq nR, \geq nR\}$
- Set of all conjuncts of a normalized description
- A clause: one conjunct in this set
- Example:

$$C \equiv \forall T. (P \sqcap \neg P) \sqcap (\forall Q. A) \sqcap (\forall Q. (\forall R. (\forall S. (B \sqcap \neg B))))$$

\mathcal{ALN} -normal form:

$$\widehat{C} = (\leq 0 T) \sqcap (\forall Q. (A \sqcap \forall R. (\leq 0 S)))$$

\mathcal{ALN} -clausal form:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_C^\# = \{\leq 0 T, \forall Q. A, \forall QR. \leq 0 S\}$$

\mathcal{ALN} -reasonings

- Subsumption
- Lcs
- Weak approximation:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{Approx}_{\uparrow}(\neg \forall R_1 R_2 \dots \dots \dots R_n P)}^{\#} = \{ \begin{aligned} & \forall R_1 R_2 \dots \dots \dots R_n. (\neg P), \\ & \forall R_1 R_2 \dots \dots \dots R_{n-1}. (\geq 1 R_n), \\ & \forall R_1 R_2 \dots \dots \dots R_{n-2}. (\geq 1 R_{n-1}) \\ & \forall R_1. (\geq 1 R_2) \\ & (\geq 1 R_1) \end{aligned} \}$$

Semantic difference definition

Definition ([Teege, 94])

Let \mathcal{L} a description logic, B and A two \mathcal{L} -concept descriptions such that $B \sqsubseteq A$. The semantic difference between B and A , noted $B - A$, is defined by :

$$B - A := \text{Max}_{\sqsubseteq} \{ C \mid C \sqcap A \equiv B \}$$

If the lcs always exists between two \mathcal{L} -descriptions, then this definition is extended to couples of descriptions B and A with $B \not\sqsubseteq A$ by :

$$B - A := B - \text{lcs}(B, A)$$

Main result

Lemma

Let B and A two \mathcal{ALN} -descriptions such that $B \sqsubseteq A$. Let C be an \mathcal{ALN} -description in $B - A$. $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_C^\#$ can be built as follows:

First, if $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\# = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$, then $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_C^\#$ must be $\{\top\}$.

Else, $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_C^\#$ is initialized at \emptyset , and then, for all c_B in $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$:

- **Inconsistency case:**

if $c_B = \forall R_1 R_2 \dots R_{n-1}. (\leq 0 R_n)$, with $n \geq 0$ (if $n = 0$ then $c_B = \perp$)
and $\exists c_A \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\# \mid c_A = \forall R_1 R_2 \dots R_n R_{n+1} \dots R_{n+m}. P$, $m \geq 0$

then we add to $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_C^\#$ all clauses c verifying:

$(c = \forall R_1 R_2 \dots R_n. c', c' \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{Approx}_\uparrow(\neg \forall R_{n+1} \dots R_{n+m}. P)}^\#) \text{ and } (A \not\sqsubseteq c)$

- **General case:**

else if $c_B \notin \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$, then we add c_B to $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_C^\#$.

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\hat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\hat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1	P_1			

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1 $\leq 1S$	P_1 $\leq 2S$	$\leq 1S$	$\leq 1S$	$\leq 1S$

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1 $\leq 1S$ $\forall T.P_1$	P_1 $\leq 2S$ $\forall T.P_1$	$\leq 1S$	$\leq 1S$	$\leq 1S$

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1 $\leq 1S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall TV.P_3$	P_1 $\leq 2S$ $\forall T.P_1$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1 $\leq 1S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	P_1 $\leq 2S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 3R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1 $\leq 1S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$ $\forall S.(\leq 0T)$	P_1 $\leq 2S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall S.(\geq 3R)$ $\forall S.(\leq 6T)$ $\forall ST.P_2$ $\forall STV.(\geq 4W)$ $\forall STVWX.(\leq 3R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1 $\leq 1S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$ $\forall S.(\leq 0T)$	P_1 $\leq 2S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall S.(\geq 3R)$ $\forall S.(\leq 6T)$ $\forall ST.P_2$ $\forall STV.(\geq 4W)$ $\forall STVWX.(\leq 3R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$ $\forall ST.(\neg P_2)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1 $\leq 1S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$ $\forall S.(\leq 0T)$	P_1 $\leq 2S$ $\forall T.P_1$ $\forall S.(\geq 3R)$ $\forall S.(\leq 6T)$ $\forall ST.P_2$ $\forall STV.(\geq 4W)$ $\forall STVWX.(\leq 3R)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$ $\forall ST.(\neg P_2)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$ $\forall STV.(\leq 3W)$ $\forall ST.(\geq 1V)$	$\leq 1S$ $\forall TV.P_3$ $\forall S.(\geq 6R)$

Example $B - A = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$

$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_B^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_1}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_2}^\#$	$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{C_3}^\#$
P_1	P_1			
$\leq 1S$	$\leq 2S$	$\leq 1S$	$\leq 1S$	$\leq 1S$
$\forall T.P_1$	$\forall T.P_1$			
$\forall TV.P_3$		$\forall TV.P_3$	$\forall TV.P_3$	$\forall TV.P_3$
$\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\forall S.(\geq 3R)$	$\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\forall S.(\geq 6R)$	$\forall S.(\geq 6R)$
$\forall S.(\leq 0T)$	$\forall S.(\leq 6T)$	$\forall ST.(\neg P_2)$	$\forall STV.(\leq 3W)$	$\forall STVWX.(\geq 4R)$
	$\forall ST.P_2$		$\forall ST.(\geq 1V)$	$\forall STVW.(\geq 1X)$
	$\forall STV.(\geq 4W)$			$\forall ST.(\geq 1V)$
	$\forall STVWX.(\leq 3R)$			

Full algorithm:

- Principle: extends previous lemma by combining all inconsistency cases that generate many clauses
- compute $\mathcal{ALN}\text{SemDiff}$
 - ▶ sound and complete
 - ▶ PTIME wrt the sizes of B and A (i.e. the numbers of clauses in their clausal forms and the maximal number of roles in any of their clauses)

Syntactic difference definition

- based on the notion of subdescription
- Associated ordering : $D \preceq_d E$ iff D is a subdescription of E

Definition (Syntactic difference)

[Kuesters, 01, Brandt et al, 02])

Let A and B be two \mathcal{ALE} descriptions. The syntactic difference $B - A$ of B and A is defined as the \mathcal{ALE} description C which is minimal w.r.t. \preceq_d such that $C \sqcap A \equiv A \sqcap B$.

- Extension to \mathcal{ALN}

The compute \mathcal{ALN} SyntDiff algorithm

Theorem

Let A and B be two \mathcal{ALN} -descriptions given in their clausal form. The syntactic difference $B - A$ is a unique \mathcal{ALN} -description C such that

if $A \sqsubseteq B$, then $C = \top$,
else $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_C^\# = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{A \sqcap B}^\# \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_A^\#$.

- Direct algorithm compute \mathcal{ALN} SyntDiff
- sound and complete
- PTIME wrt the numbers of clauses in their clausal forms

Comparison of both operators

- basically, amounts to the same computation
- except when processing inconsistencies

$B - A$	$B \equiv \forall R. \perp$ $A \equiv \forall R. (\neg P \sqcap P')$	$B \equiv \forall R. P$ $A \equiv \forall R. \neg P$
Semantic diff.	$\{\forall R. P, \forall R. \neg P'\}$	$\{\forall R. P\}$
Syntactic diff.	$\forall R. \perp$	$\forall R. \perp$
Conclusion	Sem. diff. more accurate, less convenient Synt. diff. less accurate, more intuitive	Sem. diff. more intuitive (?)

Conclusion

- Semantic difference
 - ▶ more accurate \Rightarrow automatic knowledge processing (query rewriting, services discovery ,...)
- Syntactic difference
 - ▶ more intuitive \Rightarrow knowledge hand-manipulating : knowledge engineer, user interface,...
- No definitive conclusion: application-dependent

Thank you

Bibliography



F. Baader, R. Küsters, and R. Molitor.

Computing Least Common Subsumer in Description Logics with Existential Restrictions.
In *Proceedings of IJCAI'99*.



F. Baader, R. Küsters, and R. Molitor.

Rewriting concepts using terminologies.
In *Proc. of KR2000*.



S. Brandt, R. Küsters, and A.-Y. Turhan.

Approximation and Difference in Description Logics.
In *Proc. of KR2002*.



F. Goasdoué and M.-C. Rousset.

Compilation and approximation of conjunctive queries by concept descriptions.
In *Proc. of DL2002*, 2002.



M.S. Hadid, A. Léger, C. Rey, and F. Toumani.

Computing concept covers: a preliminary report.
In *Proc. of DL02 Toulouse, France*, April 2002.



R. Küsters.

Non-Standard Inferences in Description Logics, volume 2100 of *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*.
Springer-Verlag, 2001.

Ph.D. thesis.



R. Molitor.

Structural subsumption for \mathcal{ALN} .
Technical Report LTCS-98-03, LuFG Theoretical Computer Science, RWTH Aachen, March 1998.



G. Teege.

Making the difference: A subtraction operation for description logics.