

# Ontologies and Knowledge-based Systems

- Is there a flexible way to represent relations?
- How can knowledge bases be made to interoperate semantically?

# Choosing Individuals and Relations

How to represent: “Pen #7 is red.”

# Choosing Individuals and Relations

How to represent: “Pen #7 is red.”

- $red(pen_7)$ . It’s easy to ask “What’s red?”  
Can’t ask “what is the color of  $pen_7$ ?”

# Choosing Individuals and Relations

How to represent: “Pen #7 is red.”

- $red(pen_7)$ . It’s easy to ask “What’s red?”  
Can’t ask “what is the color of  $pen_7$ ?”
- $color(pen_7, red)$ . It’s easy to ask “What’s red?”  
It’s easy to ask “What is the color of  $pen_7$ ?”  
Can’t ask “What property of  $pen_7$  has value  $red$ ?”

# Choosing Individuals and Relations

How to represent: “Pen #7 is red.”

- $red(pen_7)$ . It's easy to ask “What's red?”  
Can't ask “what is the color of  $pen_7$ ?”
- $color(pen_7, red)$ . It's easy to ask “What's red?”  
It's easy to ask “What is the color of  $pen_7$ ?”  
Can't ask “What property of  $pen_7$  has value  $red$ ?”
- $prop(pen_7, color, red)$ . It's easy to ask all these questions.

# Choosing Individuals and Relations

How to represent: “Pen #7 is red.”

- $red(pen_7)$ . It’s easy to ask “What’s red?”  
Can’t ask “what is the color of  $pen_7$ ?”
- $color(pen_7, red)$ . It’s easy to ask “What’s red?”  
It’s easy to ask “What is the color of  $pen_7$ ?”  
Can’t ask “What property of  $pen_7$  has value  $red$ ?”
- $prop(pen_7, color, red)$ . It’s easy to ask all these questions.

$prop(Individual, Property, Value)$  is the only relation needed:  
called **individual-property-value representation**  
or **triple representation**

To represent “a is a parcel”

To represent “a is a parcel”

- $prop(a, type, parcel)$ , where *type* is a special property
- $prop(a, parcel, true)$ , where *parcel* is a Boolean property



- To represent *scheduled(cs422, 2, 1030, cc208)*. “section 2 of course *cs422* is scheduled at 10:30 in room *cc208*.”

- To represent *scheduled(cs422, 2, 1030, cc208)*. “section 2 of course *cs422* is scheduled at 10:30 in room *cc208*.”
- Let *b123* name the booking:  
*prop(b123, course, cs422).*  
*prop(b123, section, 2).*  
*prop(b123, time, 1030).*  
*prop(b123, room, cc208).*
- We have **reified** the booking.
- Reify means: to make into an individual.
- What if we want to add the year?

# Semantic Networks / Knowledge Graphs

When you only have one relation, *prop*, it can be omitted without loss of information.

Logic:

*prop(Individual, Property, Value)*


triple:

$\langle \textit{Individual}, \textit{Property}, \textit{Value} \rangle$


simple sentence:

*Individual Property Value.*

graphically:




# An Example Semantic Network / Knowledge Graph



# Equivalent Logic Program

```
prop(comp_2347, owned_by, craig).  
prop(comp_2347, deliver_to, ming).  
prop(comp_2347, model, lemon_laptop_10000).  
prop(comp_2347, brand, lemon_computer).  
prop(comp_2347, logo, lemon_disc).  
prop(comp_2347, color, brown).  
prop(craig, room, r107).  
prop(r107, building, comp_sci).  
  
⋮
```

# A Structured Semantic Network / Knowledge Graph



An arc  $c \xrightarrow{p} v$  from a class  $c$  with a property  $p$  to value  $v$  means every individual in the class has value  $v$  on property  $p$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prop}(\text{Obj}, p, v) \leftarrow \\ \text{prop}(\text{Obj}, \text{type}, c). \end{aligned}$$

Example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prop}(X, \text{weight}, \text{light}) \leftarrow \\ \text{prop}(X, \text{type}, \text{lemon\_laptop\_10000}). \\ \text{prop}(X, \text{packing}, \text{cardboard\_box}) \leftarrow \\ \text{prop}(X, \text{type}, \text{computer}). \end{aligned}$$

You can do inheritance through the subclass relationship:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prop}(X, \text{type}, T) \leftarrow \\ \text{prop}(S, \text{subClassOf}, T) \wedge \\ \text{prop}(X, \text{type}, S). \end{aligned}$$



# Multiple Inheritance


- An individual is usually a member of more than one class. For example, the same person may be a wine expert, a teacher, a football coach, . . . .
- The individual can inherit the properties of all of the classes it is a member of: **multiple inheritance**.
- With default values, what is an individual inherits conflicting defaults from the different classes? **multiple inheritance problem**.

# Choosing Primitive and Derived Properties

- Associate an property value with the most general class with that property value.
- Don't associate contingent properties of a class with the class. For example, if all of current computers just happen to be brown.

- A **conceptualization** is a map from the problem domain into the representation. A conceptualization specifies:
  - ▶ What sorts of individuals are being modeled
  - ▶ The vocabulary for specifying individuals, relations and properties
  - ▶ The meaning or intention of the vocabulary
- If more than one person is building a knowledge base, they must be able to share the conceptualization.
- An **ontology** is a specification of a conceptualization. An ontology specifies the meanings of the symbols in an information system.

# Mapping from a conceptualization to a symbol



- Ontologies are published on the web in machine readable form.
- Builders of knowledge bases or web sites adhere to and refer to a published ontology:
  - ▶ a symbol defined by an ontology means the same thing across web sites that obey the ontology.
  - ▶ if someone wants to refer to something not defined, they publish an ontology defining the terminology.  
Others adopt the terminology by referring to the new ontology.  
In this way, ontologies evolve.
  - ▶ Separately developed ontologies can have mappings between them published.

# Challenges of building ontologies

- They can be huge: finding the appropriate terminology for a concept may be difficult.

# Challenges of building ontologies

- They can be huge: finding the appropriate terminology for a concept may be difficult.
- How one divides the world can depend on the application. Different ontologies describe the world in different ways.
- People can fundamentally disagree about an appropriate structure.

# Challenges of building ontologies

- They can be huge: finding the appropriate terminology for a concept may be difficult.
- How one divides the world can depend on the application. Different ontologies describe the world in different ways.
- People can fundamentally disagree about an appropriate structure.
- Different knowledge bases can use different ontologies.
- To allow KBs based on different ontologies to inter-operate, there must be mapping between ontologies.
- It has to be in user's interests to use an ontology.



# Challenges of building ontologies

- They can be huge: finding the appropriate terminology for a concept may be difficult.
- How one divides the world can depend on the application. Different ontologies describe the world in different ways.
- People can fundamentally disagree about an appropriate structure.
- Different knowledge bases can use different ontologies.
- To allow KBs based on different ontologies to inter-operate, there must be mapping between ontologies.
- It has to be in user's interests to use an ontology.
- The computer doesn't understand the meaning of the symbols. The formalism can constrain the meaning, but can't define it.

- **XML** the Extensible Markup Language provides generic syntax.  
 $\langle tag \dots \rangle$  or  
 $\langle tag \dots \rangle \dots \langle /tag \rangle$ .
- **URI** a Uniform Resource Identifier is a name of an individual (resource). This name can be shared. Often in the form of a URL to ensure uniqueness.
- **RDF** the Resource Description Framework is a language of triples
- **OWL** the Web Ontology Language, defines some primitive properties that can be used to define terminology. (Doesn't define a syntax).

# Main Components of an Ontology

- **Individuals** the things / objects in the world (not usually specified as part of the ontology)
- **Classes** sets of individuals
- **Properties** between individuals and their values

- Individuals are things in the world that can be named.  
(Concrete, abstract, concepts, reified).
- Unique names assumption (UNA): different names refer to different individuals.
- The UNA is not an assumption we can universally make:  
“The Queen”, “Elizabeth Windsor”, etc.
- Without the determining equality, we can't count!
- In OWL we can specify:  
    `owl:SameIndividual( $i_1, i_2$ )`  
    `owl:DifferentIndividuals( $i_1, i_3$ )`

- A class is a set of individuals. E.g., house, building, officeBuilding
- One class can be a subclass of another
  - owl:SubClassOf(*house*, *building*)
  - owl:SubClassOf(*officeBuilding*, *building*)
- The most general class is owl:Thing.
- Classes can be declared to be the same or to be disjoint:
  - owl:EquivalentClasses(*house*, *singleFamilyDwelling*)
  - owl:DisjointClasses(*house*, *officeBuilding*)
- Different classes are not necessarily disjoint.  
E.g., a building can be both a commercial building and a residential building.

- A property is between an individual and a value.
- A property has a domain and a range.

`rdfs:domain(livesIn, person)`

`rdfs:range(livesIn, placeOfResidence)`

- A property is between an individual and a value.
- A property has a domain and a range.

`rdfs:domain(livesIn, person)`

`rdfs:range(livesIn, placeOfResidence)`

- An *ObjectProperty* is a property whose range is an individual.
- A *DatatypeProperty* is one whose range isn't an individual, e.g., is a number or string.

- A property is between an individual and a value.
- A property has a domain and a range.

`rdfs:domain(livesIn, person)`

`rdfs:range(livesIn, placeOfResidence)`

- An *ObjectProperty* is a property whose range is an individual.
- A *DatatypeProperty* is one whose range isn't an individual, e.g., is a number or string.
- There can also be property hierarchies:

`owl:subPropertyOf(livesIn, enclosure)`

`owl:subPropertyOf(principalResidence, livesIn)`



# Properties (Cont.)

- One property can be inverse of another  
    `owl:InverseObjectProperties(livesIn, hasResident)`
- Properties can be declared to be transitive, symmetric, functional, or inverse-functional.

# Properties (Cont.)

- One property can be inverse of another  
    `owl:InverseObjectProperties(livesIn, hasResident)`
- Properties can be declared to be transitive, symmetric, functional, or inverse-functional.  
    (Which of these are only applicable to object properties?)

- One property can be inverse of another  
`owl:InverseObjectProperties(livesIn, hasResident)`
- Properties can be declared to be transitive, symmetric, functional, or inverse-functional.  
(Which of these are only applicable to object properties?)
- We can also state the minimum and maximal cardinality of a property.

`owl:minCardinality(principalResidence, 1)`

`owl:maxCardinality(principalResidence, 1)`

# Property and Class Restrictions

- We can define complex descriptions of classes in terms of restrictions of other classes and properties.  
E.g., A homeowner is a person who owns a house.

# Property and Class Restrictions

- We can define complex descriptions of classes in terms of restrictions of other classes and properties.  
E.g., A homeowner is a person who owns a house.

$$\text{homeOwner} \subseteq \text{person} \cap \{x : \exists h \in \text{house} \text{ such that } x \text{ owns } h\}$$

# Property and Class Restrictions

- We can define complex descriptions of classes in terms of restrictions of other classes and properties.  
E.g., A homeowner is a person who owns a house.

$$homeOwner \subseteq person \cap \{x : \exists h \in house \text{ such that } x \text{ owns } h\}$$

owl:subClassOf(homeOwner, person)

owl:subClassOf(*homeOwner*,  
owl:ObjectSomeValuesFrom(*owns*, *house*))

# OWL Class Constructors

owl:Thing  $\equiv$  all individuals

owl:Nothing  $\equiv$  no individuals

owl:ObjectIntersectionOf( $C_1, \dots, C_k$ )  $\equiv C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_k$

owl:ObjectUnionOf( $C_1, \dots, C_k$ )  $\equiv C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_k$

owl:ObjectComplementOf( $C$ )  $\equiv \text{Thing} \setminus C$

owl:ObjectOneOf( $I_1, \dots, I_k$ )  $\equiv \{I_1, \dots, I_k\}$

owl:ObjectHasValue( $P, I$ )  $\equiv \{x : x P I\}$

owl:ObjectAllValuesFrom( $P, C$ )  $\equiv \{x : x P y \rightarrow y \in C\}$

owl:ObjectSomeValuesFrom( $P, C$ )  $\equiv$   
 $\{x : \exists y \in C \text{ such that } x P y\}$

owl:ObjectMinCardinality( $n, P, C$ )  $\equiv$   
 $\{x : \#\{y | x P y \text{ and } y \in C\} \geq n\}$

owl:ObjectMaxCardinality( $n, P, C$ )  $\equiv$   
 $\{x : \#\{y | x P y \text{ and } y \in C\} \leq n\}$

# OWL Predicates

$\text{rdf:type}(I, C) \equiv I \in C$

$\text{rdfs:subClassOf}(C_1, C_2) \equiv C_1 \subseteq C_2$

$\text{owl:EquivalentClasses}(C_1, C_2) \equiv C_1 \equiv C_2$

$\text{owl:DisjointClasses}(C_1, C_2) \equiv C_1 \cap C_2 = \{\}$

$\text{rdfs:domain}(P, C) \equiv \text{if } xPy \text{ then } x \in C$

$\text{rdfs:range}(P, C) \equiv \text{if } xPy \text{ then } y \in C$

$\text{rdfs:subPropertyOf}(P_1, P_2) \equiv xP_1y \text{ implies } xP_2y$

$\text{owl:EquivalentObjectProperties}(P_1, P_2) \equiv xP_1y \text{ if and only if } xP_2y$

$\text{owl:DisjointObjectProperties}(P_1, P_2) \equiv xP_1y \text{ implies not } xP_2y$

$\text{owl:InverseObjectProperties}(P_1, P_2) \equiv xP_1y \text{ if and only if } yP_2x$

$\text{owl:SameIndividual}(I_1, \dots, I_n) \equiv \forall j \forall k I_j = I_k$

$\text{owl:DifferentIndividuals}(I_1, \dots, I_n) \equiv \forall j \forall k j \neq k \text{ implies } I_j \neq I_k$

$\text{owl:FunctionalObjectProperty}(P) \equiv \text{if } xPy_1 \text{ and } xPy_2 \text{ then } y_1 = y_2$

$\text{owl:InverseFunctionalObjectProperty}(P) \equiv$

$\text{if } x_1Py \text{ and } x_2Py \text{ then } x_1 = x_2$

$\text{owl:TransitiveObjectProperty}(P) \equiv \text{if } xPy \text{ and } yPz \text{ then } xPz$

$\text{owl:SymmetricObjectProperty} \equiv \text{if } xPy \text{ then } yPx$



- One ontology typically imports and builds on other ontologies.
- OWL provides facilities for version control.
- Tools for mapping one ontology to another allow inter-operation of different knowledge bases.
- The semantic web promises to allow two pieces of information to be combined if
  - ▶ they both adhere to an ontology
  - ▶ these are the same ontology or there is a mapping between them.

## Example: Apartment Building

An apartment building is a residential building with more than two units and they are rented.

## Example: Apartment Building

An apartment building is a residential building with more than two units and they are rented.

```
Declaration(ObjectProperty(:numberOfunits))
FunctionalObjectProperty(:numberOfunits)
ObjectPropertyDomain(:numberOfunits :ResidentialBuilding)
ObjectPropertyRange(:numberOfunits
                    ObjectOneOf(:two :one :moreThanTwo))
```

```
Declaration(Class(:ApartmentBuilding))
EquivalentClasses(:ApartmentBuilding
                  ObjectIntersectionOf(
                      :ResidentialBuilding
                      ObjectHasValue(:numberOfunits :moreThanTwo)
                  ObjectHasValue(:ownership :rental)))
```

# Aristotelian definitions

Aristotle [350 B.C.] suggested the definition of a class  $C$  in terms of:

- **Genus**: the super-class
- **Differentia**: the attributes that make members of the class  $C$  different from other members of the super-class

*"If genera are different and co-ordinate, their differentiae are themselves different in kind. Take as an instance the genus 'animal' and the genus 'knowledge'. 'With feet', 'two-footed', 'winged', 'aquatic', are differentiae of 'animal'; the species of knowledge are not distinguished by the same differentiae. One species of knowledge does not differ from another in being 'two-footed'."*

Aristotle, *Categories*, 350 B.C.

# Example: hotel ontology

Define the following:

- Room
- BathRoom
- StandardRoom - what is rented as a room in a hotel
- Suite
- RoomOnly

# Example: hotel ontology

Define the following:

- Room
- BathRoom
- StandardRoom - what is rented as a room in a hotel
- Suite
- RoomOnly
- Hotel
- HasForRent
- AllSuitesHotel
- NoSuitesHotel
- HasSuitesHotel

# Top-Level Ontology — Basic Formal Ontology (BFO)

- 1: **if** entity continues to exist through time **then**
- 2:     it is a **continuant**
- 3:     **if** it doesn't need another entity for its existence **then**
- 4:         it is an **independent continuant**
- 5:         **if** it has matter as a part **then**
- 6:             it is a **material entity**
- 7:             **if** it is a single coherent whole **then**
- 8:                 it is an **object**
- 9:         **else** it is an **immaterial entity**
- 10:     **else** it is a **dependent continuant**
- 11:         **if** it a region in space **then**
- 12:             it is a **spatial region**
- 13:         **else if** it is a property **then**
- 14:             **if** it is a property all objects have **then**
- 15:                 it is a **quality**
- 16:             ... **role** ... **disposition** ... **function** ...

# Continuants vs Occurrents

- A **continuant** exists in an instance of time and maintains its identity through time.
- An **occurrent** has temporal parts.
- Continuants participate in occurrents.
- a person, a life, a finger, infancy: what is part of what?



# Continuants vs Occurrents

- A **continuant** exists in an instance of time and maintains its identity through time.
- An **occurrent** has temporal parts.
- Continuants participate in occurrents.
- a person, a life, a finger, infancy: what is part of what?
- a holiday, the end of a lecture, an email, the sending of an email, the equator, earthquake, a smile, a laugh, the smell of a flower

- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event:

- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event: objects

- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event: objects
- a flock of birds, the students in CS422, a card collection:

- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event: objects
- a flock of birds, the students in CS422, a card collection: object aggregates

- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event: objects
- a flock of birds, the students in CS422, a card collection: object aggregates
- a city, a room, a mouth, the hole of a doughnut:

- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event: objects
- a flock of birds, the students in CS422, a card collection: object aggregates
- a city, a room, a mouth, the hole of a doughnut: site

- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event: objects
- a flock of birds, the students in CS422, a card collection: object aggregates
- a city, a room, a mouth, the hole of a doughnut: site
- the dangerous part of a city, part of Grouse Mountain with the best view:




- a pen, a person, Newtonian mechanics, the memory of a past event: objects
- a flock of birds, the students in CS422, a card collection: object aggregates
- a city, a room, a mouth, the hole of a doughnut: site
- the dangerous part of a city, part of Grouse Mountain with the best view: fiat part of an object.

## Overview:

- Roles of people involved in a knowledge-based system
- How representation and reasoning systems interact with humans.
- Knowledge-based interaction and debugging tools
- Building representation and reasoning systems

# Knowledge-based system architecture



# Roles for people in a KBS

- **Software engineers** build the inference engine and user interface.
- **Knowledge engineers** design, build, and debug the knowledge base in consultation with domain experts.
- **Domain experts** know about the domain, but nothing about particular cases or how the system works.
- **Users** have problems for the system, know about particular cases, but not about how the system works or the domain.

How can users provide knowledge when

- they don't know the internals of the system
- they aren't experts in the domain
- they don't know what information is relevant
- they don't know the syntax of the system
- but they have essential information about the particular case of interest?

# Querying the User

- The system can determine what information is relevant and ask the user for the particular information.
- A top-down derivation can determine what information is relevant. There are three types of goals:
  - ▶ Goals for which the user isn't expected to know the answer, so the system never asks.
  - ▶ Goals for which the user should know the answer, and for which they have not already provided an answer.
  - ▶ Goals for which the user has already provided an answer.

- The simplest form of a question is a ground query.
- Ground queries require an answer of “yes” or “no”.
- The user is only asked a question if
  - ▶ the question is askable, and
  - ▶ the user hasn't previously answered the question.
- When the user has answered a question, the answer needs to be recorded.

In the electrical domain:

- The designer of a house:
  - ▶ will know how switches and lights are connected by wires,
  - ▶ won't know if the light switches are up or down.
- A new resident in a house:
  - ▶ won't know how switches and lights are connected by wires,
  - ▶ will know (or can observe) if the light switches are up or down.



# Functional Relations

- You probably don't want to ask  $?age(fred, 0)$ ,  $?age(fred, 1)$ ,  $?age(fred, 2)$ , ...
- You probably want to ask for Fred's age once, and succeed for queries for that age and fail for other queries.
- This exploits the fact that *age* is a functional relation.
- Relation  $r(X, Y)$  is **functional** if, for every  $X$  there exists a unique  $Y$  such that  $r(X, Y)$  is true.

# Getting information from a user

- The user may not know the vocabulary that is expected by the knowledge engineer.
- Either:
  - ▶ The system designer provides a menu of items from which the user has to select the best fit.
  - ▶ The user can provide free-form answers. The system needs a large dictionary to map the responses into the internal forms expected by the system.

# More General Questions

**Example:** For the subgoal  $p(a, X, f(Z))$  the user can be asked:  
*for which  $X, Z$  is  $p(a, X, f(Z))$  true?*

- Should users be expected to give all instances which are true, or should they give the instances one at a time, with the system prompting for new instances?

**Example:** For which  $S, C$  is  $enrolled(S, C)$  true?

- Psychological issues are important.

# Re-asking Questions

For the case when a user provides instances one at a time: When should the system repeat a question or not ask a question?

**Example:**

Query	Ask?	Response
$?p(X)$	yes	$p(f(Z))$
$?p(f(c))$	no	
$?p(a)$	yes	yes
$?p(X)$	yes	no
$?p(c)$	no	

# When to ask the user

*Don't ask a question that is*

- *an instance of a positive answer that has already been given or*
- *or instance of a query to which the user has replied no.*

# Delaying Asking the User

- Should the system ask the question as soon as it's encountered, or should it delay the goal until more variables are bound?
- **Example** consider query  $?p(X) \& q(X)$ , where  $p(X)$  is askable.
  - ▶ If  $p(X)$  succeeds for many instances of  $X$  and  $q(X)$  succeeds for few (or no) instances of  $X$  it's better to delay asking  $p(X)$  and prove  $q(X)$  first.
  - ▶ If  $p(X)$  succeeds for few instances of  $X$  and  $q(X)$  succeeds for many instances of  $X$ , don't delay.

# Multiple Information Sources

Asking the user is just one instance of using multiple information sources. There are many types of subgoals:

- those the system has rules about
- those the system has facts about
- those that the user should be able to answer
- those that a web site may be able to answer (e.g., flight arrival times)
- those that a database may be able to answer (e.g., someone's phone number, or the meaning of a word)

Each information source has its own characteristics.

# Assumptions

- Some subgoals you don't know if they are true; they are **assumptions** or **hypotheses**.
- You want to collect the assumptions needed to prove the goal.
- **Example:** in the electrical domain, *ok* may be assumable.



- The system must be able to justify that its answer is correct, particularly when it is giving advice to a human.
- The same features can be used for explanation and for debugging the knowledge base.
- There are three main mechanisms:
  - ▶ Ask HOW a goal was derived.
  - ▶ Ask WHYNOT a goal wasn't derived.
  - ▶ Ask WHY a subgoal is being proved.

# How did the system prove a goal?

- If  $g$  is derived, there must be a rule instance

$$g \Leftarrow a_1 \& \dots \& a_k.$$

where each  $a_i$  is derived.

- If the user asks HOW  $g$  was derived, the system can display this rule. The user can then ask

*HOW  $i$ .*

to give the rule that was used to prove  $a_i$ .

- The HOW command moves down the proof tree.

# Why Did the System Ask a Question?

It is useful to find out why a question was asked.

- Knowing why a question was asked will increase the user's confidence that the system is working sensibly.
- It helps the knowledge engineer optimize questions asked of the user.
- An irrelevant question can be a symptom of a deeper problem.
- The user may learn something from the system by knowing why the system is doing something.

# WHY question

- When the system asks the user a question  $g$ , the user can reply with

WHY

- This gives the instance of the rule

$$h \Leftarrow \dots \& g \& \dots$$

that is being tried to prove  $h$ .

- When the user asks WHY again, it explains why  $h$  was proved.

There are four types of nonsyntactic errors that can arise in rule-based systems:

- An incorrect answer is produced; that is, some atom that is false in the intended interpretation was derived.
- Some answer wasn't produced; that is, the proof failed when it should have succeeded, or some particular true atom wasn't derived.
- The program gets into an infinite loop.
- The system asks irrelevant questions.

# Debugging Incorrect Answers

- An **incorrect answer** is a derived answer which is false in the intended interpretation.
- An incorrect answer means a clause in the KB is false in the intended interpretation.
- If  $g$  is false in the intended interpretation, there is a proof for  $g$  using  $g \Leftarrow a_1 \& \dots \& a_k$ . Either:
  - ▶ Some  $a_i$  is false: debug it.
  - ▶ All  $a_i$  are true. This rule is buggy.

# Debugging Missing Answers

- **WHYNOT** *g*. *g* fails when it should have succeeded.  
Either:
  - ▶ There is an atom in a rule that succeeded with the wrong answer, use HOW to debug it.
  - ▶ There is an atom in a body that failed when it should have succeeded, debug it using WHYNOT.
  - ▶ There is a rule missing for *g*.

# Debugging Infinite Loops

- There is no automatic way to debug all such errors: **halting problem**.
- There are many errors that can be detected:
  - ▶ If a subgoal is identical to an ancestor in the proof tree, the program is looping.
  - ▶ Define a well-founded ordering that is reduced each time through a loop.



# Implementing Knowledge-based Systems

To build an interpreter for a language, we need to distinguish

- **Base language** the language of the RRS being implemented.
- **Metalinguage** the language used to implement the system.

They could even be the same language!

# Implementing the base language

Let's use the definite clause language as the base language and the metalanguage.

- We need to represent the base-level constructs in the metalanguage.
- We represent base-level terms, atoms, and bodies as meta-level terms.
- We represent base-level clauses as meta-level facts.
- In the **non-ground representation** base-level variables are represented as meta-level variables.

# Representing the base level constructs

- Base-level atom  $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is represented as the meta-level term  $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ .
- Meta-level term  $oand(e_1, e_2)$  denotes the conjunction of base-level bodies  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ .
- Meta-level constant  $true$  denotes the object-level empty body.
- The meta-level atom  $clause(h, b)$  is true if “ $h$  if  $b$ ” is a clause in the base-level knowledge base.

# Example representation

The base-level clauses

*connected\_to*( $l_1, w_0$ ).

*connected\_to*( $w_0, w_1$ )  $\leftarrow$  *up*( $s_2$ ).

*lit*( $L$ )  $\leftarrow$  *light*( $L$ )  $\wedge$  *ok*( $L$ )  $\wedge$  *live*( $L$ ).

can be represented as the meta-level facts

*clause*(*connected\_to*( $l_1, w_0$ ), *true*).

*clause*(*connected\_to*( $w_0, w_1$ ), *up*( $s_2$ )).

*clause*(*lit*( $L$ ), *oand*(*light*( $L$ ), *oand*(*ok*( $L$ ), *live*( $L$ )))).

# Making the representation pretty

- Use the infix function symbol “&” rather than *oand*.
  - ▶ instead of writing *oand*( $e_1, e_2$ ), you write  $e_1 \& e_2$ .
- Instead of writing *clause*( $h, b$ ) you can write  $h \Leftarrow b$ , where  $\Leftarrow$  is an infix meta-level predicate symbol.
  - ▶ Thus the base-level clause “ $h \leftarrow a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_n$ ” is represented as the meta-level atom  $h \Leftarrow a_1 \& \cdots \& a_n$ .

# Example representation

The base-level clauses

*connected\_to*( $l_1, w_0$ ).

*connected\_to*( $w_0, w_1$ )  $\leftarrow$  *up*( $s_2$ ).

*lit*( $L$ )  $\leftarrow$  *light*( $L$ )  $\wedge$  *ok*( $L$ )  $\wedge$  *live*( $L$ ).

can be represented as the meta-level facts

*connected\_to*( $l_1, w_0$ )  $\Leftarrow$  *true*.

*connected\_to*( $w_0, w_1$ )  $\Leftarrow$  *up*( $s_2$ ).

*lit*( $L$ )  $\Leftarrow$  *light*( $L$ )  $\&$  *ok*( $L$ )  $\&$  *live*( $L$ ).

# Vanilla Meta-interpreter

*prove*(*G*) is true when base-level body *G* is a logical consequence of the base-level KB.

*prove*(*true*).

*prove*((*A* & *B*))  $\leftarrow$

*prove*(*A*)  $\wedge$

*prove*(*B*).

*prove*(*H*)  $\leftarrow$

(*H*  $\Leftarrow$  *B*)  $\wedge$

*prove*(*B*).

## Example base-level KB

$live(W) \Leftarrow$   
     $connected\_to(W, W_1) \ \&$   
     $live(W_1).$   
 $live(outside) \Leftarrow true.$   
 $connected\_to(w_6, w_5) \Leftarrow ok(cb_2).$   
 $connected\_to(w_5, outside) \Leftarrow true.$   
 $ok(cb_2) \Leftarrow true.$   
 $?prove(live(w_6)).$



# Expanding the base-level

Adding clauses increases what can be proved.

- **Disjunction** Let  $a; b$  be the base-level representation for the disjunction of  $a$  and  $b$ . Body  $a; b$  is true when  $a$  is true, or  $b$  is true, or both  $a$  and  $b$  are true.
- **Built-in predicates** You can add built-in predicates such as  $N$  is  $E$  that is true if expression  $E$  evaluates to number  $N$ .

# Expanded meta-interpreter

$prove(true).$   
 $prove((A \& B)) \leftarrow$   
     $prove(A) \wedge prove(B).$   
 $prove((A; B)) \leftarrow prove(A).$   
 $prove((A; B)) \leftarrow prove(B).$   
 $prove((N \text{ is } E)) \leftarrow$   
     $N \text{ is } E.$   
 $prove(H) \leftarrow$   
     $(H \Leftarrow B) \wedge prove(B).$

# Depth-Bounded Search

- Adding conditions reduces what can be proved.

% *bprove*(*G*, *D*) is true if *G* can be proved with a proof tree of depth less than or equal to number *D*.

*bprove*(*true*, *D*).

*bprove*((*A* & *B*), *D*)  $\leftarrow$

*bprove*(*A*, *D*)  $\wedge$  *bprove*(*B*, *D*).

*bprove*(*H*, *D*)  $\leftarrow$

$D \geq 0 \wedge D_1$  is  $D - 1 \wedge$

(*H*  $\Leftarrow$  *B*)  $\wedge$  *bprove*(*B*, *D*<sub>1</sub>).

# Ask-the-user meta-interpreter

% *aprove*(*G*) is true if *G* is a logical consequence of the base-level KB and yes/no answers provided by the user.

*aprove*(*true*).

*aprove*((*A* & *B*))  $\leftarrow$  *aprove*(*A*)  $\wedge$  *aprove*(*B*).

*aprove*(*H*)  $\leftarrow$  *askable*(*H*)  $\wedge$  *answered*(*H*, *yes*).

*aprove*(*H*)  $\leftarrow$

*askable*(*H*)  $\wedge$  *unanswered*(*H*)  $\wedge$  *ask*(*H*, *Ans*)  $\wedge$

*record*(*answered*(*H*, *Ans*))  $\wedge$  *Ans* = *yes*.

*aprove*(*H*)  $\leftarrow$  (*H*  $\Leftarrow$  *B*)  $\wedge$  *aprove*(*B*).

# Meta-interpreter to collect rules for WHY

% *wprove*(*G*, *A*) is true if *G* follows from base-level KB, and *A* is a list of ancestor rules for *G*.

```
wprove(true, Anc).  
wprove((A & B), Anc) ←  
    wprove(A, Anc) ∧  
    wprove(B, Anc).  
wprove(H, Anc) ←  
    (H ⇐ B) ∧  
    wprove(B, [(H ⇐ B)|Anc]).
```

Some goals, rather than being proved, can be collected in a list.

- To delay subgoals with variables, in the hope that subsequent calls will ground the variables.
- To delay assumptions, so that you can collect assumptions that are needed to prove a goal.
- To create new rules that leave out intermediate steps.
- To reduce a set of goals to primitive predicates.

# Delaying Meta-interpreter

% *dprove*(*G*, *D*<sub>0</sub>, *D*<sub>1</sub>) is true if *D*<sub>0</sub> is an ending of list of delayable atoms *D*<sub>1</sub> and  $KB \wedge (D_1 - D_0) \models G$ .

*dprove*(*true*, *D*, *D*).

*dprove*((*A* & *B*), *D*<sub>1</sub>, *D*<sub>3</sub>) ←

*dprove*(*A*, *D*<sub>1</sub>, *D*<sub>2</sub>) ∧ *dprove*(*B*, *D*<sub>2</sub>, *D*<sub>3</sub>).

*dprove*(*G*, *D*, [*G*|*D*]) ← *delay*(*G*).

*dprove*(*H*, *D*<sub>1</sub>, *D*<sub>2</sub>) ←

(*H* ⇐ *B*) ∧ *dprove*(*B*, *D*<sub>1</sub>, *D*<sub>2</sub>).

## Example base-level KB

*live(W)  $\Leftarrow$*

*connected\_to(W, W<sub>1</sub>) &  
live(W<sub>1</sub>).*

*live(outside)  $\Leftarrow$  true.*

*connected\_to(w<sub>6</sub>, w<sub>5</sub>)  $\Leftarrow$  ok(cb<sub>2</sub>).*

*connected\_to(w<sub>5</sub>, outside)  $\Leftarrow$  ok(outside\_connection).*

*delay(ok(X)).*

*?dprove(live(w<sub>6</sub>), [], D).*



# Meta-interpreter that builds a proof tree

% *hprove*(*G*, *T*) is true if *G* can be proved from the base-level KB,  
with proof tree *T*.

*hprove*(*true*, *true*).

*hprove*((*A* & *B*), (*L* & *R*))  $\leftarrow$

*hprove*(*A*, *L*)  $\wedge$

*hprove*(*B*, *R*).

*hprove*(*H*, *if*(*H*, *T*))  $\leftarrow$

(*H*  $\Leftarrow$  *B*)  $\wedge$

*hprove*(*B*, *T*).