

Knowledge Representation and Reasoning

Jef Wijsen

UMONS

January 30, 2024

$$\text{AI} \simeq \text{GOFAI} + \text{AML}$$

- AI: Artificial Intelligence
- GOFAI: Good Old-Fashioned Artificial Intelligence (\simeq symbolic AI)
- AML: Adaptive Machine Learning (reinforcement learning, big data...)

$$\text{KRR} \subseteq \text{GOFAI}$$

- KRR: Knowledge Representation and [Automated] Reasoning

Logic-based KRR

- Answer Set Programming (**ASP**): an expressive logic for specifying and solving problems in NP (including NP-complete problems).
 - Task:** Solving
 - Input:** A set Σ of logic formulas (also called constraints, rules...). (e.g., the rules of Sudoku + a partially filled grid)
 - Question:** Is there a solution (also called model, answer set...) that satisfies every formula in Σ ?
- Web Ontology Language (**OWL**): less expressive logics that allow automated reasoning about data on the Web.
 - Task:** Automated reasoning
 - Input:** A set of logic formulas Σ ; a logic formula σ .
 - Question:** Is σ a logical consequence of Σ ?

Note: Automated reasoning is computationally impossible for expressive logics.

$$\text{FO} \subsetneq \text{Datalog}^\neg \subseteq \text{P} \subseteq \text{NP} \subseteq \text{Prolog}$$

where

- FO denotes the class of problems that take as input a relational database instance and can be solved by a query in relational calculus; and
- Datalog[¬] denotes the class of problems that take as input a relational database instance and can be solved by a program in Datalog with stratified negation.




Recall:

- NP-complete problems cannot be programmed in Datalog[¬].
- Automated reasoning is already computationally impossible for FO.

See “A Datalog Primer.”

<http://informatique.umons.ac.be/ssi/teaching/bdIImons/primerDatalog.pdf>

Course Methodology

	Classical course	↔	This course
language	French	↔	English
teacher's role	teaching	↔	guiding
students' role			 
	being taught	↔	scientific discovery tour
evaluation	exam	↔	project + homeworks + written exam

Course Schedule

Just a screenshot (the full schedule is online):

This document may be updated during the course.

Tuesday, Feb. 6 (15H45)	Meeting in room P.3E11 + organization (14')
Wednesday, Feb. 7 (15H45)	motivation (72')
Thursday, Feb. 8 (15H45)	introduction (170')
Friday, Feb. 9 (10H30)	Meeting in P.0A07; start Homework 1 (due on Feb. 22)Y
Tuesday, Feb. 13 (15H45)	modeling (106')
Wednesday, Feb. 14 (15H45)	YC
Tuesday, Feb. 20 (15H45)	Meeting in B4.233; start Homework 2 (due on Mar. 4)
Thursday, Feb. 22 (15H45)	language (128')
Tuesday, Feb. 27 (15H45)	
Wednesday, Feb. 28 (15H45)	Meeting in B4.233; start Homework 3 (due on Mar. 12)
Thursday, Feb. 29 (15H45)	
Friday, Mar. 1 (10H30)	

Datalog[¬] by Example

```
red(a,b). red(b,c). red(c,a).  
blue(a,c). blue(c,d). blue(d,a).  
redTrans(X,Y) :- red(X,Y).  
redTrans(X,Z) :- redTrans(X,Y), red(Y,Z).  
blueMonopoly(X,Y) :- blue(X,Y), not redTrans(X,Y).
```

- `redTrans` and `blueMonopoly` are **IDB** predicates (because they occur in rule heads); the other predicates are **EDB** predicates (= stored database relations).
- The **PDG** (Program Dependence Graph) has a (non-negated) edge from `redTrans` to `redTrans`, and a negated edge from `blueMonopoly` to `redTrans`.
- **Stratified semantics**: execute the rules for `redTrans` until no more `redTrans`-facts can be derived; only then can rules with “not `redTrans`” be evaluated.

ASP by Example

```
person(john).  
happy(X) :- person(X), not unhappy(X).  
unhappy(X) :- person(X), not happy(X).
```

Not stratified: the 1st rule should be executed before the 2nd rule (because of “not happy”), but the 2nd should be executed before the 1st (because of “not unhappy”).

An ASP solver will find two models:

```
clingo version 4.5.4  
Solving...  
Answer: 1  
person(john) happy(john)  
Answer: 2  
person(john) unhappy(john)  
SATISFIABLE
```

Models : 2