OPPA European Social Fund
Prague & EU: We invest in your future.

AE4M33RZN, Fuzzy logic: Fuzzy description logic

Radomír Černoch

radomir.cernoch@fel.cvut.cz

3/12/2012

Faculty of Electrical Engineering, CTU in Prague

Plan of the lecture

Revision of crisp description logic

- Language $\mathcal{SHIF}$
- Concepts and interpretation
- Notion of truth

Fuzzy description logic

- Concepts
- Notion of truth
- Queries

Biblopgraphy

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF(D)}$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF}(\mathcal{D})$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$
  - atomic negation
  - intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
- $\mathcal{C}$

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF(D)}$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$
  - atomic negation
  - intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
- $\mathcal{C}$ = full concept negation
- $\mathcal{S}$

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF(D)}$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$
  - atomic negation
  - intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
- $\mathcal{C}$ = full concept negation
- $\mathcal{S}$ = $\mathcal{ALC}$ + transitive roles
- $\mathcal{H}$

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF}(\mathcal{D})$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$
  - atomic negation
  - intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
- $\mathcal{C}$ = full concept negation
- $\mathcal{S}$ = $\mathcal{ALC}$ + transitive roles
- $\mathcal{H}$ = role hierarchies
- $\mathcal{I}$

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF}(\mathcal{D})$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$
  - atomic negation
  - intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
- $\mathcal{C}$ = full concept negation
- $\mathcal{S}$ = $\mathcal{ALC}$ + transitive roles
- $\mathcal{H}$ = role hierarchies
- $\mathcal{I}$ = inverse properties
- $\mathcal{F}$

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF(D)}$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$
  - atomic negation
  - intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
- $\mathcal{C}$ = full concept negation
- $\mathcal{S}$ = $\mathcal{ALC}$ + transitive roles
- $\mathcal{H}$ = role hierarchies
- $\mathcal{I}$ = inverse properties
- $\mathcal{F}$
  - concept intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
  - role restriction
- $\mathcal{D}$

Crisp description logic

Our treatment of fuzzy description logic is based on a family of crisp description logic $\mathcal{SHIF(D)}$ [Baader, 2003]:

- $\mathcal{AL}$
  - atomic negation
  - intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
- $\mathcal{C}$ = full concept negation
- $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{ALC}$ + transitive roles
- $\mathcal{H}$ = role hierarchies
- $\mathcal{I}$ = inverse properties
- $\mathcal{F}$
  - concept intersection
  - universal restrictions
  - limited existential quantification
  - role restriction
- $\mathcal{D}$ = data types

$\mathcal{SHIF}$ concepts

Let A and R be the sets of *atomic concepts* and *atomic roles*.

Concept constructors

$C, D := \top \mid \bot$	top and bottom concepts	(1)
$\mid A$	atomic concept	(2)
$\mid \neg C$	concept negation	(3)
$\mid C \sqcap D$	intersection	(4)
$\mid C \sqcup D$	concept union	(5)
$\mid \forall R \cdot C$	full universal quantification	(6)
$\mid \exists R \cdot C$	full existential quantification	(7)

Crisp description logic ontology

Ontology consists of $\mathscr{A}$*Box* and $\mathscr{T}$*Box*. We use the set of individuals $\boldsymbol{I}$:

Crisp description logic ontology

Ontology consists of $\mathscr{A}Box$ and $\mathscr{T}Box$. We use the set of individuals I:

$\mathscr{A}Box$ (Assertion Box)

Contains *concept assertions* $\langle i \in I : \mathrm{p} \in P \rangle$
and *role assertions* $\langle (i, j \in I) : \mathrm{r} \in R \rangle$.

Crisp description logic ontology

Ontology consists of $\mathscr{A}$*Box* and $\mathscr{T}$*Box*. We use the set of individuals $\boldsymbol{I}$:

$\mathscr{A}$*Box* (Assertion Box)

Contains *concept assertions* $\langle \boldsymbol{i} \in \boldsymbol{I} : \mathrm{p} \in \boldsymbol{P} \rangle$
and *role assertions* $\langle (\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{j} \in \boldsymbol{I}) : \mathrm{r} \in \boldsymbol{R} \rangle$.

$\mathscr{T}$*Box* (Terminology Box)

Contains *general concept inclusion* (GCI) axioms $\langle \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} \rangle$ and role axioms (role hierarchy $\langle \mathrm{R}_1 \sqsubseteq \mathrm{R}_2 \rangle$, transitivity, ...).

Crisp description logic interpretation

Interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a tuple $(\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$ (*interpretation domain*, *interpretation function*), which maps

an individual to domain object	$i^{\mathcal{I}} \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$
an atomic concept to domain subsets	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$
an atomic role to subset of domain tuples	$R^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$

Crisp description logic interpretation

The non-atomic concepts are interpreted as follows:

non-atomic concept	its interpretation
$\top$	$\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\bot$	$\emptyset$
$\neg C$	$\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \setminus C^{\mathcal{I}}$
$C \sqcap D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}}$
$C \sqcup D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \cup D^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\forall R \cdot C$	$\{x \mid \forall y \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} . ((x, y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}) \Rightarrow (y \in C^{\mathcal{I}})\}$
$\exists R \cdot C$	$\{x \mid \exists y \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} . ((x, y) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}) \wedge (y \in C^{\mathcal{I}})\}$

Crisp notion of truth

Axiom satisfaction

axiom	satisfied when
$\langle i : C \rangle$	$i^{\mathcal{I}} \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\langle (i,j) : R \rangle$	$(i^{\mathcal{I}}, j^{\mathcal{I}}) \in R^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\langle C \sqsubseteq D \rangle$	$C^{\mathcal{I}} \sqsubseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$
transitive(R)	$R^{\mathcal{I}}$ is transitive
...	

- Concept C is *satisfiable*

- Concept C is ***satisfiable*** iff there is an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ s.t. $\mathcal{I} \models < i : C >$ for some i.
- Interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ ***satisfies*** a knowledgebase $\mathcal{K}$ = $\mathcal{A}$***Box*** + $\mathcal{T}$***Box*** (or $\mathcal{I}$ is a ***model*** of $\mathcal{K}$)

- Concept C is ***satisfiable*** iff there is an interpretation $\mathscr{I}$ s.t. $\mathscr{I} \models < i : \mathsf{C} >$ for some i.
- Interpretation $\mathscr{I}$ ***satisfies*** a knowledgebase $\mathscr{K} = \mathscr{A}$***Box*** + $\mathscr{T}$***Box*** (or $\mathscr{I}$ is a ***model*** of $\mathscr{K}$) iff $\mathscr{I}$ satisfies all its axioms.
- Axiom T is a ***logical consequence*** of $\mathscr{K}$

- Concept C is ***satisfiable*** iff there is an interpretation $\mathscr{I}$ s.t. $\mathscr{I} \models < i : C >$ for some i.
- Interpretation $\mathscr{I}$ ***satisfies*** a knowledgebase $\mathcal{K} = \mathscr{A}\textit{Box} + \mathscr{T}\textit{Box}$ (or $\mathscr{I}$ is a ***model*** of $\mathcal{K}$) iff $\mathscr{I}$ satisfies all its axioms.
- Axiom T is a ***logical consequence*** of $\mathcal{K}$ iff every model of $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies T. We write $\mathcal{K} \models T$.

Fuzzy description logic

Basic idea

Fuzzy description logic

Basic idea

1. Keep the the previous slides intact.

Fuzzy description logic

Basic idea

1. Keep the the previous slides intact.
2. Add $\circ$ below and above every operation.

Fuzzy description logic

Basic idea

1. Keep the the previous slides intact.
2. Add $\circ$ below and above every operation.
3. Watch the semantic change.

Overview

We will show the **fuzzyDL** reasoner [Bobillo and Straccia, 2008] capabilities, which extends the $\mathcal{SHIF}(\mathcal{D})$ family with fuzzy capabilities.

Concept constructors

We start with atomic concepts A. Derived concepts are on the next slide together with their interpretation. (Each concept is interpreted as a fuzzy subset of the domain.)

Fuzzy DL interpretation

Fuzzy interpretation $\mathscr{I}$ is a tuple $\Delta^{\mathscr{I}}, \cdot^{\mathscr{I}}$ which maps

an individual to a domain object	$\boldsymbol{i}^{\mathscr{I}} \in \Delta^{\mathscr{I}}$
an atomic concept to a domain subsets	$\mathsf{C}^{\mathscr{I}} \in \mathbb{F}(\Delta^{\mathscr{I}})$
an atomic role to a relation on the domain	$\mathsf{R}^{\mathscr{I}} \in \mathbb{F}(\Delta^{\mathscr{I}} \times \Delta^{\mathscr{I}})$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\bot$	$\mathbf{0}$
$\top$	$\mathbf{1}$
A	$A^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$\neg C$	$\underset{S}{\neg} C^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\bot$	$\mathbf{0}$
$\top$	$\mathbf{1}$
A	$A^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$\neg C$	$\underset{S}{\neg} C^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \underset{S}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \underset{S}{\wedge} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \underset{L}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \underset{L}{\wedge} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\bot$	0
$\top$	1
A	$A^{\mathscr{I}}(x)$
$\neg C$	$\underset{S}{\neg} C^{\mathscr{I}}(x)$
$C \underset{S}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathscr{I}}(x) \underset{S}{\wedge} D^{\mathscr{I}}(x)$
$C \underset{L}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathscr{I}}(x) \underset{L}{\wedge} D^{\mathscr{I}}(x)$
$C \overset{S}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathscr{I}}(x) \overset{S}{\vee} D^{\mathscr{I}}(x)$
$C \overset{L}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathscr{I}}(x) \overset{L}{\vee} D^{\mathscr{I}}(x)$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\bot$	0
$\top$	1
A	$A^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$\neg C$	$\underset{S}{\neg} C^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \underset{S}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \underset{S}{\wedge} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \underset{L}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \underset{L}{\wedge} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \overset{S}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \overset{S}{\vee} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \overset{L}{\sqcap} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \overset{L}{\vee} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \overset{R}{\underset{S}{\mapsto}} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \overset{R}{\underset{S}{\Rightarrow}} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \overset{R}{\underset{L}{\mapsto}} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \overset{R}{\underset{L}{\Rightarrow}} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \overset{S}{\underset{S}{\mapsto}} D$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \overset{S}{\underset{S}{\Rightarrow}} D^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\exists R \cdot C$	$\sup_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x,y) \underset{\circ}{\wedge} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$
$\forall R \cdot C$	$\inf_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x,y) \overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\Rightarrow}} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\exists R \cdot C$	$\sup_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x,y) \mathbin{\mathring{\wedge}} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$
$\forall R \cdot C$	$\inf_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x,y) \mathbin{\mathring{\Rightarrow}} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$
$(n\ C)$	$n \cdot C(x)$
$mod(C)$	$mod(C^{\mathcal{I}}(x))$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\exists R \cdot C$	$\sup_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) \mathbin{\mathring{\wedge}} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$
$\forall R \cdot C$	$\inf_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) \mathbin{\overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\Rightarrow}}} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$
$(n\, C)$	$n \cdot C(x)$
$mod(C)$	$mod(C^{\mathcal{I}}(x))$
$w_1 C_1 + \ldots + w_k C_k$	$w_1 C_1^{\mathcal{I}}(x) + \ldots + w_k C_k^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$

$C, D :=$	interpretation of x
$\exists R \cdot C$	$\sup_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) \mathbin{\overset{}{\underset{\circ}{\wedge}}} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$
$\forall R \cdot C$	$\inf_y R^{\mathcal{I}}(x, y) \overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\Rightarrow}} C^{\mathcal{I}}(y)$
$(n\ C)$	$n \cdot C(x)$
$mod(C)$	$mod(C^{\mathcal{I}}(x))$
$w_1 C_1 + \ldots + w_k C_k$	$w_1 C_1^{\mathcal{I}}(x) + \ldots + w_k C_k^{\mathcal{I}}(x)$
$C \lesseqqgtr n$	$\begin{cases} C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) & C^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \lesseqqgtr n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Male $\sqcap$ Female $\neq \bot$

Modifiers

Modifier is a function that alters the membership function.

Example

Linear modifier of degree c is

$$a = \frac{c}{c+1}$$
$$b = \frac{1}{c+1}$$

Fuzzy DL ontology

Ontology consists of $\mathscr{A}$***Box*** and $\mathscr{T}$***Box***:

Fuzzy DL ontology

Ontology consists of $\mathscr{A}$*Box* and $\mathscr{T}$*Box*:

$\mathscr{A}$*Box* (Assertion Box)

Contains *concept assertions* $\langle \boldsymbol{i} \in \boldsymbol{I} : \mathrm{p} \in \boldsymbol{P} \,|\, \alpha \rangle$ and *role assertions* $\langle (\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{j} \in \boldsymbol{I}) : \mathrm{r} \in \boldsymbol{R} \,|\, \alpha \rangle$.

Fuzzy DL ontology

Ontology consists of $\mathscr{A}$*Box* and $\mathscr{T}$*Box*:

$\mathscr{A}$*Box* (Assertion Box)

Contains *concept assertions* $\langle \boldsymbol{i} \in \boldsymbol{I} : \mathrm{p} \in \boldsymbol{P} \,|\, \alpha \rangle$ and *role assertions* $\langle (\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{j} \in \boldsymbol{I}) : \mathrm{r} \in \boldsymbol{R} \,|\, \alpha \rangle$.

$\mathscr{T}$*Box* (Terminology Box)

GCI axioms $\langle \mathrm{C} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{D} \,|\, \alpha \rangle$ state that "C is D **at least** by α".
Besides GCI, there are role hierarchy axioms $\langle \mathrm{R}_1 \sqsubseteq \mathrm{R}_2 \rangle$, transitivity axioms and definitions of inverse relations.

Notion of a fuzzy truth

Fuzzy axioms

axiom	satisfied if
$\langle \boldsymbol{i} : C \mid \alpha \rangle$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(\boldsymbol{i}^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$

Notion of a fuzzy truth

Fuzzy axioms

axiom	satisfied if
$\langle i : C \mid \alpha \rangle$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle (i,j) : R \mid \alpha \rangle$	$R^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}, j^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle C \sqsubseteq D \mid \alpha \rangle$	$C \mathrel{\overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\subseteq}}} D \geqslant \alpha$

Notion of a fuzzy truth

Fuzzy axioms

axiom	satisfied if
$\langle i : \mathsf{C} \mid \alpha \rangle$	$\mathsf{C}^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle (i,j) : \mathsf{R} \mid \alpha \rangle$	$\mathsf{R}^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}, j^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D} \mid \alpha \rangle$	$\mathsf{C} \overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\subseteq}} \mathsf{D} \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle \mathsf{R}_1 \sqsubseteq \mathsf{R}_2 \rangle$	$\mathsf{R}_1^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathsf{R}_2^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\langle$transitive $\mathsf{R}\rangle$	R is $\circ$-transitive

Notion of a fuzzy truth

Fuzzy axioms

axiom	satisfied if
$\langle i : C \mid \alpha \rangle$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle (i,j) : R \mid \alpha \rangle$	$R^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}, j^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle C \sqsubseteq D \mid \alpha \rangle$	$C \mathrel{\overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\subseteq}}} D \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle R_1 \sqsubseteq R_2 \rangle$	$R_1^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq R_2^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\langle$transitive $R\rangle$	R is $\circ$-transitive
$\langle R_1 = R_2^{-1} \rangle$	$R_1^{\mathcal{I}} = (R_2^{\mathcal{I}})^{-1}$

Notion of a fuzzy truth

Fuzzy axioms

axiom	satisfied if
$\langle i : C \mid \alpha \rangle$	$C^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle (i,j) : R \mid \alpha \rangle$	$R^{\mathcal{I}}(i^{\mathcal{I}}, j^{\mathcal{I}}) \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle C \sqsubseteq D \mid \alpha \rangle$	$C \overset{\circ}{\underset{\circ}{\subseteq}} D \geqslant \alpha$
$\langle R_1 \sqsubseteq R_2 \rangle$	$R_1^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq R_2^{\mathcal{I}}$
$\langle \text{transitive } R \rangle$	R is $\circ$-transitive
$\langle R_1 = R_2^{-1} \rangle$	$R_1^{\mathcal{I}} = (R_2^{\mathcal{I}})^{-1}$

Using these definitions, the notions of *logical consequence* and *satisfiability* (of both concepts and axioms) remains the same. More on slide 317.

What can you ask the reasoner?

Best/Worst Degree Bound

What is the minimal degree of an axiom that $\mathcal{K}$ ensures?

$$\boldsymbol{bdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = \sup\{\alpha \mid \mathcal{K} \models \langle \tau \mid \alpha \rangle\}$$
$$\boldsymbol{wdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = \inf\{\alpha \mid \mathcal{K} \models \langle \tau \mid \alpha \rangle\}$$

where τ is an axiom of type $\langle \boldsymbol{i} : \mathsf{C} \rangle$ or $\langle (\boldsymbol{i}, \boldsymbol{j}) : \mathsf{R} \rangle$ or $\langle \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D} \rangle$.

What can you ask the reasoner?

Best/Worst Degree Bound

What is the minimal degree of an axiom that $\mathcal{K}$ ensures?

$$bdb(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = \sup\{\alpha \mid \mathcal{K} \models \langle \tau \mid \alpha \rangle\}$$
$$wdb(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = \inf\{\alpha \mid \mathcal{K} \models \langle \tau \mid \alpha \rangle\}$$

where τ is an axiom of type $\langle i : \mathsf{C} \rangle$ or $\langle (i, j) : \mathsf{R} \rangle$ or $\langle \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D} \rangle$.

- From an empty $\mathcal{K}$, you cannot infer anything and therefore $bdb(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = 1$ and $wdb(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = 0$ (if using atomic concepts only). Only by adding new axioms into $\mathcal{K}$, the bounds “tighten up”.

What can you ask the reasoner?

Best/Worst Degree Bound

What is the minimal degree of an axiom that $\mathcal{K}$ ensures?

$$\boldsymbol{bdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = \mathbf{sup}\{\alpha \mid \mathcal{K} \models \langle \tau \mid \alpha \rangle\}$$
$$\boldsymbol{wdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = \mathbf{inf}\{\alpha \mid \mathcal{K} \models \langle \tau \mid \alpha \rangle\}$$

where τ is an axiom of type $\langle i : \mathsf{C} \rangle$ or $\langle (i, j) : \mathsf{R} \rangle$ or $\langle \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D} \rangle$.

- From an empty $\mathcal{K}$, you cannot infer anything and therefore $\boldsymbol{bdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = 1$ and $\boldsymbol{wdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau) = 0$ (if using atomic concepts only). Only by adding new axioms into $\mathcal{K}$, the bounds "tighten up".
- What happens if $\boldsymbol{wdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau) \geqslant \boldsymbol{bdb}(\mathcal{K}, \tau)$ for some axiom τ?

What can you ask the reasoner?

Best Satisfiability Bound

What is the maximal degree of satisfiability of C?

$$\mathit{bsb}(\mathcal{K}, \mathsf{C}) = \sup_{\mathcal{I}} \sup_{x \in \Delta} \{\mathsf{C}^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \mid \mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{K}\}\,.$$

What can you ask the reasoner?

Best Satisfiability Bound

What is the maximal degree of satisfiability of C?

$$bsb(\mathcal{K}, \mathsf{C}) = \sup_{\mathcal{I}} \sup_{x \in \Delta} \{\mathsf{C}^{\mathcal{I}}(x) \mid \mathcal{I} \models \mathcal{K}\}\,.$$

This is a generalization of *concept satisfiability*.

Bibliography

Baader, F. (2003).
The Description Logic Handbook: Theory, Implementation, and Applications.
Cambridge University Press.

Bobillo, O. and Straccia, U. (2008).
fuzzydl: An expressive fuzzy description logic reasoner.
In In Proc. FUZZ-IEEE-2008. IEEE Computer Society, pages 923--930.

OPPA European Social Fund
Prague & EU: We invest in your future.