



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

---

# Inference in Description Logics

Petr Křemen

## 1 Inference Procedures

1. Why inconsistency of an ontology is a problem ? What is its consequence ?
2. Show that disjointness of two concepts can be reduced to unsatisfiability of a single concept.
3. A satisfiable concept is interpreted as a non-empty set in at least one model of the theory/ontology. How to check that a concept is interpreted as a non-empty set in all models ?

## 2 Tableaux Algorithm for $\mathcal{ALC}$

1. Decide, whether the  $\mathcal{ALC}$  concept  $\exists hasChild \cdot (Student \sqcap Employee) \sqcap \neg (\exists hasChild \cdot Student \sqcap \exists hasChild \cdot Employee)$  is satisfiable (w.r.t. an empty TBox). Show the run of the tableau algorithm in detail.
2. Decide, whether the theory/ontology  $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$  is consistent. Show the run of the tableau algorithm in detail.
  - $\mathcal{T} = \{\exists hasChild \cdot \top \equiv Parent\}$
  - $\mathcal{A} = \{hasChild(JOHN, MARY), Woman(MARY)\}$
3. Decide and show, whether the ontology

$$\mathcal{K}_1 = \{\mathcal{T} \cup \{Parent \sqsubseteq \forall hasChild \cdot \neg Woman\}, \mathcal{A}\}$$

is consistent.

4. Decide and show, whether the ontology

$$\mathcal{K}_1 = \{\mathcal{T} \cup \{Parent \sqsubseteq \exists hasChild \cdot Parent\}, \mathcal{A}\}$$

is consistent.

### 3 Practically in Protégé

1. Model the previous ontology in Protégé and check (using the Pellet/Hermit reasoner) whether your solutions in the previous tasks were correct.
2. Adjust the Pizza ontology introduced in the previous seminar, so that the class *IceCream* and *CheesyVegetableTopping* become satisfiable.
3. Explain, why the Pizza ontology is consistent, although it contains unsatisfiable classes.



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

---