

Exercise 3, Sheet 2:

Program from Slide 572 (borders, reachable)

$P = \{ \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3 \}$

$P \cup \{ \text{unreachable}(X, Y) :- \text{country}(X), \text{country}(Y), \text{not reachable}(X, Y). \}$

τ_4

\Rightarrow sketch it:

dep graph:

S_1 : EDB relations
 : anything that depends on possible (+ recursive processing of reachability):

$S_1 = \{ \text{country}, \text{borders}, \text{reachable} \}$

$S_2 = \{ \text{unreachable} \}$

associated stratification of the program:

$P_1 = \{ \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3 \}$

$P_2 = \{ \tau_4 \}$

Jun 10-10:11

... evaluate it:

$I_0 := \emptyset$

$I_1 := I_0 \cup T_{P_1}^\omega(I_0)$

$= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{borders}(a, b) : a, b \text{ is a country and } a \text{ and } b \\ \text{are neighbors} \\ \cup \{ \text{reachable}(a, b) : b \text{ is reachable from } a \\ = \text{tc}(\text{borders}) \} \\ \cup \{ \text{all facts from mondial} \} \end{array} \right.$

(cf. induction proof from last week)

$I_2 := I_1 \cup T_{P_2}^\omega(I_1)$

$= I_1 \cup \{ \text{unreachable}(a, b) \text{ s.t. } (a, b) \notin \text{tc}(\text{borders}) \}$

important!
 contains all things defined before!

$= \mathcal{G}(P)$ is the "stratified model"
unique

Jun 10-10:35

.. back to the exercise sheet:

- Stratifiable P may have multiple minimal models:
 - give just some example case
- for P, $\mathcal{Y}(P)$ is a minimal model!
- some additional minimal model:
 - "insert" border (de, ans)
 - $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{Y}(P) \cup \{\text{border}(de, ans)\}$
 - it is not a model!
 - model also
 - border (ans, de) und fettane
 - readable (d, ans)
 - readable (ch, ans)
 - consider rule r-k: ("unreachable")
 - goes into $\mathcal{H}_1(P) \neq \mathcal{H}_2(P)$
 - "non-minimal model of P_1 "
 - $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{\text{r-k}\}$ does not any more derive
 - get $\mathcal{Y}'(P) := \mathcal{H}_2$ unreachable (de, ans)
- now we have $\mathcal{Y}'(P)$ is a model, and $\mathcal{Y}'(P) = (\mathcal{Y}(P) \cup \{\dots\}) \setminus \{\dots\}$
- i.e. not a proper subset of $\mathcal{Y}(P)$!
- is it minimal? (can we remove something and we still have a model?)
- .. yes, e.g. remove border (de, ans), border (ans, de) then it is still a model
- if remove readable (de, ans) → leads unreachable (de, ans)
- $\mathcal{Y}'(P) - \{\dots\} =: \mathcal{M}_1$
- \mathcal{M}_1 is a model.
- $\mathcal{M}_1 - \{\dots\}$ is not a model, but $\mathcal{M}_1 \cup \{\text{unreachable (de, ans)}\}$

Jun 10-10:44

Consider now the nonmonotonicity:

$$\mathcal{Y}(P \cup \text{Mondial}) \underset{\text{input}}{\cong} \mathcal{Y}(P) \text{ before}$$

$$\cong \{\text{unreachable}(de, ans)\}$$

$$\mathcal{Y}(P \cup \text{Mondial} \cup \{\text{border}(de, ans)\}) \underset{\text{more input}}{\neq} \{\text{unreachable}(de, ans)\}$$

some of the before conclusions is not valid any more

⇒ closed world reasoning is nonmonotonic

Jun 10-10:52

Use small examples for such things:

Boolean $p := \neg q$ FOL $P(a) := q(a)$

Dep Graph: $p \leftarrow q$

$S_1 = \{q\}$
 $S_2 = \{p\}$

$P_1 = \emptyset$ $\mathcal{I}_0 = \emptyset$
 $P_2 = \{P := \neg q\}$ $\mathcal{I}_1 = \emptyset \cup T_{P_1}^{\omega}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$
 $\mathcal{I}_2 = \emptyset \cup T_{P_2}^{\omega}(\emptyset) = \{P\}$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(P) = \{P\}$

- is a model
- is minimal

Consider $\mathcal{M} := \{\varphi\}$

- is a model
- is minimal

Jun 10-11:17

back to the lecture:

Why is this \mathcal{M} not as good as $\mathcal{Y}(P)$

- both are models
- both are minimal ?

Consider: apply P to \mathcal{M} or $\mathcal{Y}(P)$

$T_P^{\omega}(\mathcal{Y}(P)) = \{P\} = \mathcal{Y}(P)$

$T_P^{\omega}(\mathcal{M}) = \emptyset$ does not reproduce the "knowledge"

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ was invented, not "supported".

is not necessary to check this

$\Rightarrow T_P^{\omega}$ to construct $\mathcal{Y}(P)$ is polynomial (no. of vars)

check is only linear \downarrow

but: to check, we have to guess \downarrow (actually exponential)

\Rightarrow idea towards **STABLE MODELS**

guess and check ... (for stability)

Jun 10-11:24

Idea for checking stability from before:

- good (see example)
- not perfect:

bad example:

$$P = \{ p \leftarrow p \}$$

original
definition
our above
check

$$T_P^w(\emptyset) = \emptyset$$

even without negation....

is the minimal model

$$T_P(\{p\}) = \{p\}$$

satisfies this check :)

→ linear check is not that good....

but a good start....

See later....

Jun 10-11:32

Jun 10-11:36