

# Reasoning in Description Logics with a Concrete Domain in the Framework of Resolution

Ullrich Hustadt<sup>1</sup> and Boris Motik<sup>2</sup> and Ulrike Sattler<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract.** In description logics, concrete domains are used to model concrete properties such as weight, name, or age, having concrete values such as integers or strings, with *built-in* predicates, such as  $\leq$  or  $=$ . Until now, reasoning with concrete domains has been studied predominantly in the context of tableaux and automata calculi. In this paper, we present a general approach for concrete domain reasoning in the resolution framework. We apply this approach to devise an optimal decision procedure for  $\mathcal{SHIQ}(\mathbf{D})$ , the extension of  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  with a restricted form of concrete domains, serving as the logical underpinning of the web ontology language OWL-DL.

## 1 Introduction

Description logics are a family of knowledge representation formalisms closely related to first-order and modal logic. They are useful in various application fields, such as reasoning about database conceptual models, as the logical underpinning of ontology languages, for schema representation in information integration systems or for metadata management [1]. Practical applications of DLs usually require *concrete* properties with values from a fixed domain, such as integers or strings, supporting *built-in* predicates. In [2], DLs were extended with *concrete domains*, where partial functions map objects of the abstract domain to values of the concrete domain, and can be used for building complex concepts. For example, the following axiom defines minors as those humans whose age is at most 17:  $\text{Minor} \equiv \text{Human} \sqcap \exists \text{age}.\leq_{17}$ . In [2, 7, 14, 15, 10] decidability, computational complexity and reasoning algorithms for different DLs with concrete domains have been studied. This research influenced the design of the Ontology Web Language (OWL), which supports a basic form of concrete domains, so-called datatypes.

Resolution-based algorithms for DL reasoning are nowadays being intensely researched. To extend these algorithms with support for concrete domains, we present a general approach for reasoning with a concrete domain in clausal calculi whose completeness proof is based on the model generation method. Hence, our approach can be combined with most state-of-the-art calculi, such as basic superposition [4]. The main difference to (ordered) theory resolution [18, 5] is that our calculus is compatible with redundancy elimination. Moreover, we address the problem of identifying the minimal subset of clauses unsatisfiable in the theory. We next apply our approach to the decision procedure for  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  from [13], and show that adding concrete domains does not increase reasoning complexity.

Due to space limitations, we are not able to include all technical details in this paper, and refer the interested reader to [12].

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science, University of Liverpool, UK

<sup>2</sup> FZI Research Center for Information Technologies at the University of Karlsruhe, Germany

<sup>3</sup> Department of Computer Science, University of Manchester, UK

## 2 Resolution with Concrete Domains

**Definition of a Concrete Domain.** With  $\mathbf{x}$  we denote a vector of variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and, for a function  $\delta$ , with  $\delta(\mathbf{x})$  we denote a vector of values  $\delta(x_1), \dots, \delta(x_n)$ .

**Definition 1.** A concrete domain  $\mathbf{D}$  is a pair  $(\Delta_{\mathbf{D}}, \Phi_{\mathbf{D}})$ , where  $\Delta_{\mathbf{D}}$  is the domain of  $\mathbf{D}$ , and  $\Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$  is a finite set of predicate names. Each  $d \in \Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$  is associated with an arity  $n$  and an extension  $d^{\mathbf{D}} \subseteq \Delta_{\mathbf{D}}^n$ . A concrete domain  $\mathbf{D}$  is admissible if: (i)  $\Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$  is closed under negation, i.e. for each  $d \in \Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$ , there exists  $\bar{d} \in \Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$  with  $\bar{d}^{\mathbf{D}} = \Delta_{\mathbf{D}} \setminus d^{\mathbf{D}}$ , (ii) it contains a unary predicate  $\top_{\mathbf{D}}$  interpreted as  $\Delta_{\mathbf{D}}$ , and (iii)  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiability of finite conjunctions of the form  $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n d_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$  is decidable. The latter is the case if there is a solution  $\delta$  such that  $\delta(\mathbf{x}_i) \in d_i^{\mathbf{D}}$ , for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Sometimes, we consider conjunctions over literals containing terms, rather than variables. Let  $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$  be a set of literals, where  $\mathbf{t}_i$  is a vector of terms  $t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ik}$ . With  $\hat{S}$  we denote a conjunction  $C = \bigwedge d_i(\mathbf{x}_i)$ , obtained from  $S$  by replacing each occurrence of a term with the same variable, such that different terms are replaced with distinct variables. For two conjunctions  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , we write  $C_1 \equiv C_2$  if they are equivalent up to variable renaming.

We use the standard definitions of first-order clausal logics (see, e.g. [6]). To separate the extension of the concrete and abstract domain, we assume a two-sorted signature with sorts  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  for the abstract and the concrete domain. Moreover, we consider only admissible concrete domains  $\mathbf{D}$ , so we may assume that all predicates from  $\Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$  occur positively in clauses.

**Definition 2.** Let  $\mathbf{D}$  be an admissible concrete domain,  $N$  a set of clauses over a signature that includes all predicates from  $\Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$ , and  $I$  a “classic” Herbrand model of  $N$ , written  $I \models N$ , where concrete predicates are treated as “normal” predicates. Let  $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$  be the set of all concrete domain literals  $d_i(\mathbf{t}_i) \in I$ . Then  $I$  is a  $\mathbf{D}$ -model of  $N$ , written  $I \models_{\mathbf{D}} N$ , if, additionally,  $\hat{S}$  is  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiable.

**Concrete Domain Resolution on Ground Clauses.** We now present the *ground concrete domain resolution* calculus,  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  for short, which extends the ordered resolution calculus from [3] with a *concrete domain resolution* rule. As usual,  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  is parameterized with a reduction ordering  $\succ$  total on ground literals such that  $\neg A \succ A$ . A literal  $L$  is (strictly) maximal in a clause  $C \vee L$  if there is no such literal  $L' \in C$  such that  $L' \succ L$  ( $L' \succeq L$ ). With  $\succ$  we also denote the multiset extension of the literal ordering to clauses.

**Definition 3.** A set  $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$  of positive concrete literals is a  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint if  $\hat{S}$  is not  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiable. A  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint  $S$  is minimal if  $\hat{S}'$  is  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiable, for each  $S' \subsetneq S$ ;  $S$  is connected if it cannot be decomposed into two subsets without a common term.

It is easy to see [12] that each minimal  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint  $S$  is connected, or conversely, if  $S$  is not connected, it is not minimal.

We now present the rules of  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$ . The clauses  $C \vee A \vee \dots \vee A$  and  $D \vee \neg A$  are called *main premises*, whereas the clauses  $C \vee A$  and  $C_i \vee d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)$  are called *side premises*.

<b>Positive factoring:</b>	
$\frac{C \vee A \vee \dots \vee A}{C \vee A}$	(i) $A$ is strictly maximal in $C$ .
<b>Ordered resolution:</b>	
$\frac{C \vee A \quad D \vee \neg A}{C \vee D}$	(i) $A$ is strictly maximal in $C$ , (ii) $\neg A$ is maximal in $D$ .
<b>Concrete domain resolution:</b>	
$\frac{C_i \vee d_i(\mathbf{t}_i), 1 \leq i \leq n}{C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_n}$	(i) $d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)$ are strictly maximal in $C_i$ , (ii) the set $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$ is a minimal $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint.

It is well-known that effective redundancy elimination criteria are necessary for theorem proving to be applicable in practice. A powerful *standard notion of redundancy* was introduced in [3]. We adapt this notion slightly to take into account the fact that the concrete domain resolution rule does not have a main premise. Then we show the soundness and completeness of  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$ .

**Definition 4.** Let  $N$  be a set of ground clauses. A ground clause  $C$  is redundant in  $N$  if there are clauses  $D_i \in N$ ,  $C \succ D_i$ , such that  $D_1, \dots, D_m \models C$ . A ground inference  $\pi$  with side premises  $C_i$  and a conclusion  $D$  is redundant in  $N$  if there are clauses  $D_i \in N$ , such that  $C_1, \dots, C_n, D_1, \dots, D_m \models D$ ; if  $\pi$  has a main premise  $C$ , then additionally  $C \succ D_i$ .

**Lemma 1 (Soundness).** Let  $N$  be a set of ground clauses,  $I$  a  $\mathbf{D}$ -model of  $N$ , and  $N' = N \cup \{C\}$ , where  $C$  is the conclusion of an inference by  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  with premises from  $N$ . Then  $I$  is a  $\mathbf{D}$ -model of  $N'$ .

*Proof.* For positive factoring or ordered resolution, soundness is trivial [3]. Let  $C$  be obtained by the concrete domain resolution rule, with  $S$  being as in the rule definition. Since  $S$  is a  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint,  $I$  is a  $\mathbf{D}$ -model of  $N$  only if some  $d_i(\mathbf{t}_i) \in S$  exists such that  $d_i(\mathbf{t}_i) \notin I$ . Since  $C_i \vee d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)$  is by assumption true in  $I$ , some literal from  $C_i$  must be true in  $I$ . Since  $C_i \subseteq C$ ,  $C$  is true in  $I$  as well.  $\square$

**Lemma 2 (Completeness).** Let  $N$  be a set of clauses such that each inference by  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  from premises in  $N$  is redundant in  $N$ . If  $N$  does not contain the empty clause, then  $N$  is  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiable.

*Proof.* (Sketch) We extend the model building method from [3] to handle the concrete domain resolution rule. For a set of ground clauses  $N$ , we define an interpretation  $I$  by induction on the clause ordering  $\succ$  as follows: for some clause  $C$ , we set  $I_C = \bigcup_{C \succ D} \varepsilon_D$ , where  $\varepsilon_D = \{A\}$  if (i)  $D \in N$ , (ii)  $D$  is of the form  $D' \vee A$ , such that  $A$  is strictly maximal in  $D'$ , and (iii)  $D$  is false in  $I_D$ ; otherwise,  $\varepsilon_D = \emptyset$ . Let  $I = \bigcup \varepsilon_D$ . A clause  $D$  such that  $\varepsilon_D = \{A\}$  is called *productive*, and it said to *produce* the atom  $A$  in  $I$ .

Invariant (\*): if  $C$  is false in  $I_C \cup \varepsilon_C$ , then  $C$  is false in  $I$ . Since  $C$  is false in  $I_C$ , all negative literals from  $C$  are false in  $I_C$ , and since  $I_C \subseteq I$ , all negative literals from  $C$  are false in  $I$  as well. Furthermore, since  $\neg A \succ A$ , any atom produced by a clause  $D \succ C$  must be larger than any literal occurring in  $C$ , so no clause greater than  $C$  can produce an atom that will make  $C$  true.

We now show that, if all inferences from premises in  $N$  are redundant,  $I$  is a  $\mathbf{D}$ -model of  $N$ . Assume that this were not the case.

The first possibility is that there is a counter-example clause from  $N$  which is false in  $I$ . This case is identical to the one from [3], so we omit the details. Roughly, since  $\succ$  is well-founded and total, there is a smallest counterexample  $C$ . Furthermore, there is a redundant inference by  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  with the main premise  $C$  and side premises  $C_i$  which are true in  $I$ , and a conclusion  $D$  which is false in  $I$ . Since the inference is redundant, there are clauses  $D_i \in N$ ,  $C \succ D_i$ , such that  $D_1, \dots, D_m, C_1, \dots, C_n \models D$ . Since  $C$  is the smallest clause false in  $I$  and all  $D_i$  are smaller than  $C$ , all  $D_i$  are true in  $I$ , so  $D$  would have to be true in  $I$ , which is a contradiction.

The second possibility is that all clauses from  $N$  are true in  $I$ , but the set of concrete domain literals in  $I$  is not  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiable. Then,  $I$  contains a minimal connected  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint  $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$ . By definition of  $I$ , literals in  $S$  were produced by some  $E_i = C_i \vee d_i(\mathbf{t}_i) \in N$ , where  $E_i$  is false in  $I_{E_i}$ . For any  $i$ , since  $d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)$  is strictly maximal in  $C_i$ ,  $C_i$  is false in  $I_{E_i} \cup \varepsilon_{E_i}$ , and by (\*)  $C_i$  is false in  $I$ . Since  $N$  is saturated, the inference by concrete domain resolution resulting in  $D = C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_n$  is redundant in  $N$ . Obviously,  $D$  is false in  $I$ . Since the inference is redundant, non-redundant clauses  $D_i \in N$  exist, such that  $D_1, \dots, D_m, C_1 \vee d_1(\mathbf{t}_1), \dots, C_n \vee d_n(\mathbf{t}_n) \models D$ . All  $D_i$  and  $C_i \vee d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)$  are by assumption true in  $I$ , implying that  $D$  is true in  $I$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

A *fair derivation* by  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  is defined as usual, as a sequence of clause sets  $N_0, N_1, \dots$  where  $N_i = N_{i-1} \cup \{C\}$  and  $C$  is a consequence of an inference rule of  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  from premises in  $N_{i-1}$  or  $N_i = N_{i-1} \setminus \{C\}$  where  $C$  is redundant in  $N_{i-1}$ , and no inference is delayed indefinitely. With  $N_\infty$  we denote the set of clauses which never become redundant in a derivation. By Lemmata 1 and 2, and the fact that  $N_\infty$  is saturated, we get the following result:

**Theorem 1.** The set of ground clauses  $N$  is  $\mathbf{D}$ -unsatisfiable iff the limit  $N_\infty$  of a fair derivation by  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  contains the empty clause.

**Concrete Domain Resolution on General Clauses.** Lifting  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  to general clauses is not trivial. Consider e.g. the clause set  $N = \{d_1(x_1, y_1), d_2(x_2, y_2)\}$ . A connected  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint can be obtained by  $\{x_1 \mapsto x_2, y_1 \mapsto y_2\}$ ,  $\{x_1 \mapsto y_2, x_2 \mapsto y_1\}$ , or similar substitutions. To check all possible  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraints at the ground level, one has to consider all possible substitutions producing a connected  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint at the non-ground level. We formalize this idea as follows.

**Definition 5.** Let  $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$  be a multiset of positive concrete domain literals. A substitution  $\sigma$  is a partitioning unifier of  $S$  if the set  $S\sigma$  is connected. Furthermore,  $\sigma$  is a most general partitioning unifier if, for any partitioning unifier  $\theta$  such that  $\widehat{S}\sigma \equiv \widehat{S}\theta$ , a substitution  $\eta$  exists such that  $\theta = \sigma\eta$ . With  $\text{MGPU}(S)$  we denote the set of all most general partitioning unifiers of  $S$ .

In [12], we show the property ( $\diamond$ ): if  $\theta$  is a partitioning unifier of  $S$ , then there exists a most general partitioning unifier  $\sigma$  unique up to variable renaming, such that  $\widehat{S}\sigma \equiv \widehat{S}\theta$ . Also, in [12] we give a complete, but inefficient algorithm for computing  $\text{MGPU}(S)$ . In Section 4 we present a specialized algorithm suitable for  $\text{SHIQ}(\mathbf{D})$ .

We assume, as usual, that all clauses involved in an inference rule do not have variables in common. The rules of the *concrete domain resolution* calculus,  $\mathcal{R}^{\mathbf{D}}$  for short, are given next, along with the adaptation of the lifting lemma.

**Lemma 3 (Lifting).** Let  $N$  be a set of clauses with the set of ground instances  $N^G$ . For each ground inference  $\pi^G$  by  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbf{D}}$  applicable to premises  $C_i^G \in N^G$ , there is an inference  $\pi$  by  $\mathcal{R}^{\mathbf{D}}$  applicable to premises  $C_i \in N$ , where  $\pi^G$  is an instance of  $\pi$ .

<b>Positive factoring:</b>	
$\frac{C \vee A \vee B}{C\sigma \vee A\sigma}$	(i) $\sigma = \text{MGU}(\cdot)A, B$ , (ii) $A\sigma$ is strictly maximal in $C\sigma$ .
<b>Ordered resolution:</b>	
$\frac{C \vee A \quad D \vee \neg B}{C\sigma \vee D\sigma}$	(i) $\sigma = \text{MGU}(\cdot)A, B$ , (ii) $A\sigma$ is strictly maximal in $C\sigma$ , (iii) $\neg B\sigma$ is maximal in $D\sigma$ .
<b>Concrete domain resolution:</b>	
$\frac{C_i \vee d_i(\mathbf{t}_i), 1 \leq i \leq n}{C_1\sigma \vee \dots \vee C_n\sigma}$	(i) $C_i \vee d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)$ are not necessarily unique, (ii) for $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}, \sigma \in \text{MGPU}(\cdot)S$ , (iii) $d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\sigma$ are strictly maximal in $C_i\sigma$ , (iv) $S\sigma$ is a minimal $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint.

*Proof.* If  $\pi^G$  is an inference by positive factoring or ordered resolution, the argumentation is the same as in the case of ordered resolution [3]. Let  $\pi^G$  be an inference by concrete domain resolution, and let  $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$  be the set of corresponding non-ground literals. Since  $S\tau$  is a minimal  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint, it is connected, so  $\tau$  is obviously a partitioning unifier of  $S$ . By  $(\diamond)$ , there is a most general partitioning unifier  $\sigma$  such that  $\tau = \sigma\eta$  for some  $\eta$ , and  $\widehat{S\sigma} \equiv \widehat{S\tau}$ . Obviously, if  $S\tau$  is a minimal  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint, so is  $S\sigma$ . Furthermore, if literals from  $S\tau$  are strictly maximal in  $C_i^G$ , corresponding literals from  $S\sigma$  are strictly maximal in  $C_i\sigma$ , so  $D^G = D\eta$ .  $\square$

We briefly comment on the constraint (i) of the concrete domain resolution rule. Consider a clause  $d(x, y)$ . It is possible that, for the set  $S = \{d(a, b), d(b, c)\}$  of ground instances of  $d(x, y)$ , the conjunction  $\widehat{S}$  is  $\mathbf{D}$ -unsatisfiable. This is detected by the concrete domain resolution rule only if several ‘‘copies’’ of the clause  $d(x, y)$  are considered simultaneously. Without any assumptions on the nature of the predicate  $d$ , there is no upper bound on the number of ‘‘copies’’ that should be considered simultaneously. This property of the calculus obviously leads to undecidability in the general case. To obtain a decision procedure for  $\mathcal{SHIQ}(\mathbf{D})$ , in Section 4 we show that the number of such ‘‘copies’’ to be considered is bounded.

The notion of redundancy is lifted as usual [3]: a clause  $C$  (an inference  $\pi$ ) is redundant in  $N$  if all ground instances of  $C$  ( $\pi$ ) are redundant in  $N^G$ . This is enough for soundness and completeness of  $\mathcal{R}^{\mathbf{D}}$ , shown in [12] in the usual way, as in [3].

**Theorem 2.** *The set of clauses  $N$  is  $\mathbf{D}$ -unsatisfiable if and only if the limit  $N_\infty$  of a fair derivation by  $\mathcal{R}^{\mathbf{D}}$  contains the empty clause.*

**Combining Concrete Domains with other Calculi.** The concrete domain resolution rule may be added to any calculus whose completeness proof is based on the model generation method [3]: the usual arguments show that, if  $N_\infty$  does not contain the empty clause, then it has a model. Furthermore, the argument that  $I$  is a  $\mathbf{D}$ -model from Lemma 2 applies to each such calculus without modification.

### 3 Deciding $\mathcal{SHIQ}$ by Basic Superposition

We now briefly overview our previous work on deciding  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  by basic superposition from [13]. This work provides the basis for the decision procedure we present in Section 4.

**$\mathcal{SHIQ}$  Description Logic.** Let  $N_C$  and  $N_{R_a}$  be sets of concept names and abstract role names, respectively. An abstract role is an abstract role name or the inverse  $S^-$  of an abstract role name  $S$ . The set of  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  concepts is defined as the smallest set containing  $N_C$  and, if  $C$  and  $D$  are  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  concepts,  $R$  is an abstract role, and  $n$  is an integer, then  $\neg C, C \sqcap D, C \sqcup D, \exists R.C, \forall R.C, \geq n R.C$ , and

$\geq n R.C$  are also  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  concepts. A  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  knowledge base  $KB$  consists of an RBox  $KB_{\mathcal{R}}$  (i.e. a finite set of abstract role inclusion axioms  $R \sqsubseteq S$  and transitivity axioms  $\text{Trans}(R)$ ), a TBox  $KB_{\mathcal{T}}$  (i.e. a finite set of concept inclusion axioms  $C \sqsubseteq D$  for  $C, D$  possibly complex concepts), and an ABox  $KB_{\mathcal{A}}$  (i.e. a finite set of axioms  $C(a), R(a, b)$ , and (in)equalities  $a \approx b$  and  $a \not\approx b$ ). In [13], the semantics of  $KB$  is given by translating  $KB$  into first-order logic, by means of the operator  $\pi$ , in the standard way.<sup>4</sup> The basic inference problem for  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  is checking  $KB$  satisfiability, i.e. determining whether a first-order model of  $\pi(KB)$  exists.  $\mathcal{ALCHIQ}$  is the logic obtained from  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  by disallowing transitivity axioms.

**Basic Superposition Calculus.** The basic superposition calculus,  $\mathcal{BS}$  for short, has been developed to optimize theorem proving with equality [4]. A similar calculus was independently developed in [16]. The main feature of  $\mathcal{BS}$  is that it prohibits superposition into terms introduced by previous unification steps. Consider the following example, where the initial clause set contains clauses (1) – (5). Clauses (1), (2) and (3) can be resolved to produce (6). In  $[a] \approx [b]$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  have been produced through unification, which is denoted by *marking* them with  $[\ ]$ . Clause (6) is superposed into (1) to obtain (7). Since  $b$  in (7) is marked, superposition into it is prohibited. Hence, (7) is resolved with (4) to produce (8) and then with (5) to produce the empty clause.

(1)	$A(a)$	(6)	$[a] \approx [b]$
(2)	$B(b)$	(7)	$A([b])$
(3)	$\neg A(x) \vee \neg B(y) \vee x \approx y$	(8)	$C([b])$
(4)	$\neg A(x) \vee C(x)$	(9)	$\square$
(5)	$\neg C(b)$		

In  $\mathcal{BS}$ , clauses with marked terms are called *closures*. Furthermore,  $\mathcal{BS}$  is parameterized with an *admissible* ordering on terms  $\succ$ , and a *selection function*, selecting negative literals in the closure. For the inference rules of  $\mathcal{BS}$ , we direct the reader to [12]. Under the notion of redundancy from [4],  $\mathcal{BS}$  is sound and complete.

**Deciding  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  by  $\mathcal{BS}$ .** To decide satisfiability of a  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  knowledge base  $KB$ , we first eliminate transitivity axioms from  $KB$  by translating it into an equisatisfiable  $\mathcal{ALCHIQ}$  knowledge base  $\Omega(KB)$ . A slight variant of this relatively standard transformation has been presented in [19].

Next, we translate  $\Omega(KB)$  into an equisatisfiable set of first-order formulae  $\pi(KB)$ , which we then transform into an equisatisfiable set of closures  $\Xi(KB)$  using structural transformation [17]. For unary coding of numbers, these steps are polynomial. By definition of  $\pi$  and  $\Xi$ , we can show that  $\Xi(KB)$  contains only eight different so-called  $\mathcal{ALCHIQ}$ -closure types, presented below, sharing the following property ( $\spadesuit$ ): the depth of a functional term in a closure is limited to two, and the number of variables in a closure is limited by the maximal number  $n$  occurring in number restrictions  $\geq n R.C$  and  $\geq n R.C$ . The maximal number of different  $\mathcal{ALCHIQ}$ -closures is at most exponential in  $|KB|$ , for unary coding of numbers.

With  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  we denote  $\mathcal{BS}$  parameterized with a specific *lexicographic path ordering* [3] and a selection function which selects all negative binary literals. We saturate  $\Xi(KB)$  using  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  with eager elimination of redundancy. The chosen parameters make  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  perform inferences only on literals containing a term of maximal depth. This, combined with the fact that basic superposition prohibits inferences into terms introduced by previous unification steps, im-

<sup>4</sup> The set-theoretic semantics of  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  from [11] coincides with the one provided by the translation operator  $\pi$ .

1	$\neg R(x, y) \vee \text{Inv}(R)(y, x)$
2	$\neg R(x, y) \vee S(x, y)$
3	$\mathbf{P}^f(x) \vee R(x, \langle f(x) \rangle)$
4	$\mathbf{P}^f(x) \vee R(\langle f(x) \rangle, x)$
5	$\mathbf{P}_1(x) \vee \mathbf{P}_2(\langle f(x) \rangle) \vee \bigvee \langle f_i(x) \rangle \approx / \not\approx \langle f_j(x) \rangle$
6	$\mathbf{P}_1(x) \vee \mathbf{P}_2(\langle g(x) \rangle) \vee \mathbf{P}_3(\langle f(\langle g(x) \rangle) \rangle) \vee \bigvee \langle t_i \rangle \approx / \not\approx \langle t_j \rangle$ where $t_i$ and $t_j$ are either $f(\langle g(x) \rangle)$ or $x$
7	$\mathbf{P}_1(x) \vee \bigvee \neg R(x, y_i) \vee \mathbf{P}_2(y) \vee \bigvee y_i \approx y_j$
8	$\mathbf{R}(\langle \mathbf{a} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{b} \rangle) \vee \mathbf{P}(\langle \mathbf{t} \rangle) \vee \bigvee \langle t_i \rangle \approx / \not\approx \langle t_j \rangle$ where $t, t_i$ and $t_j$ are either some constant $b$ or $f_i(\langle a \rangle)$

plies another key property ( $\clubsuit$ ): applying a  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  inference rule to  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q$ -closures results in an  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q$ -closure or is redundant.

Properties ( $\spadesuit$ ) and ( $\clubsuit$ ) imply that any  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  derivation from  $\Xi(KB)$  terminates: in the worst case, all possible  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q$  closures are computed. The number of such closures is exponential in  $|KB|$ , and this set can be computed in time exponential in  $|KB|$ . Finally, since  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  is sound and complete, saturation of  $\Xi(KB)$  by  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  decides satisfiability of  $KB$ .

Unfortunately,  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  decides only the  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q^-$  fragment of  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q$ , where number restrictions are allowed only on roles without subroles. E.g., a superposition from  $[f(g(x))] \approx [h(g(x))]$  into  $R(x, f(x))$  results in  $C = R(\langle g(x) \rangle, [h(g(x))])$ . Such a closure is not redundant in the general case and is not an  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q$ -closure. In further inferences  $C$  can produce closures with functional terms of depth more than two, so termination of saturation is not guaranteed. We solve this problem by a technique called *decomposition*, which does not affect completeness of  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$ . It replaces certain closures with simpler ones, which do not cause termination problems. E.g., for  $C$ , decomposition introduces a new predicate  $Q_{R,h}$ , and replaces  $C$  with  $Q_{R,h}(\langle g(x) \rangle)$  and  $\neg Q_{R,h}(x) \vee R(x, [h(x)])$ . These two closures are  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q$ -closures, so the properties ( $\spadesuit$ ) and ( $\clubsuit$ ) hold. The predicate  $Q_{R,h}$  is unique for a pair of role and function symbols  $R$  and  $h$ . Since there are only finitely many such pairs, only a finite number of predicates is introduced, so saturation by  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  and eager decomposition terminates.

## 4 Deciding $\mathcal{SHI}Q(\mathbf{D})$ Description Logic

We now apply the concrete domain resolution to obtain a decision procedure for  $\mathcal{SHI}Q(\mathbf{D})$ . If the arity of concrete predicates is bounded, the complexity of reasoning does not increase.

**$\mathcal{SHI}Q(\mathbf{D})$  Description Logic.** Apart from abstract roles, we assume a disjoint set of *concrete* roles  $N_{R_c}$ . For  $\mathbf{D}$  an admissible concrete domain,  $\mathcal{SHI}Q(\mathbf{D})$  is the extension of  $\mathcal{SHI}Q$  with concepts of the form  $\exists T_1, \dots, T_m.d, \forall T_1, \dots, T_m.d, \leq nT$ , and  $\geq nT$ , for  $T_{(i)} \in N_{R_c}$  and  $d \in \Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$ . Role inclusion axioms are not allowed between abstract and concrete roles, and inverse concrete roles are not allowed. The new concepts are translated into FOL as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_y(\bowtie nT) &= \exists^{\bowtie n} y : T(x, y), \text{ for } \bowtie \in \{\leq, \geq\} \\ \pi_y(\forall T_1, \dots, T_m.d, x) &= \forall y_i : \bigwedge T_i(x, y_i) \rightarrow d(y_1, \dots, y_m) \\ \pi_y(\exists T_1, \dots, T_m.d, x) &= \exists y_i : \bigwedge T_i(x, y_i) \wedge d(y_1, \dots, y_m) \end{aligned}$$

**Closures with Concrete Predicates.** Transitivity elimination and decomposition apply to  $\mathcal{SHI}Q(\mathbf{D})$  as well [13], so in the rest of this paper, we focus on deciding satisfiability of an  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q^-(\mathbf{D})$  knowledge base  $KB$ . Besides  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q$ -closures,  $\Xi(KB)$  can additionally contain closures of the form listed below, where  $\langle t \rangle$  means that  $t$  may or may not be marked. We call such closures  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q(\mathbf{D})$ -closures, and show that ( $\clubsuit$ ) holds for them as well. With  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}^{\mathbf{D}}$  we denote the  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}$  calculus extended with the concrete domain resolution rule.

8	closure can additionally contain $\dots \vee \mathbf{T}(\langle \mathbf{a} \rangle, \langle \mathbf{b} \rangle) \vee \mathbf{d}(\langle \mathbf{t}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{t}_n \rangle) \vee \bigvee \langle t_i \rangle \approx / \not\approx \langle t_j \rangle$ where $t_i$ and $t_j$ are either a constant $b$ or a term $f_i(\langle a \rangle)$
9	$\neg T(x, y) \vee U(x, y)$
10	$\mathbf{P}^f(x) \vee T(x, \langle f(x) \rangle)$
11	$\mathbf{P}(x) \vee \mathbf{d}(\langle \mathbf{f}_1(x) \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{f}_n(x) \rangle) \vee \bigvee \langle f_i(x) \rangle \approx / \not\approx \langle f_j(x) \rangle$
12	$\mathbf{P}(x) \vee \bigvee \neg T(x, y_i) \vee \bigvee y_i \approx y_j$
13	$\mathbf{P}(x) \vee \bigvee \neg T_i(x, y_i) \vee d(y_1, \dots, y_n)$

**Lemma 4.** Let  $\Xi(KB) = N_0, \dots, N_i \cup \{C\}$  be a  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}^{\mathbf{D}}$ -derivation, where  $C$  is the conclusion derived from premises in  $N_i$ . Then  $C$  is either an  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q^-(\mathbf{D})$ -closure or it is redundant in  $N_i$ .

*Proof.* (Sketch)  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q^-(\mathbf{D})$ -closures are almost identical in structure to  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q^-$ -closures. Hence, it is easy to see that this property holds for  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}^{\mathbf{D}}$  inferences as before. The new aspect is the application of the concrete domain resolution rule. Consider  $n$  side premises  $C_i \vee d_i(\langle \mathbf{t}_i \rangle)$ , each possibly having a free variable  $x_i$ , and let  $S = \{d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\}$ . For any most general partitioning unifier  $\sigma$  of  $S$ ,  $S\sigma$  is connected, so there are two possibilities. If all side premises are of type 11,  $\sigma$  is of the form  $\{x_2 \mapsto x_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto x_1\}$ , so the result is of type 11. If there is a side premise of type 8, since  $S\sigma$  is connected, it may not contain a variable, so  $\sigma$  is of the form  $\{x_1 \mapsto c_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto c_n\}$ , and the result is of type 8.  $\square$

**Termination and Complexity Analysis.** We define the size of the new constructs as follows:  $|\exists T_1, \dots, T_m.d| = |\forall T_1, \dots, T_m.d| = 2 + m$ . Let  $m$  denote the maximal arity of a concrete domain predicate,  $d$  the number of concrete domain predicates, and  $f$  the number of function symbols in the signature of  $\Xi(KB)$ . As in [12],  $f$  is linear in  $|KB|$  for unary coding of numbers, since in skolemizing each  $\exists T_1, \dots, T_m.d$ , we introduce  $m$  new function symbols.  $\mathcal{ALCCHI}Q^-(\mathbf{D})$ -closures additionally contain literals of the form  $d(\langle f_1(x) \rangle, \dots, \langle f_m(x) \rangle)$ . The maximal non-ground closure will contain all such literals, whose number is bounded by  $d(2f)^m$  (the factor 2 allows each functional term to be marked or not). Hence, there are at most  $2^{d(2f)^m}$  closures containing different combinations of literals. Thus we have to decide whether  $m$  is a parameter of the input, or generally bounded. In the former case, the number of closures is doubly-exponential in the size of the input, whereas it is “only” exponential in the latter. Note that this latter choice is justifiable from a practical view point: it is hard to imagine a concrete domain with predicates of unbounded arity as well as a sequence of concrete domains with increasing arities, but where the arity of each domain is bounded. Under this assumption,  $m$  is a constant, the maximal length of a closure is polynomial in  $|KB|$ , and the number of closures is exponential in  $|KB|$ . The following lemma is the last step in determining the complexity of the decision algorithm.

**Lemma 5.** The maximal number of side premises participating in a concrete domain resolution rule in a  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}^{\mathbf{D}}$ -derivation from Lemma 4 is at most polynomial in  $|KB|$ , assuming a limit on the arity of concrete predicates.

*Proof.* In an application of the concrete domain resolution rule,  $S\sigma$  does not contain repeated literals; otherwise  $\widehat{S\sigma}$  contains repeated conjuncts and is not minimal. Hence, in the worst case, each  $d_i(\mathbf{t}_i)\sigma$  should be distinct in  $S\sigma$ . Let  $i$  be the number of individual names in  $\Xi(KB)$ . There are at most  $\ell_{ng} = d f^m$  distinct non-ground concrete domain literals, and at most  $\ell_g = d(i+if)^m$  distinct ground concrete domain literals. Assuming a bound on  $m$  and for unary coding of numbers, both  $\ell_{ng}$  and  $\ell_g$  are polynomial in  $|KB|$ .

If all side premises are non-ground, since  $S\sigma$  should be connected,  $\sigma$  must be  $\{x_2 \mapsto x_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto x_1\}$ . Hence,  $S\sigma$  contains only one

variable  $x_1$ , so the number of distinct literals in  $S\sigma$  is bounded by  $\ell_{ng}$ . The number of non-ground side premises is also bounded by  $\ell_{ng}$ , and all side premises are unique up to variable renaming.

If there is a ground side premise, since  $S\sigma$  should be connected,  $\sigma$  is  $\{x_1 \mapsto c_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto c_n\}$ . All literals in  $S\sigma$  are ground, and the number of distinct such literals is bounded by  $\ell_g$ . The number of side premises to be considered in this case is bounded by  $\ell_g$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $KB$  be an  $\mathcal{ALCHIQ}^-(\mathbf{D})$  knowledge base, defined over an admissible concrete domain  $\mathbf{D}$ , for which  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiability of conjunctions over  $\Phi_{\mathbf{D}}$  polynomial in  $|KB|$  can be decided in deterministic exponential time. Then saturation of  $\Xi(KB)$  by  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}^{\mathbf{D}}$  with eager application of redundancy elimination rules decides  $\mathbf{D}$ -satisfiability of  $KB$  and runs in time exponential in  $|KB|$ , for unary coding of numbers and assuming a bound on the arity of concrete predicates.*

*Proof.* Since property  $(\clubsuit)$  holds for  $\mathcal{ALCHIQ}^-(\mathbf{D})$ -closures, the application of  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}^{\mathbf{D}}$  inferences to  $\mathcal{ALCHIQ}^-(\mathbf{D})$ -closures can be performed in exponential time. In addition, we show that applying the concrete domain resolution rule does not take “too long”.

To apply the concrete domain resolution rule to a set of closures  $N$ , one selects a subset  $N' \subseteq N$ . By Lemma 5,  $\ell = |N'|$  is polynomial in  $|KB|$ , and  $N'$  contains at most  $\ell$  variables. If all closures from  $N'$  are non-ground, there is exactly one  $\sigma$  which unifies all of these variables. If there is at least one ground closure, then each one of  $\ell$  variables can be assigned to one of  $i$  individuals, thus giving  $i^\ell$  combinations, which is exponential in  $|KB|$ . Closures in  $N'$  are chosen from the maximal set of all closures which is exponential in  $|KB|$ , and since  $|N'|$  is polynomial in  $|KB|$ , the number of different sets  $N'$  is exponential in  $|KB|$ . Hence, the maximal number of  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraints that needs to be examined by the concrete domain resolution rule is exponential in  $|KB|$ , where the length of each  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint is polynomial in  $|KB|$ . Since satisfiability of each  $\mathbf{D}$ -constraint can be checked in deterministic exponential time, all necessary inferences by  $\mathcal{BS}_{DL}^{\mathbf{D}}$  can be performed in exponential time.  $\square$

Lemma 5 demonstrates how to implement the concrete domain resolution rule. For non-ground closures, the most general partitioning unifier is  $\sigma = \{x_2 \mapsto x_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto x_1\}$ . Hence, one should consider only closures with maximal literals unique up to variable renaming, so several “copies” of a closure need not be considered.

For a concrete domain resolution inference where at least one closure is ground, one first chooses a connected set of ground closures  $\Delta$ . Let  $\Delta_c$  be the set of constants, and  $\Delta_f$  the set of function symbols occurring in a ground functional term  $f(c)$  in a closure from  $\Delta$ . The most general partitioning unifier  $\sigma$  may contain only mappings of the form  $x_i \mapsto c$ , where  $c \in \Delta_c$ . Hence, one selects the set  $\Delta_{ng}$  of non-ground closures containing a functional term in  $\Delta_f$ . To apply the concrete domain resolution rule, one considers at most  $|\Delta_c|$  “copies” of a closure from  $\Delta_{ng}$ , since  $\sigma$  might assign a distinct value from  $\Delta_c$  to each such closure.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper we have shown how a wide range of resolution-based decision procedures for first order logic can be extended with admissible concrete domains. Our approach is applicable to any clausal calculus whose completeness proof is based on the model generation method. We have exemplified the usefulness of our approach by extending the basic superposition decision procedure for  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  with concrete domains, thus providing an optimal decision procedure for

$\mathcal{SHIQ}(\mathbf{D})$ , a logic lying at the heart of the Semantic Web ontology language OWL-DL. These algorithms can be used to extend the reduction of  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  knowledge bases to disjunctive datalog presented in [13] to handle  $\mathcal{SHIQ}(\mathbf{D})$  knowledge bases.

Part of our future theoretical work will be the extension of our decision procedure to handle nominals. This is a non-trivial task since, in the presence of nominals, we will have to handle novel forms of closures, and thus have to find new termination mechanisms. On the practical side, we are currently implementing a new description logic reasoner using the calculus presented here and the above mentioned reduction to disjunctive datalog. Once the reasoner is complete, we shall compare its performance with state-of-the-art systems such as FaCT and Racer [9, 8] to validate our approach in practice.

## REFERENCES

- [1] *The Description Logic Handbook*, eds., F. Baader, D. Calvanese, D. McGuinness, D. Nardi, and P. Patel-Schneider, Cambridge University Press, January 2003.
- [2] F. Baader and P. Hanschke, ‘A Scheme for Integrating Concrete Domains into Concept Languages’, in *Proc. IJCAI-91*, pp. 452–457, Sydney, Australia, (1991).
- [3] L. Bachmair and H. Ganzinger, ‘Resolution Theorem Proving’, in *Handbook of Automated Reasoning*, eds., A. Robinson and A. Voronkov, volume I, chapter 2, 19–99, Elsevier Science, (2001).
- [4] L. Bachmair, H. Ganzinger, C. Lynch, and W. Snyder, ‘Basic Paramodulation’, *Information and Computation*, **121**(2), 172–192, (1995).
- [5] P. Baumgartner, ‘An Ordered Theory Resolution Calculus’, in *Proc. LPAR-92*, volume 624, pp. 119–130, St. Petersburg, Russia, (July 1992). Springer.
- [6] M. Fitting, *First-Order Logic and Automated Theorem Proving*, 2nd Edition, Springer, 1996.
- [7] V. Haarslev and R. Möller, ‘Expressive ABox Reasoning with Number Restrictions, Role Hierarchies, and Transitively Closed Roles’, in *Proc. KR-2000*, pp. 273–284, San Francisco, (2000). Morgan Kaufmann.
- [8] V. Haarslev and R. Möller, ‘High Performance Reasoning with Very Large Knowledge Bases: A Practical Case Study’, in *Proc. IJCAI-01*, pp. 161–168, Seattle, USA, (August 2001). Morgan Kaufmann.
- [9] I. Horrocks, ‘Using an Expressive Description Logic: FaCT or Fiction?’, in *Proc. KR-98*, pp. 636–647, Trento, Italy, (June 1998). Morgan Kaufmann.
- [10] I. Horrocks and U. Sattler, ‘Ontology Reasoning in the  $\mathcal{SHOQ}(\mathbf{D})$  Description Logic’, in *Proc. IJCAI-01*, pp. 199–204. Morgan Kaufmann, (2001).
- [11] I. Horrocks, U. Sattler, and S. Tobies, ‘Practical Reasoning for Very Expressive Description Logics’, *Logic Journal of the IGPL*, **8**(3), 239–263, (2000).
- [12] U. Hustadt, B. Motik, and U. Sattler, ‘Reasoning for Description Logics around  $\mathcal{SHIQ}$  in a Resolution Framework’, Technical Report 3-8-04/04, FZI, Karlsruhe, Germany, (April 2004). <http://www.fzi.de/wim/publikationen.php?id=1172>.
- [13] U. Hustadt, B. Motik, and U. Sattler, ‘Reducing  $\mathcal{SHIQ}^-$  Description Logic to Disjunctive Datalog Programs’, in *Proc. KR-2004*. Morgan Kaufmann, (June 2004).
- [14] C. Lutz, *The Complexity of Reasoning with Concrete Domains*, Ph.D. dissertation, Teaching and Research Area for Theoretical Computer Science, RWTH Aachen, 2002.
- [15] C. Lutz, ‘Description Logics with Concrete Domains—A Survey’, in *Advances in Modal Logics*, volume 4. King’s College Publications, (2003).
- [16] R. Nieuwenhuis and A. Rubio, ‘Theorem Proving with Ordering and Equality Constrained Clauses’, *Journal of Logic and Computation*, **19**(4), 312–351, (April 1995).
- [17] A. Nonnengart and C. Weidenbach, ‘Computing Small Clause Normal Forms’, in *Handbook of Automated Reasoning*, eds., A. Robinson and A. Voronkov, volume I, chapter 6, 335–367, Elsevier Science, (2001).
- [18] M. E. Stickel, ‘Automated Deduction by Theory Resolution’, *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, **1**(4), 333–355, (1985).
- [19] S. Tobies, *Complexity Results and Practical Algorithms for Logics in Knowledge Representation*, Ph.D. dissertation, RWTH Aachen, Germany, 2001.