

Ontology Languages (COMP321)
Solutions for Exercise 3

1. Recall the syntax of the Description Logics \mathcal{EL} , DL-Lite, and \mathcal{ALC} . Suppose **Manager** and **Project** are concept names and **manages** is a role name.

Let \mathcal{E} be any of the following expressions:

- (a) $\top \sqsubseteq \perp$
- (b) $\exists \text{manages}.\text{Project} \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$
- (c) $\forall \text{manages}.\text{Project}$
- (d) $\exists \text{Project}.\text{manages}$
- (e) $\exists \text{manages}^{\neg}.\top \sqsubseteq \text{Project} \sqcup \text{Department}$
- (f) $\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}.\top$
- (g) $\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}.\perp$
- (h) $(\geq 7 \text{ manages}.\top) \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$
- (i) $(\geq 8 \text{ manages}.\text{Project}) \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$
- (j) $\forall \text{manages}.\top \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}.\text{Project}$
- (k) $\exists \text{manages}.\top \sqsubseteq (\geq 4 \text{ manages}.\top)$.
- (l) $(\geq 4 \text{ manages}.\top) \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}.\top$.

- Translate \mathcal{E} into natural language;
- State whether
 - it is a \mathcal{EL} concept;
 - a \mathcal{EL} concept inclusion;
 - a DL-Lite concept
 - a DL-Lite concept inclusion
 - a \mathcal{ALC} concept
 - a \mathcal{ALC} concept inclusion.
 - none of the above.

- if \mathcal{E} is a concept inclusion, check whether \mathcal{E} follows from the empty TBox (i.e., $\emptyset \models \mathcal{E}$). If this is not the case, define an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models \mathcal{E}$.
- if \mathcal{E} is a concept, check whether \mathcal{E} is satisfiable. If this is the case, define an interpretation \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$.

2. Show that every \mathcal{EL} -TBox is satisfiable.

Solution for 1:

(a) $\top \sqsubseteq \perp$ says “the domain is empty”. It is a DL-Lite and \mathcal{ALC} concept inclusion and nothing else. $\emptyset \not\models \top \sqsubseteq \perp$; in fact, one can take an arbitrary interpretation \mathcal{I} and $\mathcal{I} \not\models \top \sqsubseteq \perp$ holds because $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$.

(b) $\exists \text{manages.Project} \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$ says “everybody who manages a project is a manager”. It is a \mathcal{EL} and \mathcal{ALC} concept inclusion and nothing else. The empty TBox does not imply

$$\exists \text{manages.Project} \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$$

To show this consider the interpretation \mathcal{I} defined by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, a)\}$;
- $\text{Project}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$.

Then $a \in (\exists \text{manages.Project})^{\mathcal{I}}$ but $a \notin \text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}}$. So

$$\mathcal{I} \not\models \exists \text{manages.Project} \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$$

(c) $\forall \text{manages.Project}$ denotes the class of objects which “only manage projects, and possibly nothing”. It is a \mathcal{ALC} concept and nothing else. It is satisfiable. An interpretation \mathcal{I} with $(\forall \text{manages.Project})^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$ is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, a)\}$;

- $\text{Project}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$.

Another interpretation \mathcal{J} with $(\forall \text{manages.Project})^{\mathcal{J}} \neq \emptyset$ is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$;
- $\text{Project}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$.

(d) $\exists \text{Project.manages}$ is none of the above because one cannot write a concept names directly after \exists .

(e) $\exists \text{manages}^{\perp}. \top \sqsubseteq \text{Project} \sqcup \text{Department}$ states “everything that is managed is a project or a department”. It is a DL-Lite with “or” concept inclusion and nothing else.

$$\exists \text{manages}^{\perp}. \top \sqsubseteq \text{Project} \sqcup \text{Department}$$

does not follow from the empty TBox. An interpretation \mathcal{I} in which it is false is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, a)\}$;
- $\text{Project}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$;
- $\text{Department}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$.

A possibly more intuitive interpretation \mathcal{J} in which it is false is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, b\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b)\}$;
- $\text{Project}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$;
- $\text{Department}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$.

Then $b \in (\exists \text{manages}^-. \top)^{\mathcal{I}}$ but $b \notin (\text{Project} \sqcup \text{Department})^{\mathcal{I}}$.

(f) $\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}. \top$ states “every manager manages something”. It is a \mathcal{EL} , DL-Lite, and \mathcal{ALC} concept inclusion and nothing else.

$$\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}. \top$$

does not follow from the empty TBox. An interpretation \mathcal{I} showing this is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$.

Then $a \in \text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}}$, but $a \notin (\exists \text{manages}. \top)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

(g) $\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}. \perp$ states “every Manager manages nothing”. It is a \mathcal{ALC} concept inclusion and nothing else.

$$\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}. \perp$$

does not follow from the empty TBox. An interpretation \mathcal{I} showing this is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, b\}$;
- $\text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b)\}$.

Then $a \in \text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}}$, but $a \notin (\exists \text{manages}. \perp)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

In fact, $\exists \text{manager}. \perp$ is unsatisfiable (always empty!), and so no interpretation in which “Manager” is non-empty can be a model of $\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages}. \perp$.

(h) $(\geq 7 \text{ manages}. \top) \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$ states “if something manages at least seven things, then it is a manager”. It is a DL-Lite concept inclusion and nothing else. $(\geq 7 \text{ manages}. \top) \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$ does not follow from the empty TBox. An interpretation \mathcal{I} showing this is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, b_1, \dots, b_7\}$;

- $\text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b_1), \dots, (a, b_7)\}$.

(i) $(\geq 8 \text{ manages.Project}) \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$ states “if something manages at least eight projects, then it is a manager”. It is none of the above. However, it is a concept inclusion in an extension of \mathcal{ALC} . The semantics should be clear. $(\geq 8 \text{ manages.Project}) \sqsubseteq \text{Manager}$ does not follow from the empty TBox. An interpretation \mathcal{I} showing this is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, b_1, \dots, b_8\}$;
- $\text{Manager}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b_1), \dots, (a, b_8)\}$.
- $\text{Project}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{b_1, \dots, b_8\}$.

(j) $\forall \text{manages.}\top \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages.Project}$ states “everything manages a project”. (The reason is that $(\forall \text{manages.}\top)^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all interpretations \mathcal{I} !) It is a \mathcal{ALC} concept inclusion and nothing else. It does not follow from the empty TBox. An interpretation \mathcal{I} showing this is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$;
- $\text{Project}^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$

(k) $\exists \text{manages.}\top \sqsubseteq (\geq 4 \text{ manages.}\top)$ states “everybody managing something manages at least four things”. It is a DL-Lite concept inclusion and nothing else. It does not follow from the empty TBox. An interpretation \mathcal{I} showing this is given by

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a, b\}$;
- $\text{manages}^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b)\}$.

Then $a \in (\exists \text{manages.}\top)^{\mathcal{I}}$ but $a \notin (\geq 4 \text{ manages.}\top)^{\mathcal{I}}$.

(1) $(\geq 4 \text{ manages.}\top) \sqsubseteq \exists \text{manages.}\top$ states “everybody managing at least four things manages something”. It is a DL-Lite concept inclusion and nothing else. It follows from the empty TBox.

Solution for 2: Assume \mathcal{T} is an \mathcal{EL} -TBox. Define an interpretation \mathcal{I} by setting

- $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$;
- $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$ for all concept names A ;
- $r^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, a)\}$ for all role names r .

We have $C^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a\}$ for all \mathcal{EL} -concepts C . Hence $\mathcal{I} \models C \sqsubseteq D$ holds for all \mathcal{EL} -concept inclusions $C \sqsubseteq D$. Hence \mathcal{I} is a model of \mathcal{T} .