

# An Anytime Algorithm for Computing Inconsistency Measurement

**SEM 2009** 

Yue Ma $^1$  Guilin Qi $^2$  Guohui Xiao $^{3,5}$  Pascal Hitzler $^4$  Zuoquan Lin $^3$ 

<sup>1</sup>Laboratoire d'Informatique de Paris-Nord, Université Paris-Nord CNRS, France <sup>2</sup>School of Computer Science and Engineering, Southeast University, Nanjing, China <sup>3</sup>Department of Information Science, Peking University, China <sup>4</sup>Kno.e.sis Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA <sup>5</sup>Institut für Informationssysteme, Technische Universität Wien, Austria



1/15



**KSEM 2009** 

- Consistent KBs serve as useful knowledge resources v.s. inconsistent KBs imply any conclusion (meaningless!)
- For handling inconsistent KBs:
  - paraconsistent reasoning (1960s)
  - knowledge diagnose and repair (1980s)
  - Which approach should we take?
  - $\rightsquigarrow$  inconsistency measurement: a guidance to choice different approaches (2000s)

• How about the computational aspects of inconsistent measurement?

2/15



### Introductive Example

**KSEM 2009** 

- $\bullet \ K = \{p, \neg q, r\} \rightsquigarrow {\sf consistent}$
- $K' = \{p, \neg q, r, \neg p \lor q\} \rightsquigarrow$  inconsistent
- $\bullet \ K'' = \{p, \neg p, q, \neg q\} \rightsquigarrow \text{inconsistent}$

The inconsistency degrees (ID):

$$ID(K) = 0, ID(K') = \frac{1}{3}, ID(K'') = 1$$

3/15





# Related Work and Our Contribution

#### Related work:

- Defining (various) inconsistency degrees:
  - (1) syntax-based; (2) semantics-based
- Algorithms
  - for restricted KBs: [GrantHunter08] only deals with KBs in the form  $Q_1x_1,...,Q_nx_n$ .  $\bigwedge_i(P_i(t_1,...,t_{m_i}) \land \neg P_i(t_1,...,t_{m_i}))$ , ;
  - with high complexity: [MaQiHLin2007] with exponential times of invoking a SAT solver

#### Our work:

• To show that computing IDs is intractable generally but can be

approximated polynomially

프 ( ) ( ) ( ) (



# Inconsistency Degree by 4-valued Semantics

The set of truth values  $\{t, f, BOTH, NONE\}$ A 4-model *I*:

**KSEM 2009** 

 $Var(K) \rightarrow \{t, f, BOTH, NONE\}$ 



Figure: FOUR

• Conflict $(I, K) = \{p \mid p \in Var(K), p^I = BOTH\},\$ 

•  $\begin{aligned} \textbf{PreferModel}(K) &= \{I \mid \forall I' \in \mathcal{M}_4(K), \\ |\textit{Conflict}(I,K)| \leq |\textit{Conflict}(I',K)| \}. \end{aligned}$ 

•  $ID(K) = \frac{|Conflict(I,K)|}{|Var(K)|}$ , where I is a preferred model.

$$\stackrel{\sim}{\longrightarrow} K' = \{p, \neg q, r, \neg p \lor q\} : ID(K') = \frac{1}{3}$$
$$\stackrel{\sim}{\longrightarrow} I_1 : p^{I_1} = BOTH, q^{I_1} = f, r^{I_1} = t,$$
$$I_2 : p^{I_2} = f, q^{I_2} = BOTH, r^{I_2} = t$$

(B) < B)</p>



### Computational Complexities

Given a propositional knowledge base K and a number  $d \in [0, 1]$ :

- $ID_{\leq d}$  (resp.  $ID_{< d}$ ): is  $ID(K) \leq d$  (resp. ID(K) < d)?
- $ID_{\geq d}$  (resp.  $ID_{>d}$ ): is  $ID(K) \geq d$  (resp. ID(K) > d)?
- EXACT-ID: is ID(K) = d?
- ID: what is the value of ID(K)?

#### Theorem

**KSEM 2009** 

- $ID_{\leq d}$  and  $ID_{< d}$  are **NP**-complete;
- *ID*<sub>≥d</sub> and *ID*<sub>>d</sub> are **coNP**-complete;
- EXACT-ID is **DP**-complete;

• ID is  $\Theta_2^P$ -complete.





# Formal Definitions of Approximating IDs

#### **Definition** (Bounding Values)

Lower bounding value  $x: x \leq ID(K);$  Upper bounding value  $y: ID(K) \leq y.$ 

#### **Definition** (Bounding Models)

Given a preferred model I:

Lower bounding model I' of K:  $|Conflict(I', K)| \leq |Conflict(I, K)|$ Upper bounding model I'' of K:  $|Conflict(I'', K)| \geq |Conflict(I, K)|$ and  $I'' \in \mathcal{M}_4(K)$ 





# Formal Definitions of Approximating IDs

#### **Definition** (Bounding Values)

Lower bounding value  $x: x \leq ID(K)$ ; Upper bounding value  $y: ID(K) \leq y$ .

#### **Definition** (Bounding Models)

Given a preferred model I:

Lower bounding model $I'$ of $K$ :	$ Conflict(I', K)  \leq  Conflict(I, K) $
Upper bounding model $I''$ of $K$ :	$ \textit{Conflict}(I'',K)  \geq  \textit{Conflict}(I,K) $
	and $I'' \in \mathcal{M}_4(K)$

( ) < ) < )
 ( ) < )
 ( ) < )
</p>



# Requirements on Algorithms for Approximating IDs

An anytime approximating algorithm for computing inconsistency degrees should be able to produce two sequences  $r_1, ..., r_m$  and  $r^1, ..., r^k$ :

$$r_1 \le \dots \le r_m \le I\mathcal{D}(K) \le r^k \le \dots \le r^1, \tag{1}$$

such that these two sequences have the following properties:

**KSEM 2009** 

• Tractability:  $\exists .f(|K|)$ , g(|K|) s.t. computing  $r_i$  and  $r^j$  both stay tractable if  $i \leq f(|K|)$  and  $j \leq g(|K|)$ ;

• Convergence:  $|ID(K) - r_{i+1}| < |ID(K) - r_i|$ ,  $|ID(K) - r^i| < |ID(K) - r^{i+1}|$ ;

• Meaning: each  $r_i(r^j)$  corresponds to a lower (an upper) bounding model, which indicates the sense of the two sequences.

同下 イヨト イヨト ニヨ



# Requirements on Algorithms for Approximating IDs

An anytime approximating algorithm for computing inconsistency degrees should be able to produce two sequences  $r_1, ..., r_m$  and  $r^1, ..., r^k$ :

$$r_1 \le \dots \le r_m \le I\mathcal{D}(K) \le r^k \le \dots \le r^1, \tag{1}$$

such that these two sequences have the following properties:

**KSEM 2009** 

• Tractability:  $\exists .f(|\mathcal{K}|)$ ,  $g(|\mathcal{K}|)$  s.t. computing  $r_i$  and  $r^j$  both stay tractable if  $i \leq f(|\mathcal{K}|)$  and  $j \leq g(|\mathcal{K}|)$ ;

• Convergence:  $|ID(K) - r_{i+1}| < |ID(K) - r_i|, |ID(K) - r^i| < |ID(K) - r^{i+1}|;$ 

• Meaning: each  $r_i(r^j)$  corresponds to a lower (an upper) bounding model, which indicates the sense of the two sequences.

同下 イヨト イヨト ニヨ



# Requirements on Algorithms for Approximating IDs

An anytime approximating algorithm for computing inconsistency degrees should be able to produce two sequences  $r_1, ..., r_m$  and  $r^1, ..., r^k$ :

$$r_1 \le \dots \le r_m \le I\mathcal{D}(K) \le r^k \le \dots \le r^1, \tag{1}$$

such that these two sequences have the following properties:

**KSEM 2009** 

- Tractability:  $\exists .f(|\mathcal{K}|)$ ,  $g(|\mathcal{K}|)$  s.t. computing  $r_i$  and  $r^j$  both stay tractable if  $i \leq f(|\mathcal{K}|)$  and  $j \leq g(|\mathcal{K}|)$ ;
- Convergence:  $|ID(K) r_{i+1}| < |ID(K) r_i|, |ID(K) r^i| < |ID(K) r^{i+1}|;$
- Meaning: each  $r_i$   $(r^j)$  corresponds to a lower (an upper) bounding model, which indicates the sense of the two sequences.

向下 イヨト イヨト ニヨ



### Approximations from Above and Below

For a given  $w (1 \le w \le |Var(K)|)$ :

**KSEM 2009** 

**Theorem** (Approximation from Above)

If K is w-4 satisfiable, then  $ID(K) \le 1 - w/|Var(K)|$ . **Theorem** (Approximation from Below)

If K is w-4 unsatisfiable, then  $ID(K) \ge 1 - (w - 1)/|Var(K)|.$ 

Definition. K is w-4 satisfiable iff. there is a subset  $S \subseteq Var(K)$  such that K is S-4 satisfiable, i.e., K has a 4-model in the form of

$$p^{\Im} \in \begin{cases} \{B\} & \text{if } p \in Var(K) \setminus S, \\ \{N, t, f\} & \text{if } p \in S. \end{cases}$$

( ) < ) < )
 ( ) < )
 ( ) < )
</p>



### Approximations from Above and Below

For a given  $w (1 \le w \le |Var(K)|)$ :

**KSEM 2009** 

Theorem	(Approximation	from
Above)		

If K is w-4 satisfiable, then  $ID(K) \le 1 - w/|Var(K)|$ . **Theorem** (Approximation from Below)

If K is w-4 unsatisfiable, then  $ID(K) \ge 1 - (w - 1)/|Var(K)|$ .

Definition. K is w-4 satisfiable iff. there is a subset  $S \subseteq Var(K)$  such that K is S-4 satisfiable, i.e., K has a 4-model in the form of

$$p^{\Im} \in \begin{cases} \{B\} & \text{if } p \in Var(K) \setminus S, \\ \{N, t, f\} & \text{if } p \in S. \end{cases}$$





# Tractability of the Approximations

### Theorem (Complexity)

There exists an algorithm for deciding if K is S-4 unsatisfiable in  $\mathcal{O}(|K||S| \cdot 2^{|S|})$  time for any given  $S \subseteq Var(K)$ .

 $\rightsquigarrow$  S-4 unsatisfiability can be computed in P-time, if  $|S| = O(\log |K|)$ .

10/15

(B) < B)</p>





### Tractable Anytime Algorithm

Suppose  $r_i, r^j$  are defined as follows  $(1 \le w \le |Var(K)|)$ :

$$r^{j} = 1 - w/|Var(K)|$$
, where K is w-4 satisfiable;

$$r_i = 1 - \frac{w-1}{|Var(K)|}, \text{ where } K \text{ is } w\text{-4 unsatisfiable.}$$

- If  $w = \mathcal{O}(\log |\mathcal{K}|)$ , computing upper bounds can be done in P-time w.r.t  $|\mathcal{K}|$ .
- If w is limited by a constant, computing lower bounds can be done in P-time w.r.t. |K|.
- $r_i(r^j)$  corresponds to inconsistency degrees of K w.r.t. its upper (lower) bounding models.
- $\rightsquigarrow$  Meets all the requirements given previously for tractable anytime algorithms.





Tractable Anytime Algorithm

Tow main sources of complexity to compute approximating inconsistency degrees:

- **(**) *the complexity of* w-4 *satisfiability*  $\rightsquigarrow$  solved by previous results
- the complexity of search space ~> a truncation strategy to limit the search space by the monotonicity of S-4 unsatisfiability:

For all S, if K is S-4 unsatisfiable, K is S'-4 unsatisfiable for all  $S' \supset S$ .

12/15

法国际 医耳道氏



### **Primary Experiment**

**KSEM 2009** 



Figure: Evaluation results over KBs with  $|K| = N^2 + 2N$  and |Var(K)| = 2N for N = 5, 7, 8, 9, 10.

э

-∢ ⊒ →



### Conclusion and Outlook

Conclusion

**KSEM 2009** 

- **(**) Studied the problem complexity of ID (intractable,  $\Theta_2^p$ -complete)
- 2 Defined approximating inconsistency degrees
- Proposed a tractable anytime algorithm for computing approximating IDs

#### Outlook

- It test the algorithm on more benchmark datasets
- It o explore more optimization for the algorithm

きょうきょう





### Thanks for Your Attention!

# Questions?

Yue Ma (LIPN-CNRS), et al. @ KSEM'09 Anytime Algorithm for Inconsistency Degree

15 / 15

-

▶ < ∃ >