

Knowledge Representation & Reasoning

Shyamanta M Hazarika
CSE, SoE
Tezpur University

Strategies

1. Clause elimination

- pure clause

contains literal p such that p does not appear in any other clause
clause cannot lead to \square

- tautology

clause with a literal and its negation
any path to \square can bypass tautology

- subsumed clause

a clause such that one with a subset of its literals is already present
path to \square need only pass through short clause
can be generalized to allow substitutions

2. Ordering strategies

many possible ways to order search, but best and simplest is

- unit preference

prefer to resolve unit clauses first

Why? Given unit clause and another clause, resolvent is a smaller one $\Rightarrow \square$

Strategies 2

3. Set of support

KB is usually satisfiable, so not very useful to resolve among clauses with only ancestors in KB

contradiction arises from interaction with $\neg Q$

always resolve with at least one clause that has an ancestor in $\neg Q$

preserves completeness (sometimes)

4. Connection graph

pre-compute all possible unifications

build a graph with edges between any two unifiable literals of opposite polarity

label edge with MGU

Resolution procedure:

repeatedly: select link
 compute resolvent
 inherit links from parents after substitution

Resolution as search: find sequence of links L_1, L_2, \dots producing []

Strategies 3

5. Special treatment for equality

instead of using axioms for =

reflexivity, symmetry, transitivity, substitution of equals for equals

use new inference rule: paramodulation

from $\{(t=s)\} \cup C_1$ and $\{P(\dots t' \dots)\} \cup C_2$

where $t\theta = t'\theta$

infer $\{P(\dots s \dots)\}\theta \cup C_1\theta \cup C_2\theta$.

collapses many resolution steps into one

see also: theory resolution (later)

6. Sorted logic

terms get sorts:

x : Male mother:[Person \rightarrow Female]

keep taxonomy of sorts

only unify $P(s)$ with $P(t)$ when sorts are compatible

assumes only “meaningful” paths will lead to []

Finally...

7. Directional connectives

given $[\neg p, q]$, can interpret as either

from p , infer q (forward)

to prove q , prove p (backward)

procedural reading of \supset

In 1st case: would only resolve $[\neg p, q]$ with $[p, \dots]$ producing $[q, \dots]$

In 2nd case: would only resolve $[\neg p, q]$ with $[\neg q, \dots]$ producing $[\neg p, \dots]$

Intended application:

forward: $\text{Battleship}(x) \supset \text{Gray}(x)$

do not want to try to prove something is gray
by trying to prove that it is a battleship

backward: $\text{Person}(x) \supset \text{Has}(x, \text{spleen})$

do not want to conclude the spleen property for
each individual inferred to be a person

This is the starting point for the procedural representations
