

Sophie Tourret Andrew Cropper

Max Planck Institute for Informatics University of Oxford



July 7th, 2018

Prolog-based systems

- on Horn clauses
- using SLD-resolution (Selective Linear Definite)
 - sound and refutationally complete on Horn clauses
 - without factorization of literals
 - here duplication of literals is forbidden (implies loss of refutational completeness)



Prolog-based Inductive Logic Programming (ILP) systems

Input ({Parent_of(Ana,Ben),Parent_of(Ben,Carol)},Grand_parent_of(Ana,Carol)) ({Parent_of(Arthur,Betty),Parent_of(Betty,Charlie)},Grand_parent_of(Arthur,Charlie)) Metarules $P_0(A,C) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_2(B,C)$ ILP $P_3(A) \leftarrow P_4(A), P_5(A)$ $P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_2(B)$ Output $Grand_parent_of(A,C) \leftarrow Parent_of(A,B), Parent_of(B,C)$



Second-Order Horn Fragment \mathcal{H}	
$P_0(A) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_2(C,C)$	[not interesting]

Connected Fragment \mathcal{H}^c

 $P_0(A) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_2(B,C)$

[mildly interesting]

2-Connected Fragment \mathcal{H}^{2c}

 $P_0(A,C) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_2(B,C), P_4(A)$

[very interesting]



What is the best set of metarules to use?

- Describes the desired fragment completely.
- Does not take too much memory.
- Allows for an efficient exploration of the search space

Can we <u>reduce</u> a fragment to a <u>finite</u> subset with these properties?



First Idea: Entailment Reduction

[Cropper, Muggleton, ILP'14]

$$\begin{array}{l} C_1 = P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B) \\ C_2 = P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_2(A) \\ C_3 = P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_3(A,B) \\ C_4 = P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_3(A,B), P_4(A,B) \end{array}$$

$$\{C_1\} \models \{C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4\}$$

Loss of completeness





Better Idea: Derivation Reduction

$$egin{aligned} C_1 &= P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B) \ C_2 &= P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_2(A) \ C_3 &= P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_3(A,B) \ C_4 &= P_0(A,B) \leftarrow P_1(A,B), P_3(A,B), P_4(A,B) \end{aligned}$$

 $\{C_1, C_2, C_3\} \vdash_{\mathsf{SLD}} \{C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4\}$

This problem is undecidable!

Can this be done for the fragments of interest?



Reduction of Connected Fragments

Given a fragment \mathcal{F} , the fragment $\mathcal{F}_{a,b}$ is such that:

- a is the maximal arity of the predicates,
- *b* is the maximal number of literals in the body of clauses,
- ∞ means unbounded.
- \mathcal{F} is <u>reducible</u> from \mathcal{F}' if any clause in \mathcal{F} can be derived using SLD-resolution from clauses in \mathcal{F}' .

 $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}^*, \mathcal{H}_{a,\infty}^c$ is reducible to $\mathcal{H}_{a,2}^c$.

The fragment \mathcal{H}^c is reducible to $\mathcal{H}^c_{\infty,2}$.



Reduction of the Connected Fragment $\mathcal{H}_{2,\infty}^c$

$$P_0(x_1, x_2) \leftarrow P_1(x_3, x_1), P_2(x_1), P_3(x_3), P_4(x_3)$$



 $P_0(x_1,x_2) \leftarrow P_2(x_1), H(x_1)$

 $H(x_1) \leftarrow P_1(x_3, x_1), P_3(x_3), P_4(x_3)$



Proof Idea of the Reduction of Connected Fragments

find a spanning tree where two adjacent vertices have at most a outgoing edges [here a = 2]



Why this is at termgraph

Reduction of the 2-Connected Fragment $\mathcal{H}^{2c}_{2,\infty}$

Not possible



Counter-example for $\mathcal{H}^{2c}_{2.5}$



 $P_0(x_1, x_2) \leftarrow P_1(x_1, x_3), P_2(x_1, x_4), P_3(x_2, x_3), P_4(x_2, x_4), P_5(x_3, x_4)$



Counter-example for $\mathcal{H}^{2c}_{2,\infty}$



This transformation preserves irreducibility while increasing the size of the clause.



Summary

SLD-resolution resolution connected (\mathcal{H}^c) $\mathcal{H}^c_{\infty,2}$ $\mathcal{H}^c_{\infty,2}$ 2-connected ($\mathcal{H}^{2c}_{2,\infty}$) NO $\mathcal{H}^{2c}_{2,2}$



Counter-measures for the 2-Connected Fragment $\mathcal{H}^{2c}_{2,\infty}$

- Use standard resolution
- Allow a restricted use of triadic predicates
- Add irreducible clauses dynamically
- ... ?

