





Copyright (c) Universität Ulm Pavel Klinov 1 Bijan Parsia 2

 $^1 {\rm University}$ of UIm $\,^2 {\rm University}$ of Manchester |

August 8th, 2013

Consequence-based Reasoning for Lightweight Description Logics

Problems with Tableau-based Reasoning

Consequence-based Reasoning for \mathcal{EL}

Practical Consequence-based \mathcal{EL} Reasoning

Key Features of Tableau Reasoning

Builds a counter model to test entailments

- Prove $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq D$
- ▶ Try to build an interpretation of \mathcal{O} that satisfies $C \sqcap \neg D$

Key Features of Tableau Reasoning

Builds a counter model to test entailments

- Prove $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq D$
- ▶ Try to build an interpretation of \mathcal{O} that satisfies $C \sqcap \neg D$

Sound and complete for expressive DLs (up to SROIQ)

Key Features of Tableau Reasoning

Builds a counter model to test entailments

- Prove $\mathcal{O} \models C \sqsubseteq D$
- ▶ Try to build an interpretation of \mathcal{O} that satisfies $C \sqcap \neg D$

Sound and complete for expressive DLs (up to SROIQ)

Often practical despite the high complexity

However...

Focuses on individual (non) entailments

- Test each $A \sqsubseteq B$ to classify an ontology
- ▶ 99.9% entailments do not hold
- Optimizations rectify this but...

```
However...
```

- Test each $A \sqsubseteq B$ to classify an ontology
- ▶ 99.9% entailments do not hold
- Optimizations rectify this but...

Models explode (completion graphs exponential even for \mathcal{ALC})

```
However...
```

- Test each $A \sqsubseteq B$ to classify an ontology
- ▶ 99.9% entailments do not hold
- Optimizations rectify this but...

Models explode (completion graphs exponential even for \mathcal{ALC})

Non-determinism where it shouldn't be (GCIs)

• Example: $\exists \mathsf{R}. C \sqsubseteq D$

```
However...
```

- Test each $A \sqsubseteq B$ to classify an ontology
- ▶ 99.9% entailments do not hold
- Optimizations rectify this but...

Models explode (completion graphs exponential even for \mathcal{ALC})

Non-determinism where it shouldn't be (GCIs)

- Example: $\exists \mathsf{R}. C \sqsubseteq D$
- General GCI rule: add $\neg \exists R. C \sqcup D$, horrible

```
However...
```

- Test each $A \sqsubseteq B$ to classify an ontology
- ▶ 99.9% entailments do not hold
- Optimizations rectify this but...

Models explode (completion graphs exponential even for \mathcal{ALC})

Non-determinism where it shouldn't be (GCIs)

- Example: $\exists \mathsf{R}. C \sqsubseteq D$
- ▶ General GCI rule: add $\neg \exists R. C \sqcup D$, horrible
- Absorption: rewrite to $\exists R.\top \sqsubseteq D \sqcup \forall R.\neg C$, still bad

Issues Can Be Addressed

Via optimizations

- Smarter consistency algorithms (extending absorption, etc.)
- Smarter classification algorithms (reduce the number of consistency checks)
- Share information across consistency checks (pseudo-model merging, etc.)

Issues Can Be Addressed

Via optimizations

- Smarter consistency algorithms (extending absorption, etc.)
- Smarter classification algorithms (reduce the number of consistency checks)
- Share information across consistency checks (pseudo-model merging, etc.)
- Via alternative reasoning approaches
 - Consequence-based reasoning

Problems with Tableau-based Reasoning

Consequence-based Reasoning for \mathcal{EL}

Practical Consequence-based *EL* Reasoning

Goal-directed classification procedure for \mathcal{EL} (and extensions)

Goal-directed classification procedure for \mathcal{EL} (and extensions)

Derives subsumptions, does not check non-subsumptions

Goal-directed classification procedure for \mathcal{EL} (and extensions)

Derives subsumptions, does not check non-subsumptions

Natural deduction calculus instead of model building tableau

Goal-directed classification procedure for \mathcal{EL} (and extensions)

Derives subsumptions, does not check non-subsumptions

Natural deduction calculus instead of model building tableau

Brief history

- Long time ago: used in logic programming
- ▶ 2005: *EL*⁺ procedure by F. Baader, C. Lutz, and S. Brandt
- ▶ 2009: Full GALEN classified in a few seconds (Y. Kazakov)
- 2011: Extended to non-Horn logics

\mathcal{EL} is a lightweight Description Logic

Basis of OWL EL ontology language

\mathcal{EL} is a lightweight Description Logic

Basis of OWL EL ontology language

From its W3C spec:

 suitable for applications employing ontologies that define very large numbers of concepts and/or roles,

What is \mathcal{EL} ?

\mathcal{EL} is a lightweight Description Logic

Basis of OWL EL ontology language

From its W3C spec:

- suitable for applications employing ontologies that define very large numbers of concepts and/or roles,
- captures the expressivity of many existing ontologies,

\mathcal{EL} is a lightweight Description Logic

Basis of OWL EL ontology language

From its W3C spec:

- suitable for applications employing ontologies that define very large numbers of concepts and/or roles,
- captures the expressivity of many existing ontologies,
- ontology consistency, concept subsumption, and instance checking can be decided in polynomial time

What is \mathcal{EL} ?

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can express:

- ► Top concept ⊤
- ► Concept intersections: ContagiousDisease □ AirborneDisease

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can express:

- ► Top concept ⊤
- ► Concept intersections: ContagiousDisease □ AirborneDisease
- ► Existentials: ∃hasPart.Heart

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can express:

- ► Top concept ⊤
- ► Concept intersections: ContagiousDisease □ AirborneDisease
- ► Existentials: ∃hasPart.Heart
- General concept inclusions (GCls):
 Disease □ ∃transmittedThrough.Air ⊑ AirborneDisease

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can express:

- ► Top concept ⊤
- ► Concept intersections: ContagiousDisease □ AirborneDisease
- ► Existentials: ∃hasPart.Heart
- General concept inclusions (GCls):
 Disease □ ∃transmittedThrough.Air ⊑ AirborneDisease
- ▶ Property inclusions: hasProperPart ⊑ hasPart
- ▶ Property equivalences: hasDisease ≡ suffersFrom

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can express:

- ► Top concept ⊤
- ► Concept intersections: ContagiousDisease □ AirborneDisease
- ► Existentials: ∃hasPart.Heart
- General concept inclusions (GCls):
 Disease □ ∃transmittedThrough.Air ⊑ AirborneDisease
- ▶ Property inclusions: hasProperPart ⊑ hasPart
- ▶ Property equivalences: hasDisease ≡ suffersFrom
- ► Subproperty chains: hasProperPart hasPart ⊑ hasProperPart

What is \mathcal{EL} ?

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can not express:

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can not express:

► Disjunctions: BacterialDisease ⊔ ViralDisease

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can not express:

- ► Disjunctions: BacterialDisease ⊔ ViralDisease
- ► Universal role restrictions: ∀isCausedBy.Virus

What is \mathcal{EL} ?

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can not express:

- ► Disjunctions: BacterialDisease ⊔ ViralDisease
- ► Universal role restrictions: ∀isCausedBy.Virus
- ► Question: negation? ¬ViralDisease

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can not express:

- ► Disjunctions: BacterialDisease ⊔ ViralDisease
- ► Universal role restrictions: ∀isCausedBy.Virus
- ► Question: negation? ¬ViralDisease

No (recall De Morgan Laws)

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can not express:

- ► Disjunctions: BacterialDisease ⊔ ViralDisease
- ► Universal role restrictions: ∀isCausedBy.Virus
- ► Question: negation? ¬ViralDisease

No (recall De Morgan Laws)

ABoxes and \perp (disjointness) can be added

Lightweight means limited expressive power

Can not express:

- ► Disjunctions: BacterialDisease ⊔ ViralDisease
- ► Universal role restrictions: ∀isCausedBy.Virus
- ► Question: negation? ¬ViralDisease

No (recall De Morgan Laws)

ABoxes and \perp (disjointness) can be added

Semantics (model theory) is the same as for \mathcal{ALC} : $\mathcal{I} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$

Tractability of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{EL}}$

 \mathcal{EL} is one of the few DLs for which standard reasoning tasks, such as ontology classification or subsumption, are tractable

Question: What do we mean by tractable?

Tractability of \mathcal{EL}

 \mathcal{EL} is one of the few DLs for which standard reasoning tasks, such as ontology classification or subsumption, are tractable

Question: What do we mean by tractable?

Answer: Complexity is polynomial in the size of \mathcal{O}

Each A \sqsubseteq B can be decided in polynomial time
Tractability vs Practicality

Does tractable always imply practical?

```
Tractability vs Practicality
```

Does tractable always imply practical?

Let's make a simple calculation:

- SNOMED CT contains roughly 300,000 medical terms
- We can build a tableau and check all pairwise subsumptions
- Every test is tractable, thus so is an $O(n^2)$ algo
- Suppose each test takes just 1 millisecond
- ► Then we classify SNOMED CT just in 300,000×300,000 ms ≈ 2.8 years

```
Tractability vs Practicality
```

Does tractable always imply practical?

Let's make a simple calculation:

- SNOMED CT contains roughly 300,000 medical terms
- We can build a tableau and check all pairwise subsumptions
- Every test is tractable, thus so is an $O(n^2)$ algo
- Suppose each test takes just 1 millisecond
- ► Then we classify SNOMED CT just in 300,000×300,000 ms ≈ 2.8 years

This is NOT practical, need a goal-oriented approach

Use inference rules to derive consequences of existing axioms

Use inference rules to derive consequences of existing axioms

Inference rule: $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{name}} rac{lpha_1...lpha_{\mathsf{n}}}{\eta}:\gamma$

- $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are premises
- γ is a boolean side condition
- η is the conclusion

Use inference rules to derive consequences of existing axioms

Inference rule: $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{name}} rac{lpha_1...lpha_{\mathsf{n}}}{\eta}:\gamma$

- $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are premises
- γ is a boolean side condition
- η is the conclusion

Exp is a set of expressions

 $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{name}}$ is applicable if $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\mathsf{n}} \in \mathsf{Exp}$ and γ is true

Use inference rules to derive consequences of existing axioms

Inference rule: $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{name}} rac{lpha_1...lpha_{\mathsf{n}}}{\eta}:\gamma$

- $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are premises
- γ is a boolean side condition
- η is the conclusion

Exp is a set of expressions

 $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{name}}$ is applicable if $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\mathsf{n}} \in \mathsf{Exp}$ and γ is true

Closure of Exp w.r.t. R_1, \ldots, R_k is the minimal set which contains all conclusions of all applicable rules.

Use inference rules to derive consequences of existing axioms

Inference rule: $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{name}} rac{lpha_1...lpha_{\mathtt{n}}}{\eta}:\gamma$

- $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are premises
- γ is a boolean side condition
- η is the conclusion

Exp is a set of expressions

 $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{name}}$ is applicable if $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\mathsf{n}} \in \mathsf{Exp}$ and γ is true

Closure of Exp w.r.t. R_1, \ldots, R_k is the minimal set which contains all conclusions of all applicable rules.

 \mathcal{EL} : Exp = axioms, Closure contains the inferred taxonomy



 $R_0 \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C}$

$\mathsf{R}_{\top} = \overline{C \sqsubseteq \top}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\top} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \top}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \tfrac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O}$

$\mathbf{R_0} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\top} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \top}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

$\mathbf{R_0} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\top} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \top}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-} \quad \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}$

$\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \xrightarrow[C \subseteq C]{} \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} \xrightarrow[C \subseteq \mathsf{T}]{}$

- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$



Facts about this rule system:

- \blacktriangleright Side conditions ensure all concepts in conclusions occur in ${\cal O}$
- Question: why is this important?



Facts about this rule system:

- \blacktriangleright Side conditions ensure all concepts in conclusions occur in ${\cal O}$
- Question: why is this important?
- Answer: ensures termination and polynomiality



Facts about this rule system:

- \blacktriangleright Side conditions ensure all concepts in conclusions occur in ${\cal O}$
- Question: why is this important?
- Answer: ensures termination and polynomiality
- Provably complete, derives all entailed subsumptions between concept names

Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$ 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$ 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubset D$

R ₀	$\overline{C \sqsubseteq C}$	R⊤	$\overline{C} \sqsubseteq \top$
R⊑	$\tfrac{C\sqsubseteq D}{C\sqsubseteq E}:D\sqsubseteq E\in\mathcal{O}$	R∃	$\frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists R.C C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists R.D} : \exists R.D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
R_⊓	$\frac{C\sqsubseteq D_1\sqcap D_2}{C\sqsubseteq D_1 C\sqsubseteq D_2}$	\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{+}	$\frac{C\sqsubseteq D_1 C\sqsubseteq D_2}{C\sqsubseteq D_1\sqcap D_2}:D_1\sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in }\mathcal{O}$





- $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{T}}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow[C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2]{} \mathbf{C} \sqsubseteq D_2 \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow[C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2]{} \mathbb{C} \sqsubseteq D_2 : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\blacktriangleright \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{A}$

Ontology *O* : 1. A ⊑ ∃R.B 2. B ⊑ C 3. ∃R.C ⊑ D



- $\mathsf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{T}}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\blacktriangleright \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{A}$

Ontology *O* : 1. A ⊑ ∃R.B 2. B ⊑ C 3. ∃R.C ⊑ D



- $R_0 \xrightarrow[C \subseteq C]{} R_{\top} \xrightarrow[C \subseteq \top]{}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$



▶ B ⊑ B $\blacktriangleright A \Box A$

Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. $A \sqsubset \exists R.B$ 2. B ⊏ C 3. ∃R.C ⊏ D



- $R_0 = \frac{1}{C \Box C}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\top} = \overline{C} \Box \top$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\Box} \quad \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \quad \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{1}} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{2}} : D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}$ occurs in \mathcal{O} $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}{C \sqsubset D_1}$

\mathcal{EL} Classification, Example

 $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq A \qquad \qquad \blacktriangleright B \sqsubseteq B$

Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. A $\sqsubseteq \exists R.B$ 2. B $\sqsubseteq C$

3. ∃R.C ⊑ D

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{A}}{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B}} : \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{O}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{T}}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq A \qquad \qquad \blacktriangleright B \sqsubseteq B$
- ► A \sqsubseteq ∃R.B

Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. A $\sqsubseteq \exists R.B$

3. ∃R.C ⊑ D

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{A}}{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B}} : \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} \in \mathcal{O}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{T}}$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow[C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2]{} \mathbf{C} \sqsubseteq D_2 \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow[C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2]{} \mathbb{C} \sqsubseteq D_2 : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq A \qquad \qquad \blacktriangleright B \sqsubseteq B$
- ► A \sqsubseteq ∃R.B

Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$ 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$ 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubset D$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{\mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{B}}{\mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C}} : \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \in \mathcal{O}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\top} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \top}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$



- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq A \qquad \qquad \blacktriangleright B \sqsubseteq B$
- ► A \sqsubseteq ∃R.B

► B ⊑ C

Ontology *O* : 1. A ⊑ ∃R.B 2. B ⊑ C 3. ∃R.C ⊏ D

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{\mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{B}}{\mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C}} : \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \in \mathcal{O}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\top} \quad \overline{C \sqsubseteq \top}$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \underline{C \sqsubseteq D}_{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \underline{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C}_{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{-} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_1}_{C \sqsubseteq D_1} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$





- \blacktriangleright A \Box A
- \blacktriangleright A \square \exists R.B
- ► A ⊑ ∃R.C
- ▶ B ⊑ B ▶ B ⊑ C

Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. $A \sqsubset \exists R.B$

- 2. B ⊏ C
- 3. ∃R.C ⊏ D

$$\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} \quad \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C}}{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C}} : \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$$

- $R_0 = \frac{1}{C \Box C}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\top} = \overline{C \Box \top}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}{C \sqsubset D_1 \land C \sqsubset D_2}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{1}} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{2}} : D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

\mathcal{EL} Classification, Example

- ▶ B ⊑ B \blacktriangleright A \Box A
- \blacktriangleright A \square \exists R.B
- ► A ⊑ ∃R.C
- ► B ⊑ C

- Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. $A \sqsubset \exists R.B$
 - 2. B ⊏ C
 - 3. ∃R.C ⊏ D

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C}}{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}} : \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D} \in \mathcal{O}$$

 $R_0 = \frac{1}{C \Box C}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\top} = \overline{C} \Box \top$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \underline{C \sqsubseteq D}_{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \underline{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C}_{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \Box D_2}{C \Box D_1 C \Box D_2}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{1}} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{2}} : D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

\mathcal{EL} Classification, Example

- \blacktriangleright A \Box A
- \blacktriangleright A \square \exists R.B
- ► A ⊑ ∃R.C
- \blacktriangleright A \Box D

- ▶ B ⊑ B
- ▶ B ⊑ C

- Ontology \mathcal{O} : 1. $A \sqsubset \exists R.B$
 - 2. B ⊏ C
 - 3. ∃R.C ⊏ D

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C}}{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}} : \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D} \in \mathcal{O}$$

- $R_0 \quad \overline{C \sqsubset C}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\top} = \overline{C} \Box \top$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \ \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \mathbf{R}_{\exists} \ \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
- $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}{C \sqsubset D_1 \land C \sqsubset D_2}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{+} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{1}} \xrightarrow{C \sqsubseteq D_{2}} : D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq A \qquad \qquad \blacktriangleright B \sqsubseteq B$
- ► A ⊑ ∃R.B
- ► A ⊑ ∃R.C
- ► A ⊑ D

Ontology *O* : 1. A ⊑ ∃R.B 2. B ⊑ C 3. ∃R.C ⊏ D

These are all entailed atomic subsumptions

► B ⊑ C

R ₀	$\overline{C \sqsubseteq C}$	R⊤	$\overline{C} \sqsubseteq \top$
R⊑	$\frac{C\sqsubseteq D}{C\sqsubseteq E}:D\sqsubseteq E\in\mathcal{O}$	R∃	$\frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists R.C C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists R.D} : \exists R.D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$
\mathbf{R}_{\square}^{-}	$\frac{C\sqsubseteq D_1\sqcap D_2}{C\sqsubseteq D_1 C\sqsubseteq D_2}$	\mathbf{R}_{\square}^+	$\frac{C\sqsubseteq D_1 C\sqsubseteq D_2}{C\sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}: D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Advantages of consequence-based procedures over subsumption testing procedures (tableau)

Advantages of consequence-based procedures over subsumption testing procedures (tableau):

 They never consider subsumptions that are not entailed number of entailed subsumptions in SNOMED CT is <0.01%

Advantages of consequence-based procedures over subsumption testing procedures (tableau):

- They never consider subsumptions that are not entailed number of entailed subsumptions in SNOMED CT is <0.01%
- 2. They can derive all subsumptions in one pass average subsumption time much smaller than 1 millisecond

Advantages of consequence-based procedures over subsumption testing procedures (tableau):

- They never consider subsumptions that are not entailed number of entailed subsumptions in SNOMED CT is <0.01%
- 2. They can derive all subsumptions in one pass average subsumption time much smaller than 1 millisecond

Modern tableau-based reasoners have optimizations that reduce the number of subsumption tests and reuse results between the tests

Basic Implementation

A well-known procedure which can be used with any rules
A well-known procedure which can be used with any rules

Closure Todo





- Use two collections of expressions:
 - Closure: expressions between which all rules are applied (initially empty)
 - Todo: expressions to which rules are yet to be applied (initialized with input expressions)



- Use two collections of expressions:
 - Closure: expressions between which all rules are applied (initially empty)
 - Todo: expressions to which rules are yet to be applied (initialized with input expressions)
- Apply inferences:
 - Take the next element from Todo
 - Insert into Closure
 - ► If it is new, apply all inferences with elements from Closure
 - Add the result into Todo



- Use two collections of expressions:
 - Closure: expressions between which all rules are applied (initially empty)
 - Todo: expressions to which rules are yet to be applied (initialized with input expressions)
- Apply inferences:
 - Take the next element from Todo
 - Insert into Closure
 - If it is new, apply all inferences with elements from Closure
 - Add the result into Todo



- Use two collections of expressions:
 - Closure: expressions between which all rules are applied (initially empty)
 - Todo: expressions to which rules are yet to be applied (initialized with input expressions)
- Apply inferences:
 - Take the next element from Todo
 - Insert into Closure
 - ► If it is new, apply all inferences with elements from Closure
 - Add the result into Todo



- Use two collections of expressions:
 - Closure: expressions between which all rules are applied (initially empty)
 - Todo: expressions to which rules are yet to be applied (initialized with input expressions)
- Apply inferences:
 - Take the next element from Todo
 - Insert into Closure
 - ► If it is new, apply all inferences with elements from Closure
 - Add the result into Todo

Subsumers for C and D can be computed (semi) independently

Limited interaction:

- Derived $C \sqsubseteq D$
- ▶ Derived $C \sqsubseteq \exists R.D$

Subsumers for C and D can be computed (semi) independently

Limited interaction:

- Derived $C \sqsubseteq D$
- Derived $C \sqsubseteq \exists R.D$

Limited interaction enables the reasoner do:

• incremental reasoning: changes for C do not affect D

Subsumers for C and D can be computed (semi) independently

Limited interaction:

- Derived $C \sqsubseteq D$
- Derived $C \sqsubseteq \exists R.D$

Limited interaction enables the reasoner do:

- incremental reasoning: changes for C do not affect D
- ▶ parallel reasoning: C and D saturated in parallel

Subsumers for C and D can be computed (semi) independently

Limited interaction:

- Derived $C \sqsubseteq D$
- Derived $C \sqsubseteq \exists R.D$

Limited interaction enables the reasoner do:

- ▶ incremental reasoning: changes for C do not affect D
- ▶ parallel reasoning: C and D saturated in parallel
- distributed reasoning:

C and D may come from different ontologies!

Problems with Tableau-based Reasoning

Consequence-based Reasoning for \mathcal{EL}

Practical Consequence-based *EL* Reasoning

You want your reasoner to be:

- Fast on current inputs (performance)
- Handle growing inputs (scalability)

You want your reasoner to be:

- Fast on current inputs (performance)
- Handle growing inputs (scalability)

Question: how do you know that the reasoner is practical?

You want your reasoner to be:

- Fast on current inputs (performance)
- Handle growing inputs (scalability)

Question: how do you know that the reasoner is practical?

Answer: evaluation!

You want your reasoner to be:

- Fast on current inputs (performance)
- Handle growing inputs (scalability)

Question: how do you know that the reasoner is practical?

Answer: evaluation!

Sad truth: early implementations are almost always not practical

Evaluation Goals

Measure performance and scalability

Evaluation Goals

Measure performance and scalability

Find room for improvement

- Reveals performance bottlenecks (where the program spends most time)
- Scalability obstacles (which parameters' growth hits performance most)

Evaluation Goals

Measure performance and scalability

Find room for improvement

- Reveals performance bottlenecks (where the program spends most time)
- Scalability obstacles (which parameters' growth hits performance most)

Without evaluation optimization is like shooting in the dark

Stages of \mathcal{EL} Reasoning

Consider one-time classification



Stages of \mathcal{EL} Reasoning

Consider one-time classification



We focus on saturation and indexing

\mathcal{EL} Saturation Statistics

Useful saturation metrics:

- Number of rule applications
- Time spent applying rules
- Time spent selecting applicable rules

EL Saturation Statistics

Useful saturation metrics:

- Number of rule applications
- Time spent applying rules
- Time spent selecting applicable rules

Collection mechanism must ensure:

- Can be turned on/off any time
- No need to change the rules
- Extensibility (w.r.t. new rules or new stats)

ELK rules represented as a class hierarchy



ELK rules represented as a class hierarchy



Algorithm steps:

- Take α from Todo
- Pick some rule R
- visitor.visit(α , R, Closure, O)

ELK rules represented as a class hierarchy



Algorithm steps:

- Take α from Todo
- Pick some rule R
- visitor.visit(α , R, Closure, O)

Default visitor:

▶ R.apply(α, Closure, O)

ELK rules represented as a class hierarchy



Algorithm steps:

- Take α from Todo
- Pick some rule R
- visitor.visit(α , R, Closure, O)

Rule counting visitor:

- 1. $counter_R++$
- 2. basic visit

ELK rules represented as a class hierarchy



Algorithm steps:

- Take α from Todo
- Pick some rule R
- visitor.visit(α , R, Closure, O)

Rule timing visitor:

- 1. t = (current time)
- 2. basic visit
- 3. t = (current time) t

Rule application statistics collected, what is it telling me?

Rule application statistics collected, what is it telling me?

Many (specific) rule applications:

- Duplicate inferences?
- Redundant inferences (not needed for inferring $A \sqsubseteq B$)?

Rule application statistics collected, what is it telling me?

Many (specific) rule applications:

- Duplicate inferences?
- Redundant inferences (not needed for inferring $A \sqsubseteq B$)?

Much time spent selecting rules

Poor saturation algorithm design

Rule application statistics collected, what is it telling me?

Many (specific) rule applications:

- Duplicate inferences?
- Redundant inferences (not needed for inferring $A \sqsubseteq B$)?

Much time spent selecting rules

Poor saturation algorithm design

Much time spent applying rules:

- Poor implementation of rules
- This is mostly engineering

Rule application statistics collected, what is it telling me?

Many (specific) rule applications:

- Duplicate inferences?
- Redundant inferences (not needed for inferring $A \sqsubseteq B$)?

Much time spent selecting rules

Poor saturation algorithm design

Much time spent applying rules:

- Poor implementation of rules
- This is mostly engineering

We consider the first two issues

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Derived superclasses of A:

Ontology *O*: 1. A ⊑ B 2. A ⊑ C 3. A ⊑ D 4. D ⊑ B ⊓ C 5. B ⊓ C ⊏ E

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology *O*: 1. A ⊑ B 2. A ⊑ C 3. A ⊑ D 4. D ⊑ B ⊓ C 5. B ⊓ C ⊑ E

•
$$A \sqsubseteq B$$
 by R_{\sqsubseteq}

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology *O*: 1. A ⊑ B 2. A ⊑ C 3. A ⊑ D 4. D ⊑ B □ C 5. B □ C ⊑ E

- $A \sqsubseteq B$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq C$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology *O*: 1. A ⊑ B 2. A ⊑ C 3. A ⊑ D 4. D ⊑ B ⊓ C 5. B ⊓ C ⊑ E

- $A \sqsubseteq B$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq C$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq B \sqcap C$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^+

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology *O*: 1. A ⊑ B 2. A ⊑ C 3. A ⊑ D 4. D ⊑ B ⊓ C 5. B ⊓ C ⊑ E

- $A \sqsubseteq B$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq C$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq B \sqcap C$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+
- $A \sqsubseteq B$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-}
Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology *O*: 1. A ⊑ B 2. A ⊑ C 3. A ⊑ D 4. D ⊑ B ⊓ C 5. B ⊓ C ⊑ E

- $A \sqsubseteq B$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq C$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq B \sqcap C$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+
- $A \sqsubseteq B$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-}
- ► $A \sqsubseteq C$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-}

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology *O*: 1. A ⊑ B 2. A ⊑ C 3. A ⊑ D 4. D ⊑ B ⊓ C 5. B ⊓ C ⊑ E

- $A \sqsubseteq B$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq C$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► A \sqsubseteq B \sqcap C by **R**⁺_□

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.



Derived superclasses of A:

• $A \sqsubseteq B$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}

•
$$A \sqsubseteq C$$
 by R_{\sqsubseteq}

•
$$A \sqsubseteq B \sqcap C$$
 by R_{\sqcap}^+

$$A \sqsubseteq B \text{ by } \mathbf{R}_{\square}^{-}$$

$$A \sqsubseteq C \text{ by } \mathbf{R}_{\square}^{-}$$

Question: Does it break the termination property?

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.



Derived superclasses of A:

 \blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq B by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}

•
$$A \sqsubseteq C$$
 by R_{\sqsubseteq}

$$A \sqsubseteq B \sqcap C \text{ by } \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^+$$

 \Box C by R

Question: Does it break the termination property?

Answer: No, duplicate inferences are not inserted into Closure

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.



Derived superclasses of A:

 \blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq B by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}

•
$$A \sqsubseteq C$$
 by R_{\sqsubseteq}

$$A \sqsubseteq B \sqcap C \text{ by } \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+}$$

$$\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq C \text{ by } R_{\Box}^{-}$$

Question: Does it break the termination property?

Answer: No, duplicate inferences are not inserted into Closure Lesson: \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-} should not apply to conclusions of \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{+}

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology \mathcal{O} : Derived superclasses of A: 1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$ 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$ 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubseteq D$ 4. $C \sqsubseteq E$ 5. $\exists R.E \sqsubset F$

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology \mathcal{O} :

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$
- 2. B ⊑ C
- 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. C ⊑ E

5. ∃R.E ⊑ F

Derived superclasses of A:

• $B \sqsubseteq E$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology \mathcal{O} :

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$
- 2. B ⊑ C
- 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. C ⊑ E

5. ∃R.E ⊑ F

- ▶ $B \sqsubseteq E$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E by **R** $_{\exists}$: $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubset \exists R.E}$

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology \mathcal{O} :

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$
- 2. B ⊑ C
- 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. C ⊑ E

5. ∃R.E ⊑ F

- ▶ $B \sqsubseteq E$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E by **R** $_{\exists}$: $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubset \exists R.E}$
- ► A \sqsubseteq ∃R.C by **R**_∃ : $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq C}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C}$

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology \mathcal{O} :

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$
- 2. B ⊑ C
- 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. C ⊑ E

5. ∃R.E ⊑ F

- ► $B \sqsubseteq E$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E by **R**_∃ : $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubset \exists R.E}$
- $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$ by $R_\exists : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq C}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C}$
- ► A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E by **R**_∃ : $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C \quad C \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E}$

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology \mathcal{O} :

- 1. A ⊑ ∃R.B
- 2. B ⊑ C
- 3. $\exists R.C \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. C ⊑ E

5. ∃R.E ⊑ F

- ► $B \sqsubseteq E$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E by **R**_∃ : $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubset \exists R.E}$
- ► A \sqsubseteq ∃R.C by R_∃ : $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq C}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C}$
- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E \text{ by } \mathbf{R}_{\exists} : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C \quad C \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E}$

Sometimes the same inference(s) can be derived more than once.

Ontology \mathcal{O} :

1. $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B$

2. B ⊑ C

- 3. ∃R.C ⊑ D
- 4. C ⊑ E

5. ∃R.E ⊑ F

Derived superclasses of A:

- ► $B \sqsubseteq E$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E$ by $R_\exists : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E}$
- $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$ by $R_\exists : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq C}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C}$
- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E by R_{\exists} : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C \quad C \sqsubseteq E}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.E}$

Lesson: R_{\exists} should not apply to conclusions of R_{\exists}

What reducing duplicate inferences mean in practice?

What reducing duplicate inferences mean in practice?

Let $O_{\Box},~O_{\exists}$ be optimizations of $R_{\Box},~R_{\exists}$

	time	derived $C \sqsubseteq D$
SNOMED CT		
no optimization	26.31	47,435,318
with O⊓	25.48	41,770,050
with O∃	19.75	28,438,072
with O _□ , O _∃	18.71	22,772,804
GALEN8		
no optimization	50.39	69,138,922
with O _□	48.63	62,822,068
with O∃	25.21	37,267,987
with O _□ , O _∃	20.65	26,111,096

What reducing duplicate inferences mean in practice?

Let $O_{\Box},~O_{\exists}$ be optimizations of $R_{\Box},~R_{\exists}$

	time	derived $C \sqsubseteq D$
SNOMED CT		
no optimization	26.31	47,435,318
with O⊓	25.48	41,770,050
with O∃	19.75	28,438,072
with O _□ , O _∃	18.71	22,772,804
GALEN8		
no optimization	50.39	69,138,922
with O⊓	48.63	62,822,068
with O∃	25.21	37,267,987
with O _□ , O _∃	20.65	26,111,096

What reducing duplicate inferences mean in practice?

Let $O_{\Box},~O_{\exists}$ be optimizations of $R_{\Box},~R_{\exists}$

	time	derived $C \sqsubseteq D$
SNOMED CT		
no optimization	26.31	47,435,318
with O⊓	25.48	41,770,050
with O∃	19.75	28,438,072
with O _□ , O _∃	18.71	22,772,804
GALEN8		
no optimization	50.39	69,138,922
with O⊓	48.63	62,822,068
with O∃	25.21	37,267,987
with O _□ , O _∃	20.65	26,111,096

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or}$ premise from Closure + side condition

$$\mathbf{R}'_{\underline{\Box}} \xrightarrow{C \underline{\Box} D} \xrightarrow{D \underline{\Box} E} \\ \text{both premises} \\ \text{from Closure} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{\Box}} \xrightarrow{E} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{C}} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{C}} \xrightarrow{E} \\ \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{$$

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{R}'_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E}$ premise from Closure both premises + side condition

from Closure

Ontology: $A \sqsubset B, B \sqsubset C, C \sqsubset D$

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{R}'_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E}$ premise from Closure both premises + side condition



Ontology: $A \sqsubset B, B \sqsubset C, C \sqsubset D$

Inferences using \mathbf{R}_{\Box} : Inferences using \mathbf{R}'_{\Box} :

- 1. $A \sqsubset C$
- 2. A ⊏ D
- 3. B ⊏ D

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{R}'_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} \frac{D \sqsubseteq E}{C \sqsubseteq E}$ premise from Closure both premises + side condition



Ontology: $A \sqsubset B, B \sqsubset C, C \sqsubset D$

Inferences using \mathbf{R}_{\Box} :

- 1. $A \sqsubset C$
- 2. A ⊏ D
- 3. B ⊏ D

Inferences using
$$\mathbf{R}'_{\Box}$$

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{R}'_{\Box} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubset E}$ premise from Closure both premises + side condition



Ontology: $A \sqsubset B, B \sqsubset C, C \sqsubset D$

Inferences using \mathbf{R}_{\Box} :

- 1. $A \sqsubset C$
- 2. A ⊏ D
- 3. B ⊏ D

Inferences using \mathbf{R}'_{\Box} : 1. $A \sqsubset C$ 2. A ⊏ D

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or}$ premise from Closure + side condition

$$\mathbf{R}'_{\underline{\square}} \xrightarrow{C \underline{\square} D} \xrightarrow{D \underline{\square} E} \\ \text{both premises} \\ \text{from Closure} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{\square}} \xrightarrow{E} \\ \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{\square}} \xrightarrow{E} \\ \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{C$$

Ontology: $A \sqsubseteq B, B \sqsubseteq C, C \sqsubseteq D$

Inferences using \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} :

1. A ⊑ C

- 2. A ⊑ D
- 3. B ⊑ D

Inferences using R'_{\sqsubseteq} : 1. $A \sqsubseteq C$ 2. $A \sqsubseteq D$ 3. $B \sqsubseteq D$

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or}$ premise from Closure + side condition

$$\mathbf{R}'_{\underline{\square}} \xrightarrow{C \underline{\square} D} \xrightarrow{D \underline{\square} E} \\ \text{both premises} \\ \text{from Closure} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{\square}} \xrightarrow{E} \\ \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{\square}} \xrightarrow{E} \\ \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{C}_{\underline{\square}} \xrightarrow{E} \\ \mathbf{C} \\ \mathbf{$$

Ontology: $A \sqsubseteq B, B \sqsubseteq C, C \sqsubseteq D$

Inferences using R<sub>
—</sub>:

1. A ⊑ C

2. A ⊑ D

3. B ⊏ D

Inferences using $\mathbf{R}'_{\sqsubseteq}$: 1. $A \sqsubseteq C$ 2. $A \sqsubseteq D$ 3. $B \sqsubseteq D$ 4. $A \sqsubseteq D$ by $\mathbf{R}'_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{A \sqsubseteq B \quad B \sqsubseteq D}{A \sqsubseteq D}$

Question: which subsumption rule generates more duplicates?

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{or}$ premise from Closure + side condition

$$\mathbf{R}'_{\underline{\square}} \stackrel{C \underline{\square} D}{C \underline{\square} E} \stackrel{D \underline{\square} E}{\sum E}$$

both premises
from Closure

Ontology: $A \sqsubseteq B, B \sqsubseteq C, C \sqsubseteq D$

Inferences using R<sub>
—</sub>:

1. A ⊑ C

2. A ⊑ D

3. B ⊏ D

Inferences using $\mathbf{R}'_{\sqsubseteq}$: 1. $A \sqsubseteq C$ 2. $A \sqsubseteq D$ 3. $B \sqsubseteq D$ 4. $A \sqsubseteq D$ by $\mathbf{R}'_{\sqsubseteq} \xrightarrow{A \sqsubseteq B} \xrightarrow{B \sqsubseteq D} A \sqsubseteq D$

Also not all unique inferences are essential for classification

 $\mathcal{O}: \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B}, \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C}, \mathsf{D} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C}$

Also not all unique inferences are essential for classification

 $\mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B, B \sqsubseteq C, D \sqsubseteq \exists R.C \\ \mathcal{O} \text{ entails no non asserted atomic subsumptions} \\ But we derive A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C using \\ \mathbf{R}_{\exists} : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqcap R C} \frac{B \sqsubseteq C}{C} : \exists R.C \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Also not all unique inferences are essential for classification

Common in HCLS ontologies, many existentials only on the right:

 $SomeOrgan \sqsubseteq \exists hasRole.SomeRole$

Also not all unique inferences are essential for classification

 $\mathcal{O}: \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B}, \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C}, \mathsf{D} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C}$

 $\ensuremath{\mathcal{O}}$ entails no non asserted atomic subsumptions

But we derive $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$ using $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C} \stackrel{B \sqsubseteq C}{:} \exists R.C$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

Common in HCLS ontologies, many existentials only on the right:

 $SomeOrgan \sqsubseteq \exists hasRole.SomeRole$

Can be proved that \mathbf{R}_{\exists} : $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C} \xrightarrow{B \sqsubseteq C}$ doesn't have to apply if $\exists R.C$ doesn't occur on the left

Also not all unique inferences are essential for classification

 $\mathcal{O}: \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B}, \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C}, \mathsf{D} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C}$

 $\ensuremath{\mathcal{O}}$ entails no non asserted atomic subsumptions

But we derive $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$ using $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} : \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C} \stackrel{B \sqsubseteq C}{:} \exists R.C$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

Common in HCLS ontologies, many existentials only on the right: SomeOrgan ⊑ ∃hasRole.SomeRole

Can be proved that \mathbf{R}_{\exists} : $\frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C} \xrightarrow{B \sqsubseteq C}$ doesn't have to apply if $\exists R.C$ doesn't occur on the left

Also true for \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+ : $\frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2}$, $D_1 \sqcap D_2$ must occur on the left

Testing for Duplicate and Redundant Inferences

Some duplicate and redundant inferences are inevitable

How do you know if you have a problem?

Testing for Duplicate and Redundant Inferences

Some duplicate and redundant inferences are inevitable

How do you know if you have a problem?

Manually! Collect statistics and compare numbers:

- ► # produced inferences ≫ # unique inferences → potential problem with duplicates
- ► some rules apply much more often than others ~→ potentially redundant inferences

Testing for Duplicate and Redundant Inferences

Some duplicate and redundant inferences are inevitable

How do you know if you have a problem?

Manually! Collect statistics and compare numbers:

- ▶ # produced inferences ≫ # unique inferences → potential problem with duplicates
- ► some rules apply much more often than others ~→ potentially redundant inferences

Definitions of \gg and "much more" depend on ontology

```
Slow Rule Selection
```

Finding applicable rules is non-trivial

```
Slow Rule Selection
```

Finding applicable rules is non-trivial

```
Input: Set of named classes CN

Result: Closure, a set containing all atomic subsumptions

Closure, Todo \leftarrow \emptyset;

for C \in CN do

\lfloor Todo.add(\{C \sqsubseteq C, C \sqsubseteq \top\})

while (\alpha \leftarrow Todo.poll()) \neq null do

if \alpha \notin Closure then

Closure.add(\alpha)

for R \in select-rules(\alpha, Closure) do

\lfloor Todo.add(conclusions of R)

return Closure
```

```
Slow Rule Selection
```

Finding applicable rules is non-trivial

```
Input: Set of named classes CN

Result: Closure, a set containing all atomic subsumptions

Closure, Todo \leftarrow \emptyset;

for C \in CN do

\lfloor Todo.add(\{C \sqsubseteq C, C \sqsubseteq \top\})

while (\alpha \leftarrow Todo.poll()) \neq null do

if \alpha \notin Closure then

Closure.add(\alpha)

for R \in select-rules(\alpha, Closure) do

\lfloor Todo.add(conclusions of R)
```

return Closure

In the worst-case select-rules(...) requires O(|Closure|)Need efficient rule lookups

Rule Lookups

Assume that the initialization rules are applied eagerly

Fast processing of each new axiom α requires
Rule Lookups

Assume that the initialization rules are applied eagerly

Fast processing of each new axiom α requires:

- Looking up all unary rules $\mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}
- Looking up all binary rules $\mathbf{R} \frac{\alpha \quad \beta}{n} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}
- Looking up all binary rules $\mathbf{R} \frac{\beta \quad \alpha}{\eta} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

Rule Lookups

Assume that the initialization rules are applied eagerly

Fast processing of each new axiom α requires:

- Looking up all unary rules $\mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}
- Looking up all binary rules $\mathbf{R} \frac{\alpha \quad \beta}{n} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}
- Looking up all binary rules $\mathbf{R}\frac{\beta \quad \alpha}{\eta} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

 α is given, β and γ need to be found really fast

Rule Lookups

Assume that the initialization rules are applied eagerly

Fast processing of each new axiom α requires:

- Looking up all unary rules $\mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}
- Looking up all binary rules $\mathbf{R}\frac{\alpha}{n}\frac{\beta}{n}:\gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}
- Looking up all binary rules $\mathbf{R} \frac{\beta \quad \alpha}{\eta} : \gamma$ occurs in \mathcal{O}

 α is given, β and γ need to be found really fast

Requires indexing of both Closure and ${\cal O}$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}: \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{split} & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{R} : \alpha \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\alpha} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{R} : \alpha \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\alpha} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{R} : \alpha, \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}} &: \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} &: \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{R} : \alpha \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} &: \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{R} : \alpha, \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

Currying unifies the last two cases

$$\mathbf{R}(\alpha,\beta) = \mathbf{R'}: \alpha \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{split} & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{R} : \alpha \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\overline{\eta}}^{\underline{\alpha}} : \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{R} : \alpha, \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

Currying unifies the last two cases

$$\mathbf{R}(\alpha,\beta) = \mathbf{R'}: \alpha \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta, & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \end{pmatrix}$$

Rules can be indexed as: $\alpha \mapsto (\beta \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta))$

$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{EL}}$ Rules as Functions

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{R_0} \ : \{ C \sqsubseteq C \} \\ \mathbf{R_\top} : \{ C \sqsubseteq \top \} \end{array}$

 $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} : \{ C \sqsubseteq C \} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} : \{ C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{T} \} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}}^{-} : C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2 \mapsto \{ C \sqsubseteq D_1, C \sqsubseteq D_2 \} \end{aligned}$

```
\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} &: \{ C \sqsubseteq C \} \\ \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} &: \{ C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{T} \} \\ \mathbf{R}_{\square}^{-} &: C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2 \mapsto \{ C \sqsubseteq D_1, C \sqsubseteq D_2 \} \\ \mathbf{R}_{\square}^{-} &: C \sqsubseteq D \mapsto \begin{cases} C \sqsubseteq E, \quad D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}
```

```
\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} : \{ C \sqsubseteq C \} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}} : \{ C \sqsubseteq \mathsf{T} \} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{\Pi}}^{-} : C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2 \mapsto \{ C \sqsubseteq D_1, C \sqsubseteq D_2 \} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{\Pi}}^{-} : C \sqsubseteq D \mapsto \begin{cases} C \sqsubseteq E, \quad D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ & \mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{\Pi}}^{+} : C \sqsubseteq D_1, C \sqsubseteq D_2 \mapsto \begin{cases} C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2, \quad D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}
```

 $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{0}} : \{ C \sqsubset C \}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\mathsf{T}}: \{ C \sqsubset \top \}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{-}: C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2 \mapsto \{C \sqsubseteq D_1, C \sqsubseteq D_2\}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq}: C \sqsubseteq D \mapsto \begin{cases} C \sqsubseteq E, & D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+}: C \sqsubseteq D_{1}, C \sqsubseteq D_{2} \mapsto \begin{cases} C \sqsubseteq D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}, & D_{1} \sqcap D_{2} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ $\mathbf{R}_{\exists}: E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbb{R}. C, C \sqsubseteq D \mapsto \begin{cases} E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbb{R}. D, & \exists \mathbb{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

\mathcal{EL} Rule Indexing

$$\mathbf{R}(\alpha,\beta) = \mathbf{R'}: \alpha \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\text{Implement } \alpha \mapsto (\beta \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta)) \text{ or } \alpha \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta) \text{ for } \boldsymbol{\mathcal{EL}}$

\mathcal{EL} Rule Indexing

$$\mathbf{R}(\alpha,\beta) = \mathbf{R'}: \alpha \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\text{Implement } \alpha \mapsto (\beta \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta)) \text{ or } \alpha \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta) \text{ for } \boldsymbol{\mathcal{EL}}$

Trivial for R_0, R_{\top} , and R_{\Box}^- (no side conditions)

\mathcal{EL} Rule Indexing

$$\mathbf{R}(\alpha,\beta) = \mathbf{R'}: \alpha \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\text{Implement } \alpha \mapsto (\beta \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta)) \text{ or } \alpha \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta) \text{ for } \mathcal{EL}$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O}$$

told-subsumers ($\alpha \mapsto \gamma$): $D \mapsto \{E \mid D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O}\}$

EL Rule Indexing

$$\mathbf{R}(\alpha,\beta) = \mathbf{R'}: \alpha \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \beta \mapsto \begin{cases} \eta & \gamma \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\text{Implement } \alpha \mapsto (\beta \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta)) \text{ or } \alpha \mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \eta) \text{ for } \mathcal{EL}$

$$\mathbf{R} \sqsubseteq \frac{C \sqsubseteq D}{C \sqsubseteq E} : D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O}$$

told-subsumers $(\alpha \mapsto \gamma) : D \mapsto \{E \mid D \sqsubseteq E \in \mathcal{O}\}$

When processing $C \sqsubseteq D$ all $\{C \sqsubseteq E\}$ are derived with one look-up This is rule grouping

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_1 & \beta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_2 \\ \gamma = \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \end{array}$$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_1 & \beta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_2 \\ \gamma &= \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \end{aligned}$ subsumers $\alpha \mapsto \beta \quad \mathsf{C} \mapsto \quad \{\mathsf{D}_2 \mid \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_2 \in \mathsf{Closure}\}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_1 & \beta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_2 \\ \gamma = \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \end{array}$$

subsumers $\alpha \mapsto \beta \quad \mathsf{C} \mapsto \quad \{\mathsf{D}_2 \mid \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_2 \in \mathsf{Closure}\}$
conjunctions $\beta \mapsto \gamma \quad \mathsf{D}_2 \mapsto \quad \{\mathsf{D}_1 \mapsto \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \mid \\ \mathsf{D}_1 \sqcap \mathsf{D}_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}\} \end{array}$

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_{1} \quad C \sqsubseteq D_{2}}{C \sqsubseteq D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}} : D_{1} \sqcap D_{2} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_{1} & \beta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_{2} \\ \gamma = \mathsf{D}_{1} \sqcap \mathsf{D}_{2} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_{1} \sqcap \mathsf{D}_{2} \end{array}$ subsumers $\alpha \mapsto \beta \quad \mathsf{C} \mapsto \quad \{\mathsf{D}_{2} \mid \mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_{2} \in \mathsf{Closure}\}$ conjunctions $\beta \mapsto \gamma \quad \mathsf{D}_{2} \mapsto \quad \{\mathsf{D}_{1} \mapsto \mathsf{D}_{1} \sqcap \mathsf{D}_{2} \mid \\ \mathsf{D}_{1} \sqcap \mathsf{D}_{2} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}\}$ Result: $\eta \in \quad \{\mathsf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{D}_{1} \sqcap \mathsf{D}_{2} \mid \\ \mathsf{D}_{2} \in \mathsf{subsumers}(\mathsf{C}), \\ \mathsf{D}_{1} \in \mathsf{conjunctions}(\mathsf{D}_{2})\}$

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+ , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_{1} \quad C \sqsubseteq D_{2}}{C \sqsubseteq D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}} : D_{1} \sqcap D_{2} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Ontology \mathcal{O} Inferences 1. $A \sqsubseteq B$ 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$

- 3. $A \sqsubseteq D$
- $4. D \sqcap C \sqsubseteq E$

Selecting and Applying $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{R}}_{\sqcap}^+,$ Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_{1} \quad C \sqsubseteq D_{2}}{C \sqsubseteq D_{1} \sqcap D_{2}} : D_{1} \sqcap D_{2} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathsf{Ontology}\ \mathcal{O}$

Inferences

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq B$
- **2**. $B \sqsubseteq C$
- 3. $A \sqsubseteq D$
- $4. D \sqcap C \sqsubseteq E$

► $A \sqsubseteq B$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+ , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathsf{Ontology}\ \mathcal{O}$

38/43

Inferences

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq B$
- 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$
- 3. $A \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. $D \sqcap C \sqsubseteq E$

- $A \sqsubseteq \mathsf{B}$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► $A \sqsubseteq D$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} { $C \mapsto C \sqcap D$ } \in conjunctions(D) but $C \notin$ subsumers(A), \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^+ doesn't apply

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^+ , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathsf{Ontology}\ \mathcal{O}$

38/43

Inferences

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq B$
- 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$
- 3. $A \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. $D \sqcap C \sqsubseteq E$

- $A \sqsubseteq \mathsf{B}$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► $A \sqsubseteq D$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} { $C \mapsto C \sqcap D$ } \in conjunctions(D) but $C \notin$ subsumers(A), \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^+ doesn't apply
- $A \sqsubseteq C$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} $\{D \mapsto C \sqcap D\} \in \text{conjunctions}(C)$ and $D \in \text{subsumers}(A)$, sooo

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+ , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \sqcap D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathsf{Ontology}\ \mathcal{O}$

38/43

Inferences

- 1. $A \sqsubseteq B$
- 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$
- 3. $A \sqsubseteq D$
- 4. $D \sqcap C \sqsubseteq E$

- $A \sqsubseteq \mathsf{B}$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}
- ► $A \sqsubseteq D$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} { $C \mapsto C \sqcap D$ } \in conjunctions(D) but $C \notin$ subsumers(A), \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^+ doesn't apply
- ► $A \sqsubseteq C$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} { $D \mapsto C \sqcap D$ } \in conjunctions(C) and $D \in$ subsumers(A), sooo

• $A \sqsubseteq C \sqcap D$ by \mathbf{R}_{\sqcap}^+

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{-}^{+} , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\Box}^{+} \frac{C \sqsubseteq D_1 \quad C \sqsubseteq D_2}{C \sqsubset D_1 \Box D_2} : D_1 \sqcap D_2 \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Ontology \mathcal{O}

Inferences

- 1. $A \sqsubset B$
- 2. $B \sqsubseteq C$
- 3. $A \sqsubset D$
- 4. $D \sqcap C \sqsubset E$

- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq B$ by \mathbf{R}_{\square}
- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq D$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box} $\{C \mapsto C \sqcap D\} \in \text{conjunctions}(D)$ but $C \notin \text{subsumers}(A)$, \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+ doesn't apply
- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubset \mathsf{C} \text{ by } \mathsf{R}_{\Box}$ ${D \mapsto C \sqcap D} \in \text{conjunctions}(C)$ and $D \in \text{subsumers}(A)$, sooo
- $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}^+

 $\blacktriangleright A \sqsubseteq E$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box}

38/43

Pavel Klinov Bijan Parsia

Existential-based Indexing R_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqsubset \exists R.C} \stackrel{B \sqsubseteq C}{:} \exists R.C \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Processing $E \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} & \beta = \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \\ \gamma = \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{array}$$

Existential-based Indexing R_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \quad B \sqsubseteq C}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C} : \exists R.C \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Processing $E \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} & \beta = \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \\ \gamma = \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{array}$$

subsumptions $\alpha \mapsto \beta$ $\mathsf{B} \mapsto \{\mathsf{C} \mid \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \in \mathsf{Closure}\}$

Existential-based Indexing R_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C} \stackrel{B \sqsubseteq C}{:} \exists R.C \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Processing $E \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} & \beta = \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \\ \gamma = \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{array}$$

subsumptions $\alpha \mapsto \beta$ $B \mapsto \{C \mid B \sqsubseteq C \in Closure\}$ existentials $\beta \mapsto \gamma$ $C \mapsto \{R \mid \exists R.C \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}\}$ Existential-based Indexing \mathbf{R}_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B}{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C} \stackrel{B \sqsubseteq C}{:} \exists R.C \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Processing $E \sqsubseteq \exists R.C$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} & \beta = \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \\ \gamma = \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{array}$$

```
subsumptions \alpha \mapsto \beta \mathsf{B} \mapsto \{\mathsf{C} \mid \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \in \mathsf{Closure}\}
existentials \beta \mapsto \gamma \mathsf{C} \mapsto \{\mathsf{R} \mid \exists \mathsf{R.C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}\}
                             Result \eta \in \{A \sqsubseteq \exists R.C \mid
                                                                        C \in subsumptions(B),
                                                                        R \in existentials(C)
```

Subsumption-based Indexing R_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{\mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} \quad \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B}}{\mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C}} : \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Processing $B \sqsubseteq C$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} & \beta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} \\ \gamma = \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{array}$$

Subsumption-based Indexing R_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{\mathsf{B}_{\Box} \mathsf{C}}{\mathsf{A}_{\Box} \exists \mathsf{R.C}} : \exists \mathsf{R.C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Processing $B \sqsubseteq C$

$$\begin{split} \alpha &= \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} & \beta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} \\ \gamma &= \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{split}$$

backward-links $\alpha \mapsto \beta$ $B \mapsto \{R \mapsto A \mid A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \in \mathsf{Closure}\}$

Subsumption-based Indexing R_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{\mathbb{B}_{\Box} \mathbb{C} \quad \mathbb{A}_{\Box} \exists \mathbb{R}.\mathbb{B}}{\mathbb{A}_{\Box} \exists \mathbb{R}.\mathbb{C}} : \exists \mathbb{R}.\mathbb{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Processing $\mathbb{B} \sqsubseteq \mathbb{C}$

$$\begin{split} \alpha &= \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} & \beta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} \\ \gamma &= \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{split}$$

Subsumption-based Indexing \mathbf{R}_{\exists}

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{\mathbb{B} \subseteq \mathbb{C} \quad \mathbb{A} \subseteq \exists \mathbb{R}.\mathbb{B}}{\mathbb{A} \subseteq \exists \mathbb{R}.\mathbb{C}} : \exists \mathbb{R}.\mathbb{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Processing $B \sqsubseteq C$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha = \mathsf{B} \sqsubseteq \mathsf{C} & \beta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{B} \\ \gamma = \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O} & \eta = \mathsf{A} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \end{array}$$

```
backward-links \alpha \mapsto \beta B \mapsto \{R \mapsto A \mid A \sqsubseteq \exists R.B \in \mathsf{Closure}\}
existentials \beta \mapsto \gamma \mathsf{C} \mapsto \{\mathsf{R} \mid \exists \mathsf{R}.\mathsf{C} \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}\}
                             Result \eta \in \{A \sqsubset \exists R.C \mid
                                                                     A \in backward-links(B, R)
                                                                     R \in existentials(C)
```

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

 $\mathsf{Ontology}\ \mathcal{O}:\ \mathsf{A}\sqsubseteq\mathsf{B}\ \mathsf{B}\sqsubseteq \exists\mathsf{R}.(\mathsf{C}\sqcap\mathsf{D})\ \mathsf{C}\sqsubseteq\mathsf{E}\ \exists\mathsf{R}.\mathsf{E}\sqsubseteq\mathsf{X}$

Closure:
Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : $\mathbf{A} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{B} \quad \mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. (\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D}) \quad \mathbf{C} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{E} \quad \exists \mathbf{R}. \mathbf{E} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{X}$

Closure:

 $A \sqsubseteq B$ by R_{\sqsubseteq}

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Closure:

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example

 $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$

Closure:

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubseteq C \sqcap D$ bv R₀

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ bv \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by R₀ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C$ R_{-} by

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ bv \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by R₀ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C$ by $A \sqsubset \exists R.C ???$

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by R₀ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C$ by $A \sqsubset \exists R.C ???$ No $R \notin existentials(C)$

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ bv \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by R₀ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C$ by $A \sqsubset \exists R.C ???$ No $R \notin existentials(C)$ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset E$ by R∟

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ by \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by R₀ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C$ by $A \sqsubset \exists R.C ???$ No $R \notin existentials(C)$ $C \sqcap D \sqcap E$ by R∟ $A \sqsubset \exists R.E ???$

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathsf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathsf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ by A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by R₀ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C$ by $A \sqsubset \exists R.C ???$ No $R \notin existentials(C)$ $C \sqcap D \sqcap E$ by R∟ A ⊑ ∃R.E ??? Yes $R \in existentials(E)$,

 $A \in backward-links(C \sqcap D, R)$

Selecting and Applying \mathbf{R}_{\exists} , Example $\mathbf{R}_{\exists} \frac{E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. C \quad C \sqsubseteq D}{E \sqsubset \exists \mathbf{R}. D} : E \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}. D \text{ occurs in } \mathcal{O}$ Ontology \mathcal{O} : A \sqsubseteq B B \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D) C \sqsubseteq E \exists R.E \sqsubseteq X Closure: $A \sqsubset B$ R_{\Box} by $A \sqsubseteq \exists R.(C \sqcap D)$ \mathbf{R}_{\Box} using $\mathbf{B} \sqsubseteq \exists \mathbf{R}.(\mathbf{C} \sqcap \mathbf{D})$ by A added to backward-links($C \sqcap D, R$) $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C \sqcap D$ by R₀ $C \sqcap D \sqsubset C$ by $A \sqsubset \exists R.C ???$ $R \notin existentials(C)$ No $C \sqcap D \sqsubset E$ by R∟ $A \sqsubset \exists R.E ???$ Yes $R \in existentials(E)$,

- $A \in backward-links(C \sqcap D, R)$
- by \mathbf{R}_{\sqsubseteq} using $\exists \mathbf{R}.\mathbf{E} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{X}$

 $A \sqsubset X$

So Is It Practical?

Short answer: yes

- <10s to classify SNOMED CT (>200s for tableau)
- 10s for GALEN (∞ for tableau)

So Is It Practical?

Short answer: yes

- <10s to classify SNOMED CT (>200s for tableau)
- 10s for GALEN (∞ for tableau)
- ▶ 1hr to classify SNOMED CT on Google Nexus! Ü

So Is It Practical?

Short answer: yes

- <10s to classify SNOMED CT (>200s for tableau)
- 10s for GALEN (∞ for tableau)
- ▶ 1hr to classify SNOMED CT on Google Nexus! Ü

There is still room for improvement

- around 23,000,000 inferences made to classify SNOMED CT
- ... but only 300,000 concepts, few subsumers per each
- even more economical classification might be possible

Take Home Message

Consequence-based reasoning is different from tableau reasoning

- ▶ Uses natural deduction (rules) instead of building a model
- Never tries to test a subsumption that doesn't hold

Take Home Message

Consequence-based reasoning is different from tableau reasoning

- Uses natural deduction (rules) instead of building a model
- Never tries to test a subsumption that doesn't hold

Sound and complete rule systems known for

- \mathcal{EL} , \mathcal{EL}^+ , \mathcal{EL}^{++} (this lecture)
- ► Horn-SHIQ (the language of Full GALEN)
- ► *ALCH* (non-deterministic language)

Take Home Message

Consequence-based reasoning is different from tableau reasoning

- Uses natural deduction (rules) instead of building a model
- Never tries to test a subsumption that doesn't hold

Sound and complete rule systems known for

- \mathcal{EL} , \mathcal{EL}^+ , \mathcal{EL}^{++} (this lecture)
- ► Horn-SHIQ (the language of Full GALEN)
- ► *ALCH* (non-deterministic language)

Tractable does not necessarily mean pactical!

- Even $O(n^2)$ is fatal if it is typical case
- Converse: intractable does not always mean impractical