

Assignment 4

Course Lecturer: Yizheng Zhao

May 29, 2022

★ This assignment, due on 10th June, contributes to 10% of the total mark of the course.

Question 1. OWA and CWA

Consider the database instance $\mathcal{D}_{\text{music}}$ given by:

StudioAlbum(Fantasy) StudioAlbum(The_Eight_Dimensions) StudioAlbum(Common_Jasmin_Orange)
DebutAlbum(Jay) LiveAlbum(2004_Incomparable_Concert)
EP(Hidden_Track) EP(Initial_D) SoundtrackAlbum(Secret) CompilationAlbum(Together)
Song(Herbalist_Manual) Song(Elimination)
Singer(Jay_Chou) Singer(Eason_Chan)
Composer(Jay_Chou) Lyricist(Vincent_Fang) Police(Black_Cat)
hasFriend(Jay_Chou, Vincent_Fang) hasFriend(Jay_Chou, Will_Liu)
releases(Jay_Chou, Jay) releases(Jay_Chou, Fantasy) releases(Jolin_Tsai, Together)
sings(Eason_Chan, Elimination) sings(Jolin_Tsai, Rewind) sings(Jay_Chou, Herbalist_Manual)
writesMusicFor(Jay_Chou, Elimination) writesMusicFor(Jay_Chou, Rewind) writesMusicFor(Jay_Chou, Herbalist_Manual)
writesMusicFor(Ta-yu_Lo, Pearl_of_the_Orient)
writesLyricsFor(Jay_Chou, Elimination) writesLyricsFor(Vincent_Fang, Rewind)
writesLyricsFor(Vincent_Fang, Herbalist_Manual) DancesWith(Will_Liu, Herbalist_Manual)

Consider each of the following Boolean queries F (in DL notation).

- (a) Album(Fantasy)
- (b) StudioAlbum(The_Eight_Dimensions)
- (c) LiveAlbum(Common_Jasmin_Orange)
- (d) \neg LiveAlbum(Common_Jasmin_Orange)
- (e) \neg EP(secret)
- (f) \neg StudioAlbum \sqcup \neg LiveAlbum(2004_Incomparable_Concert)

(g) $\neg \text{StudioAlbum} \sqcup \neg \text{LiveAlbum}(\text{Eason_Chan})$

(h) $\exists \text{hasFriend}.\top(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(i) $\exists \text{hasFriend}.\exists \text{dancesWith}.\text{Song}(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(j) $\exists \text{hasFriend}.\text{Composer}(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(k) $\exists \text{hasFriend}.\{\text{Jay_Chou}\}(\text{Vincent_Fang})$

(l) $\text{DebutAlbum}(\text{2004_Incomparable_Concert})$

(m) $\text{Song}(\text{Rewind})$

(n) $\text{Singer}(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(o) $\text{Singer}(\text{Jolin_Tsai})$

(p) $\text{Lyricist}(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(q) $\text{Composer}(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(r) $\text{Composer}(\text{Ta-yu_Lo})$

(s) $\text{Police}(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(t) $\text{Police}(\text{Jolin_Tsai})$

(u) $\neg \text{Singer-SongWriter} \sqcup \neg \text{Police}(\text{Vincent_Fang})$

(v) $\neg \text{Singer-SongWriter} \sqcup \neg \text{Police}(\text{Ta-yu_Lo})$

(w) $\text{Singer-SongWriter}(\text{Jay_Chou})$

(x) $\text{Singer-SongWriter}(\text{Jolin_Tsai})$

(y) $\neg \text{SongWriter}(\text{Vincent_Fang})$

(z) $\neg \text{Dancer}(\text{Will_Liu})$

- Write those Boolean queries (marked in red) in first-order logic (FOL) notation. (Note that for many queries there is no difference between DL notation and FOL notation).
- Query answering under closed world assumption: check for each Boolean F whether the answer to the query F given by $\mathcal{D}_{\text{music}}$ is “Yes” or “No”.
- Query answering under open world assumption: check for each Boolean query F whether the certain answer to F given by $\mathcal{D}_{\text{music}}$ is “Yes”, “No”, or “Don’t know”.

Consider the following non-Boolean queries F_i ($1 \leq i \leq 4$):

(a) $F_1(x) = \text{Singer}(x)$

(b) $F_2(x) = \neg \text{Singer}(x)$

(c) $F_3(x, y) = \text{hasFriend}(x, y)$

(d) $F_4(x) = (\text{Lyricist}(x) \vee \text{Composer}(x)) \wedge \neg \text{releases}(x, \text{Jay})$

For each query F_i , give

- for closed world assumption: $\text{answer}(F_i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{music}})$;
- for open world assumption: $\text{certanswer}(F_i, \mathcal{D}_{\text{music}})$.

Question 2. Querying with TBox

Following Question 1, consider now the TBox \mathcal{T} given as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{StudioAlbum} \sqsubseteq \text{Album} \\
&\text{LiveAlbum} \sqsubseteq \text{Album} \\
&\text{StudioAlbum} \sqcap \text{LiveAlbum} \sqsubseteq \perp \\
&\text{EP} \sqcap \text{LiveAlbum} \sqcap \text{SoundTrackAlbum} \sqsubseteq \perp \\
&\text{DebutAlbum} \sqsubseteq \text{StudioAlbum} \\
&\text{Album} \equiv \exists \text{hasTrack.Song} \\
&\text{Singer} \equiv \exists \text{releases.Album} \sqcap \exists \text{sings.Song} \\
&\exists \text{releases}^-. \text{Police} \sqcap \text{Album} \sqsubseteq \perp \\
&\text{Lyricist} \equiv \exists \text{writesLyricsFor.Song} \\
&\text{Composer} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{writesMusicFor.Song} \\
&\text{SongWriter} \sqsubseteq \text{Lyricist} \sqcap \text{Composer} \\
&\text{Singer-SongWriter} \sqsubseteq \text{Singer} \sqcap \text{SongWriter} \\
&\exists \text{sings}^-. \top \sqsubseteq \text{Song} \\
&\exists \text{writesLyricsFor}^-. \top \sqsubseteq \text{Song}
\end{aligned}$$

- Re-consider the Boolean queries F given in Question 1. Compute the certain answers in the context of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{music}}$, and in the context of $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{music}})$.
- The addition of the TBox \mathcal{T} to the database instance $\mathcal{D}_{\text{music}}$ allows one to draw new conclusions from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{music}}$, and may render some of the data (ABox assertion) α in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{music}}$ redundant, i.e., $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\alpha\}) \models \mathcal{D}$. Can you identify all such assertions α ?

Question 3. Computing $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}}$ in \mathcal{EL}

Consider the \mathcal{EL} TBox \mathcal{T} :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Guitarist} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{plays_for.RockBand} \\
&\text{Bassist} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{plays_for.RockBand} \\
&\text{Drummer} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{plays_for.RockBand} \\
&\text{RockBand} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{managed_by.Manager} \\
&\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \text{Employee} \\
&\text{Manager} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{managed_by.Manager}
\end{aligned}$$

and the ABox \mathcal{A} :

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Guitarist}(\text{John_Lennon}) \quad \text{Bassist}(\text{Paul_McCartney}) \\
&\text{Drummer}(\text{Ringo_Starr}) \quad \text{RockBand}(\text{Beatles}) \\
&\text{managed_by}(\text{Beatles}, \text{Brian_Epstein})
\end{aligned}$$

- Compute the interpretation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}}$ as described in the slides.
- For \mathcal{EL} concept queries, we know that $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}}$ gives the answer “Yes” iff $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ gives the certain answer “Yes”. Check this for the following queries:
 - $\exists \text{plays_for}.\text{RockBand}(\text{John_Lennon});$
 - $\exists \text{managed_by}.\text{Manager}(\text{Paul_McCartney});$
 - $\exists \text{plays_for}.\exists \text{managed_by}.\text{Manager}(\text{Ringo_Starr}).$
- For more complex queries, $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}}$ can give the answer “Yes” even if $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ does not give the certain answer “Yes”. Check this for:
 - $F(x, y) = \exists z.(\text{plays_for}(x, z) \wedge \text{plays_for}(y, z)).$
 - $F = \exists x.\text{managed_by}(x, x).$

Question 4. Conjunctive queries over database and interpretation

Consider the following database \mathcal{D} consisting of the following tables:

Person:		Enrollment:		Attendance:		Course:	
ID	Name	StudentID	Since	StudentID	CourseID	ID	Title
2001	Jay_Chou	2002	2020	2001	30000160	30000160	KR&P
2002	Jolin_Tsai	2003	2021	2002	30000160	30000180	PR&CV
2003	Stefanie_Sun	2004	2020	2002	30000170	30000170	NLP
2004	Ta-yu_Lo			2003	30000180		

- Define the finite first-order interpretation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}$ corresponding to \mathcal{D} .
 - Reformulate each of the following SQL queries Q into first-order queries f_Q , and identify which of them are conjunctive queries.
 - Answer Q in the context of \mathcal{D} and f_Q in the context of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}$.
- (a) SELECT * FROM Person
- (b) SELECT Person.Name FROM Person, Attendance, Course
WHERE Person.ID = Attendance.PersonID
AND Course.ID = Attendance.CourseID
AND Course.Title = “KR&P”
- (c) SELECT Person.Name FROM Person, Enrollment
WHERE Person.ID = Enrollment.PersonID
AND NOT EXISTS (
SELECT * FROM Attendance
WHERE Person.ID = Attendance.PersonID)

Question 5. Certain answers in different contexts

Consider the following \mathcal{ALC} knowledge base $\mathcal{K} := (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ with:

$$\mathcal{T} := \{X \sqsubseteq Y, Y \sqsubseteq \exists r.X, X \sqsubseteq \forall r.Y, \forall r.X \sqsubseteq Y, W \equiv \neg V, \exists r.Y \sqsubseteq \neg V\}$$

$$\mathcal{A} := \{(\text{Jay_Chou}, \text{Jolin_Tsai}) : r, (\text{Jolin_Tsai}, \text{Stefanie_Sun}) : r, (\text{Stefanie_Sun}, \text{Jay_Chou}) : r, \\ (\text{Jolin_Tsai}, \text{Jolin_Tsai}) : r, (\text{Stefanie_Sun}, \text{Stefanie_Sun}) : r, \text{Stefanie_Sun} : X\}$$

- Compute the certain answers to the following conjunctive queries in the context of \mathcal{A} .
- Compute the certain answers to the following conjunctive queries in the context of \mathcal{K} .

(a) $r(x, y) \wedge Y(y)$

(b) $\exists y(r(x, y) \wedge Y(y))$

(c) $\exists x, y(r(x, y) \wedge r(y, x))$

(d) $\exists z, w(r(x, y) \wedge r(y, z) \wedge r(z, x) \wedge r(z, w) \wedge W(w))$

Question 6 (with 1 bonus mark). Simplicity of ABox

Consider feeding arbitrary ABoxes rather than simple ABoxes as input to the problem of ontology-mediated querying. Does this affect the data complexity results?

Question 7 (with 1 bonus mark). k -colorability

Is it possible to show that the problem of conjunctive query entailment (CQ-entailment) in \mathcal{ALC} is coNP-hard w.r.t. data complexity using a reduction from non- k -colorability in graphs? What if k is fixed?