

Exercises sheet OWL/DL – Reasoning

1. Translate the following axioms in to RDF Turtle

- $Human \sqsubseteq \neg Alien$

$\forall x (Human(x) \rightarrow \neg Alien(x))$

- $FatherWithDaughters \sqsubseteq Man \sqcap \forall hasChild. Woman$

$\forall x (FatherWithDaughters(x,y) \rightarrow Man(x) \wedge \forall y [hasChild(x,y) \wedge Woman(y)])$

- $Sibling \sqsubseteq \exists parent. \exists hasChild. \neg Self$

$\forall x (Sibling(x) \rightarrow \exists y [parent(x,y) \wedge \exists z [hasChild(y,z) \wedge \neg Self(z)]])$

2. Decide whether the following translations are correct or not. Explain your answer

a) Each Student had not wrote a habilitation

$Student \sqsubseteq \neg(\exists wrote. Habilitation)$

$\forall x (Student(x) \rightarrow \neg(\exists y [wrote(x,y) \wedge Habilitation(y)]))$

Also: $\forall x (Student(x) \rightarrow (\forall y [\neg wrote(x,y) \vee \neg Habilitation(y)]))$

Because every student had not wrote one Habilitation.

b) A conference chair organizes at least one event that is both research and public

$Chair \sqsubseteq \forall organizes. (Research \sqcap Public)$

$\forall x (Chair(x) \rightarrow \forall y [organizes(x,y) \wedge Research(y) \wedge Public(y)])$

True because every event is both research and public.

c) Each assistant is a university staff cannot teach in a privatissimum (exclusive tutorial)

$Assistant \sqsubseteq Staff \sqcap \forall teaches. (\neg Privatissimum)$

$\forall x (Assistant(x) \rightarrow Staff(x) \wedge \forall y [teaches(x,y) \wedge \neg Privatissimum(y)])$

False because every assistant is a staff but not a university staff. And nobody can teach privatissimum that's right.

3. Decide if the user understood the ontological definitions correctly. Explain your answer.

a) $Customer \sqsubseteq PublicOrganization$ $Customer \sqsubseteq Municipality$

$\forall x (Customer(x) \rightarrow PublicOrganization(x) \wedge Municipality(x))$

A customer is both a public organization and municipality

That's true because only then it is satisfied.

b) *GuestProfessor* $\sqsubseteq \neg \forall \text{holds}. (\text{Lecture} \sqcup \text{Seminar})$

$\forall x(\text{GuestProfessor}(x) \rightarrow \neg \forall y[\text{holds}(x, y) \wedge (\text{Lecture}(y) \vee \text{Seminar}(y))])$

$\forall x(\text{GuestProfessor}(x) \rightarrow \exists y[\neg \text{holds}(x, y) \vee (\neg \text{Lecture}(y) \wedge \neg \text{Seminar}(y))])$

If someone holds a Lecture or a seminar then he/she is a guest professor.

False because there is a not before every y holds that's why he/she is not always a guest professor.

c) *Secretary* $\sqsubseteq \text{UniEmployee}$ $\text{UniEmployee} \sqsubseteq \neg \text{Secretary}$

$\forall x(\text{Secretary}(x) \rightarrow \text{UniEmployee}(x))$

$\forall x(\text{UniEmployee}(x) \rightarrow \neg \text{Secretary}(x))$

All secretaries are university employee, but not every employee is a secretary

Not sure here!

Because the sentence is correct if you see it alone but if you combine both and you look at the truth table only secretary 0 and employee 0 or 1 is correct. So because of the not Secretary there can't be any secretary!