


Everything I know so far about [Formal Concept Analysis]

Lucas Carr

June 25, 2024



Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Lattices	2
1.1.1	Supremum and infimum	2
1.2	Formal Contexts	2
1.3	Formal Concepts	3
1.4	Concept Hierarchies	3
1.5	The Basic Theorem	3
1.5.1	I	3
1.5.2	II	4
2	Closure Systems	6
2.1	Defining a Closure System	6
2.2	Closure Operators	6
3	Implications	7
3.1	Introduction	7
3.1.1	Implications in a Formal Context	7
3.2	Sets of Implications	8
3.3	When does an implication follow from other ones?	9

1 Introduction

1.1 Lattices

A lattice \mathcal{C} is a poset s.t. for any pair $(a, b) \in \mathcal{C}$, the supremum $a \wedge b$, and infimum $a \vee b$ exist. We extend this to a complete lattice, which has the requirement that for any subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ the supremum $\bigvee \mathcal{D}$ and infimum $\bigwedge \mathcal{D}$ exist.

1.1.1 Supremum and infimum

The supremum of two elements is defined as the *least upper bound* of those two elements. We can obviously extend this over more than two elements. Given the set $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, where $S \subset \mathbb{N}$. The supremum, $\bigvee S = 5$; similarly, the infimum $\bigwedge S = 1$.




Figure 1: $d \vee c = a$, $b \wedge a = c$

When we are talking about lattices (or Hasse diagrams in general), we can refer to the supremum and infimum as the *meet* and *join*. Refer to 1.5 for more pertinent discussion regarding lattices.

We also have infimum (supremum) satisfying the following

- $x \wedge y = y \wedge x$ (commutativity)
- $x \wedge (y \wedge z) = (x \wedge y) \wedge z$ (associativity)
- $x \wedge x$ (idempotency - but arguably, reflexivity)

We use these later on to show that any finite lattice is a complete lattice.

There are also the following interesting properties:

- $a \vee 0 = a$
- $a \leq b \implies a \vee b = b$ ¹

1.2 Formal Contexts

A Formal Context is a triple $\langle G, M, I \rangle$ where G refers to a set of objects, M to a set of properties, and I an incidence relation over $G \times M$.

We have derivation operators A' and B' ; for A' , where $A \subseteq G$, the derivation operator tells us which properties belong to the objects in A , the dual holds for properties and their objects. **Formally**,

Definition 1.1

$$A' := \{m \in M \mid \forall g \in A, gIm\}$$

$$B' := \{g \in G \mid \forall m \in B, gIm\}$$

¹This is useful because it enables to move from orders (posets) to lattices

We also have closure operators, A'' , which works intuitively by applying the derivation operator on A (B), which yields a set of properties. Then applying it again on A' (B'), which yields back a set of objects (properties).

Proposition 1.2 *For subsets $A, B \subseteq G$ (defined dually for properties $C, D \subseteq M$), we have*

- a. $A \subseteq B \implies B' \subseteq A'$
- b. $A \subseteq A''$
- c. $A' = A'''$

For more natural discussion, *a* describes the behaviour that if we have two sets of objects A and B , where $A \subseteq B$; then it follows that objects in A will have at *least* all the properties of objects in B .

1.3 Formal Concepts

Presume we are working with a formal context $\langle G, M, I \rangle$.

Definition 1.3 (A, B) is a **formal concept** of our formal context iff $A \subseteq G$, $B \subseteq M$, $A' = B$, and $B' = A$

A is called the **extent**, and B is called the **intent**. We can refer to the set of all formal concepts of a formal context as a $\mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$.

1.4 Concept Hierarchies

When we think about concepts, we typically think of them in a structure (something like a taxonomy, or ontology). That is, we think of *sub* and *super* concepts. For example, Dog is a subconcept of Mammal; and so is Cat. However, Dog and Cat are not sub nor superconcepts of one another (so, in some sense we have a partial order here). Formal Concepts have the same idea.

Definition 1.4 Let (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) be formal concepts of some $\mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$. We say that (A_1, B_1) is a **subconcept** of (A_2, B_2) (equivalently, (A_2, B_2) is a **superconcept** of (A_1, B_1)) and use the \leq sign to express this. Thus we have

$$(A_1, B_1) \leq (A_2, B_2) : \iff A_1 \subseteq A_2 \iff B_2 \subseteq B_1.$$

1.5 The Basic Theorem

1.5.1 I

The first part of the Basic Theorem tells us that given some formal concept (G, M, I) , the concept lattice of $\mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$ is a complete lattice. So, constructing a lattice from a formal context, will always result in a complete lattice.

From $\mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$, let $\{(A_t, B_t) | t \in T\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$ be some arbitrary subset of formal concepts. We can then define the supremum and infimum of this subset as:

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee_{t \in T} (A_t, B_t) &:= \left(\left(\bigcup_{t \in T} A_t \right)', \left(\bigcap_{t \in T} B_t \right) \right) \\ \bigwedge_{t \in T} (A_t, B_t) &:= \left(\left(\bigcap_{t \in T} A_t \right), \left(\bigcup_{t \in T} B_t \right)' \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we want to show that there is some complete lattice \mathcal{V} that is isomorphic to the concept lattice given by $\mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$.

	Fur	Feathers	Scales	Lives on Land	Lays Eggs	Cold-Blooded
Mammals	×			×		
Birds		×		×	×	
Reptiles			×	×	×	×
Amphibians			×	×	×	×
Fish			×			×

Suppose we are interested in Mammals and Birds, $\{Mammals\}' = \{Fur, LivesonLand\}$; $\{Mammals\}'' = \{Mammals\}$. $\{Birds\}' = \{Feathers, LivesonLand, LaysEggs\}$; $\{Birds\}'' = \{Birds\}$.

Using the basic theorem from above, we can determine the supremum and infimum of our set of concepts. We have the set of concepts from above, lets call this $S := (A_t, B_t)$. We can calculate $\bigvee S$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\bigcup_{t \in T} A_t \right)'', \left(\bigcap_{t \in T} B_t \right) \\ & \left(\{Mammals, Birds\}'', \{LivesonLand\} \right) \\ & \left(\{Mammals, Birds, Amphibians, Reptiles\}', \{LivesonLand\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Dually, we can find the infimum $\bigwedge S$, given as: (which is the bottom element)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\bigcap_{t \in T} A_t, \left(\bigcup_{t \in T} B_t \right)'' \right) \\ & \left(\emptyset, (\{Fur, Feathers, LivesonLand, LaysEggs\})' \right) \\ & (\emptyset, \emptyset) \end{aligned}$$

The first part of the Basic Theorem, which we have just gone through, shows that for the concept lattice of a given formal context, $\mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$, we have an infimum and supremum for any arbitrary subset of concepts. This is just our definition of a complete lattice - so we have that any formal context has a complete lattice.

1.5.2 II

The second part of the basic theorem tells us that every complete lattice is *isomorphic* to a concept lattice. That is, given a complete lattice (\mathcal{L}, \leq) , we can find some $\mathcal{B}(G, M, I)$ that is isomorphic to \mathcal{L} .




Figure 2: Example of a complete lattice of $(\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \subseteq)$

Example 1.5

This is a complete lattice (it is finite, so it is complete); we can find a relatively simply formal context, which is isomorphic to the lattice: we need two sets, the set of supremum-irreducible elements, and the set of infimum-irreducible elements. For small lattices, we can do this via inspection - the supremum-irreducible (infimum-irreducible) elements are those which only have a single line below (above) the element.

Thus, our supremum-irreducible set is $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$;

and our infimum-irreducible set is $\{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 3, 4\}, \{2, 3, 4\}\}$.

The supremum-irreducible set represents the objects, and infimum-irreducible set represents the properties. The reason for this is intuitive: we start bottom-up with our maximally sub-concepts (remember, the distinction between properties and objects is a modelling problem), these basic elements are the ones which supremum-irreducible, i.e. they cannot be written as a super-concept of some other elements. Conversely, our infimum-irreducible elements are the most general (other than \top) elements of our lattice, they cannot be written as the sub-concepts of elements.²

Table 1: The formal context for 2

	$\{1, 2, 3\}$	$\{1, 2, 4\}$	$\{1, 3, 4\}$	$\{2, 3, 4\}$
1	×	×	×	
2	×	×		×
3	×		×	×
4		×	×	×

[How do we determine the supremum(infimum)-irreducible sets without inspection?]

²We can of course write a infimum-irreducible element e as $e \vee \top$, but this is not useful.

2 Closure Systems

2.1 Defining a Closure System

If we are given a set M , a closure system \mathcal{C} on M is a set of subsets of M ($\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M)$) for which:

- $M \in \mathcal{C}$
- if $D \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ then, $\bigcap D \in \mathcal{C}$

We might observe that the first point is ensured by the second point; this is because $\bigcap \emptyset = M$ - if we don't have this property, we have a contradiction. We might also observe that a closure system has a natural ordering; specifically, by subsumption. That is, \mathcal{C} is a poset with (\mathcal{C}, \subseteq) .

2.2 Closure Operators

3 Implications

3.1 Introduction

If M is a set of attributes, we say that $A \rightarrow B$ is an implication over M ; $A, B \subseteq M$. A set $D \subseteq M$ respects an implication $A \rightarrow B$ if i) $A \not\subseteq D$ or ii) $B \subseteq D$ - the same as material implication. We can represent this notion as $D \models A \rightarrow B$.

If we have a set of implications $L := \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$ we say that a subset $D \models L$ if it respects every implication in L : formally, $D \models L \iff \forall A \rightarrow B \in L, D \models A \rightarrow B$.

3.1.1 Implications in a Formal Context

Suppose we have a formal context $\mathcal{K} := (G, M, I)$ and $A \rightarrow B$ where $A, B \subseteq M$. We say that $K \models A \rightarrow B$ if $\forall g \in G, g' \models A \rightarrow B$. That is, a formal context is a model of some implication, if every object in G has a intent which is a model of that implication.

Given $K \models A \rightarrow B$, the following are equivalent:

$$1. \forall g \in G, g' \models A \rightarrow B$$

$$2. B \subseteq A''$$

$$3. A' \subseteq B'$$

(1) is obvious.

For (2), we need to show $K \models A \rightarrow B \iff B \subseteq A''$.

\Rightarrow We want to show that $\forall g \in G, g' \models A \rightarrow B \implies B \subseteq A''$

1. Every object which has A in its intent, also has B in its intent.
2. This means, $\forall g \in G, A \subseteq g', B \subseteq g'$
3. So B is a subset of every object intent in G .
4. Thus, $B \subseteq A''$.

\Leftarrow Show that $B \subseteq A'' \implies \forall g \in G, g' \models A \rightarrow B$.

1. A''' is the set of objects which have A in their intents
2. We know that all of these objects will have B in their intents too (assumption)
3. So, $\forall g \in G$ if $g \in A'''$ then $B \in g'$ and so $g' \models A \rightarrow B$.
4. $\forall g \in G$ and $g \notin A'''$, then $g' \models A \rightarrow B$ trivially.
5. $\forall g \in G, g' \models A \rightarrow B$

[We still need to do proof for (3)]

3.2 Sets of Implications

Let L be a set of implications over M , then

$$Mod(L) := \{T \in \mathcal{P}(M) | T \models L\}$$

$Mod(L)$ is the set of all subsets of M which are models of the set of implications L . This is a closure system on M . We can see that $M \in Mod(L)$ because for any implication $A \rightarrow B$ over M , $M \models A \rightarrow B$.

Proof: $M \models A \rightarrow B$ for any implication over M with $A, B \subseteq M$.

1. Let $A \rightarrow B$ be some implication over M .
2. Suppose $M \not\models A \rightarrow B$.
3. Then $A \subseteq M$ and $B \not\subseteq M$
4. Contradiction, since $A, B \subseteq M$

□

Proof: The intersection of any elements in $Mod(L)$ is also in $Mod(L)$.

1. Let $X, Y \in Mod(L)$,
2. Assume $X \cap Y \notin Mod(L)$,
3. Then, for some $A \rightarrow B \in L$, $X \cap Y \not\models A \rightarrow B$,
4. $X \cap Y \subseteq A$ and $X \cap Y \not\subseteq B$.
5. But $Mod(L)$ is such that $\forall m \in Mod(L), A \subseteq m \implies B \subseteq m$.
6. If $X \cap Y \subseteq A$ then $X \cap Y \subseteq B$.
7. Thus, $X \cap Y \in Mod(L)$

□

The above proves that $Mod(L)$ is a closure system on M . (From the definition in 2) If L is the set of all implications of a formal context, then $Mod(L)$ is the system of all concept intents.

Since $Mod(L)$ is a closure system, we have a closure operator $X \mapsto L(X)$, which can be described in two ways.

$$X^{\mathcal{L}} := X \cup \bigcup \{B | A \rightarrow B \in \mathcal{L}, A \subseteq X\}.$$

We then keep applying $X^{\mathcal{L}}$ until we get a fixed point $\mathcal{L}(X) := X^{\mathcal{L} \dots \mathcal{L}}$ with $\mathcal{L}(X)^{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L}(X)$.

Alternatively, we define the closure operator as $\mathcal{L}(X) := \bigcap \{Y | X \subseteq Y \subseteq M, Y \in Mod(L)\}$

These two definitions are equivalent; the first one is an iterative definition, which says: given a subset of M , X - keep applying all the implications from \mathcal{L} until we reach a fixed point. The second definition says that we define the closure of X as the intersection between all the models of \mathcal{L} which contain X .

3.3 When does an implication follow from other ones?

Let \mathcal{L} be a set of implications, and $A \rightarrow B$ an implication over M . How do we know if $\mathcal{L} \models A \rightarrow B$. Or, how do we know if an implication follows semantically from a set of implications? If every subset of \mathcal{L} which respects \mathcal{L} also respects $A \rightarrow B$.

Proof: $\mathcal{L} \models A \rightarrow B \iff B \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A)$

$\mathcal{L} \models A \rightarrow B \Rightarrow B \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A)$

1. Assume $B \not\subseteq \mathcal{L}(A)$
2. Then, $\exists Y \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{L})$ s.t. $A \subseteq Y$ and $B \not\subseteq Y$.
3. $Y \not\models A \rightarrow B$ and $Y \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{L})$
4. Contradiction, since $\mathcal{L} \models A \rightarrow B$

$B \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A) \Rightarrow \mathcal{L} \models A \rightarrow B$ by contrapositive.

1. Assume $\mathcal{L} \not\models A \rightarrow B$
2. Then, there exists some element $I \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{L})$ with $A \subseteq I$ and $B \not\subseteq I$.
3. By inspection, $I \in \{Y \mid A \subseteq Y \subseteq M, Y \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{L})\}$
4. Which would then mean that $B \not\subseteq \bigcap \{Y \mid A \subseteq Y \subseteq M, Y \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{L})\}$

□