

Towards a Notion of Defeasibility in Formal Concept Analysis

Lucas Carr

06.06.24

1 Introduction

2 The Initial Case

2.1 A Defeasible Formal Context

We define a defeasible formal context a $\tilde{\mathbb{K}} := (G, M, I, <)$ where G is a set of objects, M a set of attributes, I an incidence relation on $G \times M$ expressed as gIm for $g \in G, m \in M$ (exactly as we see with typical formal contexts); and, $<$ a strict partial order over G .

2.2 The Derivation Operators

Over the defeasible formal context $\tilde{\mathbb{K}} = (G, M, I, <)$ we introduce two operators; (\underline{A}°) and $(\underline{X}^\circ)^\circ$, $X \subseteq M$. Before we define these operators, we introduce a definition of minimality over objects in G .

$$\text{Min}(A) := \{g \in A \mid \nexists h \in A, h < g\} \quad (1)$$

We can now define the respective operators, $A \subseteq G, B \subseteq M$.

$$\underline{A}^\circ := \{m \in M \mid \forall g \in \text{Min}(A), gIm\} \quad (2)$$

$$\underline{B}^\circ := \{g \in G \mid \forall m \in B, \nexists h \in G, h < g, gIm\} \quad (3)$$

(1) Describes the minimally ranked objects in G . From here, (2) describes an operation from a set of objects $A \subseteq G$ to the attributes shared by the minimal elements in A . (3) Is an operation from a set of attributes $B \subseteq M$ which results in the *minimal* set of objects which have all the attributes in B .

We can apply these operators twice, $(\underline{B}^\circ)^\circ$ where $A \subseteq M$; this procedure would give the set of attributes shared by the minimal objects which satisfy the properties B . Conversely, $(\underline{A}^\circ)^\circ$ where $A \subseteq G$ describes the minimal set of objects whichs satisfy the properties satisfied by all the objects in A .

For an example, consider the defeasible context $\tilde{\mathbb{K}} = \{G, M, I, <\}$, with $o_i < o_j$ if $i < j$ for all objects.

	m_1	m_2	m_3	m_4
o_1	×	×		×
o_2	×	×	×	
o_3		×	×	×
o_4		×		×

Figure 1: Defeasible Formal Context

Given $A = \{m_2, m_3\}$, we have that $\underline{A}^\circ = \{o_1\}$, and $(\underline{A}^\circ)^\circ = \{m_1, m_2, m_4\}$. Conversely, given $B = \{o_3, o_4\}$, $\underline{B}^\circ = \{m_2, m_3, m_4\}$, $(\underline{B}^\circ)^\circ = \{o_3\}$.¹

¹I acknowledge that this second example could just be replaced with $\text{Min}(B)$, I will think more about this.

2.2.1 Properties of $(\cdot^\circ)^\circ$

nonmonotonic: $A \subseteq B \not\Rightarrow (\underline{A}^\circ)^\circ \subseteq (\underline{B}^\circ)^\circ$

Assume $(\cdot^\circ)^\circ$ were monotonic; then $A \subseteq B \Rightarrow (\underline{A}^\circ)^\circ \subseteq (\underline{B}^\circ)^\circ$.

From Figure 1, if we take the oo-operation on $A_1 = \{m_1, m_2\}$, we get $(\underline{A_2}^\circ)^\circ = \{o_1\}^\circ = \{m_1, m_2, m_4\}$. Then, on $A_2 = \{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$, we have $(\underline{A_2}^\circ)^\circ = \{o_2\}^\circ = \{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$. Obviously, we have $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ but $(\underline{A_1}^\circ)^\circ \not\subseteq (\underline{A_2}^\circ)^\circ$. Thus, the oo-operator is nonmonotonic.

extensive: $X \subseteq (\underline{X}^\circ)^\circ$

Assume that $(\cdot^\circ)^\circ$ is not extensive; then, there exists some $X \not\subseteq (\underline{X}^\circ)^\circ$. Let $Y \subseteq G$ such that $Y = \underline{X}^\circ$. Then \underline{Y}° is the set of properties shared by all minimal objects in Y (this minimal requirement is redundant since all elements of Y are minimal by construction). Observe that $\underline{Y}^\circ \equiv (\underline{X}^\circ)^\circ$. Since $X \not\subseteq (\underline{X}^\circ)^\circ$, there must be some $y \in Y$ such that $y^\circ \cap X \neq X$. That is, there is some object in Y which does not have all the attributes from X . However, this is a contradiction, since y would not be in Y since it is not the case that $\forall m \in X, yIm$ - which is our definition of (\cdot°) .

idempotent: $(\underline{A}^\circ)^\circ = ((\underline{A}^\circ)^\circ)^\circ$