

Prem A. Jethwa

1001861810

- Assignment 3 -

* Task 1:

Part a:

KB does entail S_1 , because as per the entailment rule, if KB is true for any state, S_1 is true too and if KB is false for any state, S_1 is either true or false.

$$\therefore KB \models S_1$$

Part b:

$\neg(\neg KB)$ does not entail $\neg(\neg S_1)$. Because as per entailment conditions and also the given truth table; it can be concluded that if the truth value are negated, there are some states where the truth value of KB is true, S_1 would be false which doesn't satisfy entailment. Hence $\neg(\neg KB) \not\models \neg(\neg S_1)$

$\neg(\neg KB)$	$\neg(\neg S_1)$
False	False
True	False
False	False
True	False
True	True
True	True
False	False
True	True

* Task 2:

Cases when Knowledge base is FALSE.

Case 1: When A is true, B is false, C is true, D is false

Case 2: When A is false, B is false, C is true, D is true

Build a statement which is only false in the given models and true otherwise.

$$\Gamma[(A \wedge \neg B \wedge C \wedge \neg D) \vee (\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge C \wedge D)]$$

Corollary to CNF,

- Apply DeMorgan's;

$$\neg(A \wedge \neg B \wedge C \wedge \neg D) \wedge \neg(\neg A \wedge \neg B \wedge C \wedge D)$$

$$(\neg A \vee \neg(\neg B) \vee \neg C \vee \neg(\neg D)) \wedge (\neg(\neg A) \vee \neg(\neg B) \vee \neg C \wedge \neg D)$$

- Remove Double Negation;

$$(\neg A \vee B \vee \neg C \vee D) \wedge (A \vee B \vee \neg C \vee \neg D)$$

which is in CNF

A	B	C	D	R B
T	T	T	T	T
T	T	T	F	T
T	T	F	T	T
T	T	F	F	T
T	F	T	T	T
T	F	T	F	F
T	F	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T
F	T	T	F	T
F	T	F	T	T
F	T	F	F	T
F	F	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	T
F	F	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T

$\text{CNF}(RB) : r(\text{Row 6}) \wedge r(\text{Row 13})$

* Task 3 -

a) Forward Chaining:

For forward chaining the KB and α both need to be in HORN form.

KB

$$A \rightarrow C$$

$$B \leftrightarrow C$$

$$D \rightarrow A$$

$$(B \wedge E) \rightarrow G$$

$$B \rightarrow F$$

$$E$$

$$D$$

$\not\models \alpha$

Converting KB to HORN form

$$A \rightarrow C$$

$$B \rightarrow C \quad C \rightarrow B$$

$$D \rightarrow A$$

$$(B \wedge E) \rightarrow G$$

$$B \rightarrow F$$

$$E$$

$$D$$

$\not\models \alpha$

Forward Chaining Steps:

$$\frac{D \quad D \rightarrow A}{A}$$

$$\frac{A \quad A \rightarrow C}{C}$$

$$\frac{B \quad B \rightarrow C}{C}$$

$$\frac{B \quad E \quad (B \wedge E) \rightarrow G}{G}$$

α derived from KB
 $\therefore KB \models \alpha$

b. Backward Chaining:

For backward chaining as well, the KB and Σ both need to be in HORN form.

KB

$$A \rightarrow C$$

$$B \leftrightarrow C$$

$$D \rightarrow A$$

$$(B \wedge E) \rightarrow G$$

$$B \rightarrow F$$

$$E$$

$$D$$

~~2/a~~

→ Converting KB to HORN form

$$A \rightarrow C$$

$$B \rightarrow C \quad C \rightarrow B$$

$$D \rightarrow A$$

$$(B \wedge E) \rightarrow G$$

$$B \rightarrow F$$

$$E$$

$$D$$

~~2/g~~

For backward chaining we need to find the dependent literals and add them to the stack.

It is done as follows:

A
C
B
G

→ D & E already there
∴ not added in stack.

Steps:

(I) $D \quad D \rightarrow A$

A

C

B

G

(II) $A \quad A \rightarrow C$

C

B

G

(III) $C \quad C \rightarrow B$

B

G

(IV) $B \quad E \quad (B \wedge E) \rightarrow G$



φ derived from KB $\therefore KB \models \varphi$

c. Resolution:

The KB must be in CNF form for applying resolution
 $(A \rightarrow C) \wedge (B \leftrightarrow C) \wedge (D \rightarrow A) \wedge ((B \wedge E) \rightarrow G) \wedge (B \rightarrow F) \wedge E \wedge D$
↳ given

$(\neg A \vee C) \wedge (B \rightarrow C) \wedge (C \rightarrow B) \wedge (\neg D \vee A) \wedge [\neg(B \wedge E) \vee G] \wedge$
 $(\neg B \vee F) \wedge E \wedge D \dots \text{(eliminating } \rightarrow \text{ and } \leftrightarrow\text{)}.$

$(\neg A \vee c) \wedge (\neg B \vee c) \wedge (\neg C \vee B) \wedge (\neg D \vee A) \wedge [(\neg B \vee \neg E) \vee G] \wedge$
 $(\neg B \vee F) \wedge E \wedge D \dots \dots$ (eliminating \rightarrow using D'Morgan)

$(\neg A \vee c) \wedge (\neg B \vee c) \wedge (\neg C \vee B) \wedge (\neg D \vee A) \wedge [\neg B \vee \neg E \vee \neg G] \wedge$
 $(\neg B \vee F) \wedge E \wedge D \dots \dots$ (CNF form).

Applying Resolution:

$(\neg A \vee c) \quad (\neg B \vee c) \quad (\neg C \vee B) \quad (\neg D \vee A) \quad (\neg B \vee \neg E \vee \neg G) \quad (\neg B \vee F)$

$E \quad D \quad \neg G$
 (complement of G added)

$(\neg A \vee c)(\neg C \vee B) \quad (\neg A \vee c)(\neg D \vee A) \quad (\neg B \vee c)(\neg C \vee B) \quad (\neg C \vee B)(\neg B \vee \neg E \vee \neg G)$
 $(\neg A \vee B) \quad (C \vee \neg D) \quad (\neg B \vee B)(C \vee \neg C) \quad (\neg C \vee \neg E \vee \neg G)$

$(\neg C \vee B)(\neg B \vee F) \quad (\neg C \vee B)(C \vee \neg D) \quad (\neg D \vee A) \quad A \quad (\neg A \vee c)$
 $(\neg C \vee F) \quad (B \vee \neg D) \quad A \quad C$

$C(\neg C \vee B) \quad B(\neg B \vee \neg E \vee \neg G) \quad E(\neg E \vee G) \quad G(\neg G)$
 $B \quad (\neg E \vee \neg G) \quad G \quad \boxed{}$



empty clause

\therefore we can say using Resolution for proof
 by contradiction $\neg B \vee \neg \alpha \rightarrow$ is
 unsatisfiable

ie. $\neg B \models \alpha$ ($\neg B$ entails α)

* Task 4:

Part a -

$J \rightarrow \text{John}$: $M \rightarrow \text{Mary}$; $M \rightarrow \text{Monday}$ [constants]

Relations:

$\text{Rain}(x) \rightarrow$ It rains on x ,

$\text{Check}(x, y) \rightarrow x$ gives y \$100 check on Tuesday

$\text{Mows}(x) \rightarrow x$ mows lawn on Wednesday.

Contract:

If it rains on Monday, then John must give Mary a check for \$100 on Tuesday.

$\boxed{\text{Rains}(\text{Mon}) \rightarrow \text{Check}(\text{J}, \text{M})}$

If John gives Mary a check for \$100 on Tuesday, Mary must mow the lawn on Wednesday.

$\boxed{\text{Check}(\text{J}, \text{M}) \rightarrow \text{Mows}(\text{M})}$

Part b :

Events :

It did not rain on Monday $\rightarrow \neg \text{Rains(Mon)}$,
John gave Mary a check for \$100 on Tuesday
 $\rightarrow \text{Check(J,M)}$
Mary mowed the lawn on Wednesday $\rightarrow \text{Mows(M)}$

Logical Statement :

$$(\neg \text{Rains(Mon)} \wedge \text{Check(J,M)} \wedge \text{Mows(M)})$$

Part c :

All possible combinations of relations and constants defined above:

$$A_1 \rightarrow \text{Rains(J)} ; A_2 \rightarrow \text{Rains(M)} ; A_3 \rightarrow \text{Rains(Mon)}.$$

$$B_1 \rightarrow \text{Mows(J)} ; B_2 \rightarrow \text{Mows(M)} ; B_3 \rightarrow \text{Mows(Mon)}.$$

$$C_1 \rightarrow \text{Check(J,J)} ; C_2 \rightarrow \text{Check(J,M)} ; C_3 \rightarrow \text{Check(J,Mon)}$$

$$C_4 \rightarrow \text{Check(M,J)} ; C_5 \rightarrow \text{Check(M,M)} ; C_6 \rightarrow \text{Check(M,Mon)}$$

$$C_7 \rightarrow \text{Check(Mon,J)} ; C_8 \rightarrow \text{Check(Mon,M)} ; C_9 \rightarrow \text{Check(Mon,Mon)}$$

Contract :

If it rains on Monday, then John must give Mary a check for \$100 on Tuesday.

$$A_3 \rightarrow C_2$$

If John gives Mary a check for \$100 on Tuesday, Mary must mow the lawn on Wednesday.

$$C_2 \rightarrow B_2$$

Events:

It did not rain on Monday $\rightarrow \neg A_3$

John gave Mary a check for \$100 on Tuesday
 $\rightarrow C_2$.

Mary mowed the lawn on Wednesday $\rightarrow B_2$.

Part d:

Here we need to check if events entail contract. The events and contract can be written as follows:

Events: $(\neg A_3) \wedge C_2 \wedge B_2$

Contract: $(A_3 \rightarrow C_2) \wedge (C_2 \rightarrow B_2)$

Checking if events entail contract using Truth Table.

A_3	B_2	C_2	$(\neg A_3) \wedge C_2 \wedge B_2$	$(A_3 \rightarrow C_2) \wedge (C_2 \rightarrow B_2)$
T	T	T	F	T
T	T	F	F	F
T	F	T	F	F
T	F	F	F	F
F	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	F	F
F	F	T	F	T
F	F	F	F	T

Here we can see that for all values where Events is True, the contract is True as well.

\therefore Events \models Contract.

\therefore Contract is not violated.

* Task 5:

I Taller (x , John) ; Taller (Bob , y)

\therefore Unifier Θ can be $\rightarrow \{x|Bob, y|John\}$

II Taller (y , Mother (x)) ; Taller (Bob , Mother (Bob))

Here y can be Bob . So that 1st part is same.

For 2nd part, Mother (x) = Mother (Bob).

$\therefore x = Bob$ or $x = \text{Sibling } (Bob)$.

\therefore Unifier Θ can be $\rightarrow \{x|Bob, y|John\}^{\text{Bob}} \text{ or }$
 $\{x|\text{Sibling } (Bob), y|Bob\}$

III Taller (Sam, Mary) ; Shorter (x , Sam)

Assuming that shorter (x , Sam) means x is shorter than Sam & Taller (Sam, Mary) means Sam is taller than Mary.

Here 2nd predicate implies that Sam is taller than x .

\therefore we can say that Taller (Sam, x) have a unifier \rightarrow which is true.

$$\Theta = \{x|Mary\}$$

\therefore Taller (Sam, Mary) & Taller (Sam, x)
have a unifier $\rightarrow \Theta = \{x|Mary\}$

IV. Shorter(x, Bob) ; Shorter(y, z).

An unifier exists for above two predicates

$$\rightarrow \theta = \{x|y, z|Bob\}$$

V. Shorter(Bob, John) ; Shorter(x, Mary)

Here even if we substitute x as Bob, we would still end up with two different predicates.

\therefore We can say that no unifier exists for these 2 predicates.

* Task 6 -

Constants:

P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, B , Left, Right

Predicates:

On (x, y) : x is on y bank

IsBoat (x) : x is boat

IsChild (x) : x is child

Initial State:

On (P_1 , Left) \wedge On (P_2 , Left) \wedge On (P_3 , Left) \wedge
 On (P_4 , Left) \wedge On (B , Left) \wedge IsBoat (B) \wedge
 IsChild (P_3) \wedge IsChild (P_4).

Goal state:

On (P_1 , Right) \wedge On (P_2 , Right) \wedge On (P_3 , Right) \wedge
 On (P_4 , Right).

Actions:

1. Move-one-left-to-right (x, y):

Move one person x from left to right using
 boat y .

PRE: On (x , Left) \wedge On (y , Left) \wedge IsBoat (y).

EFF: On (x , Right) \wedge On (y , Right) \wedge \neg On (x , Left) \wedge
 \neg On (y , Left)

2. Move-one-right2left (x, y):

Move one person x from right to left using boat y.

PRE : On(x, Right) \wedge On(y, Right) \wedge IsBoat(y)

EFF : On(x, left) \wedge On(y, left) \wedge \neg On(x, Right) \wedge
 \neg On(y, Right).

3. Move-two-left2right (x, y, z):

Move adult/child x & child y from left to right using boat z.

PRE : On(x, left) \wedge On(y, left) \wedge On(z, left) \wedge
IsBoat(z) \wedge IsChild(y).

EFF : On(x, Right) \wedge On(y, Right) \wedge On(z, Right) \wedge
 \neg On(x, Left) \wedge \neg On(y, Left) \wedge \neg On(z, Left).

4. Move-two-right2left (x, y, z):

Move adult/child x & child y from right to left using boat z.

PRE : On(x, Right) \wedge On(y, Right) \wedge On(z, Right) \wedge
IsBoat(z) \wedge IsChild(y).

EFF : On(x, Left) \wedge On(y, Left) \wedge On(z, Left) \wedge
 \neg On(x, Right) \wedge \neg On(y, Right) \wedge \neg On(z, Right)

A possible Plan:

Plan:

Move - two - left 2 right (P_1, P_2, B)

Move - one - right 2 left (P_2, B)

Move - two - left 2 right (P_3, P_2, B)

Move - one - right 2 left (P_2, B)

Move - two - Left 2 right (P_4, P_2, B)

Status after taking action:

Left Side	Right Side	
P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, B	P_1, P_2, B	\rightarrow (Initial State)
P_3, P_4	P_1	
P_2, P_3, P_4, B	P_1, P_2, P_3, B	
P_4	P_1, P_3	
P_2, P_4, B	P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, B	(Goal)

* Task 7:

Execution Monitoring | Online replanning:

In this type of planning we do not need to modify the action definitions. We can keep them as they were in the deterministic case.

Justification -

In this type of planning, instead of modifying the action definitions we do a few additional things before performing any action to check if the state of the environment is same as it is expected to perform the action.

There are 3 ways to do so i.e. Action monitoring, Plan monitoring & goal monitoring.
In the given scenario, there is an unexpected environment change happening i.e. the boat can be blown off course if there is one person in the boat which can be used as an advantage to come up with a better plan.
So the best way to monitor the world would be goal Monitoring.

Conditional Planning:

In this type of planning we need to consider the unexpected changes in the world in the action definitions. Following are the only required changes in the two action definition.

Move-one-left2Right (x,y) :

Move one person x from left to right using boat y.

PRE : $\text{on}(x, \text{left}) \wedge \text{on}(y, \text{left}) \wedge \text{IsBoat}(y)$.

EFF : $[\text{on}(x, \text{Right}) \wedge \text{on}(y, \text{Right}) \wedge \neg \text{on}(x, \text{Left}) \wedge \neg \text{on}(y, \text{Left})] \vee [\text{on}(x, \text{Left}) \wedge \text{on}(y, \text{Left})]$

Move-one-right2left (x,y) :

Move one person x from right to left using boat y.

PRE : $\text{on}(x, \text{Right}) \wedge \text{on}(y, \text{Right}) \wedge \text{IsBoat}(y)$.

EFF : $[\text{on}(x, \text{Left}) \wedge \text{on}(y, \text{Left}) \wedge \neg \text{on}(x, \text{Right}) \wedge \neg \text{on}(y, \text{Right})] \vee [\text{on}(x, \text{Right}) \wedge \text{on}(y, \text{Right})]$

Here, these were the only two location action definitions that required change because the effects of the other two

actions won't be affected considering the given information about the uncertain world changes. (ie." if there is only one person in the boat , the boat can be blown off course and end up back on the side it originally started from").

* Task 8 -

Given:

No. of predicates, $n = 3$; each predicate takes max 4 arguments.
ie. $a \Rightarrow 1 \leq a \leq 4$

No. of constants, $m = 5$

From given information,
if no. of constants are 5 & no. of arguments
 a are $1 \leq a \leq 4$.

then no. of possible arguments for 1 predicate
can be given as,

$$5^1 \leq \text{pass-args} \leq 5^4$$

As it is given that no. of predicates = 3.

\therefore we can find no. of possible arguments
for 3 predicates as follows,

$$(3 \times 5^1) \leq \text{pass-args-3} \leq (3 \times 5^4)$$

$$15 \leq \text{pass-args-3} \leq 1875$$

Now, to find possible no. of states, we know that a predicate can be either true or false i.e. it can have 2 possible values.

$$\therefore \text{no. of states} = 2^{\text{pass-ways - 3}}$$

And thus, no. of possible stages/states is,

$$2^{15} \leq \text{no. of states} \leq 2^{1875}$$

i.e. $32768 \leq \text{no. of states} \leq 2.69 \times 10^{564}$